



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

---

VOL. II.

No. 6.

---

## I.—THE NEW REVISION OF KING JAMES' REVISION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

### I.

#### SOME ACCOUNT OF THE PREVIOUS ENGLISH VERSIONS AND REVISIONS AND OF THE STATE AND TREATMENT OF THE GREEK TEXT.

In the preparation of this paper the following works were chiefly consulted, and their statements are often given with the language unchanged: *History of the English Bible*, B. F. Westcott, D. D., 12mo, 2d ed., London, 1872; *The English Bible: a Critical History of the various English Translations*, John Eadie, D. D., 2 vols., 8vo, London, 1876; *Michaelis' Introduction to the New Testament, translated from the German with Notes, etc.*, Herbert Marsh, Bishop of Peterborough, 6 vols., 8vo, 4th ed., London, 1823; *Bibliotheca Sacra seu Syllabus omnium ferme S. S. Editionum ac Versionum Jacobi Le Long*, II Partes, 8vo, Parisiis, 1709; *An Introduction to the Criticism of the Old Testament*, John Ayre, M. A., 8vo, London, 1860; *The Printed Text of the Greek New Testament*, S. P. Tregelles, LL. D., 8vo, London, 1854; *An Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, F. H. Scrivener, M. A., LL. D., 8vo, 2d ed., London, 1874.

For the first entire Bible in English we are indebted to John de Wycliffe, who was educated at the University of Oxford, and was Master of Balliol College in 1361. A certain sort of preparatory work, however, had in God's providence already been done. Caedmon embodied the historical part of the Scriptures in the alliterative metre of the Anglo-Saxon poetry; Aldhelm, Bishop of Sherborne, in the VIIth century translated the Psalter; the venerable Bede

translated the Gospel of St. John; Alfred the Great translated the four chapters of Exodus, xx-xxiii, as the basis of his laws, rendered portions of the Bible and some of the Psalms for the use of his own children; and a tradition exists, but only a tradition, that he translated the whole Bible. There is an Anglo-Saxon version of the Gospels interlinear with the Latin of the Vulgate, the Durham book, which is known to belong to the IXth or the Xth century; there is another of the same date in the Bodleian Library, called the Rushworth Gloss; there is another of somewhat later date in the Bodleian, and in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; we have the famous Ormulum, a metrical paraphrase of the Gospels, which is assigned to the latter half of the XIIth century; there is a prose translation into Norman French of about 1260, as if meant for the higher classes and perhaps for the court itself; three separate versions of the Psalms, that portion of the Bible which has always been most dear to the English people, were made in these early days: one toward the close of the XIIIth century, a second by Schorham about 1320, and the third by Richard Rolle, Chantry priest of Hampole, about 1349. All these parts of the Bible were made from the Latin Vulgate as well as the entire Bible of Wycliffe. The New Testament of Wycliffe, the greater part of which seems to have been his personal work, was finished about 1382. The translation of the Old Testament was undertaken by his friend Nicholas de Hereford, Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, an excellent scholar, and carried as far as Baruch iii. 20, and the remainder is ascribed to Wycliffe, who died in 1384. Wycliffe's work was very close to the Latin, and, like the Latin itself, sometimes smooth and happy, and again rough and obscure; Hereford's work was still more literal and rough. The Wycliffite translation therefore needed revision to make it smooth and consistent, which was accomplished about 1388 by the careful and patient labor of John Purvey, the curate and intimate friend of Wycliffe. Purvey has given such an account of his method of revision as shows him to have been an exact scholar, and this method, carried further in the subsequent revisions, has given the English Bible some of its best characteristics. The New Testament proper of Wycliffe was printed by Lea Wilson in 1848, his Four Gospels by Bosworth and Waring in 1865, and at length in 1850, about 500 years after it was translated, the whole Bible, both in the translation and the revision, was printed at Oxford in 4 vols., 4to, edited by Forshall and Madden after a comparison of 170 MSS.,

on which they had bestowed the labor of twenty-two years. A reprint of the New Testament of this edition was made by the Clarendon Press in 12mo in 1879, under the care of Mr. Walter Skeat. The influence of the Wycliffite versions, as they are now designated, on the subsequent English Bibles is thought by some scholars to have been only traditional and indirect, and even the Rheims translators are supposed not to have used them. But there are many remarkable coincidences between these and all the subsequent versions as well as the Rheims, and the matter of their connection with Wycliffe still needs to be critically investigated. So much for the first MS. English Bible from the Latin.

The first printed English New Testament from the original Greek was a work accomplished by William Tyndale in 1525. For in the meantime the entire Greek New Testament had been printed, and the great honor of first doing this belongs to the illustrious Roman Cardinal, Francis Ximenes of Spain. He was educated at Alcala and Salamanca, and specially studied the Oriental languages and divinity in his retirement at Castanel. He enjoyed the favor of Queen Isabella of Castile, and was made Archbishop of Toledo in 1498; he devoted the large revenue of his see to the worthiest objects, one of his first acts being the establishment of the celebrated University of Alcala. In 1502 he projected the Polyglot Bible known as the *Complutensian*, from *Complutum*, the ancient name of Alcala, where it was printed. It is in 6 vols., folio, the 5th vol. containing the New Testament, in double columns of the Greek and the Vulgate Latin on each page, being completed Jan. 10, 1514. This portion is carefully printed, the practised eyes of Dr. Scrivener having detected only fifty errors of the press. The Greek type is round and bold, and not unlike that of the Florentine and Milan press of that period; the Latin is printed in an elegant Gothic character. The Cardinal himself directed the work, for the execution of which he gathered as many MSS. as he could procure, and invited the coöperation of learned men, as Alphonso, Coronel, and Zamisa, Jewish proselytes, for the Hebrew; and Lopez de Stunica, Antonio of Lebrixa, Ducas of Crete, and Ferdinand of Valladolid, for the Greek. The expense of the work, which was said to have been 50,000 ducats or about £23,000, was defrayed from the income of the Archbishop himself. The entire work, consisting of 600 copies, was printed by 1517. The editors of this edition of the New Testament do not describe the MSS. they used, and though the Cardinal in his dedication to Leo X. acknowledges

the loan of MSS. from the Vatican, yet the readings and the peculiarities of the forms of the words show that the MSS. used were of the Xth century downward, and there is no evidence that any MS. of high antiquity, as *Codex B* or *Vaticanus*, was employed. This text never came into general use, and has had but small influence on subsequent editions.

Though the New Testament was printed, as we have said, in 1514, the Pope's license for its publication was not granted till March 22, 1520. In the meantime another edition was *first published*. Froben, the printer of Bâle, having heard of the Cardinal's edition, wished to anticipate its appearance, and knowing that Erasmus, who was at that time in England, had paid attention to the Greek MSS., he proposed to him, April 17, 1515, to edit the Greek Testament without delay. He undertook it, and in six months, March 1, 1516, it was completed and immediately published: *praecipitatum fuit verius quam editum*, Erasmus himself says of it. This edition, as well as his others that followed, was in folio and very handsomely printed. It contained Erasmus' revision of the Latin Vulgate standing by the Greek in a parallel column, and also his annotations. Oecolampadius, afterward somewhat famous as a Lutheran, read the proof-sheets, but Froben's hot haste allowed him to do this office only very imperfectly. The MSS. which Erasmus used are still at Bâle, but with a single exception they were neither ancient nor particularly valuable. His *Codex Apoc.* 1 being mutilated in the last six verses, Erasmus himself turned these into Greek from the Vulgate, and some portions of his translation thus made still cleave to our *received text*. In 1518-19 (the edition bears both dates) he published more leisurely his second edition, correcting many of the misprints and amending not a few readings. In 1522, in exceedingly handsome style, he put forth his third edition, famous as the first one in which he consented to introduce the text of the Three Heavenly Witnesses, which he did from a Dublin MS. of the XVIth century, and which had previously appeared in the Complutensian as a translation from the Vulgate, which Stunica, one of the editors of the Complutensian, virtually confessed. In this third edition Erasmus made many improvements. In March 1527 he published his fourth edition with the text in three parallel columns, the Greek, the Latin Vulgate, and his own revision of it. He had now for the first time seen the Complutensian, and availed himself of its aid to improve his own work, especially in the Apocalypse. In 1535, the year before his

death at Bâle, he published his fifth edition, omitting the Latin Vulgate and making only slight changes in the Greek text. This work of Erasmus was the basis of many editions that followed. We pass over the *Graeca Biblia*, folio, 1518, Venice, from the celebrated press of Aldus, which professes to be grounded on ancient MSS. In this volume the LXX. appeared for the first time, but in the New Testament Aldus seems to follow the first edition of Erasmus even to the *errata*; and if any MSS. were consulted, we do not know what they were nor how they were employed.

It had now become possible to have a Bible founded on the Hebrew of the Old Testament and on the Greek of the New. In 1488 the Hebrew Bible entire had been first printed at Socino in Italy, where Hebrew was indeed cultivated, but Germany was rather considered as its home. The Hebrew could thus be used directly, and also indirectly through the close Latin version of Pagninus (4to, Lyons, 1527-28), and the freer translation of Münster (folio, Bâle, 1534-35). The knowledge of Greek, which was brought to Italy by Lascaris and other refugees from Constantinople at about this period, spread through Europe. It was pursued in Spain at the University of Alcalá about 1500; at Louvain in France about 1526; at Oxford in 1519; and at the same period in Germany and with great enthusiasm. In 1522 appeared Luther's New Testament from the Greek, and in 1534 his Old Testament from the Hebrew. In 1522, but before he could have heard of Luther's version, William Tyndale, who had been educated at the University of Oxford, had formed his purpose of translating the New Testament from the original. This he was compelled to undertake abroad, and when it was done he printed it at Cologne in 1525. He was, as is proved by his New Testament and portions of the Old, a competent Greek and Hebrew scholar. In making his version of the New Testament he rendered the Greek directly, with the help of the Vulgate, of the Latin revision of Erasmus, and of the German of Luther. He revised his work carefully in 1534 and again in 1535, making many important improvements as well as some very minute alterations that attest his scrupulous fidelity. He was engaged on this work while Luther was completing his own great labors in the same field. Tyndale was profoundly influenced by the great Reformer, and perhaps had personal intercourse with him at this period; for Sir Thomas More asserted, though without foundation, that Tyndale's work was a translation of Luther's. Of

the Old Testament he had translated the Pentateuch, which was published in 1531, and to the edition of the New Testament of 1534 he appended the Epistles from the Old Testament, beside which he did the book of Jonah, making about one-half of the Old Testament rendered by his own hand. So faithfully and learnedly was all this work done, that a true description of the forms of the English Bible since, is that they are revisions based on Tyndale's translation.

Miles Coverdale, born in Yorkshire, being fond of study, became attached to the Augustine Convent at Cambridge. He was admitted to priest's orders in 1514. He adopted the reformed views, but though he enjoyed the protection of Crumwell, the Prime Minister, he became alarmed for his own safety and fled to the Continent, where he may have met with Tyndale. Coverdale finished what Tyndale had begun. His translation and revision was made partly from the Hebrew and partly from the Zurich Bibles of 1524-29-39 and the Latin version of Pagninus; he also made use of Luther's translation and of the Vulgate. He himself describes his work as *faithfully translated out of Latin and Dutch* (German). Passing over Matthew's Bible, so-called, of 1537, which reprinted from Tyndale, with slight variations, the New Testament and the Pentateuch; from Coverdale, Ezra to Malachi and the Apocrypha; and from unknown sources in a new translation, the remaining books of the Old Testament from Joshua to 2d Chronicles, we come to the Great Bible of 1539, April 1540, and Nov. 1540, so designated as distinguished by its size from Matthew's and Coverdale's which preceded it. This work was a revision of Matthew's by Coverdale, and although it is commonly called Cranmer's Bible, yet the first of these three editions is properly called Crumwell's, because he arranged for the preparation and publication of it, which took place in Paris; the second is properly called Cranmer's, who, being favorable to Crumwell's undertaking, brought out a new edition in London, to which he himself contributed a preface; the third is properly called Tunstall and Heath's, who made a nominal revision of it at the instance of King Henry VIII. In 1534-35, as was intimated above, Sebastian Münster, Professor of Hebrew at Bâle, published a generally accurate Latin translation of the Hebrew Bible with notes from Rabbinical commentaries. It was by the aid of this work that Coverdale revised Matthew's Old Testament. The revision of the New Testament was more independent, and based on a careful study of the Vulgate and on

Erasmus' revision of the same. It cannot be without interest to note here that when the Prayer Book of the Church of England was last revised, in 1662, it was ordered that the other Lessons should be taken from King James' version, but that the Psalter, which had been taken from the Great Bible, should remain. King James' Psalter is a more scholarly and correct translation, but Coverdale's is superior in idea and in tone.

We must now resume the history of the Greek text. Robert Stephens of Paris, perhaps the most illustrious of the learned printers, though he had incurred the enmity of the Doctors of the Sorbonne by his editions of the Latin Vulgate, was protected and patronized by Francis I. and his son Henry II. The royal press was furnished with type cast at the expense of the king, and scholars are familiar with the words *Typis Regiis* on his title-pages. He published the Greek Testament in 1546 and again in 1549 in 16mo in elegant style, and from the opening words of the preface of both, *O mirificam Regis nostri—liberalitatem*, they are called the *O Mirificam editions*. He makes no mention of the learned labors of Erasmus, but says that the Complutensian had been of service to him, and that he had used MSS. of the Imperial Library. Dr. Mill says that the edition of 1546 differs from that of 1549 in only 67 places. In 1550 he published his third or folio edition, celebrated for the sumptuous style in which it was executed, and this is the earliest ever printed with critical apparatus, the various readings referred to in the *O Mirificam* being entered here on the margin. In his preface he states that his text was formed on sixteen authorities; that is, the Complutensian and fifteen MSS., one of which must have been the celebrated *Codex D* or *Codex Bezae*. The critical part of this work was done by his son Henry. Dr. Mill says again that the folio edition differs from the smaller ones in 284 readings, chiefly to adopt the text of Erasmus' fifth edition. This edition, with as critical a character perhaps as it was reasonable to expect at that early period, became the basis of the ordinary editions that followed, and was even adopted in 1859 by Dr. Scrivener, one of the two greatest names in these studies in England in recent times, as the basis of his edition, with the various readings of Beza, the Elzevir, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles; and this edition, it may be of interest to state, was in the hands of the British and American revisers while prosecuting the work just completed.



In 1551 Stephens published at Geneva, in 2 vols. sm. 4to, an edition celebrated as giving in the first instance the division of the text into verses as we now have it. This has become an exceedingly rare and costly book; and as it has been incorrectly described by one of our greatest scholars in his Commentaries, there is subjoined as good a *fac-simile* as the printer could conveniently make of a portion of the first page of St. Matthew. It was printed in three columns: on the left of the Greek is the Vulgate, and on the right Erasmus' revision of it. Three of the five verses of the page are here given.

V.	E.
EVANGELIUM secundum Matthæum.  Liber generationis IESV Christi, filii David, filii Abraham.  Abraham genuit Isaac. Isaac autem genuit Iacob. Iacob autem genuit Iudam et fratres eius.  Iudas autem genuit Phares et Zaram de Thamar. Phares autem genuit Esrom. Esrom autem genuit Aram.	E V A N G E - lium secundum Matthæum.  I L i b e r g e n e - rationis IESV Christi, filii David, filii Abraham.  2 ¶ Abraham genuit Isaac. ¶ Isaac autem genuit Iacob. ¶ Iacob autem genuit Iudam et fratres eius.  3 ¶ Iudas autem genuit Phares et Zaram e Thamar. ¶ Phares autem genuit Esrom. Esrom autem genuit Aram.
ἘΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ κατὰ Ματθαῖον.  Βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, υἱοῦ Δαβὶδ, υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ.  Ἀβραάμ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰσαάκ. Ἰσαάκ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰακώβ. Ἰακώβ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἰούδαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ.  Ἰούδας δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Φαρές καὶ τὸν Ζαρά ἐκ τῆς Θάμαρ. Φαρές δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἐσρώμ. Ἐσρώμ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀράμ.	Har. 1. 5. Luc. 3. c. 24.  Gene. 21. 2. 2. Gene. 25. d. 24. Gene. 29. d. 15.  Gene. 32. g. 29. 1 Par. 2. a. 5. Ruth 4. d. 13.

Theodore Beza (Theodore de Bèze) resigned his ecclesiastical preferments in 1548 and retired to Geneva, where he had the chief place among the French Reformers on the death of Calvin in 1564. He published five editions of the Greek Testament (1559, 1565, 1582, 1589, 1598) with his own careful Latin version (first published

in 1556 with Stephens' text), the Latin Vulgate, and annotations. He was a better translator and commentator than critic, and it was in the former capacity that he exerted his great influence over the succeeding English versions. He neither sought new material for revising the text nor made much use of what he had at hand. He had two ancient and valuable MSS. in his own possession, the *Codex D or Bezae*, containing the Gospels and Acts in Greek and Latin, now in the Library of the University of Cambridge, and the *Codex Claromontanus* from Clermont (whence it is said to have been brought), now in the Royal Library at Paris, containing the Epistles of St. Paul also in Greek and Latin; the papers containing the collations of Henry Stephens referred to above; and Tremellius' Latin version (1569) of the Peshito Syriac (first printed 1555), the first instance in which an ancient version of the N. T. beside the Latin Vulgate contributed to form the Greek text.

The work of English revision now goes forward and produces the celebrated Genevan Bible. Under the influence of Calvin Geneva had become the seat of devoted Biblical students, and the results of their labors were made available for the revision of the English Bible by the exiles under the persecution of Queen Mary, as well as of the French which was completed in 1588, and for the production in 1607 of the Italian version of Diodati. Circumstances made it possible for the Presbyterians to make a revision with great freedom, and the danger was that it would be the Bible of a party. But for the O. T. they took the Great Bible (probably the edition of 1550) as their basis and simply corrected the text; they did not make a new translation. In their changes in the O. T. they seem chiefly to have followed the Latin translation of Pagninus and Münster. In the N. T. they took for their basis Tyndale as given in Matthew's Bible, and in revising it they scarcely did more than apply Beza's translation and commentary. In the interpretation of the text Beza was singularly clear-sighted, but in the criticism of the text he was rash; but the cases in which Beza has corrected the renderings of former translators are incomparably more numerous than those in which he has introduced incorrect readings, and his Latin version is far superior to those that had been made before, and so consequently are the Genevan revisions that followed it. The N. T. was published in 1557 with an introductory epistle by Calvin, and again greatly improved in the entire Bible in 1560. The attractiveness of the Genevan Bible was enhanced by a marginal commentary, far more complete than any yet provided for the English reader.

On the accession of Queen Elizabeth in 1558 the use of the Scriptures was again conceded to the people, and the Great Bible was allowed its place as the authorized Bible for ecclesiastical use ; but the wide circulation of the Genevan Bible made the defects of the Great Bible known, and Archbishop Parker, who was friendly to Biblical studies, took measures for a revision of the old translation. This was about 1563-64. The whole Bible was sorted out into parts, and these were distributed among able Bishops and other learned men to correct and improve ; and the work amid some difficulties went forward and appeared in a magnificent volume in 1568. It is not known by whom the whole revision was actually made, but the Archbishop, to secure greater care on the part of the revisers, had their initials placed at the end of the books. Some names, however, are passed over ; but of the revisers who can be probably identified, eight were Bishops, and from them the work took its title, *the Bishops' Bible*. The execution of the work is very unequal, and the Greek scholarship of the revisers is superior to their Hebrew. In the Old Testament improvements were made chiefly from the Genevan, but also from Pagninus, Leo Juda and Castalio. We have spoken of Pagninus above. Leo Juda, who had contributed to the Zurich German Bible, labored for many years at a new and somewhat free Latin version of the O. T., which after his death in 1542 was completed by others ; Gualther revised Erasmus' Latin N. T., and the whole Bible thus finished was published in 1544. Sebastian Castalio, Professor of Greek at Bâle, also translated the whole Bible into Latin, and carried this freedom to a far greater length, endeavoring to make the Hebrew and the Greek writers speak in pure and elegant Latinity. The new work of the revisers themselves can hardly be commended ; for it was often arbitrary and inexact. The work on the New Testament was the more valuable. Among the revisers of this part was Lawrence, probably the head-master of Shrewsbury School, and famed for his knowledge of Greek, an excellent specimen of whose strictures on the old translation has come down to us. The changes made in the New Testament were partly from the Genevan version and partly the fruit of independent and exact scholarship. In 1572 a second edition of the Bishops' Bible was published, the Old Testament being unchanged and the New being carefully revised. The Genevan Bible still held its ground, but the Great Bible was speedily displaced by the Bishops', and the latter by order of King James was afterward made the basis of his revision. The

Bishops' Bible, like the Genevan, was accompanied with marginal notes or a commentary:

The wide circulation and great influence of the Reformed versions of the Bible made it impossible for the Roman Catholic scholars to withstand the demand for vernacular translations of the Scriptures, sanctioned by the authority of the Church of Rome. An English version formed part of that plan for winning back England to the Church of Rome which was formed by Cardinal Allen. The Cardinal established a seminary at Douai in France in 1568, and afterward transferred it temporarily to Rheims in 1578, and here the revision of the N. T. was finished in 1582, and hence took its name, *the Rhemish Testament*. It was made from the Vulgate; but the earlier English translations, especially the Genevan, were the groundwork of their version. The men who made it had great erudition; as, Gregory Martin, one of the original scholars of St. John's College, Oxford, and M. A. in 1564; Cardinal Allen, who had been a Canon of York, and Principal of St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, in the reign of Queen Mary; Richard Bristow, M. A., of Christ's Church, Oxford, and afterward fellow of Exeter College, who is said to have made the notes to the New Testament; and Thomas Worthington, who also had studied at Oxford, and who is said to have prepared the tables and annotations to the Old Testament. When the New Testament was published the entire version had been delayed for want of means, and in fact the Old Testament did not appear till 1609-10 in 2 vols. 4to, at Douai, and hence the entire work is commonly called *the Douai Bible*. The Old Testament is said to have been compared with the Hebrew and the Greek, but this comparison must have been very limited. The Psalter, for instance, is given not from St. Jerome's version of the Hebrew, but from his revision of the faulty translation from the LXX., which commonly displaced it in Latin Bibles; and in general this version of the Old Testament is simply the ordinary, and not the pure, Latin text of Jerome in an English dress. Its merits and defects lie in its vocabulary, which has bestowed on our language innumerable Latin words, and offered us very many that we have refused to adopt. The translation of the New Testament is similar to that of the Old, and next to the Psalter, the Epistles are most inadequately done. One of their general principles was to adhere absolutely to the Latin; and while this course made much of their work awkward and obscure, they thus often reproduced the exact Latin order, and so the Greek, kept the phrase of the original

where others had abandoned it; and wherever the Latin failed, as in the matter of the article, or was ambiguous, they had the Greek at their command, which nice points of their work often show that they used. They had, as we have said, the Genevan Testament before them, and in many cases actually followed it. Here and there throughout the New Testament they have reproduced the original Greek in a faithful and happy manner not attained by any previous version, and we shall presently see the indebtedness of even King James' version to their work.

There were thus during the latter part of Elizabeth's reign two rival English Bibles, the Bishops', sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority for public use, and the Genevan, the common Bible of the people and even of scholars. This rivalry was undesirable, and in a conference on ecclesiastical affairs held at Hampton Court in 1603, soon after the accession of King James I., the then authorized version was brought up as a matter to be amended. The king desired that pains should be taken for one uniform translation, forbidding that any marginal notes should be added, and complaining of such as accompanied the Genevan Bible. He matured his scheme for the translation, and the list of the revisers was complete by June 30th. Precisely how this list was made up does not now appear, but the king announced to Bancroft, Bishop of London, that he had appointed four-and-fifty learned men for the work, of whom, however, only forty-seven appear in the list that has come down to us, but among them, we may add, there was no Nonconformist or Scottish or Irish scholar. They were divided into four companies for the Old Testament and two for the New, with a fixed portion of the work appointed for each company, to be done at Oxford, Cambridge, and Westminster, two companies working at each of these places. Their duty was carefully defined in a series of rules, fifteen in all, probably drawn up by Bishop Bancroft with the approbation of the king. They were required in general to follow the Bishops' Bible, but on occasion they might adopt the renderings of Tyndale, Matthew, Coverdale, Whitchurch (that is, *the Great Bible*, printed by Grafton and Whitchurch), and the Genevan. When the revision was completed at the different places of assembly, two members from each place, six in all, were chosen to superintend the final preparation for the printing in London. The work of the revision seems to have been actually undertaken in 1607, and Dr. Miles Smith, who wrote the preface, states therein that they were occupied with the work two years and nine months.

It appeared from the press in 1611 in one thick volume folio, and is a splendid monument of art. It is printed in elegant Gothic type, with the supplied words in small Roman, which are now given in italic letter, a practice introduced to some extent in the Genevan, but which had been wholly neglected in Luther's version. Careful researches have made it very probable that there were two issues in folio in 1611, and in the same year there was published an edition of the N. T. in 12mo. In 1628 the N. T. of the Authorized Version was first published in Scotland, at Edinburgh, and in 1633 the whole Bible there in 8vo. In 1638 the University printers of Cambridge printed an edition in folio, which bears clear marks of representing very exactly the true form of the Authorized Version, being more leisurely and carefully printed than the editions of 1611; in particular the matter of the supplied words is far more consistently given.

The printing of the Bishops' Bible was stopped when the new revision was undertaken, and no edition of it appears later than 1606, though the N. T. was printed as late as 1619. But the Genevan version, which was now chiefly confined to private use, competed with the Royal Bible for many years and was not displaced till about 1650. The king's revisers, it has always been admitted, were very competent to their work, and availed themselves of all the new apparatus within their reach. The appearance of the Rhemish Testament in 1582 had again called attention to the Latin Vulgate, which had been thrust aside by the revision of Erasmus and by the new Latin version of Beza, which had so largely influenced the Great Bible and the Genevan respectively. In the meantime Hebrew and Greek studies had been pursued with great care and zeal, and two important contributions had been made to the interpretation of the O. T. In 1572 Montanus, a Spanish scholar, added to the Antwerp Polyglot, which was published under the patronage of Philip II., an interlinear translation of the Hebrew based on that of Pagninus; and in 1575-79 Tremellius, a converted Jew, in conjunction with Junius, his son-in-law, published at Frankfurt-on-the-Maine an original Latin version of the O. T. with a commentary, which had an extensive circulation. Beside these works intended for scholars, three important vernacular translations had appeared. In 1587-88 a revision of the French Bible was published at Geneva, mainly it is said by Bertram, a distinguished Hebrew scholar, assisted by Beza and others; and at the same place in 1607 an Italian version by Diodati, who was

Professor of Hebrew at Geneva, but formerly of Lucca. Meanwhile two Spanish versions had appeared; one at Bâle in 1569 by Reyna, and a second based on Reyna's by de Valera at Amsterdam in 1602. And when in the preface to the Authorized Version Dr. Miles Smith, to the Chaldee, Hebrew, Syrian (which had become accessible by Tremellius' translation of the Peshito version at Heidelberg in 1569), and to the Greek and Latin authorities, adds the Spanish, French, Italian, and Dutch (Luther's German or a Dutch proper of 1560), he probably refers to these versions of Bertram, Diodati, and Reyna.

The Royal revisers did their work carefully and honestly. They differed from the Rhemish translators in seeking to make an intelligible translation, and from the Genevan in leaving Scripture uncolored by expository notes, though these two versions contributed most largely of all to the changes which King James' revisers introduced. The fourteenth of the king's rules allowed them to consult the Genevan, but the Rhemish was not on that list, and yet it was freely used. In the O. T. most of the changes are due to the Genevan Bible, to Pagninus' and Tremellius' Latin versions, but some are original. In the Prophets they followed chiefly the Genevan, while in the historical and poetical books they differ less from the Bishops' Bible. In the Apocrypha they are nearer to the Bishops' than to the Genevan, but here also there is much work that is new. They also drew from Leo Juda's and Münster's Latin versions. The revision of the New Testament was a simpler work than that of the Old, and consisted mostly of a careful examination of the Bishops' Bible with the Greek text, inferred to be mainly that of Beza's editions of 1589 and 1598, and with Beza's Latin and the Genevan and the Rhemish versions. The chief influence of the Rhemish on the Authorized Version was in its phraseology; that of Beza and the Genevan, on its interpretation. Many words and phrases are common to the Rhemish and the Authorized alone, or if found also in Wycliffe, some scholars incline to regard them as natural coincidences in two versions made independently from the Latin Vulgate. The whole work was so well executed as to prove itself in general a far better and more correct version than any that had preceded it; and it could never have held at all that place in the admiration and affection of English-speaking people which it has held for wellnigh three centuries, if it had not had great excellences. Its excellences are a general fidelity to the original Hebrew and Greek; a majesty and simplicity of style, now

energetic and spirited, and again easy and calm, according to the character of the passage; and much of the whole so precisely and so happily rendered that the wit of man seems unable to mend it. Some of its defects are a want of due care about the particles, sometimes rendering them inexactly, and again quite omitting them; here and there the neglect of the article, or the needless insertion of it, or the exaggeration of it by the use of the demonstrative pronoun; the retaining of certain Hebrew and Greek idioms, and more frequently Greek than Hebrew, which are harsh and unnatural to us, and which remain so even after our long use of them and great familiarity with them; the use of italics where they are wrongly placed or better omitted altogether; and, what is perhaps its chief fault, frequently, but with some admirable exceptions, rendering the same word or a cognate word or phrase differently in different places and sometimes even in the same sentence, which the revisers did on set purpose and even defended in their preface. Some of its defects are the work of time and inevitable in any version. Thus, some words and forms have become wholly obsolete, and some have changed their meaning; some new words and forms have been developed which more exactly and adequately express the sense of the original. Its greatest imperfection was due to the circumstances themselves under which the revisers did their work. There was down to that time no really critical treatment either of the Hebrew or the Greek Scriptures. The means of verifying and improving the Hebrew Bible were then very scanty, and the matter has not much improved since; but in the case of the New Testament, the MS. authorities, the ancient versions, the quotations of the early Fathers, even those that were accessible at that time, were not fully and carefully used, nor indeed was it the habit of the period to do this in a high degree with any ancient writers whatever. The settling of an ancient text by the examination and comparison of the best MSS., by the study of contemporary or the earliest possible records, by researches on whatever subject and in whatever direction is connected with the writings in hand, all this is a great modern achievement, the fruit of the studies and explorations of the last two hundred, and especially of the last hundred years. We have seen that the first edition of the Greek Testament, the Complutensian, was a representation of modern MSS. perhaps exclusively; that Erasmus' text, though helped by a few good MSS., differed but little from



the Complutensian; that Stephens followed Erasmus with an imperfect examination of a few other MSS.; and that Beza, whose text the revisers, as we have said above, seem chiefly to have relied upon, could have been improved by only two important MSS. and one ancient version, and even these he appears little to have used. And when the English Bible, reckoning from Tyndale, had been so often revised during the first hundred years, that a great nation like the English people, and the American people after them, should have remained comparatively content with their Bible uncorrected and unimproved for two hundred and seventy years, amid all the rich material—especially of the most ancient MSS. discovered or made accessible—which has been gathered by the providence of God and the unwearied diligence of great and good and learned men, this might well seem incredible, were it not a known and familiar fact.

Let us now consider what has been done for the text since 1611. The two editions published by the Elzevirs, the celebrated printers of Leyden, are historically of importance, though not critically. They were in 1650, and executed with the grace and elegance that belong to this renowned series of publications. The first edition was published in 1624. It is without preface, and the text is broken only by paragraphs, the verses being indicated in the margin. The editor is unknown, but the printers themselves are supposed to have taken Stephens' edition of 1550 as their basis, introducing only slight changes, which they considered to be corrections, using for this purpose one of Beza's editions. In 1633 they brought out in the same convenient form their second edition, which is regarded as the best. The text is broken up into verses; care was taken to free it from typographical errors, and a high character was assumed for it. *Textum ergo habes*, they say in the preface, *nunc ab omnibus receptum; in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus*, and hence the expression *the Received Text*, though this expression as now used denotes no precise text whatever. The Greek Testament in Walton's Polyglot in 1657 followed Stephens' text, as did Mill's in 1707; and in England *Stephens' is the Received Text*, and on the Continent the *Elzevirs' is the Received Text*. It is interesting to know how these texts stand toward each other. Mill (Proleg. 1307) reported twelve cases of variation, Tischendorf (Proleg. p. 85, 7th ed.) gave a list of 150, and Dr. Scrivener has detected even 287. Though thoughtful and scholarly men from this period down to the present time have been interested in the state of the Greek

text, and though certain scholars have bestowed much time and the most careful labor on matters contributing toward the settlement of it on a sound and permanent basis, yet after the appearance of the texts of Stephens and Beza the great body of Protestants ceased from all inquiry on what ground the Greek text rested; and what the Council of Trent did in 1545 in declaring the Latin Vulgate authentic and ultimate, the Protestants themselves tacitly did in regard to the received Greek text.

It is to English industry that we owe the first important efforts for the critical treatment of the text. The first large and important collection of various readings, drawn from MSS., is that contained in the 6th vol. of *Walton's Polyglot*, called also *the English or the London Polyglot*, 6 vols. folio, 1657. In the 5th vol., which was devoted to the New Testament in six different languages, the readings of *Codex A* or *Alexandrinus*, presented to Charles I. in 1628 and now in the British Museum, had for the first time been given; they were entered under the Greek text. Walton had also a collation of sixteen authorities, of which only three had even been used before, gathered by the care of Archbishop Ussher. That Walton did not try to form a corrected text is not at all to be regretted; for the time for that attempt had not yet arrived.

In 1675 Bishop Fell of Oxford published an edition in 8vo, with various readings at the foot of the page, with the authorities subjoined, and in his appendix he added the Barberini readings, collected about 1625 in the Barberini Library at Rome by Caryophilus of Crete, who had permission from Paul V. and Urban VIII. to use MSS. in the Vatican, including the precious *Codex B* or *Vaticanus*, for a projected edition of the Greek Testament.

At Oxford in 1707 appeared in one volume folio the Greek Testament of Dr. John Mill, the learned Principal of St. Edmund's Hall. To this great work he had cheerfully devoted the last thirty years of his life, dying only a fortnight after its publication. His purpose was to reproduce the text of Stephens' edition of 1550 and to bring together all the accessible critical materials existing. He gathered all the various readings which had previously been used, collated such Greek MSS. as were available, and first made general use of the ancient versions and of the writings of the ancient Fathers as witnesses of the ancient text. His Prolegomena are a monument of learning hardly to be dispensed with even now. Wetstein said that Dr. Mill had achieved more than all who had preceded him; and Herbert Marsh, Bishop of Peterborough,

the most accomplished Englishman of his time in these studies, said that in all his great labors he adhered strictly to the truth, never designedly misrepresenting any matter of criticism. He was not studied as he deserved to be by the later editors, and many of the best readings he adduced were overlooked by Wetstein, Griesbach, and Scholz. In 1709-19 Dr. Edward Wells of Oxford undertook to apply the results of critical investigation in his Greek Testament, which was accompanied with a revised English translation. This was the first attempt to supply a critically revised text.

In 1720 the illustrious Bentley of Trinity College, Cambridge, issued proposals for his edition of the New Testament in Greek and Latin, with the last chapter of Revelation as a specimen. This work was not accomplished, but the mere project was one of the most important steps ever taken in connection with the text of the New Testament. St. Jerome had stated that he revised the Vulgate according to the best Greek MSS., adding that even the order of the words was important in translations of Holy Scripture; and from this statement of St. Jerome, Bentley inferred that the oldest Greek MSS. ought to agree with the oldest Latin of St. Jerome both in words and in their order. This was the first proper appreciation of the old Latin versions, and the great critics of recent times, as we shall see, have acted upon Bentley's idea. Dr. Bentley's plan was to use all the authorities of the first five centuries, the Greek MSS., the oldest Latin MSS., the ancient versions, as the Syriac, the Gothic, the Coptic, and the Aethiopic, and all the Greek and Latin Fathers of the first five centuries, utterly disclaiming conjecture in the text itself. This great project of one of the greatest scholars the world ever saw was made near two centuries ago, and failed through the opposition of ignorance and of envy.

These sacred studies now passed from England to the Continent, scarcely to return till the middle of the present century. In 1734 appeared at Tübingen, in one vol. 4to, the edition of the learned and thoughtful and pious Bengel, Abbot of Alpirspach in the Lutheran communion. He gathered for his work such critical materials as he was able to gather himself, and made applications to others for collections. He placed in the margin those readings that he considered genuine, and at the end of his volume in his *Apparatus Criticus* he gave the various readings known to him with critical observations upon them; and, what was very important, he distinctly gave the evidence *for* as well as *against* each reading.

It was he that first enounced, among his rules of criticism, the great distinction between various readings: *Proclivi scriptioni praeestat ardua, The more difficult the reading, the more likely to be genuine*; for a copyist, if he makes any change, is more likely to change the more difficult into an easier form. We owe Bengel much for his improvement of the punctuation of the text and its more correct division into paragraphs, and with him originated the idea of *families or recensions* of the MSS., which was afterwards developed by Semler, Griesbach, and Scholz, and which contains reasonable and true elements, however difficult it has proved to be to adjust any form of it. He himself wished to divide all the documents into *Asiatic*, written in or about Constantinople, which he less esteemed, and *African*, the few which he thought to be of a better type.

In 1751-52 appeared the great edition of John James Wetstein in Amsterdam, in 2 vols. folio, the critical portion of which places the author in the very highest rank, leaving him inferior, if to any, to only one or two of the very highest names. Wetstein was born at Bâle in 1693, and studied at the University and became a minister. His taste for Biblical studies showed itself early; and when he was ordained in 1713 he delivered a disputation *De variis N. T. Lectionibus*. In 1714 his search for MSS. led him to Paris; and in 1715-16 and again in 1720 he visited England, and was employed by Bentley in collecting materials for his projected edition, for which Wetstein first made a complete collation of the great *Codex C* or *Ephraemi* in the Royal Library of Paris, which he also used for his own edition. In 1730 he published at Bâle *Prolegomena ad N. T. Graeci Editionem accuratissimam*, etc. Some divines, dreading his unsettling the text by his studies and publications, had a decree of the Senate promulgated against his undertaking, and he was deposed from the ministry and driven into exile. He was invited to Amsterdam by the College of the Remonstrants, and succeeded the famous Le Clerc as Professor of Philosophy and History. He here died in 1754, two years after he finished his edition of the Greek Testament, the result of the arduous labors of about forty years. Never before had there been given so full and so methodical an account of the MSS., ancient versions, and Fathers, by whose aid the text of the N. T. may be revised, as was given in his *Prolegomena*. The number of MSS. which he had himself collated, if we reckon separately every distinct portion of the N. T. contained in a MS., was about 102,

and about eleven were examined for him by other hands. He collected the collations of Mill and others, and reëxamined many of the ancient versions and Fathers. The upper part of the page of his edition contains the text, the Elzevir of 1633; below this stand the variations, if any, that were approved by Wetstein, which amount to about 500, and those chiefly in the Apocalypse, no conjectures whatever being admitted into the text, though often quoted in the notes; then followed the various readings of the MSS.; and below were illustrative passages from the classical authors, Talmudical and Rabbinical extracts, etc., and so full is this that many a scholar falling in with a striking passage illustrating the form or thought of Holy Scripture, and imagining that he was the first to notice it, will find it already laid up in this rich storehouse of Wetstein. His principles of revision were for the most part excellent, but he failed himself in applying them. In one of his theories he was quite wrong. It had long been noticed that some of the Greek MSS., which are accompanied with a Latin version, as *Codex D* or *Bezae*, *Codex E* (of the Acts and Cath. Epp.) or *Laudianus*, and *Codex D* (of the Pauline Epp.) or *Claromontanus*, remarkably agreed with the readings of the Latin; and the suspicion arose, but now regarded as unfounded, that the Greek of such MSS. had been conformed to the Latin, and hence the term *Codices Latinizantes*. Wetstein carried the charge of Latinizing to every one of the more ancient MSS., and this view damaged his labors; but as his critical and illustrative matter has never been reproduced as a whole, his Greek Testament is one of the few books that remain invaluable in their original form. His *Prolegomena* were reproduced at Halle in 1764 in 8vo by the learned J. S. Semler, Professor of Theology, with excellent notes and certain MSS. in *fac-simile*.

The vast mass of materials collected by Wetstein remained to be arranged, and steadily and consistently and critically used to emend the text. This was undertaken by John James Griesbach, Professor of Theology at Jena, with whom in a high sense texts really critical begin. In 1775-77 appeared at Halle, in 2 vols. 8vo, what is called his *first edition*. In this he used Wetstein's materials, examined many MSS. himself, and also fully collated a few. He differed from Wetstein in his estimate of the more ancient MSS. and agreed with Bentley and Bengel. He approved of the division by Bengel of the MSS. into *African* and *Byzantine*, but subdivided the former into two parts, maintaining that there were three classes

of text, two ancient and one more modern, thus agreeing with the view of Bentley that the MSS. have come down to us from three sources, *the West, Egypt, and Asia*. Griesbach named these three classes *Western, Alexandrine, and Constantinopolitan*. The first he conceived was the early text, but much marred by the errors of scribes; the second a revision of the same; and the third flowing from the other two, calling them all *recensions*; and he believed that the two former existed distinct toward the close of the II<sup>d</sup> century. He ranged his critical authorities under his three recensions, and in forming his text he placed more reliance on the agreement of the recensions than on any other external evidence. Twenty years after the publication of his first edition, during which period important critical materials had been amassed by the labors of Matthiae of Moscow, of Alter of Vienna, and especially of Birch of Copenhagen, and the publication of the *Codex Laudianus*, the *Codex Alexandrinus*, and the *Codex Bezae* had taken place, Griesbach, availing himself of all this aid, published at Halle the first volume of his *second edition* in 1796, and ten years later, in 1806, the second volume completing the work. His plan in this edition was enlarged, corrected, and improved; and he no longer insists on the refinements of theory about the additions and peculiarities of *the three recensions*. The weak point of his theory was the impossibility of drawing the line between the Western and the Alexandrian recensions, and in his *Commentarius Criticus*, published in 1811, the year before his death, though still clinging to his theory of a triple recension, he shows that Origen does not support him in this view, as he had once anticipated. As to the text he formed, where he differed from *the received text*, he generally gave a reading better attested, though in many cases not the best supported, and on the whole made great improvements. In the adjustment of conflicting probabilities he has scarcely been surpassed by any Biblical critic. Mill and Bengel approached him in this; Wetstein and Scholz were very far behind him.

in 1830-36 appeared at Leipsic in two vols. 4to the critical edition of John M. A. Scholz, Catholic Professor of Theology in the University of Bonn. He too had a recension theory, according to which all the MSS. were divided into five families, two *African* (Alexandrian and Western), one *Asiatic*, one *Byzantine*, and one *Cyprian*. This theory at a later period he rejected, and reverted to the theory of Bengel, that there were only two families, *the Alexandrian and the Constantinopolitan*; but he adopted the view

that the earlier text is to be sought among the Constantinopolitan MSS., and that the Alexandrian are less important, a view precisely the reverse of what is now known to be true. The labors of Scholz found many advocates in England among those who had not carefully studied the subject and among those who deprecated the application of criticism to the Greek Testament, and his text was accordingly reprinted there as a manual. Scholz did indeed good service as a traveller and explorer after MSS., and he has in the first instance pointed out where many are preserved; but his own collations as printed in his edition have turned out to be very inaccurately done.

This brings us to the three greatest names of this century, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, names so great that no other is associated with them in authority in the present constitution of the text.

In 1831 a duodecimo volume appeared in Berlin, with the title, *Novum Testamentum Graece ex recensione Caroli Lachmanni*. Lachmann was a professor in the University of Berlin, well known for his critical labors on the masterpieces of German literature, on the Latin poets, and above all on Lucretius, his edition of whom placed him in the foremost rank as a critic and left an impress on Latin study which has been productive of the highest results. This small edition of the Greek Testament was the result of his close labor and study carried on through five years. His purpose was to give the text the form in which the most ancient MSS. have transmitted it, and he professed implicitly to follow such MSS. so far as the then existing collations made them accessible. The oldest Greek MSS. compared with the citations of Origen formed the basis of his work; the readings of the old Latin versions, as found in unrevised MSS., and the citations of the Latin Fathers were his subsidiary aids. It was thus that his text was formed, not necessarily giving what he would consider to be the true text, but the transmitted text of about the IVth century. This text he considered would be a basis for criticism, delivered from the readings of the XVIth century, and bringing us back to a period a thousand years or more nearer to the time when the several books of the New Testament were written. In constructing the text he did not follow his own judgment, but the use of the most ancient Oriental Churches; and when this was not uniform, he preferred what was supported by African and Italian consent; and where there was great uncertainty, he indicated this partly by putting the

word or words in square brackets in the text, and partly by putting a different reading at the foot of the page; and in St. Matthew, for instance, there are forty-five cases of such bracketing, and twenty-seven readings added at the foot of the page. At the end of the volume, pp. 461-503, a list is given of the readings wherein he differs from the Elzevir edition, about 5000 in number. Lachmann thus intended by his labors to place the Greek Testament wholly on the ground of actual and early documentary authority. As this edition was altogether without preface, and the only account he had given of his purpose and plan consisted of a few words at the head of his list of the Elzevir readings just mentioned, and of an article in the *Theol. Studien u. Kritiken*, 1830, his work was much misunderstood or misrepresented. But when it became better appreciated, as it did, he was urged to undertake an edition which should fully set forth his authorities for all his readings, and to this he consented. In 1837 he obtained the aid of Philip Buttmann, son of the great Greek grammarian and critic, to arrange the authorities for the Greek, on which Buttmann was engaged for seven years. In 1839 Lachmann and Buttmann went to Fulda, in Hesse Cassel, to examine and copy the *Codex Fuldensis*, of the ante-Jerome or Old Latin text, of about A. D. 550, for the use of the new edition. In 1842, at Berlin, in 8vo, appeared the first volume, containing the Four Gospels; and to this volume a preface of 56 pp. was prefixed. The variations in the text from the small edition are not many, and they are thus explained: the text of the small edition is wholly based on the Oriental sources, as he designated them; and where these sources differ, the text is based on the consent of the Italian and the African sources; while in the larger edition, Lachmann used the combined evidence of Eastern and Western authorities. In the upper part of the page stands his recension of the text, brackets being used as before to indicate what was of doubtful authority, and below readings are placed as to which the authorities differ; the middle part of the page contains the authorities, the Greek arranged by Buttmann and the Latin by himself; and the lower part of the page is occupied with the Latin version edited mostly on the authority of the *Codices Fuldensis* and *Amiatinus*; but for the latter Buttmann was able to use only the very imperfect and inaccurate collation of Fleck (Lips. 1840, 12mo). This edition thus accomplished much that Bentley himself had projected so long before. The Greek MS. authorities which Lachmann admitted were very few; thus, in the Gospels he used only A, B,



C and D, and the fragments P, Q, T and Z; the only ancient version he used was the Latin; and the only Fathers he employed were of the Greek, Irenaeus and Origen; and of the Latin, Cyprian, Hilary of Poitiers, Lucifer of Cagliari, and in the Apocalypse Primasius. In some places he follows none of the Greek authorities on which he avowedly relies, as in the latter chapters of the Apocalypse; in these cases, though he omitted to give the authorities, he considered that the combined text of the other authorities warranted him in giving the readings which he adopts. The printing of the second volume was completed as to the text in 1845, but it was not published till 1850, about a year before his death. To this volume he prefixed notes on some passages in regard to which he had been censured, and gives here and there his own conjectures as to the true readings of other passages, using the traditional reading of the IVth century as the basis. But it is not to be forgotten that at that time it was possible for him to have but one MS. of the IVth century, *Codex B* or *Vaticanus*, and only an imperfect collation of that. The rest of the MSS. that he used date from the Vth century (A, C, T) to the IXth (G), and of these Buttmann's representation, though made not without care, was not full and exact. His Greek text seldom rests on more than four *codices*, very often on three, and not unfrequently on two; in St. Matt. vi. 20–vii. 5, and in 165 out of the 405 verses of the Apocalypse, on but one. His edition, while founded on too few documents and authorities even for his own time, has the merit of restoring the ancient Latin versions to their proper rank in the criticism of the New Testament, and of presenting an admirably revised text of the Vulgate; of giving, as Bengel had done before him, an improved punctuation of the text, which received the commendation of Tischendorf; and above all, of exerting great power over candid and inquiring minds, which will not hereafter claim for *the Received Text*, as such, any more weight than it is entitled to as the representative of the few and mostly late MSS. on which it was actually constructed.

Constantine von Tischendorf, having studied theology and philology in Leipsic, there published in 1841, in square 12mo, his first edition of the Greek Testament. Though this was greatly inferior to his subsequent critical editions, it merited the encouragement it procured for him, and the commendation of the learned Professor Schulz, of the University of Breslau, who had himself in 1827 published the first volume of a new and greatly improved edition

of Griesbach's N. T. This first edition of Tischendorf added to the text some of the authorities on which it was based, and contained *Prolegomena* partly explaining his own principles of procedure, and partly discussing the matter of *recensions* with special reference to the theories of Scholz. It is evident that the smaller edition of Lachmann had influenced Tischendorf to adopt readings according to ancient authority, though he did not do this in a uniform manner. Soon afterwards he set out on his first literary journey, and while engaged on a collation of *Codex C* or *Ephraemi* in the Royal Library of Paris, he was induced to prepare three book-seller's editions, which appeared in Paris in 1843: one dedicated to Guizot, one having the Greek in a parallel column with the Vulgate and somewhat altered to suit it, and a third containing the Greek text of the second without the Latin Vulgate. In addition to his subsequent critical studies at home, he undertook other journeys to examine, collate, and publish MSS., chiefly of the N. T. He was in Italy in 1843 and 1866; four times visited England in 1842-49-55-65; three times visited the East, where his chief discovery, that of the *Codex*  $\aleph$  or *Sinaiticus* in the Convent of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai, was made partly in 1844 and completely in 1859.

In 1849 appeared at Leipsic his fifth (2d critical) edition in square 12mo, in which the text was given as he then thought it ought to be revised after his further studies and researches. This was an advance upon his edition of 1841, but still defective, especially in the earlier portion of the work. In the *Prolegomena* to this edition he gives an account of his own labors since the appearance of the first edition, the critical principles he now adopted, the dialect of the N. T., the subject of *recensions*, etc. In this edition the various readings in the Acts, the Epistles, and the Revelation are given less sparingly than in the Gospels. His view in regard to the formation of the text was that the text was to be sought only from ancient evidence and especially from Greek MSS., but without neglecting the testimonies of ancient versions and Fathers, thus adopting Lachmann's fundamental principle. He adds that when testimonies differ, the most ancient Greek MSS. deserve special confidence, and by these he means the MSS. from the IVth to about the IXth century, but with this qualification, that the authority of the older of these is much the greater. He admitted, however, many modifications of this principle, which might in application materially interfere with a recurrence to the oldest class

of MSS. As to *recensions* he thinks the MSS. may admit a four-fold division, and be called Alexandrine and Latin, Asiatic and Byzantine; not however as four classes, but as two pairs, the first pair comprehending the more ancient MSS., the latter the more recent; but he did not allow this theory to influence his judgment in applying his critical rules. Where the text of Tischendorf and that of Lachmann differ from the common text they often agree together, from the circumstance that both editors ascribed the highest value to ancient authorities; and where Tischendorf differs from Lachmann, he commonly follows some other of the ancient MSS.

Tischendorf's seventh (3d critical) edition, published in parts at Leipsic 1856-59, is in 2 vols. 8vo, pp. vol. 1, ProL. 278, 696, vol. 2, 681, and in a smaller form in 12mo, an almost unparalleled monument of learning and diligence, but having the fault of being constructed almost without reference to the cursive MSS. A very interesting feature of this edition is the fact that in it he returns to the Received Text in 595 cases in which he had previously departed from it. Even this edition was eclipsed by the amazing work that followed, his eighth (4th critical) edition, also published in parts 1865-72, in 2 vols. 8vo, pp. vol. 1, 968, vol. 2, 1044, and a smaller form in 12mo, the text of both of which was complete; but before he had written the Prolegomena to the larger edition or the Preface to the smaller, after and probably in consequence of his great and unceasing labors in these sacred studies for some thirty years, he was smitten with paralysis and died in December, 1874. This eighth edition was the most full and comprehensive edition ever published by any editor, containing down to the time of its publication an account of the latest collations and discoveries, and as copious a body of various readings as was compatible with the design of adapting the work to general use, but the notes of the readings of the cursive MSS. are not sufficiently minute. To the general accuracy of Dr. Tischendorf's collations, Dr. Tregelles and Dr. Scrivener, the two scholars best qualified to follow him critically over a portion of his vast field of labor, bear cheerful testimony. So great is the excellence of the *Codex Sinaiticus* and the *Codex Vaticanus*, which seem to be of nearly equal antiquity, that Tischendorf and Tregelles and Dr. Scrivener are often divided in their judgments about the true readings where these MSS. differ, and those competent to form an opinion on the subject judge that Tischendorf was carried too far in his preference for the *Codex*

*Sinaiticus*, who follows it sometimes when all other high authority and even his own principles are against it; for in his edition of this MS. (Leipsic, 8vo, 1865) although the last verse of St. John's Gospel xxi. 25 has the express testimony of Origen, Tischendorf excludes it because in that MS. this one verse seemed to him to be written with fresher ink and so perhaps by a later hand. His reputation as a Biblical scholar rests less on his critical editions of the N. T. than on the chief uncial texts which he has given to the world. His examination, collation, and discoveries of Biblical MSS. surpass those of any scholar that ever lived. In 1854 he published in Leipsic in 4to a critical edition of the *Codex Amiatinus* found in the monastery on Monte Amiatis and now in Florence, written about 541, and considered as the very best MS. of St. Jerome's version. He also paid more attention than any other scholar to the MSS. of the LXX., and published four editions of it in 2 vols. 8vo, the last in 1869.

In 1865, Dr. Tischendorf, in acknowledgment of his great and learned labors, received honorary degrees from the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford; and in 1869, in consideration of his illustrious services in the matter of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, which through his influence passed into the Imperial Library of St. Petersburg, the Czar by imperial ukase bestowed on him the rank of an hereditary noble of the Russian Empire.

Samuel Prideaux Tregelles, LL. D., was born at Falmouth, England, in 1813, of Quaker parentage, and educated at Falmouth Classical School. As early as 1838 he formed the purpose of preparing a critical edition of the Greek Testament, and pursued this object throughout his life. In 1844 he first became generally known as the editor of *The Book of Revelation in Greek, edited from ancient authorities; with a New English Version*; and this attempt was received by the scholars of the Church of England with great gratitude and respect for his earnestness and his independent views. In this work he gave some account of the critical principles on which he had proceeded, and announced his intention of editing the Greek Testament with various readings. He had a just admiration for Lachmann and defended him against many objections and misconceptions, and he adopted himself essentially the plan of this great critic, withdrawing from it those features that were manifestly indefensible. It consisted in resorting to ancient authorities alone; that is, to those uncial MSS. which are not Lectionaries, except the cursive MSS. 1, 33, and 69 of the Gospels and 61 of the

Acts, which he admits among his authorities because they preserve an ancient text; and to the ancient versions and Fathers, especially Origen and Eusebius. Beside his examination and collation of MSS. in Great Britain, he undertook several foreign journeys for the same purpose. In 1845 he went to the Continent chiefly to collate the *Codex Vaticanus*, the most important, as he considered, of all the N. T. MSS.; he was in Rome five months, and though he repeatedly saw this MS. and enjoyed the favor and sympathy of Cardinal Acton, he was not allowed to transcribe any of its readings. He inspected several other MSS. in the Vatican, among which was the *Codex Basilianus*, one of the only three uncialia that contain the Apocalypse, and this contains it entire. At Florence he collated the *Codex Amiatinus* of St. Jerome's version and Tischendorf's excellent edition of this MS. is based on the combined collations of Dr. Tregelles and his own. He made collations also of MSS. at Modena, Venice, Bâle, and Munich, returning to England in 1846. In 1849 he visited Paris and collated the *Codex Claromontanus*; and again in 1850 he visited Paris, Hamburg, Berlin, Leipsic, and Dresden. During these visits he made the acquaintance at Bâle of the learned de Wette, the disciple of Griesbach; in Berlin he saw much of Lachmann and discussed with him many points of N. T. criticism; and in Leipsic he visited Tischendorf and compared some of his own collations with those made by him. Before he went abroad in 1845 he saw in England the celebrated explorer Scholz, who informed him where certain MSS. were then to be found. In 1860 the present writer carried some memoranda on these studies to London for Dr. Tregelles, from Dr. Abbot of Harvard University, and at that time Dr. Tregelles was absent in Spain to consult certain MSS. there; these memoranda were placed in the hand of Mr. William Chalk, whose services in reading the proof-sheets of his Greek Testament Dr. Tregelles mentions kindly and honorably in the introductory notice to the second part of the work. In 1848 he remodelled his translation of the Book of Revelation, omitting the Greek, but conforming, as he was now able to do, the text more closely to the ancient MSS. In 1849 he became acquainted with the *Curetonian Syriac* Fragments of the Gospels, which was a MS. found by Dr. William Cureton among the MSS. in the British Museum, brought in 1842 from the Nitrian Monasteries. This hitherto unknown version, altogether ancient in its readings, served to confirm the critical views which Dr. Tregelles had previously formed and published. In 1854

he published a volume in 8vo replete with exact and valuable information, and intended as a full and formal exposition of his own critical principles, entitled *An Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament*. In 1856 he rewrote rather than reëdited the fourth volume of *Horne's Introduction to the Scriptures*, under the special title of *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*.

At length, after all this faithful preparatory work, he put forth in 1857 the first part, containing the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark, of *The Greek New Testament, edited from ancient authorities ; with their various readings in full, and the Latin Version of St. Jerome*. It was published through the Messrs. Bagster of London, and in every way in their best style, surpassing in beauty every edition of the Greek Testament that had preceded it. The form is a 4to, with the Greek text in a large Porson type, and with the Latin of St. Jerome (after the *Codex Amiatinus*) in a narrow column on the right in small type, and below in three columns the authorities for the Greek, and the readings of the Clementine Vulgate or authorized edition of the Church of Rome. In 1861 appeared the second part, comprising the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John. In that year he was struck with paralysis, but so far recovered that he was able to publish the Acts and the Catholic Epistles in 1865, and the Epistles of St. Paul down to 2d Thess. in 1869. Early in 1870, while revising the concluding chapters of the Apocalypse, he had a second and very severe stroke of his disorder. The rest of the Pauline Epistles were sent out in 1870 as he himself had prepared them, and the Apocalypse in 1872, in as good a state as Dr. Tregelles' papers could enable them, by his friends Mr. Bloxside and Mr. Newton. Dr. Tregelles lingered in a helpless condition, and died in 1875. The seventh and concluding part, containing the *Prolegomena, Addenda, and Corrigenda*, was compiled and edited in 1879 by the Rev. Prof. Hort and the Rev. Mr. Streane of the University of Cambridge, who seem to have entertained the kindest and most considerate regard for the memory of this most devoted Christian scholar.

The authorities that Dr. Tregelles adduced for his text were much less copious than those of Tischendorf, but far more abundant than those of Lachmann. They were collated by himself or by Tischendorf, and in only a few instances by others. That his great work was most thoroughly and conscientiously done, no one has denied ; in some parts of his collations, wherein he has since been followed

by others, he was found to be scrupulously exact, and where Tischendorf and Dr. Tregelles differ in their account of British MSS., Dr. Tregelles is seldom in the wrong; in the discussions between these great critics about personal accuracy, which sometimes took place, Dr. Tregelles always appears in an amiable light. It must be admitted that he investigated the character of his authorities more than Tischendorf found time and opportunity to do, and on the basis of this investigation he undertook (Horne's Introduction, IV, p. 106 sqq., edited by Dr. Tregelles), at least for the Gospels, to group the uncials according to their quality and affinity, which he accomplished in a masterly manner.

It was the purpose then of Lachmann to form an ancient and diplomatic text. His purpose was a great conception, but his authorities were too few, and the Greek MSS. he employed were imperfectly collated by Buttmann. The MSS. B, C and D, out of his four primary documents (A, B, C witnesses for the East, and D for the West), were, as Tischendorf, N. T. 7th ed. Prol. p. cix., has shown, not as yet properly edited, and the *Codex Sinaiticus* was not yet known. Tischendorf and Dr. Tregelles followed Lachmann, with the same general purpose in view. Tischendorf's explorations and discoveries and reproduction in permanent form of uncial MSS. are, as has been said, his chief merit, and this is immense; and his examination and collation of MSS., both uncial and cursive, were extensive, and his critical apparatus the most copious yet brought together. But it was not to be expected that he would have the requisite time and strength left to form a text of the highest authority, and he was too much swayed by some of the documents which he had himself discovered. Dr. Tregelles, diligent, persevering, conscientious, while admitting authorities far beyond the limits of Lachmann, yet founded his work on too narrow a basis, and throughout the Gospels was without the *Codex Sinaiticus*, and in St. Matthew and St. Mark without the full collation of the *Codex Vaticanus*. For the rest, he had all the most important apparatus that Tischendorf used, and it is a matter of great satisfaction that they agree so far as they do in the results of their labors. But it is no disparagement to these great men to say, that they could not collate and also edit the vast materials which had become accessible. For the materials for editing the New Testament are more abundant than those of any other writings that have come down to us; and it was the very abundance of them that seemed to perplex the mind of Tischendorf, and

brought upon him the charge of fickleness for the changes he made in his work. Let us add a word on this matter of documentary evidence in the case of the New Testament and elsewhere.

The number of MSS. of the whole N. T., or of parts, which we now possess, have been computed as follows: *Uncials*, or those executed in capitals and designated by capitals, as  $\alpha$ , *A, B, C*, etc., and written from the IVth to the Xth century, 127; *Cur-sives*, or those executed in small letters and designated by numbers, as 1, 2, 3, etc., and written from the Xth to the XVth century, 1456, making in all 1583. The earliest dated MS. of the N. T. is *Codex S* of the Gospels or *Vaticanus*, which was written in A. D. 949. In the case of the Old Testament the whole number of Hebrew MSS. collated by Dr. Kennicott and De Rossi was 1200, almost all of these having been written between A. D. 1000 and 1457, and almost every one of those written before the VIIIth or the VIIth century of our era having been lost or destroyed. The earliest with a certain date was written A. D. 1106, but one (Pinner No. 1, at Odessa) has a subscription stating that it was corrected at a date corresponding to A. D. 580; and if this statement is true, then this is the most ancient Hebrew MS. now known to exist. But both the Greek Testament and the Hebrew Bible rest on far more numerous, and the Greek Testament on more ancient, documents than the generality of the Greek and the Roman writers. The oldest MS. of Aeschylus, the *Codex Medicus* in Florence, is probably of the Xth century, and the oldest of Euripides of the XIIth. There is but one MS. of Demosthenes of the first class, the *Codex Σ*, in the Royal Library of Paris, of the XIth century. Ennius, the father of Latin poetry, exists only in fragments, his entire works being supposed to have been lost irrecoverably in the XIIIth century. Of the twenty-one plays attributed to Plautus by Varro, one utterly disappeared during the Middle Ages, and at the beginning of the XVth century only the first eight were known to exist, the other twelve being discovered about 1428; and the two best MSS. of this author are very imperfect. Cicero's letters to Atticus and to his brother Quintus, some of the most precious remains of profane antiquity, exist only in a MS. made by Petrarch from an ancient copy since lost, and his *Brutus* and *Orator*, two of his elaborate rhetorical works, have come down to us in the same way by another modern hand. Only a single MS. of Velleius Paterculus is now known to exist, and that is a modern copy of an ancient MS. now lost. The first six books of the Annals



of Tacitus exist only in a single ancient MS., and that incomplete.

Undoubtedly a large number of the changes of Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Dr. Tregelles, in which all three agree, have been made on adequate authority and will stand approved; but there are still many that seem to rest on insufficient evidence and that are in themselves very unsatisfactory, not to persons ignorant of these matters, but to scholars most competent of all men living to form a judgment about them, as Dr. Scrivener in England and Dr. Wieseler in Germany. What we still need for the settling of the uncertain and unsatisfactory readings is a long and careful and laborious searching among all the documents known to us, cursive as well as uncial; and while the most ancient MSS. and the citations of the most important Fathers, both Greek and Latin, will naturally have the highest interest and often the greatest weight, yet wherever they differ or give exegetically an unsatisfactory reading, we must have recourse to every proper source of every period to help us reach the true reading and form a settled text. The providence of God has created here an occasion for the most patient and the most laborious efforts of Christian scholars. Such a text is sure to be formed at some time, though it may be done only by degrees; and it is worth the waiting for, even if it requires another century or more to accomplish it. In the meantime, and after this long period of waiting, it seems expedient to have a revision of the English New Testament conformed as well as may be to the results of the study and research of these great critics, but still subject, as of course it must be, to the modifications and corrections required by further study and research in regard to the original text.

CHARLES SHORT.