THE REVISED VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

III. The Text.

In the introductory paper to this series I touched upon the proposals for revision which were made in the last century; and, on the whole, saw reason for thankfulness in the fact that those proposals did not meet with success. A similar question will no doubt be raised as to the revision which is just concluded. What will posterity say of it? Has the moment chosen for it been a happy one? Would it not perhaps have been better to wait a little longer? If, for example, the revision had been begun instead of being completed in this present year, might not the result have been more satisfactory, and its success more entirely assured? It is proverbially easy to be wise after the event; and if, at the beginning of the last decade, it had been possible to foresee the really remarkable outbreak of interest and productiveness in the field of exegetical theology to which the Editor of this Magazine bore worthy testimony not long ago—if it had been possible to foresee what the last ten years, and especially perhaps the last two years, have brought forth, the advocates of revision might themselves have hesitated to press on the practical realization of their project just at that particular time. It would not, indeed, have been a clear case even for us who look back upon accomplished facts, and have not merely to speculate upon an uncertain future. Even for us, with this great advantage, it is by no means easy to say whether the loss might not have been equal to the gain. The

present decade, as compared with that which preceded it, has been enriched chiefly by the work of some three or four eminent men; and most, though not all, of these have had seats upon the Revision Committee. As it is they have brought to the deliberations of that Committee their own living voice and their own matured judgment, the possible loss of which would have been dearly bought even by the possession of their published works. It is easy to count off upon one's fingers some half dozen names of men who have given to the work of the revision the best years of their life, and of whom it is very doubtful whether we shall see the like of them again. To set against this is the fact, of which the last volume of the *Speaker's Commentary* is sufficient evidence, that we have had first-rate men among us who, from one cause or another, have not had seats upon the Revision Committee, and to whose opinion the Committee has not had access. And among this number have been some who were not merely men of sound and sober judgment, but scholars of high originality, who have really advanced the boundaries of knowledge and added to the permanent stock of truth in the world. The absence of such men from the Committee has been a distinct misfortune; and, in having their written works before it, the next generation will have a distinct advantage apart from anything that it may be able to contribute itself. How these two opposing arguments are to be balanced against each other is a nice and difficult question, upon which it is not necessary for me at this moment to express a definite opinion. The aspect of the question at which I have now to look is a special one. The Revisers themselves have drawn a clear distinction between the revision of the Greek text on which their translation is based, and the translation itself. Was the moment chosen for the revision of the Greek of the New Testament happy or otherwise? Was it the happiest moment that could have

been chosen? This is the point upon which I am to try to give an answer.

It was evidently no accidental coincidence that on the same day with the publication of the Revised Version there also appeared the modest volume, entitled, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, by Dr. B. F. Westcott and Dr. F. J. A. Hort. Modest as it is in compass, this volume represents—or rather will represent when it is completed[1] by the promised Introduction and Appendix—the labours of thirty years, and those labours not expended at mere hap hazard, without any guiding principle, but conducted in accordance with strictly scientific method, with a definite aim in view, prosecuted steadfastly, but circumspectly, with a prolonged and scrupulous examination of the most minute detail.

Before we go further, it may be well to state briefly some of the characteristic features in the method thus pursued. The first, and perhaps the most fundamental, characteristic is this: that *the consideration of internal evidence has been throughout subordinated to that of the external evidence.* Not that internal evidence has been ignored by any means. On the contrary, at different stages in the process of the investigation, and as a subsidiary instrument, it has evidently been of great value. But whereas it has hitherto been frequently the custom in the final discussion of each reading for the critic to ask himself, first of all, What is the bearing of this reading upon the context? What is the sacred writer most likely to have written? Which of the alternative readings bears the most appearance of corruption?—all such questions have been systematically postponed to the one main question, *Which is the oldest attested text?* The special object which the two Cambridge editors have had in view has been, to trace back the history of the text as nearly as possible to

[1] Now, happily, the case. Sept. 6th.

the Apostolic autographs themselves. This has been done by means of a searching analysis of the different authorities, and groups of authorities, taking as a starting point those, such as the patristic quotations, to which a distinct and definite date could be given. A reading, for instance, would be taken which is found in our common printed texts, and it would be followed up to its source. It would be found abundantly in the cursive MSS. which prevailed from the tenth century onwards; it would be found in some of the uncial MSS.; it would be found in some of the versions; it would be found in patristic quotations—up to a certain point, which would be in many cases the fourth century. But here the chain of evidence would be suddenly arrested. When traces of the reading at an earlier date than this were looked for, they would be strangely absent. Beginning with an immensely wide and almost universal diffusion, the evidence would be found at first gradually, but after a time rapidly, to dwindle and contract. It begins with imposing volume; it ends by vanishing away to nothing at all. The competitive reading, on the other hand, will have a history which is just the opposite of this. It is banished from the printed texts. Its representation amongst cursives is but small. But the older the uncial MS., the more surely it is present there. The more demonstrably ancient is the version, the more inevitably does it receive its support. After the fourth century traces of this reading in patristic quotations are few; before the fourth century they are many. It is found, perhaps, two or three times over in Origen; it is found (less certainly) in Eusebius; it is found in the Latin of Cyprian and Tertullian—perhaps also in Irenæus. In such a case the conclusion would be clear. The oldest reading, the primitive reading, the genuine reading, the reading of the Evangelist or Apostle himself, was that which had this abundant early and deficient later attestation. The late attestation really

counts for nothing. It affords hardly a presumption as to the true original text where it is devoid of substantial early support. Thus we have explained a second main characteristic of the Cambridge text—*the comparative neglect of the later MSS. and authorities.* It had been the custom with the older school of critics to count the MSS. ranged on one side and on the other—"twenty or more on this side, only four or five on that; the majority is clear." All this method has been discarded. Authorities must be not counted, but weighed; or rather they must be tested, so as to ascertain what is the real age and worth of their evidence; not merely that of the MSS. themselves, but that of the original from which they were last copied, that of the type of text which they contain. So far the course seemed clear, and there could be little doubt as to the result; but then came the more difficult question, What was to be done with two readings, both of which possessed substantial early attestation? The previous investigations furnished the clue. In tracking back rejected readings to their origin, it was often possible to lay the finger upon the exact point where a false reading came in. It was found first, for instance, in the Latin version, or in some Latin writers; or else, perhaps, in some authority connected with Syria or Alexandria. Instances of this kind would gradually collect and accumulate until it became possible to form some general conclusion as to the character of the corruption to which these several groups of authorities were most liable, and the nature of their relation to each other. The Latins had an inveterate taste for paraphrase. The Alexandrian tendency was to grammatical and literary emendation. Everywhere the scribes were prone to harmonize the divergent texts of parallel passages in the Synoptic Gospels, or of parallel passages in the same Gospel. Here was another instrument for discriminating between readings. Was the reading under discussion para-

phrastic, with Latin authority, however early and however strong? It belonged to the characteristic vein of corruption, and as such was to be rejected. Was it an improvement on the Greek to a more elegant and classical style? Then its Alexandrine supporters could go no great way to help it, because on this point they were discredited. Was the reading in close agreement with some parallel text, while the competing reading diverged from it? Then, again, it was open to grave suspicion. Such criteria as these were not only applicable to the decision of particular readings; they also came in to determine the general character of the authorities, whether manuscripts, versions, or Fathers. By their means it became possible to discover not merely to what class an authority belonged, but what was its place in that class. Were its tendencies pronounced or subdued? Did it mark an advanced or an initial stage of corruption? Was its text pure or mixed? Did it represent the type of a single class, or of more than one class combined? Clearly one who was thus familiar with all the idiosyncrasies of the documents with which he had to deal would have an immense advantage over one who based his whole case on *à priori* probabilities differently apprehended by different minds, and very often, when impartially considered, closely balanced upon opposite sides.

That which has been given above is the roughest possible outline of the elaborate process which a textual critic must go through before he can really be considered master of his subject. And of all who have undertaken this difficult task, none have ever gone to work with such a lofty ideal, none have ever prepared themselves by such comprehensive and searching study, as the two editors whose volume, as I have said, evidently not through accident, appeared simultaneously with the publication of the Revised Version.

Both editors had, and none more deserved to have, seats

upon the Revision Committee. They were thus able to make their views heard in the council-chamber, and to support them with all the weight of their personal authority, while as yet the outer public had but partial access to them. A partial access, indeed, they had; for the generous kindness of the editors had placed advanced copies of a provisional text in the hands of more than one scholar, to whom it proved an invaluable aid. The completed text, with all its final corrections, came out on the same day with the Revised Version, and the first step of one who was interested either in the determination of the text of the New Testament Scriptures, or in the permanent success of the New Version, was naturally to institute a comparison of the two.

The results of such a comparison are given below. It seemed, however, easy, in carrying it out, rather to extend the comparative process, to include other editors besides these already named, so as to provide something like a conspectus of the best modern authorities, and also to give some idea of their relation to the original data.

It may be well, for the sake of the general reader, just to add a few words of preliminary explanation. Of the editors, Lachmann comes first in order of time, and his importance is perhaps chiefly historical. He seized the one great principle, that the first thing to be done was to arrive as nearly as possible at the primitive text; and that, in doing this, the later copies could afford little assistance. In working out this principle, Lachmann proceeded with the utmost boldness. He confined himself to a small group of authorities, and he based his text upon these, without paying the slightest regard to printed texts or later authorities. He despaired, however, of getting back really to the original text, and only professed to reconstruct it as it had stood in the best documents at the beginning of the fourth century. And the list of his

authorities was really too small. He paid very great attention to the Latin version; but he did this to the exclusion of other versions of hardly less value. To the Curetonian Syriac, the oldest extant form of the Syriac version, he had not access at all; neither had he access to the Sinaitic Codex (ℵ) discovered by Tischendorf eight years after his death; and he was only able to make use of imperfect collations of the great Codex of the Vatican (B). These drawbacks greatly impair the present value of Lachmann's text; but, as a subsidiary authority, it may still be used. In dealing with such material as he had, Lachmann shewed the hand of a master; and it is interesting to see how the latest critics every now and then come back to his decisions. Tregelles worked upon similar lines to those of Lachmann, but on a more comprehensive scale, and with the advantage of prolonged practical acquaintance with the MSS. of the Greek Testament, many of which he collated with admirable skill and accuracy. He spent a long life in defending what he believed to be sound principles of textual criticism. He too, however, did not possess the Sinaitic Codex when he was constructing his text of the Gospels, and there are many debated points where the possession of that MS. would doubtless just have turned the scale. Tischendorf, the great contemporary and friend of Tregelles, had a still wider experience in the collation of MSS., the amount as well as the quality of the work done by him in this department being simply marvellous. His eighth edition represents up to the present time the most complete collection of the authorities for the text, and his own reconstructed text as contained in it is very good. Tischendorf learnt much while his work was going on; and this, his last edition, would lead one to suppose that he was largely influenced by Tregelles himself: he had not, however, the same clearly defined principles to work with that

Tregelles had; his results seem to have been reached more empirically; and he is not seldom led astray by excessive partiality for the MS. which he had the good fortune to discover. Alford's text was eclectic, based very much upon his predecessors, the scientific element not being quite at first hand, but with considerable good sense in the estimation of internal evidence. McClellan's able volume, which deserves the grateful appreciation of every student, shews to least advantage in textual criticism. There is not even an approach to scientific principle in the treatment of external authorities. But, at the same time, the text is important, as embodying the results of a careful and able weighing of internal evidences. It thus affords a check upon the work of editors who have proceeded upon different principles; and, in cases where it agrees with them, it must needs be considered to supply valuable corroboration. Mr. McClellan stands practically at the opposite pole to Drs. Westcott and Hort. Dr. B. Weiss may be said to be Tischendorf's best successor in Germany. He has been chosen to re-edit Meyer's well-known Commentary upon the Gospels; and the text-critical portions of this he has entirely re-written. He has paid much attention both to the internal and external evidence.

It is not of much importance that the reader should bear in mind the names of the MSS. The names are simply symbols for which the letters that are commonly used to designate them may serve as well. Nor is it even of much importance that he should remember the century in which they were written; for the copy made use of in transcribing them may have been recent, or it may have been old. The principal thing to note is the combinations in which they occur. Premising thus much, it may be said that ℵ (Codex Sinaiticus) and B (Codex Vaticanus) are the two oldest MSS., both belonging to the fourth century. A (Codex Alexandrinus) and C (Codex Ephraemi

Rescriptus) belong to the fifth century. C is difficult to decipher, and its text is not always ascertainable. A is wanting for the first twenty-four chapters of St. Matthew, and its text in the Gospels is inferior to that in the other books, this portion having apparently been copied from a different original. Codd. D (Codex Bezæ) and Z (Codex Dublinensis) belong to the sixth century. D is of the Latin type and has a Latin version in parallel columns to the Greek; Z, which is very good as far as it goes, contains unfortunately only part of St. Matthew; Ξ (Codex Zacynthius), in like manner, only part of St. Luke. Ξ and L (Codex Regius Parisiensis) are of the eighth century, and Δ (Codex Sangallensis) of the ninth. Δ has a text of peculiar value in the Gospel of St. Mark. The remaining MSS. need not be noticed more particularly. Where an asterisk is appended to the letter designating a MS. (thus ℵ*) it denotes the first hand or original copyist as distinct from later correctors.

I proceed, then, to examine the text adopted by the Revisers in St. Matthew's Gospel, with a view to ascertain the extent of its agreement more especially with the text of Drs. Westcott and Hort, but incidentally also with that of other editors. It will probably give the clearest result if the instances of agreement and of difference from that which has been taken as the standard text are collected separately. At the same time, for the convenience of the reader, a distinction will be made in the mode of printing the different passages; those which are of intrinsic interest and importance, or which have been especially the subject of controversy, will be printed in ordinary type: those of minor importance and interest, and where the interest is chiefly of a text-critical kind and less as affecting the sense, will be printed in small type: those of less importance still will not be printed in full at all, but simply with a reference to the verse, the MSS. followed by

Westcott and Hort and the Revisers being placed after the references: readings which do not really affect the sense are omitted. The readings will be numbered for convenience in subsequently referring to them. The translation first given is in all cases that of the Authorized Version, the alternative is usually taken from the Revised Version.

In classifying the readings of Westcott and Hort it has been thought best to treat as text all that is printed continuously whether in single or double brackets. In this way some slight anomalies may arise; *e.g.* No. 189, might perhaps more strictly be classed as an instance of agreement with the Revised Version. The reader will kindly make allowance for such cases.

Instances of Agreement between the Text of the Revisers and that of Drs. Westcott and Hort, in St. Matthew's Gospel.

1. Matt. i. 6. "David the king." Omit "the king." ℵ B and one other uncial MS., Revisers, and Westcott and Hort, with all the editors mentioned above except McClellan.
2. „ i. 8. "Asaph" for "Asa." ℵ B C D, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and Revisers, against Weiss and McClellan.
3. „ i. 10. "Amos" for "Amon." Same editors, also against Weiss and McClellan.
4. „ i. 18. "birth of Jesus Christ." So Revisers (text) with Westcott and Hort (text). ℵ C L and almost all MSS., Egyptian Versions, later Syriac, Origen and Eusebius.

   "birth of Christ Jesus." B, Latin translator of Origen, Westcott and Hort (margin), Weiss (probably).

   "birth of the Christ," Latin Versions, Old Syriac, Irenæus, Tregelles, McClellan, Westcott and Hort (former reading), Revisers (margin).

5. Matt. i. 25. "her first-born son." So C D L, etc., McClellan; "a son" ℵ B Z, other editors and Revisers. Compare Luke xi. 7.
6. „ ii. 18. "[lamentation and] weeping." Omit bracketed words ℵ B Z, editors and Revisers.
7. „ iii. 6. "were baptized of him in Jordan." "The river Jordan" ℵ B C Δ, editors and Revisers.
10. „ iv. 23. ℵ B C.
11. „ v. 4, 5. "Blessed are they that mourn . . . the meek," etc. Common order preserved by ℵ B C, etc., Peshito Syriac, Version of Lower Egypt, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort (text) and Revisers (text); order of verses transposed by D, Latin Versions and Old Syriac, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles and Revisers (margin).
12. „ v. 11. "say all manner of evil against you falsely." So ℵ B C, etc., Tischendorf, Tregelles, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, and Revisers; omit "falsely," D, Old Latin, Origen, Hilary, Lachmann.
13. „ v. 22. "whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause." So D E L, etc., Old Latin, Syriac Versions, Version of Lower Egypt, Irenæus, Cyprian, Hilary, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Alford (text), Tregelles (text), Revisers (margin); omit "without a cause," ℵ B, Vulgate, Æthiopic, Tertullian, Origen, Jerome and Augustine (as well as MSS. known to them), Lachmann, Tischendorf, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, and Revisers (text).
15. „ v. 30. "be cast into hell." So, E G, etc.; "go into," ℵ B, editors and Revisers.
17. „ v. 44. "Love your enemies, [bless them, that curse you, do good to them that hate you,] and pray for them which [despitefully use you and] persecute you." Omit bracketed words, ℵ B, editors and Revisers. Compare Luke vi. 28.
18. „ v. 47. For "do not even the publicans so," read "the Gentiles the same." ℵ B D Z, editors and Revisers.

19. Matt. v. 48. ℵ B Z, etc.

21. ,, vi. 1. For "alms" read "righteousness." ℵ* B D, editors and Revisers.

22. ,, vi. 4. "Thy Father which seeth in secret [himself] shall reward thee [openly]." Omit bracketed words, ℵ B D Z, editors and Revisers.

23. ,, vi. 5. "When thou prayest, thou shalt not be." "When ye pray, ye shall not be." ℵ* B Z, editors and Revisers.

24. ,, vi. 6 and 18. "shall reward thee openly." Omit "openly," ℵ B D Z, editors and Revisers.

26. ,, vi. 12. "as we forgive our debtors." "have forgiven" ℵ* B Z, editors and Revisers.

27. ,, vi. 13. The Doxology is inserted by E G, etc., Syriac Versions (with some variation) and Version of Upper Egypt (also with some variation); it is omitted by ℵ B D Z, Latin Versions, Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, recent editors, and Revisers (text).

28. ,, vi. 15. "if ye forgive not men their trespasses." So B L, etc., Lachmann, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort (text), Revisers; omit "their trespasses," ℵ D, Tischendorf, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort as alternative.

29. ,, vi. 21. "where your treasure is." For "your" read "thy" ℵ B, editors and Revisers.

30. ,, vi. 33. "the kingdom of God and his righteousness." So L Δ, etc., McClellan; "his kingdom and his righteousness" ℵ (B partly), Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort and Revisers. See below, p. 270.

33. ,, vii. 14. "Because strait is the gate." So ℵ* B*, and one other uncial MS., Tischendorf, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort and Revisers (text). "How strait," etc., correctors of ℵ B, L Δ, etc., Lachmann, Tregelles, Revisers (margin).

35. ,, vii. 23. ℵ B Z.

36. ,, vii. 29. "not as the scribes." Read "not as their scribes," ℵ B Δ and some other MSS., most editors and Revisers.

39. ,, viii. 15. [Peter's wife's mother] "ministered nnto them." Read "unto him," ℵ B C, etc., editors and Revisers.

41. Matt. viii. 23. "a ship." So ℵ (second corrector) B C, Lachmann, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, Revisers; "the ship" (*i.e.*, the particular ship which our Lord was in the habit of using), ℵ E L, etc., Tischendorf, McClellan, Weiss.

42. ,, viii. 28. "country of the Gergesenes." So E L, etc., Version of Lower Egypt and Æthiopic, McClellan; "Gerasenes," most MSS. in time of Origen, Latin Versions and Version of Upper Egypt, Lachmann; "Gadarenes," B C* Δ and one other, also MSS. known to Origen, Alford, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, and Revisers (with no mention of other readings).

43. ,, viii. 29. "Jesus, thou Son of God." Omit "Jesus," ℵ B C L, editors and Revisers.

44. ,, viii. 31. "Suffer us to go away into the herd of swine.' "Send us away into" ℵ B, editors and Revisers.

45. ,, ix. 2. ℵ B (also in ver. 5).

46. ,, ix. 4. "And Jesus knowing their thoughts." So B and some late MSS., Lachmann, Tregelles, Weiss, McClellan, Westcott and Hort (text) and Revisers (text); "seeing their thoughts," ℵ C D, etc., Alford, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort (margin) and Revisers (margin).

47. ,, ix. 8. "when the multitude saw it they marvelled." "They were afraid," ℵ B D, editors and Revisers.

48. ,, ix. 13. "I am . . . come to call . . . sinners to repentance." Omit "to repentance," ℵ B D Δ, editors and Revisers.

51. ,, ix. 36. "They fainted and were scattered abroad." For "fainted" read "were distressed" (ἐσκυλμένοι "worried", McClellan, to keep up the metaphor from sheep) ℵ B C, etc., editors and Revisers.

52. ,, x. 3. "Lebbæus whose surname was Thaddæus." So E G, etc.; "Lebbæus" simply D, and probably Origen, Tischendorf, Alford, McClellan, Westcott and Hort (margin), see also Nicholson, *Gospel according to Matthew*, p. 99; "Thaddæus" simply

א B, Lachmann, Tregelles, Weiss, Westcott and Hort (text), Revisers.

53. Matt. x. 4. "Simon the Canaanite." "Simon the Cananæan" (*i.e.*, Zealot, see Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13) B C D L, editors and Revisers.

54. „ x. 10. "nor yet staves." So C L, etc.; but "a staff" (as margin of A.V.) א B D, editors and Revisers. Note that this creates an apparent discrepancy with Mark vi. 8.

55. „ xi. 2. "he" (John) "sent two of his disciples." Revisers read "sent by his disciples" after א B C* D and editors.

56. „ xi. 9. "What went ye out for to see? A prophet?" So C D, etc., Lachmann, Tregelles (text), McClellan, Revisers (margin); "Wherefore went ye out? to see a prophet?" א* B Z, Alford, Tischendorf, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (text).

57. „ xi. 10. א B D.

60. „ xi. 19. "Wisdom is justified of her children." So corrector of B, C D L, Latin and Old Syriac Versions, Lachmann, Alford, McClellan, Revisers (margin), see also Nicholson, *Gospel according to St. Matthew*, p. 110; "by her works" א B, Version of Lower Egypt and Peshito Syriac, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (text).

61. „ xi. 23. "thou Capernaum which art exalted," etc. So E F, etc., Weiss; "shalt thou be exalted?" א B C D L, other editors and Revisers.

62. „ "shalt be brought down." So א C, etc., Alford, Tischendorf, McClellan, Revisers (margin); "thou shalt go down," B D, Lachmann, Tregelles, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (text).

64. „ xii. 6. "one greater than the temple." Literally "a greater thing," א B D, etc., editors and Revisers.

65. „ xii. 15. "great multitudes." So C D, etc. (text); "many," א B, other editors and Revisers.

66. Matt. xii. 22. "the blind and dumb both spake and saw." "The dumb spake and saw," ℵ B D, editors and Revisers.

67. „ xii. 31. "shall be forgiven unto men." So ℵ C D, etc., most editors, Revisers (text); "unto you, men." B, Athanasius, Alford (text), Westcott and Hort (margin), Revisers (margin).

68. „ "shall not be forgiven unto men." Omit "unto men" ℵ B, several Versions, most editors and Revisers.

69. „ xii. 35. "A good man out of the good treasure of his heart." Omit "of his heart," ℵ B C D, etc., editors and Revisers.

71. „ xiii. 9. "He that hath ears to hear." Omit "to hear" (also in verse 43) ℵ B L, most editors, and Revisers (text).

72. „ xiii. 22. "care of this world." Revisers read "care of the world" (literally "age") with ℵ* B D and editors. Similarly "end of the world" in verse 40.

73. „ xiii. 25. "the enemy . . . sowed tares." "Sowed also" (lit. "oversowed" McClellan, "sowed on the top" of the wheat) "tares" ℵ (ℵ* nearly, and corrector) B, Irenæus, Origen, editors and Revisers.

75. „ xiii. 51. "[Jesus saith unto them,] Have ye understood all these things? They say unto him, yea, [Lord]." Omit bracketed words ℵ B D, editors and Revisers.

76. „ xiii. 55. For "Joses" read "Joseph," first corrector of ℵ, B C, editors and Revisers.

78. „ xiv. 12. "took up the body and buried it." "Took up the corpse and buried him," ℵ B and other MSS., most editors and Revisers.

81. „ xiv. 25. ℵ B and some others.

83. „ xiv. 30. "when he saw the wind boisterous" (lit. "strong"). So C D, etc., Lachmann, Tregelles, McClellan, Revisers (margin); omit "boisterous," ℵ B*, Tischendorf, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (text).

84. „ xiv. 34. "unto the land of Gennesaret." Rather "to the land unto Gennesaret," ℵ B D L and two others, most editors and Revisers.

85. „ xv. 4. B D, corrector of ℵ, and one other uncial MS.

86. Matt. xv. 6. "and honour not his father." So E F, etc., Alford; "he shall not honour," ℵ B C D and one other MS., other editors and Revisers.

87. „ "or his mother." So C E, etc., Alford (text), Tischendorf, Tregelles, McClellan, Weiss, Revisers (margin); omit ℵ B D, Lachmann, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (text).

88. „ "commandment of God." So E F, etc.; "law," ℵ* C, and one other, Alford, Tischendorf, Weiss, Revisers (margin); "word" ℵ (corrector) B D, Lachmann, Tregelles, McClellan, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (text).

89. „ xv. 8. "This people [draweth nigh unto me with their mouth and] honoureth me," etc. Omit bracketed words ℵ B D L, editors and Revisers.

90. „ xv. 14. "blind leaders of the blind." So most MSS. and editors; "blind guides" (omitting "of the blind") ℵ* B D, Westcott and Hort, Revisers.

91. „ xv. 17. B D Z.

93. „ xv. 39. For "Magdala" read "Magadan" ℵ B D, editors and Revisers.

94. „ xvi. 2, 3. "When it is evening . . . signs of the times." These two verses are omitted by ℵ B and some others, Old Syriac, and are bracketed by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford; doubly bracketed by Westcott and Hort; omission noted also in margin of Revised Version.

95. „ xvi. 4. "the sign of the prophet Jonas." Omit "the prophet," ℵ B D L, editors and Revisers.

96. „ xvi. 8. ℵ B D.

97. „ xvi. 11. "I spake it not to you concerning bread that ye should beware." "I spake not to you concerning bread" (margin "loaves"). "But beware," etc., ℵ B C* L, most editors, and Revisers.

98. „ xvi. 13. "Whom do men say that I the Son of man am?" So D E, etc., Lachmann (text), Alford, Revisers (margin); "Who do men say that the Son of man is?" ℵ B, most editors, and Revisers.

99. „ xvi. 20. "that they should tell no man that he was

Jesus, the Christ." Omit "Jesus," ℵ B L, and some others, editors, and Revisers.

101. Matt. xvi. 26. ℵ B L.

102. „ xvii. 4. "let us make here three tabernacles." "I will make," etc., ℵ B C*, most editors, and Revisers.

103. „ xvii. 11. "Elias shall first come." Omit "first," ℵ B D, editors and Revisers.

105. „ xvii. 20. "because of your unbelief." So C D, etc., McClellan; for "unbelief" read "little faith" (ὀλιγοπιστίαν) ℵ B, most editors, and Revisers.

106. „ xvii. 21. "Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting." This verse is retained by ℵ (second corrector), C D L etc., Latin Versions and Peshito Syriac, Lachmann, Tregelles (text), McClellan, Revisers (margin); it is omitted by ℵ* B, Egyptian and Old Syriac Versions, Tischendorf, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (text).

108. „ xviii. 11. "For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost." Omit whole verse ℵ B L*, editors and Revisers (text). See Luke xix. 10.

114. „ xviii. 28. ℵ B C D.

115. „ xviii. 29. ℵ B C D.

116. „ xix. 3. "The Pharisees also came unto him." So ℵ D etc. Tischendorf, Revisers (margin); "Pharisees," B C L and some other MSS., other editors, and Revisers (text).

118. „ xix. 9. "except for fornication." So ℵ C Z, etc., Tischendorf, Tregelles, Weiss, Westcott and Hort (text). Revisers (text); "saving for the cause of fornication," B D, Lachmann, McClellan, and Westcott and Hort (margin), Revisers (margin) adding "maketh her an adulteress," etc., as in chap. v. 32, after B C*.

120. „ xix. 16. "Good master." So C E, etc., McClellan, Revisers (margin); omit "good," ℵ B D L, other editors, and Revisers (text).

121. „ xix. 17. "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God." So C E, etc.,

McClellan, Revisers (margin); "Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good," ℵ B D L, other editors, and Revisers (text). See Mark x. 18; Luke xviii. 19.

122. Matt. xix. 20. "All these things have I kept from my youth up." Omit "From my youth up," ℵ* B L, editors and Revisers.

123. „ xix. 29. "father or mother or wife." Omit "or wife," B D, editors and Revisers (text). See Luke xviii. 29.

125. „ xx. 6, 7. "found others standing [idle] . . . [and whatsoever is right that shall ye receive]." Omit bracketed words ℵ B D L, editors and Revisers.

127. „ xx. 16. "for many be called but few chosen." Omit this clause ℵ B L Z, most editors, and Revisers. See chap. xix. 30

128. „ xx. 22. "and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with." Omit this and the corresponding clause in verse 23, ℵ B D L Z, Editors and Revisers. Compare Mark x. 39.

129. „ xxi. 4. ℵ C* D L Z.

130. „ xxi. 11. ℵ B D.

131. „ xxi. 13. ℵ B L.

133. „ xxi. 32. "repented not." "Did not even repent," B, Vulgate, Version of Lower Egypt and Syriac Versions, most editors, and Revisers.

134. „ xxi. 44. This verse, which is parallel to Luke xx. 18, is retained by most MSS. and editors, and by Revisers (text); it is omitted by D, Old Latin, Origen, Eusebius, Tischendorf and Revisers (margin), and bracketed by Westcott and Hort.

135. „ xxii. 7. ℵ B L.

137. „ xxii. 13. ℵ B L.

138. „ xxii. 30. "angels of God." So ℵ L, etc., Alford (text), Tischendorf, Weiss (text), Revisers (margin); omit "of God," B D, Lachmann, Tregelles, McClellan, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (text).

139. „ xxii. 38. ℵ B, etc.

140. „ xxii. 40. "hang all the law and the prophets;" "hangeth," ℵ B D L Z, etc., editors and Revisers.

141. Matt. xxiii. 4. ℵ B L Δ.

143. „ xxiii. 8, "for one is your Master, even Christ." "For one is your teacher" (="Master," omitting "even Christ"), ℵ B D L, editors and Revisers.

144. „ xxiii. 14. "Woe unto you . . . greater damnation." Omit ℵ B D L Z, editors and Revisers (text). See Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47.

145. „ xxiii. 19. "ye [fools and] blind." Omit bracketed words, ℵ D L Z, most editors, and Revisers.

147. „ xxiii. 34. ℵ B and some other MSS.

149. „ xxiv. 6. ℵ B D L.

150. „ xxiv. 7. "famines and pestilences and earthquakes." Omit "and pestilences," ℵ B D E*, most editors, and Revisers.

151. „ xxiv. 17. "to take anything out of his house." "To take the things that are in" (lit. "out of," by a well-known Greek idiom) "his house," B L Z, etc., editors and Revisers.

152. „ xxiv. 18. ℵ B D L Z.

154. „ xxiv. 28. ℵ B D L.

156. „ xxiv. 36. "of that very hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven." So ℵ first, but not second corrector, E F, etc., Vulgate, Peshito Syriac, Version of Lower Egypt, Basil, Didymus, good MSS. known to Jerome, Tregelles and Revisers (margin); add "neither the Son," ℵ* B D, Old Latin, Irenæus and Origen, Hilary and Chrysostom, Lachmann, Tischendorf, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (text).

157. „ "but my Father only;" "the Father," ℵ B D L and other MSS., editors and Revisers.

158. „ xxiv. 27, 37, 39. Omit "also," ℵ B D, ℵ B L, B D, editors and Revisers.

160. „ xxiv. 38. "as in the days that were before the flood." So ℵ Δ, etc., Tischendorf, Tregelles and Weiss (as alternative); "as in those days," etc., B D and some others, Lachmann, McClellan, Tregelles and Weiss (text), Westcott and Hort, Revisers.

161. Matt. xxiv. 42. "ye know not what hour;" "what day" ℵ B D Δ, editors and Revisers.

162. „ xxiv. 48. "my lord delayeth his coming." Omit "his coming," ℵ B, editors and Revisers.

163. „ xxv. 2. "five of them were wise and five were foolish. They that were foolish," etc.; "five of them were foolish and five were wise. For the foolish," etc., ℵ B C, etc., editors and Revisers.

164. „ xxv. 6. ℵ B C*, etc.

165. „ xxv. 13. "ye know neither the day nor the hour [wherein the Son of man cometh]." Omit bracketed words, ℵ A B, etc., editors and Revisers.

166. „ xxv. 15, 16, . . . "and straightway took his journey. Then he," etc.; . . . "and he went on his journey. Straightway he," etc., ℵ* B, Tischendorf, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, Revisers.

168. „ xxv. 31. "all the holy angels." Omit "holy," ℵ B D L, editors and Revisers.

169. „ xxvi. 3. "the chief priests and the scribes and the elders." Omit "and the scribes," ℵ A B D L, editors and Revisers.

170. „ xxvi. 9. ℵ A B D L.

171. „ xxvi. 20. "with the twelve." So B D and other MSS., Tregelles, Westcott and Hort (margin), Revisers (margin); add "disciples," ℵ A L and other MSS., Lachmann, Tischendorf, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort (text), Revisers (text).

172. „ xxvi. 27. "And he took the cup." "A cup," ℵ B L Z and other MSS., editors and Revisers (text).

173. „ xxvi. 28. "this is my blood of the new covenant." So A C D, etc., Lachmann, Tregelles, Revisers (margin); omit "new," ℵ B L Z, Alford, Tischendorf, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (text).

174. „ xxvi. 39. "And he went a little farther." So B, etc., Latin and Egyptian Versions, Lachmann, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort (text), Revisers; "drew near

a little," ℵ A C D, etc., Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort (margin).

175. Matt. xxvi. 42. "if this [cup] may not pass away [from me]." Omit bracketed words, ℵ B, etc., most editors, and Revisers.

176. „ xxvi. 44. ℵ B L.

177. „ xxvi. 53. ℵ* B L.

178. „ xxvi. 55. "sat daily with you." Omit "with you," ℵ B L, most editors, and Revisers.

179. „ xxvi. 59. "the chief priests and elders." Omit "and elders," ℵ B D L, editors and Revisers.

180. „ xxvi. 60. "But found none: yea, though many false witnesses came, yet found they none. At the last came two false witnesses." "And they found it not, though many false witnesses came. But afterwards came two," ℵ B C* L, editors and Revisers.

181. „ xxvii. 2. "to Pontius Pilate." Omit "Pontius," ℵ B L, most editors, and Revisers.

183. „ xxvii. 10. "and gave them for the potter's field." So most MSS., all editors, and Revisers (text); "I gave," etc., Syriac Versions, Eusebius, Westcott and Hort (margin), Revisers (margin).

185. „ xxvii. 28. "And they stripped him." So ℵ* A L, etc., Tischendorf, Tregelles, McClellan, Westcott and Hort (text), Revisers (text); "clothed," B D, Lachmann, Weiss, Westcott and Hort (margin), Revisers (margin).

186. „ xxvii. 34. "vinegar." So A, etc., Weiss; "wine," ℵ B D L, other editors, and Revisers. Compare Mark xv. 23.

187. „ xxvii. 35. "that it might be fulfilled . . . did they cast lots." Omit whole quotation ℵ A B D, etc., editors and Revisers.

188. „ xxvii. 42. "If he be the King of Israel." "He is the King of Israel," ℵ B D L, most editors, and Revisers.

191. „ xxvii. 64. "lest his disciples come by night." Omit "by night," ℵ A B C*, etc., editors and Revisers.

192. „ xxviii. 2. "rolled back the stone from the door." Omit "from the door," ℵ B D, editors and Revisers.

193. Matt. xxviii. 6. "the place where the Lord lay." So A C D L, etc., Lachmann, Tregelles (text), Westcott and Hort (margin), Revisers (margin); "he lay," ℵ B, Tischendorf, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort (text), Revisers (text).

194. „ xxviii. 9. "as they went to tell the disciples." Omit ℵ B D, most editors, and Revisers.

195. „ xxviii. 20. "Amen." Omit ℵ A* B D, editors and Revisers.

Instances of Difference between the Text of the Revisers and that of Drs. Westcott and Hort, in St. Matthew's Gospel.

8. Matt. iii. 16. "the heavens were opened unto him." So Revisers (text) with C D supp. L, etc., Tregelles and McClellan; omit "unto him," ℵ B, Tischendorf, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (margin).

9. „ iii. 16. C D, etc., Revisers; ℵ B, Westcott and Hort.

14. „ v. 25. "and the judge deliver thee to the officer." So D E, etc., Tregelles, McClellan, Revisers (text); omit bracketed words ℵ B, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, and Revisers (margin).

16. „ v. 32. "and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced" ("when she is put away," Revisers) "committeth adultery." Bracketed by Westcott and Hort after D, some MSS. of Old Latin, and Greek and Latin MSS. known to Augustine.

20. „ vi. 1. "Take heed that ye do," etc. So B D, etc., Lachmann, Tregelles (text), McClellan, Weiss and Westcott and Hort (as alternative), Revisers; "But take heed," ℵ L Z, Alford (text), Tischendorf, Weiss and Westcott and Hort (text).

25. „ vi. 8. "Your Father knoweth what things ye have need of." So most MSS., and editors and Revisers (text); "God your Father," ℵ B L, Weiss (text), Westcott and Hort (text), Revisers (margin).

31. „ vii. 9. ℵ C, etc., Revisers; B* L, Westcott and Hort.

32. „ vii. 13. "wide is the gate and broad is the way." So B C L, etc., Tischendorf (text), Tregelles, McClellan,

Revisers (text); omit "is the gate" ("wide and broad is the way") ℵ*, Old Latin, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Lachmann, Tischendorf (as alternative), Weiss, Westcott and Hort (text), Revisers (margin).

34. Matt. vii. 18. "A good tree cannot bring forth." So C L Z, etc., Lachmann, Tregelles, McClellan, Revisers; "bear," ℵ* B, Tischendorf, Weiss, Westcott and Hort.

37. „ viii. 9. "I also am a man under authority." So Revisers (text), with most MSS. and editors; "a man set under authority" (as in Luke vii. 8), ℵ B, Westcott and Hort (text), and Revisers (margin).

38. „ viii. 10. "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." So ℵ C L, etc., Tischendorf, McClellan, Revisers (text); "with no man in Israel have I found so great faith," B, with oldest form of some Versions, Lachmann, Tregelles, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (margin).

40. „ viii. 18. C L Δ, etc., Revisers (text); B, Westcott and Hort (text).

49. „ ix. 14. "Why do we and the Pharisees fast oft?" So C D, etc., Alford, Tregelles, McClellan, Westcott and Hort (margin), Revisers (text); omit "oft," ℵ* B, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Weiss, Westcott and Hort (text) Revisers (margin).

50. „ ix. 18. "there came a certain ruler." So (ἐλθών) some versions; similarly (εἷς ἐλθών) C D, etc., Tregelles, McClellan, Revisers; similarly (εἰσελθών) Alford, Tischendorf; εἷς προσελθών, ℵ (second corrector), B, Weiss, Westcott and Hort (bracketing εἷς); note that other MSS. have τις προσελθών and τις ἐλθών.

58. „ xi. 15. "He that hath ears to hear." So ℵ C L Δ, Lachmann, Tregelles (text), Revisers (text); omit "to hear," B D, Tischendorf, Weiss, McClellan, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (margin).

59. „ xi. 16. "their fellows" (τοῖς ἑταίροις), G S, etc. (also nearly C E, etc.), Lachmann, McClellan, Revisers; "the others" (τοῖς ἑτέροις), ℵ B D Z, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Weiss, Westcott and Hort. In construction of sentence Revisers and editors are agreed.

63. „ xii. 4. [he, *i.e.* David] "did eat." So Revisers (text) with most MSS. and Tregelles; "they did eat," ℵ B,

Lachmann, Tischendorf, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (margin).

70. Matt. xii. 47. "Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without desiring to speak with thee." So C D Z, etc., most Versions, Lachmann, Tischendorf (text), Tregelles, McClellan, Revisers (text); omit whole verse, ℵ* B L and one other, Old Syriac, Weiss (probably), Westcott and Hort, Revisers (margin).

74. „ xiii. 35. "from the foundation of the world." So ℵ* C D, etc., Revisers; omit "of the world," corrector of ℵ, B, Old Syriac, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Revisers (margin).

77. „ xiv. 3. C E, etc., Revisers; ℵ* B*, Westcott and Hort.

79. „ xiv. 22. "into a ship." So B, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort; "into the ship," ℵ C D, etc., Tischendorf, Weiss, McClellan, Revisers.

80. „ xiv. 24. "was now in the midst of the sea." So ℵ C E, etc., Latin Versions, Lachmann, Tischendorf, McClellan, Revisers (text); "was many furlongs distant from the land," B, Syriac Versions, Version of Lower Egypt, Tregelles, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (margin).

82. „ xiv. 29. "Peter . . . walked on the water to go to Jesus." So D E, etc., Lachmann, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort (margin), Revisers (text); for "to go" read "and came," B C (apparently), Old Syriac, Tischendorf, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort (text), and Revisers (margin).

92. „ xv. 31. Omit "the maimed whole." ℵ, Version of Lower Egypt, Latin and Old Syriac Versions, McClellan, Westcott and Hort (text). Not noticed by Revisers.

100. „ xvi. 21. "From that time forth began Jesus to shew," etc. So most MSS. and editors, Revisers (text). For "Jesus" read "Jesus Christ," ℵ* B*, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (margin).

104. „ xvii. 15. "[is lunatick and] sore vexed." So ("sufferеth grievously" κακῶς πάσχει) C D, etc., Tischendorf, McClellan, Weiss, Revisers; "is ill" (κακῶς ἔχει), ℵ B L Z, Lachmann, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort.

107. „ xvii. 22. "while they abode in Galilee." So C D, etc.,

Revisers (text); "while they were gathering themselves together," ℵ B, editors, and Revisers (margin).

109. Matt. xviii. 12. ℵ E, etc., Revisers; B L, Westcott and Hort.

110. „ xviii. 14. "it is not the will of your Father." So ℵ D, etc., Latin and Syriac Versions, Tischendorf, Weiss, Westcott and Hort (margin), Revisers (text); "my Father," B F and some other MSS., Egyptian Versions, Lachmann, Tregelles, McClellan, Westcott and Hort (text).

111. „ xviii. 15. "if thy brother shall trespass against thee." So D, etc., Tregelles, McClellan, Revisers (text); omit "against thee," ℵ B, Alford (text), Lachmann, Tischendorf, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (margin).

112. „ xviii. 19. "Again I say unto you." So ℵ D and some other MSS., Tischendorf, Revisers; "Again verily I say," B E, etc., Alford, Lachmann, Tregelles, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort.

113. „ xviii. 26. "Lord, have patience with me." So ℵ etc., Revisers; omit "Lord," B D, editors.

117. „ xix. 4. "he which made them." So ℵ C, etc., most editors, Revisers (text); "created," B, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, Revisers (margin).

119. „ xix. 9. "and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery." So B C* Z, and some other MSS., Lachmann, Tregelles (text), Westcott and Hort (margin), Revisers (text); omit whole clause, ℵ D L, Alford, Tischendorf, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort (text), Revisers (margin).

124. „ xix. 29. "an hundredfold." So ℵ C D, etc., Revisers (text); "manifold," B L, editors, and Revisers (margin).

126. „ xxi. 12. "And Jesus went into the temple of God." So C D., etc., Tischendorf, Weiss (text), Westcott and Hort (margin), Revisers (text); omit "of God," ℵ B L, Lachmann, Tregelles, McClellan, Weiss (as alternative), Westcott and Hort (text), Revisers (margin).

132. „ xxi. 29. In the parable of the two sons there is a transposition of order in the question and answers in B, which is adopted in part by McClellan, and entirely by Weiss and Westcott and Hort (but with mark indicating probable corruption); the common order is retained by ℵ C D, etc., other editors, and Revisers.

136. Matt. xxii. 10. "And the wedding was furnished with guests." So C D, etc., Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford, McClellan, Revisers; "wedding chamber" (for "wedding") ℵ B* L, Tischendorf, Weiss, Westcott and Hort.

142. „ xxiii. 4. "and grievous to be borne." So B D, etc., Lachmann, McClellan, Westcott and Hort (margin), Revisers (text). Omit ℵ L, Old Latin and Syriac Versions, Alford, Tischendorf, Weiss, Westcott and Hort (text), Revisers (margin).

146. „ xxiii. 24. ℵ C D, etc., Revisers; B D* L, Westcott and Hort.

148. „ xxiii. 38. "your house is left unto you desolate." So ℵ C etc., Tischendorf, Tregelles, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort (margin), Revisers (text); omit "desolate," B L, Lachmann, Westcott and Hort (text), Revisers (margin).

153. „ xxiv. 24. "they shall deceive the very elect." So B Δ, etc., Lachmann, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort, (margin), Revisers; "even the elect should be deceived," ℵ D, Tischendorf, and similarly L Z, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort (text).

155. „ xxiv. 31. "with a great sound of a trumpet." So B, etc., Lachmann, Tregelles, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort (margin), Revisers (text); "with a great trumpet," ℵ L Δ, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort (text), Revisers (margin).

159. „ xxiv. 37. "But as the days of Noe were." So ℵ L, etc., Tischendorf, Revisers; "For as," etc., B D and another uncial MS., Lachmann, Tregelles, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort.

167. „ xxv. 16. "and made them other five talents." Similarly, ℵ* A*, etc., Tischendorf, Revisers; "gained other five," B L (and some others partially), Lachmann, Tregelles, McClellan, Weiss, Westcott and Hort.

182. „ xxvii. 4. "in that I have betrayed the innocent blood." So ("innocent"), ℵ A B* C, etc., most editors, Westcott and Hort (margin), Revisers (text); "righteous," B (second corrector), L, Egyptian Versions, Origen, Cyprian, etc., Westcott and Hort (text), Revisers (margin).

184. Matt. xxvii. 24. "I am innocent of the blood of that just person." So ℵ L, etc., text of Lachmann, Tregelles, Weiss, Revisers, Westcott and Hort (margin); "this blood" (omitting "just person"), B D, Tischendorf, McClellan, Westcott and Hort (text), and other editors as alternative, Revisers (margin).

189. „ xxvii. 49. Insert (as John xix. 34). "And another took a spear and pierced his side, and there came out blood and water," ℵ B C L, Westcott and Hort (but within double brackets), Revisers (margin).

190. „ xxvii. 56. "Mary the mother of James and Joses." "Joseph," ℵ* D* L, Tischendorf, McClellan, Westcott and Hort (text), not Revisers.

Many things come out distinctly on a systematic review which are only imperfectly apprehended while they are left to vague general impression; and there is more than one point on which I must confess that my own previous impression of the Revised Text has been modified by the more complete collection of the data given above. We shall now be in a position, so far as one Gospel can be taken as a sample of the rest of the work, to draw some general conclusions as to the relation of the Revised Text to that of recent critical editors, and as to the principles upon which it would seem to have been based in reference to the primary authorities. We will take each of these points separately.

Relation of the Revised Text to Critical Editions. That of Drs. Westcott and Hort has been adopted above as a sort of standard of comparison. When tested by reference to this, it appears that out of 195 distinct instances the Revised Text agrees with the text compared with it in 146, and differs from it in 49: the real proportion of agreement is probably larger still, as a number of minute points have been left unnoticed; and it is just on these minutest points that the unanimity of editors is usually most complete. It will be observed, however, that of the 146 instances in

which the Revised Text agrees with Westcott and Hort's, in as many as 75 it has also the consent of the other critical editors; and in 31 more it has the support of "most" of them. It should be said that this term, "most editors," has been applied with considerable reserve. Only in some three or four cases is there more than one dissentient; in 16 instances the dissentient is Lachmann or Tregelles; in two instances the dissentient is Alford, who has not been systematically quoted and to whose isolated opinion no great importance need be attached; in three instances Tischendorf dissents; in two Weiss and in one Weiss (margin); only on seven occasions (of which, one, No. 97 is doubtful, and no less than three, Nos. 105, 120, 121 are represented only in the "Errata") does the dissent of a critic like McClellan at all denote an opposition of principle, while in two at least, out of these seven instances, Nos. 120, 121, Dr. Scrivener, who in general upholds the same views as Mr. McClellan, is found on the side of the majority. In every other case "most editors" may be taken to include McClellan, and in all these McClellan and Westcott and Hort are ranged together. We shall not be far wrong, then, if we assume that here is a practical consent of editors in something like 100 out of the 146 cases in which the Revisers and Westcott and Hort are agreed. These may, to all intents be put aside as not open to very much doubt; and, whenever in these examples the Revisers have made a change, it may be assumed that it is a clear and tolerably certain improvement. There remain some 46 instances in which there is a division of opinion, and the Revisers side with Westcott and Hort; and 49 instances in which there is a similar division and they side against them. Now, quite independently of the merits of particular cases, when we consider the heterogeneous composition of the Committee, how large a conservative element there was upon it, and the fact that a two-thirds vote was necessary to carry any change—when

we consider all these drawbacks in the direction of conservatism, I think it will be admitted that there is a decided presumption in favour of the points on which the Revisers and such thorough-going critics as Drs. Westcott and Hort are agreed; and, on the other hand, the 49 instances of difference will represent nothing more than the natural admixture of caution which was sure to be present, and which most people would wish to see. This will become still more evident when I proceed to analyse the relation of the Revisers to the evidence of the MSS. But before passing on to this there are a few remarks still to make on the subject of editors. In the first place it will naturally be asked: What special examples are there of the influence of the two Cambridge editors on the decisions of the Committee? The only instance that I have observed in which the Revisers have admitted a reading into the text on the sole authority of Drs. Westcott and Hort is No. 90, "blind guides," for "blind guides" (or "leaders") "of the blind." The evidence for this is ℵ* B D, Old Syriac, and some MSS. of the Version of Lower Egypt. There is nothing very adventurous in this change; and the wonder only seems to be that other editors have not adopted it. The Revisers were evidently so clear in their own minds on the subject that they have not even mentioned the older reading in the margin. I am rather surprised at this, as it would have been consistent with their own practice elsewhere to mention it, and Westcott and Hort themselves place in the margin ὁδηγοί εἰσιν τυφλοὶ [τυφλῶν]. In one other instance, No. 30, "his kingdom and his righteousness," for "the kingdom of God and his righteousness," the Revisers have followed Westcott and Hort, with Tischendorf only, on the somewhat slender authority of ℵ and B (in part, with an inversion of the order which is accepted in the text by Lachmann and Weiss). Here, again, strange to say, they give no alternative in the margin. These are not very conspicuous instances of the

influence of the two joint-editors. It appears, however, more prominently in a number of readings which have not indeed been adopted into the text, but for which a place, otherwise doubtful, has been secured in the margin. Among the most marked of these are two that are quoted as signal examples of the untrustworthy character of ℵ B; No. 25, where in the clause "your Father knoweth what things ye have need of," these MSS read "God your Father," the intrusive word being commonly regarded as an explanatory gloss; and No. 37, "I also am a man under authority," where the same pair read "set under authority," with a suspicious resemblance to St. Luke vii. 8. In each case the reading is placed in the text (but in single brackets) by Westcott and Hort; and in each case the Revisers have also admitted it into the margin. Another strong case would be the admission to the margin of an apparent interpolation from St. John (No. 189), which Westcott and Hort doubly bracket, but which they are the only editors to recognize in any way. A word shall be said about it presently. No. 100 is also deserving of special notice. The reading "Jesus Christ" is here substituted for "Jesus" of the Received Text on the strength of ℵ* B*, by Weiss, Westcott and Hort, and is also mentioned by the Revisers in their margin. It will have been observed that this combination, though found in the introductions to the Gospels and frequently in the Epistles, is, as a rule, excluded from the Gospel narratives. Other instances in which the influence of Westcott and Hort may be traced are Nos. 80, 117, 134, 148, 182, 183. On the other hand, there are also instances in which this influence might have been expected to make itself felt, but has not done so. Such would be Nos. 92, 112, 113, 124, 132, 136, 158, 167, 190. In all but one of these the reading of Westcott and Hort is passed over in silence; and in that one (No. 124) a reading which might well have claimed a place in the text, inasmuch as it is adopted not only by

Westcott and Hort, but by all the other editors, is relegated to the margin. This is not the only curious phenomenon connected with this group of readings. No. 113 is another which has been adopted, in direct opposition to the general consent of the editors—again including McClellan. McClellan himself is the one authority that has been followed in No. 77, and Tischendorf is the only ally of the Revisers in Nos. 112, 159, 167. Here again are results for which we should hardly have been prepared. The clue to them will be, perhaps, to some extent supplied by the next division of our subject.

The Relation of the Revised Text to the principal MSS. This may be shewn, perhaps, most concisely in the form of a table. The Revisers are in agreement with the following groups of MSS. in the following instances.

א B alone of uncial MSS. (13), (15), 17, 29, (30), 44, 45, 52, 60, 65, 68, (73), 83, 98, 105, 106, 162, 166, 193 = 19 at most or 15 at least.

Note that the bracketed figures denote instances which do not quite strictly come under this category though they approach to it nearly.

א B and one other (usually א B D, א B L, א B Z). 1, 5, 6, 10, 21, 23, 26, 33, 35, 47, 54, 56, 57, 66, 71, 72, 75, 87, 90, 91, 93, 96, 101, 102, 103, 108, 114, 122, 130, 131, 135, 137, 156, 158 (*bis*), 176, 177, 178, 181, 192, 194 = 41.

B and one other, not א. 62, 123, 138, 158 = 4.

B and two others, א not being one. 41, 76, 88, 91 = 4.

B alone. 133 = 1.

It has not been thought worth while to give instances of the combination א B and *two* others. To the best of my recollection there are only three examples in this Gospel (Nos. 59, 104, 189) in which such a combination is opposed.

I now proceed to give a corresponding table of the

instances in which the Revisers have resisted the evidence of the same groups, premising that not quite the same amount of care has been taken to make it exhaustive. The Revisers are opposed to the following groups in the following instances.

א B alone of uncial MSS. 8, 9, 14, 25, 34, 37, 49, 63, 77, 100, 107, 111 = 12.

א B and one other. 25, 126, 136 = 3.

B and one other, not א. 31, 50 (corrector of א), 58, 82, 109, 113, 124, 148, 184 = 9. Compare 118, 185.

B and two others, א not being one. 146, 159 = 2.

B alone. 38, 40, 79, 80, 117, 132 = 6. Compare 4, 67.

The reason why B and its supporters other than א, figure to such a comparatively small extent in both tables is the obvious one that the affinity between B and א is so great that, when either receives the support of the other greater uncials, the chances are that the companion MS. is included in the same group. It should be remembered, however, that the instances in which א and B each heads an array of minor MSS. have not been analysed, so that the agreement between the two may seem rather larger than it is.

From the above tables the procedure of the Revisers will become sufficiently clear. It is evident that the combination of א B with two or more of the greater uncials has been treated by them as all but decisive. The combination of א B with one other first-class uncial has also had the greatest weight. We have seen that there are forty-one instances of agreement with this combination and only three instances of difference from it. When we come to the single pair, א B alone, there is much greater indecision. Their authority has been followed in from 15 to 19 cases, and

rejected in 12. With any other single supporter than ℵ, B has carried less weight still, the numbers being here 9 (or rather 11) to 4, while the isolated evidence of B has been rejected in 6 cases out of 7, or 9 out of 10.

Now if we look back at the instances in which the Revisers were found to be at variance with the main body of editors, they will be found to come for the most part under this head. In No. 77 the rejected reading only has the support of ℵ B, in 113 of B D, in 124 of B L, in 159 of B D, and one other secondary MS. This would seem to have been the cause of the Revisers' hesitation. They evidently required a strong amount of internal or collateral evidence to induce them to accept the authority of any two even of the very best MSS., where the mass of authorities was on the other side. Nor will the strongest upholder of quality against quantity find fault with this degree of caution, even though there may be several cases where he himself would have come to a different decision.

I have been asked to give an opinion, and I will give one—for what it is worth. The instances in which it seems to me that the Revisers might most reasonably have come to another conclusion, even upon their own principles, would be Nos. 50, 59, 104, 112, 113, 124, 136, 167. No. 50 appears to me to be a singularly neat example of the rule of internal evidence—that that reading is to be preferred which most satisfactorily explains the rest: if we assume that the original reading here was εἰς προσελθών, all the variations seem to be easily accounted for—εἰς in *ΕΙCΠΡΟCΕΛΘΩΝ* being mistaken for the preposition, and then first one preposition being dropped and then the other. In 59, 104 and 136 the external evidence (ℵ B D Z, ℵ B L Z, and ℵ B L) appears to be too preponderant; nor does there seem to be any very strong internal evidence to countervail it. In the remaining instances the weight of internal evidence seems to be against the Revisers.

But none of these examples is of any great moment. Taking the Revised Text as a whole, enough will have been seen to shew that it is really a very good one. A large proportion of the changes made are such as must be generally acquiesced in; and, in regard to the remainder, there is at once a praiseworthy amount of method and consistency; and there are, at the same time, abundant signs that the claims of the competing readings have been weighed with much independence and care. There must always be a certain residuum of readings as to which the evidence is so nicely balanced that either conclusion must be open to doubt; and, when due allowance is made for this, the number of cases in which the Revisers have probably come to a wrong decision will not be a large one. A judicious use has been made of the margin. Many readings that might easily have escaped notice one is glad to find there, and the omissions are not numerous. The cases where I should myself desire to see a marginal note are Nos. 16 (comp. 134), 42, 92, 112, 113, 159, 167. A question is very likely to be asked as to the precise significance of the different forms of marginal note, "some ancient authorities," "many ancient authorities," "many authorities some ancient," and so on. I can only reply that, as far as I have observed, the terms are chosen with much care; but they must not be taken to mean more than they do. In each case the note means precisely what it says, but it is not a "word to the wise," into which it is possible to read hidden meanings. "Some ancient authorities" may mean ℵ B, or it may mean a much weaker combination. "Many ancient authorities" may denote a combination which the practised critic would pretty certainly accept, or one which he would as probably reject. There are some of these notes, however, such as "many authorities, some ancient, but with variations," "many very ancient authorities," which really tell their own tale.

I cannot leave this part of my subject without stopping to point out just one moral. It is a moral which seems to emerge of itself whenever textual criticism is treated at all systematically. I mean the extent to which even these rough and imperfect investigations, in spite of the limited area which they cover, tend to confirm the main principles laid down at the beginning of this article. They will shew how necessary it is to have some conception of the history and growth of the text; and what chaotic inconsistency and confusion is introduced by those who attempt to judge each reading independently of the rest, assigning as it were to each MS. a certain number of marks in proportion to the age of its parchment, but letting the actual decision turn on what is thought to be the internal evidence, and what is really the partial aspect of such evidence as it presents itself to one particular mind. Mr. McClellan, with all his ability, has fallen entirely into this pitfall. Any one who will examine a portion of his text consecutively will find him rejecting in one breath a body of evidence which he accepts in the next, every now and then falling into a violent panic at ℵ B from which he gradually recovers, but only after a time to fall into a panic again, like a patient who suffers from intermittent fever.

In the portion of text which our examination has covered there are only, I believe, three at all considerable difficulties to which the opposite theory is exposed. These are the two examples of which I spoke above, Nos. 25 and 37, in which ℵ B have strong *primâ facie* internal evidence against them, and No. 189, where ℵ B C L admit what appears to be an almost certain interpolation from St. John. Let us think, however, what this comes to at the worst. It means that the common original of those four MSS. represents a text not older than the date at which St. John's Gospel became generally current. Recent investigations have shewn decisively that this was the case in the time

of Justin and his disciple Tatian. But there are a thousand indications in the relation of that text to the early Fathers Irenæus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus, Cyprian, and in its relation to the early versions, which shew that the main stock of this combined text cannot be later than such a date. A little while before the death of Justin, which Dr. Hort places about 148 A.D., will give us about the point desired. A text dating as far back as this would still be liable to some corruption (and in Justin himself corruption is found at a rather advanced stage); and we have at once room for the comparatively few errors by which the text of ℵ B and their companion MSS. is defaced, and a sufficient account of its great excellence.

These are, however, just the points on which we shall look with the greatest interest for the enlightenment that we are sure to receive when the introductory portion of the great work to which allusion has been so often made above is published. So far as I can see at present, the theory of textual criticism that is there maintained is not only open to far fewer difficulties than any other, but is really the only consistent and comprehensive theory that even attempts to take in *the whole* of the phenomena. Still it too is not entirely without its difficulties; and it would certainly have been a fortunate thing if those difficulties could have been thoroughly thrashed out, and the whole question placed upon a firm and stable footing before the Revised Version had been undertaken. It is not quite so true as Heraclitus supposed, that all things are in a state of flux. Much, indeed, there is that is constantly fluctuating.

> "Powers depart,
> "Possessions vanish, and opinions change."

But in questions of science the flux leads ultimately to rest. And if there is any one branch of theology which

possesses this truly scientific character, it is precisely that of textual criticism. A few years may see the labours of generations, accumulating slowly but surely, at last reach their goal. And then it may be a source of regret that this weighty task of Revision had not been reserved until its first and perhaps greatest half was already done, and all that remained for the Revisers was to step into and occupy ground prepared for them. We may dream of such a state of things; and the dream seems to have some not inconsiderable auguries of its own accomplishment. Still, it may after all prove fallacious; and, in the meantime, we must not let "the better" be "the enemy of the good,"—especially where the difference between "the good" and a possible "better" is so small.[1]

W. SANDAY.

SOME FEATURES OF THE LIFE EVERLASTING.

ST. JOHN xiv. 2, 23.

IN discussing the Vision of Isaiah a number or two back,[2] I said: "We often speak of that bourn from which no traveller returns, and lament that no one of those who have crossed the stream of death has ever come back to tell us what would have added praise to praise, by bringing us a report of the land that lies beyond." And in rebuke of the thoughtlessness or ingratitude which prompts us to speak thus, I alluded to the fact that "He who could not be holden of death *had* returned to assure us that it is a wealthy land and a good," and passed on to point out that "a whole order of men, the prophets, have risen into the spiritual and

[1] The next article will consist of a review of some of the principal results of the Revision as it affects the text of the four Gospels.

[2] THE EXPOSITOR, vol. ii. p. 81.