

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expositor-series-1.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php)

of that last great stage of judgment called the kingdom of Christ. The view of these Scriptures appears to be that the city of God, which is to be the nucleus of the nations, is growing day by day; that it is gradually gathering into itself and around itself all beings and all things that are worthy to rule; that the dead are coming into it, each man in his own order; that the living are centring round it, each nation in its own place and time. The very conception of the Divine Headship is that of a body which is ever expanding, which is daily adding to itself or evolving from itself new members of the great theocracy, and new powers of the world to come. The kingdom of God is ever coming; the throne of the judgment is ever being unveiled. It is coming with clouds, because it works by a process of gathering, and therefore it is unseen by any single eye. But in the dispensation of the fulness of time, when He shall have gathered together all things unto Himself, the vision of the Divine Empire will be complete; the throne of judgment will emerge from the clouds and darkness that are round about it, and the Messianic promise of the second Psalm will be fulfilled—"I will give thee *the nations* for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession."

GEORGE MATHESON.

---

### TEXTUAL CRITICISM ILLUSTRATED FROM THE PRINTING-OFFICE.

IV. CONCLUDING SUGGESTIONS.—It seems difficult to quit the subject without some remark as to the practical bearing of the considerations that have preceded, and the general view of textual criticism which one influenced by them must adopt. As a consequence the present article can have but little direct connection with the defining portion of its

title, for the printing-office, which has served to the entire essay as a starting-point, must now pass from sight, to give place to the wider subject which is its goal. I am painfully aware of the danger which I hereby incur of drawing upon myself the reproof of Apelles to the cobbler; but still, as the foregoing statements are so far novel that they hint at a compromise where compromise had been supposed impossible, I may be borne with if I seek, I trust without undue presumption, to pursue my argument to its legitimate issue. Perhaps of more importance, however, than the whole of these individual deductions is that deliverance of the mind from the ultra-veneration for Codices B and N which results from recognition of the extensive corruptness of the earlier manuscripts. When once the critical judgment is emancipated from this tyranny and enabled to look impartially at the whole evidence in every case, then, though it may often be that no one of the above principles suggests an elucidation, some other circumstance, either sought for or for the first time allowed its due weight, will still induce a different conclusion from the one to which modern practice would conduct. To form some rough idea for my own satisfaction, I have gone through the tabulated readings, about sixty in number, cited by Canon Cook against the Revised Version in his recent work on the Synoptic Gospels; and I find that in some three-fifths of the instances I can agree with him, and in the remaining two-fifths with the Revisers,—or, as several of the readings are marginal only, I hold, in respect of the new *text*, about as often one way as the other. This statement is by no means made from the delusion that any intrinsic value will be attached to it, but simply with a view to exhibiting in a tangible form the position I am really taking in regard to each of the opposing schools. On the one hand I see a number of scholars, of whom I trust I shall always both speak and feel with the utmost deference and veneration,

but whom I cannot but hold to have made far too light of certain facts most weighty and insuperable. They found themselves in the presence of two manuscripts undeniably older than any others, exhibiting a text very considerably in mutual accord, and marked by the two striking features which they regarded as paramount attestations of genuineness because proclaiming upon the very surface the non-interference of editorial hands. Hence they were led—in practice at least, though protesting the reverse in theory—to shut their eyes to the abounding demonstrations that *other* than editorial corrupting forces had been at work, and to make of textual criticism a comparatively simple science whose entire rationale could be almost expressed by the formula, The reading of Codex B except where a shorter or more awkward one can be found elsewhere. On the other hand there appear a body of learned theologians who feel themselves called upon to resist the modern system tooth and nail, through the timid though pious conviction that by upsetting the old traditional lines it unsettles the minds of men, and is thus liable, practically though undesignedly, to assail the outworks of Revelation itself. They esteem it as by a providential ordering that a multitude of mediæval manuscripts have come down to us which exhibit a general accordance with the text ecclesiastically received ; and they refuse to recognize as also by providential ordering the fact that other manuscripts of vastly weightier authority have been more recently disinterred and one after another presented for our use. Having regard to the strong convictions expressed upon both sides, we may well believe that “in medio tutissimus” may prove, as so often, a serviceable proverb ; and that while thus our decisions may need rarely to be swayed by authorities later than the fifth century, we may well look with suspicion upon any course of procedure which leads us largely and long together away from the text which is our inheritance from the past.

A compromise then is our desideratum; is there any common ground discoverable upon which the opposing views of facts may at length be brought into harmony? I think there does exist that which with a little adjustment may be so applied. It seems at first an inexplicable pair of paradoxes that the one side should tell us of an "attempt at a *judicious* selection from rival texts" made at the Syrian Recension, while yet assuming that event to have been exclusively disastrous; and that the other should point to the wholesale corruption of the copies existing before the assigned Syrian date—so that not only all the Greek codices of that period which have been preserved, but those which were used by Clement, Justin, Origen, and Eusebius, by "Irenæus and the African Fathers and the whole Western with a portion of the Syrian Church" (the words are Dr. Scrivener's), were literally teeming with blunders—and yet placidly maintain that a text substantially agreeing with the Received was from first to last dominant and assured. There is certainly the greatest difficulty, as this latter side have shewn, in accepting the fact of a formal and authoritative recension of which no trace of a record can be found; but it will be fully as hard for them as it is for their antagonists to account for the sudden disappearance of the "wholesale corruption" without the aid of some such explanatory hypothesis. If impurity was rampant everywhere till the middle of the fourth century, but after that date not only did new corruptions cease but the old ones were cleansed away and manuscripts generally returned to the original and unperverted text, there must have been some definite event, and not a mere "survival of the fittest," which caused so remarkable a revolution to come about. We only require, then, to hold the one side to ever so qualified a use of their epithet "*judicious*," and to remove the historical objection from the eyes of the other, in order to obtain in this recension the actual basis upon

which we seek to agree. May I therefore venture to suggest a modification of the theory of Dr. Hort, which, without presenting the same serious difficulties, seems equally capable of accounting for the change? But another event, opening the way to this, must claim our consideration first.

Canon Cook has recently furnished us with a glowing and interesting account of the occurrence which he terms "the Eusebian Recension," or the transcription, under the direction of Eusebius, of fifty manuscripts at Cæsarea in about the year 334. Our Codices B and  $\aleph$  he gives strong reasons for supposing to be two of the actual copies then produced, and there is probably no special occasion for the other side to object to his view. I cannot however allow that the conditions of haste, on which he so much dwells, are either necessary or adequate for explanation of the characteristics which those codices so distinctively present. Quite enough, I submit, has been herein offered already to account for corruptions far worse than theirs; and we have heard of no similar hypothesis being surmised for explaining the much grosser errors of manuscripts of the Western type. Then as to this matter of urgent haste, I cannot but feel that it is pressed by the learned Canon very far beyond its importance. We printers' readers ought to be the first to avow the incompatibility of haste with accuracy; but our one great reason for abhorring the former requirement is our consciousness that it is only in the veriest trifles that any abatement on its account will be allowed us in the latter. Nor is it conceivable that a bishop, characterized by the honesty which Canon Cook so ungrudgingly ascribes to Eusebius, could have wilfully allowed any pressure as to time to pass as an excuse for sacrificing accuracy to its claims. But this is not all, and the case soon shews itself to be a complicated one. It is obviously impossible to attribute the whole of the observed discrepancies to the

hurry of that one occasion, from the simple fact that in the majority of instances both these codices read alike. A portion therefore are assigned to systematic cutting-down—a theory however which seems even less commendable than that of culpable haste, since such proceeding, if perpetrated at all, would amount to just so *much* as to render its concealment by Eusebius a fraud, and yet so *little* that in the light of a practical abridgment the result would be ridiculously inappreciable. And then again, while the readings in the two manuscripts prove a large degree of community of origin, there is also so constant a manifestation of *difference* that they could not possibly have been transcribed from one single copy; and yet who can suppose that if Eusebius had been really pressed to the extent represented, he would not, with all the resources of royalty at command, have assembled the fifty scribes within a single room and had his own prepared copy multiplied identically by dictation? By this means he would have saved enormously in time, and would have gained greatly in accuracy as well; whilst if he had really been producing a “recension” of his own, what means could have been so simple for carrying this into full effect? Nor, lastly, are the readings of B and  $\aleph$ , with one or two exceptions, such as could for a moment be regarded as having arisen from doctrinal causes. The learned Canon speaks of the Arian tendencies of Eusebius, but he candidly admits that he can find no definite evidence of them in these readings; on the contrary, the instance in which he makes the strongest point of doctrinal motive—the omission of the account of the agony in Gethsemane—is one for which not the Arians but the orthodox are the parties charged. It is obvious however—I am indebted to the courtesy of the Rev. Dr. Salmon for drawing my attention to the point—that Canon Cook is thinking of Arianism as practically identical with Unitarianism, of

which in reality it was "absolutely the reverse" and lying "rather in the direction of Ditheism." It had accordingly no scruple whatever in giving our Lord the title of "God," and in fact, says Dr. Salmon, "the Arians were willing to use such high language about our Lord that when it was wanted to exclude them from the church it became necessary to insist on the non-scriptural word *Homoousios*. I do not believe," he adds, "that the Arian controversy affected New Testament readings on the one side or the other, not even in the case of 'God manifest in the flesh.'" As to such changes therefore as that of inserting a point in Romans ix. 5—with which B and  $\aleph$  have simply nothing to do—or the most important omission referred to in the next paragraph, it is clear that the genuine Arian would be the last person to accord them the slightest favour; while as to the class of heretic whom Canon Cook has in mind, it may suffice in reply to refer to two readings of these codices which tend very decisively in the opposite direction: there is the famous *μονογενῆς Θεός* in John i. 18, peculiar to these two and C, and the *ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ* in Acts xx. 28, which among the most ancient authorities is furnished by these two alone. No doubt the *real* Arian would prefer these readings, and thus, strangely enough, they support Canon Cook's theory in the letter by means of establishing the very opposite in spirit. At all events the proclivities of this "recension" towards *degrading* the Saviour must at the worst have been very feeble ones indeed.

But I fear that this hypothesis has been mainly propounded with a view to accounting for the omission of the closing twelve verses of the Gospel of Mark, the integrity of which, as gauged by a standard of quantity rather than quality, is apparently regarded by the conservative school as the very centre of the position to be maintained. I have already stated that I cannot go with them in this,

and whilst no one disputes the great antiquity of the verses, it perplexes me how any one can deliberately insist that they are strictly homogeneous with the book which they conclude. This is not the place, nor am I the writer, to discuss their possible canonicity (though, with the authorship not even guessed at, this *can* only be a matter of opinion); but the awkward transition with which they read even in English seems sufficient evidence that they were not written with the rest of the Gospel, though possibly they may in part be a reproduction of a lost conclusion of the Evangelist's own. The blank left in Codex B, so far from being a triumphant proof of the dishonesty of the scribe or his master, is actually in one sense a stronger testimony against the genuineness of the verses, demonstrating as it does that their omission was not owing to accident: doubtless they were known to exist but believed to be spurious, and the blank was left either in case the original conclusion should come to light or simply as denoting that the Gospel was incomplete. And if to a first hasty glance Canon Cook seems to have made a point by citing, by the side of this omission, that also of the notice of the Ascension in Luke, the very slightest inspection of the facts causes the theory of doctrinal tampering to break down at once; for whilst it is only the scribe of B who has left out the record of the Ascension in Mark (he having re-written for **N** the sheet from which the twelve verses are missing—and that apparently for the express purpose of omitting them), it is **N** itself on the contrary which omits that record in Luke, and the scribe of B not only gives it correctly in his own manuscript, but, as the diorthota of the other, he promptly *supplies the omission there*. A more complete refutation of the charge of theological interference—whether on the part of Eusebius himself or of *either* of his transcribers—could surely not be desired; while even if there had been a grain of plausi-

bility left it, this also ought to evaporate before the circumstantial account, untouched in either codex, to be read in the first chapter of the Acts (to say nothing of the pointed statement in the opening of the Epistle to the Hebrews).

Not then in the theory of extensive change, designed or accidental, attending a "Eusebian Recension" shall we find any appreciable explanation of the great phenomena of textual evidence. In turning however from this point I feel bound to acknowledge my indebtedness, in the preparation of this paper, to the work of Canon Cook just referred to; and the same opportunity may be taken in regard to the several learned and courteous divines who have offered me valuable hints as it has been passing through the press. We come then to the consideration of what element of probable fact we are to recognise in the "Syrian Recension." I have already remarked that without something of the kind we seem involved in a hopeless mystery; and yet it has most powerfully contributed in my own case to breaking company upon other points with the school of its supporters. If then after the close, about 335, of Eusebius's work of transcription at Cæsarea, we have an assumed recension at Antioch somewhere about 350, does not the suggestion force itself upon us that the one event may have grown out of the other? True that no bishops and fathers appear to have then met in solemn conclave for the formal decision of the text; yet what could have been more likely than that the more active and intelligent of his own collaborators, struck by the profusion of various readings which the labours of Eusebius had brought into juxtaposition, should have resolved to utilise this unprecedented opportunity for revising their own working copies and especially for supplying those additional words or passages which they found to exist in such abundance elsewhere? Working in concord would however be obviously their first essential,

and thus *every* addition, genuine or spurious, would be everywhere supplied, and the more prominent of other variations would be also mutually conformed. A very unscientific mode of procedure undoubtedly this was, but why it is to be quietly assumed that it was always or even generally a work of deterioration is what I am simply at a loss to conceive. The theory—I mean Dr. Hort's—breaks down all ideas of a higher antiquity of B and N as compared with the other sources of the Textus Receptus, and places them, or their originals, on the very same level with those others which the Syrian editors preferred; thus confessing that the priority claimed for the text of the former is a deduction of *mental evolution alone*. And if the eight instances of conflate readings were increased to eight hundred, and all of these were as incontestable as some of the eight are suspicious, I maintain that the case would continue in practically the same position. Conflation—to which I have not an atom of objection as a most likely incident in the revising process, but one whose results must be *individually* tested as lax repetitions or genuine restorations—proves or renders probable just so much as this: that if all the authorities anterior to the recension give a passage in one of its shorter forms, then any manuscript presenting the longer one contains *elements* of a Syrian character; but as to the whole of that manuscript's readings being thereby stamped as Syrian, still less as to all Syrian readings being set down as essentially *spurious*, I fail to see that, beyond the preference for shorter and harder, the slightest atom of reason has been assigned. Of that preference itself it has been the main purport of these papers to demonstrate the mistake: shorter and harder are only purer when viewed as against editorial corruptions, and it is not these, but those of transcribers, which really form the vast majority of the whole. When therefore an esteemed adviser represents to me that good manuscripts were at the recension

“corrected by inferior ones,” and that B and  $\aleph$ , though “blundering copies,” are “copies of the best archetype that we can trace,” it seems sufficient to reply, What constitutes inferiority? and what can we know or use of a lost archetype except as we find it reproduced in its descendants? Of the earlier courses of manuscript transmission we seem enabled tolerably to conceive—copyists’ errors by wholesale on the one hand, and on the other a preliminary series of private recensions at which, in its most essential features, the greater subsequent drama was in rehearsal. And when we have mounted, by means of concurrent readings, to the archetypal copy from which the lines of B and  $\aleph$  diverged at the first, what have we grasped but a codex in which copyists have been left to their own sweet will, and omission, substitution, and transposition have already effectually done their work?

But to return at length to the work of the recension itself. Dr. Hort supposes Antioch to have been the locality of its occurrence, and though my own surmise would transfer at least its commencement to Cæsarea, we may readily gather how natural it would be for its influence to be carried at once from thence to the former city. They were both Levantine ports (practically at least, for Seleucia was “the port of Antioch”), and thus, though two hundred and fifty miles apart, enjoying what for those days was an exceptional amount of intercommunication; whilst Eusebius, who was actual bishop of the one, was engaged in prolonged controversy with churchmen in the other, the far more important bishopric of which he came in fact to have offered to him. Thus the quietly accomplished work at Cæsarea could not fail to be promptly transmitted to Antioch, where it is quite conceivable, if the conception be required, that it continued for a while to undergo further revision—nay, it is fully possible that the actual leaders in the work may themselves have been Antiochian residents

who had, at Eusebius's desire, gone specially to Cæsarea to assist. And so these modifications, being in no case ecclesiastical changes, but mere adoptions of longer or easier readings which all possessed manuscript authority of some sort, would be very likely in an uncritical age to be accepted at once as improvements not open to question, till in a business sense the "revised edition of the New Testament" would come into general demand, and, spreading quickly from centre to centre, would form the basis of our normal text. As Eusebius died in 340 we can feel no surprise at the omission of any mention of it by him; and Chrysostom, though presbyter at Antioch, was not born till about 347, so that long before he became interested in such matters it was in all probability quite a thing of the past. Athanasius and the Jerusalem Cyril certainly *might* have referred to it, and so perhaps might Basil and the two Gregories. But bibliography in the fourth century was not what it is in the nineteenth. In those days it bore mainly upon burning church questions, and seems never to have concerned itself with individual editions of the Scriptures except to denounce two or three of them as corrupted with heretical intent.

I have thus sought to shew, on the one hand, how easy it is for manuscripts, valuable as wholes, to contain long arrays of blunders in their details, and on the other, for a text, formed on the most unscientific of methods, to be none the less very frequently in the right. I feel justified, then, at the conclusion of my task, in respectfully calling upon critics to review the positions they have taken—not only as to the purity of Codex B, but as to the grounds upon which that supposed purity is based. As a corrector of the press I can but reiterate the assertion that, unless we can feel assured of a strict and continuous comparison with the copy having been made, no evidence of general carefulness in the copyist can be assumed as a security against even

gross mistakes. I well remember a compositor who would set page after page of Whiston's "Demosthenes" with scarcely an accent wrong or a point misplaced, but yet in every thirtieth line or so would omit from three to thirty words by homœotel. And equally free from doubt are my deductions as to the facility with which awkward readings come in by accident, so that I must take upon me to plead with those I am addressing to abandon the paradox that "the unlikeliest reading is the likeliest," and to be content with substituting the more moderate canon, "A difficult reading must be dismissed with *more hesitation* than an easier one." The "Procliviori præstat ardua" is certainly not to be relied upon as a universal rule, and a far sounder result would often be reached by regarding as the foremost of all probabilities that of the Evangelist or Apostle having written an intelligible and fairly constructed sentence.

If, then, the science of textual criticism is ever to become a thing upon which scholars can agree, it will require, though by no means to be made easier, to take in a very much wider field. Not wider in time however, but only in material, for it is now admitted that there exists but an insignificant interval between the ages of B and N on the one hand and of A and C on the other; whilst the early fathers and versions and the evidence derived from subjective reasoning will also require to be carefully weighed before our nearest approach to accuracy can be attained. Intrinsic probability, including the readiest method of accounting for variations, ought, I submit, to take precedence of discrimination between individual authorities; though we have generally sufficient of these as old as the fifth century to allow us to view the others as only an occasional check. Then too, though I say it in direct opposition to one who has been among the most valued of my counsellors—I am permitted the liberty of naming the Rev. Dr. Sanday—the applauded standard of an ideal

consistency will require, in its present shape, to be utterly banished from the field. Instead of depreciating Alford for "want of principle and attempt to treat each case simply by itself," let us rather go beyond him in his own distinctive method and boldly advance the rule of individual analysis as the only basis upon which sound criticism can be built. The true text is assuredly too widely scattered, and the causes of its scattering are too multitudinous, for its approximate discovery to be ever effected by rigid adherence to any single line: nay, it may even be questioned whether any two doubtful readings exist as to which all the leading authorities and all the internal considerations are strictly and undeviatingly the same. The reliance therefore upon some particular manuscripts tested only by some particular canons is a tacit admission that the true text is beyond the editor's power to discover, so that he is fain to content himself with an artificial semblance which we are asked not so much believingly to accept as to admire for its unswerving devotion to rule. Consistency indeed, in its genuine form, a printer's reader should be the last person to decry, and the critic who openly sets it at nought will be a sport of the winds surpassing Tischendorf himself. But when what is meant is only an objective consistency—a consistency which maintains that the three leading manuscripts are to be followed in reading "the only-begotten God" because they have been followed in so many places besides—then it is time to denounce it as a narrow and a misleading consistency, a premature verdict from a mere fraction of the evidence, and a closing of the eyes to the really weightiest part of the case. And along with other reforms do let our critics have the courage to abandon their disdain of whatever lies beyond the cold region of science, and let them be willing plainly to propound the question, Which reading is the most *desirable* to stand, as harmonizing best with the con-

text or with what we have fair ground for expecting in itself? I do not ask for evidence to be forced in this behalf, but do let there be an end made to that untoward system of seeking for whatever tends most violently the other way. For there does exist, in respect of such investigations, an innate feeling on the part of most of us which recoils from submitting the words that have brought blessings to many to the repulsive testings of mere diplomatic criticism. Can we not witness, indeed, how each time that such discussions have come before us—

like a man in wrath, the heart  
Stood up and answered, "I have felt" ?

Let this sentiment, then, receive its proper recognition, and, under the control of a matured judgment, it may be trusted to point often to the result which will yield the truest ultimate satisfaction.

ALFRED WATTS.

---

### ON PHILIPPIANS i. 22.

THE interesting remarks made by Canon Evans, in the February number of the EXPOSITOR, on the *μισθός* which St. Paul was anticipating, suggest to me to crave a little space in order to state briefly what seems to me a probable interpretation of the difficult words which form the first half of Philippians i. 22.

Verses 21 to 24 stands thus in the Greek: (21) Ἐμοὶ γὰρ τὸ ζῆν Χριστὸς καὶ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν κέρδος. (22) εἰ δὲ τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκί, τοῦτό μοι καρπὸς ἔργου καὶ τί αἰρήσομαι οὐ γνωρίζω. (23) συνέχομαι δὲ ἐκ τῶν δύο, τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων εἰς τὸ ἀναλύσαι καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι. (24) πολλῶ [γὰρ] μᾶλλον κρείσσον· 24 τὸ δὲ ἐπιμένειν [ἐν] τῇ σαρκὶ ἀναγκαϊότερον δι' ὑμᾶς.

The first two of these verses—it suffices to quote those two in the English—are given in the Authorized Version thus: "For to me to live *is* Christ, and to die *is* gain. But if I live in the flesh, this *is* the fruit of my labour; yet what I shall choose I wot not."