

THE
BIBLICAL REPERTORY.

APRIL, 1834.

No. II.

James Carnahan
ART. I.—*An Address delivered before the Alumni Association of Nassau Hall, on the day of the Annual Commencement of the College, Sept. 25, 1833, by John Sergeant, LL. D.*

THE day which closes the college life of a young man, is highly interesting, not only to the individual, but also to his friends and to his country.

Having finished his preparatory studies, he is ready to select a profession or occupation for life. Released from the inspection and control of teachers, he is henceforth to follow, in a great measure, his own guidance.

On such occasions, the most heedless can hardly exclude from their minds serious reflections respecting the past, and painful solicitude respecting the future. At this moment, whatever directions, or warnings, or encouragements may be given, by men of distinguished talents and virtues, cannot fail to make a deep and salutary impression on the youth anxious to know which way to direct his steps. On this account we cannot too highly commend the custom which prevails of having addresses delivered on the anniversaries of our literary institutions, by men eminent in civil and professional life. When the subject is well chosen and when the speaker is adequate to the task which he has undertaken, the most happy results may be safely anti-

diate exercise of repentance of sin and faith in Christ. We would tell them at the same time, what we believe the Bible tells them, not only that they have, of themselves, no power to perform these duties, but that their inability is, as has been said, **THE VERY ESSENCE OF THEIR GUILT.** We would tell them, that their hearts are so wicked that none but God himself can change them, and that they are therefore cast wholly dependent on his sovcreign will. We would add, that whatever hope we might have of success should be grounded not upon any appeals that *we* might make, but upon the efficiency of Him who is 'exalted to GIVE repentance unto Isreal and forgiveness of sins.' The truth is, God never sends forth his servants with the expectation that **THEY** can convert their hearers. It is their duty to go, and like Ezekiel, to prophesy over the slain; to cause their 'bones to live,' is the office of the same Spirit that created the world. O! if ministers acted more upon the sentiment, 'Neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase;' if, feeling their own weakness, they would gird themselves, by prayer, and faith, and holy living, in the strength of their Master, how would he honour their instrumentality in the salvation of souls! Then would the gospel become what it was in apostolic days; then would this rebellious world soon bow in holy allegiance to Israel's Redeemer and Israel's King.

Chas. Hodge

ART. IX.—*Lachmann's New Testament.*

AFTER the discovery of the art of printing, almost the first efforts of the press were devoted to sacred subjects. The most extended and uniform demand in the Christian Church, was naturally for the Word of God. As the Scriptures existed, at this period, only in manuscript copies, and as these manuscripts, as was unavoidable, were more or less inaccurate, it became a matter of great interest and responsibility to know which MSS. were to be followed, or how the mistakes of one might be corrected from the better readings of the others. When any one reflects on the great difficulty of transcribing accurately a book so large as the New Testament, he must be sensible that, without a constant miracle, every new transcript must be attended with more or less blunders. And as the mistakes of the MS. copied would be included in the transcript in addition to its own, it is easy to see

that, in the course of ages, the departures from the original text must become both numerous and serious. As, however, the number of independent transcriptions in all parts of the church, would not be marred by the same errors, it is clear that, by an extensive comparison of different copies, a much nearer approach to the true text might be attained, than by following exclusively any one copy. And it must be further apparent, that just in proportion to the number of these independent transcripts, no matter how great their individual errors, is the chance of the true original reading being preserved, and the opportunity of clearly identifying it. Accordingly, the text of the New Testament is much more certainly fixed than that of the great majority of the Greek and Latin classics, as the number of MSS. still extant of the former, is much greater than of those of the latter. And precisely those portions of the Scriptures, which were the least frequently transcribed, are those about the true reading of which there is the greatest doubt. Thus, for example, the Apocalypse exists now in fewer MS. copies, than any other portion of the New Testament, and it is of all others the most incorrect and doubtful. So far, therefore, from being alarmed for the certainty of the Scriptures, when informed that the number of various readings, or discrepancies between the copies, amount to upwards of a hundred thousand, we may be sure that as this great number implies the great extent of the independent sources of information as to the true text, the opportunity of ascertaining that text is proportionably increased. When we find the best MSS. of the western, eastern and southern sections of the church—the ancient versions of these several divisions—and the ancient fathers all conspiring to represent a passage in the same words, there can be no doubt as to its correctness, no matter how variously it may be presented in later or inferior copies. That it is, however, a work of great labour, great difficulty, and great responsibility, to ascertain and weigh all the evidence for and against any particular reading, and to decide finally what must be received as the true Word of God, is sufficiently evident from what has been said. There are few subjects, therefore, of greater interest, although few are so little regarded, as the history of the labours of critics and editors in fixing the text of the New Testament. No man knows on what ground he stands, until he knows on what evidence the reading which he finds in his Greek Testament, is regarded as part of the genuine Scriptures. It becomes every student therefore to look at this subject; to ascertain how the various editors have proceeded in the formation of the text which they exhibit; what materials they used, on what critical principles, and with what accuracy, skill and integrity, they employed

them. These are matters of grave import, when the Word of God is concerned.

The first, and on some accounts, one of the most important editions of the New Testament, was that contained in the Complutensian Polyglott, published under the auspices of Cardinal Ximenes. It was commenced in 1502, and finished 1514—but not actually published until 1522. Unfortunately, with regard both to the materials employed for this edition, and the manner in which they were used, there is much uncertainty, and of course much diversity of opinion. As to the first point, we have nothing but the assertion of the editors, and the internal character of the text from which to form an opinion. The editors assert that their MSS. were *vetustissima simul et emenditissima*, but as they have been since destroyed, this point cannot be ascertained from actual inspection. From the fact that the Complutensian text agrees generally with the modern MSS. and rarely has readings characteristic of the more ancient ones, many critics disregard the assertion of the editors, and maintain that the text is founded exclusively on MSS. of recent date. There is the same doubt as to the skill and fidelity of the editors. From the fact of their being Catholics, and from the manner in which they speak of the Latin Vulgate, Wetstein accuses them of having formed their text rather on the authority of that version, than of the Greek MSS. Of this charge, however, Bishop Marsh, who on other grounds depreciates this edition, acquits them. And, on inspection, the Complutensian text is found to differ too frequently from the Latin Vulgate, to justify the assertion of its editors being unduly influenced by its authority. As this edition is one of the principal grounds on which rest the claims of some important passages in the New Testament to be considered genuine, it is one of great interest. Mill expresses his regret, that subsequent editors did not content themselves with marking their corrections in the margin, and adopting this text as their standard, as he thinks no other, on the whole, so good. And Wetstein, its great impugner, pays it the silent, though effective tribute, of scarcely ever approving a reading which has not the testimony of the Complutensian text in its favour.*

The edition of Erasmus, though not completed until after that of the Cardinal Ximenes, was published before it, owing to the delay which waiting for the Pope's permission occasioned in the publication of the latter. The qualifications of Erasmus, as a

* As the Complutensian Polyglott is very scarce and costly, some of our readers may be glad to know that the Greek Text of that edition, with the Latin Vulgate of the edition of Clement VIII., has been published separately in 2 vols. 8vo.

critical editor, were of the highest order; but his materials were very scanty, and his attention was so much distracted, that it was impossible for him to do justice to the importance of the work. He was engaged by a bookseller at Basle, and was obliged to furnish a sheet for the press daily—while he had on hand several other literary enterprises, any one of which was sufficient to occupy his whole time. He had five MSS. those numbered 1, 2, 3, 61 and 69, in Wetstein's catalogue. Three of these made one complete copy—the fourth contained the whole of the New Testament except the book of Revelation. Besides these MSS. he used the works of Theophylact, containing the text of the New Testament, and the commentary of that father, and the Latin Vulgate. Such were the materials which Erasmus possessed for his first edition, published in 1515. His second was published in 1519—differing in upwards of four hundred places from the former. In 1522 he published his third edition, in which, for the first time, he inserted the controverted passage, 1 John, v, 7. The fourth appeared in 1527, and the fifth in 1535, both still farther corrected and improved by a comparison with the Complutensian, published 1522.

During the interval between the publication of the first and fifth editions of Erasmus, several others were printed, but these were in general merely reprints of one or other of those of Erasmus. That of Colinaeus, 1534, was indeed of a different character, but it had little influence on the formation of the received text. The next editions therefore of importance, in the history of that text, were those of Robert Stephens. Of these there were four; the most important was the third, 1550, in folio; one of the most elegant specimens of typography which that age produced. The materials employed by Robert Stephens were—1st, the several editions which had preceded his own; and 2d, fifteen MSS. eight of which were from the Royal Library at Paris. Of the age or value of these MSS. little can now be certainly ascertained, as it is doubtful whether they are now extant—Travis and many others maintaining they were lost with the library of Beza—while others suppose that those belonging to the Royal Library were returned, and are now preserved in that collection. Those which critics think they can identify as the same used by Robert Stephens, are comparatively modern. As to the skill and fidelity exercised in the use of these materials, although Griesbach brings many complaints against the editor, there seems to be no ground for suspecting any thing more than what may be readily admitted, viz. that the criticism of the New Testament was not then in the advanced state at which it arrived two or three centuries afterwards.

The apparatus employed by Theodore Beza, was more extensive than that of any of his predecessors. He had not only the materials collected by Robert Stephens, but also the results of a more extensive collation of MSS. made by Henry Stephens, and on the Gospels, the Codex Bezae, the oldest MS. extant, and on the Epistles, the Codex Claromontanus, with the Syriac version. As to the use which he made of these materials, there is a difference of opinion. Mill says he employed them rather for the purpose of interpretation than to fix the text; and Wetstein, with his characteristic bitterness, accuses him of negligence, levity, and fraud. His main ground of complaint, however, seems to have been that he wrote in favour of the punishment of heretics. Beza's piety, learning, and sense of responsibility to God, are pledges that there was no ground for this charge of unfaithfulness. The result of his labours was the formation of a text which differed in sixty places from that of Robert Stephens. One hundred and fifty other readings he indicates in his notes as preferable to those which he retained in the text; and nearly six hundred others as of equal authority. This work was completed in 1598.

The next edition was the *Textus Receptus*. The Elzevirs, learned and successful printers of Holland, were the publishers of this edition, but its editors are unknown. Their object was merely to form a text by a comparison of the previous editions. Hence it bears the title, "*Novum Testamentum ex Regiis aliisque optimis Editionibus cum cura expressum.*" It was not therefore, on account of any peculiar confidence reposed in its editors, nor on account of the value of the critical materials employed in its formation, that this text attained to such general acceptance and authority; but simply because of its beauty and typographical accuracy. By innumerable reprints it was widely disseminated, and came into common use; and thus obtained an ascendancy which it has never lost. This edition was printed in 1624. On examination, it is found that the unknown editors followed principally the third edition of Robert Stephens and that of Beza. It differs, in fact, only in twelve places from the former. This edition of Robert Stephens, into which the received text resolves itself, rests on the Complutensian as its basis, on the fifth of Erasmus, which it very frequently follows, and the editor's sixteen MSS.

It appears from this brief statement, that it would be little less than miraculous, if an edition resting on the authority of comparatively few MSS. of whose age or value no certainty can now be attained, should in every point be found correct. There was cause, therefore, for the extended and laborious efforts of subsequent editors, that by the comparison and just appreciation of

the hundreds of MSS. of the New Testament still extant, of the various ancient versions, and the quotations of the ancient writers, the sacred text might be more firmly settled, and more nearly assimilated to that of the sacred penman. The three most important critical editions, subsequent to the formation of the received text, are those of Mill, Wetstein, and Griesbach. There is nothing peculiar in the critical principles of either of the two former. Their effort seems to have been, merely to examine more extensively all the various sources of knowledge of the ancient text, and to form a more critical estimate of their relative value. With regard to Griesbach, however, the case was different. He first undertook to construct a text, not on the testimony of MSS., fathers, and versions, considered as separate and independent witnesses; but having arranged these witnesses into distinct classes and families, on the testimony of these classes, as such. Having divided all the MSS. into the Western, Alexandrian, and Byzantine classes, should any two of these concur, (no matter how few the separate MSS. included under each,) in favour of a particular reading, he would adopt it as genuine. Hence to two or three MSS. belonging to one class, was often assigned the same weight as to a hundred belonging to another. The principle on which this classification is founded is evidently just and natural, because it is plain, if one particular MS. had been transcribed a hundred times, each transcript could not be entitled to a separate voice in deciding on the genuine text. We might as well take the testimony of every copy of a printed edition. But as in this latter case, the Complutensian, the Erasmusian, the Stephanian editions, can alone be considered independent witnesses, and not the several copies of each, so, if it were possible to divide and arrange the MS. authorities into really distinct classes, a great point would be gained. But here is the difficulty, and it seems nearly insurmountable. Griesbach admits he did not know whether to make three classes, or five, or seven. Michaelis is for making four; other critics two. Should this difficulty be gotten over, then comes another equally great, viz. to decide to which class each particular MS. belongs. Griesbach says: "In some cases, a MS. follows one class in the Gospels, and another in the Epistles; and in others, the readings are so mixed up, it is impossible to tell to which the reading is to be referred." Whatever may be the theoretical correctness of this system, it is plain that it has not been so carried out as to afford a safe basis for the formation of the text of the sacred volume. Griesbach's edition on this, and other accounts, has lost all authority even among the German critics. The recent edition of Scholze, though the result of long and laborious preparation, is con-

sidered in a great measure a failure. The only work which is regarded as making a real advance since the time of Griesbach, is that of Lachmann, which, we are informed, has won almost all suffrages, and is becoming an authority. As his edition is not attended by any Prolegomena, he refers his readers for an account of his critical principles, to an article published by himself in the "*Studien und Kritiken*," for 1830. From this source we propose to give a brief statement of his plan, that our readers may know what to expect in this new attempt to fix the sacred text.

1. The first position assumed by Lachmann is that his object should not be merely to correct the text of Griesbach. Without evincing any disposition to question the merits of that distinguished critic, he felt from the beginning that he was not to be regarded as a leader. The principal ground of objection to his system is that he assumed the received text as the basis of his edition; feeling called upon only to justify himself when he altered that text without reflecting that he was as much responsible for what he allowed to remain, as for what he changed. Instead of inquiring, in the first instance, what readings were to be regarded as resting on historical evidence, he, and all the critics of that period, with the solitary exception of Bentley, assumed that all they met with were of this character, and began at once on internal grounds, to decide upon their respective claims. Griesbach, indeed, paid great attention to the sources of these readings, and in this respect greatly excelled the majority of contemporary philologists, but still he was led only to investigate what, from internal evidence, or his critical rules, he thought himself able to decide upon; other matters he generally passed over. But to a critic it matters nothing whether a reading be important or not.

Lachmann, therefore, thought it best at once to reject the text which for three hundred years the church has generally received, in favour of that which is at least fourteen hundred old; and to assume the responsibility of what he allows to remain unchanged as well as what he alters. In answer to the obvious question, Why aim at re-establishing the text of the fourth century, and not that of the apostolic age itself? he says, his principles would of course lead him to endeavour to ascertain the apostolic text, but of this he despairs. That text can only be made out by availing ourselves at times of internal evidence, where external fails; and especially by a careful observance of the peculiar *usus loquendi* of the several sacred writers. This means, though acknowledged to be excellent, he thinks ought only to be applied after we have a text formed on the exclusive basis of historical tradition or external evidence. To form such text is the object of his labours.

This is a mere historical problem, and one which may be finally solved and settled; whereas the formation of a text on critical principles which appeal to other than historical evidence, is an endless work; because the means constantly increase as our knowledge increases. That there is nothing either popish or merely mechanical in this historical method of proceeding, he thinks is evident enough, from its being the method adopted by Richard Bentley, whom he pronounces the greatest critic of modern times. A more plausible objection is, that this method must lead at times to the adoption of readings less intelligible than others, and even certainly false—contrary to what we have been long accustomed to, and offensive perhaps to pious persons. All these things are of little concern to him, as his office and object are not to form a text which can offend no one, but to state what was the reading at a given time.

2. The second point is presented by the question, How is the oldest text to be ascertained? It is clear that some limit must be fixed, when we speak of the oldest text. It is, however, not necessary to adopt any reading in a more modern state than that in which it existed in the fourth century, and as authenticated by the Latin version corrected by Jerome. As far at least as the original text of Jerome can be ascertained, and the Greek can be inferred from the Latin, we may be certain that we have either the readings of good Latin MSS., or that of the Greek copies from which Jerome's corrections were made. It is true, as he admits, that, through the slothfulness of the Vatican critics, the text of Jerome has not been restored: yet it is not lost, and if we look at the MSS. written before the tenth century, we shall find them much more coincident with the ancient Greek MSS. than with those modern ones on which the received text is founded. This, as he remarks, was also Bentley's plan, who wished to form his text mainly on the agreement of the ancient MSS. with the Vulgate. It would seem to be an obvious objection to this feature of Lachmann's plan, that there is quite as much difficulty in restoring the true text of the Vulgate, as that of the Greek, and that before the Vulgate can be made a basis on which to rest the formation of the Greek text, this restoration should be effected. He states in a note that he proposes publishing a critical edition of the Vulgate with various readings &c., as an essay towards this restoration. Considering the great and universally acknowledged importance of the Latin version, as a critical authority, he expresses great surprise that the recent catholic editor of the New Testament, Dr. Scholz, did not form his text mainly on the Vulgate, by which he would, at once, have approached nearer to the reading approved by his own church, and to the ancient text, than

by his mere correction of Griesbach. But he adopted the strange idea that the oldest MSS. and fathers do not exhibit so old a text as that contained in the more common modern manuscripts.

Lachmann, however, does not propose to rest satisfied with the Vulgate, and he thinks Bentley, had he prosecuted his labours, would have looked beyond it also. Indeed, Jerome himself marks out a free, and more correct course, as is clear from the excellent critical principles which he lays down. His object was to exhibit the Latin *codicum Graecorum emendata conlatione sed veterum*. He rejected readings supported by only a few MSS., relying on the testimony of the versions where the MSS. differed.

There is another principle of importance to be here noticed, viz. that a reading should not only be old, but widely extended. On this account it will not do to rely exclusively on the Vulgate, for Jerome, though he deferred to the authority of the Greek MSS., yet says expressly that he departed as little as possible from the common Latin readings. Instead therefore, of trusting to the testimony of one individual, the editor urges the propriety of endeavouring to ascertain the most widely diffused readings from the coincidence of the Greek MSS., the versions and the ecclesiastical writers.

3. Another critical principle which Lachmann adopts, is the division of the MSS. into two distinct families. The pervading characteristic difference between these families, he is persuaded, could not have escaped the sagacity of Bentley, had he continued his critical labours. He would doubtless, as he supposes, have anticipated Griesbach's results, and prevented his errors. This diversity manifests itself between Irenaeus and Origen, and is the more important, because it is continued; the versions before Jerome agreeing with the western fathers; while with the eastern, we find the most ancient Greek MSS. and a Coptic Greek MS. coinciding. The pointing out clearly of these facts is a great part of the merit of Griesbach. As both of these families necessarily rest upon a common original text, it is only from a great number of readings any one can determine to which any particular witness (MS. or version) is to be referred. And when a reading decidedly western is found in the oldest copies of the eastern or Alexandrian class, it is to be considered thereby as doubly guaranteed. When Origen presents in any passage two readings, one of which is western, it is to be supposed that he has availed himself of a MS. true to the original text, and not of one derived from the west, or corrected from western authorities; since either of these suppositions has little plausibility. Any reading therefore common to both classes is to be considered as widely spread and ancient; and therefore worthy of a place in the text. The authority

of one class is with this editor no greater than the other. All readings which have only a part of either family in their favour he rejects—even though from internal or other grounds he is persuaded they are correct. For his object is not to give the true text, but that which can be historically shown to be the oldest and the most disseminated.

Another statement of the editor, with regard to his plan, is, that his object is to give only the oriental text. He says, he found that within the limits prescribed, he could not exhibit fully the characteristic varieties of both classes of MSS. The western readings are in fact but imperfectly known, and in part they are extant only in a Latin form. He would therefore either have to mix the Latin with the Greek under the text, or to translate the former into the latter. On this account he determines to confine himself to the exhibition of the text of the oriental class. Diversities, therefore, confined to the western class, he passes unnoticed; but when there was a difference among the MSS. of the oriental class themselves, the western class would fix his choice. A word or sentence which was in every part of Christendom, at once read and not read, stands between brackets as uncertain; what every where seems to have been variously read, is given, one reading in the text, the other in the lower margin, and when necessary, with the sign of equality before it.

With regard to those matters which do not depend on the authority of MSS. but on the interpretation of the text, he of course follows his own judgment. To this class belong interpunction, the *iota subscriptum*, the division of words and the accents. As the transcribers generally neglected those differences in orthography which made no difference in the pronunciation of the words, the editor with regard to such points, does not follow his MSS. but the rules of grammar. With respect however to other orthographical diversities, he pursues the opposite course, and writes as he finds written.

4. As the text of this edition is founded exclusively on historical authorities, it becomes peculiarly interesting to know on what sources the editor has mainly relied. He informs us that in respect to the Greek MSS. he has conformed to Bentley's plan, and confined himself to those written in uncial or capital letters, because of these only can the antiquity be confidently relied upon. Of the Oriental class of these MSS., the Alexandrian Codex (A.), of which a fac simile has been printed, is the first and the most available. The Vatican Codex (B) though it has been twice or even more frequently collated, is far less accurately known, and therefore can be but imperfectly used in the formation of the text.

The Codex Ephraemi (C) (one of the rescripti) was twice examined by Wetstein, but not in a satisfactory manner. The fragments of Paul's Epistles in the Codex Coislinianus 202 (H) printed by Montfaucon, are convenient for use, but of little value. The Rescripti of the Gospels among the Wolfenbüttel MSS. (PQ) are much more important. Besides these there are the fragments of the Gospel of John (T) printed by Borgias and a copperplate of the Dublin MS. of Matthew marked Z by Schulz and Scholz in their lists.

It will be observed that these MSS. enable the editor, in the greater part of the New Testament at least, to compare A and B, but not in all parts. In a considerable portion of Matthew, and 2. Corinthians iv. 13, xii. 6, his only oriental authority is B; and from Heb. ix. 14, through the Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse, his only witness is A., except the few places in which the testimony of C is available. Of course, in these portions the diversity of readings prevalent in the east, cannot be exhibited fully. Some help indeed is to be obtained from the quotations of the fathers; but, for reasons which he assigns, Lachmann has confined himself to the testimony of Origen. The careful examination of the genuine works of Athanasius, should, he thinks, be one of the first objects of attention to his successor in his department of critical labour. Aid also, to some extent, he obtained from the version of Jerome, where it differs from the western reading, for then it gives that of the Greek MSS. In some cases, he says, when the vulgate failed him, he has gone counter to a single oriental manuscript, on the authority of the more modern and common copies. As this however, is a departure from his principles and plan, it occurs but seldom.

As regards the western class of authorities, he remarks, that as far as Paul's epistles are concerned, the best witnesses are the Codex Claromontanus (Δ), and the Codex Boernerianus (G).* Matthai's printed edition of the latter, he says, is invaluable. The Latin versions which he considers pure, are for the Gospels, those in the MSS. of Vercelli (a) and Verona (b), to which he adds the Colbertian, by Sebatier, (c). The one at Cambridge (d) is trustworthy as to the Acts of the Apostles. For Paul's Epistles nothing better can be wished than that of Clermont, (f) which Sebatier has completed by the one from St. Germain (ff) and the Boernerian. In the Revelations, Primasius, he says, is of some use, though the translation is free and inaccurate. Of the western fathers, Irenaeus, Cyprian, and Hilary, are particularly

* The Greek MSS. which this editor uses, he makes A. B. C. D. E. Δ G. H. P. Q. T. Z., the Latin a b c d e f f' g h.

important. Of the version of Ulfilas, and the Syriac, he makes no use. Of those sources or authorities which are of a mixed character, the only one, besides the vulgate, from which he derived much advantage, is the famous Cambridge MS. (D). Little attention he thinks, is requisite to discover that this is a transcript of a western manuscript, in various ways and from various causes altered and corrupted. When this codex coincides with the pure oriental authorities, and the pure western are silent, or deficient, he considers the coincidence as decisive.

It seems then, that in the epistles of Paul, and in a great measure also, in the gospels, the western authorities are complete. But in the Acts and Revelations we have only one western witness, and even this fails towards the close of the Acts; consequently where the testimony of some father is not of avail, the diversity of the west must be unknown. In the last sections of Acts where the western witnesses fail, and the fathers are silent, the editor finds himself confined to A, and B, often C, and the vulgate.

In this exhibition of the principles and sources of his work, Lachmann has not failed to point out its weaknesses—which at least proves his sincerity and honesty. He does not hesitate to admit, that his edition has incorrect readings, in common with the received text, which might without difficulty be corrected. He even allows that his text has errors where the common text is correct. Cases of this kind he points out himself. His determination to exclude from his present work the western readings, he admits has in certain instances injured his text, but not often; for although the two classes are in a multitude of cases of equal authority, yet the cases are few, that a reading peculiar to the west is the true one; and there is even a preference due, when internal evidence is taken into view, to the eastern authorities, on the principle of Jerome: *multo purior fontis unda quam rivi*.

He apprehends that his text will give the least satisfaction in those places, where instead of its reading, others, though having but little external authority in their favour, are obviously genuine. But, true to his principle to give only the historically supported, and the widely disseminated, he adopts the erroneous, in preference to the true reading. First, because, he says, very frequently mere external authority has little to do with the evident truth of a reading: and secondly, because at times mere conjecture (which no one would allow to influence the text) outweighs all external evidence.

He thinks there is no doubt, the shorter form of the Lord's prayer in Luke, as it is given by Origen, Jerome, and the Vatican Codex, is the genuine reading, yet he is obliged, from the co-

incidence of A C P, with all the western authorities, to adopt the longer. Thus in Luke, xxiv. 36, he adopts, without even marking as doubtful the words, "*and he said to them, Peace be with you*"—though he believes them spurious. The latter part of Mark, he thinks, on internal grounds, evidently unworthy of a place in the text, and yet as all his authorities, except B, have the passage, it is retained. The passage in Mark, xv. 28, "*and the Scripture was fulfilled, which said, and he was counted with transgressors,*" is without doubt spurious, though here the external authorities are more divided. The west is unanimously in its favour; the east is divided, Eusebius is for, P for, A B C against: of the mixed authorities, D is against, the Vulgate for. According to his principle the passage must be adopted.

This edition viewed then not as an attempt to restore the true text, but to exhibit that which was prevalent in the east, at as early a period as the author's authorities would allow, is one of great interest. Though we have much abridged the account the author gives of his plan, we believe we have omitted none of its essential features.