

Bookmarks

- [Westcott and Hort's •Introduction](#)
 - [INTRODUCTION](#)
 - [PART I](#)
 - [A. 6-14. Transmission by writing](#)
 - [C. 20-22. History of this edition](#)
 - [PART II](#)
 - [A. 25-27. Intrinsic Probability](#)
 - [B. 28-37. Transcriptional Probability](#)
 - [SECTION III. GENEALOGICAL EVIDENCE 49-76](#)
 - [B. 54-57. Genealogy and Number](#)
 - [E. 66-72. Applications of genealogy](#)
 - [PART III](#)
 - [A. 98-106. Greek MSS](#)
 - [B. 107-122. Versions](#)
 - [C. 123-126. Fathers](#)
 - [A. 170-176. Western characteristics](#)
 - [C. 181-184. Alexandrian characteristics](#)
 - [D. 185-187. Syrian characteristics](#)
 - [B. 231-212. Texts found in Greek MSS](#)
 - [C. 213-219. Texts found in Versions](#)
 - [D. 220-223. Texts found in Greek Fathers](#)
 - [PART IV](#)
 - [B. 378-392.](#)

[First](#) [Next ->](#)

Westcott and Hort's *Introduction*

Cambridge
PRINTED BY C.J. CLAY M.A.
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE NEW TESTAMENT
IN THE ORIGINAL GREEK

THE TEXT REVISED BY
BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT D.D.
AND
FENTON JOHN ANTHONY HORT D.D.

INTRODUCTION
APPENDIX

Cambridge and London
MACMILLAN AND COMPANY
1881

All rights reserved

IPSA SUMMA IN LIBRIS OMNIBUS SALVA EST EX DEI
PROVIDENTIA: SED TAMEN
ILLAM IPSAM PROVIDENTIAM NON DEBEMUS EO
ALLEGARE UT A LIMA QUAM
ACCURATISSIMA DETERREAMUR. EORUM QUI
PRAECESSERE NEQUE DEFECTUM
EXAGITABIMUS NEQUE AD EUM NOS ADSTRINGEMUS;
EORUM QUI SEQUENTUR
PROFECTUM NEQUE POSTULABIMUS IN PRAESENTI
NEQUE PRAECLUDEMUS IN
POSTERUM: QUAE LIBET AETAS PRO SUA FACULTATE
VERITATEM INVESTIGARE ET
AMPLECTI FIDELITATEMQUE IN MINIMIS ET MAXIMIS
PRAESTARE DEBET.

BENGEL MDCCXXXIV

[Textual notation](#)

■ [C. 393-404.](#)

[Orthography](#)

■ [F. 423, 424.](#)

[Conclusion](#)

■ [APPENDIX](#)

Page 1

[First](#) [Next ->](#)

[First](#) [Next ->](#)

Westcott and Hort's *Introduction*

Cambridge

PRINTED BY C.J. CLAY M.A.

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE NEW TESTAMENT

IN THE ORIGINAL GREEK

THE TEXT REVISED BY

BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT D.D.

AND

FENTON JOHN ANTHONY HORT D.D.

INTRODUCTION

APPENDIX

Cambridge and London

MACMILLAN AND COMPANY

1881

All rights reserved

IPSA SUMMA IN LIBRIS OMNIBUS SALVA EST EX DEI PROVIDENTIA: SED
TAMEN

ILLAM IPSAM PROVIDENTIAM NON DEBEMUS EO ALLEGARE UT A LIMA QUAM
ACCURATISSIMA DETERREAMUR. EORUM QUI PRAECESSERE NEQUE DEFECTUM
EXAGITABIMUS NEQUE AD EUM NOS ADSTRINGEMUS; EORUM QUI SEQUENTUR
PROFECTUM NEQUE POSTULABIMUS IN PRAESENTI NEQUE PRAECLUDEMUS IN
POSTERUM: QUAE LIBET AETAS PRO SUA FACULTATE VERITATEM INVESTIGARE
ET

AMPLECTI FIDELITATEMQUE IN MINIMIS ET MAXIMIS PRAESTARE DEBET.

BENGEL MDCCXXXIV

[First](#) [Next ->](#)

INTRODUCTION

§1. THIS edition is an attempt to present exactly the original words of the New Testament, so far as they can now be determined from surviving documents. Since the testimony delivered by the several documents or witnesses is full of complex variation, the original text cannot be elicited from it without the use of criticism, that is, of a process of distinguishing and setting aside those readings which have originated at some link in the chain of transmission. This Introduction is intended to be a succinct account (I) of the reasons why criticism is still necessary for the text of the New Testament; (II) of what we hold to be the true grounds and methods of criticism generally; (III) of the leading facts in the documentary history of the New Testament which appear to us to supply the textual critic with secure guidance; and (IV) of the manner in which we have ourselves endeavoured to embody the results of criticism in the present text.

§2. The office of textual criticism, it cannot be too clearly understood at the outset, is always secondary and always negative. It is always secondary, since it comes into [page 2] play only where the text transmitted by the existing documents appears to be in error, either because they differ from each other in what they read, or for some other sufficient reason. With regard to the great bulk of the words of the New Testament, as of most other ancient writings there is no variation or other ground of doubt, and therefore no room for textual criticism; and here therefore an editor is merely a transcriber. The same may be said with substantial truth respecting those various readings which have never been received, and in all probability never will be received, into any printed text. The proportion of words virtually accepted on all hands as raised above doubt is very great, not less, on a rough computation, than seven eighths of the whole. The remaining eighth therefore, formed in great part by changes of order and other comparative trivialities, constitutes the whole area of criticism. If the principles

followed in the present edition are sound, this area may be very greatly reduced. Recognising to the full the duty of abstinence from peremptory decision in cases where the evidence leaves the judgement in suspense between two or more readings we find that, setting aside differences of orthography, the words in our opinion still subject to doubt only make up about one sixtieth of the whole New Testament. In this second estimate the proportion of comparatively trivial variations is beyond measure larger than in the former; so that the amount of what can in any sense be called substantial variation is but a small fraction of the whole residuary variation, and can hardly form more than a thousandth part of the entire text. Since there is reason to suspect that an exaggerated impression prevails as to the extent of possible textual corruption in the New

Page 2

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

exaggerated impression prevails as to the extent of possible textual corruption in the New Testament, which might seem to be confirmed by language [page 3] used here and there in the following pages, we desire to make it clearly understood beforehand how much of the New Testament stands in no need of a textual critic's labours.

§3. Again, textual criticism is always negative, because its final aim is virtually nothing more than the detection and rejection of error. Its progress consists not in the growing perfection of an ideal in the future, but in approximation towards complete ascertainment of definite facts of the past, that is, towards recovering an exact copy of what was actually written on parchment or papyrus by the author of the book or his amanuensis. Had all intervening transcriptions been perfectly accurate, there could be no error and no variation in existing documents. Where there is variation, there must be error in at least all variants but one; and the primary work of textual criticism is merely to discriminate the erroneous variants from the true.

§4. In the case indeed of many ill preserved ancient writings textual criticism has a further and a much more difficult task, that of detecting and removing corruptions affecting the whole of the existing documentary evidence. But in the New Testament the abundance, variety, and comparative excellence of the documents confines this task of pure `emendation' within so narrow limits that we may leave it out of sight for the present, and confine our attention to that principal operation of textual criticism which is required whenever we have to decide between the conflicting evidence of various documents.

PART I THE NEED OF CRITICISM FOR THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

§5. The answer to the question why criticism is still necessary for the text of the New Testament is contained in the history of its transmission, first by writing and

then by printing, to the present time. For our purpose it will be enough to recapitulate first in general terms the elementary phenomena of transmission by writing generally; with some of the special conditions affecting the New Testament, and then the chief incidents in the history of the New Testament as a printed book which have determined the form in which it appears in existing editions. For fuller particulars, on this and other subjects not needing to be treated at any length here, we must refer the reader once for all to books that are professedly storehouses of information.

A. 6-14. Transmission by writing

§6. No autograph of any book of the New Testament is known or believed to be still in existence. The originals must have been early lost, for they are mentioned by no ecclesiastical writer, although there were many motives for appealing to them, had they been forthcoming, in the second and third centuries: one or two passages have sometimes been supposed to refer to them, but certainly by a misinterpretation. The books of the New Testament have had to share the fate of other ancient writings in being copied again and again [page 5] during more than fourteen centuries down to the invention of printing and its application to Greek literature.

Page 3

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

fourteen centuries down to the invention of printing and its application to Greek literature.

§7. Every transcription of any kind of writing involves the chance of the introduction of some errors: and even if the transcript is revised by comparison with its exemplar or immediate original, there is no absolute security that all the errors will be corrected. When the transcript becomes itself the parent of other copies, one or more, its errors are for the most part reproduced. Those only are likely to be removed which at once strike the eye of a transcriber as mere blunders destructive of sense, and even in these cases he will often go astray in making what seems to him the obvious correction. In addition to inherited deviations from the original, each fresh transcript is liable to contain fresh errors, to be transmitted in like manner to its own descendants.

§8. The nature and amount of the corruption of text thus generated and propagated depends to a great extent on the peculiarities of the book itself, the estimation in which it is held, and the uses to which it is applied. The rate cannot always be uniform: the professional training of scribes can rarely obliterate individual differences of accuracy and conscientiousness, and moreover the current standard of exactness will vary at different times and places and in different grades of cultivation. The number of transcriptions, and consequent opportunities of corruption, cannot be accurately measured by difference of date, for at any date a transcript might be made either from a contemporary manuscript or from one written any number of centuries before. But these inequalities do not render it less true that repeated transcription involves multiplication of error; and the consequent presumption that a relatively late text is likely to be a relatively corrupt text [page 6] is found true on the application of all available tests in an overwhelming proportion of the extant MSS in which ancient literature has been preserved.

§9. This general proposition respecting the average results of transcription requires to be at once qualified and extended by the statement of certain more

limited conditions of transmission with which the New Testament is specially though by no means exclusively concerned. Their full bearing will not be apparent till they have been explained in some detail further on, but for the sake of clearness they must be mentioned here.

§10. The act of transcription may under different circumstances involve different processes. In strictness it is the exact reproduction of a given series of words in a given order. Where this purpose is distinctly recognised or assumed, there can be no errors but those of workmanship, 'clerical errors', as they are called; and by sedulous cultivation, under the pressure of religious, literary, or professional motives, a high standard of immunity from even clerical errors has at times been attained. On the other hand, pure clerical errors, that is, mechanical confusions of ear or eye alone, pass imperceptibly into errors due to unconscious mental action, as any one may ascertain by registering and analysing his own mistakes in transcription; so that it is quite possible to intend nothing but faithful transcription, and yet to introduce changes due to interpretation of sense. Now, as these hidden intrusions of mental action are specially capable of being restrained by conscious vigilance, so on the other hand they are liable to multiply spontaneously where there is no distinct perception that a transcriber's duty is to transcribe and nothing more; and this perception is rarer and more dependent on [page 7] training than might be supposed. In its absence unconscious passes further into conscious mental action; and thus transcription may come to include tolerably free modification of language and even rearrangement of material. Transcription of this kind need involve no deliberate preference of

Page 4

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

rearrangement of material. Transcription of this kind need involve no deliberate preference of sense to language; the intention is still to transcribe language: but, as there is no special concentration of regard upon the language as having an intrinsic sacredness of whatever kind, the instinctive feeling for sense cooperates largely in the result.

§11. It was predominantly though not exclusively under such conditions as these last that the transcription of the New Testament was carried on during the earliest centuries, as a comparison of the texts of that period proves beyond doubt. The conception of new Scriptures standing on the same footing as the Scriptures of the Old Testament was slow and unequal in its growth, more especially while the traditions of the apostolic and immediately succeeding generations still lived; and the reverence paid to the apostolic writings, even to the most highly and most widely venerated among them, was not of a kind that exacted a scrupulous jealousy as to their text as distinguished from their substance. As was to be expected, the language of the historical books was treated with more freedom than the rest: but even the Epistles, and still more the Apocalypse, bear abundant traces of a similar type of transcription. After a while changed feelings and changed circumstances put an end to the early textual laxity, and thenceforward its occurrence is altogether exceptional; so that the later corruptions are almost wholly those incident to transcription in the proper sense, errors arising from careless performance of a scribe's work, not from an imperfect conception of it. [page 8] While therefore the greater literalness of later transcription arrested for the most part the progress of the bolder forms of alteration, on the other hand it could perpetuate only what it received. As witnesses to the apostolic text the later texts can be valuable or otherwise only according as their parent texts had or had not passed comparatively unscathed through the earlier times.

§12. Again, in books widely read transmission ceases after a while to retain exclusively the form of diverging ramification. Manuscripts are written in which

there is an eclectic fusion of the texts of different exemplars, either by the simultaneous use of more than one at the time of transcription, or by the incorporation of various readings noted in the margin of a single exemplar from other copies, or by a scribe's conscious or unconscious recollections of a text differing from that which lies before him. This mixture, as it may be conveniently called, of texts previously independent has taken place on a large scale in the New Testament. Within narrow geographical areas it was doubtless at work from a very early time, and it would naturally extend itself with the increase of communication between distant churches. There is reason to suspect that its greatest activity on a large scale began in the second half of the third century, the interval of peace between Gallienus's edict of toleration and the outbreak of the last persecution. At all events it was in full operation in the fourth century, the time which from various causes exercised the chief influence over the many centuries of comparatively simple transmission that followed.

§13. The gain or loss to the intrinsic purity of texts from mixture with other texts is from the nature of the [page 9] case indeterminable. In most instances there would be both gain and loss; but both would be fortuitous, and they might bear to each other every conceivable proportion. Textual purity, as far as can be judged from the extant literature, attracted hardly any interest. There is no evidence to shew that care was generally taken to choose out for transcription the exemplars having the highest claims to be regarded as authentic, if indeed the requisite knowledge and skill were forthcoming. Humanly speaking, the only influence which can have

knowledge and skill were forthcoming. Humanly speaking, the only influence which can have interfered to an appreciable extent with mere chance and convenience in the selection between existing readings, or in the combination of them, was supplied by the preferences of untrained popular taste, always an unsafe guide in the discrimination of relative originality of text. The complexity introduced into the transmission of ancient texts by mixture needs no comment. Where the mixture has been accompanied or preceded by such licence in transcription as we find in the New Testament, the complexity can evidently only increase the precariousness of printed texts formed without taking account of the variations of text which preceded mixture.

§14. Various causes have interfered both with the preservation of ancient MSS and with their use as exemplars to any considerable extent. Multitudes of the MSS of the New Testament written in the first three centuries were destroyed at the beginning of the fourth, and there can be no doubt that multitudes of those written in the fourth and two following centuries met a similar fate in the various invasions of East and West. But violence was not the only agent of destruction. We know little about the external features of the MSS of the ages of [page 10] persecution: but what little we do know suggests that they were usually small, containing only single books or groups of books, and not seldom, there is reason to suspect, of comparatively coarse material; altogether shewing little similarity to the stately tomes of the early Christian empire, of which we possess specimens, and likely enough to be despised in comparison in an age which exulted in outward signs of the new order of things. Another cause of neglect at a later period was doubtless obsolescence of form. When once the separation of words had become habitual, the old continuous mode of writing would be found troublesome to the eye, and even the old `uncial' or rounded capital letters would at length prove an obstacle to use. Had biblical manuscripts of the uncial ages been habitually treated with ordinary respect, much more invested with high authority, they could not have been so often turned into `palimpsests', that is, had their ancient writing obliterated that the vellum might be employed for fresh writing, not always biblical. It must also be remembered that in the ordinary

course of things the most recent manuscripts would at all times be the most numerous, and therefore the most generally accessible. Even if multiplication of transcripts were not always advancing, there would be a slow but continual substitution of new copies for old, partly to fill up gaps made by waste and casualties, partly by a natural impulse which could be reversed only by veneration or an archaic taste or a critical purpose. It is therefore no wonder that only a small fraction of the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament preserved to modern times were written in the uncial period, and but few of this number belong to the first five or six centuries, none [page 11] being earlier than the age of Constantine. Most uncial manuscripts are more or less fragmentary; and till lately not one was known which contained the whole New Testament un mutilated. A considerable proportion, in numbers and still more in value, have been brought to light only by the assiduous research of the last century and a half.

B. 15-18. Transmission by printed editions

§15. These various conditions affecting the manuscript text of the New Testament must be borne in mind if we would understand what was possible to be accomplished in the early printed editions, the text of which exercises directly or indirectly a scarcely credible power to the present day. At the beginning of the sixteenth century, far more than now, the few ancient documents of the sacred text were lost in the crowd of later copies; and few even of the late

Page 6

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

documents of the sacred text were lost in the crowd of later copies; and few even of the late MSS were employed, and that only as convenience dictated, without selection or deliberate criticism. The fundamental editions were those of Erasmus (Basel, 1516), and of Stunica in Cardinal Ximenes' Complutensian (Alcala) Polyglott, printed in 1514 but apparently not published till 1522. In his haste to be the first editor, Erasmus allowed himself to be guilty of strange carelessness: but neither he nor any other scholar then living could have produced a materially better text without enormous Labour, the need of which was not as yet apparent. The numerous editions which followed during the next three or four generations varied much from one another in petty details, and occasionally adopted fresh readings from MSS, chiefly of a common [page 12] late type: but the foundation and an overwhelming proportion of the text remained always Erasmanian, sometimes slightly modified on Complutensian authority; except in a few editions which had a Complutensian base. After a while this arbitrary and uncritical variation gave way to a comparative fixity equally fortuitous, having no more trustworthy basis than the external beauty of two editions brought out by famous printers, a Paris folio of 1550 edited and printed by R. Estienne, and an Elzevir (Leyden) 24mo of 1624, 1633, &c., repeating an unsatisfactory revision of Estienne's mainly Erasmanian text made by the reformer Beza. The reader of the second Elzevir edition is informed that he has before him "the text now received by all"; and thus the name 'Received Text' arose. Reprints more or less accurate of one or other of these two typographical standards constitute the traditional printed text of the New Testament even now.

§16. About the middle of the seventeenth century the preparation for effectual criticism began. The impulse proceeded from English scholars, such as Fell, Walton, and Mill; and seems to have originated in the gift of the Alexandrine MS to Charles I by Cyril Lucar, the Patriarch of Constantinople, in 1628. France contributed a powerful auxiliary in Simon, whose writings (1689-1695) had a large share in discrediting acquiescence in the accepted texts. The history of criticism from this time could hardly be made intelligible here: it will be briefly sketched further on, when explanations have been given of the task that had to be

performed, and the problems that had to be solved. In the course of the eighteenth century several imperfect and halting attempts were made, chiefly in Germany, to apply evidence [page 13] to use by substantial correction of the text. Of these the greatest and most influential proceeded from J. A. Bengel at Tubingen in 1734. In the closing years of the century, and a little later, the process was carried many steps forward by Griesbach, on a double foundation of enriched resources and deeper study, not without important help from suggestions of Semler and finally of Hug. Yet even Griesbach was content to start from the traditional or revised Erasmian basis, rather than from the MSS in which he himself reposed most confidence.

§17. A new period began in 1831, when for the first time a text was constructed directly from the ancient documents without the intervention of any printed edition, and when the first systematic attempt was made to substitute scientific method for arbitrary choice in the discrimination of various readings. In both respects the editor, Lachmann, rejoiced to declare that he was carrying out the principles and unfulfilled intentions of Bentley, as set forth in 1716 and 1720. This great advance was however marred by too narrow a selection of documents to be taken into account and too artificially rigid an employment of them, and also by too little care in obtaining precise knowledge of some of their texts: and though these defects, partly due in the first instance to the unambitious purpose of the edition, have been in different ways avoided by

first instance to the unambitious purpose of the edition, have been in different ways avoided by Lachmann's two distinguished successors, Tischendorf and Tregelles, both of whom have produced texts substantially free from the later corruptions, neither of them can be said to have dealt consistently or on the whole successfully with the difficulties presented by the variations between the most ancient texts. On the other hand, their indefatigable labours in the discovery and exhibition [page 14] of fresh evidence, aided by similar researches on the part of others, provide all who come after them with invaluable resources not available half a century ago.

§15. A just appreciation of the wealth of documentary evidence now accessible as compared with that enjoyed by any previous generation, and of the comparatively late times at which much even of what is not now new became available for criticism, is indeed indispensable for any one who would understand the present position of the textual criticism of the New Testament. The gain by the knowledge of the contents of important new documents is not to be measured by the direct evidence which they themselves contribute. Evidence is valuable only so far as it can be securely interpreted; and not the least advantage conferred by new documents is the new help which they give towards the better interpretation of old documents, and of documentary relations generally. By way of supplement to the preceding brief sketch of the history of criticism, we insert the following table, which shews the dates at which the extant Greek uncials of the sixth and earlier centuries, with five others of later age but comparatively ancient text, have become available as evidence by various forms of publication. The second column marks the very imperfect publication by selections of readings; the third, tolerably full collations; the fourth, continuous texts. The manuscript known as [^] in the Gospels and as G (G3) in St Paul's Epistles requires two separate datings, as its two parts have found their way to different libraries. In other cases a plurality of dates is given where each publication has had some distinctive importance. [page 15] (fragg. = fragments) Readings Collations Continuous S all books complete Ig60 1552 13 all books exc. part of Heb., Epp. Past. and Apoc. ' (1583) I jS3, 1-99 I1857,) ISs A all books 1657 1,86 C fragg. of nearly all books

1710 1751 y 1843 Q fragg. I.c. Jo. (? 1752) , 1762 1860 '1' fragg. Jo. [Lc.] 1789 D Evv. Act. 155?? 1657 1793' 1864 D2Paul (1582) 1657 1853 N fragg. Evv. 1 +>1830) 1846, 1876 P fragg. Evv. (? 1752) 1 I4S 186 R fragg. I.c. 1857 Z fragg. Mt. 180r, 155o [^ itlt. Mc.] (1880) L Ew. lDsO 1751, 1785 tS46 iS fragg. Lc. X S6 r >A Evv. 15361 eGsPaul exc. Heb. | 1710 +1791) E^Act. | 1715, ISjo P., all books exc. Evv. l s 865 + X S6g

§19. The foregoing outline may suffice to shew the manner in which repeated transcription tends to multiply corruption of texts, and the subsequent mixture of independent texts to confuse alike their sound and their corrupt readings; the reasons why ancient MSS in various ages have been for the most part little preserved and little copied; the disadvantages under which the Greek text of the New Testament was first printed, from late and inferior MSS; the long neglect to take serious measures for amending it; the slow process of the accumulation and study of evidence; the late date at which any considerable number of corrections on [page 16] ancient authority were admitted into the slightly modified Erasmusian texts that reigned by an accidental prescription, and the very late date at which ancient authority was allowed to furnish not scattered retouchings but the whole body of text from beginning to end; and lastly the advantage enjoyed by the present generation in the possession of a store of evidence largely augmented in amount and still more in value, as well as in the ample instruction afforded by previous criticism and previous texts.

Page 8

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

C. 20-22. History of this edition

§20. These facts justify, we think, another attempt to determine the original words of the Apostles and writers of the New Testament. In the spring of 1853 we were led by the perplexities of reading encountered in our own study of Scripture to project the construction of a text such as is now published. At that time a student aware of the untrustworthiness of the `Received' texts had no other guides than Lachmann's text and the second of the four widely different texts of Tischendorf. Finding it impossible to assure ourselves that either editor placed before us such an approximation to the apostolic words as we could accept with reasonable satisfaction, we agreed to commence at once the formation of a manual text for our own use, hoping at the same time that it might be of service to others. The task proved harder than we anticipated; and eventually many years have been required for its fulfilment. Engrossing occupations of other kinds have brought repeated delays and interruptions: but the work has never been laid more than partially aside, and the intervals during which it [page 17] has been intermitted have been short. We cannot on the whole regret the lapse of time before publication. Though we have not found reason to change any of the leading views with which we began to prepare for the task, they have gained much in clearness and comprehensiveness through the long interval, especially as regards the importance which we have been led to attach to the history of transmission. It would indeed be to our shame if we had failed to learn continually.

§21. The mode of procedure adopted from the first was to work out our results independently of each other, and to hold no counsel together except upon results already provisionally obtained. Such differences as then appeared, usually bearing a very small proportion to the points of immediate agreement, were discussed on paper, and where necessary repeatedly discussed, till either agreement or final difference was reached. These ultimate differences have found expression among the alternative readings. No rule of precedence has been adopted; but documentary attestation has been in most cases allowed to confer the place of honour as against internal evidence, range of attestation being further

taken into account as between one well attested reading and another. This combination of completely independent operations permits us to place far more confidence in the results than either of us could have presumed to cherish had they rested on his own sole responsibility. No individual mind can ever act with perfect uniformity, or free itself completely from its own idiosyncrasies: the danger of unconscious caprice is inseparable from personal judgement. We venture to hope that the present text has escaped some risks of this kind by being the production of two editors of different habits of mind, working [page 18] independently and to a great extent on different plans, and then giving and receiving free and full criticism wherever their first conclusions had not agreed together. For the principles, arguments, and conclusions set forth in the Introduction and Appendix both editors are alike responsible. It was however for various reasons expedient that their exposition and illustration should proceed throughout from a single hand; and the writing of this volume and the other accompaniments of the text has devolved on Dr Hort.

§22. It may be well to state that the kindness of our publishers has already allowed us to place successive instalments of the Greek text privately in the hands of the members of the Company of Revisers of the English New Testament, and of a few other scholars. The Gospels, with a temporary preface of 28 pages, were thus issued in July 1871, the Acts in February 1873, the

Page 9

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

temporary preface of 28 pages, were thus issued in July 1871, the Acts in February 1873, the Catholic Epistles in December 1873, the Pauline Epistles in February 1875, and the Apocalypse in December 1876. The work to which this provisional issue was due has afforded opportunity for renewed consideration of many details, especially on the side of interpretation; and we have been thankful to include any fresh results thus or otherwise obtained, before printing off for publication. Accordingly many corrections dealing with punctuation or otherwise of a minute kind, together with occasional modifications of reading, have been introduced into the stereotype plates within the last few months.[page 19]

PART II THE METHODS OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM

§23. Every method of textual criticism corresponds to some one class of textual facts: the best criticism is that which takes account of every class of textual facts, and assigns to each method its proper use and rank. The leading principles of textual criticism are identical for all writings whatever. Differences in application arise only from differences in the amount, variety, and quality of evidence: no method is ever inapplicable except through defectiveness of evidence. The more obvious facts naturally attract attention first; and it is only at a further stage of study that any one is likely spontaneously to grasp those more fundamental facts from which textual criticism must start if it is to reach comparative certainty. We propose to follow here this natural order, according to which the higher methods will come last into view.

SECTION 1. INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF READING 24-37.

§24. Criticism arises out of the question what is to be received where a text is extant in two or more varying documents. The most rudimentary form of criticism consists in dealing with each variation independently, and adopting at

once in each case out of two or more variants that which looks most probable. The evidence here taken into account is commonly called `Internal Evidence': as other kinds of Internal Evidence will have [page 20] to be mentioned, we prefer to call it more precisely `Internal Evidence of Readings'. Internal Evidence of Readings is of two kinds, which cannot be too sharply distinguished from each other; appealing respectively to Intrinsic Probability, having reference to the author, and what may be called Transcriptional Probability, having reference to the copyists. In appealing to the first, we ask what an author is likely to have written: in appealing to the second, we ask what copyists are likely to have made him seem to write. Both these kinds of evidence are alike in the strictest sense internal, since they are alike derived exclusively from comparison of the testimony delivered, no account being taken of any relative antecedent credibility of the actual witnesses.

A. 25-27. Intrinsic Probability

§25. The first impulse in dealing with a variation is usually to lean on Intrinsic Probability, that is, to consider which of two readings makes the best sense, and to decide between them accordingly. The decision may be made either by an immediate and as it were intuitive judgement, or by weighing cautiously various elements which go to make up what is called

judgement, or by weighing cautiously various elements which go to make up what is called sense, such as conformity to grammar and congruity to the purport of the rest of the sentence and of the larger context; to which may rightly be added congruity to the usual style of the author and to his matter in other passages. The process may take the form either of simply comparing two or more rival readings under these heads, and giving the preference to that which appears to have the advantage, or of rejecting a reading absolutely, for violation of one or more of the congruities, or of adopting a reading absolutely, for perfection of congruity. [page 21]

§26. These considerations evidently afford reasonable presumptions; presumptions which in some cases may attain such force on the negative side as to demand the rejection or qualify the acceptance of readings most highly commended by other kinds of evidence. But the uncertainty of the decision in ordinary cases is shown by the great diversity of judgement which is actually found to exist. The value of the Intrinsic Evidence of Readings should of course be estimated by its best and most cultivated form, for the extemporaneous surmises of an ordinary untrained reader will differ widely from the range of probabilities present to the mind of a scholar prepared both by general training in the analysis of texts and by special study of the facts bearing on the particular case. But in dealing with this kind of evidence equally competent critics often arrive at contradictory conclusions as to the same variations.

§27. Nor indeed are the assumptions involved in Intrinsic Evidence of Readings to be implicitly trusted. There is much literature, ancient no less than modern, in which it is needful to remember that authors are not always grammatical, or clear, or consistent, or felicitous; so that not seldom an ordinary reader finds it easy to replace a feeble or half-appropriate word or phrase by an effective substitute; and thus the best words to express an author's meaning need not in all cases be those which he actually employed. But, without attempting to determine the limits within which such causes have given occasion to any variants in the New

Testament, it concerns our own purpose more to urge that in the highest literature, and notably in the Bible, all readers are peculiarly liable to the fallacy of supposing that they understand the author's meaning and purpose because they under[page 22] stand some part or some aspect of it, which they take for the whole; and hence, in judging variations of text, they are led unawares to disparage any word or phrase which owes its selection by the author to those elements of the thought present to his mind which they have failed to perceive or to feel.

B. 28-37. Transcriptional Probability

§28. The next step in criticism is the discovery of Transcriptional Probability, and is suggested by the reflexion that what attracts ourselves is not on the average unlikely to have attracted transcribers. If one various reading appears to ourselves to give much better sense or in some other way to excel another, the same apparent superiority may have led to the introduction of the reading in the first instance. Mere blunders apart, no motive can be thought of which could lead a scribe to introduce consciously a worse reading in place of a better. We might thus seem to be landed in the paradoxical result that intrinsic inferiority is evidence of originality.

§29. In reality however, although this is the form in which the considerations that make up Transcriptional Probability are likely in the first instance to present themselves to a student

feeling his way onwards beyond Intrinsic Probability, the true nature of Transcriptional Probability can hardly be understood till it is approached from another side. Transcriptional Probability is not directly or properly concerned with the relative excellence of rival readings, but merely with the relative fitness of each for explaining the existence of the others. Every rival reading contributes an element to [page 23] the problem which has to be solved; for every rival reading is a fact which has to be accounted for, and no acceptance of any one reading as original can be satisfactory which leaves any other variant incapable of being traced to some known cause or causes of variation. If a variation is binary, as it may be called, consisting of two variants, a and b, the problem for Transcriptional Probability to decide is whether it is easier to derive b from a, through causes of corruption known to exist elsewhere, on the hypothesis that a is original, or to derive a from b, through similar agencies, on the hypothesis that b is original. If the variants are more numerous, making a ternary or yet more composite variation, each in its turn must be assumed as a hypothetical original, and an endeavour made to deduce from it all the others, either independently or consecutively; after which the relative facilities of the several experimental deductions must be compared together.

§30. Hence the basis on which Transcriptional Probability rests consists of generalisations as to the causes of corruption incident to the process of transcription. A few of the broadest generalisations of this kind, singling out observed proclivities of average copyists, make up the bulk of what are not very happily called 'canons of criticism'. Many causes of corruption are independent of age and language, and their prevalence may be easily verified by a careful observer every day; while others are largely modified, or even brought into existence, by peculiar circumstances of the writings themselves, or of the conditions of their transmission. There is always an abundance of variations in which no practised scholar can possibly doubt which is the original reading, and

which must therefore be derivative; [page 24] and these clear instances supply ample materials for discovering and classifying the causes of corruption which must have been operative in all variations. The most obvious causes of corruption are clerical or mechanical, arising from mere carelessness of the transcriber, chiefly through deceptions of eye or ear. But, as we have seen (§ 10), the presence of a mental factor can often be traced in corruptions partly mechanical; and under the influence of a lax conception of the proper office of a transcriber distinctly mental causes of change may assume, and often have assumed, very large proportions. Even where the definite responsibilities of transcription were strongly felt, changes not purely clerical would arise from a more or less conscious feeling on a scribe's part that he was correcting what he deemed an obvious error due to some one of his predecessors; while, at times or places in which the offices of transcribing and editing came to be confused, other copyists would not shrink from altering the form of what lay before them for the sake of substituting what they supposed to be a clearer or better representation of the matter.

§31. The value of the evidence obtained from Transcriptional Probability is incontestable. Without its aid textual criticism could rarely attain any high degree of security. Moreover, to be rightly estimated, it must be brought under consideration in the higher form to which it can be raised by care and study, when elementary guesses as to which reading scribes are likely in any particular case to have introduced have been replaced by judgements founded on previous investigation of the various general characteristics of those readings which can with moral certainty be assumed to have been introduced by scribes. But even at its [page 25] best this class of Internal Evidence, like the other, carries us but a little way towards the recovery of an

class of Internal Evidence, like the other, carries us but a little way towards the recovery of an ancient text, when it is employed alone. The number of variations in which it can be trusted to supply by itself a direct and immediate decision is relatively very small, when unquestionable blunders, that is, clerical errors, have been set aside. If we look behind the canons laid down by critics to the observed facts from which their authority proceeds, we find, first, that scribes were moved by a much greater variety of impulse than is usually supposed; next, that different scribes were to a certain limited extent moved by different impulses; and thirdly, that in many variations each of two or more conflicting readings might be reasonably accounted for by some impulse known to have operated elsewhere. In these last cases decision is evidently precarious, even though the evidence may seem to be stronger on the one side than the other. Not only are mental impulses unsatisfactory subjects for estimates of comparative force; but a plurality of impulses recognised by ourselves as possible in any given case by no means implies a plurality of impulses as having been actually in operation. Nor have we a right to assume that what in any particular case we judge after comparison to be the intrinsically strongest of the two or more possible impulses must as a matter of course be the one impulse which acted on a scribe if he was acted on by one only: accidental circumstances beyond our knowledge would determine which impulse would be the first to reach his mind or hand, and there would seldom be room for any element of deliberate choice. But even where there is no conflict of possible impulses, the evidence on the one side is often too slight and questionable to be implicitly trusted by any one who wishes to ascertain his author's true text, and not merely to follow a generally sound rule. Hence it is only in well marked and unambiguous cases that the unsupported verdict of Transcriptional Probability for detached readings can be safely followed.

§32. But the insufficiency of Transcriptional Probability as an independent guide is most signally shown by its liability to stand in apparent antagonism to Intrinsic Probability; since the legitimate force of Intrinsic Probability, where its drift is clear and unambiguous, is not touched by the fact that in many other places it bears a divided or ambiguous testimony. The area of final antagonism, it is

already evident, is very much smaller than might seem to be implied in the first crude impression that scribes are not likely to desert a better reading for a worse; but it is sufficiently large to create serious difficulty. The true nature of the difficulty will be best explained by a few words on the mutual relations of the two classes of Internal Evidence, by which it will likewise be seen what a valuable ancillary office they discharge in combination.

§33. All conflicts between Intrinsic and Transcriptional Probability arise from the imperfection of our knowledge: in both fields criticism consists of inferences from more or less incomplete data. Every change not purely mechanical made by a transcriber is, in some sense, of the nature of a correction. Corrections in such external matters as orthography and the like may be passed over, since they arise merely out of the comparative familiarity of different forms, and here Intrinsic Probability has nothing to do with what can properly be called excellence or easiness. All other corrections, [page 27] that is, those which bear any relation to sense, would never be made unless in the eyes of the scribe who makes them they were improvements in sense or in the expression of sense: even when made unconsciously, it is the relative satisfaction which they give to his mental state at the time that creates or shapes them. Yet in literature of high quality it is as a rule improbable that a change made by transcribers should improve an author's sense, or express his full and exact sense better than he has done himself. It follows that, with the exception of pure blunders, readings originating with scribes must always at the time have

Page 13

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

exception of pure blunders, readings originating with scribes must always at the time have combined the appearance of improvement with the absence of its reality. If they had not been plausible, they would not have existed: yet their excellence must have been either superficial or partial, and the balance of inward and essential excellence must lie against them. In itself therefore Transcriptional Probability not only stands in no antagonism to Intrinsic Probability, but is its sustaining complement. It is seen in its proper and normal shape when both characteristics of a scribe's correction can alike be recognised, the semblance of superiority and the latent inferiority.

§34. It is only in reference to mental or semi-mental causes of corruption that the apparent conflict between Transcriptional and Intrinsic Probability has any place: and neither the extent nor the nature of the apparent conflict can be rightly understood if we forget that, in making use of this class of evidence, we have to do with readings only as they are likely to have appeared to transcribers, not as they appear to us, except in so far as our mental conditions can be accepted as truly reflecting theirs. It is especially necessary to bear [page 28] this limitation in mind with reference to one of the most comprehensive and also most widely prevalent mental impulses of transcribers, the disposition to smooth away difficulties; which is the foundation of the paradoxical precept to 'choose the harder reading', the most famous of all 'canons of criticism'. Readings having no especial attractiveness to ourselves may justly be pronounced suspicious on grounds of Transcriptional Probability, if they were likely to be attractive, or their rivals unacceptable, to ancient transcribers; and conversely, if this condition is absent, we can draw no unfavourable inferences from any intrinsic excellence which they may possess in our own eyes.

§35. The rational use of Transcriptional Probability as textual evidence depends on the power of distinguishing the grounds of preference implied in an ancient scribe's substitution of one reading for another from those felt as cogent now after close and deliberate criticism. Alterations made by transcribers, so far as they are due to any movement of thought, are with rare exceptions the product of first

thoughts, not second; nor again of those first thoughts, springing from a rapid and penetrating glance over a whole field of evidence, which sometimes are justified by third thoughts. This is indeed a necessary result of the extemporaneous, cursory, and one-sided form which criticism cannot but assume when it exists only as a subordinate accident of transcription. But even the best prepared textual critic has to be on his guard against hasty impressions as to the intrinsic character of readings, for experience teaches him how often the relative attractiveness of conflicting readings becomes inverted by careful study. What we should naturally expect, in accordance with what has [page 29] been said above (§ 33), is that each reading should shew some excellence of its own, apparent or real, provided that we on our part are qualified to recognise it. If any reading fails to do so, clerical errors being of course excepted, the fault must lie in our knowledge or our perception; for if it be a scribe's correction, it must have some at least apparent excellence, and if it be original, it must have the highest real excellence. Contrast of real and apparent excellence is in any given variation an indispensable criterion as to the adequacy of the evidence for justifying reliance on Transcriptional Probability.

§36. Fortunately variations conforming to this normal type are of frequent occurrence; variations, that is, in which a critic is able to arrive at a strong and clear conviction that one reading is intrinsically much the most probable, and yet to see with equal clearness how the rival

reading is intrinsically much the most probable, and yet to see with equal clearness how the rival reading or readings could not but be attractive to average transcribers. In these cases Internal Evidence of Readings attains the highest degree of certainty which its nature admits, this relative trustworthiness being due to the coincidence of the two independent Probabilities, Intrinsic and Transcriptional. Readings thus certified are of the utmost value in the application of other methods of criticism, as we shall see hereafter.

§37. But a vast proportion of variations do not fulfil these conditions. Where one reading (a) appears intrinsically preferable, and its excellence is of a kind that we might expect to be recognised by scribes, while its rival (b) shews no characteristic likely to be attractive to them, Intrinsic and Transcriptional Probability are practically in conflict. In such a case either b must be wrong, and therefore must, as compared with [page 30] a, have had some attractiveness not perceived by us, if the case be one in which the supposition of a mere blunder is improbable; or b must be right, and therefore must have expressed the author's meaning with some special fitness which escapes our notice. The antagonism would disappear if we could discover on which side we have failed to perceive or duly appreciate all the facts; but in the mean time it stands. Occasionally the Intrinsic evidence is so strong that the Transcriptional evidence may without rashness be disregarded: but such cases are too exceptional to count for much when we are estimating the general trustworthiness of a method; and the apparent contradiction which the imperfection of our knowledge often leaves us unable to reconcile remains a valid objection against habitual reliance on the sufficiency of Internal Evidence of Readings.

SECTION II. INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF DOCUMENTS 38-48

§38. Thus far we have been considering the method which follows Internal Evidence of Readings alone, as improved to the utmost by the distinction and separate appreciation of Intrinsic and Transcriptional Probability, and as applied

with every aid of scholarship and special study. The limitation to Internal Evidence of Readings follows naturally from the impulse to deal conclusively at once with each variation as it comes in its turn before a reader or commentator or editor: yet a moment's consideration of the process of transmission shews how precarious it is to attempt to judge which of two or more readings is the most likely to be right, without considering which of the attesting documents or combinations of documents [page 31] are the most likely to convey an unadulterated transcript of the original text; in other words, in dealing with matter purely traditional, to ignore the relative antecedent credibility of witnesses, and trust exclusively to our own inward power of singling out the true readings from among their counterfeits, wherever we see them. Nor is it of much avail to allow supposed or ascertained excellence of particular documents a deciding voice in cases of difficulty, or to mix evidence of this kind at random or at pleasure with Internal Evidence of Readings assumed in practice if not in theory as the primary guide. The comparative trustworthiness of documentary authorities constitutes a fresh class of facts at least as pertinent as any with which we have hitherto been dealing, and much less likely to be misinterpreted by personal surmises. The first step towards obtaining a sure foundation is a consistent application of the principle that **KNOWLEDGE OF DOCUMENTS SHOULD PRECEDE FINAL JUDGEMENT UPON READINGS.**

§39. The most prominent fact known about a manuscript is its date, sometimes fixed to a year by a note from the scribe's hand, oftener determined within certain limits by palaeographical or

other indirect indications, sometimes learned from external facts or records. Relative date, as has been explained above (§ 8), affords a valuable presumption as to relative freedom from corruption, when appealed to on a large scale; and this and other external facts, insufficient by themselves to solve a question of reading, may often supply essential materials to the process by which it can be solved. But the occasional preservation of comparatively ancient texts in comparatively modern MSS forbids confident reliance on priority of date unsupported by other marks of excellence. [page 32]

§40. The first effectual security against the uncertainties of Internal Evidence of Readings is found in what may be termed Internal Evidence of Documents, that is, the general characteristics of the texts contained in them as learned directly from themselves by continuous study of the whole or considerable parts. This and this alone supplies entirely trustworthy knowledge as to the relative value of different documents. If we compare successively the readings of two documents in all their variations, we have ample materials for ascertaining the leading merits and defects of each. Readings authenticated by the coincidence of strong Intrinsic and strong Transcriptional Probability, or it may be by one alone of these Probabilities in exceptional strength and clearness and uncontradicted by the other, are almost always to be found sufficiently numerous to supply a solid basis for inference. Moreover they can safely be supplemented by provisional judgements on similar evidence in the more numerous variations where a critic cannot but form a strong impression as to the probabilities of reading, though he dare not trust it absolutely. Where then one of the documents is found habitually to contain these morally certain or at least strongly preferred readings, and the other habitually to contain their rejected rivals, we can have no doubt, first, that the text of the first has been transmitted in comparative purity, and that the text of the second has suffered comparatively large corruption; and next, that the superiority of the first must be as great in the variations in which Internal

Evidence of Readings has furnished no decisive criterion as in those which have enabled us to form a comparative appreciation of the two texts. By this cautious advance from the known to the unknown we are enabled to deal confidently with a [page 33] great mass of those remaining variations, open variations, so to speak, the confidence being materially increased when, as usually happens, the document thus found to have the better text is also the older. Inference from the ascertained character of other readings within the identical text, transmitted, it is to be assumed, throughout under identical conditions, must have a higher order of certainty than the inferences dependent on general probabilities which in most cases make up Internal Evidence of Readings.

§41. The method here followed differs, it will be observed, from that described above in involving not a single but a threefold process. In the one case we endeavour to deal with each variation separately, and to decide between its variants immediately, on the evidence presented by the variation itself in its context, aided only by general considerations. In the other case we begin with virtually performing the same operation, but only tentatively, with a view to collect materials, not final results: on some variations we can without rashness predict at this stage our ultimate conclusions; on many more we can estimate various degrees of probability; on many more again, if we are prudent, we shall be content to remain for the present in entire suspense. Next, we pass from investigating the readings to investigating the documents by means of what we have learned respecting the readings. Thirdly, we return to the readings, and go once more over the same ground as at first, but this time making a tentative choice of readings simply in

over the same ground as at first, but this time making a tentative choice of readings simply in accordance with documentary authority. Where the results coincide with those obtained at the first stage, a very high degree of probability is reached, resting on the coincidence of two and often three independent kinds of evidence. [page 34] Where they differ at first sight, a fresh study of the whole evidence affecting the variation in question is secured. Often the fresh facts which it brings to light will shew the discordance between the new and the old evidence to have been too hastily assumed. Sometimes on the other hand they will confirm it, and then the doubt must remain.

§42. To what extent documentary authority alone may be trusted, where the Internal Evidence of Readings is altogether uncertain, must vary in different instances. The predominantly purer text of one document may undoubtedly contain some wrong readings from which the predominantly less pure text of another is free. But the instances of this kind which are ultimately found to stand scrutiny are always much fewer than a critic's first impression leads him to suppose; and in a text of any length we believe that only a plurality of strong instances confirming each other after close examination ought to disturb the presumption in favour of the document found to be habitually the better. Sometimes of course the superiority may be so slight or obscure that the documentary authority loses its normal weight. In such cases Internal Evidence of Readings becomes of greater relative importance: but as its inherent precariousness remains undiminished, the total result is comparative uncertainty of text.

§43. Both the single and the triple processes which we have described depend ultimately on judgements upon Internal Evidence of Readings; but the difference between isolated judgements and combined judgements is vital. In the one case any misapprehension of the immediate evidence, that is, of a single group of individual phenomena, tells in full force upon the solitary process by which one reading is selected from the rest for adop[page 35] tion, and there is no room for rectification. In the other case the selection is suggested by the result of a large

generalisation about the documents, verified and checked by the immediate evidence belonging to the variation; and the generalisation itself rests on too broad a foundation of provisional judgements, at once confirming and correcting each other, to be materially weakened by the chance or probability that some few of them are individually unsound.

§44. Nevertheless the use of Internal Evidence of Documents has uncertainties of its own, some of which can be removed or materially diminished by special care and patience in the second and third stages of the process, while others are inherent and cannot be touched without the aid of a fresh kind of evidence. They all arise from the fact that texts are, in one sense or another, not absolutely homogeneous. Internal knowledge of documents that are compared with each other should include all their chief characteristics, and these can only imperfectly be summed up under a broad statement of comparative excellence. At first sight the sole problem that presents itself is whether this document is `better' or `worse' than that; and this knowledge may sometimes suffice to produce a fair text, where the evidence itself is very simple. Yet it can never be satisfactory either to follow implicitly a document pronounced to be `best', or to forsake it on the strength of internal evidence for this or that rival reading. Every document, it may be safely said, contains errors; and second only to the need of distinguishing good documents from bad is the need of leaving as little room as possible for caprice in distinguishing the occasional errors of `good' documents from the sound parts of their text. [page 36]

Page 17

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

the occasional errors of `good' documents from the sound parts of their text. [page 36]

§45. General estimates of comparative excellence are at once shown to be insufficient by the fact that excellence itself is of various kinds: a document may be `good' in one respect and `bad' in another. The distinction between soundness and correctness, for instance, lies on the surface. One MS will transmit a substantially pure text disfigured by the blunders of a careless scribe, another will reproduce a deeply adulterated text with smooth faultlessness. It therefore becomes necessary in the case of important MSS to observe and discriminate the classes of clerical errors by which their proper texts are severally disguised; for an authority representing a sound tradition can be used with increased confidence when its own obvious slips have been classed under definite heads, so that those of its readings which cannot be referred to any of these heads must be reasonably supposed to have belonged to the text of its exemplar. The complexity of excellence is further increased by the unequal distribution of the mental or semi-mental causes of corruption; while they too can be observed, classified, and taken into account, though with less precision than defects of mechanical accuracy. Where the documentary witnesses are not exclusively MSS having continuous texts in the original language, but also, for instance, translations into other languages or quotations by later authors, similar deductions are required in order to avoid being misled as to the substantive text of their exemplars. Thus allowance has to be made for the changes of phraseology, real or apparent, which translators generally are prone to introduce, and again for those which may be due to the defects or other peculiarities of a given language, or the purpose of a given translation. In quotations account must in like manner be taken of the modifications, in [page 37] tentional or unconscious, which writers are apt to make in passages which they rapidly quote, and again of the individual habits of quotation found in this or that particular writer. In all these cases on the one hand comparative excellence is various and divided; and on the other an exact study of documents will go a great way towards changing vague guesses about possible errors into positive knowledge of the limits within which undoubted errors have

been actually found to exist. The corrective process is strictly analogous to that by which evidence from Transcriptional Probability is acquired and reduced to order: but in the present case there is less liability to error in application, because we are drawing inferences not so much from the average ways of scribes as a class as from the definite characteristics of this or that documentary witness.

§46. The true range of individuality of text cannot moreover be exactly measured by the range of contents of an existing document. We have no right to assume without verification the use of the same exemplar or exemplars from the first page to the last. A document containing more books than one may have been transcribed either from an exemplar having identical contents, or from two or more exemplars each of which contained a smaller number of books; and these successive exemplars may have been of very various or unequal excellence. As regards alterations made by the transcriber himself, a generalisation obtained from one book would be fairly valid for all the rest. But as regards what is usually much more important, the antecedent text or texts received by him, the prima facie presumption that a generalisation obtained in one book will be applicable in another cannot safely be trusted until the recurrence of [page 38] the same textual characteristics has been empirically ascertained.

§47. A third and specially important loss of homogeneousness occurs wherever the transmission of a writing has been much affected by what (§§ 5, 6) we have called mixture, the irregular

of a writing has been much affected by what (§§ 5, 6) we have called mixture, the irregular combination into a single text of two or more texts belonging to different lines of transmission. Where books scattered in two or more copies are transcribed continuously into a single document (§ 46), the use of different exemplars is successive: here it is simultaneous. In this case the individuality, so to speak, of each mixed document is divided, and each element has its own characteristics; so that we need to know to which element of the document any given reading belongs, before we can tell what authority the reading derives from its attestation by the document. Such knowledge evidently cannot be furnished by the document itself; but, as we shall see presently, it may often be obtained through combinations of documents.

§48. Lastly, the practical value of the simple application of Internal Evidence of Documents diminishes as they increase in number. It is of course in some sort available wherever a text is preserved in more than a single document, provided only that it is known in each variation which readings are supported by the several documents. Wherever it can be used at all, its use is indispensable at every turn; and where the documents are very few and not perceptibly connected, it is the best resource that criticism possesses. On the other hand, its direct utility varies with the simplicity of the documentary evidence; and it is only through the disturbing medium of arbitrary and untrustworthy rules that it can be made systematically available for writings preserved in a plurality [page 39] of documents. For such writings in fact it can be employed as the primary guide only where the better documents are in tolerably complete agreement against the worse; and the insufficiency must increase with their number and diversity. Wherever the better documents are ranged on different sides, the decision becomes virtually dependent on the uncertainties of isolated personal judgements. There is evidently **NO** way through the chaos of complex attestation which thus confronts us except by going back to its causes, that is, by enquiring what antecedent circumstances of transmission will account for such combinations of agreements and differences between the several documents as we find actually existing. In other words, we are led to the necessity of investigating not only

individual documents and their characteristics, but yet more the mutual relations of documents.

SECTION III. GENEALOGICAL EVIDENCE 49-76

A. 49-53. Simple or divergent genealogy

§49. The first great step in rising above the uncertainties of Internal Evidence of Readings was taken by ceasing to treat Readings independently of each other, and examining them connectedly in series, each series being furnished by one of the several Documents in which they are found. The second great step, at which we have now arrived, consists in ceasing to treat Documents independently of each other, and examining them connectedly as parts of a single whole in virtue of their historical relationships. In their prima facie character documents present themselves as so many independent and rival texts of greater or less purity. But as a matter of fact they are not independent: by the nature of the [page 40] case they are all fragments, usually casual and scattered fragments, of a genealogical tree of transmission, sometimes of vast extent and intricacy. The more exactly we are able to trace the chief ramifications of the tree, and to determine the places of the several documents among the branches, the more secure will be the foundations laid for a criticism capable of distinguishing the original text from its successive corruptions. It may be laid down then emphatically, as a second principle, that ALL

TRUSTWORTHY RESTORATION OF CORRUPTED TEXTS IS FOUNDED ON THE STUDY OF THEIR HISTORY, that is, of the relations of descent or affinity which connect the several documents. The principle here laid down has long been acted upon in all the more important restorations of classical texts: but it is still too imperfectly understood to need no explanation. A simple instance will show at once its practical bearing.

§50. Let it be supposed that a treatise exists in ten MSS. If they are used without reference to genealogy by an editor having a general preference for documentary evidence, a reading found in nine of them will in most cases be taken before a rival reading found only in the tenth, which will naturally be regarded as a casual aberration. If the editor decides otherwise, he does so in reliance on his own judgement either as to the high probability of the reading or as to the high excellence of the MS. He may be right in either case, and in the latter case he is more likely to be right than not: but where an overwhelming preponderance of the only kind of documentary evidence recognised is so boldly disregarded, a wide door is opened for dangerous uncertainty.

§51. Another editor begins by studying the relations of the MSS, and finds sufficient evidence, external or [page 41] internal, for believing that the first nine MSS were all copied directly or indirectly from the tenth MS, and derived nothing from any document independent of the tenth. He will then know that all their variations from the tenth can be only corruptions (successful cursory emendations of scribes being left out of account), and that for documentary evidence he has only to follow the tenth. Apart therefore from corruptions in the tenth, for the detection of which he can obviously have no documentary evidence, his text will at once be safe and true.

§52. If however the result of the second supposed editor's study is to find that all the nine MSS were derived not from the tenth but from another lost MS, his ten

documents resolve themselves virtually into two witnesses; the tenth MS, which he can know directly and completely, and the lost MS, which he must restore through the readings of its nine descendants, exactly and by simple transcription where they agree, approximately and by critical processes where they disagree. After these processes some few variations among the nine may doubtless be left in uncertainty, but the greater part will have been cleared away, leaving the text of the lost MS (with these definite exceptions) as certain as if it were accessible to the eyes. Where the two ultimate witnesses agree, the text will be as certain as the extant documents can make it, more certain than if the nine MSS had been derived from the tenth, because going back to an earlier link of transmission, the common source of the two witnesses. This common source may indeed be of any date not later than the earliest of the MSS, and accordingly separated from the autograph by any number of transcriptions, so that its text may vary from absolute purity to any amount of corruption: but as conjecture is the sole possible [page 42] instrument for detecting or correcting whatever errors it may contain, this common source is the only original with which any of the methods of criticism now under discussion have any concern. Where the two ultimate witnesses differ, the genealogical method ceases to be applicable, and a comparison of the intrinsic general character of the two texts becomes the only resource

§53. The relations of descent between existing documents are rarely so simple as in the case supposed. To carry the supposition only one step further, the nine MSS might have been found to fall into two sets, five descended from one lost ancestor and four from another; and then the Page 20

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

to fall into two sets, five descended from one lost ancestor and four from another; and then the question would have arisen whether any two of the three authorities had a common origin not shared by the third. If it were ascertained that they had, the readings in which they agreed against the third would have no greater probability than the rival readings of the third, except so far as their common ancestor was found to have higher claims to authority as a single document than the third as a single document. If on the other hand the nine could not be traced to less than two originals, a certain much diminished numerical authority would still remain to them. Since however all presumptions from numerical superiority, even among documents known to be all absolutely independent, that is, derived from the autograph each by a separate line of descent, are liable to be falsified by different lengths and different conditions of transmission, the practical value of the numerical authority of the two supposed witnesses against the third could not be estimated till it had been brought into comparison with the results yielded by the Internal Evidence of all three witnesses. [page 43]

B. 54-57. Genealogy and Number

§54. It is hardly necessary to point out the total change in the bearing of the evidence here made by the introduction of the factor of genealogy. Apart from genealogy, the one MS becomes easily overborne by the nine; and it would be trusted against their united testimony only when upheld by strong internal evidence, and then manifestly at great risk. :But if it is found that the nine had a common original, they sink jointly to a numerical authority not greater than that of the one; nay rather less, for that one is known absolutely, while the lost copy is known only approximately. Where for want of sufficiently clear evidence, or for any other reason, the simplification of pedigree cannot be carried thus far, still every approximation to an exhibition of their actual historical relations presents them in a truer light for the purposes of textual criticism than their enumeration in their existing form as so many separate units. It enables us on the one hand to detect the late origin and therefore irrelevance of some part of the prima facie

documentary evidence, and on the other to find the rest of it already classified for us by the discovered relations of the attesting documents themselves, and thus fitted to supply trustworthy presumptions, and under favourable circumstances much more than presumptions, as a basis for the consideration of other classes of evidence.

§55. It would be difficult to insist too strongly on the transformation of the superficial aspects of numerical authority thus effected by recognition of Genealogy. In the crude shape in which numerical authority is often presented, it rests on no better foundation than a vague transference of associations connected with majorities of voices, this [page 44] natural confusion being aided perhaps by the application of the convenient and in itself harmless term 'authorities' to documents. No one doubts that some documents are better than others, and that therefore a numerical preponderance may have rightly to yield to a qualitative preponderance. But it is often assumed that numerical superiority, as such, among existing documents ought always to carry a certain considerable though perhaps subordinate weight, and that this weight ought always to be to a certain extent proportionate to the excess of numbers. This assumption is completely negated by the facts adduced in the preceding pages, which shew that, since the same numerical relations among existing documents are compatible with the utmost dissimilarity in the numerical relations among their ancestors, no available presumptions whatever as to text can be obtained from number alone, that is, from number not as yet interpreted by descent.

Page 21

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

obtained from number alone, that is, from number not as yet interpreted by descent.

§56. The single exception to the truth of this statement leaves the principle itself untouched. Where a minority consists of one document or hardly more, there is a valid presumption against the reading thus attested, because any one scribe is liable to err, whereas the fortuitous concurrence of a plurality of scribes in the same error is in most cases improbable; and thus in these cases the reading attested by the majority is exempt from the suspicion of one mode of error which has to be taken into account with respect to the other reading. But this limited prima facie presumption, itself liable to be eventually set aside on evidence of various classes, is distinct in kind, not in degree only, from the imaginary presumption against a mere minority; and the essential difference is not [page 45] altered by the proportion of the majority to the minority.

§57. Except where some one particular corruption was so obvious and tempting that an unusual number of scribes might fall into it independently, a few documents are not, by reason of their mere paucity, appreciably less likely to be right than a multitude opposed to them. As soon as the numbers of a minority exceed what can be explained by accidental coincidence, so that their agreement in error, if it be error, can only be explained on genealogical grounds, we have thereby passed beyond purely numerical relations, and the necessity of examining the genealogy of both minority and majority has become apparent. A theoretical presumption indeed remains that a majority of extant documents is more likely to represent a majority of ancestral documents at each stage of transmission than vice versa. But the presumption is too minute to weigh against the smallest tangible evidence of other kinds. Experience verifies what might have been anticipated from the incalculable and fortuitous complexity of the causes here at work. At each stage of transmission the number of copies made from each MS depends on extraneous conditions, and varies irregularly from zero upwards: and when further the infinite variability of chances of preservation to a future age is taken into account, every ground for expecting a priori any sort of

correspondence of numerical proportion between existing documents and their less numerous ancestors in any one age falls to the ground. This is true even in the absence of mixture; and mixture, as will be shown presently (§§ 61, 76), does but multiply the uncertainty. For all practical purposes the rival probabilities represented by relative [page 46] number of attesting documents must be treated as incommensurable.

C. 58, 59. Manner of discovering genealogy

§58. Knowledge of the Genealogy of Documents, as of other facts respecting them, can sometimes be obtained to a certain extent from external sources, under which may be included various external indications furnished by themselves; but it is chiefly gained by study of their texts in comparison with each other. The process depends on the principle that identity of reading implies identity of origin. Strictly speaking it implies either identity of origin or accidental coincidence, no third alternative being possible. Accidental coincidences do occur, and have to be reckoned for: but except where an alteration is very plausible and tempting, the chance that two transcribers have made the same alteration independently is relatively small, in the case of three it is much smaller, and so on with rapidly increasing improbability. Hence, while a certain number of identities of reading have to be neglected as capable of either interpretation, the great bulk may at once be taken as certain evidence of a common origin. Such community of origin for a reading may of course as regards the two or more attesting documents be either complete,

for a reading may of course as regards the two or more attesting documents be either complete, that is, due to a common ancestry for their whole texts, or partial, that is, due to 'mixture', which is virtually the engrafting of occasional or partial community of ancestry upon predominantly independent descent.

§59. Here, as in the investigation of the comparative excellences of continuous texts, we are able to arrive at general conclusions about texts by putting together [page 47] the data furnished by a succession of variations of reading. What we have to do is to note what combinations of documents, large or small, are of frequent recurrence. Wherever we find a considerable number of variations, in which the two or more arrays of documents attesting the two or more variants are identical, we know that at least a considerable amount of the texts of the documents constituting each array must be descended from a common ancestor subsequent to the single universal original, the limitation of ancestry being fixed by the dissent of the other array or arrays. Each larger array may often in like manner be broken up into subordinate arrays, each of which separately is found repeatedly supporting a number of readings rejected by the other documents; and each such separate smaller array must have its own special ancestry. If the text is free from mixture, the larger arrays disclose the earlier divergences of transmission, the smaller arrays the later divergences: in other words, wherever transmission has been independent, the immediate relations of existing documents are exhibited by those variations which isolate the most subordinate combinations of documents, the relationships of the ultimate ancestors of existing documents by those variations in which the combinations of documents are the most comprehensive; not necessarily the most numerous individually, but the most composite.

D. 60-65. Complications of genealogy by mixture

§60. In the texts just mentioned, in which transmission has followed exclusively the simple type of divergent ramification, cross divisions among documents are

impossible, except to the limited extent within which accidental coincidence can operate. If L M are two transcripts of the original, L1 L2 of L, and M1 M2 of M, the five distributions [page 48] (i) L1L2 against M1M2, (ii) L1 against L2M1, (iii) L2 against L1M1, (iv) M1 against L1L2M2, and (v) M2 against L1 L2 M1 are all possible and all likely to occur: but the two distributions (vi) L1M1 against L2M2 and (vii) L1M2 against L2M1 are impossible as results of divergent genealogy. In the

second distribution L2 appears to desert its own primary array and join the array of M; but the truth is that in a text transmitted under these conditions L1 must have introduced a corruption, while L2 has merely remained faithful to a reading of the original which had been faithfully preserved by L and M alike. On the other hand in the sixth distribution either L1M1 must have the wrong reading and L2;??12 the right, or vice vers??z: if L1M1 are wrong, either L and M must have both concurred in the error, which would have rendered it impossible for either L2 or M2 to be right, or L1 and M1, transcribed from different exemplars, must have each made the same change from the true reading of L and M preserved by L2 and M2, which is impossible except by accidental coincidence and mutatis mutandis the case is the same if L1M1 be right and L2M2 wrong, and again for the two corresponding alternatives of the seventh distribution. In this fact that the sixth and seventh combinations, that is, cross combinations, cannot exist without mixture we have at once a sufficient criterion for the presence of mixture. Where we find cross combinations associated with variations so numerous and of such a character that

find cross combinations associated with variations so numerous and of such a character that accidental coincidence is manifestly incompetent to explain them, we know that they must be due to mixture, and it then becomes necessary to observe within what limits the effects of mixture are discernible.

§61. In so far as mixture operates, it exactly inverts the results of the simpler form of transmission, its effect being to produce convergence instead of divergence. Corruptions originating in a MS belonging to one primary array may be adopted and incorporated in transcripts from other MSS of the same or of other primary arrays. An error introduced by the scribe of L1 in one century, and unknown to L2 M1 M2, may in a later century be attested by all the then extant representatives of L1 I.2M1, those of M' alone being free from it, the reason being that, perhaps through the instrumentality of some popular text which has adopted it, it has found its way into intermediate descendants of L2 and of M1. It follows that, whenever mixture has intervened, we have no security [page 49] that the more complex arrays of existing documents point to the more ancient ramifications: they may just as easily be results of a wide extension given comparatively late by favourable circumstances to readings which previously had only a narrow distribution. Conversely a present narrowness of distribution need not be a mark of relatively recent divergence: it may as easily (see § 76) be the only surviving relic of an ancient supremacy of distribution now almost obliterated by the invasion of mixture. This is of course a somewhat extreme case, but it is common enough: as a matter of fact, mixture is found to operate on every scale, from the smallest to the largest.

§62. Mixture being thus liable to confuse and even invert the inferences which would indubitably follow from the conditions of transmission were transmission exclusively divergent, we have next to enquire what expedients can be employed when mixture has been ascertained to exist. Evidently no resource can be so helpful, where it can be attained, as the extrication of earlier unmixed texts or portions of texts from the general mass of texts now extant. The clearest evidence for tracing the antecedent factors of mixture in texts is afforded by readings

which are themselves mixed or, as they are sometimes called, 'conflate', that is, not simple substitutions of the reading of one document for that of another, but combinations of the readings of both documents into a composite whole, sometimes by mere addition with or without a conjunction, sometimes with more or less of fusion. Where we find a variation with three variants, two of them simple alternatives to each other, and the third a combination of the other two, there is usually a strong presumption that the third is the latest and due to mixture, not the third the earliest and the other two due to two independent impulses of simplification. Peculiar contexts may no doubt sometimes give rise to this paradoxical double [page 50] simplification: but as a rule internal evidence is decisive to the contrary. If now we note the groups of documents which support each of the three variants; and then, repeating the process with other conflate readings, find substantially the same groups of documents occupying analogous places in all cases, we gain first a verification of the presumption of mixture by the mutual corroboration of instances, and next a determination of one set of documents in which mixture certainly exists, and of two other sets of documents which still preserve some portion at least of two more ancient texts which were eventually mixed together. Sometimes the three groups are found nearly constant throughout, sometimes they have only a nucleus, so to speak, approximately constant, with a somewhat variable margin of other documents. This relative variability however, due to irregularity of mixture, does not weaken the force of the inferences to be drawn from each single instance. If a reading is conflate, every document supporting it is thereby shown to have a more Page 24

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

instance. If a reading is conflate, every document supporting it is thereby shown to have a more or less mixed text among its ancestry; so that, in considering any other doubtful variation, we have empirical evidence that the contingency of mixture in each such document is not a priori unlikely. About those documents which habitually support the conflate readings we learn more, namely that mixture must have had a large share in producing their text. Similarly we learn to set an especial value on those documents which rarely or never support the conflate readings; not necessarily as witnesses to a true text, for in all these cases each true reading is paired with a simple wrong reading, but as witnesses to texts antecedent to mixture. [page 51]

§63. The results thus obtained supply the foundation for a further process. It is incredible that mixed texts should be mixed only where there are conflate readings. In an overwhelming proportion of cases the composition of two earlier readings would either be impossible or produce an intolerable result; and in all such cases, supposing the causes leading to mixture to be at work, the change due to mixture would consist in a simple replacement of one reading by another, such change being indifferently a substitution or an addition or an omission. Here then we should find not three variants, but two only: that is, the reading of the mixed text would be identical with one of the prior readings; and as a matter of course the documents attesting it would comprise both those that were descended from the mixed text and those that were descended from that earlier text which the mixed text has here followed. When accordingly we find variations exhibiting these phenomena, that is, having one variant supported by that set of documents which habitually attests one recurring factor of mixture in conflate readings, and another supported by all the remaining documents, there is a strong presumption that a large portion of the adverse array of documents is descended from no line of transmission independent of the remaining portion, (that is, independent of the set of documents which habitually attests the other factor of mixture in conflate

readings,) but merely echoes at second hand the attestation of that remaining portion of the array: the lines of descent of the two groups which together make up the array are in short not parallel but successive. It follows that the documentary authority for the two variants respectively is virtually reduced to that of [page 52] the two groups habitually preserving the separate factors of mixture.

§64. It is true that variability in the margin of attestation, if we may for brevity repeat a phrase employed above (§ 62), may render it uncertain with which portion of the composite array certain documents should be classed, thus weakening but not destroying the force, whatever it may be, of their opposition to the reading of the single array. It is true also that the authority of the portion of documents which belongs to the mixed text does not become actually nothing: it is strictly the authority of a single lost document, one of the sources of the mixture, belonging to the same line of transmission as the earlier group of documents supporting the same reading independently of mixture, and thus adding another approximately similar member to their company. These qualifications do not however affect the substantial certainty and efficacy of the process here described, as enabling us in a large number of variations to disentangle the confusion wrought by mixture. It is independent of any external evidence as to dates, being founded solely on the analysis and comparison of the extant texts: but of course its value for purposes of criticism is much enhanced by any chronological evidence which may exist.

§65. On the other hand there is much mixture of texts for which the extant documentary evidence antecedent to mixture is too small or uncertain to be detached from the rest, and

evidence antecedent to mixture is too small or uncertain to be detached from the rest, and therefore to yield materials for the application of this process. In such cases we have to fall back on the principle of Internal Evidence of Groups, to be explained presently, which is applicable to mixed and unmixed texts alike. [page 53]

E. 66-72. Applications of genealogy

§66. After this brief sketch of the modes of discovering genealogical facts by means of the extant texts, which will, we hope, be made clearer by the concrete examples to be given further on, we come to the uses of the facts so obtained for the discrimination of true from false readings. One case of the examples given in § 51 shews at once that any number of documents ascertained to be all exclusively descended from another extant document may be safely put out of sight, and with them of course all readings which have no other authority. The evidence for the fact of descent may be of various kinds. Sometimes, though rarely, it is external. Sometimes it consists in the repetition of physical defects manifestly not antecedent to the supposed original, as when the loss of one or more of its leaves has caused the absence of the corresponding portions of text in all the other documents. Sometimes the evidence is strictly internal, being furnished by analysis of the texts themselves, when it is found that a fair number of mere blunders or other evidently individual peculiarities of the supposed original have been either reproduced or patched up in all the supposed derivative documents, and secondly that these documents contain few or no variations from the text of the supposed original which cannot be accounted for by natural and known causes of corruption.

§67. This summary reduction of documentary evidence by the discovery of extant ancestors of other existing documents is however of rare occurrence. On the other hand, wherever a text is found in a plurality of documents, there is a strong probability that some of them are descended from a single lost original. The proof

of com[page 54] mon descent is always essentially the same, consisting in numerous readings in which they agree among themselves and differ from all other documents, together with the easy deducibility, direct or indirect, of all their readings from a single text. In the absence of the second condition the result would differ only in being less simple: we should have to infer the mixture of two or more lost originals, independent of each other as well as of the remaining extant documents.

§68. The manner of recovering the text of a single lost original, assuming the fact of exclusive descent from it to have been sufficiently established, will be best explained by a free use of symbols. Let us suppose that the extant descendants are fourteen, denoted as a b c d g f g h i k l m n o; that, when their mutual relationships are examined they are found to fall into two sets, a c b c d c f g h i and k l m n o, each having a single lost ancestor (X and Y respectively) descended from the common original; and again that each of these sets falls similarly into smaller sets, the first into three, ab, cdef, andghi, the second into two, kb and m n o, each of the five lesser sets having a single lost ancestor (ady8e respectively) descended from the common subordinate original, ady from X, de from Y. Let us suppose also that no cross distributions implying mutual or internal mixture can be detected. We have then this pedigree: O X Y adyae r- | nr--T-1T-nr-Ir-lnr--I a bv g e fg fii k Z 7n no

§69. Readings in which all fourteen documents agree belonged indubitably to the common

§69. Readings in which all fourteen documents agree belonged indubitably to the common original O. On the other hand the genealogical evidence now before us furnishes no indication as to the readings of O in variations in which all the descendants of X are opposed to all the descendants of Y: for reasons already given (§ 57) the proportion nine to five tells us nothing; and the greater compositeness of abcdeggeg; as made up of three sets against two, [page 55] is equally irrelevant, since we know that each larger set has but a single ancestor, and we have no reason for preferring X singly to Y singly. These variations therefore we reserve for the present. Where however the descendants of either X or Y are divided, so that the representatives of (say) y join those of 8 and f against those of a and ??, and the question arises whether the reading of X is truly represented by a13 or by y, the decision must be given for that of y, because, mixture and accidental coincidence apart, in no other way can y have become at once separated from a: and joined to Sf; in other words, the change must have been not on the part of y but of ad or rather an intermediate common ancestor of theirs. The reading thus ascertained to have been that of both X and Y must also, as in the first case, have been the reading of O. Accordingly, so far as the whole evidence now before us is concerned, that is, assuming absence of mixture with documents independent of O, all readings of aSl] against 78f may be at once discarded, first as departures from the text of O, and next as departures from the text of the autograph, since the direct transmission of all the documents passes through (), and thus it is not possible, on the present conditions, for a a to agree with the autograph against

C) except by conjecture or accidental coincidence. The same results follow in all the analogous cases, namely for readings of y against a??8e, a against ayaf, 8 against aSeeX and e against aSy8. The combinations ay against /3de and Sy against aSs are possible only by mutual mixture among descendants of X antecedent to a??By, since they form cross distributions with the assumed combination aA against y3e: but this particular mixture would not interfere with the present operation of fixing the reading of X by coincidence with the reading of Y, because there would be no more mixture with Y than in the other cases, and the force of the consent of Y with part of the descendants of X remains the same

whatever that part may be.

§70. It will be seen at once what a wide and helpful suppression of readings that cannot be right is thus brought about by the mere application of Genealogical method, without need of appeal to the Internal Evidence of either Texts or Readings except so far as they contribute in the first instance to the establishment of the genealogical facts. Precisely analogous processes are required where any of the five lesser sets are divided, say by opposition [page 56] of cd to ef; so that we have to decide whether the true reading of 13 is found in cd or in et. The final clear result is that, when we have gone as far as the discoverable relations among our documents admit, we have on the one hand banished a considerable number of the extant variants as absolutely excluded, and on the other ascertained a considerable number of readings of 0, in addition to those parts of the text of O in which all its descendants agree.

§71. Two elements of uncertainty as to the text of O alone remain. First, the condition presupposed above, absence of mixture from without, does not always hold good. Where mixture from without exists, the inference given above from the concurrence of y with 8e against a13 becomes but one of three alternatives. It is possible that mixture with a text independent of O has affected y and Y alike, but not a??; and if so, a,8 will be ..._ true representatives of X and of 0. This possibility is however too slight to be weighed seriously, unless the reading of y and Y is found actually among existing documents independent of 0, provided that they are

Page 27

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

and Y is found actually among existing documents independent of O, provided that they are fairly numerous and various in their texts, or unless the hypothesis of mixture is confirmed by a sufficiency of similarly attested readings which cannot be naturally derived from readings found among the descendants of O. Again, it is possible that the reading of aS is itself due to mixture with a text independent of O: and if so, though rightly rejected from the determination of the reading of O, it may possibly be of use in determining the reading of an ancestor of O, or even of the autograph itself. But both these contingencies need be taken into account only when there is already ground for supposing mixture from without to exist.

§72. The second element of uncertainty is that which always accompanies the earliest known divergence from a single original. Given only the readings of X and Y, Genealogy is by its very nature powerless to shew which were the readings of O. It regains its power only when we go on to take into account fresh documentary evidence independent of O, and work towards an older common original from which both it and O are descended. O then comes to occupy the place of X or Y, and the same process is repeated; and so on as often as the evidence will allow. It must however be reiterated (see § 52) that, when O has come to mean the autograph, we have, in reaching the earliest known divergence, arrived [page 57] at the point where Genealogical method finally ceases to be applicable, since no independent documentary evidence remains to be taken up. Whatever variations survive at this ultimate divergence must still stand as undecided variations. Here therefore we are finally restricted to the Internal Evidence of single or grouped Documents and Readings, aided by any available external knowledge not dependent on (Genealogy).

F. 73-76. Variable use of genealogy according to unequal preservation of documents

§73. The proper method of Genealogy consists, it will be seen, in the more or less complete recovery of the texts of successive ancestors by analysis and

comparison of the varying texts of their respective descendants, each ancestral text so recovered being in its turn used, in conjunction with other similar texts, for the recovery of the text of a yet earlier common ancestor. The preservation of a comparatively small number of documents would probably suffice for the complete restoration of an autograph text (the determination of the earliest variations of course excepted) by genealogy alone, without the need of other kinds of evidence, provided that the documents preserved were adequately representative of different ages and different lines of transmission. This condition however is never fulfilled. Texts are not uncommonly preserved in a considerable assemblage of documents the genealogy of which can be fully worked out, but is found to conduct to one or two originals which, for all that appears to the contrary, may be separated from the autograph by many ages of transmission, involving proportionate possibilities of corruption. Here Genealogical method retains its relative value, for it reduces within narrow limits the amount of variation which need occupy an editor when he comes to the construction of his text: [page 58] but it leaves him in the dark, as all criticism dealing only with transmitted variations must do, as to the amount of correspondence between the best transmitted text and the text of his author. These cases correspond to such limited parts of the documentary evidence of more adequately attested texts as represent single stages of textual history.

Page 28

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

§74. In those rare cases, on the other hand, in which extant documentary evidence reaches up into quite ancient times the process may be carried back to a stage comparatively near the autograph: but here the evidence is as a matter of fact never abundant enough for more than rough and partial approximations to the typical process described above. Here too, as always, we have to ascertain whether the confusing influence of mixture exists, and if so, within what limits. Under such circumstances any chronological and geographical information to be obtained from without has great value in interpreting obscure genealogical phenomena, especially as marking the relative date and relative independence of the several early documents or early lost ancestors of late documents or sets of documents.

§75. In proportion as we approach the time of the autograph, the weight of composite attestation as against homogeneous attestation increases; partly because the plurality of proximate originals usually implied in composite attestation carries with it the favourable presumption afforded by the improbability of a plurality of scribes arriving independently at the same alteration; partly because the more truly composite the attestation, that is, the more independent its component elements, the more divergences and stages of transmission must have preceded, and thus the earlier is likely to have been the [page 59] date for the common original of these various generations of descendants, the later of which are themselves early. Nothing of course can exclude the possibility that one line of transmission may have ramified more rapidly and widely than another in the same time: yet still the shorter the interval between the time of the autograph and the end of the period of transmission in question, the stronger will be the presumption that earlier date implies greater purity of text. But the surest ground of trusting composite attestation is attained when it combines the best documentary representatives of those lines of transmission which, as far as our knowledge goes, were the earliest to diverge.

Such are essentially instances of ascertained concordance of X and Y (§ 69), in spite of the dissent of some descendants of one or both.

§76. The limitation to "the best documentary representatives" is necessary, because the intrusion of mixture in documents, or in lost originals of documents or of documentary groups may disguise the actual historical relations (see § 61), and give the appearance of greater compositeness of attestation to readings which have merely invaded lines of transmission that for a while were free from them. It thus becomes specially necessary to observe which documents, or lost originals of documents or documentary groups, are found to shew frequent or occasional mixture with texts alien from their own primary ancestry, and to allow for the contingency accordingly. Many cases however of ambiguous interpretation of evidence are sure to remain, which the existing knowledge of the history of mixture is incompetent to clear up; and for these recourse must be had to evidence of other kinds. [page 60]

SECTION IV. INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF GROUPS 77, 78

§77. We have reserved for this place the notice of another critical resource which is in some sense intermediate between Internal Evidence of Documents and Genealogical Evidence, but which in order of discovery would naturally come last, and the value of which will have been made more apparent through the inherent and the incidental defects of Genealogical Evidence described in the preceding paragraphs. This supplementary resource is Internal Evidence of Groups. In discussing Internal Evidence of Documents, we spoke only of single documents: but Page 29

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

Groups. In discussing Internal Evidence of Documents, we spoke only of single documents: but the method itself is equally applicable to groups of documents. Just as we can generalise the characteristics of any given MS by noting successively what readings it supports and rejects, (each reading having previously been the subject of a tentative estimate of Internal Evidence of Readings, Intrinsic and Transcriptional,) and by classifying the results, so we can generalise the characteristics of any given group of documents by similar observations on the readings which it supports and rejects, giving special attention to those readings in which it stands absolutely or virtually alone. In texts where mixture has been various, the number of variations affording trustworthy materials for generalisations as to any one group can be only a part of the sum total of variations; but that part will often be amply sufficient. The evidence obtained in this manner is Internal Evidence, not Genealogical. But the validity of the inferences depends on the genealogical principle that community of reading implies community of origin. If we find, for instance, in any group of documents a succession of readings [page 61] exhibiting an exceptional purity of text, that is, readings which the fullest consideration of Internal Evidence pronounces to be right in opposition to formidable arrays of Documentary Evidence, the cause must be that, as far at least as these readings are concerned, some one exceptionally pure MS was the common ancestor of all the members of the group; and that accordingly a recurrence of this consent marks a recurrence of joint derivation from that particular origin, and accordingly a strong presumption that exceptional purity is to be looked for here again. The inference holds equally good whether the transmission has been wholly divergent, or partly divergent and partly mixed; and any characteristic, favourable or unfavourable, may be the subject of it.

§78. The value of Internal Evidence of Groups in cases of mixture depends, it will be seen, on the fact that by its very nature it enables us to deal separately with the different elements of a document of mixed ancestry. In drawing general conclusions from the characteristics of the text of a document for the appreciation of its individual readings successively, we assume the general homogeneousness of its text; but this assumption is legitimate only if unity of line of ancestry is

presupposed. The addition of a second line of ancestry by mixture introduces a second homogeneousness, which is as likely as not to conflict with that of the first, and thus to falsify inferences drawn from the first, unless there be means of discriminating from the rest of the text the portions taken from the second original. But each well marked group of which the mixed document is a member implies at least the contingency of a distinct origin; and thus, in readings in which the document is associated with the rest of the group, its authority need not be that which [page 62] it derives in the bulk of its text from its fundamental or primary original, but is strictly that belonging to the common ancestor of its secondary original and of the other members of the group. Such readings might be truly described as forming a series of minute fragments of a copy of the lost document which was the secondary original, leaving corresponding gaps in the more or less faithfully preserved text of the primary original, except where conflate readings have wholly or partly preserved both texts. In the next Part we shall have ample opportunity of illustrating what has here been said.

SECTION V. RECAPITULATION OF METHODS IN RELATION TO EACH OTHER 79-84

§79. To recapitulate. The method of Genealogy is an application of one part of the knowledge of Documents; and like the method founded on the Internal Evidence of Documents it involves

Page 30

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

of Documents; and like the method founded on the Internal Evidence of Documents it involves three processes; first the analysis and comparison of the documentary evidence for a succession of individual variations; next the investigation of the genealogical relations between the documents and therefore between their ancestors, by means of the materials first obtained; and thirdly the application of these genealogical relations to the interpretation of the documentary evidence for each individual variation. The results of the interpretation of documentary evidence thus and thus alone made possible are various. In the first place it winnows away a multitude of readings which genealogical relations prove to be of late origin, and which therefore cannot have been derived by transmission from the autograph. Where the extant evidence suggests but [page 63] is insufficient to prove thus much, and in the case of all other variants, this method so presents and limits the possible genealogical antecedents of the existing combinations of documentary evidence as to supply presumptions in favour of one variant against another varying from what amounts under favourable circumstances to practically absolute certainty down to complete equipoise.

§80. So far as genealogical relations are discovered with perfect certainty, the textual results which follow from them are perfectly certain too, being directly involved in historical facts; and any apparent presumptions against them suggested by other methods are mere guesses against knowledge. But the inequalities and occasional ambiguities in the evidence for the genealogical relations frequently admit of more than one interpretation, and this greater or less substitution of probability for certainty respecting the documentary history reduces the textual verdict to a presumption, stronger or weaker as the case may be. Genealogical presumptions ought however to take precedence of other presumptions, partly because their immediate basis is in itself historical not speculative, and the subject-matter of all textual criticism is historical, partly because the generalisations by which that historical basis is ascertained involve less chance of error than the analogous generalisations required for any kind of

Internal Evidence.

§81. The only safe order of procedure therefore is to start with the reading suggested by a strong genealogical presumption, if such there be; and then enquire whether the considerations suggested by other kinds of evidence agree with it, and if not, whether they are clear and strong enough to affect the claim of higher attestation. If they appear so to be, a [page 64] full re-examination becomes necessary; and the result, especially if similar instances recur, may be the discovery of some genealogical complication overlooked before. No definite rule can be given as to what should be done where the apparent conflict remains, more especially where the documentary evidence is scanty or obscure. For our own part, in any writing having fairly good and various documentary attestation we should think it dangerous to reject any reading clearly supported by genealogical relations, though we might sometimes feel it equally necessary to abstain from rejecting its rival.

§82. Next in value to Genealogical Evidence is Internal Evidence of Documents, single or in groups. But where the documents exceed a very small number, the Internal Evidence of single Documents, as has already been explained (§ 48), is rendered for the most part practically inapplicable by the unresolved complexity. The Internal Evidence however of Groups of Documents is always applicable if there are documents enough to form groups. It is the best substitute for Genealogical Evidence proper in texts, or in any parts of texts, in which genealogical relations are too obscure for use; and it affords the most trustworthy presumptions

genealogical relations are too obscure for use; and it affords the most trustworthy presumptions for comparison with purely genealogical presumptions, having similar merits derived from the form of the processes by which it is obtained, while relating to a different class of phenomena. The highest certainty is that which arises from concordance of the presumptions suggested by all methods, and it is always prudent to try every variation by both kinds of Internal Evidence of Readings. The uncertainty however inherent in both, as dependent on isolated acts of individual judgement, renders them on the whole untrustworthy against a con[page 65] currence of Genealogy and Internal Evidence of Documents; though a concurrence of clear Intrinsic with clear Transcriptional Probability ought certainly to raise at least a provisional doubt.

§83. Textual criticism fulfils its task best, that is, is most likely to succeed ultimately in distinguishing true readings from false, when it is guided by a full and clear perception of all the classes of phenomena which directly or indirectly supply any kind of evidence, and when it regulates itself by such definite methods as the several classes of phenomena suggest when patiently and circumspectly studied. This conformity to rationally framed or rather discovered rules implies no disparagement of scholarship and insight, for the employment of which there is indeed full scope in various parts of the necessary processes. It does but impose salutary restraints on the arbitrary and impulsive caprice which has marred the criticism of some of those whose scholarship and insight have deservedly been held in the highest honour.

§84. Nevertheless in almost all texts variations occur where personal judgement inevitably takes a large part in the final decision. In these cases there is no failure of method, which strictly speaking is an impossibility, but an imperfection or confusion of the evidence needed for the application of method. Here different minds will be impressed by different parts of the evidence as clearer than the rest, and so virtually ruling the rest: here therefore personal discernment would seem the surest ground for confidence. Yet here too, once more, the true supremacy of method is vindicated; for it is from the past exercise of method that personal

discernment receives the education which tends to extinguish its illusions and [page 66] mature its power. All instinctive processes of criticism which deserve confidence are rooted in experience, and that an experience which has undergone perpetual correction and recorection.

SECTION VI. CRITICISM AS DEALING WITH ERRORS ANTECEDENT TO EXISTING TEXTS 85-95

A. 85-92. Primitive errors

§85. The preceding pages have dealt exclusively with the task of discriminating between existing various readings, one variant in each case being adopted and the rest discarded. The utmost result that can be obtained under this condition is the discovery of u-hat is relatively original: whether the readings thus relatively original were also the readings of the autograph is another question, which can never be answered in the affirmative with absolute decision except where the autograph itself is extant, but which admits of approximative answers varying enormously in certainty according to the nature of the documentary evidence for the text generally. Even in a case in which it were possible to shew that the extant documents can be traced back to two originals which diverged from the autograph itself without any intermediate common ancestor, we could never be quite sure that where they differed one or other must have the true reading,

we could never be quite sure that where they differed one or other must have the true reading, since they might independently introduce different changes in the same place, say owing to some obscurity in the writing of a particular word. In almost all actual cases an interval, short or long, must have divided the autograph from the earliest point or points to which genealogy conducts us back, and any interval implies the possibility of corruption, while every addition to the length of the interval increases the probability of corruption. On the other hand documentary evidence including a fair variety of very ancient attestation may bring the meeting-point of the extant lines of transmission so near the autograph that freedom from antecedent corruption ceases to be improbable, without however thereby becoming a priori probable. In such cases therefore any investigation of [page 67] the ultimate integrity of the text is governed by no theoretical presumptions: its final conclusions must rest on the intrinsic verisimilitude or suspiciousness of the text itself.

§86. These considerations have an important bearing on certain paradoxical conflicts of evidence respecting transmitted variations, which present themselves occasionally in most texts and frequently in many; and which are peculiarly apt to mislead editors to whom textual criticism is only a subordinate province of interpretation. The reading clearly indicated by Genealogical or other evidence obtained from whole texts, or by Transcriptional Evidence of Readings, or by both together, may be as clearly condemned by Intrinsic Evidence. We are not speaking of the numerous cases in which readings that have seemed to a critic in the first instance too strange to be true approve themselves on better knowledge, perhaps as no more than tolerable, but oftener still as having a peculiar impress of truth which once apprehended cannot easily be questioned; or in which competent critics receive opposite impressions from the same reading, one holding it to be impossible, the other to have the stamp of originality. These differences of judgement throw no light upon readings which all competent critics feel on consideration to be impossible, and yet which are strongly attested by, it may be, every kind of evidence except Intrinsic Evidence.

§87. The true solution lies in the fact that the subject matter of the different kinds of evidence is not identical. Intrinsic Evidence is concerned only with absolute originality; it pronounces which of two or more words or phrases a given author in a given place was more likely to use, or, in extreme cases in either direction, whether either of them was what he must have used or could not possibly have used. All other kinds of evidence are concerned only or predominantly with relative originality: they pronounce, speaking roughly, which of two or more readings is more likely to have given rise to the others, or is found in the best company, or has the best pedigree. The apparent conflict therefore is dependent on the assumption, usually well founded, that the two originalities coincide. Where they do not, that is, where corruption has preceded the earliest extant documentary evidence, the most nearly original extant reading may nevertheless be wrong, simply because the reading of the autograph [page 68] has perished. What an editor ought to print in such a case, supposing he has satisfied himself that the best attested reading is really impossible, may vary according to circumstances. But it is clearly his duty in some way to notify the presumed fact of corruption, whether he can offer any suggestion for its removal or not.

§88. In the cases just mentioned, while the best attested reading is found to be impossible, the other reading or readings shown by evidence not Intrinsic to be corruptions of it are or may be

found quite possible but not more: they derive their prima facie probability only from an assumed necessity of rejecting their better attested rival. In other cases the reading (or one of the readings) shown to be of later origin has very strong Intrinsic Evidence in its own favour; that is, we have a combination of positive clear Intrinsic Evidence for the worse attested reading with negative clear Intrinsic Evidence against the better attested reading. So complete an inversion of the ordinary and natural distributions of evidence always demands, it need hardly be said, a thorough verification before it can be accepted as certain. It does however without doubt occasionally occur, and it arises from a state of things fundamentally the same as in the former cases, with the difference that here a transcriber has happened to make that alteration which was needed to bring back the reading of the autograph, that is, has in the course of transcription made a successful Conjectural Emendation. No sharp line can in fact be drawn between the deliberate conjectural emendations of a modern scholar and many of the half or wholly unconscious changes more or less due to mental action which have arisen in the ordinary course of transcription, more especially at times when minute textual accuracy has not been specially cultivated. An overwhelming proportion of the cursory emendations thus made and silently embodied in transcribed texts are of course wrong: but it is no wonder that under favourable circumstances they should sometimes be right. It may, once more, be a matter of doubt what form of printed text it will here be most expedient under given circumstances to adopt. The essential fact remains under all circumstances, that the conjectural origin of these readings is not altered by the necessity of formally including them in the sum of attested readings; and that an editor is bound to indicate in some manner the conjectural character of any attested reading [page 69] which he accepts as the reading intended by the author, and yet which he does not believe to have been received by continuous transmission from the autograph.

§89. We have dwelt at some length on these two classes of variations because at

first sight they appear to furnish grounds for distrusting the supremacy of what we have ventured to call the higher kinds of evidence. They not unnaturally suggest the thought that, whatever may be said in theory respecting the trustworthiness of evidence not Intrinsic, it breaks down in extreme cases, and must therefore contain some latent flaw which weakens its force in all. But the suspicion loses all plausibility when it is seen that it springs from a confusion as to the subject matter of attestation (see § 87), and that the attestation itself remains as secure in extreme cases as in all others. The actual uncertainties arise not from any want of cogency of method, but from inadequate quantity or quality of the concrete evidence available in this or that particular text or variation.

§90. Both the classes of variations just considered imply corruption in the earliest transmitted text. The same fact of corruption antecedent to extant documentary evidence has to be recognised in other cases, some of which form a third class of variations. Besides the variations already noticed in which the evidence shews one variant to have been the parent of the rest, while yet on Intrinsic grounds it cannot be right, there are others in which the variants have every appearance of being independent of each other, while yet on Intrinsic grounds none having sufficiently good documentary attestation, or even none at all, can be regarded as right: that is to say, a convergence of phenomena points to some lost reading as the common origin of the existing readings. Fourthly, there may be sufficient grounds for inability to accept the transmitted text even in places where the documents agree.

text even in places where the documents agree.

§91. In all four cases the ground of belief that the transmitted text is wrong is Internal Evidence of Readings. In the third it is or may be a combination of Intrinsic and Transcriptional Evidence: in the first, second, and fourth it is exclusively Intrinsic Evidence, except where recognition of corruption is partly founded on perception of the lost original reading, which, as we shall see shortly, involves the use of Transcriptional Evidence. The use of Internal Evidence of Readings in detecting corruption is precisely identical with its use, or [page 70] rather one of its uses, in the discrimination of attested readings. In coming to a decision on the strength of Intrinsic Evidence, a critic makes one of three affirmations respecting two variants Q and S; (1) a is more probable than d; (2) a is not only more probable than ,6, and is not only suitable to the place, but is so exactly and perfectly suitable that it must be right; and (3) a is not only less probable than an but so improbable absolutely that it cannot be right, so that a as the only remaining variant must be right: (2) and (3) of course include (1), and also are compatible with each other. Now in pronouncing a text corrupt, he affirms neither more nor less than in the fundamental proposition of the third instance, in which he equally finds his whole evidence exclusively in the reading condemned, and in its own relations to the context, without reference to any other variant. In both procedures the affirmation has against it all the uncertainties which we have pointed out as inherent in the exclusive use of Intrinsic Evidence: nevertheless there are places in nearly all texts where its force is so convincing that the most cautious critic cannot refuse to make the affirmation, and in every ill preserved text they abound.

§92. The first, second, and fourth cases are essentially the same. The presence of more than one variant in the first and second case does not place them on a different footing from the fourth, because all but the one are by supposition subsequent to the one, and are therefore virtually out of sight when the question of accepting the most original of attested readings as the true reading arises. A critic may doubtless feel less reluctant to pronounce a reading corrupt when he

sees that it gave trouble to ancient scribes; but the encouragement is due to corroboration of personal judgement, not to any kind of evidence; it comes from the ancient scribes in the character of critics, not as witnesses to a transmitted text. On the other hand the third case has an advantage over the others by combining a certain measure of Transcriptional with Intrinsic Probability. The supposition of corruption has the strength of a double foundation when it not only accounts for our finding an impossible text but supplies a common cause for two readings, the apparent independence of which would otherwise be perplexing and this it does even in the absence of any perception as to what conjectural reading would fulfil the various conditions of the case. [page 71]

B. 93-95. Removal of primitive errors by conjecture

§93. In discussing the corruption of texts antecedent to extant documents, the forms in which it presents itself, and the nature of the critical process by which it is affirmed, we have reserved till last a brief notice of the critical process which endeavours to remedy it, that is, Conjectural Emendation. Although in practice the two processes are often united, and a felicitous conjecture sometimes contributes strong accessory evidence of corruption, it is not the less desirable that they should be considered separately. The evidence for corruption is often irresistible, imposing on an editor the duty of indicating the presumed unsoundness of the text, although he may be

Page 35

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

on an editor the duty of indicating the presumed unsoundness of the text, although he may be wholly unable to propose any enduring way of correcting it, or have to offer only suggestions in which he cannot place full confidence.

§94. The art of Conjectural Emendation depends for its success so much on personal endowments, fertility of resource in the first instance, and even more an appreciation of language too delicate to acquiesce in merely plausible corrections, that it is easy to forget its true character as a critical operation founded on knowledge and method. Like the process of detecting corruption, it can make no use of any evidence except Internal Evidence of Readings, but it depends on Intrinsic and Transcriptional Evidence alike: Where either there is no variation or one variant is the original of the rest, that is, in the fourth, first, and second of the cases mentioned above, two conditions have to be fulfilled by a successful emendation. As regards Intrinsic Evidence, it must, to attain complete certainty, be worthy of the second form of affirmation noticed above, that is, be so exactly and perfectly suitable to the place that it cannot but be right; or, to attain reasonable probability, it must be quite suitable to the place positively, and free from all incongruity negatively. As regards Transcriptional Evidence, it must be capable of explaining how the transmitted text could naturally arise out of it in accordance with the ordinary probabilities of transcription. Where there are more independent variants than one, that is, in the third case, the only difference is that the suggested correction must in like manner be capable of giving rise naturally to every such transmitted Reading. Thus in all cases the problem [page 72] involved in forming a judgement on a suggested Conjectural Emendation differs in one respect only from the ordinary problems involved in deciding between transmitted readings on the strength of Intrinsic and Transcriptional Evidence combined, and of these alone; it consists in asking whether a given reading out of two or three fulfils certain conditions well absolutely, whereas in other cases we ask which of two or three readings fulfils the same conditions best.

§95. The place of Conjectural Emendation in the textual criticism of the New Testament is however so inconsiderable that we should have hesitated to say even

thus much about it, did it not throw considerable light on the true nature of all textual criticism, and illustrate the vast increase of certainty which is gained when we are able to make full use of Documentary Evidence, and thus confine Internal Evidence to the subordinate functions which alone it is normally fitted to discharge. [page 73]

PART III APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES OF CRITICISM TO THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

§96. The principles of criticism explained in the foregoing section hold good for all ancient texts preserved in a plurality of documents. In dealing with the text of the New Testament no new principle whatever is needed or legitimate: but no other ancient text admits of so full and extensive application of all the various means of discriminating original from erroneous readings which have been suggested to scholars by study of the conditions of textual transmission. On the one hand the New Testament, as compared with the rest of ancient literature, needs peculiarly

Page 36

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

one hand the New Testament, as compared with the rest of ancient literature, needs peculiarly vigilant and patient handling on account of the intricacy of evidence due to the unexampled amount and antiquity of mixture of different texts, from which few even of the better documents are free. On the other it has unique advantages in the abundance, the antiquity, and above all in the variety of its documentary evidence, a characteristic specially favourable to the tracing of genealogical order.

CHAPTER I. PRELIMINARY CHRONOLOGICAL SURVEY OF DOCUMENTS 97-128

§97. Before entering on the historical phenomena of the text itself, and the relations between its principal documents, we think it best to interpose a short general survey [page 74] of the written evidence with which all criticism has to deal, presenting it in a form somewhat different from that of the detailed catalogues which it is the office of other books to supply. The entire body of documentary evidence, with inconsiderable exceptions, consists of three parts; extant Greek MSS, ancient translations or 'Versions' in different languages, and quotations from the New Testament made by ancient Christian writers or 'Fathers'.

A. 98-106. Greek MSS

§98. The Greek MSS of the New Testament are divided into two classes, conventionally though somewhat incorrectly termed 'Uncials' and 'Cursives', according as they are written in capital or in minuscule characters. Since Wetstein's time (1751, 1752) it has been customary to distinguish Uncials by capital letters, and Cursives for the most part by arabic numerals. At the head of the list of Uncials stand four great MSS belonging to the fourth and fifth centuries. When complete, they all evidently contained the whole Greek Bible. At least three, and not improbably all four, had all the books of the New

Testament that have been subsequently recognised as canonical, at least two containing other books in addition: as two are mutilated at the end, it is impossible to speak with greater precision. These four MSS are products of the earlier part of that second great period of Church history which begins with the reign of Constantine; the time when the various partial Canons of Scripture were brought together and as it were codified in various ways, the first step in the process being probably the catalogue of Eusebius in his Church History (of about 325), and the most decisive step, at least for the Greek churches, the catalogue of Athanasius in his 39th Paschal Epistle, of 367. About 332 Constantine directed Eusebius to have fifty easily legible copies of the complete Scriptures executed by skilful calligraphers for the use of the churches in his newly founded capital. We learn nothing of the texts or the contents of these "sumptuously prepared volumes" (Eus. Vit. Const IV 37): but if the contained books corresponded with Eusebius's own list of a few years earlier (ff. E. III 25), none of our present MSS can well have been of the number. The incident illustrates however a need which would arise on a smaller scale in many places, as new and splendid churches came to be built under the Christian Empire after the great persecution: and the four extant copies are doubtless casual [page 75] examples of a numerous class of MSS, derived from various origins though brought into existence in the first instance by similar circumstances. These four are the Codex Vaticanus (B), containing the whole New Testament except the later chapters of Hebrews, the Pastoral Epistles, Philemon, and the Apocalypse; the Codex Sinaiticus (S), containing all the books entire; the Codex Alexandrinus (A), containing

Codex SinaiZzcus (S.), containing all the books entire; the Codex=Alexandrinus (A), containing all, except about the first 24 chapters of St Matthew's and two leaves of St John's Gospel and three of 2 Corinthians; and the Codex Ephraezni (C), containing nearly three fifths of the whole (145 out of 238 leaves), dispersed over almost every book, one or more sheets having perished out of almost every quire of four sheets. The two former appear to belong to the middle part of the fourth century: the two latter are certainly of somewhat later date, and are assigned by the best judges to the fifth century.

§99. The remaining uncial MSS are all of smaller though variable size. None of them shew signs of having formed part of a complete Bible, and it is even doubtful whether any of them belonged to a complete New Testament Six alone (including one consisting of mere fragments) are known to have contained more than one of the groups of books, if we count the Acts and the Apocalypse as though they were each a group. The Gospels are contained in fair completeness in nineteen uncial MSS (including SABC), the Acts in nine, the Catholic Epistles in seven, the Pauline Epistles in nine (besides the transcripts E3 and F2), and the Apocalypse in five. The numbers given for the Gospels, Acts, and Pauline Epistles do not include some more or less considerable fragments: but the line is hard to draw, and much is lost of C and r, which are included in the list.

§100. After the four great Bibles the chronological distribution becomes remarkable. The fifth century supplies (besides AC) only Q and T, both consisting of fragments of Luke and John: the sixth century supplies for the Gospels 1) (all four, but incomplete), N and 1' (fragments of all four), S (Matthew and Mark, almost complete), R (fragments of Luke), and Z (fragments of Matthew); for the Acts D and E2 (both incomplete); and for the Pauline Epistles D2 (not quite complete): under each head some lesser fragments are not reckoned. The seventh century furnishes merely a few fragments; the eighth, besides lesser fragments, EL (Gospels), X (large [page 76] fragments of Luke), and Bs (Apocalypse). But the MSS of the ninth and tenth centuries are about as numerous as those of all preceding centuries together. The preceding assignation

of uncials to this or that century is founded in most cases on no independent judgement, but on the published estimates of the best qualified palaeographers. It is quite possible that some of the intermediate uncials may be placed a century too high or too low, for the absence of dated MSS before the ninth century renders palaeographical determination of the absolute chronology as yet insecure. The approximate outlines of the relative or sequential chronology appear however to have been laid down with reasonable certainty; so that the total impression left by a chronological analysis of the list of uncials can hardly be affected by possible errors of detail.

§101. The bilingual uncial MSS have a special interest They are, in Greek and Latin, DA of the Gospels, DE2 of the Acts, and D2[E3F2]G3 of the Pauline Epistles; in Greek and Thebaic (the language of Upper Egypt), the fragmentary T of Luke and John, with some still smaller fragments of the same kind.

§102. The Cursive MSS range from the ninth to the sixteenth centuries. Many of them contain two or more groups of books, and about 30 the whole New Testament If each MS is counted as one, irrespectively of the books contained, the total number is between 900 and 1000.

§103. An accessory class of Greek MSS is formed by Lectionaries or books of ecclesiastical lessons taken from the New Testament, of which above 400 have been catalogued. Above four fifths contain only Gospel lessons most of the rest lessons from the Acts and Epistles, some few being mixed. About 70 are uncials, and the rest cursives. None however are believed to be older than the eighth or possibly the seventh century, and uncial writing continued in use for Lectionaries some time after it had become obsolete for complete copies of the New Testament or complete divisions of it

§104. Such is the nominal roll of Greek MSS. If however we confine our attention to those sufficiently known to be used regularly as direct evidence, a numerically large deduction has to be made, the amount of which, as distinguished from its value, cannot be estimated even in a rough manner. Comparatively few Lectionaries have as yet been collated. Some of these have been found to contain readings of sufficient value and interest to encourage further enquiry in what is as yet an almost unexplored region of textual history, but not to promise considerable assistance in the recovery of the apostolic text. Of the numerous cursive MSS of the New Testament and its parts hardly any have been printed in extenso. We have however complete and trustworthy collations of a select few from Tregelles, and of a large miscellaneous (English) array from Dr Scrivener, both most careful collators; and tolerably complete collations of other miscellaneous assemblages from Alter (Vienna) and Matthaei (chiefly Moscow and Dresden); with which other collations might probably be classed. On the customary mode of reckoning, by which the four traditional divisions of the New Testament (Acts and Catholic Epistles being counted as one) are taken separately, the full contents of about 150 cursives, besides Lectionaries, may be set down as practically known from these sources. A much larger number are known in various degrees of imperfection, some perhaps almost as well as those included in this first class, from the labours of a series of collators, of whom

Mill, Wetstein, Griesbach, Birch, Scholz, and Muralt deserve special mention. Many others have been examined only in selected passages, by which rough presumptions, but hardly more, can be formed as to the general character of the text; and many others again are entirely unknown.

§105. This large amount of present ignorance respecting the contents of cursives is much to be lamented. Valuable texts may lie hidden among them; many of them are doubtless sprinkled with relics of valuable texts now destroyed; and fresh collations always throw more or less light on the later history of the text generally, and sometimes on its earlier history. But enough is already known to enable us to judge with reasonable certainty as to the proportional amount of valuable evidence likely to be buried in the copies as yet uncollated. If we are to trust the analogy thus provided, which agrees with what might have been anticipated from the average results of continued transcription generally, nothing can well be less probable than the discovery of cursive evidence sufficiently important to affect present conclusions in more than a handful of passages, much less to alter present interpretations of the relations between the existing documents.

§106. The nominal list of uncials needs hardly any appreciable deductions to make it a true representation [page 78] of the uncial evidence completely available. With the exception of the lately discovered 2:, all the older and more important uncials, some fragments excepted, have now been published in continuous texts, and the various readings of the rest are included in the apparatus critici of Tischendorf and (with unimportant exceptions) of Tregelles.

B. 107-122. Versions

§107. The second class of documents consists of Versions, that is, ancient translations of the whole or parts of the New Testament, made chiefly for the service of churches in which Greek was at least not habitually spoken. Besides some outlying Versions, there are three principal classes, the LATIN, the SYRIAC, and the EGYPTIAN. The history of all is still more or less obscure.

§108. The LATIN MSS are usually classified under two heads, 'Old Latin' (sometimes miscalled 'Italic') and 'Vulgate'. For some purposes the distinction is convenient and almost necessary: but it disguises the fact that there IS a wider difference between the earlier and the later stages of the 'Old Latin' (in this comprehensive sense of the term) than between the later stages and the Vulgate. The statements of Tertullian leave no doubt that when he wrote, near the beginning of the third century, a Latin translation of the New Testament was already current in North Africa. How much earlier it came into existence, and in what manner, cannot be ascertained, but it may be reasonably assumed to have originated in Africa. An exact and authentic transcript of portions of the African text is conveyed to us by the early Latin patristic quotations. The rich evidence supplied by Tertullian's works is indeed difficult to disentangle, because he was fond of using his knowledge of Greek by quoting Scripture in immediate and original renderings, the proportion of which to his quotations from the existing version is indeterminate but certainly large. This disturbing element is absent however from Cyprian's quotations, which are fortunately copious and carefully made, and thus afford trustworthy standards of African Old Latin in a very early though still not the earliest stage.

§109. In the fourth century we find current in Western Europe, and especially in North Italy, a second type of text, the precise relation of which to the African text of the second and third centuries has not yet been clearly ascertained. These two Latin texts have very much in [page 79] common, both in the underlying Greek text and in language and many of the

differences are fully compatible with the supposition that the African was the parent of the European text, having undergone revision when it travelled northwards, and been in some measure adapted to the needs of a more highly cultivated population. On the other hand, other differences, not so easily accounted for by this process, afford some justification for the alternative view that Italy had an indigenous version of her own, not less original than the African. The distinctively African renderings which occur not unfrequently in some of the best European documents may be explained in conformity with either view; as survivors from an earlier state, or as aliens introduced by mixture. Recent investigations have failed to solve this difficult problem, and it must be left for further examination: fortunately the value of the two early forms of the Latin text is not appreciably affected by the uncertainty. The name 'Old Latin', in its narrower and truer sense, may properly be retained for both, where there is no need of distinguishing them, and for the European text, where the African is not extant or never existed; the special designations 'African Latin' and 'European Latin' being employed where they bear a divided testimony.

§110. After the middle of the fourth century we meet with Latin texts which must be referred to a third type. They are evidently due to various revisions of the European text, made partly to bring it into accord with such Greek MSS as chanced to be available, partly to give the Latinity

Page 40

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

bring it into accord with such Greek MSS as chanced to be available, partly to give the Latinity a smoother and more customary aspect. In itself the process was analogous to that by which the European text must have been formed, on the supposition that it was of African parentage: but, as we shall see presently, the fundamental text now underwent more serious changes, owing to the character of the Greek MSS chiefly employed. The fact that the Latin text found in many of Augustine's writings is of this type has long been used with good reason to shew what he meant by the *Itala* which he names in a single laudatory notice (*De docl. Chr. ii 15*). Without doubt this name was intended to distinguish the version or text which he had in view from the 'African' version or text with which he was likewise familiar ('*codices Afros*' *Retr. i 21 3*). The only open question is whether he had definitely before his mind a special text due to a recent North Italian re[page 80] vision, as has been usually assumed by those who have interpreted rightly the general bearing of his words, or was merely thinking of the text of Italy in such a comprehensive sense as would include what we have called the European text. The former view was a necessary inference from the assumption that the best known Old Latin MSS of the Gospels had a strictly African text: but much of its probability is lost when it is seen how far removed they are from a Cyprianic standard. But whatever may be the precise force of the term as used by Augustine, such revised texts as those which he himself employed constitute an important stage in the history of the Latin New Testament: and it can hardly lead to misunderstanding if we continue to denote them by the convenient name 'Italian'.

§111. The endless multiplicity of text in the Latin copies at length induced Jerome, about 383, to undertake a more thorough revision of the same kind. We learn from his own account nothing about his Greek MSS except that they were "old"; or about his mode of proceeding except that he made no alterations but such as were required by the sense, and that he kept specially in view the removal of the numerous interpolated clauses by which the Gospels were often brought into factitious similarity to each other in parallel passages. Internal evidence shews that the Latin MSS which he took as a basis for his corrections contained

an already revised text, chiefly if not wholly Italian' in character. In the Gospels his changes seem to have been comparatively numerous; in the other books of the New Testament, which he left without any explanatory preface, but which he must have taken in hand as soon as the Gospels were finished, his changes were evidently much scantier and more perfunctory. It is worthy of notice that readings distinctly adopted in his own writings are not seldom at variance with the revised text which bears his name. These discrepancies may possibly be due to a change of view subsequent to the revision: but in any case it would be rash to assume that Jerome deliberately considered and approved every reading found in his text, even of the Gospels, and much more of the other books which passed through his hands. The name `Vulgate' has long denoted exclusively the Latin Bible as revised by Jerome; and indeed in modern times no continuous text of any other form of the Latin version or versions was known before 1695. [page 81]

§112. Generations not a few had passed before the Hieronymic revision had even approximately displaced the chaos of unrevised and imperfectly revised Latin texts; and during the period of simultaneous use the Latin Vulgate, as we may now call it, suffered much in purity by the casual resumption of many readings expelled or refused by Jerome. Scribes accustomed to older forms of text corrupted by unwitting reminiscence the Vulgate which they were copying, so that an appreciable part of Jerome's work had been imperceptibly undone when the Vulgate attained its final triumph. Partly from this cause, partly from the ordinary results of

Vulgate attained its final triumph. Partly from this cause, partly from the ordinary results of transcription, the Vulgate text underwent progressive deterioration till long after the close of the Middle Ages, notwithstanding various partial attempts at correction. At length the authoritative `Clementine' revision or recension of 1592 removed many corruptions. Many others however were left untouched, and no critically revised text of the Latin Vulgate New Testament founded systematically on more than one or two of the best MSS has yet been edited. The text of at least two of the best as yet known, and a very few others comparatively good, has however been printed at full length.

§113. The existing MSS of the Old Latin Gospels, distinguished by small letters, belong for the most part to the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries: one however (c), strange to say, was written as late as the eleventh century. Hardly any are quite complete, and those which contain more than inconsiderable fragments amount to about fourteen, of which on an average scarcely more than half are extant in any one passage: in this computation Ante-Hicronymic texts of all types are included. Among the few fragments not counted are two leaves which agree closely with one of the comparatively complete MSS: but with this exception all known MSS shew more or less textual individuality, and there are many traces of sporadic and casual mixture. Two of the MSS (e k) are substantially African, a large proportion of their texts being absolutely identical with that of Cyprian, where he differs from European MSS and Fathers; but each has also an admixture of other readings: both are unfortunately very imperfect, e having lost above twofifths of its contents, chiefly in Matthew and Mark, and k above three-fourths, including the whole of Luke and John. Two other MSS (jy), and one or two fragments, must be classed as `Italian'. The remaining ten, though [page 82] African readings are found to a certain extent in some of them, and Italian readings in others, have all substantially European texts.

§114. Various modifications of late revision and mixture are represented in some Latin MSS of the Gospels, which do not properly fall under any one of the preceding heads. Four of them are usually marked as Old Latin (ff1 g1.2 l); but

most of the number pass simply as copies of the Vulgate. With few exceptions their texts are as yet imperfectly known; and the relations of their texts to each other, and to the Hieronymic or any other late revisions, have still to be investigated. They are certainly however in most cases, and not improbably in all, monuments of the process described above (§ 112) by which Old Latin readings, chiefly European but in a few cases African, found their way into texts fundamentally Hieronymic. The chief worth of these Mixed Vulgate MSS for the criticism of the Greek text consists in the many valuable particles of Latin texts antecedent to the Vulgate which have thus escaped extinction by displacing Jerome's proper readings. Mixed texts of this class are not confined to the Gospels; but in the other books, so far as they are yet known, their Ante-Hieronimic elements contain a much smaller proportion of valuable materials.

§115. The Gospels alone are extant in a series of tolerably complete Old Latin MSS. For most of the other books we have, strictly speaking, nothing but fragments, and those covering only a small proportion of verses. The delusive habit of quoting as Old Latin the Latin texts of bilingual MSS has obscured the real poverty of evidence. These MSS are in Acts Cod. Bezae (D, @, as in the Gospels) and Cod. La7zdzanzgs (En, e), and in St Paul's Epistles Cod CZarozzozzZanus (D2, d) and Cod. Boerrerrzanus (G3, g without Hebrews). The origin of the Latin text, as clearly revealed by internal evidence, is precisely similar in all four MSS. A

genuine (independent) Old Latin text has been adopted as the basis, but altered throughout into verbal conformity with the Greek text by the side of which it was intended to stand. Here and there the assimilation has accidentally been incomplete, and the scattered discrepant readings thus left are the only direct Old Latin evidence for the Greek text of the New Testament which the bilingual MSS supply. A large proportion of the Latin texts of these MSS is indeed, beyond all reasonable doubt, unaltered Old Latin: but where they exactly correspond to the Greek, as they do habitually, it is impossible to tell how much of the accordance is original, and how much artificial; so that for the criticism of the Greek text the Latin reading has here no independent authority. The Latin texts of A of the Gospels and F2 of St Paul's Epistles are Vulgate, with a partial adaptation to the Greek. Besides the Graeco-Latin MSS there are four Gothico-Latin leaves of Romans.

§116. The relics of genuine Old Latin MSS of the books after the Gospels are as follows. For Acts: a few palimpsest leaves of an African text (h); a complete European copy (g), and also the story of Stephen from a Lectionary (ff2), both agreeing closely with the quotations of Lucifer; and some palimpsest fragments of the later chapters (s), with a text of the same general type. For the Catholic Epistles: one (? European) MS of St James, and some fragments of the next three epistles in a later (? Italian) text (q): the palimpsest fragments of James and I Peter accompanying s of Acts are apparently Vulgate only. For the Pauline Epistles: considerable Italian fragments of eight epistles (r), with leaves from two other MSS having similar texts (r2 r??) For the Apocalypse: two palimpsest leaves of a purely African text (h), and a late European text of the whole book (g). Other portions of Ante-Hieronimic texts of different books are said to have been discovered in Italy, and doubtless others will in due time be brought to light.

§117. This is the fitting place to speak of the quotations made by Latin Fathers, for they constitute a not less important province of Old Latin evidence than the

extant MSS, not only furnishing landmarks for the investigation of the history of the version, but preserving numerous verses and passages in texts belonging to various ages and in various stages of modification. Even in the Gospels their aid is always welcome, often of the highest value; while in all other books they supply not only a much greater bulk of evidence than our fragmentary MSS, but also in not a few cases texts of greater antiquity. Some books and parts of books are of course much worse represented than others, more especially such books as formed no part of the original North African Canon. But in the Apocalypse Primasius, an African writer of the sixth century, has preserved to us an almost uninterrupted text, which is proved by its close similarity to the quotations of Cyprian to be African Latin of high purity. Thus, singularly enough, the Apocalypse possesses the unique advantage of having been preserved in a Latin text at once continuous and purely African. The quotations of other late African Fathers from various books exhibit an African text much altered by degeneracy and mixture, but preserving many ancient readings.

§118. The SYRIAC versions are, strictly speaking, three in number. The principal is the great popular version commonly called the Peshito or Simple. External evidence as to its date and history is entirely wanting: but there is no reason to doubt that it is at least as old as the Latin version. Till recently it has been known only in the form which it finally received by an evidently authoritative revision, a Syriac `Vulgate' answering to the Latin `Vulgate'. The impossibility of

Page 43

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

authoritative revision, a Syriac `Vulgate' answering to the Latin `Vulgate'. The impossibility of treating this present form of the version as a true representation of its original text, without neglecting the clearest internal evidence, was perceived by Griesbach and Hug about the beginning of this century: it must they saw, have undergone subsequent revision in conformity with Greek MSS. In other words, an Old Syriac must have existed as well as an Old Latin. Within the last few years the surmise has been verified. An imperfect Old Syriac copy of the Gospels, assigned to the fifth century, was found by Cureton among MSS brought to the British Museum from Egypt in 1842, and was published by him in 1858. The character of the fundamental text confirms the great antiquity of the version in its original form; while many readings suggest that, like the Latin version, it degenerated by transcription and perhaps also by irregular revision. The rapid variation which we know the Greek and Latin texts to have undergone in the earliest centuries could hardly be absent in Syria; so that a single MS cannot be expected to tell us more of the Old Syriac generally than we should learn from any one average Old Latin MS respecting Old Latin texts generally. But even this partially corrupted text is not only itself a valuable authority but renders the comparatively late and `revised' character of the Syriac Vulgate a matter of certainty. The authoritative revision seems to have taken place either in the latter part of the third or in the fourth century. Hardly any indigenous Syriac theology older than the fourth century has been preserved, and even from that age not much available for textual criticism. Old Syriac readings have been observed as used [page 85] by Ephraim and still more by Aphraates: but at present there are no means of supplying the lack of Old Syriac MSS to any appreciable extent from patristic quotations. Of the Old Syriac Acts and Epistles nothing as yet is known. The four minor Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse, not being included in the Canon of the Syrian Churches, form no part of the true Syriac Vulgate, but are extant in supplementary versions, None of the editions of the Syriac Vulgate come up to the requirements of criticism: but considerable accessions to the evidence for the Greek text are hardly to be looked for from this source.

§119. A second version, closely literal in its renderings, was made by Polycarpus

for Philoxenus of Mabug in 508. Little is known of it in this its original condition. We possess a revision of it made by Thomas of Harkel in 616, containing all the New Testament except the Apocalypse. The margin contains various readings taken from Greek MSS, which must either have been ancient or have had ancient texts. A third version, written in a peculiar dialect, is found almost exclusively in Gospel Lesson-books, and is commonly called the Jerusalem Syriac. The text is of ancient character: but there is no other evidence to shew when the version was made. Besides one almost complete Lesson-book known for some time, a few considerable fragments have lately come to light. They include a few verses of the Acts. Various signs render it likely that both these versions were in some sense founded on one or other of the two forms of the Peshito. But the whole subject awaits fuller investigation.

§120. The third great group of Versions is the EGYPTIAN. The Coptic or Egyptian versions proper are three, very unequally preserved. The Memphitic, the version of Lower Egypt, sometimes loosely designated as the Coptic, contains the whole New Testament, though it does not follow that all the books were translated at the same period, and the Apocalypse was apparently not treated as a canonical book. The greater part of the version cannot well be later than the second century. A very small number of the known MSS have been used in the existing editions, and that on no principle of selection. A cursory examination by Dr Lightfoot has

Page 44

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

editions, and that on no principle of selection. A cursory examination by Dr Lightfoot has recently shown much diversity of text among the MSS; and in Egypt, as elsewhere, corruption was doubtless progressive. The version of Upper Egypt, the Thebaic or Sahidic, was probably little if at all inferior in antiquity. It in like manner contained the whole New Testament, with the Apocalypse as an appendix. No one book is preserved complete, but the number of extant fragments, unfortunately not yet all published, is considerable. Of the third Egyptian version the Bashmuri, about 330 verses from St John's Gospel and the Pauline Epistles alone survive. With the Egyptian versions proper it is at least convenient to associate the Aethiopic, the version of ancient Abyssinia, dating from the fourth or fifth century. Though written in a totally different language, it has strong affinities of text with its northern neighbours. The best judges maintain its direct derivation from a Greek original: but neither this question nor that of the relation of the Thebaic to the Memphitic version can be treated as definitively settled while so much of the evidence remains unpublished. The numerous MSS of the Aethiopic have been ascertained to vary considerably, and give evidence of revision: but the two editions yet printed are both unsatisfactory. No book of the New Testament is wanting.

§121. Besides the three great groups two solitary versions are of considerable interest, the one from outlying Asia, the other from outlying Europe. These are the ARMENIAN and the GOTHIC. The ARMENIAN, which is complete, was made early in the fifth century. Some modern copies, followed by the first printed edition, contain corruptions from the Latin Vulgate: but the Armenian translators certainly followed Greek MSS, probably obtained from Cappadocia, the mother of Armenian Christianity. The GOTHIC version, the work of Ulfilas the great bishop of the Goths, dates from the middle of the fourth century. He received a Greek education from his Christian parents originally Cappadocians: and Greek MSS unquestionably supplied the original for his version. We possess the Gospels and the Pauline Epistles (Hebrews excepted) with many gaps, admirably edited from MSS of about the sixth century.

§122. The other versions are of comparatively late date and of little direct value for the Greek text, though some of them, as the Slavonic, bear traces of ancient texts. Most of them are only secondary translations from other versions, chiefly the Latin and Syriac Vulgates. [page 87]

C. 123-126. Fathers

§123. The third class of documentary evidence is supplied by the writings of the Fathers, which enable us with more or less certainty to discover the readings of the MS or MSS of the New Testament which they employed. The quotations naturally vary in form from verbal transcripts of passages, short or long, through loose citations down to slight allusions. Nay there are cases in which the absence of even an allusion allows the text read by an author to be inferred with tolerable certainty: but this negative evidence is admissible only with the utmost caution.

§124. Besides the evidence as to the texts used by ancient writers which is supplied by their quotations, allusions, or silences, a few of them sometimes make direct assertions as to variations of reading within their knowledge. The form of assertion varies much, now appearing as a statement that, for instance, "some" or "many" or "the most accurate" "copies" contain this or that variant, now as an allegation that the true reading has been perversely depraved by rash or by heretical persons for some special end. This whole department of patristic evidence

rash or by heretical persons for some special end. This whole department of patristic evidence has a peculiar interest, as it brings vividly before the reader the actual presence of existing variations at a remote antiquity, Its true value is twofold: for the history of the whole text it certifies two or more alternative readings as simultaneously known at a definite time or locality; and for the settlement of the text in a given passage it usually enables the reading adopted by the writer to be known with a higher degree of certainty than is attainable in a majority of cases by means of ordinary quotations. But this superior certitude must not be confounded with higher authority: the relative excellence or the historical position of the text employed by a Father has nothing to do with the relative adequacy of our means of ascertaining what his text actually was. Moreover in the statements themselves the contemporary existence of the several variants mentioned is often all that can be safely accepted: reliance on what they tell us beyond this bare fact must depend on the estimate which we are able to form of the opportunities, critical care, and impartiality of the respective

§125. An enumeration of the Greek Fathers would be out of place here. The names most important in textual criticism will come before us presently, when we have to [page 88] speak of the peculiar value of their evidence as enabling us to trace the outlines of the early history of the text. This is however the place for observing that the extent of patristic evidence still preserved is considerably less than might have been a priori anticipated. Numerous verses of the New Testament are rarely or never quoted by the Fathers: the gaps in the evidence are still more striking if we take the Ante-Nicene Fathers by themselves. A small portion of Origen's commentaries is virtually all that remains to us of the continuous commentaries on the New Testament belonging to this period: they include Matt. xiii 36-xxii 33 in the original Greek (perhaps in an abridged form), and Matt. xvi 13-xxvii 66 in a condensed Latin translation, preserving matter not found in the Greek now extant; some verses of St Luke (a much condensed Latin translation of Homilies on i-iv, not continuous, and on five later passages of St Luke being also extant); John i s-7, 19-29; ii 12-25; iv 13-54, viii 19-25 and 37-53 xi 39-57; xiii 2-33 (little more than a sixth of the whole) in the full original text; Romans in the

much

condensed and much altered version of Rufinus; many verses of x Corinthians and Ephesians; and a few scattered verses of some of the other books. The extant commentaries and continuous series of homilies written before the middle of the fifth century are as follows:- Theodore of Mopsuestia on the minor Pauline Epistles in a Latin translation; Chrysostom's Homilies, which include St Matthew St John, Acts (ill preserved), and all the Pauline Epistles Theodoret on all the Pauline Epistles, his notes being chiefly founded on the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Chrysostom; and Cyril of Alexandria's Homilies on St Luke (many fragments in Greek and large portions in a Syriac translation) and Commentary on John i r-x 17; xii 49-end, with fragments on the rest of the book and on the other Gospels and several of the

Pauline Epistles; together with fragments by other writers preserved in Catenae under various conditions, sometimes apparently in their original integrity, but much oftener in a condensed and partly altered shape.

§126. It is on the whole best to class with patristic evidence a few collections of biblical extracts, with little or no intervening matter, selected and arranged for doctrinal or ethical purposes. The Ethica of Basil of Caesarea (Cent. Iv) and the Parallela Sacra of John of Damascus (Cent. VIII) are the best known Greek ex[page 89] amples. parts of some of Cyril of Alexandria's dogmatic writings, especially the Thesazzrzzs, have nearly the same character. A

Page 46

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

Latin collection of a similar kind, the *Speculum* which wrongly bears the name of Augustine, but is of unknown authorship, has usually been placed with Old Latin MSS under the signature on, and contains an interesting but not early Old Latin text. Of much the same structure are the three books of *Testimonia* by Cyprian, and indeed a large part of his little treatise *De exhortatione martyrii* addressed to Fortunatus.

127, 128. Documentary preparation for this edition

§127. It is right that we should here explain to what extent we have thought it our duty to take part ourselves in the indispensable preparatory work of collecting documentary evidence. Great services have been rendered by scholars who have been content to explore and amass texts and readings for the use of others; or again who have discussed principles and studied documents without going on to edit a text. On the other hand an editor of the New Testament cannot completely absolve himself from either of these two preliminary tasks without injury to his own text but the amount of personal participation required is widely different for the two cases. If he has not worked out at first hand the many and various principles and generalisations which are required for solving the successive problems presented by conflicts of evidence, the resulting text is foredoomed to insecurity: but the collection of evidence is in itself by no means an indispensable apprenticeship for the study of it.

§128. We have accordingly made no attempt to follow the example of those editors who, besides publishing critical texts of the New Testament, have earned the gratitude of all who come after them by collation of MSS and accumulation of registered evidence in the form of an apparatus coiticus. As we have never proposed to do more than edit a manual text, so we have no considerable private stores to add to the common stock. The fresh evidence which we have obtained

for our own use has been chiefly patristic, derived in a great measure from writings or fragments of writings first published during the last hundred years, or now edited from better MSS than were formerly known. While in this and other respects the evidence already accessible to all students has been to a [page 90] certain limited extent augmented, it has of course been frequently verified and re-examined, not only for the sake of clearing up ambiguities or doubts, but because the needful experience could hardly be otherwise acquired. The exigencies of our task demanded a personal acquaintance with the outward phenomena of MSS, with the continuous texts of individual MSS and versions, and with the varying conditions under which the New Testament is quoted and referred to by the Fathers; for no information at second hand can secure the conveyance of a correct and vivid impression of the true and complete facts by bare lists of authorities cited for a succession of detached and sharply defined various readings. But we have deliberately chosen on the whole to rely for documentary evidence on the stores accumulated by our predecessors, and to confine ourselves to our proper work of investigating and editing the text itself. Such a concentration of labour ought at least to favour an impartial survey of the entire field of evidence, and to give time and opportunity for prolonged consideration of the text and its history in various lights.

CHAPTER II. RESULTS OF GENEALOGICAL EVIDENCE PROPER 129-255

SECTION I. DETERMINATION OF THE GENEALOGICAL

Page 47

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

SECTION I. DETERMINATION OF THE GENEALOGICAL RELATIONS OF THE CHIEF ANCIENT TEXTS 129-168

§129. After this short preliminary survey of the existing documents out of which the text of the New Testament has to be recovered, we have now to describe the chief facts respecting their ancestry and the character of their texts which have been learned by study of their contents or from any other sources, and which render it possible to deal securely with their numerous variations [page 91] in accordance with the principles of criticism explained in the preceding section. We have already seen, first, that decision upon readings requires previous knowledge of documents, and secondly that the most valuable part of the knowledge of individual documents implies a previous knowledge of the genealogical history of the text as a whole. The first step therefore towards fixing the places of the existing documents relatively to each other is to employ them conjointly as evidence for discovering the more ancient ramifications of transmission; and for this purpose the whole mass of documents of all dates and all kinds must at the outset be taken into account.

A. 130, 131. Priority of all great variations to Cent. V

§130. A glance at any tolerably complete apparatus criticus of the Acts or Pauline Epistles reveals the striking fact that an overwhelming proportion of the variants common to the great mass of cursive and late uncial Greek MSS are identical with the readings followed by Chrysostom (ob. 407) in the composition of his Homilies. The coincidence furnishes evidence as to place as well as time; for the whole of Chrysostom's life, the last ten years excepted, was spent at Antioch or in its neighbourhood. Little research is needed to shew that this is no isolated phenomenon: the same testimony, subject to minor qualifications unimportant for the present purpose, is borne by the scattered quotations from these and other books of the New Testament found in his voluminous works generally, and in the fragments of his fellow-pupil Theodorus of Antioch and Mopsuestia, and in those

of their teacher Diodorus of Antioch and Tarsus. [page 92] The fundamental text of late extant Greek MSS generally is beyond all question identical with the dominant Antiochian or Graeco-Syrian text of the second half of the fourth century. The community of text implies on genealogical grounds a community of parentage: the Antiochian Fathers and the bulk of extant MSS written from about three or four to ten or eleven centuries later must have had in the greater number of extant variations a common original either contemporary with or older than our oldest extant MSS, which thus lose at once whatever presumption of exceptional purity they might have derived from their exceptional antiquity alone.

§131. The application of analogous tests to other groups of documents leads to similar results. The requisite chronological criteria are to be found in the Greek patristic evidence of the second, third and fourth centuries; in the Latin patristic evidence of the third and fourth centuries; in the Old Latin version, as dated indirectly by the Latin patristic evidence; in the Vulgate Latin, the Gothic, and virtually the Armenian versions, as dated by external evidence; and the two (or possibly three) oldest extant Greek MSS, B, 8, and A; the Armenian version and probably A being however a little over the line. To this list may safely be added the Old and Vulgate Syriac, as they have some sufficient if slight patristic attestation in the early part of the fourth century, although the evidence which completely establishes their antiquity, being

Page 48

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

fourth century, although the evidence which completely establishes their antiquity, being inferential, would not entitle them to a place here; and also the two principal Egyptian versions, the early age of which, though destitute of the testimony which it would doubtless have received from the preservation of an early Coptic literature, is established by historical considerations independent of the character of the texts. [page 93] The list, however limited, contains a sufficient variety of strictly or approximately direct historical evidence to enable us at once to refer to the fourth century at latest the original of nearly every considerable group of extant documents which frequently recurs in the apparatus criticus, and indeed to carry back some to the third, and others to the second century. In each case the genealogical process here employed can of course do no more than supply an inferior limit of age: a lost original thus proved to be as old as the fourth century may, for all that we have thus far seen, be in reality as old as the other lost originals which can be positively referred to earlier times. What we have gained is the limitation of enquiry by the knowledge that all the important ramifications of transmission preceded the fifth century.

B. 132-151. Posteriority of Syrian (8) to `Western' (B) and other (neutral, a) readings shown (I) by analysis of Conflate Readings

§132. Within this comparatively restricted field we have next to investigate the genealogical relations of the principal groups of documents, or, what is virtually the same thing, of their respective lost originals, following partly, as before, external evidence, partly the indications of sequence obtained by Internal Evidence of the Groups as wholes. The presence of early and extensive mixture betrays itself at once in the number and intricacy of cross distributions of attestation (see § 60), and thus it becomes important to ascertain at the outset whether any whole groups have been affected by it; and if such can be found, to determine the contributory groups which are thereby proved not merely to be of earlier date, but to have been the actual parents of the groups of mixed origin.

§133. The clearest evidence for this purpose, as we have already seen (§ 62), is furnished by conflate readings, where they exist; and in the case of some of the primary groupings of the textual documents of the New Testament they are fortunately not wanting. Before proceeding however to examine some examples of this kind, it may be well to notice a few illustrations of the phenomenon of 'conflation' in its simpler form, as exhibited by single documents. Here and always we shall use the ordinary notation, unless there is sufficient reason for departing from it: a list of special symbols and abbreviations employed is given in the Appendix. In Acts vi 8 where the two readings TTA71pi^/5 XaptTO5 and mX;npv5 STZrTf(os are attested each by a plurality of documents, E alone combines them, by means of a conjunction, reading TA??p775 XaptTOS KaL TTlv??TtQ)S. In Mark vi 56 the Latin MS couples the readings eY TaL5 Qyopat5 and eV Tats TAaTeTaC5 by a conjunction, and slightly modifies them reading in foro et in pZatezs. In John v 37 D makes eKeuvos aVTOs out of eKetvos and avTos without a conjunction; and similarly John xiii 24 stands in one principal text as VeVCt oUv TOVT? N. rI. Kat AeyeL aVT(9 EtTe TTS e(rTtV TTEpt OV XeyetX in another as vEvet ovv TOVTZ S. 1T TTV??tO ??Q?? TL5 aV eXi7 sTept ov Xetyet?? while S adds one forn; to the other, merely changing a tense, and reads Vev'eL OVV TOVTla N. I r.. iTV??t-O 6)az TL5 av et77 TTtpt OV eAeyevn K&L Aeyet avroJ ELTTt TL5 taTLv TTePC OV Xeyet. In I Cor. x I9 the readings TT OVV 07/yF; OTt eLoUxoSvrov TZ errTtV; 77 OTZ eloo)Aov TC tv-TLV; and Page 49

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

readings TT OVV 07/yF; OTt eLoUxoSvrov TZ errTtV; 77 OTZ eloo)Aov TC tv-TLV; and Tt OVV Fr//1t; OTI etoll)AoGvrov E(TTCV TL- OVX OTZ e'o^UXo'v ef:rTsV TtX or their Latin equivalents, are ingeniously interwoven by fuAd. as quid ergo divo ? f uod idoiGis immoZatuon sit aZif uzd, aut f uod idoZutzz sit aZifuid ? non luod idvAum szt aZifuzd. Luke xvi 30 [page 95] illustrates another kind of combination, in which part of a longer reading is replaced by the whole of the shorter reading: for eQV TtS eK veKpoJv STOpCV0D STpO5 QVTOVS or CQV TT5 c/C VtKpLVV QVQv-TD (implied in the Latin reading si yuis ex mortuzs resurrexerit [v. 1. surrexerit 94 8 has TTS eK veKpo)V aVaCTi1 TTpOS QVTOV5> while two or three other documents retain both verbs. In I Cor. i 8 the Latin Vulgate effects the combination by making the one element dependent on the other, changing the Old Latin in ad7oentu l)oszzini noszri (ev TD rTapovaL??Q TOU KVpLOV rlfital)v) into in die adz??entus IDomini nostri by incorporating the Greek reading ev TTl ??epa TOV KVpLOV 7]stoJV. Bold conflation, of various types, are peculiarly frequent in the Aethiopic version, at least in the extant MSS.

§134. We now proceed to conflate readings involving important groups of documents, premising that we do not attempt to notice every petty variant in the passages cited, for fear of confusing the substantial evidence. Mark vi 33 (following Kat Eloav aVTOV5 ViTO.yovTQs KaL LtT]tyL'L??v av T;OX,\OL, KQL TTeX QTTO TTQO-O)V TO)V TTOXtlDV o??vvEopa??(tov CKEC) (a) KaL STpOllX0OV aVTOU5 SB (LA I3) It (39) 49 lat.vg me arm (LA I3 It 39 h.^ve TTpO(TYjX0OV) KaC TTpOWlX0OV avTov avTOv syr.vg (,B) KaL (rvvr/Xf??oV QVTOV D 28 b KQC s1A??ov aVTOV S I ff i Kac 77A??ov a om. CU3 (C) (v) KaL 7TpOr1X??OV aVTOV5 KQt vTVV-qXvaOV TTPO5 QVTOV AEFQHKMUVrII cu.omn.exc.S f f syr.hl aeth [page 96]

§135. Here we have two short readings of three words each (a??}!3)?? differing only by the preposition compounded with the verb and by the presence or absence of the last letter, having therefore a strong prima facie appearance of being derived the one from the other. The documents attesting a are four uncials (two of

them our two oldest), three cursives, and at least three versions in different languages, one of them made late in Cent. IV, one early in Cent. v, and the third of age treated as not yet determined, but at least not later than Cent. III. The Vulgate Syriac is on the whole a supporter of an as it reads TporlA6ov and has but one clause: its ending may be due either to modified reduplication of the last word of a or, more probably, to conflation with the last word of ,8. For iB (and the readings evidently derived from it) we have an uncial of Cent. VI, two cursives, and three Old Latin MSS. No true Old Latin MS is in any way favourable to a or o against:: two, ek, which contain other parts of this Gospel, are absent; as are also the Thebaic and Old Syriac and Jerusalem Syriac versions. The longer reading o, which is that of the Received Text, is supported by eleven uncials, one of them of Cent. v (or possibly IV) and the rest not earlier than Cent. VIII; all cursives except five; two Latin MSS belonging approximately to the Italian revision, which cannot be younger and is probably not older than Cent. IV; and two versions unquestionably later than Cent. IV.

§136. If now we compare the three readings with reference to Transcriptional Probability, it is evident that either o is conflate from a and ,B, or a and ,8 are independent simplifications of o; for the similarity of QVTOV^ and QVTOVS, combined with the relative dissimilarity of both to

Page 50

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

for the similarity of QVTOV^ and QVTOVS, combined with the relative dissimilarity of both to XTPoS auTov, shews that o can hardly have been a pas[page 97] sage from a to p or from ,d3 to a; and the independent derivation of p and o from a, or of a and o from ,E, would be still more incredible. There is nothing in the sense of o that would tempt to alteration: all runs easily and smoothly, and there is neither contradiction nor manifest tautology. Accidental omission of one or other clause would doubtless be easy on account of the general similarity of appearance (KaL. .X7AOov. ..avro. ..), and precedents are not wanting for the accidental omission of even both clauses in different documents or groups of documents. On the other hand the change from XTPoS avTov of o to avrov^ of ,(3 is improbable in itself, and doubly improbable when CKCt has preceded. Supposing however a and p to have preceded o, the combination of the two phrases, at once consistent and quite distinct in meaning, would be natural, more especially under the influence of an impulse to omit no recorded matter; and the change from avrov to T pOS avTov (involving no change of historical statement, for the place denoted by avTov was the place to which the Lord had gone) might commend itself by the awkwardness of avrov (itself a rare adverb in the New Testament) after frvvc'opagaoV CKCt) and by the seeming fitness of closing this portion of narrative with a reference to the Lord Himself, who is moreover mentioned in the opening words of the next verse.

§137. As between a and 13 the transcriptional probabilities are obscure. svvr??Xftov avrou is certainly otiose after cTvveopaKov CKCL, and a sense of the tautology might lead to change; but the changes made by scribes hardly ever introduce such vivid touches as this of the arrival of the multitude before the apostles. C)n the other hand TTpur//??6ov aVTovs might be altered on account of the unfamiliarity of the construction or the unexpectedness of [page 98] the sense, which harmonises with the earlier words elBov CLVTOU5 v,rayovras but would hardly be suggested by them; and then SVVf'OpQ/LOV might suggest to the ear and perhaps to the mind ??vvrlAffov?? after which auTovs would be inevitably read as auTov' OLVTOLS being in manifest contradiction to the contrast between ev TLD r)toLX and qre??i: the tautology introduced might easily escape notice at

first under the different phraseology, especially if CvvelAftov were taken to express the arrival subsequent to the running, though it was perceived afterwards, as we see by the omission of auTov^{\wedge} in a, and of the whole clause in c, where conzwenergng stands for $\text{sognoz}^{\wedge}\text{erzgmt}$ above.

§138. As regards Intrinsic Probability, B may be dismissed at once, on grounds virtually given already. Had 8 been the only extant reading, it would have roused no suspicion: but when it has to be compared with an we cannot but notice the irrelevance of the repetition of TVV in composition with two different verbs not in immediate sequence, and the intrusiveness of $\text{KaL TporlX0ov auTovs}$ between the local and the personal endings of the journey expressed by fKfL and $\text{TTpO}\backslash 5 \text{ auTotv}$; the position of this clause can be justified only if $\text{o}^{\wedge}\text{vve'opa,aov}$ is inserted merely to account for the prior arrival, and in that case f'KfL is out of place. Nor is St Mark's characteristic abundance of detail to the purpose here, for his multiplication of accessory facts is at least equalled by his economy of words. Had he wished to introduce the only fresh point in 8 , that conveyed by $\text{TTpO}'5 \text{ avTov}^{\wedge}$ the language natural to him would have been $\text{e'opa}^{\wedge}\text{uov KaL}$ (or better $\text{UpaALOVtS) TTpOWIA00V aVTOVS KaL CuvXIA0ov TTpO5 auTov}$. But the truth is that this fresh point simply spoils the point of ftfA6(OV in v. 34; the multitude 'followed' (Matt., Luke) the Lord to the desert region (fKCL), but the [page 99] actual arrival at His presence was due to His act, not theirs, for He 'came out' of His retirement

actual arrival at His presence was due to His act, not theirs, for He 'came out' of His retirement in some sequestered nook to meet them. Thus, if we look below the surface, the additional phrase in 8 is found to disarrange the diction and confuse rather than enrich the sense; while according to the clear and exact language of a the fact to which the whole sentence leads up stands emphatically at its close, and there is no premature intrusion of what properly belongs to the next part of the narrative.

§139. Accordingly the balance of Internal Evidence of Readings, alike from Transcriptional and from Intrinsic Probability, is decidedly in favour of the derivation of 8 from a and jB rather than of a and: from 8; so that, as far as can be judged without the aid of other passages, the common original of the documents attesting a and the common original of the documents attesting ??S must both have been older than the common original of the documents attesting 8.

§140. To examine other passages equally in detail would occupy too much space. For the following similar variations it will for the most part suffice to add but brief comments to the documentary attestation. Mark viii 26 (following Kal a7Tf(rrezXeP avTov ffS OTKOV aurov Ae'yLov) (a) Mu7o'f f L7s T5V KLi5^LUV fFCf??0DD (K)BL I*-209 me (f3) eY7raye flS TOV OZKOV aov Kal

ALrXofvl eLlrDs fis rriv KLO,LL71V D(q) (\$2) Y7rays f ??S TSV OLKIJV Cou Kai f ll Y eLs T71V KLO#L\ V flCfX6,5S SLr18ePL fFrFris SLrlaf fV TD K(i7,LLD I3-69- ,46 28 6I 8I; also (Olilittilig AL5O'f) i, and (omitting SLNO f V rD Kt??,tLD) bfJf g o vg Y7raye f CS TOV OLKOV COV KaL ALV f Ls T71V KLO^LQY fLafX6DS Mr/oe f lS T5V KsO^L\ V fLvez6Ds ai\??a VRayf flS TOV OLKL>V srov Kal fav eL9 Tr/v KLOpLP??V fL^f)6DD AL\Of flffDS TLY} (or pL\OfV; [page 100] f LIFrns) [pLrlof] f'V Tr} KLo??LD arm; also apparently (omitting r XXrl ...crov) syr.hl.mg Mr18evl fL7rDs f LS rr??v KroLLr)v (or f V r,rl KroALr/) (c) k KrP:!/ ACINXAEFGHIIMsuVrX§??':S AL'1??f fisrDs rLV'L f'V rD Here a is simple and vigorous, and it is unique in the

N. 1.: the peculiar initial Mrloe' has the terse force of many sayings as given by St Mark, but the softening into M7 by S;> shews that it might trouble scribes. In ,8 we have a deprived of its novelty by the ?r/rSrvl fr'srDs of Matt. ix 6 and its parallel, and of its abruptness by the previous insertion of FYsTays faS rov OLAiOV froV from Matt. viii 4 and its parallels. Then follow several different but not all independent conflations of a and ,3. By the insertion of a, ? little modified, in the midst of k1 the Greek form of ??2 anses; and thls, with the superfluous last words removed, is the prevalent Latin reading. In one MS, a, a i'resh conflation supervenes, the middle clause of the Latin :2 being replaced by a) almost unaltered. Arm. (and apparently WiLII one omission the margin of syr.hl) prefixes rl to g82 The reading of (c) k is as short as av and may be derived directly from it; but is more probably 13 delivered from Its extraneous first clause by the influence of a Lastly o combines a with S by substituting it for the first clause of h3; a less clumsy means of avoiding the contradiction latent in the probability that the `house' would be in the `village' than the introduction of f'rlU in ,S2. This neat combination retains Mrwotse without its abruptness by making It a conjunction, but involves a new contradiction unless rœL/L f'V be taken as rLV'L rrov f'V by a laxity ill suited to the context. The documents attesting o, it is to be observed, include the early uncials CN as well as A, and also A and the Syriac Vulgate.

§141. Mark ix 38 (following ??loarrKaXf, f LIsa??aLwv nva L?V rr,> OVO^LQTs arov er r1??LLLov L Kal faKcoXvara??Lfv aUTov?? Llrt oUrs dKOXOV0fL /??u??tv C cu3f (syr.vg-hr me aeth) ,(3) os OVK arsoXov6f L yf 0 rl/lr V Kal f KLSxlzoMwf V avrov D e

(syr.vg-hr me aeth) (,(3) os OVK arsoXov6f L yf 0 rl/lr V Kal f KLsxlzoMwf V avrov D e Ka)Xvora/t e v avrov a k 17ptV f'KtOXVO??LLfV avrov I-209 [page 101] Vs OVK ILKOA OV11L r1\$LLV Kal f rsoXvcrasiEv av??rov X 13-69-346 28 al' b c gz vg syr.hl.mg arm (o) os OUK dKOXOV0fL nvrsv, Kai f'KrsXvnralLev avrov?? orL OVK fIKO\OV6fL l??uLv ANEFGHKMSUVrII cu.omn.exc.20 (81 has o7KoXov6s?? and all /lf0' r}MPoV in

the first clause and al' ??Lfl9' r1Mrov in the third: 33 is defective.) Part of the confusion of readings is due to obvious causes, which throw little light on genealogy. From Luke ix come a#:oXoV6fF and iLfl9' 71LLLOV; while in both Gospels Z general proneness to alter imperfects and the influence of the preceding aorist have together produced fKroXvarnZfv. But in f??3, besides assimilation to St Luke, there is a bold transposition of the last clause bringing it into proximity to its subject, with a necessary change of c??'rC to os (ct. Matt. v 45 in similar documents); while in two modifications of k; the aorist f'KeoXvaay f v reappears, and one of them, i32, the most widely spread, has also rffllv in conformity with a. The transposed clause is preserved in both places by 8 with exact similarity of ending. Here again 8 is supported by N as well as A, but not by any early version.

§142. Mark ix 49 (a) Sif^lS ynp Sil!p'L aXLLJd??fnrfra?? (>;)BLa 1-118-2C9 61 81 435 al!' me.codd the arm.codfl (9) sTnnra yap 6vfrLa riXi aXLrr6r1srerac D cu2 (a) b cf7ri (k) tol hols/z gig (fl c tol holrn 1 j????,if" omit aAL: a apo k has words apparently implying the Greek original 7ralra Of (or yap) ourria avaXroDricrnat, o being read for (3, and aNAAO) for aN1AS\1C.) 8) 7r??s rLp 7rUpl (LXLfr9rflITfrfL??, KaL 7rarra 6vrrL'a aXI aX??r6rjrrcrat ACNXEFGHKMSUVrII cu.ollm.exAc 15 rq vg sur vg-hl me.codd aeth arm codd go Vlct (vg.codd opt omit LLX,; X adds it after STVpf'.) A reminiscence of Lev. vii I3 (rsal STf^LV O(^dpOV f6urrntas vtirfav aXI axzrr6rirTfTas) has created 13 out of a, r.fyplf??)\lc3 being read as 01claaAtaA1cO with a natural reduplication,

lost again in some Latin copies. The change would be aided by the words that follow here, Kaxov ro aAas K??r.x. In rS the two incongruous alternatives are simply added together, yap being replaced by rrar'. Besides ACNX, 8 has at least [page 102] the Vulgate Syriac and the Italian and Vulgate Latin, as well as later versions.

§143. Luke ix 10 (after KQ2 5TapaXa??7LOV aVTOVS U5T(XLs7p7,7CEV Kar ziSzav)

(a) eis src??XFv KaXovLLe'vx7v B11(5(raloe (st??)BLXX 33 me the . KLoLLqV LP

(13)eLs TLX5TOV etpT,7,LLOV y^* et rb [? 13-346-] (69) 157 (syr.vt) (cf. Tert) (els t-r. 13-69-346 syr.vt) eLs T05TOV etp7S^Ov B71(??Lraloe c}Tf vC syr.vg eFs TOTL7V etpS7^LOV KQxovALevov B17(ILTaloa a ef (o)eLs TOiTOV ep71,LLOV 7roxelos KaXov;Ltv77S B7r10Lraloe (A)C kGHKMSUVrAAII cu.omn.exc 3(5) syr.hl aeth arm go (A CU4 place ffp7f7^LOV before TOxTOV?? I-r3l-2o9 ornit it) The change from a to ,B would be suggested by the occurrence of fap7,7/LOS T05TOS in the two parallels (Matt. XIV 13 Mark vl 31), lty the words OTF toAe ev ep77#Lso TOT'LO {T,LLfV two verses later, and by the difficulty of associating the incident with a `city'. Two forms of ??', in taking up the name from aX still avoid this difficulty by refusing ssoXtv In S the difficulty is ingeniously overridden by keeping both a and 13, but making a dependent on a. For o we find, with AC, the fc7ur latest but no early version. In this variation S* goes with h;', and D virtually with a.

§144. Luke xi 54 (after 7lptavro ou ypaAL,LLaTf LS Kal ol ef7apl Lralol O®SIVLOS

§144. Luke xi 54 (after 7lptavro ou ypaAL,LLaTf LS Kal ol ef7apl Lralol O®SIVLOS fVfXeIVKala5TOLrTOALaTZ7>teLV aVTOVTep2 TTXelOVLOV>) (a) (5VEOtpfVOVTfS avrov 07lpevLraL TL eK Toi) ITTOyaroS avrov SBL me aeth Cyr.syr (om. avrov t; me Cyr.syr) (:) ??7rorures aLpopwu77v riva Xaj6>etv avrov tva fVpLOOTIP Kan7yopw7aras aVTov D syr.vt ??tT7roLlvrfS aLpopALX7v TLVa Aah7fL^p aVTov Lva KaTrlyo p??frLoaTlv avrov lat.vt (om. avrov 1?? L- e rXze) (a) eveopevovrfS avrov, XTOUVTfS 65pfVLTaL TL fK TOV aTrL;pLaTos avrOr, sva KaT7.7yopV erLoarLv avrov A CXE G H K M U vrAAIl cu.omn.exc.j lat.vg syr.vg-hl (om. avrov X I30 lat.vg: Kal ,,tt,7TorvTes cu.mu lat.vg syr.hl arm. om f'V operovres avrov arm: om. ??ttl7roUvrfS l-l 18-131- 20, 23; isZzzerroganZes (? eXsTfpLorLe7vres) avrovn >,ft,7roUvres 87S7pLvtraLR rL f'K rov aTro*LLaros avrovn sva adpopwLLrlv fVvpLOLTLV KaTrlyop77LTa?? [page 103] The figurative language of a is replaced in ??' by a simply descriptive paraphrase, just as in the preceding sentence the chief documents that attest ??' change EflaLes e'veXelv to LSelva7s c'XeLv and aTTOLrrOeaTL'(flV aUTOM to sTsV??aXXelv avTLo: and in the second or Latin form of 3 fspeisLrlv KaTrRA yopi1Lral becomes KaT777op77LTOfTIV in conformity with Matt. xii lo, Mark iii 2. In >t, both phrases are kept, the descriptive being used to explain the figurative: the now superfluous middle part of a however is dropped, and (;1TOVV(TS is transposed to ease the infinitive Ir1pfvtnal. Again the documents of

§145. Luke xii 18 (after KaSfXLo yov Tas arolix1Kav Kal Ffi(ovas OitO8O??0ITLO, Kal avva&ei7 f'Kfi savTa) (a, TOV (TITOV Kal Ta ayaSa ALOv (S)BTL(X) 1-118-131(209) (13- 69-124) 157 (al) (syr.hr me the aeth) arm (the bracketed documents add yov to srirov) (r) Ta yfV/??ara lsor s D 435 (a7 I(r)en lffat) f mb } syr.vt TOVS KapTTOVS ZOU lt 39 a c d e 1n (8) Ta Syev7jKaTa ,aoV Kal Tfl ayaSayov AQEFGHKMSU Vraltlcu.omn.exc.X2 fvg syr.vg- hl Bas Cyr TOV (TiToV pOV Kal TA yfvT7yaTaZov 346 For the rather peculiar combination of TOV (TiToV and sa dyaiia the single general term ra yevrMara?? common in the LXX and Apocrypha,

is substituted by '??', the precise combination $\text{sr}v\text{vayf}Fv\text{ ra }vfv'7\text{Hara bei:lg}$ indeed found in Ex. xxiii 10; Lev. xxv 20; Jer. viii 13: some documents have the similar TOVS KapTrovs MOV from v. 17. n 8 t e full double form of a is retained, but the plural $\text{ra yfvt}7\text{ aTa}$ replaces rov triTov in accordance with the plural $\text{ra ayad}3a$. Another form of conflation of a and 13 appears in 346. Besides AQ and Cyril, o has, as in Mark ix 49, the Vulgate Syriac and the Italian and Vulgate Latin in addition to the Harklean Syriac versions: both S* and D support S. [page 104]

§146. Luke xxiv 53 (after Kal 17($\text{rav Alarravrds f'V r(o Zfp}\{D)$) (a) $\text{evAoyovvres rAv 0f ov SBC}^*L$ me syr.llr ($\$ \text{alVOVVrfS rov dfOV D a b eff I0.codcl}$ (8) $\text{aLuouvrL s Kai fvAoyoXiprfs rAv 0L oV AC!XFHKMSUV ranrs cu omn cf g vg syr.vg-hl arm svAoyovprfs Kai aevoUvrfs rov dfOV aeth}$ This simple instance needs no explanation. The distribution of documents is fairly typical, a having AC2X with the two Vulgates, the Italian Latin (and another MS containing a similar element), and two later versions while the Aethiopic has an independent conflation in inverse order.

§147. It is worth while to note at once the distribution of the chief MSS and versions with reference to the three classes of readings contained in these eight ternary variations. Only the first hand is taken into account cursives differing from the main body are not noticed, and slightly

first hand is taken into account cursives differing from the main body are not noticed, and slightly aberrant readings are classed with those from which they deviate least. Several MSS and versions are too fragmentary to give more than faint indications of the origin of their texts within these narrow limits, and indeed for the rest of them the results can be only provisional. a p | 3 Total ap S Total r o; 3 8 : I.at vt oX e 8 LEte uncials and C rsives o| o 8 8

§148. Comparison of these eight variations strongly confirms the conclusion to which the independent evidence respecting each has provisionally led, that the longer readings marked 8 are conflate each from two earlier readings. The fundamental grouping of documents also remains the same throughout, notwithstanding the partial fluctuation. The conflate readings marked 8 are found in AC(N) of the earlier and in all later uncials except L, not invariably however in C, X, or h; as also in the great mass of cursives, and in the Gothic and Harklean Syriac, two versions known to be late. On the other hand no 8 or conflate readings are found in sBDL lat.vt syr.vt me (the), these four versions being also the most ancient. The most constant witnesses for the readings marked jB are D and most or all of the Old Latin MSS, though they do not always support the same modification of p: and in the three places in which it is extant the Old Syriac is with them. The most typical group attesting the readings marked a, which in these passages we have found reason to believe to be the original readings, consists of t;BL and the Egyptian versions, with the Jerusalem Syriac in its three places; though s twice passes over to the ranks of ??, even in Luke ix 10, where D is virtually with a. The five remaining comparatively late versions or forms of versions contain either readings of all three classes in different proportions, or (Aethiopic) both 8 readings and a readings: and CX have a similar variable character.

§149. Speaking roughly then we may assign the attestation of Greek MSS thus: to a a small handful of uncials, including the two oldest, and a few varying cursives, sometimes wanting; to ,B D and sometimes a few varying cursives, with the rare accession of S or another uncial; to 8 nearly all the later uncials, with two or three

of the older, especially A, and nearly all [page 106] the cursives. The like rough distribution of the three great families of versions which date from early times will be as follows: to a the Egyptian, and to oS the Old Latin and Old Syriac; while the later versions, dating from the fourth and following centuries (one perhaps a little earlier), with one limited exception include 8 readings, and two here exhibit 8 readings alone.

§150. To the best of our belief the relations thus provisionally traced are never inverted. We do not know of any places where the a group of documents supports readings apparently conflated from the readings of the ,87 and 8 groups respectively, or where the ,67 group of documents supports readings apparently conflated from the readings of the a and 8 groups respectively. Hence it is certain not only that the 8 readings were always posterior in date to the a and the ,87 readings in variations illustrating the relation between these three groups by means of conflation, but also that the scribes or editors who originated these 8 readings made use in one way or another of one or more documents containing these a readings, and one or more documents containing these jS readings; that is, they either wrote with documents of both classes before them, or wrote from documents of one class which had readings from the other class written in the margin, or wrote from documents of one class while carrying in their own minds reminiscences from documents of the other class of which they had had knowledge at some previous time.

Page 55

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

§151. Now it is morally impossible that their use of documents of either or both classes should have been confined to those places in which conflation enables us to detect it in actual operation. The facts observed thus far do not forbid the hypothesis that the originators [page 107] of the 8 readings made use likewise of documents belonging to some additional class, conceivably purer than the documents which furnished them with a and with ,l] readings respectively, and that these additional documents may have been followed by them in a greater or less part of the rest of their text. But the proved actual use of documents of the a and ,G7 classes in the conflate readings renders their use elsewhere a vera causa in the Newtonian sense. With every allowance for the provisional possibility of some use of other hypothetical documents, it may be safely taken for granted that those documents which we know to have been either literally or virtually in the hands of the 8 scribes were freely employed by them in other parts of their text.

C. 152-162. Posteriority of `Syrian' to `Western' and other (neutral and `Alexandrian') readings shown (2) by Ante-Nicene Patristic evidence

§152. The next step accordingly is to discover whether traces of such employment can be found. The variations in the Gospels afford innumerable opportunities for recognising singly the three principal groups of documents, detached from the rest. Oppositions of each of the three groups in turn to all or nearly all the other extant documents abound everywhere, presenting a succession of Distinctive readings of each group, that is, readings having no other attestation: ternary variations in which each of the three groups approximately attests a different variant occur also, but much more rarely. The large field of documentary evidence over which we are now able to range enlarges at the same time our

knowledge of the groups themselves. Other Greek MSS and other MSS of versions become available: but above [page 108] all we obtain some valuable geographical and historical data from the patristic quotations which in many cases give clear additional attestation to the several groups.

§153. It will be convenient from this point to designate two of the primary groups of documents no longer by Greek letters but by names. We shall call the p group `Western', an appellation which has for more than a century been applied to its leading members. It was given at a time when the patristic evidence was very imperfectly known, and its bearing ill understood; and was suggested by the fact that the prominent representatives of the group were Graeco-Latin MSS, certainly written in the West, and the Old Latin version, which throughout its range from Carthage to Britain is obviously Western. The fitness is more open to question since it has become evident that readings of this class were current in ancient times in the East as well as the West and probably to a great extent originated there. On the whole we are disposed to suspect that the `Western' text took its rise in North-western Syria or Asia Minor and that it was soon carried to Rome, and thence spread in different directions to North Africa and most of the countries of Europe. From North-western Syria it would easily pass through Palestine and Egypt to Ethiopia. But this is at present hardly more than a speculation; nor do any critical results depend upon it. Whatever may have been the original home of the `Western' text, a change of designation would now cause more confusion than it would remove, and it remains true that the only continuous and approximately pure monuments of the `Western' texts now surviving have every right to the name. The 8 group we propose to call `Syrian', for [page 109] Page 56

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

surviving have every right to the name. The 8 group we propose to call `Syrian', for [page 109] reasons which have partly been noticed already, and which will appear more clearly further on. To these must here be added another group, which would be fitly marked ??, for, as we shall see, its originals must have preceded those of the Syrian group. The local relations of those of its habitual representatives which can be geographically fixed prescribe for it the name `Alexandrian'. 154. We have hitherto spoken of the primary groups and the ancient texts attested by them with reference to the Gospels alone, where the evidence is at once most copious and most confused. For a full knowledge of their characteristics however it is necessary to pursue them through other books of the New Testament. St Paul's Epistles stand next to the Gospels in the instructiveness of their variations, and fortunately tolerably unmixed Western texts of them are preserved in two independent Greek uncials and in a large body of quotations from Latin Fathers. The Western attestation of the Acts is much less full, and suffers grievously in parts by the loss of leaves in the Codex Bezae (D); but still it can be fairly made out; while the Alexandrian text stands out in much prominence, far more so than in the Pauline Epistles. In the Catholic Epistles the Western text is much obscured by the want of the requisite documents, either Greek or Latin, and probably also by the limited distribution of some of the books in early times; so that it can rarely be relied on for the interpretation of evidence: on the other hand the Alexandrian text is as conspicuous as in the Acts. In the Apocalypse the difficulty of recognising the ancient texts is still greater, owing to the great relative paucity of documents, and especially the absence or loss of this book from the Vatican MS (B) which is available for nearly all the rest [page 110] of the New Testament; and thus the power of using a directly genealogical method is much limited.

§155. The variations here mentioned between different parts of the New Testament are, it will be noticed, of two kinds, being due partly to the varying

amount and distribution of documentary evidence which happens to be extant at the present day, partly to the facts of ancient textual history disclosed by the evidence. It is important to observe that, wherever the evidence is copious and varied enough to allow the historical facts to be ascertained, the prevalent characteristics of the ancient texts, as regards both their readings and their documentary attestation, are identical or at least analogous throughout, the diversities which exist being almost wholly confined to proportion.

§156. Patristic evidence, which we have now to examine for indications of the ancient texts, needs at all times to be handled with much circumspection, for it includes data of every degree of trustworthiness. The uncertainty which affects many apparent patristic attestations, that is, the difficulty of knowing how far they can safely be taken as conveying to us the readings of the MSS used by the Fathers, arises from two causes. First, what a Father actually wrote is very liable to be falsified by the proneness of both scribes and modern editors to alter the text before them into conformity with the written or printed text most familiar to themselves; and since a text substantially identical with that of 8 was unquestionably the only text likely to be known to transcribers generally throughout the centuries to which existing Greek patristic MSS with the rarest exceptions belong, as also to the authors of nearly all the [page 111] current editions of the Greek Fathers till quite lately, it is no wonder that those Greek corruptions which can on sufficient evidence be determined as such are almost invariably found to consist in the introduction, not in the removal, of 8 readings; and nearly the same may be said as to Vulgate readings in the texts of Latin Fathers. This kind of corruption is hardly ever systematic or

readings in the texts of Latin Fathers. This kind of corruption is hardly ever systematic or thorough, but it is common enough; it is usually abundant in those passages of Christian writers which owe their preservation to Catenae, especially where, as frequently happens, they have been evidently condensed by the compiler. It may often be detected by recourse to better MSS, by comparison with other quotations of the same passage by the same writer, or, best of all, by close examination of the context: but in many cases a greater or less degree of doubt remains as to the words actually written by a Father.

§157. The second possible cause of error in dealing with patristic evidence is laxity of quotation by the writers themselves, more especially when they quote indirectly or allusively. The laxity may arise either from conscious or semi-conscious modification for the sake of grammar or convenience, or from error of memory, a frequent cause of error being confusion with other similar passages. Here too there is a considerable residuum of more or less doubtful cases, though comparison with other quotations of the same passage and above all experience will remove many prima facie ambiguities. Allusive references are sometimes as decisive as full and direct quotations, and they have the advantage of being much less liable to corruption by scribes and editors. But whatever imperfections of verification of patristic evidence may cling to particular passages, they do not to [page 112] any appreciable extent affect the generalisations as to the patristic attestation of particular groups of documents obtained by taking a large number of passages together. The broad facts come out clearly: where there is doubt, it for the most part relates to the presence or absence of rare exceptions.

§158. When we examine the remains of the AnteNicene Christian literature with a view to collect evidence respecting the ancient texts which the groupings of the extant documents shew to have existed, we are for some time after the apostolic age hampered both by the paucity of the writings preserved and by the scantiness and comparative vagueness of the textual materials contained in them. The only period for which we have anything like a sufficiency of representative knowledge consists roughly of three quarters of a century from about 175 to 250: but the

remains of four eminent Greek Fathers, which range through this period, cast a strong light on textual history backward and forward. They are Irenaeus, of Asia Minor, Rome, and Lyons; his disciple Hippolytus, of Rome; Clement, of Athens and Alexandria; and his disciple Origen, of Alexandria and Palestine. To the same period belong the Latin representatives of North Africa, Tertullian and Cyprian, as also Cyprian's Roman contemporary Novatian. Towards the close of the third century we have somewhat considerable remains of Methodius, of Lycia and Tyre, an enemy of the Origenian school; and in the first third of the fourth century several writings of Eusebius of Caesarea in Palestine, the most learned of its disciples. For the second half of the third century we have other fragments, but they are few in number. [page 113]

§159. The most striking phenomenon of the evidence belonging to the time before 250 is the number of places in which the quotations exhibit at least two series of readings, Western and what may be called Non-Western. The first clear evidence of any kind that we possess, that obtained from recorded readings of Marcion (Pontus and Rome) and from the writings of Justin Martyr (Samaria and Rome), is distinguished by readings undoubtedly Western, and thus shews that texts of this character were in existence before the middle of the second century. The same character of text is found in Irenaeus and Hippolytus, and again in Methodius and predominantly

Page 58

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

character of text is found in Irenaeus and Hippolytus, and again in Methodius and predominantly in Eusebius. Thus the text used by all those AnteNicene Greek writers, not being connected with Alexandria, who have left considerable remains is substantially Western. Even in Clement of Alexandria and in Origen, especially in some of his writings, Western quotations hold a prominent place.

§160. On the other hand the many Non-Western readings supplied by Clement of Alexandria prove that great divergencies were in existence at latest by the end of the second century Any possible doubts on this head that could be suggested by his free mode of citation would be entirely swept away by what we find in Origen's extant writings. Many of the verses which he quotes in different places shew discrepancies of text that cannot be accounted for either by looseness of citation or by corruption of the MSS of his writings; and in most instances the discrepant readings are those of the primary extant groups, including the `Alexandrian' group, of which we shall presently have to speak in detail. It is even possible, as Griesbach shewed long ago, to trace to a certain extent his use of different MSS [page 114] when writing different treatises; and moreover he now and then refers in express words to variations between MSS, as indeed Irenaeus had at least once done. Many of his readings in variations in which Western documents stand opposed to all other documents are distinctly Western, many more are distinctly Non-Western. On the other hand his quotations to the best of our belief exhibit no clear and tangible traces of the Syrian text.

§161. That these characteristics, positive and negative, of the quotations found in Origen's writings are due to accident is in the highest degree improbable. A long and laborious life devoted chiefly to original biblical studies, combined with a special interest in texts, and the twofold opportunities supplied by the widely different circumstances of Alexandria and Palestine, to say nothing of varied intercourse with other lands, could hardly fail to acquaint him with all leading types of Greek text current in the Churches, and especially in the Eastern Churches: and as a matter of fact we find all other known great types of text represented in his writings except the one; that one moreover, had it then existed,

being more likely to have come to the notice of a dweller in Palestine than any other.

§162. Nor is the testimony that of a single Father, however well placed and well fitted for reflecting the lost testimony of all contemporary Churches on such a matter. The whole body of patristic evidence down to his death, or later, tells the same tale. Before the middle of the third century, at the very earliest, we have no historical signs of the existence of readings, conflate or other, that are marked as distinctively Syrian by the want of attestation from groups of documents which have [page 115] preserved the other ancient forms of text. This is a fact of great significance, ascertained as it is exclusively by external evidence, and therefore supplying an absolutely independent verification and extension of the result already obtained by comparison of the internal character of readings as classified by conflation.

D. 163-168. Posteriority of Syrian go Western, Alexandrian, and other (neutral) readings shown (3) by Internal Evidence of Syrian readings

§163. The Syrian conflate readings have shown the Syrian text to be posterior to at least two ancient forms of text still extant, one of them being `Western', and also to have been, at least in

Page 59

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

ancient forms of text still extant, one of them being 'Western', and also to have been, at least in part, constructed out of both. Patristic evidence has shewn that these two ancient texts, and also a third, must have already existed early in the third century, and suggested very strong grounds for believing that in the middle of the century the Syrian text had not yet been formed. Another step is gained by a close examination of all readings distinctively Syrian in the sense explained above, comparing them on grounds of Internal Evidence, Transcriptional and Intrinsic, with the other readings of the same passages. The result is entirely unfavourable to the hypothesis which was mentioned as not excluded by the phenomena of the conflate readings, namely that in other cases, where the Syrian text differs from all other extant ancient texts, its authors may have copied some other equally ancient and perhaps purer text now otherwise lost. In themselves Syrian readings hardly ever offend at first. With rare exceptions they run smoothly and easily in form, and yield at once to even a careless reader a passable sense, [page 116] free from surprises and seemingly transparent. But when distinctively Syrian readings are minutely compared one after the other with the rival variants, their claim to be regarded as the original readings is found gradually to diminish, and at last to disappear. Often either the transcriptional or the intrinsic evidence is neutral or divided, and occasionally the two kinds of evidence appear to be in conflict. But there are, we believe, no instances where both are clearly in favour of the Syrian reading, and innumerable where both are clearly adverse to it.

§164. The testimony of the simpler variations in which the other ancient texts are united against the Syrian reading is remarkably confirmed by that of many of those variations in which they are divided among themselves. Here one of the readings has to approve itself on transcriptional grounds by its fitness to give rise not to one but to two or more other readings, that is either to each independently or to one which will in like manner account naturally for the third (or the rest); and the failure of the Syrian reading to fulfil this condition is usually manifest. The clearest cases are those in which the immediate parent of the Syrian reading is seen to be itself in turn derived from another, so that the two steps of the

process illustrate each other: not a few distinctively Syrian readings are in reality Western or Alexandrian readings, somewhat trimmed and modified.

§165. To state in few words the results of examination of the whole body of Syrian readings, distinctive and non-distinctive, the authors of the Syrian text had before them documents representing at least three earlier forms of text, Western, Alexandrian, and a third. Where they found variation, they followed different procedures [page 117] in different places. Sometimes they transcribed unchanged the reading of one of the earlier texts, now of this, now of that. Sometimes they in like manner adopted exclusively one of the readings, but modified its form. Sometimes they combined the readings of more than one text in various ways, pruning or modifying them if necessary. Lastly, they introduced many changes of their own where, so far as appears, there was no previous variation. When the circumstances are fully considered, all these processes must be recognised as natural.

§166. Thus not only do the relations disclosed by the conflated Syrian readings reappear conspicuously in the much larger field of distinctively Syrian readings generally, but no fresh phenomenon claims to be taken into account, unless it be the existence of the Alexandrian text, which has its own extant attestation apart from the Syrian text. Taking these facts in conjunction with the absence of distinctively Syrian readings from the patristic evidence of the Origenian and Ante-Origenian periods, while nevertheless distinctive readings of all the texts known to have

Page 60

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

Ante-Origenian periods, while nevertheless distinctive readings of all the texts known to have been used in the production of distinctively Syrian readings abound in the Origenian period, as also, with the possible exception of distinctively Alexandrian readings, in the Ante-Origenian period, we are led to conclude that the hypothesis provisionally allowed must now be definitively rejected, and to regard the Syrian text as not only partly but wholly derived from the other known ancient texts. It follows that all distinctively Syrian readings may be set aside at once as certainly originating after the middle of the third century, and therefore, as far as transmission is concerned, corruptions of the apostolic text. [page 118]

§167. The same facts lead to another conclusion of equal or even greater importance respecting non-distinctive Syrian readings, which hold a conspicuous place by their number and often by their intrinsic interest. Since the Syrian text is only a modified eclectic combination of earlier texts independently attested, existing documents descended from it can attest nothing but itself: the only authority which they can give to readings having other documentary attestation, that is to readings Syrian but not distinctively Syrian, is the authority of the Syrian text itself, which resolves itself into that of a lost ancient MS of one or possibly more of those older texts from which the Syrian text was in any given variation derived. Accordingly a reading supported both by the documents belonging to the Syrian group and by those belonging to e. ?? the Western group has no appreciably greater presumption in its favour than if it were supported by the Western group alone: the only accession is that of a lost Western MS not later in date than the time when the Syrian text was formed; and in almost all cases this fact would add nothing to our knowledge of the ancestry of the reading as furnished by the Non-Syrian documents attesting it.

§168. If our documents were free from all mixture except that contained in the Syrian text, that is, if no document of later origin itself combined elements from

different texts, the application of this principle would be always clear and certain. Since however most of the more important documents are as a matter of fact affected by later mixture, the origin of any given reading in them can only be determined by grouping; and since grouping is sometimes obscure, a greater or less degree of doubt about the antecedents of a non-distinctive Syrian reading [page 119] may in such cases remain. Thus it may be clear that a reading was first Western and then Syrian, while yet there may be a doubt whether certain of the attesting documents derived it from a Syrian or from an earlier source. If from the former, the reading must be held to be in effect distinctively Western: if from the latter, the possibility or probability of its having existed not only in the Western but in a Non-Western Pre-Syrian text has to be taken into account. These occasional ambiguities of evidence do not however affect the force or the ordinary applicability of the principle itself: and in practice the doubt is in most cases removed by Internal Evidence of Groups.

SECTION II. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CHIEF ANCIENT TEXTS 169-187

§169. Leaving for the present the Syrian text and its own history, we must now go back to the earlier periods within which the primary ramifications of the genealogical tree have been shown to lie. It follows from what has been said above that all readings in which the Pre-Syrian texts concur must be accepted at once as the apostolic readings, or to speak more exactly, as the most original of recorded readings. Indeed this is only repeating in other words that all

Page 61

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

most original of recorded readings. Indeed this is only repeating in other words that all distinctively Syrian readings must be at once rejected. The variations between Pre-Syrian texts raise much more difficult questions, which can be answered only by careful examination of the special characteristics of the several texts. [page 120]

A. 170-176. Western characteristics

§170. On all accounts the Western text claims our attention first. The earliest readings which can be fixed chronologically belong to it. As far as we can judge from extant evidence, it was the most widely spread text of Ante-Nicene times; and sooner or later every version directly or indirectly felt its influence. But any prepossessions in its favour that might be created by this imposing early ascendancy are for the most part soon dissipated by continuous study of its internal character. The eccentric Whiston's translation of the Gospels and Acts from the Codex Bezae, and of the Pauline Epistles from the Codex Claromontanus, and Bornemann's edition of the Acts, in which the Codex Bezae was taken as the standard authority, are probably the only attempts which have ever been made in modern times to set up an exclusively or even predominantly Western Greek text as the purest reproduction of what the apostles wrote. This all but universal rejection is doubtless partly owing to the persistent influence of a whimsical theory of the last century, which, ignoring all Non-Latin Western documentary evidence except the handful of extant bilingual uncials, maintained that the Western Greek text owed its peculiarities to translation from the Latin; partly to an imperfect apprehension of the antiquity and extension of the Western text as revealed by patristic quotations and by versions. Yet, even with the aid of a true perception of the facts of Ante-Nicene textual history, it would have been strange if this text as a whole had found much favour. A few scattered Western readings have long been approved by good textual critics [page 121] on transcriptional and to a great extent insufficient grounds; and in Tischendorf's last edition their number has been augmented, owing to the misinterpreted accession

of the Sinai MS to the attesting documents. To one small and peculiar class of Western readings, exclusively omissions, we shall ourselves have to call attention as having exceptional claims to adoption. But when the Western readings are confronted with their ancient rivals in order to obtain a broad comparative view of the two texts, few scholars could long hesitate to pronounce the Western not merely to be the less pure text, but also to owe its differences in a great measure to a perilous confusion between transcription and reproduction, and even between the preservation of a record and its supposed improvement; and the distrust thus generated is only increased by further acquaintance.

§171. What has been here said is equally true whether we confine ourselves to Western readings having only a Western attestation or include with them those Western readings which, having been adopted into the Syrian text, have a combination of Western and Syrian attestation. When once the historical relations of the texts have been ascertained, it would be arbitrary to refuse the evidence of the latter class in studying the general character of Western readings apart from attestation, for the accident of their appropriation by the Syrian text when the other Western readings were neglected can have no bearing on the antecedent relations of the whole class to the apostolic originals. But as a matter of fact the general conclusions would be the same in either case: throughout both classes of Western readings there is no diversity of salient characteristics. [page 122]

§172. To what extent the earliest MSS of the distinctively Western ancestry already contained distinctive Western readings, cannot now be known. However they may have differed from the apostolic autographs, there was at all events no little subsequent and homogeneously progressive change. It is not uncommon to find one, two, or three of the most independent and most authentically Western documents in agreement with the best representatives of Non- Western Pre-Syrian texts against the bulk of Western authorities under circumstances which render it highly difficult to account for the concurrence by mixture: and in such cases these detached documents must attest a state of the Western text when some of its characteristic corruptions had not yet arisen, and others had. On the other hand it is probable that even the relatively latest Western readings found in distinct provinces of Western documents, for instance in different languages, were already in existence at a very early date of Church history, it may be before the end of the second century.

§173. The chief and most constant characteristic of the Western readings is a love of paraphrase. Words, clauses, and even whole sentences were changed, omitted, and inserted with astonishing freedom, wherever it seemed that the meaning could be brought out with greater force and definiteness. They often exhibit a certain rapid vigour and fluency which can hardly be called a rebellion against the calm and reticent strength of the apostolic speech, for it is deeply influenced by it, but which, not less than a tamer spirit of textual correction is apt to ignore pregnancy and balance of sense, and especially those meanings which are conveyed by exceptional choice or collocation of words. An extreme [page 123] form of the paraphrastic tendency is shown in the interpolation of phrases extending by some kind of parallelism the language of the true text; as kat T77S VV#L+5S after (L5 vvrovv??o Iv TOV VV??+LOV in Matt. xxv I; yCVV@ KQL tCVVUCtV between OL VLLOL TOV QL@VOS TOVTOV and zQKOV5LV I(QL 7aML5ROVTQL in Luke xx 34; and (K TYjS (TQpKOS

QVTOV KCLL CK T@V OSTEXV QVTOU after jLL??/?17 sv??LLev TOV CZ,LLQTOS QVTOV in Eph. v 3o. Another equally important characteristic is a disposition to enrich the text at the cost of its purity by alterations or additions taken from traditional and perhaps from apocryphal or other nonbiblical sources; as Sv (L O VLOS jLLOV O ayaTT/ITOi, EV SOL evaoKx1Ca (originating of course in Ps. ii 7) given as the words spoken from heaven at the Baptism in Luke iii 22; and a long interpolation (printed in the Appendix) beginning `YSMCLS 86 tNTCLrE after Matt. xx 28. The two famous interpolations in John v and viii, which belong to this class, will need special notice in another place. Under the present head also should perhaps be placed some of the many curious Western interpolations in the Acts, a certain number of which, having been taken up capriciously by the Syrian text, are still current as part of the Received text: but these again will require separate mention.

§174. Besides these two marked characteristics, the Western readings exhibit the ordinary tendencies of scribes whose changes are not limited to wholly or partially mechanical corruptions. We shall accordingly find these tendencies, some of them virtually incipient forms of paraphrase, in other texts of the New Testament: but in the Western text their action has been more powerful than elsewhere. As illustrations may be mentioned the insertion and multiplication of genitive pronouns, but [page 124] occasionally their suppression where they appeared cumbrous; the insertion of objects, genitive, dative, or accusative, after verbs used absolutely; the insertion of conjunctions in sentences which had none, but occasionally their excision where

the insertion of conjunctions in sentences which had none, but occasionally their excision where their force was not perceived and the form of the sentence or context seemed to commend abruptness; free interchange of conjunctions; free interchange of the formulae introductory to spoken words; free interchange of participle and finite verb with two finite verbs connected by a conjunction; substitution of compound verbs for simple as a rule, but conversely where the compound verb of the true text was difficult or unusual; and substitution of aorists for imperfects as a rule, but with a few examples of the converse, in which either a misunderstanding of the context or an outbreak of untimely vigour has introduced the imperfect. A bolder form of correction is the insertion of a negative particle, as in Matt. xxi 32 (01'7 being favoured, it is true, by the preceding sov), Luke xi 48, and Rom. iv 19; or its omission, as in Rom. v 14; Gal. ii 5; V 8.

§175. Another impulse of scribes abundantly exemplified in Western readings is the fondness for assimilation. In its most obvious form it is merely local, abolishing diversities of diction where the same subject matter recurs as part of two or more neighbouring clauses or verses, or correcting apparent defects of symmetry. But its most dangerous work is 'harmonistic' corruption, that is, the partial or total obliteration of differences in passages otherwise more or less resembling each other. Sometimes the assimilation is between single sentences that happen to have some matter in common; more usually however between parallel passages of greater length, such especially as have in some sense a common [page 125] origin. To this head belong not only quotations from the Old Testament, but parts of Ephesians and Colossians, and again of Jude and 2 Peter, and, above all, the parallel records in the first three Gospels, and to a certain extent in all four. It is difficult to exaggerate the injury thus inflicted (u??) on the resources for a right understanding of the Gospel history by the destruction of many of the most characteristic and instructive touches contributed by the several narratives, whether in the form of things otherwise said, or of additional things said, or of things left unsaid. A sense of the havoc wrought by harmonistic corruption in the Old Latin texts, in their origin Western texts, has been already

mentioned as one of the primary motives alleged by Jerome for his revision; and though his effort had only a limited success, the Vulgate contrasts favourably with prior Latin texts of the Gospels in this respect. It should be observed that the harmonistic changes in the Western as in all other texts were irregular and unsystematic. Nor is it rare to find Western changes proceeding in an opposite direction; that is, to find paraphrastic or other impulses followed in the text of one Gospel in unconsciousness or disregard of the creation of new differences from the language of a parallel narrative.

§176. It must not be supposed that the liberties taken by the authors of the Western readings, though far exceeding what we find appearing for the first time in other texts of the New Testament, are unknown in other literature transmitted under not unlike circumstances. Several books of the Apocrypha of the Old Testament exist in two forms of text, of which one is evidently an amplified and interpolated modification of the other. Analogous phenomena in various manners [page 126] and degrees occur in the texts of some of the earliest post-apostolic Christian writings, as the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas; and even the interpolations of the Ignatian Epistles are to a certain extent of the same kind. In the Christian 'apocryphal' or legendary literature, some of which, in its elements if not in its present shape, is undoubtedly as old as the second century, much of the extraordinary diversity in different MSS can only be explained by a hardly credible laxity of idea and practice in the

transmission of texts. Some at least of the writings here mentioned, if not all of them, had a large popular currency: and it is probably to similar conditions of use and multiplication, prevailing during the time of the slow process by which the books of the New Testament at last came to be placed on the same footing as those of the Old, that we must look for a natural explanation of the characteristics of their Western texts. In surveying a long succession of Western readings by the side of others, we seem to be in the presence of a vigorous and popular ecclesiastical life, little scrupulous as to the letter of venerated writings, or as to their permanent function in the future, in comparison with supposed fitness for immediate and obvious edification.

B. 177-180. The neutral text and its preservation

§177. We now proceed to other Pre-Syrian texts. If it be true, as we have found reason to believe, first, that during that part of the Ante-Nicene period of which we have any direct knowledge `Western' texts were at least dominant in most churches of both East and West, and secondly, that, whatever may be the merits of individual [page 127] Western readings, the Western texts generally are due to a corruption of the apostolic texts, it is natural to ask where comparatively pure texts were preserved. The only extant patristic writings which to any considerable extent support extant Pre-Syrian readings at variance with Western readings are connected with Alexandria, that is, the remains of Clement and Origen, as mentioned above (§

159), together with the fragments of Dionysius and Peter of Alexandria from the second half of the third century, and in a certain measure the works of Eusebius of Caesarea, who was deeply versed in the theological literature of Alexandria. In like manner, of the three great versions or families of versions which must date from the earliest centuries, two in their Old or unrevised form must be classed as Western, the Latin clearly and almost entirely, the very imperfectly preserved

Syriac more obscurely: but it is only the two versions of Lower and of Upper Egypt, and the latter, which is the further from Alexandria, less than the former, that can be pronounced extensively Non-Western. That a purer text should be preserved at Alexandria than in any other church would not in itself be surprising. There, if anywhere, it was to be anticipated that, owing to the proximity of an exact grammatical school, a more than usual watchfulness over the transcription of the writings of apostles and apostolic men would be suggested and kept alive. But the rapid total extinction of comparatively pure texts in all other places would undeniably be a riddle hard of solution.

§178. No such enigmatic history however demands acceptance. The early traces of a text free from Western corruption in churches remote from Alexandria, though relatively few in number, are indubitable and significant. [page 128] They are the same facts that were mentioned above (§ 172) in speaking of the progressiveness of Western changes, only seen from the other side. When we find that those very Western documents or witnesses which attest some of the most widely spread and therefore ancient Western corruptions attest likewise ancient NonWestern readings in opposition to most Western documents, we know that they must represent a text in process of transition from such a text as we find at Alexandria to a more highly developed Western text, and consequently presuppose a relatively pure Non-Western text. This early evidence is sometimes at once Greek Latin, and Syriac, sometimes confined to one or two of the languages. It shews that at least in remote antiquity the Non-Western text was by no means confined to Alexandria.

Page 65

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

§179. As regards the other facts of the Ante-Nicene period, the negative evidence is not of a trustworthy kind. If we deduct from the extant Ante-Nicene Greek patristic quotations those of the Alexandrian Fathers, the remainder, though sufficient to shew the wide range of the Western text, is by no means sufficient by itself to disprove the existence of other texts. What we have urged in a former page (§ 162) respecting the absence of patristic evidence for the Syrian text before the middle of the third century at earliest was founded on the whole evidence, including that of Clement and Origen, Origen's evidence being in amount more than equal to all the rest put together, and in probable variety of sources and actual variety of texts exceptionally comprehensive: and moreover this negative argument was confirmed by the internal phenomena of the Syrian text itself. But further, much positive evidence for the persistence of Non-Western texts in various regions throughout the Ante-Nicene period is contained in the varied texts of Fathers and versions of the fourth and fifth centuries. It is true that the only considerable text of a Father or version of this later period which closely approximates to a Non-Western Pre-Syrian text, that of the younger Cyril, has again Alexandria for its locality. It is true also that it is not absolutely impossible for the large Non-Western Pre-Syrian elements which enter into many mixed texts of the later period to have all radiated from Alexandria in the third century. Nevertheless the preservation of early NonWestern texts in varying degrees of purity in different regions would account for the facts much more naturally than such a hypothesis. On the one hand there is no reason to think the prominence of Alexandria in the extant evidence accidental: nowhere probably was the perpetuation of an incorrupt text so much an object of conscious desire and care, and the local influence of Origen's school for some generations after his death was likely to establish a tradition of exceptional jealousy for the very words of Scripture. On the other hand our documentary evidence, taken as a whole, equally suggests, what historical probability would have led us to anticipate, that in various and perhaps many other places the primitive text in

varying degrees of purity survived the early Western inundation which appeared to submerge it.

§180. Such being the facts, we have not thought it advisable to designate Non-Western Pre-Syrian readings generally as `Alexandrian', although this, or something like this, is the sense in which the term `Alexandrian' is commonly used, when it is not extended to all ancient readings alike that are not found in the later Greek MSS. [page 130] Not only were these readings not confined to Alexandria, but a local name suggests erroneous associations when applied to a text which owes its comparative isolation to the degeneracy of its neighbours. On the laxity with which existing MSS are themselves often called Alexandrian we shall have occasion to remark hereafter.

C. 181-184. Alexandrian characteristics

§181. There is moreover, as we have already intimated, a class of ancient readings to which the name `Alexandrian' of right belongs. They are brought to light by a considerable number of variations among those documents which have chiefly preserved a Non-Western Pre-Syrian text, and which are shown by the whole distribution of documentary evidence to have nothing to do with variations between Western and Non-Western texts. They enter largely, as we shall see presently, into the texts of various extant uncial MSS, and with the help thus afforded to the recognition of documentary grouping it is usually easy to see which variants in successive

Page 66

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

recognition of documentary grouping it is usually easy to see which variants in successive variations have the distinctively `Alexandrian' attestation, and thus to arrive at a comparative view of the general internal characteristics of the two series of readings.

§182. The differences of type are by no means so salient here as in the previous comparison of Western with Non-Western texts; but on due consideration the case becomes clear. On grounds of Intrinsic and Transcriptional Probability alike, the readings which we call Alexandrian are certainly as a rule derived from the other Non-Western Pre-Syrian readings, and not vice versa. The only documentary authorities attesting them with any approach to constancy, and capable of being assigned [page 131] to a definite locality, are quotations by Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, and occasionally other Alexandrian Fathers, and the two principal Egyptian Versions, especially that of Lower Egypt. These facts, taken together, shew that the readings in question belong to a partially degenerate form of the Non-Western Pre-Syrian text, apparently limited in its early range, and apparently originating in Alexandria. It cannot be later in date than the opening years of the third century, and may possibly be much earlier. Some of its readings at one time attracted the attention of critics, owing to certain peculiarities in their secondary attestation: but the greater number have been confused with other Non-Western readings, doubtless owing to the accidental loss of all Greek MSS having an approximately unmixed Alexandrian text. Had D of the Gospels and Acts and D>E3F>G3 of the Pauline Epistles all in like manner perished, it would have been in like manner far harder than now to form a clear conception of the Western text, and consequently of early textual history.

§183. The more startling characteristics of Western corruption are almost wholly absent from the Alexandrian readings. There is no incorporation of matter extraneous to the canonical texts of the Bible, and no habitual or extreme licence of paraphrase; though a certain amount of paraphrase and what may be called inventive interpolation finds place in the less read books, that is, the Acts and Catholic Epistles (especially I Peter), and probably the Apocalypse. The changes

made have usually more to do with language than matter, and are marked by an effort after correctness of phrase. They are evidently the work of careful and leisurely hands, and not seldom display a delicate philological tact which [page 132] unavoidably lends them at first sight a deceptive appearance of originality. Some of the modes of change described above as belonging to incipient paraphrase occur as distinctly here as in the Western texts, though as a rule much more sparingly; and the various forms of assimilation, especially harmonistic alteration and interpolation in the Gospels, recur likewise, and at times are carried out in a very skilful manner.

§184. Alexandrian changes sometimes occur in places where Western changes exist likewise, sometimes where they do not; and again the Syrian text sometimes follows one, sometimes another, of the three antecedent texts in the former case, of the two in the latter. Considerable variety of distribution, irrespective of Non-Syrian mixture, accordingly arises in the documentary attestation. We often find the Alexandrian group opposed to all other documents, often the Alexandrian and Syrian groups combined in opposition to the others, implying an adoption of an Alexandrian reading by the Syrian text. But the most instructive distributions, as exhibiting distinctly the residual Pre-Syrian text which is neither Western nor Alexandrian, are those produced by the simultaneous aberration of the Western and Alexandrian texts, especially when they severally exhibit independent modes of easing an apparent difficulty in the text antecedent

they severally exhibit independent modes of easing an apparent difficulty in the text antecedent to both.

D. 185-187. Syrian characteristics

§185. The Syrian text, to which the order of time now brings us back, is the chief monument of a new period of textual history. Whatever petty and local mixture may have previously taken place within limited [page 133] areas, the great lines of transmission had been to all appearance exclusively divergent. Now however the three great lines were brought together, and made to contribute to the formation of a new text different from all. As we have seen, the reading now of one, now of another was adopted, such adoption being sometimes a mere transcription but often accompanied by a varying amount of modification not rarely resulting in an entirely new reading. Occasionally also the readings of two of the antecedent texts were combined by simple or complex adaptations. The total process to which these operations belonged was essentially different from the preceding processes of change. In itself the mixture of independent texts might easily be, and perhaps usually was, fortuitous or even unconscious. But the complexity of the Syrian text as derived from three distinct sources simultaneously, the elaborate manner in which they are laid under contribution, and the interfusion of adjustments of existing materials with a distinctly innovative process, shown partly in verbal transformation of adopted readings, partly in assimilative or other interpolations of fresh matter, belong to a manner of change differing as widely from change of either the Western or the Alexandrian type as even Western change from ordinary careless transcription. The Syrian text must in fact be the result of a 'recension' in the proper sense of the word, a work of attempted criticism, performed deliberately by editors and not merely by scribes.

§186. The guiding motives of their criticism are transparently displayed in its effects. It was probably initiated by the distracting and inconvenient currency of at least three conflicting texts in the same region. The alternate borrowing from

all implies that no selection of [page 134] one was made,--indeed it is difficult to see how under the circumstances it could have been made,- as entitled to supremacy by manifest superiority of pedigree. Each text may perhaps have found a patron in some leading personage or see, and thus have seemed to call for a conciliation of rival claims: but at all events, if a new measure was to be adopted for promoting unity of text, no course was so natural and convenient as the acceptance of the traditional authority of each text already accredited by honour and use, at least in an age when any really critical perception of the problem involved in the revision of a written text would have been an anachronism. It would have been no less an anachronism at each variation to find reasons for the preference to be given to this or that text in specialities of documentary attestation or again in consideration of Transcriptional Probability. The only grounds of selection, affording any true means of advancing towards textual purity, that could find place in the conditions of the time, or that can now be discerned in the resulting text, depend on a rough and superficial kind of Intrinsic Probability. But the governing impulses, just as in the case of nearly all licentious as distinguished from inaccurate transcription, unquestionably arose from a very natural failure to distinguish between the purity of a text and its present acceptability or usefulness.

§187. The qualities which the authors of the Syrian text seem to have most desired to impress on it are lucidity and completeness. They were evidently anxious to remove all stumbling-blocks

Page 68

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

on it are lucidity and completeness. They were evidently anxious to remove all stumbling-blocks out of the way of the ordinary reader, so far as this could be done without recourse to violent measures. They were apparently equally desirous that he should have the benefit of in[page 135] structive matter contained in all the existing texts, provided it did not confuse the context or introduce seeming contradictions. New omissions accordingly are rare, and where they occur are usually found to contribute to apparent simplicity. New interpolations on the other hand are abundant, most of them being due to harmonistic or other assimilation, fortunately capricious and incomplete. Both in matter and in diction the Syrian text is conspicuously a full text. It delights in pronouns, conjunctions, and expletives and supplied links of all kinds, as well as in more considerable additions. As distinguished from the bold vigour of the `Western' scribes, and the refined scholarship of the Alexandrians, the spirit of its own corrections is at once sensible and feeble. Entirely blameless on either literary or religious grounds as regards vulgarised or unworthy diction, yet shewing no marks of either critical or spiritual insight, it presents the New Testament in a form smooth and attractive, but appreciably impoverished in sense and force, more fitted for cursory perusal or recitation than for repeated and diligent study.

SECTION III. SKETCH OF POST-NICENE TEXTUAL HISTORY 188- 198

A. 188-190. The two stages of the Syrian text

§188. We have thus far found it conducive to clearness to speak of the Syrian text in the singular number. Two stages of it however can be traced, which may have been separated by an interval of some length. At an [page 136] early period of modern textual criticism it was perceived that the Vulgate Syriac version differed from early versions generally, and from other important early documentary authorities, in the support which it frequently gave to the common late Greek text:

and as the version enjoyed a great traditional reputation of venerable antiquity, the coincidence attracted much interest. Eventually, as has been already noticed (§ 118), it was pointed out that the only way of explaining the whole body of facts was to suppose that the Syriac version, like the Latin version, underwent revision long after its origin, and that our ordinary Syriac MSS represented not the primitive but the altered Syriac text: and this explanation has been signally confirmed in our own day by the discovery of part of a copy of the Gospels in which the national version is preserved approximately in its Old or unrevised state. Two facts render it highly probable that the Syriac revision was instituted or sanctioned by high authority, personal or ecclesiastical; the almost total extinction of Old Syriac MSS, contrasted with the great number of extant Vulgate Syriac MSS; and the narrow range of variation found in Vulgate Syriac MSS, so far as they have yet been examined. Historical antecedents render it tolerably certain that the locality of such an authoritative revision, accepted by Syriac Christendom, would be either Edessa or Nisibis great centres of life and culture to the churches whose language was Syriac, but intimately connected with Antioch, or else Antioch itself, which, though properly Greek, was the acknowledged capital of the whole Syrian population of both tongues. When therefore we find large and peculiar coincidences between the revised Syriac text and the text of the Antiochian Fathers of the [page 137] latter part of the fourth century, and strong indications that the revision was deliberate and in some way authoritative in both cases, it becomes natural to suppose that the two operations had some

historical connexion.

§189. Nevertheless the two texts are not identical. In a considerable number of variations the Vulgate Syriac sides with one or other of the Pre-Syrian texts against the Antiochian Fathers and the late Greek text, or else, as we have already found (§§ 134, 143), has a transitional reading, which has often, though not always, some Greek documentary attestation. These lesser irregularities shew that the Greek Syrian revision in its ultimate form, the only form adequately known to us, and the Syriac revision, though closely connected in origin, cannot both be due to a single critical process performed once for all. The facts would, we believe, be explained by the supposition, natural enough in itself, that (1) the growing diversity and confusion of Greek texts led to an authoritative revision at Antioch, which (2) was then taken as a standard for a similar authoritative revision of the Syriac text, and (3) was itself at a later time subjected to a second authoritative revision, carrying out more completely the purposes of the first; but that the Vulgate Syriac text did not undergo any corresponding second revision. The revision apparently embodied in the Harklean Syriac will be noticed further on.

§190. The final process was apparently completed by 350 or thereabouts. At what date between 250 and 350 the first process took place, it is impossible to say with confidence; and even for conjecture the materials are scanty. There can be little doubt that during the long respite from persecution enjoyed by the Church in the latter half of the third century multiplication of copies [page 138] would be promoted by the increase of converts and new security of religious use, and confusion of texts by more frequent intercourse of churches. Such a state of things would at least render textual revision desirable; and a desire for it might easily arise in a place where a critical spirit was alive. The harmony between the characteristics of the Syrian revision and the well known temper of the Antiochian school of critical theology in the fourth century, at least on its weaker side, is obvious; and Lucianus the reputed founder of the school, himself educated at Edessa, lived in the latter part of the third century, and suffered martyrdom in 3

I 2. Of known names his has a better claim than any other to be associated with the early Syrian revision; and the conjecture derives some little support from a passage of Jerome, which is not itself discredited by the precariousness of modern theories which have been suggested by it. When he says in his preface to the Gospels "Praetermitto eos codices quos a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos paucorum hominum adserit perversa contentio", he must have had in view some definite text or texts of the Gospels or the New Testament generally, appealed to by some definite set or sets of men as deriving authority from names honoured by them. Jerome's antagonism to Antiochian theology would readily explain his language, if some Antiochian Father had quoted in controversy a passage of the New Testament according to the text familiar to him, had been accused of falsifying Scripture, and had then claimed for his text the sanction of Lucianus. Whether however Lucianus took a leading part in the earlier stage of the Syrian revision or not, it may be assigned with more probability either to his generation or to that which immediately followed than to any other; [page 139] and no critical results are affected by the presence or absence of his name.

B. 191-193. Mixture in the fourth century

§191. Two successive external events which mark the opening years of the fourth century, the terrible persecution under Viocletian and his colleagues and the reaction under Constantine,

Page 70

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

terrible persecution under Valerian and his colleagues and the reaction under Constantine, doubtless affected the text not less powerfully than the Canon of the New Testament. The long and serious effort of the imperial government to annihilate the Scriptures could not be otherwise than unequally successful in different places; and thus while throughout whole regions all or nearly all existing MSS would perish without leaving their text transmitted through fresh copies, the vacant places would presently be filled, and more than filled, by transcripts which would import the texts current in more fortunate lands. Thus whatever irregularities in the geographical distribution of texts had grown up in the earlier centuries would be suddenly and variously multiplied. Moreover the tendency of the changes brought about in that century of rapid innovation by the new relations between the Church and the empire, and by the overwhelming influence of theological controversies, was unfavourable to the preservation of local peculiarities of any kind. It is therefore no wonder that the ancient types of text now lose themselves in a general medley, not indeed vanishing entirely from view, but discernible only in fragments intermingled with other texts. Whatever may be the causes, mixture prevails everywhere in the fourth century: almost all its texts, so far as they can be seen through the quotations of the Fathers, are more or less chaotic. [page 140]

§192. The confusion was naturally most extensive in the Greek texts; but the versions did not altogether escape it. Enough is already known of the Latin texts to enable us to see what kind of processes were at work. Along with the old Western licence as to diction, in which Latin scribes must have long continued to indulge, we find not only indigenous mixture, the combination of diverging or possibly of independent Latin types, but also mixture with Greek texts. Combinations of this latter kind were in fact more or less rude revisions, not differing in essential character from the Hieronymic revision to which the Vulgate is due. As in that better known case, they proceeded from a true feeling

that a Greek MS as such was more authentic than a Latin MS as such, uncontrolled by any adequate sense of the difference between one Greek MS and another. As was to be expected, the new Greek elements of these revised Latin MSS came from various sources, now Pre-Syrian with or without the specially Alexandrian corruptions, now distinctly Syrian, Greek readings of this last type being however almost confined to the Italian and Hieronymic revisions. How far the mixture perceptible in Egyptian texts should be referred to this time, it is not as yet possible to say.

§193. Exact knowledge of the patristic texts of the fourth century is much impeded by the uncritical manner in which the works of most of the Greek Fathers have been edited. But wherever firm ground can be reached, we find essentially the same characteristics; almost total absence of all the ancient texts in approximate integrity, and infinitely varying combinations of them, together with an increasing infusion of the later Syrian readings. The most remarkable fact, standing out in striking contrast to the previous state of things, is the sudden collapse of the Western text after Eusebius: a few writers offer rare traces of the expiring tradition in occasional purely Western readings which subsequently vanish; but even this slight and sporadic testimony is exceptional. On the other hand elements derived from Western texts entered largely into most of the mixtures which encounter us on every side. A similar diffusion of large elements derived from the Alexandrian text, discernible in the patristic evidence, is still better attested by versions or revisions of versions in this and the next following period, and apparently by the phenomena of subsequent Greek MSS. At Alexandria itself the Alexandrian tradition lives on through the fourth century, more or less disguised with foreign accretions, and then in the early

through the fourth century, more or less disguised with foreign accretions, and then in the early part of the fifth century reappears comparatively pure in Cyril. On the growing influence of the Syrian texts throughout this time enough has already been said.

C. 194, 195. Final supremacy of the Syrian text

§194. The history of the text of the New Testament in the following centuries is obscure in details; but the facts which stand out clearly are sufficient for the purposes of criticism. The multiplicity of texts bequeathed by the fourth century was of long continuance. If, passing over the four great early Bibles gBAC, and also the Graeco-Latin and Graeco-Egyptian MSS, we fix our attention on what remains to us of purely Greek MSS down to the seventh or eighth century, we cannot but be struck by the considerable though unequal and on the whole decreasing proportion in which Pre-Syrian readings [page 141] of all types are mingled with Syrian. On the other hand before the close of the fourth century, as we have said, a Greek text not materially differing from the almost universal text of the ninth century and the Middle Ages was dominant, probably by authority, at Antioch, and exercised much influence elsewhere. It follows that, however great and long continued may have been the blending of texts, the text which finally emerged triumphant in the East was not a result of any such process, in which the Antiochian text would have been but one factor, however considerable. With one memorable exception, that of the Story of the Woman taken in Adultery, there is evidence of but few and unimportant modifications of the Antiochian text by the influence of other ancient texts before it became the current text of the East generally.

§195. Two classes of causes were at work to produce this singular result. On the one hand Greek Christendom became more and more contracted in extent. The West became exclusively Latin, as well as estranged from the East: with local exceptions, interesting in themselves and valuable to us but devoid of ail

extensive influence the use and knowledge of the Greek language died out in Western Europe. Destruction of books, which had played so considerable a part in textual history at the threshold of the Constantinian age, was repeated again and again on a larger scale, with the important difference that now no reaction followed. The ravages of the barbarians and Mahometans annihilated the MSS of vast regions, and narrowly limited the area within which transcription was carried on. Thus an immense number of the MSS representing texts furthest removed in locality from Antiochian (or Constantinopolitan) influence [page 143] perished entirely, leaving no successors to contribute readings to other living texts or to transmit their own texts to the present day. On the other hand Greek Christendom became centralised, and the centre, looked up to increasingly as such while time went on, was Constantinople. Now Antioch is the true ecclesiastical parent of Constantinople; so that it is no wonder that the traditional Constantinopolitan text, whether formally official or not, was the Antiochian text of the fourth century. It was equally natural that the text recognised at Constantinople should eventually become in practice the standard New Testament of the East.

D. 196, 197. Relics of Pre-Syrian texts in cursives

§196. We have hitherto treated the Greek text of the Middle Ages as a single text. This mode of representation, strictly true in itself, does not convey the whole truth. An overwhelming proportion of the text in all known cursive MSS except a few is as a matter of fact identical,

Page 72

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

proportion of the text in all known cursive MSS except a few is as a matter of fact identical, more especially in the Gospels and Pauline Epistles, however we may account for the identity. Further, the identity of readings implies identity of origin; the evidence already given has shown many of the characteristic readings to have originated about 250-350, assigning them at the same time a definite single origin, for we need not here distinguish stages in the Syrian revision; and there are no reasons whatever for assigning a different origin to the rest. If an editor were for any purpose to make it his aim to restore by itself as completely as possible the New Testament of Antioch in 350, he could not help taking the approximate consent of the cursives as equivalent to a primary documentary [page 144] witness; and he would not be the less justified in so doing for being unable to say precisely by what historical agencies the one Antiochian original was multiplied into the cursive hosts of the later ages. But it is no less true that the consent is only approximate. Although numerous important variations between the Antiochian and other more ancient texts have left no trace in known cursive texts, hardly a verse is free from deviations from the presumed Constantinopolitan standard, sometimes found in a few cursives or one, sometimes even in a large array; and there are not wanting cursives which suggest a doubt whether such a standard forms any part of their ancestry. These diversities of cursive texts, perceptible enough even in Mill's pages, and brought into clearer relief by the collations made or employed by Griesbach and Scholz, can now be studied as to all their characteristic phenomena by means of Dr Scrivener's exhaustive collations.

§197. Variations of cursives from the prevalent late text are of two kinds, differing in origin, though not always capable of being distinguished. They are due either to mixture with other texts, or to ordinary degeneracy of transmission. In the latter case they must of course have originated in an age which deprives them at once of all critical value and of all but the most subordinate historical interest: in the former case they not only often supply important documentary evidence for the restoration of the apostolic text, in which light we shall have to consider them presently, but form a remarkable link historically between the ninth

and following centuries and the preceding periods, being in fact analogous to the Old Latin readings often preserved in Vulgate Latin MSS. They are virtually copies of minute fragments of lost MSS, belonging doubtless in most instances to the middle or late uncial times, but sometimes of an earlier date, and in either case derived directly or indirectly, wholly or partially, from ancient texts. They shew that the final victory of the Antiochian text did not carry with it a total suppression of MSS of other texts; while the fact that the cursives with distinctly mixed texts are not only proportionally but absolutely much more numerous in the tenth and eleventh than in the twelfth and later centuries shews equally that the MSS of other texts fell more and more into neglect. The cursives mentioned above as probably or possibly independent of any Constantinopolitan origin are doubtless on this supposition copies, more or less pure, of MSS similar to those which, immediately or remotely, furnished detached ancient readings to the mixed cursives. They might be compared to the Old Latin c, written several centuries not only after the formation of the Latin Vulgate, but even after its general adoption.

E. 198. Recapitulation of history of text

§198. The continuity, it will be seen, is complete. Early in the second century we find the Western text already wandering into greater and greater adulteration of the apostolic text, which, while doubtless holding its ground in different places, has its securest refuge at

which, while doubtless holding its ground in different places, has its securest refuge at Alexandria; but there in turn it suffers from another but slighter series of changes: and all this before the middle of the third century. At no long time after we find an attempt made, apparently at Antioch, to remedy the growing confusion of texts by the editing of an eclectic text combining readings from the three principal texts, itself [page 146] further revised on like principles, and in that form used by great Antiochian theologians not long after the middle of the fourth century. From that date, and indeed earlier, we find a chaos of varying mixed texts, in which as time advances the elder texts recede, and the Antiochian text now established at Constantinople increasingly prevails. Then even the later types with mixed base disappear, and with the rarest exceptions the Constantinopolitan text alone is copied, often at first with relics of its vanquished rivals included, till at last these too dwindle, and in the copies written shortly before the invention of printing its victory is all but complete. At each stage there are irregularities and obscurities: but we believe the above to be a true sketch of the leading incidents in the history of the text of the New Testament; and, if it be true, its significance as a key to the complexities of documentary evidence is patent without explanation.

SECTION IV. RELATIONS OF THE PRINCIPAL EXTANT DOCUMENTS TO THE CHIEF ANCIENT TEXTS 199-223

A. 199, 200. Nature of the process of determination

§199. In the preceding pages we have been tracing the history of ancient lines of transmission, divergent and convergent, by means of evidence chiefly furnished by the existing documents. In order to use the knowledge thus obtained for the restoration of the text, we have next to follow the converse process, and ascertain which ancient text or texts are represented by each important document or set of documents. Up to a certain point [page 147] this exploration of the ancestry of documents has been performed already at an earlier stage of the investigation, for

we could have made little progress if we had not been able to recognise certain more or less defined groups of documents as habitually attesting analogous ancient readings, and thus as being comparatively faithful representatives of particular ancient texts. But we are now enabled both to verify with increased exactness the earlier classifications, and to extend them to other documents the texts of which were too ambiguous at first sight to allow them to be classified without the aid of standards external to themselves.

§200. The evidence is supplied by the numerous variations in which each variant can at once be assigned with moral certainty to some one of the ancient texts, to the exclusion of those variations in which the grouping of documents is at this stage obscure. At each variation we observe which ancient text is attested by the document under examination. The sum of these observations contains the required result. Neglecting petty exceptions as probably due to some unnoticed ambiguity, unless they happen to be of special clearness, we find that the document habitually follows some one ancient text; or that it sometimes follows one, sometimes another, but has no characteristic readings of the rest; or again that it follows all in turn. Thus we learn that it has transmitted one ancient type of text in approximate purity; or that it is directly or indirectly derived by mixture from two originals of different defined types; or that it has arisen from a more comprehensive mixture. The mixture may of course have taken place in any proportions, and the same observations which bring to light the various elements will supply also

proportions, and the same observations which bring to light the various elements will supply also a fair estimate of the [page 148] proportions between them: most commonly there is no difficulty in recognising one text as the base on which readings of one or more other types have been inserted in greater or less number. From the component elements of the text of a document as thus empirically ascertained to be present in the illustrative variations taken into account, and also, more roughly, from their proportions, the component elements of its text generally, and their proportions, become approximately known. This knowledge supplies a key to other less simple variations, by shewing either to which ancient text a given reading must be referred, so far as its attestation by each such document is concerned, or at least to which ancient text or texts each such document gives little or no warrant for referring it. The uses of the information thus obtained, and their limitation, will appear in due time.

B. 231-212. Texts found in Greek MSS

§201. We have next to give a brief account of the relations of the principal extant documents to ancient texts as ascertained in the manner described above. Greek Uncial MSS are arranged here in the order that seems most convenient for exhibiting their textual composition without reference to any supposed order of excellence. Some repetitions have been found unavoidable.

§202. Western texts virtually unmixed survive exclusively in Graeco-Latin MSS written in Western Europe. They are well represented in the Gospels and Acts by D; some leaves in different places and some whole chapters at the end of Acts being however lost. Though the MS was written in Cent. VI, the text gives no clear signs of having undergone recent degeneracy: it is, to the best of our belief, substantially a Western text of Cent. 11, with occasional readings probably due to Cent. IV. Much more numerous are readings belonging to a very early stage of the Western text, free as yet from corruptions early enough to be found in the European or even in the [page 149] African form of the Old Latin version, and indeed elsewhere. In spite of the prodigious amount of error which D contains,

these readings, in which it sustains and is sustained by other documents derived from very ancient texts of other types, render it often invaluable for the secure recovery of the true text: and, apart from this direct applicability, no other single source of evidence except the quotations of Origen surpasses it in value on the equally important ground of historical or indirect instructiveness. To what extent its unique readings are due to licence on the part of the scribe rather than to faithful reproduction of an antecedent text now otherwise lost, it is impossible to say: but it is remarkable how frequently the discovery of fresh evidence, especially Old Latin evidence, supplies a second authority for readings in which D had hitherto stood alone. At all events? when every allowance has been made for possible individual licence, the text of D presents a truer image of the form in which the Gospels and Acts were most widely read in the third and probably a great part of the second century than any other extant Greek MS.

§203. Western texts of the Pauline Epistles are preserved in two independent uncials, D2 and Gn, in G3 to the exclusion of Hebrews. What has been said of L) of the Gospels may be applied with little deduction to the Pauline D2, allowance being made for the inferior interest of all Western texts of St Paul. The text of G3, to a great extent coincident, apparently represents a later type, but still probably not later than Cent. IV. It is to be observed that though many readings of D2 in opposition to G3 are supported by other very ancient texts, others receive no such confirmation, and are shown by Latin evidence to be no less Western than those of G3.

Page 75

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

such confirmation, and are shown by Latin evidence to be no less Western than those of G3. But this is merely an example of the variety of Western texts. Since G3 was apparently written late in Cent. IX, probably at St Gallen by an Irish scribe (though it may possibly have been brought to St Gallen from Ireland), the nature of its text may be due either to the preservative power of the seclusion of Greek learning in the West or to direct transcription from a very much older copy. The text of the Gospels in what was originally part of the same MS is, we shall see, entirely different. Two of the uncial Graeco-Latin copies of the Pauline Epistles, E3 and F2, cannot count as independent sources of evidence: k3 has long been recognised as a transcript of D2, and we believe [page 150] F2 to be as certainly in its Greek text a transcript of G3; if not, it is an inferior copy of the same immediate exemplar. Not a single Greek MS of any age, as we have already (§ 171) had occasion to notice, has transmitted to us an Alexandrian text of any part of the New Testament free from large mixture with other texts.

§204. Tried by the same tests as those just applied B is found to hold a unique position. Its text is throughout Pre-Syrian, perhaps purely Pre-Syrian, at all events with hardly any, if any, quite clear exceptions, of which the least doubtful is the curious interpolation in Rom. xi 6. >From distinctively Western readings it seems to be all but entirely free in the Gospels, Acts, and Catholic Epistles: in the Pauline Epistles there is an unquestionable intermingling of readings derived from a Western text nearly related to that of G3; and the facility with which they can generally be here recognised throws into clearer relief the almost total absence of definite Western influence in the other books. Here and there indeed may be found readings which are perhaps in some sense Western, having some slight Old Latin or similar attestation: but they are few and not clearly marked, so that their existence does not sensibly render less significant the absence of distinctively Western readings manifestly such. Respecting Alexandrian readings negative statements as to a document containing a Non-Western Pre-Syrian text

can never be made without hesitation, on account of the narrow limitation of the difference of documentary attestation characteristic of the two forms of this text respectively. But we have not been able to recognise as Alexandrian any readings of B in any book of the New Testament which It contains; so that, with the exceptions already noticed, to the best of our belief neither of the early streams of innovation has touched it to any appreciable extent. This peculiar character is exhibited to the eye in the documentary evidence of those variations in which both a Western and an Alexandrian corruption is present, and one of these corruptions is adopted in the Syrian text, B being then conspicuous in the usually slender array supporting the reading from which both have diverged. It must not of course be assumed to follow that B has remained unaffected by sporadic corruption independent of the three great lines, Western, Alexandrian and Syrian. In the Gospel of St Matthew for instance it has occasionally admitted widely spread readings of very [page 152] doubtful genuineness. But the influence of these three lines upon almost all extant documents has been so enormous that the highest interest must already be seen to belong to a document of which thus far we know only that its text is not only Pre-Syrian but substantially free from Western and Alexandrian adulteration.

§205. The relations to ancient texts which disclose themselves on analysis of the text of S are peculiarly interesting. As in its contemporary B, the text seems to be entirely or all but entirely, Pre-Syrian: and further a very large part of the text is in like manner free from Western or Alexandrian elements. On the other hand this fundamental text has undergone extensive mixture either with another text itself already mixed or, more probably, with two separate texts, one

Page 76

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

either with another text itself already mixed or, more probably, with two separate texts, one Western, one Alexandrian. Thus, widely different as is S from the Syrian text, as well as independent of it, it is analogous in composition, except that it shews no trace of deliberate adjustment and critical modification. The mixture is unequally distributed, being most abundant in the Gospels and apparently in the Apocalypse, and least abundant in the Pauline Epistles; but it is never absent for many verses together. The Western readings are specially numerous in St John's Gospel, and in parts of St Luke's: they belong to an early and important type, though apparently not quite so early as the fundamental text of D, and some of them are the only Greek authority for Western readings which, previous to the discovery of S, had been known only from versions.

§206. Every other known Greek MS has either a mixed or a Syrian text, mixture becoming rarer as we approach the time when the Syrian text no longer reigned supreme, but virtually reigned alone. Moreover every known Greek MS except those already mentioned contains a Syrian element, which is in almost all cases large, but is very variable. The differences in respect of mixture fall under three chief heads;--difference in the proportion of Syrian to Pre-Syrian readings; difference in the proportion of Pre-Syrian readings neither Western nor Alexandrian to those of both these classes; and difference in the proportion of Western to Alexandrian readings. It is to be observed that the Non-Syrian element of these mixed Greek MSS is hardly ever, if ever, exclusively Western or exclusively Alexandrian. Sometimes the one type predominates, sometimes the other, but neither appears quite alone. This state of things would naturally arise if, as [page 152] was to be anticipated from the phenomena of the fourth century, the Pre-Syrian texts in their purer forms quickly died out, and were replaced by a multitude of mixed texts. In like manner It is no wonder that tile Pre-Syrian text neither Western nor Alexandrian, which already by the fourth century was apparently less popular than that of either the Western or the Alexandrian type, is afterwards found less conspicuously represented in mixed texts than its rivals.

§207. The text of A stands in broad contrast to those of either B or 8, though the

interval of years is probably small. The contrast is greatest in the Gospels, where A has a fundamentally Syrian text, mixed occasionally with Pre-Syrian readings, chiefly Western. In the other books the Syrian base disappears, though a Syrian occurs among the other elements. In the Acts and Epistles the Alexandrian outnumber the Western readings. All books except the Gospels, and especially the Apocalypse, have many Pre-Syrian readings not belonging to either of the aberrant types: in the Gospels these readings are of rare occurrence. By a curious and apparently unnoticed coincidence the text of A in several books agrees with the Latin Vulgate. In so many peculiar readings devoid of Old Latin attestation as to leave little doubt that a Greek MS largely employed by Jerome in his revision of the Latin version must have had to a great extent a common original with A. Apart from this individual affinity, A both in the Gospels and elsewhere may serve as a fair example of the MSS that, to judge by patristic quotations, were commonest in the fourth century. Even the difference of text in the Gospels, though very possibly due only to accidental use of different exemplars for different groups of books, corresponds to a difference existing on a larger scale; for the Syrian text of the Gospels appears to have become popular before that of the rest of the New Testament.

§208. In C the Syrian and all three forms of PreSyrian text are combined in varying

Page 77

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

§208. In C the Syrian and all three forms of PreSyrian text are combined in varying proportions, distinctively Syrian readings and such distinctively Western readings as were not much adopted into eclectic texts being however comparatively infrequent.

§209. With respect to the texts of extant uncial MSS of the Gospels later than the four great Bibles, a few words on some of the more important must suffice. The Greek text of the Graeco- Thebaic fragments of St Luke [page 153] and St John (T, Cent. v) is entirely Pre-Syrian and almost entirely Non-Western. That of the considerable fragments of St Luke called X has a similar foundation, with a larger share of Alexandrian corrections, and also a sprinkling, of Western and Syrian readings: this character is the more remarkable as the date seems to be Cent. VIII. Of greater general importance is L of about the same date, which contains the Gospels in approximate completeness. The foundation of the text is Non-Western Pre-Syrian. No extant M S has preserved so many Alexandrian readings in the Gospels, but the early readings neither Western nor Alexandrian are also very numerous. On the other hand the fundamental text has been largely mixed with late Western and with Syrian elements. The composition, it will be seen, has analogies with that of S, though the actual texts are entirely independent, and the much smaller proportion of Alexandrian corrections in X, the great dissimilarity of its Western element, and the absence of a Syrian element, constitute important differences. In three Gospels the St Gallen MS A (see above on G3 of the Pauline Epistles, §

203) has an ordinary Syrian text sprinkled thinly with Alexandrian and a few Western readings. But in St Mark this fundamental text is for the most part displaced by mixture with a Non- Western Pre-Syrian text of the same type as the fundamental text of L and X, and thus full of Alexandrian corrections as well as other early Non-Western readings: traces of the process remain in conflate or intermediate readings. The numerous fragments of PQRZ of the Gospels (see § 100) are variously mixed, but all have a large proportion of Pre-Syrian readings; in such MSS as NXr(?E), and still more as KM, Pre-Syrian readings are very much fewer. The smaller fragments we must pass over, with one exception: too

few lines of Wd (St Mark) survive to enable us to form a trustworthy conception of its text generally; hut it includes a large Western element of a very curious type.

§210. The Codex Landianzgs (E2) of Acts is interesting on more accounts than one. It was apparently the identical Greek MS used by Bede. As it is Graeco-Latin in form, its text might be expected to be Western. A Western text it does contain, very distinctly such, though evidently later than that of D; but mixed on apparently equal terms, though in varying proportions, with a no less distinctly Alexandrian text: there are also Syrian readings, but they are fewer in number. P2 is all but purely [page 154] Syrian in the Acts and I Peter, while in the other Epistles and the Apocalypse a similar base is variously mixed with another text predominantly but not exclusively Alexandrian, often agreeing with A where A has readings of this class. The Pauline fragments M2 and H3 have mixed texts, that of M2 being of more ancient character and more interesting. The historical antecedents of B2, and indeed of all MSS of the Apocalypse, are still obscure.

§211. A few words must suffice here on Greek Cursives. By far the most free from Syrian readings is 61 of the Acts, which contains a very ancient text, often Alexandrian, rarely Western, with a trifling Syrian element, probably of late introduction. The cursive which comes nearest to 61 of Acts in antiquity of text, though at a long interval, is 33 of the Gospels; which

nearest to 61 of Acts in antiquity of text, though at a long interval, is 33 of the Gospels; which has indeed a very large Syrian element, but has also an unusual proportion of Pre-Syrian readings, chiefly Non-Western of both kinds though also Western: the same type of text runs through the whole MS, which is called 13 in the Acts and Catholic Epistles, and 17 in the Pauline Epistles. Most cursives of the Gospels which contain many ancient readings owe more to Western than to Alexandrian sources. Among these may be named four, 13, 69, 124, and 346, which have recently been shown by Professors Ferrar and T. K. Abbott to be variously descended from a single not very remote original, probably uncial: its Non-Syrian readings belong to very ancient types, but their proportion to the fundamentally Syrian text as a whole is not great. Nearly the same may be said of I and 209 of the Gospels, which contain a large common element of ancient origin, partly shared by 118, as also by 131. The most valuable cursive for the preservation of Western readings in the Gospels is 8 I, a St Petersburg MS called 2pe by Tischendorf as standing second in a list of documents collated by Muralt. It has a large ancient element, in great measure Western and in St Mark its ancient readings are numerous enough to be of real importance. Another more than usually interesting text, somewhat of the same type but much more largely Syrian, is that of It 39, the British Museum Gospel Lectionary called y by its collator Dr Scrivener. In 157 of the Gospels we have the best example of the few cursives which more nearly resemble 33 in the composition of their Pre-Syrian element, though not connected with 33 by any near affinity.

§212. The proportion of cursives of the Acts and [page 155] Catholic Epistles containing an appreciable amount of Pre-Syrian readings is much larger than in the Gospels or even in the Pauline Epistles, and the Alexandrian readings thus attested are greatly in excess of the Western, without taking into account 61 or 13. Fortunately however Western texts are not altogether ill represented, though only by scattered readings, chiefly in 137, 180, and 44, this last being a M S belonging to the Baroness Burdett-Coutts (iii 37), for the loan of a collation of which we have to thank Dr Scrivener's kindness; and to these MSS should be added 31 (the Leicester MS called 69 in the Gospels), which has many Non-Alexandrian

PreSyrian readings of both kinds. The chief characteristics of the ancient elements in the cursive texts of St Paul are the extreme irregularity with which they appear in different parts of his epistles, and the small proportion of Western readings to others. Certain corrections in the margin of 67 (66 of the Acts and Catholic Epistles) stand apart by their inclusion of a relatively large number of very ancient readings, which have no other cursive attestation, some distinctively Western, others not so: these marginal readings must have been derived from a MS having a text nearly akin to that of the fragmentary MS called M2, though not from M2 itself. Besides 17, mentioned above, no other MSS of St Paul require special notice. Much ancient evidence is assuredly preserved in not a few cursive texts of the Apocalypse: but they have not as yet been traced with any clearness to their sources.

C. 213-219. Texts found in Versions

§213. Analogous phenomena of mixture to those observed in most Greek MSS recur in the later Versions and states of versions: but the want of adequate knowledge of individual MSS of all versions except the Old Latin leaves much uncertain that will doubtless hereafter be cleared up. The African and European Latin, as has been already intimated, represent Western texts of different antiquity: but most of the aberrant readings found in single MSS are probably due to independent mixture with other Greek texts. In the Italian and Vulgate revisions mixture with

independent mixture with other Greek texts. In the Italian and Vulgate revisions mixture with Greek texts of various types played a large part: in the Italian Latin the Syrian contingent is especially conspicuous. We have already spoken of the [page 156] various forms of Latin mixture which are perceptible in 'Mixed Vulgate' MSS (§ 114): it is likewise possible that some of their Non-Western readings may have come directly from Greek MSS.

§214. The textual character of the Old state of the national or Peshito Syriac version is to a certain extent ambiguous as being known only through a solitary and imperfect MS. We cannot always distinguish original readings of the version, antecedent to the bulk of Western readings, from readings in no sense Western introduced into it by mixture in the later generations before our MS was written. In many cases however the discrimination is rendered morally certain by the grouping of documents: and at all events the widest examination of all classes of documents only confirms the general conclusions on the history of the Syriac version set forth above (§ 118) as suggested by the prima facie relations of early grouping. In its origin the version was at least predominantly Western of an early type, such few Alexandrian readings as occur having probably come in at a later though still early time. At the revision, whether independent or conforming to a Greek Syrian revision, changes having the Syrian characteristics already described were introduced into the fundamental text. The revised or Vulgate Syriac text differs from the final form of the Greek Syrian text chiefly in retaining many Non-Western readings (some few of them apparently Alexandrian) which afterwards gave way to Western or to new (distinctively Syrian) readings.

§215. The Harklean Syriac, which the thorough recasting of diction constitutes rather a new version founded on the Vulgate Syriac than a revision of it in the ordinary sense, receives its predominant character from the multitudes of ordinary Antiochian readings introduced; but readings of more ancient Greek types

likewise make their appearance. Taken altogether, this is one of the most confused texts preserved: but it may be rendered more intelligible by fresh collations and better editing, even if they should fail to distinguish the work of Thomas of Harkel from that of his predecessor Polycarpus. It would not be surprising to find that Polycarpus simply converted the Vulgate Syriac into an exact imitation of the Greek Antiochian text, and that the more ancient readings were introduced by Thomas from the "three (v. /. two) approved and accurate Greek copies in the Enaton of the great city [page 157] of Alexandria, in the holy monastery of the Enatonians", with which he states that he carefully compared his predecessor's version. In this case the readings noted in the margin might well be those which he did not see fit to adopt, but thought it best to place on record in a secondary place. The Non- Antiochian readings in the text, with or without an asterisk, have the same general character as the marginal readings, and can mostly claim a very high antiquity: many of them are distinctively Western, and they include a large proportion of the peculiar Western variations and interpolations in the Acts. In the Catholic Epistles the readings of the Harklean Syriac have a more mixed character than in the other books.

§216. The Jerusalem Syriac Lectionary has an entirely different text, probably not altogether unaffected by the Syriac Vulgate, but more closely related to the Old Syriac. Mixture with one or more Greek texts containing elements of every great type, but especially the more ancient, has however given the whole a strikingly composite character. Variations occur to a certain extent between repetitions of the same passages in different parts of the Lectionary, and also

Page 80

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

extent between repetitions of the same passages in different parts of the Lectionary, and also between the several MSS in the few places where the new fragments contain the same portions with each other or with the principal MS. These differences are probably caused by mixture with late Greek MSS; which is indeed likely to have affected this Syriac text in all the extant copies: but for the most part the same peculiar text presents itself throughout.

§217. The Egyptian versions are substantially true to their prima facie character. The main body of both versions is founded on a very ancient Non-Western text, sometimes affected by the Alexandrian corrections, sometimes free from them. Neither of them however has escaped mixture. Syrian readings are rare, even in the printed editions, and it is probable that they belong only to a late and degenerate state of the versions: the variation which Dr Lightfoot has found as to the presence or absence of some conspicuous interpolations, Syrian by either origin or adoption, in different Memphitic MSS, and the appearance of a series of them in the margins but not the text of the leading Oxford MS, suggest that this element may have been wholly wanting in the first few centuries. The Western influence is more deeply seated, but is probably of two kinds. The Memphitic no less than the Thebaic has Western readings, but they are [page 158] with comparatively few exceptions, readings much current in the fourth century, and possibly owe their place to comparatively late mixture. The Thebaic on the other hand has a large proportion of distinctively Western readings of an older type. Whatever may be the real origin of the Aethiopic, it is on the one hand strongly Syrian, on the other in strong affinity with its Egyptian neighbours, and especially its nearer neighbour the Thebaic: both ancient Western and ancient Non-Western readings, Alexandrian and other, are conspicuous in its unsettled but certainly composite text

§218. The two solitary outlying versions bear marks of their late date, but not less of the valuable texts which were still current when they were made. The Armenian includes at least three large elements, Syrian, early Western, and early Non-Western, including some Alexandrian modifications. The coincidence of

many of the Western readings in the Armenian with the Latin Vulgate, in conjunction with the real adulteration of the first printed edition from the Latin Vulgate, as mentioned above (§ 121) has brought this version under a vague suspicion of having been at some period subjected to Latinising corruption. The coincidences however with the Old Latin in peculiar readings against the Vulgate Latin are likewise numerous and can only be explained by descent from a Greek Western original. The Gothic has very much the same combination as the Italian revision of the Old Latin, being largely Syrian and largely Western, with a small admixture of ancient Non-Western readings. Whether the copies which furnished the Western element were obtained by Ulfilas in Europe or brought by his parents from Cappadocia, cannot be determined: in either case they were Greek, not Latin.

§219. It will be seen that, extensive and intricate as have been the results of mixture upon Versions, the broad historical relations of their texts correspond to the relations found among other documentary authorities. The only readings, belonging to distinctive types, that can with any certainty claim the authority of either of the three great independent families of versions originating in the earliest period are either Western or Alexandrian. Apparent exceptions to this statement may be found in occasional Syrian readings, or what appear to be such, attested by the Old Syriac or the Memphitic: but the evident presence of a late or extraneous element in the solitary [page 159] MS of the one and in the printed editions, founded on late MSS, of the

Page 81

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

solitary [page 159] MS of the one and in the printed editions, founded on late MSS, of the other, together with the prevailing character of both texts, renders it highly improbable that these exceptions existed in the versions in their earlier days. The Revised Syriac is the first version to betray clearly the existence of the Greek Syrian revision, exhibiting a large proportion of the characteristically Syrian new readings and combinations of old readings. Various Latin revised texts follow, with analogous but different combinations, two alone deriving a very large share of their complexion from the Syrian text. The Egyptian texts, and especially the Memphitic, likewise sooner or later became adulterated, as we have said, with extraneous elements; but at what dates is uncertain. The only versions, besides the Italian and Vulgate Latin, in which the completed Syrian text is clearly and widely represented are definitely known to be of the fourth or later centuries, that is, the Gothic, Aethiopic, Armenian, and Harklean Syriac: the date of the Jerusalem Syriac is unknown.

D. 220-223. Texts found in Greek Fathers

§220. Enough has already been said (§§ 158-162) on the texts which can be recognised in the extant remains of the several Ante-Nicene Greek Fathers. A few supplementary remarks must however be inserted here on the peculiar nature of the textual evidence furnished by Greek works preserved, wholly or in great part, only in ancient translations. In the quotations found in these works the texts of Versions and Fathers are variously blended together so that their testimony needs to be examined with special care, while it is often too valuable to be neglected. Irenaeus furnishes the most prominent example. Of his great treatise against heresies, which is extant in a Latin translation, no Greek MS is known to exist. Epiphanius however, writing about 375, has transcribed into his own principal work the greater part of the first of the five books. Other Greek writers and compilers, from Eusebius onwards, have preserved many short fragments, a few being likewise extant in a Syriac or Armenian dress. Secure knowledge of the character of the text of the New Testament used by Irenaeus himself can of course be obtained only from the Greek extracts and from such readings extant Only in

Latin as are distinctly fixed by the [page 160] context; and it is solely from these materials that we have described his text as definitely Western. In the use of the Greek extracts the age and other circumstances of the several sources from which they are derived have to be considered. The Greek transmission is independent of the Latin transmission, but not always purer. Greek corruptions absent from the Latin version, due either to the use of degenerate MSS of Irenaeus by late writers or to degenerate transmission of the works of these writers themselves, can often be detected in the language of Irenaeus himself, and might therefore be anticipated in his quotations. But these individual ambiguities do not disturb the general results. The passages subject to no reasonable doubt render it certain that the translator largely modified biblical quotations in conformity with an Old Latin text familiar to him, but perhaps unconsciously, certainly irregularly and very imperfectly. We thus learn what antecedents to the Latin readings we have to take into account as possible where the Greek has perished, aided by the fact that passages quoted several times exhibit a text sometimes identical, sometimes modified in various degrees. Occasionally, with the help afforded by the other Old Latin evidence, we can arrive at moral certainty that the translator has faithfully reproduced his author's reading: but more commonly the two alternatives have to be regarded as equally possible. Both texts are Western; and the evidence is valuable, whether it be that of Irenaeus or virtually of a fresh Old Latin MS, though in the former case it is much more valuable. Were indeed Massuet's commonly accepted theory true, that the Latin

Page 82

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

much more valuable. Were indeed Massuet's commonly accepted theory true, that the Latin version of Irenaeus was used by Tertullian the biblical text followed by the translator would take precedence of all other Old Latin texts in age. We are convinced however, not only by the internal character of this biblical text but by comparison of all the passages of Irenaeus borrowed in substance by Tertullian, that the Greek text alone of Irenaeus was known to him, and that the true date of the translation is the fourth century. The inferior limit is fixed by the quotations made from it by Augustine about 421.

§221. Several important works of Origen are likewise wholly or in part, extant only in Latin, and need similar allowance for two alternatives in the employment of their evidence as to biblical texts. Caution is especially needed where Rufinus is the translator, as in the early treatise [page 161] *De Principiis*, the commentaries on Canticles and Romans, and the Homilies on several early books of the Old Testament and on three Psalms: for his well known licence in manipulating Origen's own language undoubtedly extended to the quotations; and at least in the commentaries the depravation of text has apparently been increased by the condensation of the voluminous original. Yet even here numerous readings can be determined with certainty as Origen's. More reliance can be placed, though still with some reserve, on Jerome's translations, that is, those of the Homilies on St Luke, (Isaiah?), Jeremiah (mostly also extant in Greek), and Ezekiel, and of two on Canticles For part of the commentary on St Matthew we have an interesting anonymous translation, the portion for XVIi 34-xxvii 66 being preserved in no other shape. For xvi 13-XXii 33 it overlaps an extant section of the Greek text; and comparison suggests that they are both independent condensations of a fuller original, so that neither can be safely neglected, though the Latin has the disadvantages of Old Latin modification as well as greater brevity. It has however occasionally preserved matter omitted altogether by the Greek abbreviator. Other Greek patristic writings extant in Latin may be passed over.

§222. The Syriac MSS brought to England within the present century have

contributed some valuable patristic texts. The Theophania of Eusebius, edited and translated by Dr Lee, presents phenomena analogous to those of the Latin Irenaeus. Some of the readings are undoubtedly of Old Syriac parentage, and introduced by the translator; others as certainly belong to Eusebius; and many may have either origin. Moreover the predominant colour of both texts is Western, though the influence of a NonWestern text over Eusebius is also perceptible. The help of Greek fragments is available both here and in the other Syriac patristic translation most useful to the textual critic, that of a large part of the younger Cyril's Homilies on St Luke, edited and translated by Dr Payne Smith. In this instance the disturbing element is the Vulgate Syriac: but the great bulk of the text of the biblical quotations is unaffected by it, and takes high rank as a documentary authority for a Non-Western Pre-Syrian text of the verses which it covers.

§223. Respecting Post-Nicene Greek patristic writings generally it will suffice here to refer to what has been said already (§ 193) on the extremely mixed character of their [page 162] texts, shewing a growing preponderance of Syrian readings even where the text of Antioch was not adopted almost or altogether without modification. With the works of Cyril of Alexandria may be named an obscure exposition of faith (Kara ,uspos 7rZa*T19), formerly called a work of Gregory of Neocaesarca (Cent. III), and now attributed with much probability to Apollinaris, which has a remarkable Pre-Syrian and chiefly Non-Western text. A more than average proportion of similar elements presents itself in the quotations of Epiphanius; and even so late a writer as John of Damascus (Cent. VIII) makes considerable use of an ancient text.

writer as John of Damascus (Cent. VIII) makes considerable use of an ancient text.

SECTION V. IDENTIFICATION AND ESTIMATION OF READINGS AS BELONGING TO THE CHIEF ANCIENT TEXTS 224-243

A. 224. Nature of the process of identification

§224. The constituent elements of each principal extant document, so far as they have been contributed by the several great ancient types of text, having thus been approximately determined, we are now in a position to determine by their aid the ancient distribution of a much larger number of separate readings than was possible when only the comparatively unmixed representatives of each type were taken into account. Here then at last genealogical evidence becomes extensively applicable to use in the discrimination of false readings from true. As each variation comes before us with its two or more variants, each attested by a group of documents, we are now enabled in a large proportion of cases to assign at once each variant to one of the ancient texts on the strength of the grouping of documents which makes up its attestation, and thereby to obtain (to say the least) a presumption of the highest value as to its genuineness or spuriousness. [page 163]

B. 225, 226. Identification and rejection of Syrian readings

§225. The first point to decide with respect to each reading is whether it is Pre-Syrian or not. If it is attested by the bulk of the later Greek MSS, but not by any

of the uncials SBCDLPQRTZ (5 in St Mark) W (also 33) in the Gospels (the smaller fragments we pass over here), sABCDES (also 13 61) in Acts, SABC (also I 3) in the Catholic Epistles, or sABCDsG3 (also 17 67**) in the Pauline Epistles, and not by any Latin authority (except the latest forms of Old Latin), the Old or the Jerusalem Syriac, or either Egyptian version, and not by any certain quotation of a Father earlier than 250, there is the strongest possible presumption that it is distinctively Syrian, and therefore, on the grounds already explained (§ 158), to be rejected at once as proved to have a relatively late origin. It is true that many documents not included in these privileged lists contain Pre-Syrian elements; but only in such small proportion that the chance of a Pre-Syrian reading finding attestation in these late relics of vanishing or vanished texts, and none in the extant documents wholly or mainly of Pre-Syrian ancestry, is infinitesimal; and, when this hypothetical possibility is set against the vera causa supplied by the Syrian revision, becomes yet more shadowy. The special need of strictly limiting early patristic authority for the present purpose to what is 'certain' will be explained further on.

§226. The Syrian or Post-Syrian origin of a reading is not much less certain if one or two of the above Greek MSS, as CLPQR 33 in the Gospels, AC[E2] I3 in the Acts and Catholic Epistles, and AC 17 in the Pauline [page 164] Epistles, are found on the side of the later MSS, or even if similar testimony is prima facie borne by such a version as the Memphitic, the MSS of which have not yet been subjected to a critical sifting. It would be useless to attempt to lay down absolute rules of discrimination; the essential prerequisites for striking the balance are familiarity with the documents, and a habit of observing their various groupings: but the fundamental materials of judgement must be such facts and combination of facts, slightly sketched in the preceding pages, as are implied in the rough arrangement of documents just

sketched in the preceding pages, as are implied in the rough arrangement of documents just given. The doubt that must sometimes remain is not often whether a given reading is Syrian, but whether it is distinctively Syrian, that is, whether it originated with the Syrian revision, or was an older reading, of whatever type, adopted by the Syrian revisers. In the final decision, as will be seen, this doubt is very rarely of practical moment.

C. 227-232. Identification of Western and of Alexandrian readings

§227. Distinctively Syrian and Post-Syrian readings being set aside, there remain only such readings as the nature of their documentary attestations marks out, often with certainty, often with high probability, as older than 250. Such readings may with substantial truth be called 'Ante-Nicene'; but the term 'Pre-Syrian', if less familiar, is not less convenient, and certainly more correct. The account which we have already given of the early history of the text must have dispelled any anticipation that textual criticism, in reaching back to the middle of the third century, would have nearly fulfilled its task. In truth not only the harder but the larger part remains. We have to begin with simply endeavouring to range under the three principal types or lines of text all readings evidently worthy of attention as possibly right, at the same time making full use of the instruction to be gained by observing the attestations of all Pre-Syrian readings whatever, whether they have any appearance of being possibly right or not. Of the variations in which the endeavour is baffled we shall speak presently. Multitudes of variations present no difficulty at all, and as many need only a little consideration to interpret them.

§228. Such Western readings as have acquired no accessory attestation by adoption into the Syrian or other mixed texts catch the eye at once in books or parts of books in which we have one or more Greek MSS with a tolerably

unmixed Western text and in which Old Latin evidence is not wanting. In the Gospels such readings are attested by D, the chief Old Latin MSS and Fathers, the Old Syriac, and the Greek Ante-Nicene Fathers, those of Alexandria partially excepted. They are not materially less conspicuous if in the Gospels they are likewise supported by a stray uncial as s or X or r, or by a few cursives, as 81 (especially), or I and its kindred, 13 and its kindred, 22, 28, 157, &c., or by the Latin or Syriac Vulgate (indeed any Syrian text), or the Thebaic, Aethiopic, Armenian, or Gothic. In Acts De and the Old Latin fragments and Fathers, with the Greek patristic evidence as above, are the primary attestation: S, E2, 31, 44, 61, 137, 180, &c., or any of the above versions except the Gothic, especially the Harklean Syriac or Thebaic, may be the secondary; the numerous quotations by Irenaeus taking a prominent place. In the [page 166] Pauline Epistles the primary documents are D2G3 (E3 and FQ need no further mention), the Old Latin fragments and Fathers, and Greek patristic quotations as above: in the second place may stand s or B, 31, 37, 46, 80, 137, 221, &c., or any of the above versions, the Gothic in particular. The secondary documents here named are only those whose sporadic attestation of Western readings not afterwards Syrian is most frequent: from readings of this class few if any uncials having a large Pre-Syrian element are entirely free.

§229. The analogous Alexandrian readings need more attention to detect them. Since it has so happened that every MS containing an approximately unmixed Alexandrian text has perished, the Alexandrian readings can have no strictly primary attestation among extant documents, and are therefore known only through documents containing large other elements. In the Gospels

are therefore known only through documents containing large other elements. In the Gospels they are chiefly marked by the combination SCLX 33, and also Z in St Matthew, A in St Mark, g and sometimes R in St Luke, with one or both of the Egyptian versions, and sometimes another version or two, especially the Armenian or the Vulgate or another revised Latin text; and of course Alexandrian Fathers. The least inconstant members of this group are CL and the Memphitic. In the Acts the chief representatives are SACE9 13, 61, and other cursives, as 27 29 36 40 68 69 102 110 112; and the same in the Catholic Epistles, with the loss of E2 and 61, and the partial accession of Pg; and in the Pauline Epistles SACP., 5 6 Ij 23 39 47 73 137 &c.; with the same versions, so far as they are extant, and Fathers as in the Gospels. As however all these documents abound in neutral readings, and most of them in Western readings, the identification of Alexandrian [page 167] readings can be effected only by careful observation and comparison of contrasted groupings in successive variations. The process is a delicate one, and cannot be reduced to rule: but, though many cases must remain doubtful, we believe that the identification can usually be made with safety.

§230. In each of the two classes of variations just noticed the array opposed to the group representing the aberrant text, that is, the Western or the Alexandrian text, as the case may be, owes much of its apparent variety, and more of its apparent numbers, to the presence of the irrelevant Syrian contingent. Two other classes of variations, differing from these in nothing but in the transposition of the habitually Syrian documents to the aberrant side, must evidently be interpreted in precisely the same way. Readings having only characteristic Western and characteristic Syrian attestation must have belonged to the Western text: readings having only characteristic Alexandrian and characteristic Syrian attestation must have belonged to the Alexandrian text.

§231. On the other hand the rival readings cannot be exactly described except in negative terms. Against a Western stands a Non-Western Pre-Syrian reading: against an Alexandrian stands a Non-Alexandrian PreSyrian reading. The attestation of these readings is simply residual; that is, each of them must have

been the reading of all extant Pre-Syrian texts, whatever they may be, except the Western in the one case, the Alexandrian in the other. It follows that, unless reason has been found for believing that all attestation of texts neither Western nor Alexandrian has perished, it must be presumed that the rival reading to a Western reading is not exclusively Alexandrian, and that the rival [page 168] reading to an Alexandrian reading is not exclusively Western.

§232. A large proportion of variations still remains in which the assignation of the readings to different types of ancient text is in various degrees difficult or uncertain. The difficulty arises chiefly from two causes. the mixed composition of some of the principal extant documents, especially Greek uncials, and the not infrequent opposition of documents habitually agreeing as witnesses for one of the aberrant types, resulting in apparent cross distribution. Owing to the former cause Western readings, for instance, which were saved from the extinction which befel their parent texts in the Greek East in the fourth century by their reception into eclectic texts of that period, must naturally be often found attested by documents lying outside the properly Western group. Almost all our better uncials occur singly in their turn as supporters of very distinctly Western readings, and therefore it would be surprising if two or three of them were never to hold the same position together; so that a reading which two or three of them concur in

never to hold the same position together; so that a reading which two or three of them concur in supporting may quite possibly have had a Western origin. But where there is no clear inequality of number and also of predominant character in the attestation which documents of this kind give to the two rival readings of a variation, it may be difficult or impossible to say whether the opposition is between a Western and a Non-Western, or between a Non-Alexandrian and an Alexandrian reading. The cases of apparent cross distribution, of which the Old Latin evidence furnishes the most conspicuous examples, are of course equally due to mixture, and especially to the mixture produced by revision of versions after Greek MSS. Latin MSS known to contain revised texts may [page 169] naturally be taken to follow a Non-Western source where they stand in opposition to MSS of purer Old Latin pedigree; and in many similar instances a complete survey of the documentary evidence suffices to bring to light the essential features of the grouping in spite of partial confusion. But among these cases likewise there remain ambiguities which can be cleared up only by other kinds of evidence, or which cannot be cleared up at all.

D. 233-235. Identification of neutral readings

§233. Besides all the various classes of binary variations examined in the preceding paragraphs, and besides those ternary variations in which the third variant is distinctively Syrian, there are, as we have already seen (§ 184), many other ternary variations in which one reading has a characteristic Western attestation, another has a characteristic Alexandrian attestation, the Syrian evidence being in support of either the first or the second, while the third is attested by documents ascertained to be of wholly or chiefly Pre-Syrian origin: in other words, both the principal aberrant texts stand clearly side by side, each clearly distinguished from a third text. Such third reading may doubtless be, and often manifestly is, nothing but a secondary modification of one of the other readings; for, as has been already intimated, it is not unusual to find together less and more developed Western readings, or less and more developed Alexandrian readings, or both together: nor are mixtures of the two lines unknown. But there

are many other third readings which cannot without great difficulty be assigned on either external or internal grounds to such an origin, and [page 170] which must stand on at least an equal rank with the other two, as having to all appearance an independent ancestry.

§234. If then a Pre-Syrian text exists which is neutral, that is, neither Western nor Alexandrian, the phenomena of attestation provide two resources for learning in what documents we may expect to find such a text preserved, comparison of the two fundamental types of binary variations, and direct inspection of the ternary or yet more complex variations last mentioned. In order to avoid needless repetition, the information thus obtained has been to a certain extent employed already in the account of the constituent elements of different documents (§§ 199-223): but, strictly speaking, it is only at the present stage of the investigation that the large body of evidence supplied by the binary variations becomes available. By comparison of binary variations we find what documents recur oftenest in the attestations of Non-Western and the attestations of Non-Alexandrian readings, taken together; in other words, what documents are oftenest found joining others in opposition to either of the aberrant texts singly. By inspection of ternary variations we find what documents oftenest stand out in clear detachment from all others by patent opposition to a Western and an Alexandrian text simultaneously.

Page 87

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

§235. As might be expected, the results of both processes are accordant as to the documents which they designate as most free at once from Western and from Alexandrian peculiarities. We learn first that, notwithstanding the lateness of our earliest Greek MSS as compared with some of the versions, and the high absolute antiquity of the fundamental texts which the older ver[page 171] sions represent, the constituent texts of our better Greek MSS must be in the main of at least equal antiquity, and that the best of them are, even as they stand, more free from Western and Alexandrian peculiarities than any version in its present state. We learn next that B very far exceeds all other documents in neutrality of text as measured by the above tests, being in fact always or nearly always neutral, with the exception of the Western element already mentioned (§ 204) as virtually confined to the Pauline Epistles. At a long interval after B, but hardly a less interval before all other MSS, stands S. Then come, approximately in the following order, smaller fragments being neglected, T of St Luke and St John, S of St Luke, L, 33, A (in St Mark), C, Z of St Matthew, R of St Luke, Q, and P. It may be said in general terms that those documents, B and x excepted, which have most Alexandrian readings have usually also most neutral readings. Thus among versions by far the largest amount of attestation comes from the Memphitic and Thebaic; but much also from the Old and the Jerusalem Syriac, and from the African Latin; and more or less from every version. After the Gospels the number of documents shrinks greatly; but there is no marked change in the relations of the leading uncials to the neutral text, except that A now stands throughout near C. In Acts 6 I comes not far below S, I 3 being also prominent, though in a much less degree, here and in the Catholic Epistles. The considerable Pre-Syrian element already noticed (§ 212) as distinguishing a proportionally large number of cursives in this group of books includes many neutral readings: for examples of these cursives it will suffice to refer to the two lists given above (§ 228, 229), which include the more important MSS. In some of the [page 172] Catholic Epistles, as also in the subsequent books, an appreciable but varying

element of the text of P?? has the same character. For the Pauline Epistles there is little that can be definitely added to SBAC except 17 and P2: the best marked neutral readings are due to the second hand of 67.

E. 236-239. Suspiciousness of Western and of Alexandrian readings

§236. Nearly all that has been said in the preceding pages respecting the documentary attestation of the three leading types of Pre-Syrian text remains equally true whatever be the historical relation of these types to each other. On the other hand, it was necessary at an earlier stage (§§ 173 ff., 183), in describing the characteristics of the Western and Alexandrian texts, to state at once the general conclusions on this head to which we are irresistibly led by Internal Evidence of Texts, alike on that more restricted study of Western and Alexandrian readings which is limited to variations in which their characteristic attestation is least disguised by extraneous evidence, and on the more comprehensive study of all readings that can be ultimately recognised as Western or Alexandrian. In a vast majority of instances the result is identical: in binary variations the Non-Western reading approves itself more original than the Western, the Non-Alexandrian than the Alexandrian: in ternary variations the neutral reading, if supported by such documents as stand most frequently on the Non-Western and Non-Alexandrian sides in binary variations, approves itself more original than the Western and also more original than the Alexandrian. The Western and Alex[page 173] andrian texts as wholes are therefore in the strictest sense, as we have called them partly by anticipation, aberrant texts.

§237. It does not follow however that none of their distinctive readings are original. If it could be shown with reasonable certainty that the three lines diverged simultaneously from the apostolic autographs, or from a common original derived almost immediately from the autographs, the chance that one line alone has preserved true readings where the two others agree, that 1S, that two transcribers have independently made the same changes, would be infinitesimal (see § 75), except as regards changes of a very obvious and tempting kind. No such presupposition is however imposed by the actual evidence: we have no right to affirm that the two great divergences were simultaneous, not successive. Both are indeed of such extreme antiquity that a strong presumption must always lie against an exclusively Western or exclusively Alexandrian reading; since, apart from accidental coincidence, its genuineness would presuppose as a necessary condition, not only that the two divergences were not simultaneous, but that the rival reading came into existence either at the first divergence or between the first and the second.

§238. Of the unfavourable presumptions arising out of the internal character of distinctive Western and distinctive Alexandrian readings generally we have said enough already (§§ 170 ff., 181 ff.). A certain number might on purely internal grounds be received or rejected with equally or almost equally good reason: it is however, we believe, quite safe to dismiss them along with their much more numerous associates that are condemned by individual internal evidence no less than by the prevailing character of the text to which they belong: it may be added that they are seldom intrinsically of much interest. Others remain which by strong internal probability of some kind plead against summary rejection. The plea can never with prudence be set entirely aside: but the number of such readings which eventually make good a claim to a possible place in the apostolic text is, in our judgement, exceedingly small.

§239. There are indeed some Western readings in the Gospels, and perhaps in the

Acts, which cannot be explained by accidental error of transcription, or by any of the ordinary causes of textual corruption, such as paraphrase, or assimilation to other passages of the New or Old Testament; and in such cases an incautious student may be easily tempted by the freshness of the matter to assume that it must have come from the hand of the writer of the book before him. The assumption would be legitimate enough were the Western texts of late origin: but it loses all its force when we remember (see § 173) that in the second century oral traditions of the apostolic age were still alive; that at least one written Gospel closely related to one or more of the four primary Gospels, together with various forms of legendary Christian literature concerning our Lord and the Apostles, was then current in some churches; and that neither definition of the Canon of the New Testament nor veneration for the letter as distinguished from the substance of its sacred records had advanced far enough to forbid what might well seem their temperate enrichment from such sources as these. Transcriptional probability is likewise of no little weight here: the absence of Western readings of this kind from the Non [page 175] Western texts is inexplicable on the supposition that they formed part of the apostolic text.

F. 240-242. Exceptional Western non-interpolations

§240. On the other hand there remain, as has been before intimated (§ 170), a few other Western readings of similar form, which we cannot doubt to be genuine in spite of the

Western readings of similar form, which we cannot doubt to be genuine in spite of the exclusively Western character of their attestation. They are all omissions, or, to speak more correctly, non-interpolations, of various length: that is to say, the original record has here, to the best of our belief, suffered interpolation in all the extant Non-Western texts. The almost universal tendency of transcribers to make their text as full as possible, and to eschew omissions, is amply exemplified in the New Testament. Omissions of genuine words and clauses in the Alexandrian and Syrian texts are very rare, and always easy to explain. In the Western text, with which we are here concerned, they are bolder and more numerous, but still almost always capable of being traced to a desire of giving a clearer and more vigorous presentation of the sense. But hardly any of the omissions now in question can be so explained, none in a satisfactory manner. On the other hand the doubtful words are superfluous, and in some cases intrinsically suspicious, to say the least; while the motive for their insertion is usually obvious. With a single peculiar exception (Matt. xxvii 49), in which the extraneous words are omitted by the Syrian as well as by the Western text, the Western non-interpolations are confined to the last three chapters of St Luke. In various parts of the Gospels other Western omissions are to be found, which [page 176] it would be rash to condemn absolutely, the attestations being precisely similar to those of the non-interpolations which we accept, and the internal evidence, intrinsic and transcriptional, being open to some doubt; in other words, an intermediate class of Western omissions that may perhaps be non-interpolations must be admitted. Examples will be found in Matt. (vi 15, 25;) ix 34; (xiii 33;) xxi44; (xxiii 26;) Mark ii 22; (X 2;) XiV 39; Luke V 3 9; X 41 f.; xii I 9, 2 I, 3 9; xxii 6 2; (xxiv 9 ;) John iii 3 2; iv 9. With the difficult question of notation here involved we are not for the moment concerned: it is enough here to repeat that we find ourselves wholly unable to believe some of the clauses and sentences omitted by Western documents to be genuine, while in other not obviously dissimilar cases our judgement remains suspended.

§241. These exceptional instances of the preservation of the original text in exclusively Western readings are likely to have had an exceptional origin. They

are easily reconciled with the other phenomena if we suppose, first, that the text which became fixed at Alexandria, and in due time was partially adulterated by Alexandrian corruptions, was an offshoot from the text which we have called the neutral text, and which had parted company from the earliest special ancestry of the Western text at a yet earlier date; and secondly, that the interpolations which give rise to the appearance of Western omissions took place in the interval, if not at the actual divergence, and thus stand in all Non-Western texts, whether derived through Alexandria or not. These interpolations are for the most part quite unlike Alexandrian interpolations, and have much more of a 'Western' character; so that the hypothesis which might at first [page 177] sight suggest itself, of their having originated at Alexandria, and thence spread by mixture to Non-Western texts elsewhere, is set aside by internal evidence as well as by the want of other corroborative instances. The purely documentary phenomena are compatible with the supposition that the Western and the Non-Western texts started respectively from a first and a second edition of the Gospels, both conceivably apostolic: but internally none of the Non-Western interpolations certainly justify this claim to a true though a secondary kind of originality, and some of them, it is not too much to say, shew a misunderstanding which renders it impossible to assign to them any worthier origin than to ordinary Western interpolations.

§242. Nothing analogous to the Western non-interpolations presents itself among distinctively

Page 90

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

§242. Nothing analogous to the Western non-interpolations presents itself among distinctively Alexandrian readings of any form, omissions, additions, or substitutions. Now and then, though fortunately but rarely, the attestation of what seems to be an Alexandrian reading, unusually well attested, approaches too near the attestation of some neutral readings to exclude doubt as to the true origin, while internal evidence is likewise indecisive. But this occasional ambiguity of external evidence is not to be confounded with incongruities of internal character in readings of clearly defined external type. No variations are known to us in which a distinctively Alexandrian reading, indubitably such, approves itself as genuine against Western and neutral texts combined, or even against the neutral text alone. Of the numerous variations which at first sight appear to involve conflicts between the neutral text and the Western and Alexandrian texts combined it will be more opportune to speak further on. [page 178]

G. 243. Recapitulation of genealogical evidence proper

§243. To sum up what has been said on the results of genealogical evidence proper, as affecting the text of the New Testament, we regard the following propositions as absolutely certain. (I) The great ancient texts did actually exist as we have described them in Sections II and III. The main line of neutral and comparatively pure text was from an early time surrounded and overshadowed by two powerful lines containing much aberration, the `Western' being by far the most licentious and the most widely spread, and the Alexandrian being formed by skilful but mostly petty corrections which left the neutral text untouched, at all events in the Gospels and Pauline Epistles, except in a very small proportion of its words. Late in the third century, or soon after, MSS came to be written in which the three main texts were mixed in various proportions, and the process went forward on a large scale in the following century, when all the unmixed texts began to die out. The Western, hitherto the most influential of all texts, now disappeared rapidly, lingering however, it would seem, in the West. One of the mixed texts was formed in Syria with care and contrivance, modifying as well as

combining the earlier texts, and by the middle of the fourth century was established in influence. For some centuries after the fourth there was in the East a joint currency of the Syrian and other texts, nearly all mixed, but at last the Syrian text, the text of Constantinople, almost wholly displaced the rest. (II) In the Gospels and Pauline Epistles, and to a less extent in the Acts, all the four principal forms of text are fairly represented in extant documents; in other books the representation of [page 179] one or more of the texts is seriously incomplete or doubtful. (III) The extant documents contain no readings (unless the peculiar Western non-interpolations noticed above are counted as exceptions), which suggest the existence of important textual events unknown to us, a knowledge of which could materially alter the interpretation of evidence as determined by the above history. (IV) In a large proportion of variations the assignation of the several readings to the several ancient texts by means of extant documents is clear and certain, and thus affords a sure clue to the original reading. (V) In many other ancient variations the distribution of documentary evidence must as a matter of fact be due to ancient distribution among the several texts, with or without subsequent mixture, although the extant documentary evidence is too scanty or too confused to allow confident decision between two or more possible views of the historical antecedents of the several readings. This last proposition implies that we have to do with many variations in which the tests supplied by the general history of the text of the New Testament are not available for direct use, and other critical resources are needed. To these we must presently turn.

must presently turn.

SECTION VI. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS CRITICISM WITH REFERENCE TO ANCIENT TEXTS 244-255

A. 244-246. Foundation of historical criticism by Mill, Bentley, and Bengel

§244. Before however we pass from the great ancient texts, it will be right to interpose a few words of comment on previous criticism dealing with the same subject. Al[page 180] though the series of editions which can be said to approximate to a true text of the New Testament begins in 1831, the preliminary studies of the eighteenth century, unduly neglected since the earlier part of the present century, form the necessary introduction to all secure progress hereafter. It will be sufficient to mark the most salient points in the progress of criticism.

§245. Mill led the way in 1707 not only by his ample collection of documentary evidence but by his comprehensive examination of individual documents, seldom rising above the wilderness of multitudinous details, yet full of sagacious observations. He incidentally noticed the value of the concurrence of Latin evidence with A, the most conspicuous and the only complete representative of an ancient Non-Western Greek text then sufficiently known; and this glimpse of genealogical method was not lost upon Bentley, who with clear and deliberate purpose made Greek and Latin consent the guiding principle of his own project for a restoration of the text. The actual project fell to the ground until it was revived and carried out in Lachmann's edition of 1831, the starting point of the later period; in which however it assumed a somewhat different shape through the substitution of the Old Latin for the Vulgate Latin, and the ranging of the Greek Western uncials on the Latin or, as it was more properly called, the `Western' side. But the principle itself was received at once into fruitful soil, and contributed more than any other antecedent to the criticism of the intervening

period.

§246. How deeply the value of the principle, as set forth in Bentley's Proposals of 1720, impressed Bengel, although he accepted it only in part, is evident from many pages of his Introduction of 1734. Bengel himself pointed out the deceptiveness of numerical superiority detached from variety of origin, prepared for sifting the confused mass of Greek MSS by casting upon it, as he said, the Versions and Fathers as an additional heap, and endeavoured to classify the documents known to him according to their presumed derivation from ancient texts. I-l e divided them into two great `nations' or `families', the `Asiatic' and the `African', answering roughly to what we have called Syrian and Pre-Syrian, and further, less distinctly, subdivided the latter into two subordinate `nations' or `families', represented typically by A and by the Old Latin. At the same time he laid great stress on internal evidence, in this as in other respects making large use of [page 181] materials scattered through Mill's notes; and it is chiefly to his earnest if somewhat crude advocacy that Transcriptional Probabilities under the name of `the harder reading' owe their subsequent full recognition.

B. 247-249. Development of historical criticism by Griesbach, in contrast with Hug's theory of recensions

Page 92

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

§247. Bengel was succeeded in Germany by Semler, and under his influence by a group of acute and diligent textual critics, stimulated to fresh researches both by Bengel's writings and by the rich accession of new materials from Wetstein's edition of 1751-2, and from the various explorations and collations which were vigorously carried on in the later years of the century. What Bengel had sketched tentatively was verified and worked out with admirable patience, sagacity, and candour by Griesbach, who was equally great in independent investigation and in his power of estimating the results arrived at by others. Bengel's 'Asiatic' text he called 'Constantinopolitan': the two more ancient texts, which he clearly defined, he called 'Western' and 'Alexandrian'. Unfortunately he often followed Semler in designating the ancient texts by the term 'recension', and thus gave occasion to a not yet extinct confusion between his historical analysis of the text of existing documents and the conjectural theory of his contemporary Hug, a biblical scholar of considerable merit, but wanting in sobriety of judgement.

§248. Hug started from what was in itself on the whole a true conception of the Western text and its manifold licence. He called it the KOIVQ fK8O5IS, or 'Vulgate Edition' taking the name from the text of the LXX as it was in its confusion before the reform attempted by Origen in his Hexapla. But further he conjectured that the disorderly state of this popular text led to its being formally revised in three different lands, the product of each revision being a 'recension' in the strict sense of the word. The alleged evidence consists in two well known passages of Jerome. In the first he speaks of the diversity of copies of the LXX in different regions; Alexandria and Egypt appeal, he says, to the authority of Hesychius; Constantinople and Antioch approve of the copies of Lucian the Martyr; the intermediate provinces read the Palestinian volumes, wrought out by Origen and published by Eusebius and [page 182] Pamphilus; and the whole world is set at discord by this threefold difference. In the second passage, already cited (§ 190), he is stating vaguely to what Greek sources he proposes to have recourse in correcting the Latin Gospels "I pass by", he says, "those volumes which bear the names of Lucianus and Hesychius, and are upheld by the perverse contentiousness of a few men": he adds in obscure language that 'they had neither

been allowed to make corrections (emendare) after the Seventy in the Old Testament, nor profited by making corrections in the New Testament'. The latter quotation, enigmatic as it is, distinctly implies the existence of copies of the New Testament or the Gospels bearing in some way the names of Lucianus and Hesychius, and supposed to have in some way undergone correction; and likewise associates the same names with some analogous treatment of the LXX. As they appear in company with Origen's name in a similar connexion in the first quotation, Hug supposed that Hesychius had made a recension of both Testaments for Alexandria, Lucianus for Antioch, and Origen for Palestine. He had next to discover descendants of the supposed recensions in existing groups of documents, and had no difficulty in assigning the Constantinopolitan text to Lucianus: but since Hesychius plausibly claimed the `Alexandrian' text, he could find no better representation of Origen's supposed work than an ill defined and for the most part obscure assemblage headed by AKM.

§249. Origen's quotations prove conclusively that no such text as these documents present can ever have proceeded from him: and it is hardly less certain, as Griesbach shewed by the implicit testimony of various passages, that he never made anything like a recension of the New Testament. It does not follow that the same can be said of Lucianus and Hesychius. As we have

already observed (§§ 185, 190), the Syrian text must have been due to a revision which was in fact a recension, and which may with fair probability be assigned to the time when Lucianus taught at Antioch. Of the Alexandrian corrections more than one stage can certainly be traced: whether the primary corrections were due to a distinct revision cannot we think, be determined, and it would be little gain to, know. That Hesychius had no hand in any revision which can have produced them is proved by the occurrence of many of them in Origen's writings, at a much earlier date. But it is quite conceivable that Hesychius made or [page 183] adopted some eclectic text too short-lived to have left recognisable traces of itself in extant evidence, though it may be a hidden factor in the process of mixture to which some of our texts are partly due. Thus much it is but just to Hug to say, though the point is of no practical consequence. But neither the deserved discredit into which Hug's theory of recensions as a whole has fallen, nor the uncertainty as to the precise nature of the facts referred to in Jerome's second passage, create any doubt as to the soundness of Griesbach's fundamental classification of texts, which rests entirely on the independent base furnished by the observed phenomena of existing documents.

C. 250-253. Defects of Griesbach's criticism

§250. There are indeed some defects in Griesbach's view which he could hardly have failed to correct if all the evidence now accessible had been in his hands. Perhaps the most important of these is a confusion between the classification of ancient texts and the classification of documents derived from them. He was aware indeed that no existing MS preserves any 'recension' or leading ancient text in absolute purity, and that one source of corruption was the intrusion of readings out of another 'recension' (Preface to Gospels of 1796, p. IXXVIII; cf. Megetemafa, pp. xxxviii f.). But still in effect he treated our documents as capable of being each on the whole identified with some one ancient text. In other

words, he failed to apprehend in its true magnitude the part played by mixture in the history of the text during the fourth and following centuries, or to appreciate the value of the observation of groupings as a critical instrument by which a composite text can be to a great extent analysed into its constituent elements.

§251. Hardly if at all less important was his confusion of Alexandrian readings with readings preserved wholly or chiefly at Alexandria. His discrimination of the internal character of Western and Alexandrian corrections (ib. p. lxxvii) is excellent as far as it goes, and may supply useful guidance in some cases of obscure attestation. But his mode of using the two great texts can be justified only on the impossible assumption that the Alexandrian text, with its bulk of pure readings and its distinctive corruptions alike, was, so to speak, full-blown from the beginning. [page 184] The very fact that these corruptions originated at Alexandria implies that MSS free from them, as well as from Western corruptions, existed previously at Alexandria and there is no apparent reason why this earlier form of text should not have been propagated in greater or less purity at Alexandria by the side of the altered text or texts. If it was, and if any existing documents represent it, their text, whatever its value may be, has not the defects of a distinctive Alexandrian text. But further there is no apparent reason why documents should not exist derived from sister MSS to those which originally came to Alexandria, and which thus were the parents of later MSS current at Alexandria, including those in which the Alexandrian corrections originated; and if so, no ordinary internal evidence can enable us to decide whether the ancestry

Page 94

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

originated; and if so, no ordinary internal evidence can enable us to decide whether the ancestry of any given existing documents having this character of text was altogether independent of Alexandria, or had its home at Alexandria but was unaffected by any distinctive Alexandrian corruption. Griesbach seems however to have tacitly assumed both that Alexandria had but one Non-Western text, and that no early Non-Western text survived except at Alexandria; and accordingly in most variations the critical problem which virtually presented itself to him was merely whether it was more likely on internal grounds that the (assumed) Western reading was a corruption of the (assumed) Alexandrian or the Alexandrian of the Western, the characteristics of each 'recension' and the special probabilities of the immediate context being considered together.

§252. Thus owing to an imperfect conception of the process of transmission, leading to a misinterpretation of quite the most important evidence, unchecked by attention to grouping, Griesbach was driven to give a dangerously disproportionate weight to internal evidence, and especially to transcriptional probability, on which indeed for its own sake he placed excessive reliance: and this, not his wise anxiety to discriminate the ancient sources of readings before counting or weighing authorities, is the chief cause of the inferiority of his own text of the New Testament, which stands in singular contrast to the high qualities of his criticism. The other great cause of its insufficiency we have already mentioned (§§ 16, 17), his use of the Received Text as a basis for correction. To have taken as his basis those ancient texts in which he himself placed most confidence would have increased [page 185] the difficulties of his task as an editor, since they frequently did not offer him the same reading; but, as Lachmann triumphantly shewed, in no other way was it possible to avoid the errors that must often find acceptance when numberless variations are approached from the wrong side

§253. The limitations of view in Griesbach and his predecessors were the natural

result of the slenderness of their materials. Bentley and Bengel wrote when A was f or practical purposes the one ancient purely Greek uncial; and the peculiarities of its text, used as a standard, coloured their criticism, and to a certain extent even that of Griesbach. He learned much from his study of C and L: but the very large distinctively Alexandrian element which they contain had probably a considerable share in leading him implicitly to assume that any extant ancient text not Western must be Alexandrian, and that in the most exclusive sense. A later generation has less excuse for overlooking the preservation of a neutral text, in approximate integrity in B, and in greater or less proportions in many other documents; or for questioning the vast increase of certainty introduced by its recognition in weighing the claims of rival Pre-Syrian readings.

D. 254, 255. Permanent value of Griesbach's criticism

§254. In dwelling on Griesbach's errors at some length, notwithstanding the neglect into which his writings have unhappily fallen, we should be grieved even to seem regardless of a name which we venerate above that of every other textual critic of the New Testament. It was essential to our purpose to explain clearly in what sense it is true, and in what sense it is not true, that we are attempting to revive a theory which is popularly supposed to have been long since exploded. No valid objection can, we believe, be brought against the greater part of Griesbach's historical view. It is commonly met by vague sceptical assertions which make no attempt to deal with the actual phenomena. Criticisms which merely shewed that he had been

attempt to deal with the actual phenomena. Criticisms which merely shewed that he had been led into too broad and unqualified assertions as to this or that document have left untouched or even unawares strengthened his main positions. The most plausible allegation, that his latest discoveries as to Origen's readings compelled him [page 186] to abandon his attempt to distinguish between his `Western' and his `Alexandrian' readings, and thus destroyed the basis of what is called his theory, depends on a double misconception. The recognition of the fact that Origen sometimes used a MS either `Western' or containing a large `Western' element did indeed render it impossible to affirm that a reading found in Origen must needs be `Alexandrian', that is, it prescribed special care in the interpretation of one single source of evidence; but it made no change in other respects: and the Meletemata of 1811, in which the recognition is conveyed, reiterate Griesbach's familiar statements in precise language, while they shew a growing perception of mixture which might have led him to further results if he had not died in the following spring.

§255. It is not necessary to our purpose to pass under review the principles and texts of Griesbach's three great successors, all of whom have published texts of a substantially ancient type, and from each of whom, from Tregelles in particular, we have learned much. But we are bound to express our conviction that the virtual abandonment of Griesbach's endeavour to obtain for the text of the New Testament a secure historical foundation in the genealogical relations of the whole extant documentary evidence has rendered the work of all appreciably more imperfect in itself, and less defensible on rational grounds. Such corrections of Griesbach's leading results as have been indicated above (§§ 250-252) would have removed the difficulties which have unquestionably been felt by dispassionate judges, though they have also been distorted and exaggerated by partisans. In taking up his investigations afresh, we have, we trust, found a way not only to make a some?? hat nearer approximation to the apostolic text than our immediate predecessors, but also to strengthen the critical bases on which their own texts are for the most part founded. [page 187]

CHAPTER III. RESULTS OF INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF GROUPS AND DOCUMENTS 256-355

SECTION I. DOCUMENTARY GROUPS AS LIMITED BY REFERENCE TO PRIMARY GREEK MSS GENERALLY 256-280

A. 256-260. General considerations on Documentary Groups

§256. In attempting to give an account of the manner in which the historical relations of the great ancient texts of the New Testament can be safely used for decision between rival readings, we have of necessity (see § 72) transgressed the limits of purely genealogical evidence, in so far as we have dwelt on the general internal character of the Western and Alexandrian texts as a ground for distrusting readings apparently Western only, or Western and Syrian only, or Alexandrian only, or Alexandrian and Syrian only. The evidence which has been thus appealed to is in effect Internal Evidence of Groups (§§ 77, 78), in principle identical with Internal Evidence of Documents in virtue of the genealogical axiom that, accidental coincidences apart, identity of reading implies ultimate identity of origin. Thus, to take the simplest case, finding a frequent recurrence of D, the Old Latin, and the Old Syriac in isolated combination, we knew

Page 96

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

frequent recurrence of D, the Old Latin, and the Old Syriac in isolated combination, we knew that in each such reading they must be all lineally descended from a single common ancestor. Having found reason to think that readings attested by [page 188] this particular group of documents are of great antiquity, we examined them successively in order to ascertain their prevailing internal character by means of variations in which the internal evidence is morally free from doubt.

§257. Now a moment's consideration shews that the essentials of this process are independent of the historical adjuncts here attached to it, and remain the same for every possible combination of documents; and that therefore its power of employing easy variations as a key to difficult variations is of universal range. So applied, it is essentially a particular mode of using Internal Evidence of Documents; only not continuous extant documents but, as it were, fragmentary lost documents. Whenever a particular detached combination of documents is of sufficiently frequent occurrence to give room for generalisations, and those of its readings which admit of being provisionally accepted or rejected on Internal Evidence of Readings, Intrinsic and Transcriptional, are found to be all or nearly all apparently right, we are justified in anticipating that its other readings, as to which our judgement has thus far been suspended, or even on the whole adverse, are right too, and in requiring on reexamination very strong local internal evidence to rebut the favourable presumption. A similar recurrence of numerous apparently wrong readings will throw suspicion on the other or doubtful readings of the same group, provided that it remains in all cases literally or practically detached: we say practically, because the accession of a group containing no document outside the habitual attestation of such a text as the Syrian violates detachment in appearance alone. Either the favourable or the unfavourable presumption may also [page 189] be further defined according to particular classes of readings.

§258. Since in all cases the inference depends on assumed homogeneousness of text, its basis may appear to be subject to uncertainty; for homogeneousness is

interrupted by the intrusion of mixture, and it is theoretically possible that lost originals of groups might be mixed, as well as extant MSS. But the originals from which most groups which it is in practice worth while to keep in mind must have diverged can with difficulty be referred to so late a date as the times of general mixture, and no clear evidence of antecedent mixture has come to our own notice. The homogeneousness of the fundamental texts of all important groups may therefore, we believe, be safely trusted.

§259. The limitation, more or less strict, to detached combination is necessary because otherwise the characteristics of the special common ancestor will be mixed up with the characteristics of a remoter and for present purposes less important ancestor. In all places where there is no variation D and the two associated versions are likewise found in combination, not the less truly because all other documents have the same reading; and this combination points with equal certainty to a single common ancestor: but here the single common ancestor was the apostolic autograph, followed perhaps by an indefinite number of immediate descendants; whereas what we want to know is the character of the special ancestor, as displayed either in departure from the original text or in fidelity shewn to it where others have departed from it. Similarly, where we find D and its associates agreeing with, for instance, XBCL and the Memphitic against all other documents, if we have ascer[page 190]

Page 97

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

instance, XBCL and the Memphitic against all other documents, if we have ascertained that this second group often stands in opposition to the first, we know that the reading must have existed in a common ancestor of the two special ancestors, and that therefore it can tell us nothing about the special characteristics of either.

§260. The most delicate and difficult part of the use of groupings in criticism consists in judging how far a group loses its virtual identity by slight losses or slight accessions of constituent members. The least important losses and accessions from this point of view are evidently those which accompany fragmentariness of text, so that the change is not, for instance, from concurrence to opposition, but from concurrence to total absence, or vice versa: in such cases much depends on the number and variety of the remaining members. Others again, which look as if they ought to be important, are found in experience to be of little or no account: that is, if we treat separately the groupings with and without the varying member, the characteristics are found to be identical; so that the same results would have been reached by treating both forms of combination as a single group. An excellent example is supplied by many of the Alexandrian corrections in St Mark, where we have every binary and ternary combination of aCLA besides the full quaternion. But the accession or loss of any primary document should always be treated as constituting a new group until observation has shown that no real difference can be detected in the results. How easily readings having the same origin might come to have an attestation perpetually varying within certain limits may be readily understood, for instance in such an example as that just cited, as soon as we apprehend clearly the manner in which ordinary casual mixture came to pass. Whether [page 191] two or more MSS were deliberately compared for simultaneous use, or variations were noted in a margin and then at the next stage taken up into the text, or reminiscences of a text formerly heard or read became intermingled with the immediate impressions of eye and ear in transcription, -in all these cases a transcriber was making a conscious or unconscious selection of readings to insert into his fundamental text; and no two transcribers would make exactly the same selection. However great

may be the superficial complexities of existing attestation, the-primitive relations of text from which they are derived must have been simple; as otherwise each variation must have exhibited a much greater number of variants: and thus it is no wonder that after a while we find ourselves enabled to ascribe practical identity to groups not identical as to all their members.

B. 261-264. Progressive limitation of Groups with reference to Primary Greek MSS

§261. It might perhaps be imagined that the possible combinations of our numerous documents would constitute an intractable multitude of groups: but no such difficulty exists in practice. Genealogical possibilities make up the merest fraction of arithmetical possibilities; and of the combinations that actually occur only a small proportion deserve more than momentary attention. The Syrian text as a whole must, we believe, be condemned by Internal Evidence of Groups almost as surely as by the evidence connected with the history of texts; and texts supported by only a portion of the Syrian phalanx have still less claim to consideration. Greek manuscripts containing a large amount of Pre-Syrian text, early Versions, and early Fathers are not numerous, and to a great extent are fragmentary or discontinuous; and combinations into which none of them enter may evidently in most cases be safely neglected. A student soon becomes aware that the groupings which can by any possibility affect his

student soon becomes aware that the groupings which can by any possibility affect his judgement in doubtful variations are sure to contain one or more of a very small number of primary documents. If at any time in the examination of a specially difficult case his attention is attracted by a reading supported by a group hitherto neglected by him, he will naturally take fresh opportunities of observing its characteristics. But the whole operation is simpler than it seems on paper.

§262. No one, we believe, who agrees explicitly or implicitly with the account which we have given of the Syrian text and its attestation would hesitate, after studying the Internal Evidence of Groups, to take SBCDL 33 in the Gospels, sABCDEg 13 61 in Acts, SABC 13 in the Catholic Epistles, and SABCD2G3 17 in the Pauline Epistles, as the primary documents in the sense just mentioned. This is of course entirely consistent with the assignation of substantial weight to numerous other documents in different degrees in the decision between rival readings. What is meant is that all groups containing none of these primary documents are found so habitually to support the obviously wrong variants where internal evidence is tolerably clear, that they must lie under the strongest suspicion in doubtful variations. Some few other Greek MSS, mostly fragmentary, might to a certain extent claim to be placed in the same class (see § 225): but it is safer to keep to these conspicuously preeminent and approximately complete copies. In strictness the African and European Latin, [page 193] the Old Syriac, the Egyptian versions, and the AnteNicene Fathers should be added to the list: we venture however to omit them here for the sake of simplicity, the practical effect of omitting them being extremely small, as will be explained further on.

§263. Now if each of the Greek MSS singled out as primary is individually entitled to this exceptional distinction as a representative of Pre-Syrian texts, we should naturally expect the complete combinations of them to attest a specially pure text; the text thus attested being certified by the concurrence of all the great lines of transmission known to have existed in the earliest times, since undoubtedly all known Pre-Syrian forms of text are sufficiently represented among the primary MSS except the Western texts of the Catholic Epistles (in so

far as they have a Western text) and of part of the Acts, and these exceptions are shown by the analogies of other books to affect little beyond degrees of certainty. And this is precisely what we do find: the groups formed by the complete combinations of these primary documents attest clearly the purity of their ancestry by the prevailing internal excellence of their readings. The number of their readings which can with any show of reason be pronounced to be apparently corruptions of other existing readings is exceedingly small; and in our opinion the claim is in all these cases unfounded.

§264. When these groups lose their most distinctively Western members, D in the Gospels and Acts and D2G3 in the Pauline Epistles, and with them, as usually happens, one or more of the predominantly Western versions, totally different because less comprehensive groups come into view, SBCL 33 in the Gospels, SABC and the one or two cursives in the other books; but [page 194] these also, when tried by internal evidence, are found not less constantly to bear the marks of incorrupt transmission. Thus far we have been dealing with essentially the same distributions as in former pages, though from a different point of view: the last result is nearly equivalent to the former conclusion that, certain peculiar omissions excepted, the Western text is probably always corrupt as compared with the Non-Western text.

C. 265-267. Relation of Primary Greek MSS to other documentary evidence

§265. Before we proceed to examine the character of the more narrowly limited groups, it is necessary to consider in some little detail the bearing of the evidence of Greek MSS not singled out for primary authority, and of all versions and patristic quotations. Texts in all the languages supply a greater or less amount of various Pre-Syrian evidence having a strong prima facie claim to authority, the true force of which manifestly cannot be left undetermined. It is needless to discuss variations in which the secondary Pre-Syrian evidence (the Syrian evidence may be passed over here and elsewhere) is predominantly on the side of the primary group, or in which it divides itself with anything like equality: the apparent difficulty begins with the numerous cases in which the reduced band of primary MSS is sustained by only a small proportion of the secondary evidence; and then the question arises whether any and if so what amount or weight of secondary evidence, in conjunction with outlying primary MSS, ought to balance or outweigh the strong antecedent authority of the primary band of primary MSS. The question here is not, as it was above [page 195] (§ 262), whether this or that document should be included among primary documents, but whether the documents accepted as primary, whichever they may be, can safely be allowed an absolutely paramount authority. Taking for granted that all the documentary evidence contributes, more or less appreciably, to the formation of a right judgement as to the merits of all rival readings, and further that in many variations documents not classed as primary contribute materially to a right decision, either directly or as aiding the interpretation of the whole evidence, we have still to ask how far primary documents can be implicitly trusted where they have little or no support from other documents. The doubt presents itself most strongly in readings attested by a very small number of primary MSS exceptionally commended by Internal Evidence of Groups and Documents: but the principle is not affected by the number.

§266. The strongest presumption against the legitimacy of any such separate

authority of the primary MSS is derived from the prima facie superiority of composite to homogeneous attestation (see § 75); while on the other hand (see § 76) it is checked by the contingency, varying in probability according to the ascertained elements of the secondary documents that may be in question, that apparent compositeness of attestation may really be due to mixture and therefore delusive. A satisfactory answer to the question can however be obtained from two sources only, Internal Evidence of such groups as consist wholly or almost wholly of primary MSS, and consideration of the nature of the texts of the secondary documents as bearing on the point at issue. On the Internal Evidence of the more important groups of this class enough will be said in the following sections. We are [page 196] for the present concerned with the preliminary enquiry whether any class of secondary documents has such a textual character that their total or almost total absence from the attestation of a reading otherwise sufficiently attested by primary MSS should throw doubt on its genuineness.

§267. To conduct the enquiry with due circumspection, it is necessary to pay special attention to those variations in which the extant evidence includes important secondary documents preserved only in fragments, and especially documents which would merit a place on the primary list but for their imperfect preservation. If in such cases the result were often r __ 1 l_ to Page 100

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

primary list but for their imperfect preservation. If in such cases the result were often r _ _1 l_ to the primary MSS, it would evidently in variations where they are absent be requisite to take into account the twofold contingency of their hypothetical presence on this or on that side. If however, on careful consideration of every kind of evidence, their actual presence is not found to justify doubts as to the antecedent authority of the primary MSS, we can with the more confidence trust the primary MSS in those more numerous variations where, with perhaps no accession to the number of their allies, they are confronted by a less imposing array.

D. 268. Absence of Secondary Greek MSS from Groups containing Primary Greek MSS

§268. The first class of secondary documents, according to the usual order, is formed by the secondary Greek MSS; in which we do not include those whose texts are wholly or almost wholly of Syrian origin. Nothing can be clearer than the mixed character of all these MSS; so that, in supposing them to have derived [page 197] a given reading from, for instance, a Western origin, ultimate or immediate, we are not contradicting the known fact that they have numerous ancient Non-Western readings, when it is equally known that they contain numerous Western readings. If in some places their aggregation in opposition to the primary MSS appears too great to be explained by accidental coincidence of several separate mixtures with Western or other sources, we have to remember, first, that none or almost none of them are without a large Syrian element, and secondly, that there is no reason to suppose the Syrian to have been the only eclectic text which had a wide influence about the fourth century.

E. 269-273. Absence of Versions from Groups containing Primary Greek MSS

§269. Respecting Versions, it is to be observed at the outset that the large extent to which they have either from the first or at some later time participated in Western corruption must lead us to expect from them but scanty support to the true reading in a large proportion of Pre-Syrian variations. Of the versions more ancient than the times of general mixture, the Old Latin being wholly Western, and the Old Syriac, as now extant for not quite half of the Gospels and for no other books, being almost wholly Western, there remain only the two closely related Egyptian versions, of which the Thebaic, itself preserved only in fragments, contains so large a Western element that earlier critics reckoned it as wholly Western. It is certain, on evidence already given (§§ 120, 217), that the original Memphitic version became ultimately corrupted from common Greek sources, and the [page 198] printed editions to a great extent represent this debased form of Memphitic text; so that till the best MSS have been completely collated, we have no security that Memphitic readings at variance with the general character of the version belong to its primitive state. Moreover, as we have seen, even in its earlier days it was probably touched by the Western influence. There remain the later versions and the revised forms of the Latin and Syriac versions; and though they all contain Non-Western Pre Syrian elements in various proportions, and accordingly have all a certain number of readings in common with the primary Greek MSS against most versions, we have no right to regard their predominant or even concordant opposition as outweighing an otherwise trustworthy attestation.

§270. This distribution of Western and Non-Western texts among versions is reflected in the

Page 101

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

§270. This distribution of Western and Non-Western texts among versions is reflected in the range of support which the primary Greek MSS (in opposition to :D in the Gospels and Acts, D2Ga in the Pauline Epistles) most usually receive from the several versions. Their most constant allies are, as we should expect, one or both of the Egyptian versions. Next to them probably come documents essentially Western, but preserving much of the earlier state of text which existed when many of the Western readings had not yet arisen, such as the Old Syriac and the African Latin. But, as we have said, the primary Greek MSS likewise receive in turn the support of every other version, sometimes of, several at once, not seldom even where all or nearly all other Greek MSS stand in opposition.

§271. On the other hand the support of versions is sometimes wholly wanting. Before however this distribution can be rightly judged, a very large majority [page 199] of the variations *prima facie* belonging to it must be cleared away. The causes of the irrelevance fall under two principal heads, inability to express Greek distinctions, and freedom of rendering. Where the variation lies between two approximately synonymous words, it is often impossible to say which it was that the author of a given version had before him. Such version cannot therefore be cited for either variant, and the necessary absence of a version from the side of the primary Greek MSS in an apparatus criticus leaves it undecided whether the Greek original of the version had or had not their reading. A similar uncertainty attends grammatical forms partially identical in meaning, such as the aorist and perfect of verbs; and also, though not in all cases, the presence or absence of the article. The ambiguity caused by freedom of rendering is sometimes not essentially different from the preceding cases, namely, where the genius of the translator's language would have rendered literal translation of one of the Greek readings unendurably stiff, or even impossible, and the most obvious rendering of it coincides with what would be a literal representation of the other Greek reading.

§272. But, apart from this involuntary licence, most translators are liable to deviate from their original by slight verbal paraphrase in just the same way as

transcribers of the fundamental text: in other words, many associations of versions with Greek evidence in support of changes of diction are due to accidental coincidence. Every paraphrastic impulse which affects a transcriber is not less likely to affect a translator, who has a strong additional temptation to indulge the impulse in the fact that he is creating a new set of words, not copying words set one after another before him. One of the commonest [page 200] forms of paraphrase is a change of order; and a large proportion of the readings in which the primary Greek MSS stand alone differ from the rival readings in order only. How little reliance can be placed on the adverse testimony of versions in such a matter is indeed proved by the absence of Greek or any other authority for numberless scattered inversions of order, to be found in MSS of so literal a version as the Old Latin. Other changes of a paraphrastic kind, in which versions may have the appearance of supplying attestation in another language to similar Greek readings, but which doubtless were often in fact made by the translators and the Greek scribes independently, are the insertion of expletives, more especially pronouns (very liberally added as suffixes by Syriac translators), *z*at after OIJTQ)5, and the like; the resolution or introduction of participial constructions; and permutations of conjunctions, and introductory language generally. In some of these cases a peculiarity of form in one Greek reading renders it probable that versions which attest it are faithfully reproducing their original, while it remains uncertain which original underlies any or all of the versions on the opposite side: in other cases either Greek reading might so

any or all of the versions on the opposite side: in other cases either Greek reading might so easily be paraphrased by the other, either in Greek or in any other language, that no single version can be safely taken to represent exactly its original; though it is usually probable that some only of the versions have disguised their fundamental reading.

§273. But, when allowance has been made for all these cases in which the apparent isolation of the primary Greek MSS is possibly or probably delusive, a certain number of variations remain in which the isolation must in the present state of our evidence be counted as [page 201] unambiguous. For the reasons given above, the supposition that readings thus unattested by any version may yet be original is consistent with the known facts of transmission; and continuous examination of the readings attested by the primary Greek MSS without a version fails to detect any difference of internal character between them and readings in which the primary Greek MSS are sustained by versions. While- therefore so narrow a range of attestation renders special caution imperative with respect to these readings, and some of them cannot be held certain enough to render all recognition of their rivals superfluous, we have found no sufficient reasons either for distrusting them generally or for rejecting any of them absolutely.

F. 274-279. Absence of Fathers from Groups containing Primary Greek MSS

§274. The presence or absence of Fathers as allies of the primary Greek MSS is evidently to a great extent fortuitous, depending as it does so much on the nature of the passage, as causing it to be quoted often, seldom, or not at all. Except therefore in the comparatively few cases in which it is morally certain that a passage must have been quoted by one or more given Fathers in given contexts, had it stood with a particular reading in the text used by him or them, negative patristic evidence is of no force at all.

§275. This universal rule is completely applicable to the variations which we are now considering, where neither variant is attested by any Father who does not habitually follow a Syrian text: it is applicable in principle, but subject to more or less qualification, where [page 202] the reading opposed to that of the primary Greek MSS has patristic attestation not obviously Syrian, and their reading has none. The extent of its applicability must be affected by the usual character of the text of the Fathers who cite the passage. Almost all Greek Fathers after Eusebius have texts so deeply affected by mixture that their dissent, however clearly established, cannot at most count for more than the dissent of so many secondary Greek uncial MSS, inferior in most cases to the better sort of secondary uncial MSS now existing. The patristic evidence which can appreciably come into account must thus be limited to that of Ante-Nicene Fathers, and those very few later Fathers who used approximately Ante-Nicene texts.

§276. But further, the apparent patristic evidence literally or virtually Ante-Nicene requires in its turn critical sifting. All the possible sources of error explained in former pages (§§ 156, 157) have to be kept constantly in mind; with the additional consideration that here we are dealing with detached variations, in which, except in the way of observation of analogies, we can obtain no corrective help from other variations. Positive grounds for distrusting the faithful transmission of a patristic attestation concordant with the Syrian text may very often be found, for instance in a recorded variation of MSS or in the clear implication of the context. Where this is the case,

a recorded variation of MSS or in the clear implication of the context. Where this is the case, there is nothing arbitrary in ignoring the printed testimony, or even, if the evidence is strong enough, in reckoning it as favourable to the rival reading. Wherever a transcriber of a patristic treatise was copying a quotation differing from the text to which he was accustomed, he had virtually two originals before him, one present to his eyes, the other to his [page 203] mind; and, if the difference struck him, he was not unlikely to treat the written exemplar as having blundered. But since the text familiar to nearly all transcribers after the earlier ages, to say nothing of editors, was assuredly the Syrian text, this doubleness of original could arise only where the true patristic reading was Non-Syrian. For the converse supposition there is no similar justification: for the only known causes that can be assigned for the appearance of a Non-Syrian reading in a patristic quotation are faithful transmission and accidental error; and where the reading is independently known to be of high antiquity, the chance of accidental coincidence in error is in an immense preponderance of cases too minute to come into account.

§277. Even where there is no obvious positive internal ground for doubting whether the words written by a Father have been faithfully preserved, some slight uncertainty must always rest on a patristic attestation of a variant adopted by the Syrian text, since the supposed doubleness of original remains equally possible, and equally likely, whether the circumstances of the individual quotation do or do not happen to contain suspicious indications. This uncertainty ceases to be slight when the apparent position of the patristic testimony creates a grouping unlike any of the groupings into which it habitually enters, and when if transferred to the other side it would find itself in accustomed company.

§278. Again, there is often reason to doubt whether what a Father wrote was identical with what he read: positive grounds may be found for distrusting a free quotation as faithfully representing the biblical text used, provided that the difference between one variant and another is such as might readily be reproduced accident[page 204] ally by the free manner or the special purpose of

the citation. Patristic quotations in short, like versions, may easily seem to make up a composite attestation, when it is really nothing more than an accidental coincidence. Such deceptive attestations might conceivably arise in either direction: but in a large majority of cases they would be due to a paraphrastic impulse such as that which we find working in scribes; that is, for either process the original peculiarities of order or diction which tempt to modification would be the same. In like manner the intermingling of unconscious reminiscences of parallel or similar passages, a specially fruitful cause of corruption in patristic quotations, may easily result in readings identical with readings due in MSS to harmonistic or other assimilation, and thus produce a deceptive semblance of joint attestation. Accordingly quotations apparently opposed to the primary Greek MSS are oftener found to be for these reasons questionable representatives of the texts used by the patristic writers than those which seem to support the primary Greek MSS. Suspicions as to fidelity of quotation, unsustained by other evidence, by the nature of the case can never transpose attestation from one side to the other; they can only create uncertainty: but uncertainty suffices to destroy the force of the prima facie contrast between the presence of patristic attestation on the one side and its absence on the other.

§279. Lastly, even the presence of tried and verified Pre-Syrian patristic evidence in opposition to the primary Greek MSS, in conjunction with its absence from their side, loses much of the weight to which it would otherwise be entitled, when the actual texts employed in the extant

writings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers are [page 205] taken into consideration. Western readings, it will be remembered, are abundant in Clement and Origen, much more in Eusebius; and these are the only AnteNicene Fathers, represented to us by more than petty fragments, whose texts are not approximately Western. Now the readings of primary Greek MSS with which we are here concerned have opposed to them D in the Gospels and Acts, D2Ga in the Pauline Epistles and almost always other Western documents as well, making up a clear Western element in the attestation, whether the origin be `Western' or not. If therefore even Clement or Origen swell the array, the source of their readings in these passages, as in many others where no doubt is possible, may be Western; and if so, they contribute nothing towards shewing that these readings were only preserved by the Western text, not originated by it. Nevertheless, since the greater part of the texts of the Alexandrian Fathers is Non-Western (see § 159), their certified opposition to a reading of the primary Greek MSS ought to forbid its unqualified acceptance except after the fullest consideration.

G. 280. Absence of Versions and Fathers from Groups containing Primary Greek MSS

§280. We have spoken separately of the absence of Versions and of Fathers from the company of the primary Greek MSS: it remains to consider the rare and extreme cases in which Versions and Fathers are absent together. Independently of the special utility of versions and patristic quotations in supplying the landmarks of textual history their certified testimony has a high corroborative worth. The unknown Greek MSS [page 206] from which they all derive their authority preceded our earliest extant MSS in several cases by long periods eventful in textual history, and thus at least rescue any reading of our MSS which they undoubtedly attest from the suspicion of having come into existence at any

recent stage of transcription, in the century, we may say, preceding 350. This ancillary aid of Versions and Fathers in individual variations is invaluable, notwithstanding their unfitness to supply a primary and continuous standard of text as compared with our best Greek MSS. But, though the security of verification is withdrawn where Versions and Fathers are both absent, it by no means follows that a positive insecurity takes its place. Every version, so far as it is at present known to us, contains so many readings which it is morally impossible to believe to be right, and a certain proportion of these readings are scattered in such apparent irregularity, that we have no right to assume either that the deficiencies of one version, as the Memphitic, would in every case be made up by some other version, or that deficiencies of all versions and deficiencies of all extant patristic evidence would never happen to coincide. Moreover the transition to total absence of Versions and Fathers is bridged over by the many places in which a secondary version, as the Aethiopic or Armenian, supplies the only accessory authority. The whole number of cases where the primary Greek MSS stand alone is extremely small, when the deceptive variations mentioned above (§§ 271, 272), have been set aside: and neither in their internal character nor in their external relations to other documents have we found reason to deny to such readings the favourable presumption which their attestation by the better of the extant Greek MSS would confer. [page 207]

SECTION II. DOCUMENTARY GROUPS AS LIMITED BY REFERENCE TO THE BEST PRIMARY GREEK MSS 281-355

Page 105

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

A. 281-283. Relation of variations between Primary Greek MSS to the chief ancient texts

§281. After this examination of the relation of the evidence of Versions and Fathers to that of the primary Greek MSS in respect of the final process of determining the text, we must now resume the consideration of the numerous variations in which the primary Greek MSS differ widely among themselves. Here, in investigating Internal Evidence of Groups for each individual group or class of groups) we lose clear and obvious parallelism with the great ancient texts. But the distribution of attestation for most of the groups must as a matter of fact have in most cases been determined by the great ancient texts, with or without subsequent mixture, whether it be in our power to assign each document to a definite text or not (see § 243 V); and therefore that cannot well be the right reading which would render the documentary distribution incompatible with known genealogies. It is not indeed requisite that we should be able to decide between two or more possible histories of a variation; but an important confirmation is wanting when we are unable to suggest at least one such history consistent alike with the composition of documents as known through the simpler and more normal distributions of attestation, and with the genuineness of the reading commended by Internal Evidence of Groups and other considerations. Before therefore we [page 208] proceed to enquire into the character of special groups in detail, it will be right to examine a little more closely the probable relation of the primary ancient lines of transmission to many important variations now to be considered.

§282. The principal difficulty with which we have to deal arises from an apparent combination of Western and Alexandrian attestations in opposition to a group of documents which bears no clear and obvious marks of compositeness of attestation, but which is commended by Internal Evidence of Groups; so that the

preference accorded to this group seems to involve the paradox of a preference of a single line of descent to two concordant lines of descent. Given the independence of the Western and Alexandrian texts, the supposed preference is genealogically untenable as regards readings which could not owe their place in both texts to accidental coincidence in error. Now, though no contradiction is involved in the hypothesis of the adoption of early Alexandrian readings into a late Western text or of early Western readings into a late Alexandrian text, the actual evidence contains comparatively few traces of any such relation of dependence; while the definite original parallelism of the two texts is evinced by the many places in which they smooth away difficulties of language by entirely different devices. Either therefore

(1) the readings of which we are now speaking as found only in the better of the primary Greek MSS must be of Alexandrian origin; or (2) they must have originated in some indeterminate equally aberrant text, assignation of them to a Western origin being in most cases clearly impossible; or (3) the opposed attestation cannot rightly be said to combine the two primary aberrant texts. [page 209]

§283. The two former suppositions stand in so flagrant opposition to the suggestions of internal evidence, howsoever obtained, and harmonise so ill with the results furnished by other groupings, that nothing but the proved inadmissibility of the third supposition could justify their acceptance. The third supposition is however natural enough, as soon as we recognise on the one hand the wide and early prevalence of Western readings, and on the other the mixed composition of the Greek MSS which are the chief extant representatives of the Alexandrian text (compare § 269). The Alexandrian text of the Gospels for instance would have been

text (compare § 269). The Alexandrian text of the Gospels for instance would have been hopelessly obscure but for the very large Alexandrian elements which SCL(A) 33 contain in various places and proportions: yet the presence of a Western element in these MSS is equally indubitable, and it furnishes what must be in most cases the true key to the paradox. The readings attested by the best of the primary Greek MSS are as a rule simply Non-Western readings which are extant in an exceptionally small number of existing documents because the Western corruptions of them obtained an exceptionally early and wide popularity in one or other of the eclectic texts of the third and fourth centuries. That one of these eclectic texts arose at Alexandria, the text of Hesychius (see § 249) being indeed probably of this character, is likely enough; and, if so, it might be called a late Alexandrian text: but such a fact would only serve to illustrate the conclusion just stated. This conclusion harmonises in every respect with all known facts; and we are unable to think of any other interpretation which can be consistently applied without startling incongruities alike of external and of internal evidence. [page 210]

B. 284-286. General relations of B and a to other documents

§284. When the various subordinate groupings which arise by the defection of one or another member of the leading groups of primary Greek MSS described as mainly Non-Western are tested by the prevalent character of their readings, the results thus obtained are for most of them as well marked as in the cases where the primary Greek MSS agree together. Two striking facts here successively come out with especial clearness. Every group containing both S and B is found, where Internal Evidence is tolerably unambiguous, to have an apparently more original text than every opposed group containing neither; and every group containing B, with the exception of such Western groups as include B in the Pauline Epistles, is found in a large preponderance of cases, though by no means

universally, to have an apparently more original text than every opposed group containing s.

§285. Thus Internal Evidence of Groups conducts us to conclusions respecting these two MSS analogous to, and confirmatory of, the conclusions obtained independently by ascertaining to what extent the principal extant documents severally represent the several ancient lines of text. We found S and B to stand alone in their almost complete immunity from distinctive Syrian readings; s to stand far above all documents except B in the proportion which the part of its text neither Western nor Alexandrian bears to the rest; and B to stand far above S in its apparent freedom from either Western or Alexandrian readings with the partial exception in the Pauline Epistles already mentioned more than once (§§ 204 ff.) [page 211]

§286. The two processes deal with distinct classes of phenomena, the one with distributions of external attestation, the other with internal characteristics. The former simply registers in what company a given document is or is not found, with reference to certain well marked assemblages constantly recurring and having a conspicuously ancient origin: the latter deduces from those variations which on internal grounds afford clear presumptions the quality of the texts attested by the various groups into which a given document enters, and thus ultimately the quality of the document itself as a whole. The results of the former process are brought into comparison with those of the latter by a similar but independent deduction of the texts of the observed assemblages of documents. To a certain limited extent the materials in this case are identical with those employed in the latter process, for the various Syrian, Western, and

Page 107

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

identical with those employed in the latter process, for the various Syrian, Western, and Alexandrian assemblages are included among the numerous groups. But this partial coincidence does not materially impair the independence of the two processes, at least as regards any mixed or any approximately neutral document; for among the variations from which the character of, let us say, the Western text is deduced there will be found many in which each of the mixed documents now in question stands in opposition to the Western reading; and again many groupings, which by the ascertained quality of their texts go to shew the quality of a given document included in them all, are of too ambiguous composition to be used as evidence of the character of the Western or other assemblages. Thus the correspondence between the results of the two modes of investigating the groups containing S and B, and again those containing B with [page 212] out S, is not created, as might be incautiously surmised, by a twofold presentation of inferences essentially the same, but amounts to a real verification. On the other hand the ascertainment of the quality of any single document by bringing together the ascertained qualities of the texts of the different groups of which it is a member is not essentially different from the direct ascertainment of its quality on internal grounds without intermediate reference to groups, except in its omission to take into account those variations in which the document stands absolutely alone.

C. 287-304. Relation of B to S and characteristics of Groups containing both B and S

§287. It now becomes necessary to scrutinise more closely the trustworthiness of the propositions laid down above respecting the preeminent excellence of the Vatican and Sinaitic MSS, which happen likewise to be the oldest extant Greek MSS of the New Testament. It is at the outset essential to distinguish carefully the readings and the groups of documents in which they stand side by side from those in which one of them stands alone. Following the gradual narrowing of groups, we come first to the combination t;B, which is, as we have intimated, wherever it

occurs, the constant element of those variable groups that are found to have habitually the best readings. The statement remains true, we believe, not less when the groups dwindle so as to leave XB comparatively or absolutely alone than when they are of larger compass. The cases in which xB have no support of Greek MSS, or no support at all, are connected by every gradation with the cases in which they stand at the head [page 213] of a considerable group; and the principle is not affected by the size of the groups. But when the number of members is nearly or quite reduced to two, it is of consequence to find out what can be known respecting the antecedents of each, and especially respecting their mutual relations.

§288. The first point that arises for examination is the independence of their testimony. The numerous readings in which they stand alone against all or nearly all extant Greek MSS suggests at once the enquiry whether they had separate ancestries or were, to a greater or less extent, copies of a single exemplar. The enquiry is the more necessary because the two MSS are really brought together as to their transcription in a singular manner by the fact observed by Tischendorf, that six leaves of the New Testament in s, together with the opening verses of the Apocalypse, besides corrections, headings, and in two cases subscriptions, to other parts, are from the hand of the same scribe that wrote the New Testament in B. The fact appears to be sufficiently established by concurrent peculiarities in the form of one letter, punctuation, avoidance of contractions, and some points of orthography. As the six leaves are found on

Page 108

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

avoidance of contractions, and some points of orthography. As the six leaves are found on computation to form three pairs of conjugate leaves, holding different places in three distant quires, it seems probable that they are new or clean copies of corresponding leaves executed by the scribe who wrote the rest of the New Testament, but so disfigured, either by an unusual number of corrections of clerical errors or from some unknown cause, that they appeared unworthy to be retained, and were therefore cancelled and transcribed by the 'corrector'. However this may be, their internal character of text differs in no respect from that of their neighbours. [page 214] The fact that the scribe of B was a 'corrector' of S shews that the two MSS were written in the same generation, probably in the same place: but as regards the text it has no independent force, though it would have to be taken into account if the internal evidence were to point to the use of a common exemplar. On the other hand a strong presumption to the contrary is created by remarkable differences in the order of the books, the divisions into sections, and other externals.

§289. Turning then to the internal evidence afforded by the texts themselves, we are at once confronted by the question,-How can we know that any two MSS are both derived from a common parent or near ancestor? Certainly not, as is often assumed, from the bare fact that they have many readings in common, with or without the support of other documents. What is absolutely certain in these cases is that those readings have some common ancestor, coincidences in independent error being always excepted; and it is morally certain that the same ancestor supplied more or less of the rest of the text. But this ancestor may have been at any distance from the MSS, near or remote, back to the autograph itself inclusive. That this is no exaggeration will be seen at once by following the course of transmission downwards instead of upwards. Whenever an original reading has disappeared from all representatives of all originally independent lines of transmission except two, and each of these two lines has either but a single extant representative or has itself lost the true reading in all its extant representatives but one, the resulting distribution is precisely as supposed, two MSS against the rest: and this is a common case in many texts. To what stage in the transmission the

common ancestor implied by the identical [page 215] readings belonged, can in fact, so far as it can be determined at all, be determined only by the internal character of these readings, and by the genealogical relationships to other documents disclosed by these and the other readings.

§290. As soon as the test furnished by the most elementary analysis of attestations, and consequently of genealogies, is applied, the supposition that the texts of X and B as wholes are in any one book or chapter of the Testament derived from a single near ancestor falls to the ground. It is negatived at the first glance by the multitude of variations in which they are divided, while each is associated with a variety of attestation. Apart from the associated attestations the diversities of reading would be inconclusive: they might have been produced by the independent carelessness or licence of two transcribers of the same exemplar. But where each discrepant reading has other witnesses, and there is no room for accidental coincidence, the discrepancies in two transcripts of the same exemplar can have no other origin than mixture; that is, at least one of the transcripts must be virtually a transcript of two different originals. In this restricted sense alone is the hypothesis of a proximate common origin of S and B worthy of being seriously examined; that is, in the sense that a single proximate original has supplied a large common element in their texts.

Page 109

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

§291. To examine the hypothesis in this shape, we must put out of sight all the elements of each MS which it owes to undoubted mixture with texts capable of being recognised through a long succession of variations, and which may therefore easily have come in together; that is, every clearly Western and every clearly Alexandrian [page 216] reading of s in such books as are preserved in B, and every clearly Western reading of B in the Pauline Epistles. The residue would then approximately represent each text reduced to the form which it must have had just before the great final independent mixture, upon the hypothesis that antecedent to this mixture the two texts had a common proximate origin. To make comparison clearer, we may further leave out of account every reading of either MS singly which has no other attestation whatever.

§292. The resulting text however would still entirely fail to shew the imagined agreement. Multitudes of discrepancies between S and i? would remain, in which each MS would have some very early documentary evidence supporting it. Doubtless the hypothesis might still be rendered possible by supposing all the readings in which g and B differ to have been taken simultaneously in one of these MSS from a single accessory original, or each MS to have its own accessory original. But the same conjectural mode of composition might be imagined with equal propriety for any other pair of MSS having at least an equal number of coincidences peculiar to themselves and no greater number of discrepancies. It is only one among an almost infinite number of at least equally probable contingencies, and has therefore no a priori probability of its own, though it would have no inherent improbability if other textual phenomena pointed to it. The problem cannot possibly be solved on the ground of attestation alone: but, so far as the phenomena of attestation contribute to its solution, they do not suggest a near common origin for even the residuary portions of S and B.

§293. We now come to the indications furnished by [page 217] the internal character of identical readings. If some of the identical readings are manifestly

wrong, and if they further are of such a nature that accidental coincidence will not naturally account for their having the double attestation, they must have had a common original later than the autograph; and it becomes probable that some at least of those other identical readings which afford no clear internal evidence of the intrinsic kind had likewise only that later MS than the autograph for their common original. But this negative fact is all that we learn; and it is compatible with even the extreme supposition that the common source of the identical readings was the original of all extant documents, though itself but imperfectly representing the autograph, and thus that these readings, wrong though they be, were the ancestors of all other existing variants of the same variations (see §§ 86, 87). If on the other hand some of the wrong identical readings are manifestly derived from other existing readings, the common original must of course have been later than the common original of the other readings; but the question of its remoteness or proximateness to the two extant MSS remains undecided.

§294. The only quite trustworthy evidence from internal character for derivation from a common proximate original consists in the presence of such erroneous identical readings as are evidently due to mere carelessness or caprice of individual scribes, and could not easily have escaped correction in passing through two or three transcriptions. To carry weight, they must of course be too many to be naturally accounted for by accidental coincidence of error in two independent scribes. Now, to the best of our belief, t; and B have in common but one such reading, if we set aside the itacisms, or permutations of [page 218] vowels, current in uncial

reading, if we set aside the itacisms, or permutations of [page 218] vowels, current in uncial times, as between o and (o, v and c??; including the confusion between 77,uels and VzftS. This solitary blunder is 7r(lpaXAay71 B tpo7rqs avrosKin'lrAtaTos for 7r. ;^/ T. a7roaKtaXrwttta in James i 17. The final -aros might possibly be derived from an avros which stands at the head of the next verse in a good cursive (40) and in two Syriac texts, and which has much intrinsic force: on this supposition the reading of s and B, though erroneous, would be nearer to the true reading than the common reading. But the evidence as a whole does not point to so deeply seated a corruption; and it may be fairly assumed that the reading -aros is due either to thoughtless assimilation to the preceding genitive or to a mental separation of aTTO' from IrKbac,aa and consequent correction of the supposed solecism. But, though a series of such coincidences would imply community of proximate origin, a single instance does not, nor would two or three. Our extant MSS afford examples of more startling coincidences, unquestionably accidental, as aeLpoLs gofots (SA) for vstpocs &+ov in 2 Pet. ii 4, fOopas +0a,or77S (SAC) for arTopa??A +0aprrs in r Pet. i 23, and etierravro (s#C*D*) for etLz:rraTOn followed by Avov(ravres oe oc arroaTo??oL, in Acts viii I3, the subject of the verb being O f^P(oV. The coincident readings of t; and B likewise include one or two peculiar spellings having a somewhat problematical appearance: they occur however in peculiar words, in which it is difficult to find a trustworthy criterion of intrinsic certainty or even probability. They include likewise a few substantive readings which are capable of being accounted for as blunders, but which may as reasonably be admitted as genuine, and in most cases are sustained by internal evidence. [page 219]

§295. Thus far we have obtained only negative results. We have found readings that are explicable by the supposition of a common proximate original: we have found none that it is difficult to explain without it. We must now turn to such

positive indications of the relative antiquity of the common original as can be obtained by taking genealogical relations into account. These are of two kinds, arising from comparisons in which the two MSS are taken together, and from those in which they are taken separately.

§296. Under the former head we have to compare the readings in which S and B together stand unsupported with those in which they have the concurrence of one or two important MSS or of ancient versions and quotations without extant MSS. Here we are merely reconsidering from a special point of view the evidence from which the enquiry started (§ 281), the Internal Evidence of Groups. Having found uB the constant element in various groups of every size, distinguished by internal excellence of readings, we found no less excellence in the readings in which they concur without other attestations of Greek MSS, or even of Versions or Fathers. The two sets of groupings, containing no reading in common, illustrate and confirm each other. The general character of the readings of both is the same, so that there is no internal evidence against the natural presumption that they come from the same source. But the readings of sB in which they are associated with other and various witnesses for very early texts cannot by the nature of the case have originated with the scribe of a proximate common source; so that, if the common source was proximate, they must have been received and transmitted from an earlier source: and accordingly there is no reason, in the absence [page 220] of constraint from internal evidence, to imagine a different origin for those readings of sB which have no other attestation. It might indeed be suggested that both sets of readings were obtained from a single proximate common source, but that the one set originated there, while the other was transmitted. But

Page 111

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

common source, but that the one set originated there, while the other was transmitted. But against this contingent possibility must be set the comparative inconstancy of the members of the smaller groups containing NB, and the consequent probability that occasionally they would all be found ranged against readings having the same parentage as those which they elsewhere concur with fB in supporting (see § 280).

§297. These considerations shew that the common original of xB for by far the greater part of their identical readings, whatever may have been its own date, had a very ancient and very pure text, and that there is no sufficient reason for surmising that the rest of their identical readings came from any other source. They prove that one of three alternatives must be true: either the respective ancestries of s and B must have diverged from a common parent extremely near the apostolic autographs; or, if their concordant readings were really derived from a single not remote MS, that MS must itself have been of the very highest antiquity; or, lastly, such single not remote MS must have inherited its text from an ancestry which at each of its stages had enjoyed a singular immunity from corruption. For practical purposes it is of little moment which alternative is true. The second and third alternatives would leave open the possibility that single readings of sB, otherwise unsupported, may have originated with the common proximate source here implied: but there is no difference between the three alternatives as regards the general character and [page 221] date of the readings taken together, and the consequent presumption in favour of any one of them.

§298. When however we go on, secondly, to compare the identical readings of sB with the readings of S unsupported by B and of B unsupported by S, the first alternative obtains so much positive corroboration that the second and third may be safely dismissed. For the present purpose we must neglect the numerous readings in which S or B forms part of a large group, and attend to those readings only in which they stand respectively in opposition to all or almost all other Greek MSS, but with some other support: with the places where they stand absolutely alone we are not for the present concerned. It is then seen that a large

proportion of the small groups containing one or other of the two MSS contain also other documents (versions or quotations) attesting a high antiquity of text. Many of the readings of B having this accessory attestation are doubtless wrong, and, as we shall see presently, a much greater number of the readings of ??: what we are now concerned with however is not genuineness but antiquity. Each of the two MSS is proved by these readings to be at least in part derived from an original preserving an extremely ancient text, for the most part not represented by our other extant MSS: and these two texts are by the nature of the case different from each other.

§299. The distinct existence of these two independent texts is further illustrated by places where they emerge into view simultaneously; that is, in a certain number of those ternary or yet more composite variations in which the readings of s and of B are different from each other, but are closely connected together in opposition to the reading or readings of the great bulk of docu[page 222] ments, and in which each of the two MSS is supported by a small number of documents having a largely PreSyrian text. In these cases, allowance being made for the possibility of an occasional accidental coincidence, the reading of neither X nor B can have originated in the process of transcription from a proximate common source, and the two MSS confront each other with exclusively early texts of different ancestry.

§300. It follows from the binary and the ternary variations alike that the hypothesis of a proximate common original for the identical readings of fB involves the necessity of postulating at least three independent sources of exceptionally ancient character of text for the two MSS, independently of sources akin to documents still largely extant. It is at once obvious that the same phenomena are accounted for with much greater probability by the simple explanation that the identical readings do not represent a third and proximate common original, containing a single pure text preserved with extraordinary fidelity, but are merely those portions of text in which two primitive and entirely separate lines of transmission had not come to differ from each other through independent corruption in the one or the other.

§301. The importance of this conclusion is so great that we venture to repeat in other and fewer words the principal steps which lead to it. Whatever be the mutual relation of & and B, each of them separately, s in the Apocalypse excepted, is found on comparison of its characteristic readings with those of other documentary authorities of approximately determinate date to have a text more ancient by a long interval than that of any other extant Non-Western MS containing more than a few verses; to be in fact essentially a text of the second [page 223] or early third century. This fact, which is independent of coincidences of SB, so that it would remain true of S if B were unknown, and of B if S were unknown, suggests the most natural explanation of their coincidences. They are due, that is, to the extreme and as it were primordial antiquity of the common original from which the ancestries of the two MSS have diverged, the date of which cannot be later than the early part of the second century, and may well be yet earlier. So high an antiquity would of course be impossible if it were necessary to suppose that the 'common original' was a single archetypal MS comprising all the books as they now stand in either existing MS. But, as has been noticed elsewhere (§ I4: see also § 352), there is reason to suspect that the

great MSS of the Christian empire were directly or indirectly transcribed from smaller exemplars which contained only portions of the New Testament; so that the general term 'common original') which we have used for the sake of simplicity, must in strictness be understood to denote the several common originals of the different books or groups of books. There is however no clear difference of character in the fundamental text common to B and S in any part of the New Testament in which B is not defective. The textual phenomena which we find when we compare them singly and jointly with other documents are throughout precisely those which would present themselves in representatives of two separate lines diverging from a point near the autographs, and not coming into contact subsequently. Other relations of pedigree are doubtless theoretically possible, but involve improbable combinations.

§302. An answer, in our opinion a true and sufficient answer, is thus found to the question how far the testimonies of 2; and B are independent of each other. Their independence can be carried back so far that their concordant testimony may be treated as equivalent to that of a MS older than S and B themselves by at least two centuries, probably by a generation or two more. Here, as always, high relative and absolute antiquity supplies a strong presumption of purity, but cannot guarantee it: on the one hand the writings of the New Testament were liable to textual change in the earliest generations of their existence as well as a little later; on the other the close approach to the time of the autographs raises the presumption of purity to an unusual strength. It must be remembered however that part of the evidence with which we have been dealing relates to quality as well as to antiquity: Internal Evidence of Groups, independently of

dealing relates to quality as well as to antiquity: Internal Evidence of Groups, independently of the aid which it gives towards ascertaining the proximity or distance of the common original of X and B, retains its own direct value. As was pointed out above (§ 296), even if it were credible that they were divided from their common ancestor by no more than two or three transcriptions, we should have on this ground to ascribe to the ancestry of the common ancestor an extraordinary freedom from corruption.

§303. That absolute purity cannot be ascribed to all readings attested by sB is implied in the existence of the Western non-interpolations (§ 240). We shall presently have to notice the possibility of a concurrence of S and B in support of wrong Western readings in St Paul's Epistles, implying a departure in the ancestries of both from their common fundamental text; and this is perhaps the most natural explanation of the attestation of the unquestionably wrong reading ayA0ev for 7/X00V by sBD2G3 cu2 Orig in Gal. ii 12. Account must likewise be taken of [page 225] the places in which, without difference of reading between S and B, the true text appears to be lost in all existing documents, or in all but one or two of a subsidiary character. Besides these clear or possible errors in SB there are some few variations in which their joint reading, though supported by some other testimony, is subject to more or less of doubt. But we have not found reason to make any further deduction from their united authority. In this as in all similar cases no account of course can be taken of coincidences that might be easily due to the independent origination of the same error by two different scribes. Under this head preeminently fall identical changes of an itacistic kind, as the confusion between imperatives in -6 and infinitives in -(lt?? and also between ??K6tS and v??Lets: it seldom happens that both MSS go unquestionably astray together in such points, for their laxity is but comparative, but examples do occur. When these indecisive coincidences have been set aside, no readings of SB remain which we could venture to pronounce certainly or probably wrong as against other existing readings. This general immunity from substantive errors that can without room for doubt be recognised as errors in the common original of SB, in conjunction with its very high antiquity, provides in a multitude of places a safe

criterion of genuineness, not to be distrusted except on very clear internal evidence. Accordingly, with the exceptions mentioned above, it is our belief (1) that readings of SB should be accepted as the true readings until strong internal evidence is found to the contrary, and (2) that no readings of sB can safely be rejected absolutely, though it is sometimes right to place them only on an alternative footing, especially where they receive no support from Versions or Fathers. [page 226]

§304. Sufficient examples of important or interesting readings attested by XB, but lost from the texts of all other extant uncials, will be found in the Appendix, as in the notes on Matt. v 22; X 3; xi 19; xvi 21; xvii 20; xxviii 6; Mark ix 29, xvi 9-20; Acts xx. 5, 28; I Pet. v 2 j Eph. i 1. Two or three additional places may be noticed 11cre, in which there is reason to think that the bearing of the internal evidence is liable to be misunderstood. Mark iv 8 Kaz Qtl\l\|a e'2rehev K. r ??.> taz f OLOOV Kan7rOV ava ,3aLvorra Kat av4(lvo,afva NB (avgavol;fvov ADLa cal, avtavovTa C and most documents). Here the true force of the parable requires that not the fruit, but the plants into which the seeds have expanded, be said to mount up and grow. The temptations to corruption were peculiarly strong; avaaaGvovra, immediately following Knp7rovx had an ambiguous termination readily assumed to belong to the masculine accusative, and thus drew after it the other participle, one text adopting the middle form, which involved least change, the other the neuter form, which coincided with avaliaTvovTa: an additional motive for alteration would be the apparent paradox Page 114

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

coincided with *avalía TvovTa*: an additional motive for alteration would be the apparent paradox of seeds being said to 'mount up', a paradox which St Mark apparently intended to soften by means of the order of words. Finally the Western and Syrian texts completed the corruption by changing *aA1??a* to the *a'X\o* of vv. 5, 7. John iv 15 *Tva ,aX1 aLElroo yw18e 8stepXoa,uat* (or *oya??*) *esPIRaae avTActv M*B Orig5* (*epXLo,uaf* most documents). *alepxossas* is here used in its idiomatic sense 'come all the way', which expresses the woman's sense of her often repeated toil. Being commonly used in other senses, the word was easily misunderstood and assumed to be inappropriate and the change would be helped by the facility with which one of two similar consecutive syllables drops out. Acts xxviii 13 *KaraXSevres els 2vpar;orE1ras e7rfMfLvayev r/8fpaS TpeLS O&fV WfptfXOVtfs KaT??vrr/??a??eV* (LS *P0yLOV S*B* ,, (SuEinz2gs ez [= '7veif ed anchor', as *vg czzm szzstaZissent a'e* Also for *apavres aor*(rov in xxvii 13]) *memph* ('??oizag for??Az'); where most documents have *1rfpTfxSovrfs*. *IlfpcfAoPres* here is explained by the use of the same verb in xxvii 40, *Kal Tas aylcvpas T'fpLfXOVrfs fFLov ffS rr??v &??aChavX* where it clearly means the casting loose (literally 'stripping off') of the anchors (with their cables) in order to set the vessel free to drive, though it is otherwise unknown as a nautical term. By analogy it must here mean the casting loose of the cables which attached the vessel to the shore in harbour (called in ampler phrase *ra a7royera XV*(Ja(rdJa?? [page 227] *XraL, aroKoirac &c.*), the elliptic employment of transitive verbs being common in Greek nautical language as in English (compare *apavTfs* in xxvii 13, cited above). The veneral sense then is merely 'and loosing from thence', that is, from Syracuse, where there had been a stay of three days. On the other hand the run from Syracuse to Rhegium could never be described as circuitous (*7rep??el\??90vr??s*)?? unless the ship were thrown out of her course by contrary winds, a circumstance not likely to be noticed by means of an obscure implication (cf. xxvii 4, 7, S); while scribes, to whom this geographical difficulty was not likely to suggest itself, would be tempted by the superficial smoothness

of T spzeXIovres.

D. 305-307. Binary uncial combinations containing B and s respectively

§305. We come next to the variations in which X and B stand on different sides. The first step towards dealing successfully with the problems which here arise is to examine the internal character of the readings attested by the two series of binary groups formed by S and by B combined with each other primary Greek MS. Now every such binary group containing B is found by this process to offer a large proportion of readings which on the closest scrutiny have the ring of genuineness, while it is difficult to find any readings so attested which look suspicious after full consideration. Such groups are in the Gospels BL, BC, BT, BS, BD, AB, BZ, B 33, in St Mark BA; in the Acts AB, BC, BD, BEo, B 6I; in the Catholic Epistles AB, BC, BPa; in the Pauline Epistles hB, BC, BMa, (BPa??) B II, B 67%*. These readings are in fact for most of the groups, especially those belonging to the Gospels, hardly of less uniformly good character than the readings of SB. Once more, their character is not found appreciably different whether [page 228] they do or do not receive the support of Versions or Fathers.

§306. One binary group containing B requires separate mention, namely BD2 of the Pauline Epistles. :From what has been already said (§§ 204, 228) on the Western element of B in these Epistles it will be evident that the combinations BD2G3 and BG3, when they are unsustained by clear Non-Western Pre-Syrian attestation, may be taken to imply a Western reading. The

Page 115

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

clear Non-Western Pre-Syrian attestation, may be taken to imply a Western reading. The question thus arises whether the same is to be said of BD2. On the one hand D represents on the whole an earlier and purer form of the Western text than G3, SO that, were not 12 known to contain a Western element in these epistles, the combination BD2 would, like the BD of the Gospels and Acts, have a strong presumption in its favour; and the presumption, though weakened, is by no means destroyed by the contingency which has thus to be taken into account. On the other hand De has some clearly Western corruptions from which G3 is free; and the analogy of BD,,G3 and BG3 preclude any assumption that BDD could not have this character. The decision must accordingly rest with Internal Evidence, which is on the whole definitely favourable to the BDR readings, while some of them are not free from doubt. They cannot as a class be condemned with the readings of BD2G3 and BG3; but neither is it certain that none of them are of the same origin and quality. Since the inferior quality of BG3 and the ambiguity as to BD2 are explained by the exceptional intrusion of an alien element into the Pauline text of B, the existence of which alien element is ascertained independently of the quality of its readings, the character of the fundamental text of B, as shown [page 229] by the other binary combinations, evidently remains unaffected.

§307. When S is tested in like manner, the results are quite different. None of its binary combinations, if their readings are examined consecutively, are found to be habitually of good character, though here and there readings occur which are not to be hastily dismissed. The readings of sD in the Gospels and Acts are often interesting, but they are shown by the Versions and Fathers which usually support them to be simply Western: the character of uD with the Old Latin, of S with the Old Latin, and of D with the Old Latin is identical. Except in the peculiar Western non-interpolations we have never found reason to trust fD. It is worth mention here that much the most considerable deduction to be made from the superiority of text in Tischendorf's ediZio octasa to his earlier editions is due to the indiscriminate vagueness of his estimate of S: a large proportion of those readings adopted by him which we have been obliged to reject are ordinary

Western readings which are attested by X in consequence of the Western element which it contains. 1A7ith SD of the Gospels may be classed KG3 of the Pauline Epistles; while the rarer combination SD2 of the Pauline Epistles contains both bad and good readings, the latter being apparently confined to the parts where B is defective, and elsewhere to those variations in which the reading of B is that of its Western element peculiar to these books, so that in the absence of this element we might have expected SBD2 in place of XV2. Trial by Internal Evidence is likewise unfavourable to such groups as in the Gospels SL,

SC, XT, St, SZ, S 33, in St Mark SA; in the Acts SA, SC, SE2, X 6I; in the Catholic Epistles KA, SC, SP2; in the [page 230] Pauline Epistles XA, fC, (sP??,)s I 7; though they contain a few readings which may perhaps be genuine. Their pedigree is usually, we believe, perhaps almost always, Alexandrian. The character is here, as elsewhere, ascertained independently of the origin: but it is instructive to see how completely the results of the comparison of binary groups containing S and B respectively are explained by the presence of large Western and Alexandrian elements in f. The character of what remains of the text of S after their subtraction must be largely excellent, as the character of XB shews; an estimate of the degree of excellence cannot however be formed till we have taken another step.

E. 308-325. Singular and subsingular readings of B

Page 116

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

§308. The readings of B and of X respectively have now to be compared in those variations in which they stand unsustained by any other Greek uncial MS. Such readings are of two kinds, 'singular readings', as they are usually called, which have no other direct attestation whatever, and what may be called 'subsingular readings', which have only secondary support, namely, that of inferior Greek MSS, of Versions, or of Fathers, or of combinations of documentary authorities of these kinds. Subsingular readings of B, which are in fact the readings of a particular class of groups containing B, will require consideration presently. What we have to say on the singular readings of B may be made clearer by a few remarks on singular readings generally.

§309. The attention prima facie due to singular readings of any one document is evidently variable, according to the number and genealogical relations of the whole body of extant documents. If a text is preserved in but two documents, every reading of each where they differ is a singular reading, one or other of which must be right; unless indeed both are wrong, and the true reading has perished. If the documents are more numerous, the singular readings of one document have no less prima facie authority than the rival readings found in all other documents alike, provided that the other documents have had a common original (see § 52), making the readings common to them to be virtually, though not in appearance, as 'singular' as the others. The same principle holds good whatever be the total number of documents, unless they have all only one common ancestor; that is, the prima facie authority of the singular readings of any document cannot be estimated by the bare numerical relation (see §§ 54-57), but varies partly with the independence of ancestry of the one document in relation to all the rest, partly with the affinities of ancestry among the rest. Where the whole pedigree is very complex, as in the New Testament, any documents which frequently stand in very small groups attesting evidently genuine readings,

against the bulk of documents of various ages, must evidently contain so large elements having an independent ancestry that the a priori presumption against their singular readings cannot be much greater than against singular readings at their best, that is, in texts preserved in two documents only.

§310. On the other hand (see §§ 56, 58) the singular readings of a document may always be due either to inheritance from a more or less remote ancestry, which may be of any degree of purity, or to quite recent [page 232] corruption, or, which is much the commonest case, partly to the one, partly to the other. Whatever a document has inherited of the autograph text is of necessity included in its proper or ancestral text; and in order to ascertain the character of those of its singular readings which belong to its ancestral text, we must sift away as far as possible those other singular readings which are mere individualisms, so to speak, originating with the scribe or one of his immediate predecessors. Complete discrimination is of course impossible in the absence of the exemplar or exemplars; but every approximation to it is a gain. Except by conjecture, which does not concern us here, no scribe can make a text better than he found it; his highest merit is to leave it no worse. The inherited text of a document must therefore have been usually better, never worse, than the text which it actually presents to the eye; and the character of the inherited text is inevitably disguised for the worse by every 'individualism' which remains undetected.

§311. Individualisms may obviously belong to various types, from purely clerical errors to

§311. Individualisms may obviously belong to various types, from purely clerical errors to alterations of purely mental origin.. Sufficient clerical errors betray themselves, beyond the possibility of doubt, to enable us with a little care to form an estimate of the degree of general accuracy attained by the scribe of a given document, and also of the kinds of mistakes to which he was prone (see § 45). The mere subtraction of a large number of irrelevant readings from the gross list of singular readings gives, as we have seen, greater exactness to the appreciation of the character of the ancestral text. But moreover the further knowledge gained respecting the habits of the scribe becomes of use both positively and negatively in dealing at a later stage with individual [page 233] variations. Singular readings which make good sense and therefore need imply no clerical error, but which might also be easily explained as due to a kind of clerical error already fixed upon the scribe by undoubted examples, are rendered by the presence of possible clerical error as a vera causa more doubtful than they would otherwise be. Singular readings which make good sense, and which cannot be explained by clerical error except such as lies outside the known proclivities of the scribe, acquire a better title to consideration. Again, those singular readings which are evidently errors, but are not clerical errors, can likewise be classified, and the results of classification used in the same manner: for instance, in the New Testament an appreciable number of the singular readings of A consist in the permutation of synonyms, and it can hardly be doubted that these readings are true individualisms. Whether however such singular readings are individualisms or of older date, is often not easy to tell: but it is always useful to remember that the text of a document as it stands is partly ancestral, partly due to transcriptional error in the last stage or stages of transmission, though definite indications of the one or the other origin may be wanting for each individual variation.

§312. When the singular readings of B are examined for the purpose here explained, it is found that on the one hand the scribe reached by no means a high standard of accuracy, and on the other his slips are not proportionally numerous or bad. Like most transcribers, he occasionally omits necessary portions of text because his eye returned to the exemplar at the wrong place. As the longer

portions of text so omitted consist usually either [page 234] of 12 to 14 letters or of multiples of the same, his exemplar was doubtless written in lines of this length. Often, but not always, an obvious cause of omission may be found in homeoteuton, the beginning or ending of consecutive portions of text with the same combinations of letters or of words. Reduplications due to the same cause likewise occur, but more rarely. More characteristic than these commonest of lapses is a tendency to double a single short word, syllable, or letter, or to drop one of two similar consecutive short words, syllables, or letters. The following are examples: Mark ix 25 e:Xer{beTTS TaCCx for erXenlTaccZ; Acts xviii I 7 TOtT@NT@NTX for TOyT@NTO); Mark xiii I3 eICcTEAoc for elcTcAoc; John xiv IO aerx for aerxAerx g Luke vii 24 caAeroME:N for c??ACrOMCNON; Mark iii 5 ACI for Aere; Vi 22 ClfAHvOyCHC for clccA??vorcllc; vii 2I AIAorlcMol for AI??AOrlCMOI; also without similarity of form, Mark vi I C??ll9CN for C??HAVHCN; Vii I8 acyNTol for acyNeTol. Occasionally we find assimilations of ending, as Mark v 38 aXaAatovTas xroRAas (for 7roAAa); Rom. xiv I8 zOKtzOLS TOtS avSponrots (for Zoxt,aos); or even, but very rarely, such verbal assimilations as zVpvryya o' (K\pUt(V in Acts x 37 for ??Ba7r??LV??LLa O exwpvSv.

§313. The singular readings of B which cannot strictly be called clerical errors, and yet which appear to be individualisms of the scribe, are confined within still narrower limits. A current supposition, to which frequent repetition has given a kind of authority, that the scribe of B was

Page 118

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

supposition, to which frequent repetition has given a kind of authority, that the scribe of B was peculiarly addicted to arbitrary omissions, we believe to be entirely unfounded, except possibly in the very limited sense explained below, while the facts which have given it plausibility are everywhere conspicuous. [page 235] In the New Testament, as in almost all prose writings which have been much copied, corruptions by interpolation are many times more numerous than corruptions by omission. When therefore a text of late and degenerate type, such as is the Received Text of the New Testament, is consciously or unconsciously taken as a standard, any document belonging to a purer stage of the text must by the nature of the case have the appearance of being guilty of omissions; and the nearer the document stands to the autograph, the more numerous must be the omissions laid to its charge. If B is preeminently free from interpolations, Western, Alexandrian, or Syrian, it cannot but be preeminently full of what may relatively to the Received Text be called omissions. Strictly speaking, these facts have no bearing on either the merits or the demerits of the scribe of B, except as regards the absolutely singular readings of B, together with those nearly singular readings in which the other attestation may easily be due to accidental coincidence: multitudes of the so called omissions of B are found in other good documents, few or many, and therefore, if not genuine, must at least have originated at a point in the line of transmission antecedent to B. It has seemed best however to speak of the supposed omissions of B here once for all, both those which concern the character of B individually and those which concern the character of the older text or texts from which it was derived.

§314. The great mass of omissions, or rather for the most part non-interpolations, which B shares with other primary documents being set aside as irrelevant, it remains to be considered whether its singular readings, which alone are relevant, include such and so many [page 236] omissions as to indicate a characteristic habit of the scribe. It is a conceivable hypothesis that the scribe of B, besides

inheriting a text unusually free from interpolations, was one of the very few transcribers addicted to curtailment, and thus corrupted the inherited text in a direction opposite to the usual course of transcription: the question is whether such a hypothesis is borne out by a comprehensive examination of the facts. What has been said above (§ 312) as to omissions due to purely clerical error need not be repeated. The only readings of B which can with any plausibility be urged on behalf of the hypothesis are the instances in which it omits slight and apparently non-essential words found in all other documents, such as pronouns and articles. It is on the one hand to be remembered that such words are peculiarly liable to be inserted, especially in Versions and quotations by Fathers; and still more that we find numerous similar omissions in good groups containing B, with every gradation in the amount of support which it receives, so that these omissions in B alone might be taken as genuine non-interpolations without incongruity as to the attestation, as well as consistently with the general character of the text of B. In our opinion this is the most probable account of the matter in some cases, and possibly in all: but it is on the whole safer for the present to allow for a proneness on the part of the scribe of B to drop petty words not evidently required by the sense, and therefore to neglect this class of omissions in B alone, where good confirmatory external or internal evidence is wanting. If however a like scrutiny is applied to important words or clauses, such as are sometimes dropped in the Western texts for the sake of apparent directness or simplicity, we find no traces [page 237] whatever of a similar tendency in B. Omissions due to clerical error, and especially to AzonzoeoteZeuSon, naturally take place sometimes without destruction of sense: and all the analogies suggest that this is the real cause of the very few substantial

sense: and all the analogies suggest that this is the real cause of the very few substantial omissions in B which could possibly be referred to a love of abbreviation. As far as readings of any interest are concerned, we believe the text of B to be as free from curtailment as that of any other important document.

§315. The chief feature of the few remaining individualisms of B, so far as they can be recognised with fair certainty as such, is their simple and inartificial character. Nearly all of them are due to easy assimilation, chiefly between neighbouring clauses or verses, occasionally between parallel passages. Consecutive words are perhaps occasionally transposed: but here on the other hand account has to be taken of the peculiar habitual purity of the text of B in respect of the order of words; a purity which is specially exhibited in numerous ternary or more composite variations, in which B is the sole or almost the sole authority for the one collocation which will account for the other variants. Of paraphrastic change there is little or no; thing. The final impression produced by a review of all the trustworthy signs is of a patient and rather dull or mechanical type of transcription, subject now and then to the ordinary lapses which come from flagging watchfulness, but happily guiltless of ingenuity or other untimely activity of brain, and indeed unaffected by mental influences except of the most limited and unconscious kind.

§316. This examination of the tolerably certain individualisms of B, of all kinds, prepares the way for an [page 238] examination of the character of its remaining singular readings. We must first however consider the readings of a set of groups intermediate between those last considered (§§ 28I-304) and B, that is, what we have called the subsingular readings of B. When the groups formed by B with one or more secondary Greek MSS and with one or more Versions or Fathers are tried by Internal Evidence, the proportional number of readings which are to all appearance genuine is very large indeed. Readings so attested cannot in fact be well distinguished in character from readings of SB. When B stands supported by only a single version, the results are by no means so uniform. When it is followed only by the Old Latin, or one or more Old Latin MSS or Fathers, the readings

seldom commend themselves as worthy of unreserved confidence, though it is no less true that they are seldom manifestly wrong (see § 204): they may as a rule be strictly called doubtful readings. On the other hand when the associated version is the Memphitic, Thebaic, or Old Syriac, the presumption of genuineness raised by the habitual character of the readings is much greater, and not a few of them are almost certainly right. With other versions the combinations are various in quality, as might be expected from the mixed origin of the versions themselves and their present condition as edited.

§317. These diminutions of attestation lead us continuously to the singular readings proper. Here too so many readings of B by itself commend themselves on their own merits that it would be rash to reject any hastily, though undoubtedly not a few have to be rejected at last. Occasionally too some stray quotation of a Father shews that readings of B which might have been [page 239] thought to be individualisms were really at least several generations older than the age when 13 was written. Thus in I Cor. xiii 5 it has ro jan1 eavT77S with Clem. Pasd. 252 for TQ eQVTBSw retained by Clem. SZrom. 956; both readings being shown by the respective contexts to have been actually used by Clement, and both making excellent sense. But, wherever there is no such accessory authority, clear internal evidence is needed to justify the acceptance of singular readings of B, since the possibility that they are no more than individualisms is constantly present. .

individualisms is constantly present. .

§318. The special excellence of B displays itself best perhaps in ternary or more than ternary variations. This has been already noticed (§ 315) in reference to collocations of words; but the statement is equally true as regards readings of all kinds. Where the documents fall into more than two arrays, the readings of B are usually found to be such as will account for the rival readings, and such as cannot easily be derived from any one of them, or any combination of them. Not the least instructive are what may be termed composite ternary variations, which easily escape notice in the cursory use of an ordinary apparatus criticus. They arise when two independent aberrant texts have removed a stumbling-block due to the original form of a phrase or sentence by altering different parts of the phrase, not by altering the v. hole or the same part in a different manner. If, as is usual, the evidence affecting each alteration is presented separately, we have in form not a single ternary variation but two or more successive binary variations. Now in such cases it is of frequent occurrence to find B nearly or even quite alone in supporting what is evidently the genuine variant [page 240] in each binary variation, while most of the other documents, representing ancient as well as later texts, divide themselves into those which are right in one place and those which are right in another.

§319. If it is suggested that these phenomena might be due to a skilful selection and combination of readings from two sources by the scribe of Bs the hypothesis is decisively negated by several considerations. If it were true for composite variations, it should fit also the ternary variations of the more obvious type, in which B similarly supports the neutral reading; whereas in most of them it would be peculiarly difficult to derive the neutral reading from any kind of coalescence of the aberrant readings. Secondly, the process hypothetically attributed to the scribe of B is incongruous with all that is known of his manner of transcription and capacity of criticism. Thirdly, the ternary variations in which B stands absolutely alone are not separable in character from those in which its readings are `subsingular', having the support of, for instance, one or two early versions;

and thus the operation would have to be attributed to one or more scribes of the first or early second century, while it would demand a degree of skill of which we have no example in extant records. Fourthly, the hypothesis is distinctly condemned by transcriptional evidence, which has an exceptional force in ternary variations (see § 29).

§320. It should be noticed that some few variations in the Pauline Epistles, in which the local Western element of B has affected the text, present a deceptive appearance of exceptions to what has been stated. Thus the accessory Western text, which makes itself felt in simple confluations (Col. i 12 KAXfO'aVTt Kat [KaVto#JaYTt B [page 241] from tKavtovavTt and the Western KaXf'fravTt, 2 Thess. iii 4 KaL ETTOL??CaTf KaL T otetTE Kat TTOttTfTf B from [Kal] TTOtECTE KaL TTOt\O-ftf and the Western KaL fT Ot\CaTC Kat ATOtECTE), is but partially followed in the composite ternary variation of Rom. x 5. Here the scribe of B adopted two out of three closely connected Western (and subsequently Syrian) changes, the transposition of OTt and the insertion of avra after TTo??r/craS, but in the third place negligently left aVT71 untouched, doubtless the reading of his primary exemplar, and thus produced an impossible combination. Combinations like these imply imperfect workmanship, not skilful choice. Nor is it material to know whether the scribe of B himself took the Western readings from a second exemplar, or, as seems more likely, merely copied a single exemplar with marginal or interlinear corrections which he incorporated into the text (see §§ 335 ff.): the

with marginal or interlinear corrections which he incorporated into the text (see §§ 335 ff.): the essential nature of the process is not changed by its being carried a single step back. Except in so far as even the slightest mixture may be said to involve some kind of selection, we hold it to be certain that the readings of B are never the result of any eclectic process. Its occasional individual aberrations of course sometimes take place where there is variation already, and therefore sometimes go to make up ternary variations. But it remains true that the readings of B in ternary variations, simple or composite, are habitually those of the original text, and the readings of the other texts divergent attempts to amend it.

§321. What has been said on the excellence usually shown by the readings of B in ternary variations will be made more intelligible by two or three examples of different types. James v 7 .oov o, l/E@p7OS 6KOEXETaF TOP rtytov Kaprov rrls ??75S, llaKpo??v??v er; auTZ f@S Xa??D rpo??yov Kar O+sHOv [page 242] B (? 31) lat.vg the (? aeth) arm. One text supplies the concluding adjectives with KapTov (from the first clause) as a substantive (S 9 j me syr.hl.mg pp, with slight variations), another, the Syrian with lftOV (AKnL2P2 cuPl syr. vg-hl.txt ppS??I). Here the elliptic expression has manifestly given rise to two different corrections; and B is the only certain Greek authority for the true text. This is an example of the simplest and most fundamental form of ternary readings, with the neutral text clearly exhibited.

§322. Mark vi 43 KaL i1pav KXaoyara sLoaeKa KO<'pLVO>V TXW1pLOMaTa B. The easier KXaoFaresv of viii 20 (TOfr(9V o(??pupLocsv TX71pLDHaTa Kxa(r??LarLov zIpare, where the necessary order enforces the genitive) is adopted by S 13-69-124346 209 (I omits). The Western (and Syrian) text, starting from this last reading, borrows KOpLVOVS 7rXripeTsX to replace the last two words, from viii 19; Matt. xiv 20 (AD unc11 cupl latt syrr me); most Latins, with 33 and some secondary Greek MSS, introducing further assimilations to Matt. There are also two remarkable confluations: LQ vary from B only by adopting KO+LVOVS from the Western reading (or the antecedent parallel passages); 28, which has many relics of a very ancient text hereabouts, retains the

KXaoyara of B, but for the rest follows the Western and Syrian text. Here the choice clearly lies between three readings, those of B, of X and the lost early originals of two texts now partially preserved in cursives, and of L??; and the difficulty of accounting for the well attested KXcLapara is unfavourable to the

second. The reading of LQ, KXaoyara eLiZigEKa KO+Lovs rrxrlpLslLLara?? which has no intrinsic probability, may be due to accidental mixture (in v. 31 they, and they alone, have the impossible fVK(IL'pOV): the reading of B, which has much intrinsic probability, was likely to be changed on account of the double accusative, even apart from the influence of parallel passages, and might easily give rise to all the other variants with the help of harmonistic assimilation. If we take the three parts of the composite variation separately, a good group is found supporting each of the three readings of B, KxacrllLaTa being attested by BLA 28, KOdpLV@V by SB I-209 13-69-124-346, and irxrlpLolLLaTa by SBLQ 1-209 13-69-124-

346. This last specially certain attestation marks the virtual authority for the entire fundamental text from which the Western correction departed, the peculiar word TrArlpcsllLaTa being the turning-point of change; and evidently the common ancestor of X Ac. altered one of the three preceding words, [page 243] and the common ancestor of LA another, while B alone held fast the true text throughout.

§323. Once more, the unique character of B in a series of separate but mutually related variations, making up as it were an extended composite variation, is illustrated by St Mark's

Page 122

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

variations, making up as it were an extended composite variation, is illustrated by St Mark's account of the denials of St Peter. Alone of the evangelists St Mark notices two crowings of a cock. According to the true text he follows the same lines as St Matthew and St Luke, while he makes the requisite additions in three places: that is, he inserts the word 'twice' (oL's) in both the prediction (xiv 30) and St Peter's recollection of the prediction (xiv 72 b), and the phrase 'a second time' (fK tfVTfpOV) in the statement that 'a cock crew' immediately after the third denial (xiv 72 a). Thus all the points are tersely but sufficiently given. The text however, as it thus stood, presented more than one temptation to correction. At the first of the four places (v. 30) the direct harmonistic influence from the other Gospels was naturally strong and unchecked, and thus the first oLs is largely omitted (by t; C* aeth arm as well as the Westerns, D cuv lat.afr-eur). When v. 72 e was reached, fK Of vrL pOU was as naturally a stumbling-block for a different reason, because there had been no mention of a previous cockcrowing. The supposed difficulty was met in two ways: a text now represented by a small group (gLcvg.cod), doubtless Alexandrian, assimilated v. 72 to v. 68 and the parallel narratives by striking out fK 8eVTfpOV; while the Western text boldly adapted v. 68 to v. 72 by inserting KaF axEKTGsp f+Lsvxioev after 7rpoavXIov. Lastly v. 72 b was affected by the various texts both of the preceding words and of the original prediction (v. 30), here expressly repeated and thereby brought into strict parallelism, and accordingly EL'< is omitted by more documents than e'K eFVTf'pOV. The Syrian text makes the whole uniformly symmetrical and complete by accepting the Western interpolation in v. 68, while it retains oLs in both places. The confusion of attestation introduced by these several cross currents of change is so great that of the seven principal MSS SABCDA no two have the same text in all four places. Neither of the two extreme arrangements, the Syrian (with A), which recognises the double cockcrowing in all four places, and that of s c, which recognises it nowhere but simply follows the other Gospels, could have (given

rise to the other readings. The chief cause of disturbance is manifestly the attempt to supply an explicit [page 244] record of the first cock-crowing, and the original absence of Kni aXeKTCOp f®gV5fffV in v. 68 is sufficiently attested by SBL It 17 c me. Half however of this group, as we have seen, followed the alternative expedient of omitting eJc Afvrepør, two of the number going on to omit the following 8ts: and thus it appears that the only consistent authorities for the true text in this series of variations are B, a lectionary, and the Memphitic.

§324. Such being the results of an examination of ternary variations, it is no wonder that binary variations likewise supply us with multitudes of readings of B, slenderly supported or even alone, which have every appearance of being genuine, and thus exemplify the peculiar habitual purity of its text. Readings like these are striking illustrations of the danger of trusting absolutely to even an overwhelming plurality of early and good authorities (see § 282 f.), and the need of bearing in mind the distorting effects of mixture. For instance it is morally certain that in Gal. vi IS B, with two good cursives and some Versions and Fathers, is right in reading ou.re yap for eY yap XPL>TQ,) `I11??ul ourc, which is borrowed from v 6; and yet the array sustaining the interpolation includes fACDSGaPS with Versions and Fathers. Such a distribution could never have arisen except by a wide early adoption of a yet earlier aberration of some influential text, which here was evidently Western. On the other hand there are many subsingular readings of B that cannot claim more than the secondary rank of alternative readings which may possibly be genuine, and there are many others that may be safely rejected. The claims of absolutely singular readings of }3 in binary variations are naturally found to be usually of no great strength, though some among them appear to be very possibly genuine, and their genuineness would not be out

Page 123

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

some among them appear to be very possibly genuine, and their genuineness would not be out of harmony with the known textual relations of B. [page 245]

§325. The existence of numerous genuine subsingular readings of B in binary variations gives the key to the origin of another class of variations, fundamentally the same but different in appearance, which, though rare in the Gospels, are not uncommon in the other books preserved in B. The peculiarity of these variations consists in the agreement of B with the Syrian text against the great mass of documents representing the more ancient texts. How is this distribution to be explained? Are these readings of 13 corruptions of its fundamental text from a Syrian source, or do they belong to its fundamental text, so that they must have stood in the purest of the texts out of which the Syrian text was constructed? Internal evidence is decisively favourable to the second answer for at least the larger number of passages, and thus affords a strong presumption for the rest. Perhaps the most striking example is the well known variation in I Cor. xv 5I, where there can be no doubt that the peculiar form of St Paul's words, together with forgetfulness of the language of the apostolic age (I Thess. iv 15, 17), led to a transposition of the negative from the first clause to the second, and the introduction of a seemingly easy but fallacious antithesis. Here the wrong position of the negative is supported by S(A)CG3 17 with some Versions and Fathers, and also, with a verbal change, which probably formed part of the corruption in its earliest shape, by D3 with other Versions and Fathers. Thus B alone of primary uncials, sustained however by the Memphitic and apparently by Origen and other good Fathers, as also by lost MSS mentioned by Fathers, upholds the true position in company with the Syrian text. The only difference of distribution between such cases and those noticed in the last paragraph is the [page 246] shifting of the Syrian documents from the one side to the other; and such a shifting is the natural result of the eclecticism of the Syrian revisers (see §§ 185 f.). Two causes have doubtless contributed to the unequal occurrence of the readings here described, genuine readings attested by B almost alone in addition to the Syrian documents, so that if the Syrian attestation were removed they would be subsingular readings of B j their greater abundance in the Acts and

Epistles than in the Gospels being partly due to the more rapid and more widely current corruption of the Gospels, and partly to the relative paucity of extant uncials containing the Acts and Epistles. The former cause belongs to the actual history of the text; the latter is a mere accident in the preservation of documents to this day.

F. 326-329 Singular and subsingular readings of S and other MSS

§326. Turning from B to Sy we find ourselves dealing with the handiwork of a scribe of different character. The omissions and repetitions of small groups of letters are rarely to be seen; but on the other hand all the ordinary lapses due to rapid and careless transcription are more numerous, including substitutions of one word for another, as when yLviotrKet aVTOVS replaces ffK17V

§327. These various characteristics of the singular and subsingular readings of S are easily explained in connexion with the relation between the texts of B and of S described above, and at the same time enable this relation to be ascertained with somewhat greater precision. The ancestries of both MSS having started from a common source not much later than the autographs, [page 248] they came respectively under different sets of influences, and each in the course of time lost more or less of its original purity. With certain limited exceptions already

Page 124

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

course of time lost more or less of its original purity. With certain limited exceptions already noticed, the concordance of B and S marks that residual portion of the text of their primitive archetype in which neither of the two ancestries had at any point adopted or originated a wrong reading. Where their readings differ, at least one of the ancestries must have departed from the archetypal text. The possibility that both have gone astray in different ways must remain open, for it would be only natural that there should be an occasional coincidence of place between corruptions admitted into the one line of transmission and corruptions admitted into the other; and as a matter of fact there are a few passages where it is difficult to think that either B or S has preserved the reading of the common original. But these coincidences are likely to be only exceptional; and all that has been observed up to this point respecting the character of our two MSS justifies a strong initial presumption in each particular case that the text of their archetype is preserved in one or other of them.

§328. It follows that any subsingular, or even singular, reading of either B or S may owe the limitation of its attestation to either of two totally different sets of antecedents. A subsingular reading of 13 (or x) may be, first, equivalent to a subsingular reading of sB combined, which has lost part of its attestation by the accidental defection of S (or B); it may be, secondly, an early corruption limited in range of acceptance. Both explanations being in all cases possible, the antecedent probabilities differ widely according as the one or the other MS is in question. The ancestry of B posterior to the common archetype was probably a chain of very few [page 249] links indeed; certainly the various transcribers who had a hand in making it must either have been in a position which kept them ignorant of the great popular textual corruptions of the second and third centuries or must have for the most part preferred to follow their own inherited exemplars. It was not so in all cases, as is shown by such examples as those which have been cited above (§ 326); and an exceptional adulteration of the fundamental text of B must be recognised as having occasionally left X alone where SB ought, so to speak, to have stood together. On the other hand the certainty that the ancestry of S posterior to the common archetype must, at one or more points in its history,

have been exposed to contact with at least two early aberrant texts, since it accepted a considerable number of their readings (§ 205), enables us to account at once for the good internal character of most subsingular readings of B, and for the questionable internal character of most subsingular readings of 8. Where the corrupt readings adopted by the ancestors of S happened to be widely adopted in current texts likewise, B would be left with little or no support from Greek MSS; that is, the true text of the common archetype would be preserved in subsingular readings of B. Where the corrupt readings adopted by the ancestors of S happened to find little or no reception in eclectic texts, B and mixed Greek texts generally would be found alike attesting the true text of the common archetype, and subsingular readings of S would be nothing more than examples of early aberration early extinguished. The erroneous subsingular readings of B, proportionally as well as absolutely much less numerous than those of S, may be described in the same general terms with respect to their genealogical cha[page 250] racter, subject to the difference that the sources of corruption in B are for the most part of a sporadic and indeterminate character (g 204). Finally, the absence of any external criterion for referring the various singular and subsingular readings of either MS to one or other of the two possible origins, combined with the exceptional antiquity and purity of the fundamental text which they both preserve intact in very large though unequal proportions, demands a specially vigilant consideration for every such reading of both before it is definitely rejected.

reading of both before it is definitely rejected.

§329. It may be added explicitly here that, except for the Apocalypse, and the peculiar Western non-interpolations of the Gospels, a similar examination of the singular and subsingular readings of every extant MS except B and s leads to entirely unfavourable results. There are a few, a very few, cases in which the genuineness of such a singular or subsingular reading must be admitted as possible: but all such readings occur, we believe, in ternary or more composite variations, and differ from the readings of B or S merely by the absence of some slight erroneous modification. The same general statement may likewise be made respecting the trial of individual MSS by means of binary combinations into which S and B do not enter (as in the Gospels CD, CI,, CZ, C5, DL, DZ, LA, Lt, AC, AD &c.), or indeed respecting any other application of Internal Evidence of Groups to the testing of their internal character.

G. 330-339. Determination of text where B and S differ

§330. It will be evident from the foregoing pages that B must be regarded as having preserved not only [page 251] a very ancient text, but a very pure line of very ancient text, and that with comparatively small depravation either by scattered ancient corruptions otherwise attested or by individualisms of the scribe himself. On the other hand to take it as the sole authority except where it contains self-betraying errors, as some have done, is an unwarrantable abandonment of criticism, and in our opinion inevitably leads to erroneous results. A text so formed would be incomparably nearer the truth than a text similarly taken from any other Greek MS or other single document: but it would contain many errors by no means obvious, which could with more or less certainty have been avoided by the free use of all existing evidence.

§331. Enough has already been said on the determination of the text where B is supported by

S. A few words must be added here on the mode of dealing with the numerous variations in which these two preeminent MSS differ from each other. Setting aside ternary variations, most of the distributions in which the conflict of t5 and B requires notice belong to one or other of the three following types: (1) B with a small group against the rest; (2) S and 13 each with a large group dividing the array; and (3), much less important, S with a small group against the rest. The characteristics and twofold genealogical antecedents of the first and third have been already considered (§§ 324, 326 ff). In the first two cases, and also to a limited extent in the third, Genealogy and Internal Evidence of Groups have brought us to the point of having two readings before us, with so real a conflict of authority that, notwithstanding the habitually greater integrity of text in B than in 8, the normal relations between the different kinds of evidence are to [page 252] a certain extent disturbed. Two classes of evidence rise into unusual importance here, Secondary documentary evidence and Internal evidence. The effects of both under these circumstances are the same; first to rescue a slenderly attested reading from being entirely set aside and next, if the two classes of evidence sustain each other, or either is of exceptional strength, to render superfluous the retention of the other reading as an alternative. The bearing of Internal evidence, which here can be only Internal Evidence of Readings, requires no special comment. The change in the relative importance of Secondary documentary evidence will need a little explanation.

§332. All Secondary documentary evidence has its value for these variations, in so far as it shews a given reading attested by a primary MS not to be an individualism; provided of course Page 126

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

shews a given reading attested by a primary MS not to be an individualism; provided of course that the coincidence is such as cannot well be accidental. By supplying diversity of attestation, It has at the least the effect of proving that the reading had some sort of pedigree; and, considering the absence of very close and immediate relations of affinity between most extant documents, the pedigree must usually have been of some length. Little would be gained by this were the uncial itself secondary: but if its readings are habitually good in an exceptional proportion, the relative probability of the given reading is at once much increased.

§333. There is however a much greater increase of authority when the secondary evidence is that of a peculiarly good element in a mixed document, being then equivalent to fragments of a document which if continuously preserved would have been of primary or not much lower rank. Such elements are found, for instance, [page 253] in some Mixed Latin MSS, and also in some cursive Greek MSS. If a given cursive is observed to concur several times with the very best documents against not only all or almost all other cursives but almost all uncials in favour of a manifestly right reading, we know that it must contain an element of exceptional purity, and reasonably infer that the same element is the parent of other less certain readings in supporting which it joins with perhaps a single primary uncial only. Under these conditions the uncial may receive weighty documentary support from an apparently insignificant document.

§334. On a superficial view it might seem arbitrary to assign a given cursive or other mixed document high authority in those variations which differ from the common text, and refuse it any authority where it agrees with the common text. As however has been implicitly shown in former pages (§ 197), this view derives its plausibility from neglect of the conditions on which criticism allows authority to a document on the ground that it is 'good', that is, gives it relative confidence in doubtful cases because it has been found on the right side in clear cases in which most documents are on the wrong side. If the homogeneousness of a

cursive text is found to be broken by sporadic ancient readings, we know that we have virtually two distinct texts to deal with under the same name; that is, the readings discrepant from the common text proclaim themselves as derived from a second ancestor which had an ancient text. It can never indeed be positively affirmed that all the readings agreeing with the common text came distinctively from the principal or Syrian ancestor of the supposed cursive, for in regard of any one such reading [page 254] it is always speculatively possible that it may have had a place in the virtually Pre- Syrian as well as in the Syrian ancestor: but in the face of the certainty that it must have existed in the Syrian ancestor this speculative possibility has no appreciable force for the purposes of criticism.

§335. It so happens that the relation between two extant uncial MSS of St Paul's Epistles illustrates vividly the composite origin of many texts, including the texts of some at least of such cursives as have been noticed above. The St Germain MS E3, apparently written in Cent. x or late in Cent. IX, has long been recognised as a copy of the Clermont MS D2, executed after D2 had suffered much revision by correcting hands: a possible doubt as to the direct derivation of the one from the other is taken away by the senseless readings which the scribe of E3 has constructed out of a combination of what was written by the original scribe of D2 and what was written by its correctors;—an interesting illustration, it may be observed in passing, of the manner in which the strange BSaJOpO-Op of SX in 2 Pet. ii 15 must have resulted from a fusion of the two readings BLLOP and Bo(rop. D2, it will be remembered (§§ 100 f., 203), was written in

Page 127

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

two readings BLOP and Bo(rop. D2, it will be remembered (§§ 100 f., 203), was written in Cent. VI, and has a Western text. The readings introduced by the two chief correctors referred to Cent. VII (D2??) and Cent IX (D2b) respectively, and especially the readings due to the later of the two, are for the most part Syrian: on the other hand, while the later corrector alters many Pre-Syrian readings which his predecessor had passed over, he fails to make his own assimilative revision complete.

§336. A short passage from D2 (Rom. xv 31-33) will sufficiently exhibit the chief phenomena of the corrections and transcription, the readings of the correctors being set between the lines: Lva puat??Lo arro TLOV ars/douvrsDv ev raw tva 7?? O??CLKOVLCL els lovoata Kal r; oxpof opLa yov r/ ev I17??L 2 ??v,rpoaol Icos y6v/ra Ov roLs ayLotsp tva e'v xapa f'X00 rrpos vfiLas Sca SeX/yaros Xv `Iv dots KQL ava??rL;l??Lo yeS' VtULOV o af Seos rr/s f lpxpwys

r)rx yera qvavrLilv VLLLI)V ay 2 7V. This passage contains five Western readings, of which the first four, 71 8SpofopL'aS fV (before `ifpOL 2JLI??15??L)?? XpLrrrou `117LJOV, and the of zrfreo, are brought by the correctors into conformity with [page 255] the true and the Syrian texts alike; the fifth, ava??vl??Lo yefi' U,LLLOV for rJVV(LVa??avu LujLLLL V??LLV, remains untouched. The two Western readings which are also Syrian, ysvr/ras roLs

ayLots for r. a. y. and e'A??Lo...lcaL for L'A??LOV, are likewise left as they were. Lastly, the second L'va, omitted by all PreSyrian authorities, is inserted in agreement with the Syrian text. Of the five changes here made :1Eg adopts the first three, substituting them for the original readings of D2. The last two it neglects, retaining the original readings: the correctors' omission of ritrz was apparently expressed by cancelling dots, which might easily escape the eye; the disregard of tRcov is probably due merely to carelessness, of which the scribe gives abundant signs. It will be seen at once that, if both the later corrector of D2 and the scribe of En had done effectually that which they evidently proposed to

do, E3 would in this place have simply represented the Syrian text; and that the combined negligence was the cause of the survival of three Western readings.

§337. These instructive phenomena naturally receive little consideration now, because the exact knowledge that we possess of the original D2 renders attention to the copy E3 superfluous. Supposing however that D2 had been lost, the complex antecedents of the text of EB would have been unknown: it would have presented itself merely as a Syrian document sprinkled with Western readings. When then we find other late MSS having a Syrian text sprinkled with Western or other Pre-Syrian readings, we may reasonably take D2 and Ea as exhibiting the manner in which the mixture has probably arisen, and indirectly illustrating other possible modes of mixture. Evidently the textual value of E3 is virtually confined to the fragments which it preserved of the original writing of D2, while in the absence of D2 there would be no way of distinguishing these fragments from the rest of the text except by their discrepance from the Syrian text: and in like manner discrepance from the Syrian text is the only safe test for the readings of the ancient element in any late mixed document, because in late times the texts which would be virtually taken as standards for assimilative correction were naturally Syrian, no others being current.

§338. It is true that by attending to the discrepant readings alone we should be neglecting some readings which as a matter of fact were in the original writing of D2, namely the Western readings that became Syrian (in the passage cited these are the change of order and the [page

Page 128

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

readings that became Syrian (in the passage cited these are the change of order and the [page 256] resolved construction): but if D2 had been lost there would have been no means of knowing this. Two courses alone would have been open; to attend exclusively to the readings discrepant from the Syrian text, as being almost certainly derived from the Non-Syrian element in the ancestry of E3; or to allow to all the readings of E3 whatever authority the discrepant readings might claim. In the former case there would be a negative disadvantage; a necessary loss of evidence, but no falsification of it: the composite text of E3 would be virtually ignored outside the definite limits, but the risk of attributing to the better element of its ancestry readings due in fact to the worse would be avoided. In the latter case there would be a certainty of extensive positive error, since E3 obviously abounds in purely Syrian readings, and yet, for want of a discriminative test, they would be included with the rest in the general attribution of the authority belonging properly to the more ancient element alone. Here again D2 and E3 elucidate the necessity of limiting the separate authority of cursives containing ancient elements of text to their Non-Syrian readings (see the end of § 334).

§339. Some weight might doubtless be consistently given to the cumulative negative evidence against a reading supplied by the absence of any cursive attestation whatever; because it might be anticipated that the fortuitous irregularity with which the ancient readings are scattered over any one mixed text would be neutralised by the juxtaposition of all mixed texts, so that a genuine reading would be likely to obtain attestation from at least one or other of the number. But the anticipation is not verified by experience, for numerous absolutely certain readings have no cursive or other similar attestation; and this fact has to be taken into account in doubtful cases. Here, as in all cases where textual character is in question what is said of cursives applies equally to late uncials: the outward and formal difference between the two classes of MSS involves no corresponding difference of texts.

H. 340-346. Determination of text where B is absent

§340. The comparative certainty afforded by the peculiar character of B is felt at once when we pass to parts of the text where it is wanting. As regards the ancient [page 257] texts, we lose the one approximately constant Greek neutral document: as regards Internal Evidence of Groups, we lose all the groups into which B enters. This state of evidence occurs under three different conditions; first, in detached variations in the Pauline Epistles, where the Western element of B has displaced its fundamental or neutral element, the absence of which is virtually equivalent to the absence of B; secondly, in those parts of the Pauline Epistles which were contained in the lost leaves of B, but in which the relations of the other documents are to a considerable extent illustrated by facts of grouping observed in those parts of the same series of books for which B is extant; and thirdly, in the Apocalypse, where analogies of grouping are to say the least imperfect, and the few important documents common to the rest of the New Testament present themselves in novel relations.

§341. First both in order of books and in gradation come the isolated Western readings of B in the Pauline Epistles. Where BD2G3 or BGa with other chiefly Western documents stand alone among Pre-Syrian documents, there is no difficulty. Distinctively Western substitutions or additions attested by B are with a few doubtful exceptions, as K??PUCcT S I Cor. ix 9, epyBvfvrXs xiv 28, fVOftI(VVifVO] 2 Cor. viii 24, VzftS...fffTf Gal. iv 28, which it is prudent

epyBvfvrXs xiv 28, fVOftI(VVifVO] 2 Cor. viii 24, VzftS...fffTf' Gal. iv 28, which it is prudent to retain as alternatives, of no better character than similar distinctively Western readings not supported by B. Such readings therefore as 7rAr/po??op??qcra?? for T??&np(1)(rat Rom. xv I3 (cf. v. 29 v. 1.), +LAOTYAOV^,aaT XV 20, Oll)pO+Opta for otaKovta xv 3I, Ap??orTo,BoAov xvi IO, OVOOf a7r:qA??ov Gal. i II, and the transposition of Ts 2 ovcr2?? KocpcvOto and v7taCMf'VOtS fV XPL>TZ I??c??ov (ancient lines) in I Cor. i 2 we have had no hesitation in rejecting. [page 258] The internal evidence is not so clear with respect to distinctively Western omissions, and for the present at least it is safest to indicate doubt about words omitted by this group. But where other documents not clearly Western form part of the attestation, interpretation of the evidence is often difficult, if the rival reading is well attested. We can have no security in these cases that B derived its reading from its neutral element: and, if it derived it from its Western element, then two alternatives are??possible: either the accessory documents are really Non-Western, in which case the rival reading is often Alexandrian; or they are mixed (usually Syrian) and have adopted a Western reading, in which case the rival reading is more likely to be simply Non-Western, although its attestation is consistent with its being Alexandrian. In these cases we have exactly the state of things, as far as regards extant attestation, which Griesbach assumed to have from early times existed everywhere (see § 251), an attestation which might easily be only Western opposed to an attestation which might easily be only Alexandrian. If however these variations are examined together, Internal Evidence is generally favourable to the apparently Non-Western readings: but in not a few cases the other reading must be retained as an alternative, or even appears to be the more probable of the two.

§342. Since in the Pauline Epistles B (as well as s, A, and C) sometimes supports distinctively Western readings, so that they gain, for instance, the attestation BD2G3 as well as sD2Ga, AD2G3, and (more rarely) CD2G3 and even ACD2G3 and occasionally sACD2G3, it might be asked what security we have that sBD2G3, or even the same group with other uncials added, do not make a Western combination. As a matter of attestation [page 259] the contingency

contains no improbability; and the recognition of it prescribes special watchfulness where there is no sufficient accessory Non-Western attestation, this being in fact another of the cases in which secondary documentary evidence of the better sort acquires a high interpretative value. But Internal Evidence is so favourable to the group SBD2G3 that except in a very few cases, as ov Rom. iv 8, atxya\ (oz??tovTa jaf CV T(0^ VO2a5) Vii 23, 17 omitted after Tov Osov I Cor. xv IO, aytots omitted I Thes. v 2 7, and KaL rVs a'^yvotrt7Tos added 2 COL Xi 3, we have not found reason to treat their readings as doubtful.

§343. We come next to the analogous difficulties which arise where I3 totally fails us as regards direct evidence, but still affords some indirect aid in the interpretation of groupings, namely in the latter part (ix I4-end) of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in the Pastoral Epistles, and in the Epistle to Philemon. Here too the main distinctive problem is how to distinguish oppositions of Western and Non-Western from oppositions of Non-Alexandrian and Alexandrian readings; and it has to be dealt with in the same manner as in the former case. Another uncertainty is suggested by a recollection of the excellence of subsingular readings of 13 in those parts of the Pauline Epistles which are preserved in it, and of the similar excellence of readings differing in attestation from these by the mere addition of the Syrian documents (§§ 324 f.). Evidently the only resource here is to allow an alternative place to readings slenderly supported, or supported chiefly by Syrian documents, provided that the attestation includes such documents as are often associated with B in its subsingular readings, and that the local internal evidence is favourable. It Page 130

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

associated with B in its subsingular readings, and that the local internal evidence is favourable. It would be convenient to an editor in this part of the New Testament to assign to S such an authority as a consideration of the whole evidence has up to this point constrained us to assign to B. But the absolute excellence of S is neither lessened nor increased by the loss of a purer MS: the comparative excellence of its fundamental text and the deterioration of that text by mixture alike remain unchanged, while the discrimination of the different elements through grouping is deprived of one important resource. Such being the case, the text of these eighteen or nineteen chapters of the Pauline Epistles is undeniably less certain than that of the rest, though, as far as we can judge, the uncertainty is small in amount and of no real moment.

§344. When at last we reach the Apocalypse, new and troublesome conditions of evidence are encountered. Not only is B absent, but historical landmarks are obscure, and familiar documents assume a new position. Probable traces of a Western and perhaps an Alexandrian text may be discerned, with analogous relations to the extant uncials which contain other books: but they are not distinct enough to give much help, and for the most part Internal Evidence of Groups is the highest available guide of criticism. As before, s has a large neutral element; but in addition to mixture, probably Western and Alexandrian, evident individualisms of the scribe, or of one of his immediate predecessors, come forth in much greater luxuriance than before, as also they do in the Epistle of Barnabas which follows the Apocalypse in the same handwriting; this less scrupulous treatment of the text being perhaps connected with the ambiguous authority of the Apocalypse in the canonical lists of Cent. IV, Nor is internal evidence as a rule here [page 261] favourable to S unsupported by other uncials: indeed a large proportion of the readings of the binary combinations sA, SC, sPS are questionable or clearly wrong. C preserves nearly the same character as in the Acts and Epistles. The elements of A apparently remain unchanged; but the

ancient or neutral element is larger. Both these MSS however acquire a high relative eminence through the want of compeers, or documents approximately such. Their consent is well supported by internal evidence, even where it has no documentary confirmation; and A stands quite alone, or unsustained by any other Greek MS, in some manifestly right readings, such as ,, in xii IO, and ft Tt5 itS afXyaX(})atav cts acx,ttaA

§345. We are by no means sure that we have done all for the text of the Apocalypse that might be done with existing materials. But we are convinced that the only way to remove such relative insecurity as belongs to it would be by a more minute and complete examination of the genealogical relations of the documents than we have been able to accomplish, nor have we reason to suspect that the result would make any considerable change.

§346. The relation of the `Received Text' to the ancient texts in the Apocalypse requires separate notice In all other books it follows with rare exceptions the text of the great bulk of cursives. In all the books in which there was an undoubted Syrian text the text of the great bulk of cursives is essentially Syrian, with a certain number of later (`Constantinopolitan') modifications; in other books the text is, if not Syrian, at least such as must have been associated with the original Syrian books at Constantinople. The exceptional readings of the `Received Text', in which it abandons the majority of the cursives, are hardly ever distinctively Alexandrian; in almost all cases they are Western readings, sometimes very slenderly attested, which evidently owe their place to coincidence with the Latin Vulgate, [page 263] having been adopted by Erasmus in the first instance, and never afterwards removed The foundation of the

Page 131

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

adopted by Erasmus in the first instance, and never afterwards removed. The foundation of the 'Received Text' of the Apocalypse on the other hand was a transcript of the single cursive numbered I: Erasmus had in his earlier editions no other Greek MS to follow, though eventually he introduced almost at random a certain number of corrections from the Complutensian text. Now I is by no means an average cursive of the common sort. On the one hand it has many individualisms and readings with small and evidently unimportant attestation: on the other it has a large and good ancient element, chiefly it would seem of Western origin, and ought certainly (with the somewhat similar 38) to stand high among secondary documents. While therefore the text of I differs very widely from the true text by its Western readings, its individualisms, and the large late or Constantinopolitan element which it possesses in common with other cursives, a text formed in the way that the 'Received Text' is formed in other books would probably have differed from the true text on the whole much more. Thus the 'Received Text' of the Apocalypse has a curiously anomalous position. Besides containing a small portion of text which, like some single words in other books with less excuse, was fabricated from the Latin by Erasmus without any Greek authority to supply a defect in his one MS, it abounds in readings which cannot be justified on any possible view of documentary evidence, and are as a matter of fact abandoned by all textual critics: and yet the proportion of cases in which it has adopted the readings most current in the degenerate popular Greek texts of the Middle Ages, though large, is probably smaller than in any other book of the New Testament. [page 264]

I. 347-355. Supplementary details on the birthplace and the composition of leading MSS

§347. In all that we have hitherto said we have taken no account of the supposed locality in which MSS were written, except in certain definite cases. The reason is because we do not believe anything certain to be as yet known. Up to a certain point the bilingual MSS (Graeco- Latin and Graeco-Thebaic) tell their own tale:

about no other important early MS is it as yet possible to make any geographical assertion with confidence. It is indeed usually taken for granted that the chief uncials of the New Testament were written at Alexandria. This floating impression appears to be founded on vague associations derived from two undoubted facts; (1) that the translations of the Old Testament which form the LXX were made at Alexandria, while the chief uncials of the New Testament agree in some prominent points of orthography and grammatical form (by no means in all) with the chief uncials of the LXX, the four oldest being moreover parts of the same manuscript Bibles, and (2) that A was at some unknown time, not necessarily earlier than the eleventh century, preserved at Alexandria, and is hence called the Codex Alexandrinus. The supposition cannot be pronounced incredible; but it is at present hardly more than a blind and on the whole improbable conjecture. An Alexandrian origin, much more an exclusively Alexandrian or Egyptian use, cannot be reasonably maintained for most of the unclassical orthographies and grammatical forms found in MSS of the New Testament, as we shall have to explain more at length in Part IV. The character of the substantive [page 265] texts affords only the most uncertain indications; for (1) there is no reason to suppose that more than a small fraction of the readings often called Alexandrian had any special connexion with Alexandria, and (2) the clearest phenomena of Versions of the fourth and fifth centuries shew how widely spread at that time were Greek MSS containing a large proportion of those readings which did really originate at Alexandria.

§348. Possibly hereafter some of the external accompaniments of the text may be found to contain trustworthy evidence. At present we know of almost nothing to appeal to except such orthographies as are shown by their isolated distribution to be due to scribes, not to the autographs. This evidence at best points only to the home or school of the scribe himself, and cannot take account of migration on his part. Such as it is, it suggests that A and C were connected with Alexandria. Orthographies apparently Alexandrian occur also in S, but chiefly or wholly in words for which A or C have them likewise. On the other hand some Western or Latin influence is very clearly marked in the usual or occasional spelling of some proper names, such as Icralc and I(TTPCLBALf[^T715] or IcropaNX[eLr71s]. In B the Alexandrian indications are to the best of our belief wholly wanting. Western indications are fainter than in X, but not absent. The superfluous euphonic r is sometimes inserted-in Iapar/X [(CTNS] but only in Acts, apparently implying the presence of Western or Latin influence in the scribe of that manuscript of Acts which was copied by the scribe of B. The substitution of XpLfTTO5 I??71Jovs for I17(rovs XPWTOS in places where it is almost certainly not right is mainly confined to Western documents, and it is also in St Paul's Epistles a favourite individualism of B. [page 266]

§349. Again it is remarkable that the principal Latin system of divisions of the Acts, found in the Codex Amtatinus and, slightly modified, in other Vulgate MSS, is indicated by Greek numerals both in s (with large irregular omissions) and in B, but is otherwise unknown in Greek MSS and literature. The numerals were apparently inserted in both MSS, certainly in S, by very ancient scribes, though not by the writers of the text itself, B indeed having antecedently a wholly different set of numerals. The differences in detail are sufficient to shew that the two scribes followed different originals: the differences of both from the existing Latin arrangement are still greater, but too slight to allow any doubt as to identity of ultimate origin. The coincidence suggests a presumption that the early home,

and therefore not improbably the birthplace, of both MSS was in the West.

§350. The other systems of divisions marked in B and S have not hitherto yielded any trustworthy indications; and, what is more surprising, the same must be said of the structure and contents of the MSS themselves. It might have been anticipated that in order to ascertain the regions in which they were written it would suffice to observe what books they do or do not include, and in what manner the books are arranged, account being taken of the Old as well as the New Testament. But the attempt is baffled by the scantiness of our information. Comparison with the few extant catalogues and other evidence of local use in the fourth century leads only to ambiguous results; and the difficulty of decision is increased by the wide differences of structure and arrangement between B and S, and again between both and A. [page 267]

§351. Taking all kinds of indications together, we are inclined to surmise that B and s were both written in the West, probably at Rome; that the ancestors of B were wholly Western (in the geographical, not the textual sense) up to a very early time indeed; and that the ancestors of s were in great part Alexandrian, again in the geographical, not the textual sense. We do not forget such facts as the protracted unwillingness of the Roman church to accept the Epistle to the Hebrews, commended though it was by the large use made of it in the Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians: but the complex life of Christian Rome in the fourth century cannot safely be

Page 133

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

the Corinthians: but the complex life of Christian Rome in the fourth century cannot safely be measured by its official usage; and it would be strange if the widely current History of Eusebius led no Roman readers to welcome the full Eusebian Canon, with the natural addition of the Apocalypse, a book always accepted in the West. The supposition here made would account for all ascertained facts and contradict none. Yet we are well aware that other suppositions may be possibly true; and we must repeat that the view which we have here ventured to put forward as best explaining the sum total of the phenomena is only a surmise, on which we build nothing.

§352. The fundamental similarity of text throughout the whole of B, and again throughout the whole of S with the exception of the Apocalypse, deserves special notice, because it is more probable that the exemplars from which they were taken contained each only a single book or group of books than that they were large enough to contain the whole series of books (see §§ 14, 301). Even among cursives it is not uncommon to find one or more groups of books written in a different age from the rest, with which they are bound up; so that a transcript [page 268] of the whole volume would really represent two different exemplars (see § 46): and for a different reason a similar diversity of sources must often have been disguised by transcription in the fourth and fifth centuries. The transition from small portable MSS of limited contents is strikingly illustrated by a fortunate accident in the transcription of one of the four great comprehensive MSS which are the earliest now extant. In the MS of the Apocalypse from which C was taken some leaves had been displaced, and the scribe of C did not discover the displacement. It thus becomes easy to compute that each leaf of the exemplar contained only about as much as 10 lines of the text of the present edition; so that this one book must have made up nearly 120 small leaves of parchment, and accordingly formed a volume either to itself or without considerable additions. The distinctive character of text exhibited by A in the Gospels, by A in St Mark, and by B in the Pauline Epistles, as also the orthography of B (I

§353. A word may be added here respecting the different 'hands' of MSS. It

sometimes happened that the original scribe ('first hand') of a MS discovered that he had begun to transcribe wrongly, and accordingly corrected himself before going further: in such cases what he first wrote may have been either a mere blunder or the unconsciously remembered reading of another copy. After the completion of a MS it was often revised by a `corrector' with a view to the removal of clerical errors. The thoroughness with which this laborious process was carried out must however have varied to a singular extent: and moreover the revision appears sometimes to have included the occasional introduction of readings from a different exemplar. Changes made by a hand apparently contemporary with the original hand may usually be set down to the `corrector'. Additional changes might be made subsequently at any date on account of observed difference of reading from another MS simultaneously read or another current text. Sometimes these changes were confined to a small portion of text, or were sprinkled very thinly over the whole, sometimes they were comparatively systematic: but it is hardly ever safe to assume that a reading left unchanged is to be taken as ratified by the copy or text from which neighbouring changes were derived. Since corrections in previously written MSS, as distinguished from corrections made in the process of transcription, are not likely to be conjectures, they may be treated as virtually particles of other lost MSS at least as early as the time of correction: the textual value of the lost MSS can of course be ascertained only by successive examination [page 270] of their successive particles, and therefore often but imperfectly.

§354. For some six centuries after it was written B appears to have undergone no changes in its text except from the hand of the `corrector', the `second hand'. Among his corrections of clerical errors are scattered some textual changes, clearly marked as such by the existence of very early authority for both readings: the readings which he thus introduces imply the use of a second exemplar, having a text less pure than that of the primary exemplar, but free from clear traces of Syrian influence. The occurrence of these definite diversities of text renders it unsafe to assume that all singular readings which he alters were individualisms of the first hand, though doubtless many of them had no other origin. The scale of alteration was however very limited: hardly any of the corrections affect more than two or three letters, except the insertions of rightly or wrongly omitted words. Some few of the early corrections perceptible in the MS appear to have been made by the original scribe himself; and to his hand Tischendorf refers seven alternative readings placed in the margin of Matt. xiii 52; xiv 5; xvi 4; xxii 10, xxvii 4 Luke iii 1 (bis). In the tenth or eleventh century, according to Tischendorf's apparently well founded

judgement, the faded characters of the fourth century were retraced in darker ink. The readings adopted for renewal were almost always those of the second hand; and words or longer portions of text wrongly repeated by the original scribe were left untouched. There was no systematic attempt to correct the text itself, except as regards the orthography, which was for the most part assimilated to the common literary standard; but Syrian readings were introduced here and there, though rarely, if ever, in cases where there would be more than a trifling difference in the space occupied by the old and the new readings respectively. We have passed over the readings of this third hand of B in the Appendix because they not only were inserted at a very late period, but exhibit no distinctive internal character. Confusion between the second and third hands of B has led to much error; and it is only of late that the true history of the changes undergone by the

MS has been fully understood.

§355. The original writing of S has escaped retracement, but it has been altered much at different times. The three principal hands alone need mention here. The 'cor[page 271] rector' proper (R') made use of an excellent exemplar, and the readings which he occasionally introduces take high rank as authorities. Those of another hand (gfib) of somewhat similar appearance but ill determined date (? Cent.VI) are likewise for the most part distinctly ancient, but include many of later origin. The much more numerous readings introduced by ??o (? Cent. VII) are for the most part Syrian; but scattered among them are readings handed down from a

high antiquity: the exemplar employed by this writer had apparently some such mixed character as we find in X of the Gospels. These examples will suffice to illustrate the phenomena of correction generally. The manner in which it produces mixture of texts in transcripts from corrected MSS has been already explained by the example of D2 and Es (§§ 335-339). In some instances, as often in A and C, an erasure preceding correction has completely obliterated the original writing: but, as the amount of space which it occupied can almost always be ascertained, a comparison of the lengths of the existing variants is usually sufficient to determine the reading with tolerable certainty.

CHAPTER IV. SUBSTANTIAL INTEGRITY OF THE PUREST TRANSMITTED TEXT 356-374

§356. Having now described the nature of the evidence available for settling the text of the New Page 135

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

§356. Having now described the nature of the evidence available for settling the text of the New Testament, and explained the modes of applying it which leave least room for error, it is right that we should give some answer to the reasonable enquiry whether there is good ground for confidence that the purest text transmitted by existing documents is strictly or at least substantially identical with the text of the autographs. This enquiry will however be best approached through another, which is closely connected with the subject of the preceding chapter; namely, whether there is or is not reason to [page 272] think that, notwithstanding the peculiar authority conferred on the best uncials by the clear results of Genealogical Evidence proper and of Internal Evidence of Groups, the true reading is sometimes one that is attested by inferior documents alone. This antecedent enquiry is complementary to a question discussed in another place (§§ 265-283), how far Primary Greek MSS may safely be trusted where accessory attestation is more or less completely wanting. From the nature of the case there is no room for absolute and unqualified answers: but we trust that the following considerations, taken along with what has been said already, will meet all such doubts as can be raised with a fair show of reason.

357-360. Approximate non-existence of genuine readings unattested by any of the best Greek uncials

§357. The vague but necessary term 'inferior documents' covers two classes of evidence which demand attention on wholly different grounds; first, Greek uncials which in external character, as in conventional designation, have no generic difference from the best Greek uncials, and secondly, the earlier Versions and Fathers. First then it may be asked, -Given the relative supremacy which we have been led to ascribe under normal conditions to fB and S in most books, and to some extent to A and C in the Apocalypse, is there or is there not good ground

to expect that the true reading should sometimes exist not in them but in less good or in secondary Greek uncials? There is no theoretical improbability in the supposition here made. This is obviously true in cases where X and B are at variance, that is, where the positive evidence afforded by the coinci[page 273] dence of two extremely ancient independent lines is absent: for, where they differ from each other, the true reading may differ from that of either, and may have survived in an independent line to a somewhat later time, and so have found its way into other uncials. But the theoretical possibility holds good likewise where B and s agree, though reduced within much narrower limits. Near as the divergence of the respective ancestries of B and t; must have been to the autographs, there must have been an appreciable interval of transcription (§§ 241, 301 ff.); and it is a priori conceivable that relics of a line of transmission starting from a yet earlier point should find their way into one or another uncial of the fifth or following centuries, and further that such relics should include genuine readings which disappeared in the writing of an intermediate ancestor of B and X.

§358. When however the readings of secondary or even primary uncials in opposition to B and S are consecutively examined, they present no such phenomena, whether of accessory attestation or of internal character, as might have been expected were the supposition true. The singular readings with rare and unimportant exceptions have all the appearance of being individualisms. The scanty subsingular readings having some attestation by early Versions or Fathers will be noticed under the next head. The readings attested by two or more of these uncials, which make up by far the greater part of the whole number of these readings, can be

uncials, which make up by far the greater part of the whole number of these readings, can be recognised at once as distinctively Syrian or Alexandrian or Western, or as obvious modifications of extant readings having one or other such attestation and character. Among all the endless varieties of mixture there is a striking sameness in the elements mixed. The immediate sources of all our uncials not purely Syrian, except B and S, were evidently for the most part the popular eclectic texts of about the fourth century, Syrian or other, and not the various earlier and simpler AnteNicene texts from which the eclectic texts were compounded, and which the eclectic texts soon drove out of currency. Lastly, the verdict of internal evidence is almost always unfavourable where it is not neutral.

§359. Passing backwards to Ante-Nicene times, we have to deal with the second question, - May we or may we not reasonably expect to find true readings in very limited but very ancient groups of documents in opposition to Fs and x? There are many Pre-Syrian readings the antiquity of which is vouched for by Versions or Fathers, but which nevertheless are supported by no Greek MS but a stray uncial or two, or only by a few cursives, (such cursives naturally as are otherwise known to contain ancient elements of text,) or even in many cases by no Greek MS at all. The attestation of these readings, or at least of the second and third classes of them, resembles the accessory attestation of the subsingular readings of B, which we have already learned to judge on the whole favourably: it resembles also the accessory attestation of the subsingular readings of ??, which we have rarely found to have the stamp of genuineness. All such readings shew how plentiful a crop of variation existed in the early centuries and was swept out of sight by the eclectic texts.

§360. Readings thus attested by Versions and Fathers almost without support from existing Greek MSS have as yet received from critics no attention proportionate to their historical interest. The accident of their neglect by the Greek editors of the fourth century, [page 275] and their consequent approximate or complete extinction in Greek copies of the New Testament, can have no bearing on the character of their pedigree in the earlier ages. It is therefore but

right to enquire whether the accidental preservation of B and S does or does not give their texts an undeserved preeminence, which they would have lost had continuous uncials existed containing such texts as these stray readings represent. A scrutiny of the readings themselves dispels the suspicion. We have for our own part been quite prepared to find among these relics of ancient variation many readings highly commended by Internal Evidence: but experience has not justified any such anticipation. A very few readings absent from all existing Greek MSS we have thought it safest to retain as alternative readings; for instance in Matt. iv It HYYLK(V (for M(TaVOfrf, llylK??V yap), attested by syr.vt Orig(as represented by scllol Procop.Es. I44 Hier.Es.128) Vict.ant.Mc.273(expressly); and in I John iv 3 XveL (for ,u77 oKoXoyc??), attested by `ancient copies' mentioned by Socrates, and also by lat.vg Iren.lat(with context) Orig.Mt.lat;(?scllol) Tert Lucif Aug Fulg. There are a few others supported by yet slighter authority, which have an appearance of intrinsic probability in places where the better attested readings seem to be specially difficult; and these we have not attempted to separate from purely conjectural readings. Readings belonging to either of these classes are however in the highest degree exceptional, and do not disturb the general impression produced by examination of the whole number. Most indeed of the readings of great antiquity which stand in no extant Greek uncial are seen at a glance to be ordinary Western readings; so that doubtless the reason why those of them which occur in the Gospels [page 276] and Acts are deprived of the support of D

Page 137

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

those of them which occur in the Gospels [page 276] and Acts are deprived of the support of D is simply the comparative purity of its early Western text. While then it cannot be confidently affirmed that no relics of lines of transmission independent of the ancestries of B and s now exist in one or more secondary documents of one kind or another (compare § 357), the utmost number of such relics is too petty, even with the inclusion of doubtful instances, to affect appreciably the conclusions already obtained. It is of course only with such evidence as actually exists that the primary uncials can be brought into comparison: but the fullest comparison does but increase the conviction that their preeminent relative purity is likewise approximately absolute, a true approximate reproduction of the text of the autographs, not an accidental and deceptive result of the loss of better Greek MSS.

361-370. Approximate sufficiency of existing documents for the recovery of the genuine text, notwithstanding the existence of some primitive corruptions

§361. The way has now been cleared for the final question,--Is it or is it not reasonable to expect that in any considerable number of cases the true reading has now perished? Have we a right to assume that the true reading always exists somewhere among existing documents? The question is often foreclosed on one or both of two grounds which in our judgement are quite irrelevant. First, some think it incredible that any true words of Scripture should have perished. In reply it is a sufficient argumentum ad hominem to point to the existence of various readings, forming part of various texts accepted for long ages, and the frequent difficulty of [page 277] deciding between them, even though we say nothing of difficulties of interpretation: on any view many important churches for long ages have had only an approximately pure New Testament, so that we have no right to treat it as antecedently incredible that only an approximately pure New Testament should be attainable now, or even in all future time. For ourselves we dare not introduce considerations which could not reasonably be applied to other ancient

texts, supposing them to have documentary attestation of equal amount, variety, and antiquity. Secondly, the folly and frivolity of once popular conjectures have led to a wholesome reaction against looking beyond documentary tradition. Some of them are attempts to deal textually with what are really difficulties of interpretation only; the authors of others, though they propose remedies which cannot possibly avail, are not thereby shown to have been wrong in the supposition that remedies were needed; and a few have been perhaps too quickly forgotten. Though it cannot be said that recent attempts in Holland to revive conjectural criticism for the New Testament have shown much felicity of suggestion, they cannot be justly condemned on the ground of principle. The caution imposed by the numerous failures of the earlier critics has on the whole worked well; but it has no bearing on the question at issue.

§362. On the other hand a strong presumption in favour of the immunity of the text of the New Testament from errors antecedent to existing documents is afforded by the facts mentioned under the last head (g 35 7-360). If among the very ancient evidence now extant, collected from various quarters, so little can be found that approves itself as true in opposition both to B and ??, [page 278] there is good reason at the outset to doubt whether any better readings have perished with the multitudes of documents that have been lost.

§363. The question however needs more careful consideration on account of the apparent ease

§363. The question however needs more careful consideration on account of the apparent ease and simplicity with which many ancient texts are edited, which might be thought, on a hasty view, to imply that the New Testament cannot be restored with equal certainty. But this ease and simplicity is in fact the mark of evidence too scanty to be tested; whereas in the variety and fullness of the evidence on which it rests the text of the New Testament stands absolutely and unapproachably alone among prose writings. For all other works of antiquity, the Old Testament (in translations) and some of the Latin poets excepted, MSS earlier than the ninth or even tenth century are of extreme rarity. Many are preserved to us in a single MS or hardly more; and so there is little chance of detecting corruption wherever the sense is good. Those only which are extant in many copies of different ages present so much as a distant analogy with the New Testament: and, if through the multitude of various readings, and the consequent diversities of printed editions, they lose the fallacious uniformity of text which is the usual result of extreme paucity of documents, there is always a nearer approximation to perfect restoration. Doubtful points are out of sight even in critical editions of classical authors merely because in ordinary literature it is seldom worth while to trouble the clearness of a page. The one disadvantage on the side of the New Testament, the early mixture of independent lines of transmission, is more than neutralised, as soon as it is distinctly perceived, by the antiquity and variety of the evidence; [page 279] and the expression of doubt wherever doubt is really felt is owing to the paramount necessity for fidelity as to the exact words of Scripture.

§364. But it will be seen from the preceding pages that we possess evidence much more precisely certified than by the simple and general titles of antiquity, excellence, and variety. Two or three of our best documents might have been lost, and yet those titles might still be justly claimed; while without those documents both the history of the text and its application would be so imperfectly understood that the results in that case would be both different and more uncertain. It is the minute study of the whole evidence in relation to the best documents which brings out their absolute and not merely their relative excellence. The external

evidence is therefore such that on the one hand perfect purity is not a priori improbable, and a singularly high degree of purity is highly probable; and yet the conditions are not such-it is difficult to see how they could ever be such-as to exclude the possibility of textual errors.

§365. These general probabilities however are but preparatory to the definite question,-Are there as a matter of fact places in which we are constrained by overwhelming evidence to recognise the existence of textual error in ??11 extant documents? To this question we have no hesitation in replying in the affirmative. For instance in 2 Pet. iii lo fBKαPS with three of the best cursives and two Versions read (TTOLXfEa oe Kaverov,bLeva Av6r/??reral Kat yrl Kac Ta ev avT17 epRya espeAricrexaL. Before erpe??(reTaL two other Versions insert a negative. C replaces evpe??7(reTaL by a??paVL??ftri??ovTaL?? for which we find KaTaKa??eTaL in ALS and most cursives and [page 280] several Versions and Fathers; while one representative of the Old Latin omits it altogether. External evidence is here strongly favourable to erpf G;q??cTat, as must be felt even by those who do not see any special significance in the concordance of :4 and B. Internal evidence of transcription is absolutely certain on the same side, for cvpedwycrercu fully accounts for all four other readings, two of them being conjectural substitutes, two less audacious manipulations; while no other reading will account for the rest. Yet it is hardly less certain by intrinsic probability that erpe07y(rsTaL cannot be right: in other words, it is the most original of recorded readings, the parent of the rest, and yet itself corrupt.

Conditions of reading essentially the same, in a less striking form, occur here and there in other places.

§366. But there is no adequate justification for assuming that primitive corruption must be confined to passages where it was obvious enough to catch the eye of ancient scribes, and would naturally thus lead to variation. Especially where the grammar runs with deceptive smoothness, and a wrong construction yields a sense plausible enough to cause no misgivings to an ordinary reader, there is nothing surprising if the kind of scrutiny required for deliberate criticism detects impossible readings accepted without suspicion by all transcribers. On the various kinds of primitive errors, and the nature of the evidence on which in each case their existence can be affirmed, we have said enough in the Second Part (§§ 85-92).

§367. Little is gained by speculating as to the precise point at which such corruptions came in. They may be due to the original writer, or to his amanuensis if he wrote from dictation, or they may be due to one of the [page 281] earliest transcribers. Except from extraneous sources, which here have no existence, it is never possible to know how many transcriptions intervened between the autograph and the latest common ancestor of all the elements in all extant documents; and a corruption affecting them all may evidently have originated at any link of that initial chain. Moreover the line of demarcation between primitive and other corruptions is less easy to draw than might be supposed. As was intimated above (§ 360), account has to be taken of a few places in which what appears to be the true reading is found exclusively in one or two secondary or hardly even secondary documents; perhaps transmitted from the autograph, and preserved by some rare accident of mixture notwithstanding the otherwise complete extinction of the line of transmission by which it had been conveyed, perhaps due only to a casual and unconscious emendation of an erroneous current reading. But these gradations of primitiveness in corruption have no practical

moment. The only fact that really concerns us is that certain places have to be recognised and marked as insecure.

§368. The number of such places which we have been able to recognise with sufficient confidence to justify the definite expression of doubt is not great. If we exclude books in which the documentary attestation of text is manifestly incomplete, as the Apocalypse, some of the Catholic Epistles, and the latter part of Hebrews, it is relatively extremely small. There may be and probably are other places containing corruption which we have failed to discover: but judging by analogy we should expect the differences to be of no real interest. We cannot too strongly express our disbelief in the existence of undetected interpolations of any moment. This [page 282] is of course, strictly speaking, a speculative opinion, not a result of criticism. But we venture to think that the processes of criticism which it has been our duty to consider and work out have given us some qualifications for forming an opinion as to the probabilities of the matter. There are, it ought to be said, a few passages of St Matthew's Gospel (xii 40; [xiii 35 ;] xxiii 35; xxvii 9) in which it is difficult to believe that all the words as they stand have apostolic authority: the second part of xxvii 49 would have to be added to the list, if sufficient reasons should be found for accepting the possible but doubtful view that it is not a Non-Western interpolation, but an original reading omitted without authority by the Western text. But the question which these passages raise is rather literary than textual, for we see no reason to doubt that, as regards the extant form or edition of the first Gospel, their text as it stood in the autograph has been exactly preserved.

Page 140

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

exactly preserved.

§369. It will not be out of place to add here a distinct expression of our belief that even among the numerous unquestionably spurious readings of the New Testament there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes. The licence of paraphrase occasionally assumes the appearance of wilful corruption, where scribes allowed themselves to change language which they thought capable of dangerous misconstruction; or attempted to correct apparent errors which they doubtless assumed to be due to previous transcription; or embodied in explicit words a meaning which they supposed to be implied. But readings answering to this description cannot be judged rightly without taking into account the general characteristics of other readings exhibited by the same or allied docu[page 283] ments. The comparison leaves little room for doubt that they merely belong to an extreme type of paraphrastic alteration, and are not essentially different from readings which betray an equally lax conception of transcription, and yet are transparently guiltless of any fraudulent intention. In a word, they bear witness to rashness, not to bad faith.

§370. It is true that dogmatic preferences to a great extent determined theologians, and probably scribes, in their choice between rival readings already in existence: scientific criticism was virtually unknown, and in its absence the temptation was strong to believe and assert that a reading used by theological opponents had also been invented by them. Accusations of wilful tampering with the text are accordingly not unfrequent in Christian antiquity: but, with a single exception, wherever they can be verified they prove to be groundless, being in fact hasty and unjust inferences from mere diversities of inherited text. The one known exception is in the case of Marcion's dogmatic mutilation of the books accepted by him: and this was, strictly speaking, an adaptation for the use of his followers; nor had it apparently any influence outside the sect. Other readings of his, which he was equally accused of introducing, belonged manifestly to the texts of the copies which came into his hands, and had no exceptional character or origin. The evidence which has recently come to light as to his disciple Tatian's

Diatessaron has shown that Tatian habitually abridged the language of the passages which he combined; so that the very few known omissions which might be referred to a dogmatic purpose can as easily receive another explanation. The absence of perceptible fraud in the origination of any of the various readings [page 284] now extant may, we believe, be maintained with equal confidence for the text antecedent to the earliest extant variations, in other words, for the purest transmitted text, though here internal evidence is the only available criterion; and, as we have intimated above, any undetected discrepancies from the autographs which it may contain, due to other or ordinary causes, may safely on the same evidence be treated as insignificant. The books of the New Testament as preserved in extant documents assuredly speak to us in every important respect in language identical with that in which they spoke to those for whom they were originally written.

C. 371-374. Conditions of further improvement of the text

§371. The text of this edition of course makes no pretension to be more than an approximation to the purest text that might be formed from existing materials. Much, we doubt not, remains to be done for the perfecting of the results obtained thus far. Even in respect of the discovery of new documents, and fuller acquaintance with the contents of some that have in a manner been

Page 141

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

new documents, and fuller acquaintance with the contents of some that have in a manner been long known, useful contributions to the better understanding of obscure variations may fairly be expected. It is difficult to relinquish the hope that even yet Lagarde may be able to accomplish at least a part of his long projected edition of the testimonies of the oriental versions, so that the New Testament may be allowed to enjoy some considerable fruits of his rare gifts and acquirements: a complete and critically sifted exhibition of the evidence of the Egyptian versions would be [page 284] a specially acceptable boon. But it would be an illusion to anticipate important changes of text from any acquisition of new evidence. Greater possibilities of improvement lie in a more exact study of the relations between the documents that we already possess. The effect of future criticism, as of future discovery, we suspect, will not be to import many fresh readings; but there is reason to hope that the doubts between alternative readings will be greatly reduced.

§372. We must not hesitate however to express the conviction that no trustworthy improvement can be effected except in accordance with the leading principles of method which we have endeavoured to explain, and on the basis of the primary applications of them which have been here made to the interpretation of the documentary phenomena of the New Testament. It is impossible to entertain an equal degree of confidence in the numerous decisions which we have felt ourselves justified in making in comparatively obscure or difficult variations; because in these cases a greater liability to error was involved in the proportionally larger part inevitably played by individual personal judgements. Even where a text is certain enough to make the exhibition of alternative readings superfluous, gradation of certainty is a necessary consequence of the manifold gradations of evidence. But, while we dare not implicitly trust our own judgement in details, the principles of criticism here followed rest on an incomparably broader foundation, and in an overwhelming proportion of cases their application is free from difficulty. As was said at the outset, the best textual criticism is that which takes account of every class of textual facts, and assigns to the subordinate method corresponding to each class of textual [page 286] facts its proper use and

rank. All that has been said in the intervening pages has been an attempt to translate into language the experience which we have gradually gained in endeavouring to fulfil that aim.

§373. There is no royal road to the ascertainment of the true texts of ancient writings. Investigation of the history and character of documentary ancestries would indeed be out of place for the text of the New Testament if the documentary evidence were so hopelessly chaotic that no difference of authority could carry much weight as between readings all having some clearly ancient attestation. The consequent necessity of always judging chiefly by Internal Evidence of Readings would undeniably save much labour. But it would introduce a corresponding amount of latent uncertainty. The summary decisions inspired by an unhesitating instinct as to what an author must needs have written, or dictated by the supposed authority of 'canons of criticism' as to what transcribers must needs have introduced, are in reality in a large proportion of cases attempts to dispense with the solution of problems that depend on genealogical data. Nor would there be a material increase of security by the assignment of some substantial weight to documentary evidence, so long as it were found or thought necessary to deal with each passage separately, and to estimate the balance of documentary evidence by some modification of numerical authority, without regard either to genealogical affinities as governing the distribution of attestation or to the standard of purity which this or that document

governing the distribution of attestation or to the standard of purity which this or that document or group of documents habitually attains. Under all these circumstances the absence or neglect of the most essential kinds of textual evidence would leave a real precariousness of text which could be avoided only [page 287] by an enormously increased exhibition of alternative readings.

§374. For scepticism as to the possibility of obtaining a trustworthy genealogical interpretation of documentary phenomena in the New Testament there is, we are persuaded, no justification either in antecedent probability or in experience; and, if this be so, the range of uncertainty is brought at once within narrow limits. When it is clearly understood that coincidence of reading infallibly implies identity of ancestry wherever accidental coincidence is out of the question, all documents assume their proper character as sources of historical evidence, first respecting the antecedent lines of textual transmission, and then respecting the relation of each reading to these antecedent texts. Nearly a century and a half ago the more important ancient texts were clearly recognised, and the great subsequent accession of materials has but added certainty to this first generalisation, while it has opened the way for further generalisations of the same kind. Again, when it is seen that the variations in which decision is free from difficulty supply a trustworthy basis for ascertaining the prevalent character of documents and groups of documents, and thus for estimating rightly the value of their testimony in other places, little room is left for difference of estimate. Whatever may be the ambiguity of the whole evidence in particular passages, the general course of future criticism must be shaped by the happy circumstance that the fourth century has bequeathed to us two MSS of which even the less incorrupt must have been of exceptional purity among its own contemporaries, and which rise into greater preeminence of character the better the early history of the text becomes known. [page 288]

PART IV NATURE AND DETAILS OF THIS EDITION

A. 375-377. Aim and limitations of this edition

§375. The common purpose of all critical editions of ancient books, to present their text in comparative purity, is subject to various subordinate modifications. Our own aim, like that of Tischendorf and Tregelles, has been to obtain at once the closest possible approximation to the apostolic text itself. The facts of textual history already recounted, as testified by versions and patristic quotations, shew that it is no longer possible to speak of "the text of the fourth century", since most of the important variations were in existence before the middle of the fourth century, and many can be traced back to the second century. Nor again, in dealing with so various and complex a body of documentary attestation, is there any real advantage in attempting, with Lachmann, to allow the distributions of a very small number of the most ancient existing documents to construct for themselves a provisional text by the application of uniform rules, and in deferring to a separate and later process the use of critical judgement upon readings. What is thus gained in facility of execution is lost in insecurity of result: and while we have been led to a much slower and more complex mode of procedure by the need of obtaining impersonal and, if the word may be forgiven, [page 289] inductive criteria of texts, documents, and readings, we have at the same time found it alike undesirable and impossible to take any intermediate text, rather than that of the autographs themselves, as the pattern to be reproduced Page 143

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

intermediate text, rather than that of the autographs themselves, as the pattern to be reproduced with the utmost exactness which the evidence permits.

§376. Two qualifications of this primary aim have however been imposed upon us, the one by the imperfection of the evidence, the other by the nature of the edition. Numerous variations occur in which the evidence has not appeared to us decisive in favour of one reading against the other or the others; and accordingly we have felt bound to sacrifice the simplicity of a single text to the duty of giving expression to all definite doubt. In this respect we have followed Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tregelles: and it is a satisfaction to observe that Tischendorf's latest edition, by a few scattered brackets in the text and occasional expressions of hesitation in the notes, shewed signs of a willingness to allow the present impossibility of arriving every where at uniformly certain conclusions. Secondly, it did not on the whole seem expedient, in a manual text of the New Testament intended for popular use, to give admission to any readings unattested by documentary evidence, or to give the place of honour to any readings which receive no direct support from primary documents. Since then the insertion of any modern conjectures would have been incompatible with our purpose, we have been content to affix a special mark to places where doubts were felt as to the genuineness of the transmitted readings, reserving all further suggestions for the Appendix: and again, by an obvious extension of the same principle, the very few and unimportant readings which have both [page 290] an inferior attestation and some specially strong internal probability have not been elevated above a secondary place, but treated as ordinary alternative readings. Thus the text of this edition, in that larger sense of the word `text' which includes the margin, rests exclusively on direct ancient authority, and its primary text rests exclusively on direct ancient authority of the highest kind.

§377. Alternative readings are given wherever we do not believe the text to be certain, if the doubt affects only the choice between variations found in existing

documents. It is impossible to decide that any probable variation, verbal or real, is too trivial for notice; while it would be improper to admit any variation to a place among alternative readings except on the ground of its probability. Nothing therefore is retained among alternatives which in our judgement, or on final consideration in the judgement of one of us, has no reasonable chance of being right. But no attempt is made to indicate different shades of probability beyond the assignment to the principal and the secondary places respectively: and all probable variations not in some sense orthographical are given alike, without regard to their relative importance. Nor would it be strictly true to say that the secondary or alternative readings are always less probable than the rival primary readings; for sometimes the probabilities have appeared equal or incommensurable, or the estimates which we have severally formed have not been identical. In these cases (compare § 21) precedence has been given to documentary authority as against internal evidence, and also on the whole, though not without many exceptions, to great numerical preponderance of primary documentary authority as against high but narrowly limited attestation. [page 291]

B. 378-392. Textual notation

§378. The notation employed for expressing these diversities of probability or authority will need a little explanation in detail. We have been anxious to avoid excessive refinement and complexity of notation: but, as variations or readings of which we felt bound to take notice are

Page 144

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

complexity of notation: but, as variations or readings of which we felt bound to take notice are of three classes, which must on no account be confounded, we have been obliged to use corresponding means of distinction. Moreover every various reading belonging to any of these classes must by the nature of the case be either an omission of a word or words which stand in the rival text, or an insertion of a word or words absent from the rival text, or a substitution of a word or words for another word or other words employed in the rival text, or of an order of words for another order found in the rival text; and clearness requires that each of these three forms of variation should as a rule have its own mode of expression.

§379. The first class consists of variations giving rise to alternative readings in the proper sense; that is, variations in which both readings have some good ancient authority, and each has a reasonable probability of being the true reading of the autograph. To these the fundamental and simplest notation belongs. A secondary reading consisting in the omission of words retained in the primary reading is marked by simple brackets [] in the text, enclosing the omitted word or words. A secondary reading consisting in the insertion of a word or words omitted in the primary reading is printed in the margin without any accompanying marks, the place of insertion being indicated by the symbol T in the text. [page 292] A secondary reading consisting in the substitution of other words for the words of the primary reading is printed in the margin without any accompanying marks, the words of the primary reading being enclosed between the symbols < > in the text. Where there are two or more secondary readings, they are separated by v. in the margin; unless they differ from each other merely by the omission or addition of words, in which case they are distinguished from each other by brackets in the margin, enclosing part or the whole of the longer reading. Occasionally one of two secondary readings differs from the primary reading by omission only, so that it can be expressed by simple brackets in the text, while the other stands as a substitution in the margin. Changes of punctuation have sometimes rendered it necessary to express a possible omission by a marginal reading rather than by brackets (Luke x 41, 42; John iii 31, 32; Rom. iii 12).

Changes of accent have sometimes been likewise allowed to affect the form of alternative readings; but only when this could be done without inconvenience. A few alternative readings and punctuations are examined in the Appendix: they are indicated by Ap. attached to the marginal readings. Where there is likely to be any confusion of marginal readings answering to different but closely adjoining places in the text, they are divided by a short vertical line.

§380. The second class of notation is required for places in which there is some reason to suspect corruption in the transmitted text, if there is no variation, or in all the transmitted texts, if there is more than one reading (§§ 365-368). Under this head it has been found convenient to include a few places in which the reading [page 293] that appears to be genuine is not absolutely unattested, but has only insignificant authority (§§ 360, 367). Such suspicion of primitive corruption is universally indicated by an obelus (t) in the margin or small obeli (tt) in the text, and further explained by a note in the Appendix. The typical notation consists of Ap.t in the margin, the extreme limits of the doubtful words in the text being marked by < >, In a single instance (Apoc. xiii 16) the reading suspected to be genuine has been prefixed to Ap.f on account of the peculiar nature of the evidence. We have not however thought it necessary to banish to the Appendix, or even the margin, a few unquestionably genuine readings which are shown by documentary and transcriptional evidence to have been in all probability successful ancient emendations made in the process of transcription, and not to have been transmitted

ancient emendations made in the process of transcription, and not to have been transmitted continuously from the autograph (§ 88). Such true readings, being at once conjectural and traditional, have been placed in the text between small abeli (tt), the best attested reading being however retained in the margin with Ap. added, and an account of the evidence being given in the Appendix.

§381. Both the preceding classes of notation refer exclusively to places in which in our opinion there is substantial ground for doubting which of two or more extant readings is genuine, or in which no extant reading --in a few cases no adequately attested extant reading can be confidently accepted as genuine. The third class of notation on the other hand deals exclusively with readings which we believe to be certainly foreign to the original text of the New Testament in the strictest sense, and therefore to have no title to rank as alternative [page 294] readings, but which have in various degrees sufficient interest to deserve some sort of notice.

§382. For ordinary readings of this kind the Appendix is the fitting repository. In the Gospels and Acts however there are a considerable number of readings that have no strict claim to a place except in the Appendix, and yet plead strongly for a more immediate association with the true text. To have allowed them to be confounded with true alternative readings would have practically been a deliberate adulteration of the New Testament: but we have thought that on the whole historical truth would be best served by allowing them some kind of accessory recognition, and thus we have been forced to adopt additional modes of notation with peculiar symbols. None can feel more strongly than ourselves that it might at first sight appear the duty of faithful critics to remove completely from the text any words or passages which they believe not to have originally formed part of the work in which they occur. But there are circumstances connected with the text of the New Testament which have withheld us from adopting this obvious mode of proceeding.

§383. The first difficulty arises from the absence of any sure criterion for

distinguishing Western omissions due to incorrupt transmission, that is, Western noninterpolations, from Western omissions proper, that is, due only to capricious simplification (§ 240): whoever honestly makes the attempt will find his own judgement vacillate from time to time. On the whole it has seemed best that nothing should at present be omitted from the text itself on Western authority exclusively. Those Western omissions therefore which we can confidently accept as, properly speaking, non-interpolations are [page 295] marked by double brackets [[]]; while those about which there is a reasonable doubt are marked by simple brackets [], that is, they are not distinguished from ordinary cases of ambiguous evidence. Western omissions evidently arbitrary are of course neglected. The omission of the singular addition to Matt. xxvii 49 has been treated as a Western non-interpolation, as its early attestation was Western, though its adoption by the Syrian text has given it a wide range of apparent documentary authority. The last three chapters of St Luke's Gospel (xxii 19 f.; xxiv 3, 6, 12, 36, 40, 51, 52) supply all the other examples.

§384. The second consideration which has led to the adoption of an accessory notation for certain noteworthy rejected readings is of a different kind. It has been already pointed out (g 173, 239) that some of the early Western interpolations must have been introduced at a period when various forms of evangelic tradition, written or oral, were still current. There is accordingly no improbability in the supposition that early interpolations have sometimes preserved a record

no improbability in the supposition that early interpolations have sometimes preserved a record of words or facts not otherwise known to us. From a literary point of view such fragmentary and, as it were, casual records are entirely extraneous to the Gospels, considered as individual writings of individual authors. From a historical, and, it may be added, from a theological point of view their authority, by its very nature variable and indefinite, must always be inferior to that of the true texts of the known and canonical books; but as embodiments of ancient tradition they have a secondary value of their own which, in some cases at least, would render their unqualified exclusion from the Bible a serious loss. A rule that would for instance banish altogether from the printed [page 296] Gospels such a sentence as the first part of Luke xxiii 34 condemns itself, though the concurrence of the best texts, Latin and Egyptian as well as Greek, shews the sentence to be a later insertion. Yet single sayings or details cannot be effectually preserved for use except as parts of a continuous text: and there is no serious violation of the integrity of the proper evangelic texts in allowing them to yield a lodgement to these stray relics surviving from the apostolic or subapostolic age, provided that the accessory character of the insertions is clearly marked. Double brackets [[]] have therefore been adopted not only for the eight interpolations omitted by Western documents and by no other extant Pre-Syrian evidence, but also for five interpolations omitted on authority other than Western, where the omitted words appeared to be derived from an external written or unwritten source, and had likewise exceptional claims to retention in the body of the text (Matt. XYi 2 f.; Luke xxii 43 f.; xxiii 34), or as separate portions of it (Mark xvi 9-20; John vii 53--viii II).

§385. In addition to the specially important interpolations thus printed in the same type as the true text but with double brackets, there are many Western additions and substitutions which stand on a somewhat different footing from ordinary rejected readings; not to speak of the very few which, being possibly genuine, there was no need to separate from ordinary alternative readings. It was not so easy to decide whether any notice should be taken of any others. The influence of extraneous records or traditions of one kind or another is clearly perceptible in

some cases, and its presence may with more or less probability be suspected in others. On the other hand the great mass of these readings can have no other source [page 297] than paraphrastic or assimilative impulses of an ordinary kind. On the whole it seemed advisable to place in the margin between peculiar marks q F a certain number of Western interpolations and substitutions containing some apparently fresh or distinctive matter, such as might probably or possibly come from an extraneous source or which is otherwise of more than average interest, but having no sufficient intrinsic claim to any form of incorporation with the New Testament. We wish it accordingly to be distinctly understood that readings so marked are in our judgement outside the pale of probability as regards the original texts, and that it is only necessities of space which compel us unwillingly to intermix them with true alternative readings. Except in so far as they are all Western, they form an indefinite class, connected on the one side by intermediate examples (as Luke ix s4f.; xxiv 42) with the doubly bracketed readings, and on the other including readings which might with equal propriety have been noticed only in the Appendix (see § 386), or even passed over altogether. From the nature of the case the line was hard to draw, and perhaps some inconsistencies may be found, too much, rather than too little, having doubtless been here and there included; but for the present a provisional course has much to recommend it. Ultimately the readings enclosed within d F may probably be omitted with advantage. The Epistles and Apocalypse contain no Western readings which have any distinct title to be so marked. The paraphrastic change to which such books are liable differs much from the variation in the record of facts and sayings which easily invades books historical Page 147

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

much from the variation in the record of facts and sayings which easily invades books historical in form, more especially if other somewhat similar writings or traditions are current by their side. [page 298]

§386. There remain, lastly, a considerable number of readings which had no sufficient claim to stand on the Greek page, but which for one reason or another are interesting enough to deserve mention. They are accordingly noticed in the Appendix, as well as the other readings having some peculiar notation. It did not appear necessary to define by marks their precise place in the text: but the line to which each belongs is indicated in the margin by A,??. unaccompanied by any other word or symbol. This class of rejected readings, which includes many Western readings along with many others of various origin, is of course, like the preceding, limited only by selection, and might without impropriety have been either enlarged or diminished.

§387. The examination of individual readings in detail is reserved for the Appendix. In a few cases however a short explanation of the course adopted seems to be required here. First in importance is the very early supplement by which the mutilated or unfinished close of St Mark's Gospel was completed. This remarkable passage on the one hand may be classed among the interpolations mentioned at the end of § 384 as deserving of preservation for their own sake in spite of their omission by Non-Western documents. On the other it is placed on a peculiar footing by the existence of a second ancient supplement, preserved in five languages, sometimes appearing as a substitute, sometimes as a duplicate. This less known alternative supplement which is very short, contains no distinctive matter, and was doubtless composed merely to round off the abrupt ending of the Gospel as it stood with ε>λο??Sorvro yap for its last words. In style it is unlike the ordinary narratives of the Evangelists, but comparable to the four introductory [page 299] verses of St Luke's Gospel. The current supplement (xvi 9-20) was evidently an independently written succinct narrative beginning with

the Resurrection and ending with the Ascension, probably forming part of some lost evangelic record, and appropriated entire, as supplying at once a needed close to St Mark's words and a striking addition to the history, although the first line started from the same point as the beginning of the sixteenth chapter. The two supplements are thus of very unequal interest; but as independent attempts to fill up a gap they stand on equal terms, and may easily be of equal antiquity as regards introduction into copies of St Mark's Gospel; so that we have felt bound to print them both within [[]] in the same type. Moreover, as we cannot believe that, whatever may be the cause of the present abrupt termination of the Gospel at v. 8, it was intended by the Evangelist to end at this point, we have judged it right to mark the presumed defect by asterisks, and to suggest the probability that not the book and paragraph only but also the last sentence is incomplete.

§388. The Section on the Woman taken in Adultery (John vii 53-viii II) likewise required an exceptional treatment. No interpolation is more clearly Western, though it is not Western of the earliest type. Not only is it passed over in silence in every Greek commentary of which we have any knowledge, down to that of Theophylact inclusive (Cent. XI-XII); but with the exception of a reference in the Apostolic Constitutions (? Cent. IV), and a statement by an obscure Nikon (Cent. x or later) that it was expunged by the Armenians, not the slightest allusion to it has yet been discovered in the whole of Greek theology before the twelfth century. The [page 300] earliest Greek MSS containing it, except the Western Codex Bezae, are of the eighth century. It is absent from the better MSS of all the Oriental versions except the Aethiopic, and apparently Page 148

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

is absent from the better MSS of all the Oriental versions except the Aethiopic, and apparently from the earliest form of the Old Latin. In the West it was well known in the fourth century, and doubtless long before. It has no right to a place in the text of the Four Gospels: yet it is evidently from an ancient source, and it could not now without serious loss be entirely banished from the New Testament. No accompanying marks would prevent it from fatally interrupting the course of St John's Gospel if it were retained in the text. As it forms an independent narrative, it seems to stand best alone at the end of the Gospels with double brackets to shew its inferior authority, and a marginal reference within q F at John vii 52. As there is no evidence for its existence in ancient times except in Western texts, we have printed it as nearly as possible in accordance with Western documents, using the text of D as the primary authority, but taking account likewise of the Latin evidence and of such later Greek MSS as appear to have preserved some readings of cognate origin. The text thus obtained is perhaps not pure, but it is at least purer than any which can be formed on a basis supplied chiefly by the MSS of the Greek East.

§389. The short Section on the Man working on the Sabbath bears a curious analogy to the preceding, and is not unlikely to come from the same source. As however it is at present known only from the Codex Bezae, in which it replaces Luke vi 5, transposed to the end of the next incident, we have with some hesitation relegated it to the Appendix.

§390. The double interpolation in John v 3, 4 has been for other reasons consigned to the same receptacle. [page 301] Both its elements, the clause (K8fXO??(V@V TXV TSV taXT@V KtV??CtV and the scholium or explanatory note respecting the angel, are unquestionably very ancient: but no good Greek document contains both, while each of them separately is condemned by decisive evidence. In internal character it bears little resemblance to any of the readings which have been allowed to stand in the margin between the symbols M ??; and it has no claim to any kind of association with the true text.

§391. In some of the best documents a modified form of St John's statement (xix 34) about the piercing of our Lord's side is inserted in St Matthew's text after xxvii 49, although our Lord's death follows in the next verse. If the words are an interpolation, as seems on the whole most probable, their attestation involves no special anomaly, not being essentially different from that of the interpolations in Luke xxii and xxiv which are found in the best documents but omitted by the Western (§§ 240 f., 383). The superficial difference of attestation would seem to be chiefly if not wholly due to the accident that here the Syrian revisers preferred the shorter Western text. On this supposition the fortunate circumstance that their habitual love of completeness met with some counteraction, probably from a sense of the confusion arising out of the misplacement of the incident, has saved the texts of later times from a corruption which they might easily have inherited, and would doubtless have held fast. Apart however from the possibility that the words did belong to the genuine text of the first Gospel in its present form (see § 368), we should not have been justified in excluding them entirely from our text so long as we retained similar interpolations; and we have therefore inserted them, like the rest, in double brackets. [page 302]

§392. Besides the three classes of notation already explained, a peculiar type has been found necessary for the words *ev* 'E+eertL) in Eph. i I. If there were here, as usual, a simple issue of genuineness or spuriousness, the words would have to be condemned. But the very probable

genuineness or spuriousness, the words would have to be condemned. But the very probable view that the epistle traditionally entitled *I IPOS E4EE>IOY??R* was addressed to a plurality of churches has naturally given rise to a supposition that the words are not so much spurious as local, filling up an intentional gap in the text rightly for Ephesian readers, but intended to be replaced by *ev* and another name for readers belonging to other churches addressed. In expression of this view we have retained the words with a change of type in preference to leaving a blank space; as we see no reason to doubt that at least one primary recipient of the epistle was Ephesus, from which great centre it would naturally be forwarded to the churches of other cities of Western Asia Minor. We have thought it safer however to enclose *ev 'E+eoeo* in ordinary brackets, as Origen is perhaps right, notwithstanding the fanciful interpretation with which he encumbers his construction, in taking the words *70ts aytots TOtS OV(rtV Kaz 7rurToes ev Xpurrov 117(ro* to run on continuously, so that no place would be left for a local address.

C. 393-404. Orthography

§393. A short explanation remains to be given respecting the Orthography adopted, and also the various typographical details or other external arrangements, some purely formal, some closely related to sense, by which the contents of ancient MSS are presented in a shape adapted for ready use and understanding. An editor of the New Testament is often driven to wish that it were possible to evade the necessity of choosing between one mode of spelling and another. Much time would be saved by [page 303] adopting a conventional spelling, such as stands in the Received Text; and the many points of orthography in which there is little hope of arriving at approximate certainty in the present state of knowledge throw some serious discouragement on the attempt to reproduce the autographs in this as well as in more important respects. Yet it is not seemly, when the text of the New Testament is being scrupulously elaborated word by word, that it should be disfigured many times in every page by a slovenly neglect of philological truth. The abandonment of all restoration of the

original forms of words is also liable to obliterate interesting and perhaps important facts, affinities of authorship and the like being sometimes indicated by marks trivial in themselves. No strictly middle course is satisfactory: for, though not a few ancient spellings are placed above doubt by the consent of all or nearly all the better uncials, there is every gradation of attestation between these and spellings of highly questionable authority. We have therefore thought it best to aim at approximating as nearly as we could to the spelling of the autographs by means of documentary evidence; with this qualification, that we have acquiesced in the common orthography in two or three points, not perhaps quite free from doubt, in which the better attested forms would by their prominence cause excessive strangeness in a popular text. Under the head of spelling it is convenient to include most variations of inflexion.

§394. Much of the spelling in the current editions of Greek classical authors is really arbitrary, depending at least as much on modern critical tradition as on ancient evidence, whether of MSS of the book edited or of MSS of other books or of statements of Greek grammarians. Indeed to a great extent this artificiality of spelling is inevitable for want of MSS of any considerable antiquity. In the Greek Bible however, and especially in most books of the New Testament, there is a tolerable supply of available resources, so that criticism can occupy a position not unlike that which it holds with respect to Latin writings preserved in fairly ancient MSS.

unlike that which it holds with respect to Latin writings preserved in fairly ancient MSS.

§395. The spellings found in good MSS of the New Testament at variance with the MSS of the middle ages and of the Received Text are probably in a few cases the true literary spellings of the time, though not found in printed editions of other books: but for the most part they [page 304] belong to the `vulgar' or popular form of the Greek language. There has been as yet so little intelligent or accurate study of the later varieties of Greek that we must speak with some reserve: but we believe it is not too much to say that no undoubted peculiarities of a local or strictly dialectic nature are at present known in the New Testament. The often used term `Alexandrine' is, thus applied, a misnomer. The erroneous usage apparently originated partly in the mere name Codex Alexandrinus, the MS so called having been for a long time the chief accessible document exhibiting these forms, partly in the Alexandrian origin of the Septuagint version, assumed to have supplied the writers of the New Testament with their orthography: the imagined corroboration from the existence of the same forms in Egypt is set aside by their equally certain existence elsewhere. The term `Hellenistic' is less misleading, but still of doubtful propriety. It was coined to denote the language of Greek-speaking Jews: but, though the only extant books exhibiting in large number these modes of language were written either by Greek-speaking Jews or by Christians who might have derived them from this source, the same modes of language were certainly used freely by heathens in various parts of the Greek world. Another objection to the term `Hellenistic' is the danger of confusion with the `Hellenic' or `Common Dialect', that is, the mixed and variable literary language which prevailed from the time of Alexander except where Attic purity was artificially cultivated, a confusion exemplified in the practice of calling Philo a `Hellenistic' writer, though he has hardly a better title to the name than Polybius.

§396. A large proportion of the peculiar spellings of the New Testament are simply spellings of common life. In most cases either identical or analogous

spellings occur frequently in inscriptions written in different countries, by no means always of the more illiterate sort. The Jewish and Christian writings which contain them are of popular character: naturally they shew themselves least where literary ambition or cultivation are most prominent. Many found in inscriptions, in the LXX, and in some Christian apocryphal books are absent from the New Testament. Within the New Testament there is a considerable general uniformity: but differences as to books and writers are likewise discernible, and worthy of being noted; thus these spellings are least frequent with St Paul and the author of [page 305] the Epistle to the Hebrews, who are in other respects the most cultivated writers.

§397. A question might here be raised whether there is sufficient ground for assuming that the spellings found in the oldest MSS of the New Testament were also, generally speaking, the spellings of the autographs; whether in short the oldest extant orthography may not have been introduced in the fourth or some earlier century. Versions afford no help towards answering the question; and Fathers not much more, owing to the lateness of the MSS in which nearly all their writings have been preserved; though it is instructive to observe that the better MSS of some patristic writings shew occasional unclassical forms or spellings as used by the authors in their own persons as well as in quotations, while they disappear in inferior MSS. Although however there is a lack of direct evidence, the probabilities of the case are unfavourable to the hypothesis of the introduction of such forms by transcribers of the New Testament. In the fourth and following centuries, and even during a great part of the third, a natural result of the social

following centuries, and even during a great part of the third, a natural result of the social position of Christians would be a tendency of scribes to root out supposed vulgarisms, as is known to have been the case in the revisions of the Old Latin as regards grammatical forms as well as vocabulary. In this matter the orthography of late MSS has no textual authority. Like their substantive text, it is a degenerate descendant from the orthography of the early Christian empire, and cannot have survived independently from primitive times; so that its testimony to classical spellings is without value, being derived from the literary habits of scribes, not from their fidelity in transmission. Hence, be the spellings of our best MSS right or wrong, they are the most trustworthy within our reach. Even if it be taken as a possible alternative that they originated with the scribes of the second century, we must still either follow our best MSS or rewrite the orthography by blind conjecture. The simpler supposition that in the main they were transmitted from the autographs need not however be questioned. The unclassical forms or spellings of our MSS were certainly current in the apostolic age, as is proved by inscriptions; and they are not out of keeping with the prevalent characteristics of the diction of the New Testament: so that no tangible reason can be given why the apostles and other writers should not have employed them. [page 306]

§398. Accordingly in orthographical variations we have followed essentially the same principles as in the rest of the text; allowance being made in their application for the much smaller amount of documentary evidence, and for the facility with which all experience shews that accustomed spellings flow from the pens of otherwise careful transcribers. Possibly we may here and there have erred in adopting an unclassical form or spelling. It is still more probable that the writers of the New Testament employed unclassical forms or spellings. in many places where no trace of them now exists, and where therefore their present use could not be justified. Yet we have taken much pains as to individual details, and given perhaps only too much time to what are after all trifles, though in not a few

cases there was little hope of arriving at more than provisional results without a disproportionate extension of the field of labour. Fortunately in this matter the individual details are of less consequence than the general colouring which they collectively produce, and about the truth of the general colouring here given we have no misgiving. Even in details a liberal indication of alternative readings (see § 403) goes far towards suggesting the probable limits of uncertainty.

§399. The course of orthographical change during the centuries known to us from extant MSS coincided approximately with that of verbal or substantive change. But ancient spellings died out much more quickly than ancient substantive readings; so that the proportion of MSS containing them is considerably smaller. The evidence as to some of these spellings is complicated by coincidence with the range of itacism: that is, some of the rival forms differ from each other only by permutation of such vowels, including diphthongs, as are also liable to be exchanged for each other in mere error. Throughout the uncial period, of which alone it is necessary to speak here, some licence as to itacism is always present, and in a few late uncials the licence is gross and extensive: yet the confusion of vowels, especially in the more ancient copies, is found to lie within constant limits, which are rarely transgressed. Thus S shews a remarkable inclination to change fl into L, and B to change z into el, alike in places where either form is possible and in places where the form actually employed in the MS is completely discredited by the want of any other sufficient evidence or analogy; the converse confusions being very rare in both, and particu[page 307] larly in B. Hence B has to be left virtually out of account as an authority

Page 152

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

particu[page 307]larly in B. Hence B has to be left virtually out of account as an authority against unclassical forms with L, and X against unclassical forms with f??; while in the converse cases the value of their evidence remains unimpaired, or rather is enhanced, allowance being made for the possible contingency of irregular permutations here and there. Till the unsifted mass of orthographical peculiarities of a M S has been cleared from the large irrelevant element thus contributed by what are probably mere itacisms, no true estimate can be formed of its proper orthographical character. When this rectification has been made, it becomes clear that the unclassical forms and spellings abound most in the MSS having the most ancient text, and that their occurrence in cursives is almost entirely limited to cursives in which relics of a specially ancient text are independently known to exist.

§400. To accept however every ancient spelling differing from the late spellings would be as rash as to accept every Western reading because it is very ancient. Curiously enough, but quite naturally, the Western documents are rich in forms and spellings not found in other documents, and some few are also confined to documents in which the Alexandrian text is very prominent. Here again B holds a neutral place, having many spellings in common with each class of text. We have as a rule taken only such unclassical spellings as had the support of both classes, or of either alone with B. Even where 13 stands alone, we have usually followed it for the text, unless forbidden by some tolerably strong internal or analogical reason to the contrary. But in many cases there is no room for hesitation about the reading, all the best uncials being concordant.

§401. The irregularity of the extant orthographical evidence is so great that it would have often been unsatisfactory to decide on the form to be given to a word in any one place without previous comparison of the evidence in all or nearly all places where the same or similar words occur. Most orthographical variations have been carefully tabulated, and the readings decided on consecutively as they stood in the tables, not as they occur scattered among substantive readings. Many of the particulars required were not to be found in the published apparatus criSici:

but the labour involved in collecting them has not been fruitless. Examination of the columnar tables of attestation, by bringing to light approximate uniformi[page 308] ties affecting particular books or writers, or collocations of letters or words, and the like, has often shown that an exceptional smallness or largeness of evidence has been probably due to accident. On the other hand it would be unreasonable to assume that the same writer, even in the same book, always spells a word in the same way. Absolute uniformity belongs only to artificial times; and, after full allowance has been made for anomalies of evidence, the verdict of MSS is decisive against the supposition. Absolute uniformity therefore we have made no attempt to carry out, even within narrow limits; while we have assumed the existence of such a moderate or habitual uniformity in the usage of the writers as would enable us to come to a decision for the text in difficult cases. Many ancient spellings are therefore adopted in individual places on evidence which might be perilously small if they were taken alone, and if substantive readings were in question; but we have printed absolutely nothing without some good documentary authority.

§402. In some departments of orthography the evidence is so unsatisfactory that the rejected spellings are but little less probable than those adopted; and thus they should in strictness be accounted alternative readings. But to have printed them in the margin along with the substantive alternatives would have crowded and confused the pages of our text beyond measure, without any corresponding gain. They are therefore reserved for the Appendix, in which a few

any corresponding gain. They are therefore reserved for the Appendix, in which a few additional remarks on some special points of orthography, especially on some forms of proper names, may fitly find a place. The alternative readings thus relegated to the Appendix under the head of orthography include not only forms of inflexion, but forms of particles, as aVv or eav, and variations in the elision or retention of the last vowel of aItAo and of such prepositions as end with a vowel. We have ventured to treat in the same manner variations of the indicative or subjunctive after such particles as ,va, e'av, and orav, and after relatives with a'v or eav.

§403. A word may be interposed here on a topic which in strictness belongs to Part III (compare § 303), but which it is more convenient to notice in connexion with orthography. Attention was called above (§ 399) to the necessity of making allowance for purely itacistic error in considering the properly orthographical testimony of MSS. But there is another more important question concerning itacistic error, namely how far its early prevalence invalidates the authority of the better MSS as between substantive readings which differ only by vowels apt to be interchanged. The question cannot be answered with any confidence except by careful comparison of the various places in the New Testament which are affected by it. The results thus obtained are twofold. It becomes clear that in early times scribes were much more prone to make changes which affected vowels only than to make any other changes, and that every extant early document falls in this respect below its habitual standard of trustworthiness. Readings intrinsically improbable have often a surprising amount of attestation; and thus internal evidence attains unusual relative importance. It is no less clear that the several documents retain on the whole their relative character as compared with each other, and that readings unsupported by any high documentary authority have little probability. Where the testimony of early Versions and Fathers is free from uncertainty, it has a special value in variations of this kind by virtue of mere priority of date, as the chances of corruption through such interchange of vowels as is not obviously destructive of sense are considerably more increased by repetition of transcription than the chances of

corruption of any other type: but MSS of Versions are in many cases liable to corresponding errors of precisely the same kind, and the interpretations of Fathers are open to other special ambiguities.

§404. Probably the commonest permutation is that of o and ??, chiefly exemplified in the endings -oslev and -LD/LLV, -osseSa and -LD??L??a. Instances will be found in I Cor. xv 49, where we have not ventured to reject either cpope'^X??ev or Hpope/royev?? and in Rom. v I, where the imperative etprlvw1v LXLDIbeV, standing as it does after a pause in the epistle, yields a probable sense, virtually inclusive of the sense of elpr/vrp eVxoKevS which has no certain attestation of good quality but that of the `corrector' of S. Another frequent permutation is that of e and az, likewise exemplified in forms of the verb, especially in the infinitive and the second person plural of the imperative. Thus in Luke xiv 17 it is difficult to decide between??EpXe(rie and eVpxLLr??ac?? or in xix I3 between srpafllyALareu>afrOaF and llpa ??areu(ra/rde, the infinitive in the latter place being justified by St Luke's manner of passing from oratio obliqua to oratio recta. Gal. iv 18 furnishes one of the few instances in which B and S have happened to fall into [page 310] the same itacistic error, both reading <;7Xoiierde where <;1Aovxrda?? alone has any real probability. Examples of another type are the Western Kalvofonvias for tfV000vzas in I Tim. vi 20; 2 Tim. ii 16; and the more perverse confusion by which in Matt. xi 16 the idiomatic rozs ere'pocs, the other `side' or party in the game played by the children sitting in the marketplace, appears in the Syrian text as 70es f'raFpols with aur??v

added. The interchange of 6 and rl may be illustrated by 5#fV and ryqv in Acts xi 1 r, where the best uncials are opposed to the versions and of ft with Q by fl and 77 in 2 Cor. ii 9: less frequent forms of itacism may be passed over. Lastly, itacism plays at least some part in the common confusion of 5MffD and VLLf??S. The prevailing tendency is to introduce 7.7,LLLLS wrongly, doubtless owing to the natural substitution of a practical for a historical point of view, as is seen to a remarkable extent in I Peter: but there are many permutations which cannot be traced to this cause. The peculiarly subtle complexity of the personal relations between St Paul and his converts as set forth in 2 Corinthians has proved a special snare to scribes, the scribes of the best MSS not excepted. Occasionally the variation between i7,LLflS and tHf&S is of much interest. Thus though the limited range of attestation has withheld us from placing rLvfs rxv Icat3' 3MaS Tro??77Ta7V in the text proper of Acts xvii 28, there would be a striking fitness in a claim thus made by St Paul to take his stand as a Greek among Greeks; as he elsewhere vindicates his position as a Roman (xvi 37; xxii 25, 28), and as a Pharisee (xxiii 6).

D. 405-416. Breathings, Accents, and other accessories of printing

§405. Orthography deals with elements of text transmitted uninterruptedly, with more or less of purity, from the autographs to the extant MSS. In passing next from the letters to the various marks which custom and convenience require to be affixed to them, we leave, with one partial exception, the domain of the written tradition. Whether the autographs contained Breathings, Accents and the like, it is impossible to know. None exist in the earlier uncials of the New Testament, and it is morally certain that they were not included in transcription during a succession of centuries; so that, if any existed in the first instance, the record of them must have speedily [page 311] perished. The earliest MSS of the New Testament that exhibit breathings and accents are in any case too degenerate in orthography and

in substantive text alike to be followed with any confidence, even were it possible to regard them as having inherited these marks from an unbroken succession of ancestral MSS. But in truth they have no authority derived from ancestral transmission at all, the accessory marks having been doubtless chosen or placed, when they were first inserted, in conformity with the pronunciation or grammatical doctrine of the time. They are the expression of a tradition, but not of a tradition handed down through transcription, nor a tradition belonging to the New Testament more than to any other book containing any of the same words. The one exception to this statement is made by the conversion of a preceding hard consonant, K, T;, or rs into an aspirate consonant, which thus carries in itself the impress of the rough breathing. The opportunity for such conversion of course arises only in avTf?? a7roS f'Trt, KaTar lLfra?? VroX where the final vowel suffers elision, in verbs compounded with these prepositions, and in the particle OVX.

§406. The problem therefore, as limited by the evidence, is to discover not what the apostles wrote, but what it is likely that they would have written, had they employed the same marks as are now in use, mostly of very ancient origin: and the only safe way to do this is to ascertain, first, what was the general Greek usage, and next, whether any special usage of time, place, or other circumstances has to be further taken into account. The evidence at the command of modern grammarians for this purpose consists partly of the statements or precepts of ancient grammarians, partly of the records of ancient grammatical practice, that is, the marks found in such MSS as contain marks. To this second class of evidence the later uncials and earlier cursives of the New Testament make an appreciable contribution, which has not yet received

cursives of the New Testament make an appreciable contribution, which has not yet received due attention from grammarians: but their testimony respecting ancient Greek usage, though it has thus its use, in combination with other evidence, when marks have to be affixed to the text of the New Testament, must not be confounded with a direct transmission of affixed marks from primitive times.

§407. Some few unusual Breathings indicated by aspiration of the preceding consonant occur in good MSS of the New Testament; but their attestation is so irregular [page 312] that it is difficult to know what to do with them. They are assuredly not clerical errors, but genuine records of pronunciation, whether of the apostolic age or some other early time, and have to a certain extent the support of inscriptions, even of inscriptions from Attica. They seem to be chiefly relics of the digamma, and are interesting as signs of the variety of spoken language which often lies concealed under the artificial uniformity of a literary standard. The range of good MSS supporting them in one place or another is remarkable, and in some few places they can claim a large aggregation of good MSS yet in others they receive but little attestation, and usually they receive none at all. In two or three cases we have admitted them to the text, content elsewhere to leave them for the present as alternatives in the Appendix where any needful details as to these or other accessory marks will be found. The amply attested reading $\text{OVK elrrn}^{\text{?}}\text{ev}$ in John viii <; does not come under the present head, earqKev being merely the imperfect of CrrK@ , as it appears also to be in Apoc. xii 4. The sense of an imperfect rather than a present is required by the context, which must refer to the primal apostasy as representing the Jews' abandonment of the truth into which they were born, and there is a fitness in the virtually intensive force ('stand fast') which belongs by prevalent though not constant usage to $\text{Lrr}^{\text{?}}\text{rl}^{\text{?}}$. The imperfect of this somewhat rare verb is not on record: but imperfects are too closely connected with presents to need separate authority, and multitudes of

unique forms of verbs are known only from single passages. The aspiration of avrov used reflexively is discussed in the Appendix.

§408. The breathings of proper names possess a semblance of documentary evidence in the Latin version and its presentation of names with or without H. Yet, however early the first link in the Latin chain may be, it is evidently disconnected from the Palestinian pronunciation of Greek, the true object of search. The serious inconsistencies and improbabilities contained in the Latin usage condemn it equally on internal grounds: it is obviously due rather to unconscious submission to deceptive analogies and associations of sound than to any actual tradition. The breathings of Greek and Latin proper names can usually be fixed by the etymology: where this fails, it is seldom difficult to find direct or indirect authority in coins inscriptions, or even early MSS of Latin authors. The well [page 313] attested aspirate of the African Hadrumetur: prescribes rXo;6?? 'A8pnywrtlvLo, as the name of the obscurer Asiatic city must have had the same origin. In proper names transliterated from the Hebrew or Aramaic we have in like manner exactly followed the Hebrew or Aramaic spelling, expressing s and l? by the smooth breathing, and t1 and n by the rough breathing. This principle, manifestly the only safe guide in the absence of evidence, sanctions `AISEXX dAyapR 'AKeXoa,aax, AALJpalos, Avav;as, eAvvaX tAvvas?? Aperas, 'Aplyadaza, EyM

§414. The use of capital initials for the most part tells its own tale; but some explanation is required as to the exceptional employment of Kvplōs and Xpllrros. Wherever Kl'7plōs is

Page 156

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

required as to the exceptional employment of Kvplos and Xpllrros . Wherever $\text{Kl}'7\text{plOS}$ IS preceded by an article, it is manifestly a pure appellative, and needs no capital. When the article is wanting, apart from such phrases as aro sfOi ; $\text{iTaTpOS } 7//\text{A(i)V Kal KUpLOV } \text{'I,1C01}$, Xplo rov and $\text{fV KVpLLD [I^,o ov]}$, in a considerable number of cases the form is evidently taken from the LXX, where it usually represents yeSovozAz (7ahaeh), SL'doozzzi , or some other name of God. Direct and in this respect exact quotations from the LXX, which evidently throw no light on the usage of the writer who quotes them, similar direct quotations in which Kvplos is not the word employed in at least existing texts of the LXX, reminiscences of one or more passages in the LXX, and detached phrases of frequent occurrence in it (as ayysXos Kvptov) make up the greater number of these cases. The only writers who in our judgement employ the anarthrous $\text{Kl}'\text{splos}$ as a name after the manner of the LXX, but quite independently, are St James, St Peter, and (in the Apocalypse) St John; and even in reminiscences of the LXX, or short phrases taken from it, the distribution of this use [page 317] of Kvplos is strikingly limited. In all these five classes of passages, which shade into each other, the capital has been used, because here Kvplos is the equivalent of a proper name, though it may sometimes contain a secondary allusion to the Greek signification. On the other hand after careful examination we can find no instance in which the omission of the article need be referred to the Greek idiom by which, for instance, 7,7XtOS and KOOIAOS are often used anarthrously, that is, in which KVptOC seems to be used convertibly with o KVplOS . In other words, where the God of Israel is not intended, the absence of the article is always accompanied by a directly or indirectly predicative force in $\text{Kl}'7\text{plOS}$, and a capital initial would certainly be wrong. Such passages are numerous in St Paul's epistles, very rare elsewhere.

§415. The grounds of distinction for xpLLrros and xpilTros are different. Here the Greek word exactly translates an appellative of the Old Testament which was in popular speech becoming or become a proper name, and in like manner it becomes at last a proper name itself. We doubt whether the appellative force, with its various associations and implications, is ever entirely lost in the New

Testament, and are convinced that the number of passages is small in which Messiahship, of course in the enlarged apostolic sense, is not the principal intention of the word. The presence or absence of the article is only an imperfect criterion, as its absence is compatible with the meaning ``a Christ", and its presence with limitation to a single definite person. Adequate representation of the gradation of use is beyond the power of notation: yet we could not willingly give support to the perverse interpretation which makes [o] xpurros a merely individual name, as we should have done had we used the capital initial always. In using it where the article is absent (the forms `li^,o-ovs splcros, Xpurros 'Ir,orovs being included), and avoiding it where the article is present (o xpurros '17)L7;0i;S being included) and in the vocative of Matt. xxvi 68, we have, we hope, obtained fair approximations to the predominant force of the word. In I Peter alone it seemed best to retain the capital both with and without the article, for fear of obscuring the apparently complex usage of this epistle. Fortunately both forms throughout the New Testament are bound together by the common accent, the ox) tone Xpiv- ros never having been exchanged for the xpLorros appropriate to a true proper name. [page 318]

§416. An initial capital has likewise been used for eY+zerros in the four places, all in St Luke's Gospel, in which it stands in the singular without an article. In this shape it exactly represents the anarthrous ESiog, a very ancient name not confined to the Jews, and is virtually itself a proper

anarthrous ESiog, a very ancient name not confined to the Jews, and is virtually itself a proper name. In the LXX the article is usually inserted: but in Ecclesiasticus, doubtless a better authority for Palestinian custom, zY+loros occurs frequently, and has the article but once, except in combination with another title.

E. 417-423. Punctuation, Divisions of text, and Titles of books

§417. Punctuation properly includes not stops only, but spaces at the beginning, middle, or end of lines, and indeed any notation having a similar effect, that is the distribution of words into clauses, and of clauses into sentences of greater or less complexity. In this sense probably no MSS are without punctuation, though in the earlier biblical MSS it is vague and comparatively infrequent. Comparison of the punctuation of extant MSS leads to the conclusion that, though in some places breaks or stops occur with fair constancy, there has been no transmission of punctuation of any kind from the autographs; so that whatever punctuation is found is merely a record of ancient interpretations of unknown authority. Punctuations presupposed in the renderings of Versions may often be older, but they have essentially the same character; and those which are involved in the renderings or interpretations of Fathers differ only as having usually the authority, whatever it may be, of known expositors or theologians. Many interpretations embodying punctuations naturally became traditional within a wider or narrower sphere: but the starting-point of each tradition must have been an individual act of judgement upon an inherited text, not a continuously transmitted reproduction of an original punctuation as part of a text. Modern editors have therefore no option but to punctuate in accordance with the best interpretation that they are themselves able to arrive at, with ancient and modern aids; and no unwillingness to encumber a text with needless comments can dispense them from the necessity of deciding a multitude of subtle and difficult points of interpretation, to be expressed only by stops. [page 319]

§418. In arranging the punctuation, on which we have bestowed especial pains, we have followed the example first set by Lachmann in aiming at the greatest simplicity compatible with clearness. We fear that we may not always have succeeded in preserving a strictly uniform scale of punctuation; but some of the deviations have been intentional, being made with a view to help the reader through confusions or ambiguities. In some cases of doubt, or of division of judgement, an alternative punctuation has been placed in the margin.

§419. Punctuation passes insensibly into the larger arrangements denoted by paragraphs and sections. The course which we have followed has been to begin by examining carefully the primary structure of each book as a whole, and then to divide it gradually up into sections of higher or lower rank, separated by spaces, and headed if necessary by whole words in capitals. In the subdivision of sections we have found great convenience in adopting the French plan of breaking up the paragraphs into subparagraphs by means of a space of some length. In this manner we have been able to keep together in combination a single series of connected topics, and yet to hold them visibly apart. The advantage is especially great where a distinct digression is interposed between two closely connected portions of text. We have been glad at the same time to retain another grade of division in the familiar difference between capitals and small letters following a full stop. Groups of sentences introduced by a capital thus bear the same relation to subparagraphs as subparagraphs to paragraphs. The transitions of living speech are

relation to subparagraphs as subparagraphs to paragraphs. The transitions of living speech are often however too gradual or too complex to be duly represented by punctuation or any arrangement of type. The utmost that can then be done is to mark those articulations of a book, paragraph, or sentence which apparently dominate the rest, and to preserve the subordination of accessory points of view to the main course of a narrative or argument.

§420. Passages apparently metrical in rhythm have been printed in a metrical form, whether taken from the Old Testament or not; and in the former case fresh words substituted or added in the same strain have been dealt with in the same way. We have not thought it necessary to follow the Massoretic arrangements of passages from the poetical books of the Old Testament, even in passages transcribed without modification. In many places [page 320] indeed it would have been impossible, owing to the changes of form or language introduced in the process of quotation. We have merely tried to indicate probable or possible lines of Hebraic metrical structure clothed in a Greek dress, first by assigning a separate line to each member, and then by expressing the most salient parallelisms through an artificial ordering of lines. Doubtful cases however have not been rare; and we are far from supposing that the divisions and distributions here employed are exclusively right.

§421. The hymns of the Apocalypse shew, strange to say, no metrical arrangement of diction, so that they could be marked only by a narrower column of type, and in Luke ii 14 the diversities of possible construction led to the adoption of the same course. On the other hand the example of Eph. v 14, which seems to be taken from a Christian source, has emboldened us to give a metrical form to the latter part of I Tim. iii 16, the difficulties of which are certainly somewhat lightened by the supposition that it is part of a hymn. But we are unable to recognise in the Pastoral Epistles any other quotations, metrical or not, such as are supposed by some to be introduced or concluded by the phrase *7rLLrros o Xoyos*. We have been especially glad to mark the essentially metrical structure of the Lord's Prayer in St Matthew's Gospel, with its invocation, its first

triplet of single clauses with one common burden, expressed after the third but implied after all, and its second triplet of double clauses, variously antithetical in form and sense. Other typographical arrangements speak for themselves.

§422. In the order of the different books we have for various reasons not thought it advisable to depart from traditional arrangements. We should have defeated our own purpose had we needlessly mixed up such disputable matter as the chronology and authorship of the apostolic writings with the results of textual criticism, obtained by different methods from evidence of an entirely different kind. We have however followed recent editors in abandoning the Hieronymic order, familiar in modern Europe through the influence of the Latin Vulgate, in favour of the order most highly commended by various Greek authority of the fourth century, the earliest time when we have distinct evidence of the completed Canon as it now stands. It differs from the Hieronymic order in two respects. First, the Acts are immediately followed by the Catholic [page 321] Epistles. The connexion between these two portions, commended by its intrinsic appropriateness, is preserved in a large proportion of Greek MSS of all ages, and corresponds to marked affinities of textual history. This connexion is not sacrificed in the arrangement found in the Sinai MS and elsewhere, by which the Pauline Epistles are placed next to the Gospels. The Sinaitic order has the undoubted advantage of keeping together those books of the New Testament which were most decisively invested with a scriptural character in the earlier ages. But there is a manifest incongruity in placing the Acts in the midst of the Epistles; and moreover, Page 159

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

But there is a manifest incongruity in placing the Acts in the midst of the Epistles; and moreover, since the choice lies between what are after all only rival traditions, strong reasons would be needed to justify us in forsaking the highest ancient Greek authority, in accordance with which the Pauline Epistles stand after the Catholic Epistles. Secondly, the Epistle to the Hebrews stands before the Pastoral Epistles. It is certainly not satisfactory to ourselves personally to separate what we believe to be genuine writings of St Paul from the bulk of his works by an epistle in which we cannot recognise his authorship. But no violence has, we trust, been here done to truth in deferring throughout to the most eminent precedent, since the Epistle to the Hebrews is on all hands acknowledged as in some sense Pauline, and St Paul's epistles addressed to single persons may very well be placed by themselves. We have therefore been content to indicate the existence of three groups in the table prefixed to the whole Pauline collection.

§423. The titles of the books of the New Testament are no part of the text of the books themselves. Their ultimate authority is traditional, not documentary. In employing them according to universal custom, we neither affirm nor question their accuracy in respect of authorship or destination. In length and elaboration they vary much in different documents: we have adopted the concise and extremely ancient form preserved in MB and some other documents, which is apparently the foundation of the fuller titles. In prefixing the name EYArI EAIO N in the singular to the quaternion of `Gospels', we have wished to supply the antecedent which alone gives an adequate sense to the preposition KATA in the several titles. The idea, if not the name, of a collective `Gospel' is implied throughout the well known passage in the third book of Irenaeus, who doubtless received it from earlier genera[page 322] tions. It evidently preceded and produced the commoner usage by which the term `Gospel' denotes a single written representation of the one fundamental Gospel. There are apparent references to ``the Gospel" in a collective sense in Justin Martyr, while he also

refers to 'the memoirs of the apostles' as 'called Gospels'. The difference in orthography between the title IIPos KOAA=??AEIE and St Paul's words e'> Ko1ko(rlraFs has too strong documentary attestation to be rejected: the evidence is fully set forth by Dr Lightfoot (Co/. p. I 7), who has arrived independently at the same conclusion. The spelling CoArssbce was in use at a time subsequent to the apostolic age; and a current pronunciation might easily fix the form of name for the epistle, while St Paul's way of writing was faithfully retained by most transcribers in the text itself.

F. 423, 424. Conclusion

§424. In conclusion we desire to express sincere acknowledgements to our publishers for the patience with which they have endured the protraction of this edition through many long years, and for the considerate kindness with which they have forwarded our wishes in various ways. No less acknowledgements are due to the officers and workmen of the Cambridge University Press for the equal patience with which they have carried out a work troublesome in itself, and rendered doubly troublesome by intermissions and revisions. To Dr Tregelles, had he been still living, it would have been to us a special pleasure to express our sense of the generous encouragement always received from him. Many friends have earned our gratitude by help rendered in various ways. Among them we must especially single out Mr A. A. VanSittart and the Rev. Hilton Bothamley, to whose minute care in the examination of the proof sheets the text owes much in the way of typographical accuracy, and who have contributed invaluable

Page 160

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

owes much in the way of typographical accuracy, and who have contributed invaluable assistance of other [page 323] kinds. A certain number of misprints, chiefly in accents and breathings, which had escaped notice in the first or private issue, owe their rectification to notes kindly furnished by correspondents in England, Germany, and America. Any further corrections of overlooked errors of the press will be sincerely welcomed: with the utmost desire to secure accuracy, we have learned increasingly to distrust our own power of attaining it in the degree to which an edition of the New Testament should aspire.

§425. It only remains to express an earnest hope that whatever labour we have been allowed to contribute towards the ascertainment of the truth of the letter may also be allowed, in ways which must for the most part be invisible to ourselves, to contribute towards strengthening, correcting, and extending human apprehension of the larger truth of the spirit. Others assuredly in due time will prosecute the task with better resources of knowledge and skill, and amend the faults and defects of our processes and results. To be faithful to such light as could be enjoyed in our own day was the utmost that we could desire. How far we have fallen short of this standard, we are well aware: yet we are bold to say that none of the shortcomings are due to lack of anxious and watchful sincerity. An implicit confidence in all truth, a keen sense of its variety, and a deliberate dread of shutting out truth as yet unknown are no security against some of the wandering lights that are apt to beguile a critic: but, in so far as they are obeyed, they at least quench every inclination to guide criticism into delivering such testimony as may be to the supposed advantage of truth already inherited or ac[page 324] quired. Critics of the Bible, if they have been taught by the Bible, are unable to forget that the duty of guileless workmanship is never superseded by any other. From Him who is at once the supreme Fountain of truth and the all-wise Lord of its uses they have received both the materials of knowledge and the means by which they are wrought into knowledge: into His hands, and His alone, when the working is over, must they render back that which they have first and last received.

APPENDIX

I. NOTES ON SELECT READINGS

THE subjects of the following notes may be classified under four heads. First, the few peculiar clauses or passages, partly Western interpolations, partly Non-Western interpolations, which are printed between ?? D either within the text itself or appended to it (Asgh-od, § 240 f., 383, 384), and the Western additions and substitutions printed in the margin of the text between 4 F in the Gospels and Acts (Fwtgrod. § 385). Secondly, miscellaneous rejected readings sufficiently interesting to deserve special notice (A}tt10g. § 386). The places where they occur are indicated by Ap. in the margin. Thirdly, a few variations, also marked by Ap., in which there has been reason for discussing alternative readings or punctuations retained in the text and margin. Fourthly, words or passages, marked with Ap.+ in the margin, in which one or both of us have been unable to acquiesce in any well attested extant reading as right, and accordingly believe or suspect some 'primitive error' or corruption to be present, whether a probable suggestion as to the true reading can be offered or not (I1??rod. § 361-368, 380, 88).

Page 161

[<- Previous](#) [First](#) [Next ->](#)

These notes do not form a critical commentary, though some of them, taken singly, might properly be so described in reference to particular passages. As regards the great bulk of the readings simply indicated by Ap., and to a certain extent the readings enclosed between q s in the margin, the list might without any serious difference of purpose have been made much longer. Perhaps less uniformity of standard in selection has been maintained than might have been desired: but the list was not intended to have any completeness except in respect of the more important or interesting readings, and those of less moment which we have noticed have been taken in great measure for their illustrative and as it were representative character.

Again, as compared one with another, the notes are written on a great variety of scale, ranging from a bare classification of documents to long and minute discussion of every kind of evidence. These deliberate irregularities, though doubtless sometimes affected by accidental circumstances, have been guided by a practical purpose: that [page 1] is, in reciting documentary evidence we have assumed that our readers would have access to the apparatus critici of Tischendorf and Tregelles; and we have rarely thought it necessary to discuss the claims of rival readings except where there is still difference of opinion among competent persons, and the true bearing of the evidence appears to be as yet but imperfectly understood. The frequent indications and occasional fuller statements of Internal Evidence, Intrinsic and Transcriptional will shew, we trust, that the constancy of our eventual adhesion to documentary authority has been preceded by careful consideration of the interpretation of each particular context, and by attention to the various influences that might affect transcription. In this and other respects the Appendix may be taken as an illustrative supplement to the Introduction.

In the short statements of documentary evidence our chief aim has been to reduce the confused catalogues of 'authorities' to some degree of order by means of

classification. Readings which could safely be referred to one or other of the early lines of transmission are simply described as `Western', `Alexandrian', `Syrian', `Western and Syrian' (that is, originally Western and then adopted into the Syrian text), and so on. After each of these designations follows in brackets a list of the languages in which the reading is extant, the several Latin Syriac and properly Egyptian versions being taken together under these three heads, and languages for which the evidence is uncertain or suspicious being usually enclosed in square brackets: where `Gr.' is followed by square brackets containing the symbol for one or two documents (as D in many Western readings), it is to be understood that there is no other Greek authority for the reading. The enumeration of languages is often followed by specification ('incl.') of documents having an exceptional claim to be mentioned, such as primary MSS not habitually found supporting readings of the ancient text or texts to which the reading in question belongs, but especially Greek or Latin Ante Nicene Fathers, or occasionally Fathers of later date but exceptional text, as Cyril of Alexandria. On the other hand the dissent of documents which do often attest readings of somewhat similar ancestry is frequently noticed (as `not c ff syr. vt') especially if such attestation occurs in the immediate neighbourhood.

A full enumeration of documents attesting readings referred definitely to ancient texts is given only where the adverse testimony of documents of the same class is considerable, or there is some other special reason for completeness. A full enumeration is likewise given for readings not referred to an ancient text for readings adopted ill the text itself where the reading rejected is

[<- Previous](#) [First](#)

not referred to an ancient text for readings adopted ill the text itself where the reading rejected is both Pre-Syrian (of any type) and Syrian for variations in which the documents are split by diversity of reading into several small groups; and for a few important variations treated more fully than the rest. These documentary statements are intended to be in one sense complete; no tangible item of evidence within our knowledge has been absolutely passed over: but we have not cared to waste space, and distract attention from the weightier evidence, by an exhaustive enumeration of every petty 'authority', for instance of all late Fathers; and have usually preferred to gather up a handful of such virtually irrelevant [page 3] names under a single designation, such as ppsr. With cursives we have dealt in the same manner, usually citing by their numbers those only which have a considerable proportion of Pre-Syrian readings, and briefly indicating the existence of others. Suspicious evidence, such as that of the inferior MSS of Versions and uncertified and questionable quotations of Fathers, is often enclosed in []. Mere indirectness of evidence, usually though not always involving some little uncertainty, is marked with (), a ? being added where there is a more appreciable degree of uncertainty. But variations and gradations of trustworthiness can be only imperfectly expressed by any notation.

The amount of detail given in patristic references has varied according to circumstances. Standard pages (or, in certain cases, chapters) have been systematically specified for citations loosely or incorrectly recorded by others, or now first recorded; and also, less consistently, in many other cases, especially for the Ante-Nicene Fathers. In the absence of a reference to pages or chapters, the book containing a quotation has been specified wherever it could affect the character or the certainty of the attestation. For instance the text followed by Origen in his Comm. on St Matthew (Orig. 21fi) has a much more Western character than the text followed in his Comm. on St John (Orig.7o). Similarly the quotations of Cyril of Alexandria can be less relied on when they occur in books not edited since Aubert's time, as the Thesaurzszs, Gl??7phyra, and De Ado1- atione, the Epistles, and the Commentary on Isaiah, than when they occur in the books edited by the lamented Mr P. E. Pusey, as the Commentaries on the Minor

Prophets and St John and some of the minor dogmatic treatises; and these again differ in authority according to the MSS extant. We have of course been careful to mark distinctly the quotations of Greek writers which are extant only in Latin or Syriac and which may thus come from either of two sources (??n/1^0d. § 2ao)> and also to distinguish, when possible, the work of different translators. But it must suffice to notice once for all the complexity of the testimony obtained from the Armenian translation of Ephrem's Syriac commentary (or parts of it) on Tatian's Diatessaron, noxv made accessible by Moesinger's Latin rendering. It is often difficult to distinguish Ephrem's own (Syriac) readings from those which he found in the Syriac Diatessaron; and hardly ever possible to distinguish Tatian's own Greek readings from Old Syriac readings introduced by his translator.

The following are the chief abbreviations used in reference to MSS and in some cases to other documents:-' unc `uncials,' cu `cursives o `al' (after specified cursives) other (cursives), `al6' six others (most of these enumerations are only approximative), `alP' a few others; `almU' many others; `alpm s very many others, 'alPt'nearly all others; `alb??' others having good texts or textual elements, `al??P'' others having exceptionally good texts or textual elements. Hyphens are used for linking together the cursives (of the Gospels) 13-69-124-346 and 1-rl8r3l-209 (see Zntrod. § 211), as their joint authority where they agree is only the authority of a single common original.