

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 *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

So also in the realization of his constant watchfulness over us and near living presence at all times, what a serene, satisfying sense of protection will the soul enjoy! Habitual, elevated self-possession, great peacefulness of spirit, sweet contentment in one's earthly lot, calm hopefulness in it, the glad sense of our complete relationship in being, act, and destiny to God and his cause, and the inspiring expectation of unbounded good forever at his right hand on high — these are some of the legitimate results of the proper reception into the heart and life of the facts of God's providence.

Have, then, the processions of living beings — each made in God's image for a life like his own and with himself — come and gone in such long and startling succession just that they might jostle for a few short days furiously one against the other, in their mad strife for worldly gain? Or is not, rather, earth's history altogether incomplete as yet — foretoking in its very unfinished condition hitherto a future of the most grand proportions, and of the most glorious harvests of all good things? "The Lord reigneth: let the earth rejoice!"

ARTICLE VI.

REVELATION AND INSPIRATION.

BY REV. E. P. BARROWS, D.D., LATELY PROFESSOR OF HEBREW LITERATURE IN
ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

No. IV.

INTEGRITY OF THE GOSPEL NARRATIVES.

THE genuineness of the Gospel narratives being admitted, the further question of their integrity, that is, of their uncorrupt preservation, at once arises. If it be granted that the histories of our Lord's life current under the names of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, are rightly ascribed to those men as their authors, how do we know that they have come down to us without corruption or mutilation?

What is meant by the Integrity of the Gospel Narratives?

It is necessary to define, first of all, what is meant in the present inquiry by the uncorrupt preservation of the Gospel narratives. We have to do, not with the so-called "various readings," but with the question of essential alterations and mutilations. When the *textual critic*, whose business it is to examine and compare manuscripts or editions of a work, and to judge respecting the variations of text found in them, speaks of a given text as "corrupt," he means one thing; but in a question concerning the truthfulness of the Christian system as exhibited in a given text, corruption of the record means something very different. The textual critic understands by a corrupt text one that has been marred by the carelessness or bad judgment of transcribers, whence have arisen so many various readings, though these do not change or essentially obscure the facts and doctrines of Christianity. But in an inquiry whether we have in our four canonical Gospels the account of our Lord's life and teachings as it was originally written by the evangelists, we have to do, not with the question of various readings, such as are incident to all copies, but of *essential variations*; of alterations and mutilations, for example, like those which Marcion and Tatian attempted, by which the facts and doctrines themselves are changed or obscured.

Now the existence of various readings in the manuscripts of the Gospels (as of the other books of the New Testament), and of the printed editions executed from these manuscripts, is a fact patent to all, which cannot be denied, and which there is no necessity for denying. This phenomenon is in harmony with the general analogy of divine providence. God does not rain down from heaven food and raiment, as he could do with infinite ease, but he gives men in the arrangements of nature, the means of procuring food and raiment, and they must work to obtain them. Nor has it pleased God to preserve, in either a miraculous or a providential way, the original languages of scripture as vernacular

to even a single nation. The ancient Hebrew and Greek are dead languages, to be learned, as we learn any other dead language, by years of patient study. When the missionary goes to Syria or India or China, God does not communicate to him in a supernatural way a knowledge of the tongues spoken by those nations. He must learn them by the diligent use of the means at his disposal. It is hardly necessary to add that the translators of the Bible are not preserved by inspiration from all mistakes and misapprehensions. They must find out and correct their errors just as translators in a secular sphere are under the necessity of doing. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread," is the stern rule for everything valuable in the spiritual, not less than in the physical, sphere of human life. To this great law the department of sacred criticism is subjected. It is the will of God that we should have a pure text — pure in a critical sense — not without hard labor, but by years of patient toil in the study and collation of the abundant materials which his good providence has preserved for us.

Various readings have arisen in the manuscripts of the New Testament books, as in other manuscripts, from the mistakes of the copyists, and sometimes from the unskilful corrections of these copyists, or of those subsequently employed to compare and correct the copies. These various readings may be conveniently divided, as is done by Tregelles,¹ into *substitutions*, *insertions*, and *omissions*. Were we writing on the subject of textual criticism it would be easy to show in what a natural way most of the various readings belonging to these three classes have arisen, without any intention of wilful falsification on the part of the copyists. At present we content ourselves with a few general remarks.

First, by far the greatest number of various readings had their origin in simple inadvertence. It should be remembered that in the ancient manuscripts the *scriptio continua* prevailed; that is, the text was written continuously, in uncial (capital) letters, without any division between the

¹ In Horne's Introduction, Vol. iv. chapter 6.

words, and, as a general rule, without any accents, breathings, or marks of interpunction. This made it far more difficult for the copyist to follow the manuscript before him, and for the collator to discover the errors in transcription. A particularly fruitful source of omissions was in this mode of writing. When two adjacent words, lines, or sentences had a similar termination, the eye of the copyist often overlooked the word, line, or sentence intervening between them. So, also, through inadvertence the order of words might be altered, synonymous words put one for another, contracted words confounded with each other, etc. Again, when the copyist wrote from dictation, he was liable to confound one vowel, or even word, with another.

Secondly, some various readings are due to unskilful criticism, as when the copyist, or the corrector to whose revision the copy was submitted, substituted a plainer or more grammatical reading for that which he found in the text, sought to bring a passage in one writer into more exact agreement with the corresponding passage in another, supplied supposed deficiencies, etc. Insertions are a frequent mode of variation, the copyist filling out the text of his author from a parallel passage, or inserting marginal notations in the text. Of amplification from a parallel passage we have an undoubted example in Acts ix. 5, where the words: "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks," have been added from Acts xxvi. 14.

Thirdly, the more abundantly an ancient work was multiplied by transcription, the greater the number of various readings thus arising. And as the books of the New Testament, more especially the Gospel narratives, were transcribed far more frequently than any other writings, the number of various readings connected with their text is proportionably great. Yet these make the true reading not less, but more certain, since, by a diligent comparison of these variations, in connection with the age and character of the manuscripts to which they belong, we are enabled to restore, proximately at least, the primitive text.

Finally, for the purposes of textual criticism, all manuscripts are not of equal authority. Other things being equal, the most ancient are entitled to the most weight. The same is true of those readings which are obtained by means of versions. The older the versions, the older the Greek copies from which they were executed. But in estimating the authority of manuscripts there are various other considerations, particularly their characteristic readings, as indicating the class or family of manuscripts to which they belong. Much labor has been expended by textual critics in the attempt to classify the vast mass of manuscripts collected from different and distant regions, and dating from the fourth century and onward, part of them executed in the original Greek, part in ancient versions, others of them bilingual, that is, containing the original and a version of it side by side. To give even the history of the controversies that have arisen respecting the proper classification of these manuscripts, and the authority due to the several classes would require a volume. But this is unnecessary in the present inquiry, which has respect to the question of essential alterations, insertions, or omissions, whereby the facts and teachings of the Gospel narratives are supposed to have been changed or mutilated.

The Essential Integrity of the Gospel Narratives.
General Remarks.

Of the autograph manuscripts proceeding immediately from the authors of the Gospels we find no trace after the apostolic age. We have consequently no absolute standard of comparison. But there is no ground for supposing that, could we recover their text, it would differ in any essential respects from that which we now possess. We do not need the wood of the true cross that we may have redemption through the blood which Christ shed upon it. Neither do we need the identical manuscripts written by the four evangelists, since we have the contents of these manuscripts handed down to us without corruption in anything essential.

When the youthful inquirer first learns the number of

“various readings” which textual criticism has brought to light, amounting to so many thousands, it may seem to him as if the facts and teachings of the evangelic record were brought into a state of utter uncertainty. But let him dismiss all apprehensions on this point. By far the greater number of these variations relate to unimportant particulars; as, for example, whether the conjunction *and* (*καί*) shall be inserted or omitted; whether *but* (*δέ*) or *for* (*γάρ*) is the true reading; whether we are to read *and when thou prayest thou shalt not be* (*καὶ ὅταν προσεύχῃ οὐκ ἔσῃ*), or *and when ye pray ye shall not be* (*καὶ ὅταν προσεύχησθε οὐκ ἔσεσθε*); whether this or that order of words, giving substantially the same sense, is to have the preference; which of two words in a given clause exhibits the true reading; whether in Matt. vi. 1, to give a single instance, we are to read, with the received text, *alms* (*ἐλεημοσύνην*) or according to the more approved text, *righteousness* (*δικαιοσύνην*); whether a smoother or a rougher expression, a more or less grammatical form, be genuine reading, etc. A few of the variations are of a more important character. But even in respect to such variations we may decide either way without changing or obscuring the great truths of the gospel, since these are not dependent on particular words or phrases, but pervade and vivify the New Testament, as the vital blood does the body.

We propose to show the essential integrity of the evangelic record under the two following divisions: first, the text since the last quarter of the second century; secondly, the earlier text; the whole to be closed with a notice of the more important variations, real or alleged.

The Text since the Last Quarter of the Second Century.

The essential integrity of the evangelic text from the last quarter of the second century and onward admits of proof amounting to demonstration.

First, we have several hundred manuscripts of the Gospels, or parts of them, dating from the fourth century and onwards — the Vatican and Sinai belonging to the fourth, the Alex-

andrine Codex and Codex Ephraemi, with some fragments, to the fifth, the Codex Bezae and several others, to the sixth century, etc. According to any proposed principle of classification, these manuscripts represent different families, and some of them, as the Codex Bezae, contain very remarkable readings. Yet, written as they are in different centuries, and coming from widely different regions, they contain, notwithstanding all their various readings, essentially the same text; if not the same in a critical point of view, yet the same so far as the great facts and doctrines of Christianity are concerned. The argument from this source has been well elaborated by Professor Norton. Speaking of the imagined license which Eichhorn supposes to have been taken by the early transcribers, he says that upon this supposition :

“No generally received text would have existed; none, therefore, could have been preserved and handed down. Instead of that agreement among the copies of each Gospel which now exists, we should have found everywhere manuscripts presenting us with different collections of narratives and sayings, and differing, at the same time in their arrangement of the same facts, and in their general style of expression. At the same time we should have found the want of agreement which must have existed among different manuscripts of any one of the Gospels, extending itself equally to the translations of that Gospel, and to the professed quotations from it in ancient writers.”¹

And he justly calls attention to the fact, that in transcription it is only a single copy (with those subsequently executed from it) that can be corrupted, while the co-existing copies remain in their purity.

“This copy” — that of the falsifier — “would have no influence upon contemporary copies; and in the case of the Gospels we may say upon numerous contemporary copies, in which the true text might be preserved, or into which different alterations might be introduced. It is quite otherwise since the invention of printing. He who now introduces a

¹ Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. i. Part i. chapter 1.

corruption into the printed edition of a work introduces it into all the copies of that edition; if it be the only edition into all the copies of that work, and, in many cases, into a great majority of the copies which are extant, or which are most accessible. . . . The power of an ancient copyer to alter the text of a work was very different from that of a modern editor; yet it would seem that they must have been confounded in the hypothesis under consideration, unless some further account is to be given of the manner in which the text of our present Gospels has been formed and perpetuated.”¹

The conclusion at which Professor Norton justly arrives is, that “the existing copies of each of the Gospels have been derived from some common exemplar, faithfully followed by transcribers.”

Secondly, the quotations of the church Fathers from the last part of the second century and onward are, as has often been remarked, so copious that almost the entire text of our present Gospels might be reconstructed from them. Had there been in the manuscripts of that age those essential variations assumed by Eichhorn and others, some traces of them ought to have appeared in this vast mass of citations. But, though they exhibit abundant various readings, they agree for substance with each other and with the text of our existing manuscripts, only that the earlier Fathers sometimes quote loosely from memory, blend together different narratives, and interweave with the words of scripture their own explanatory remarks.²

In the first half of the third century flourished the distinguished biblical scholar Origen, who devoted a long life to the elucidation of the holy scriptures, giving especial attention to the state of the text. He uses very strong language in respect to the diversities of the copies current in his day. In discussing, for example, the question how our Lord could have said to the young man who, in answer to his recital of

¹ Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. i. Part i. chapter 1.

² See in the preceding Article of this series Vol. xxvi. pp. 87, 88.

the commandments, closing, according to Matthew, with the words, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," affirmed, "All these things have I kept from my youth up; what lack I yet?"—how our Lord could have said to one who "with a good conscience professed to have kept the afore-named commandments," "If thou wilt be perfect go and sell that thou hast and give to the poor," etc.,¹ Origen ventures, very uncritically, to suggest that the clause, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," which is not found in the parallel narratives of Mark and Luke, was not spoken by the Saviour, but has been inserted in the text, justifying his surmise on the ground of "the disagreement of the copies concerning many other things." And he goes on to say:

"But now it is plain that much diversity of the copies has arisen, whether from the carelessness of certain scribes, or from the boldness of some in making bad emendations, or also from those who in the work of emendation add or take away what seems good to them."²

This is very strong language. Yet it is manifest from the general tenor of Origen's writings that he has in mind, not essential corruptions and mutilations of the Gospel narratives wilfully made after the manner of Marcion, but only such diversities in the copies as arise from the carelessness of copyists and the rash emendations of those appointed to revise the copies. He speaks as a textual critic, and his words are to be interpreted accordingly.

"Origen did not consider that the text in general had been rendered uncertain; in such of his numerous writings as are still extant in Greek, he quotes and uses a very large portion of the New Testament; and he thus supplies more important evidence than any other early Father as to the readings which were current in his day. It is true that he sometimes cites passages differently, and that he must at different times have used copies which did not read alike; but this does not affect the general testimony of his citations

¹ Matt. xix. 18, 19, compared with Mark x. 19 and Luke. xviii. 20.

² Commentary on Matt. xix. 19.

further than to show that such varieties existed in the copies which this critical writer and reader thought worthy of use."¹

Thirdly, we have some very ancient versions, particularly the Old Latin, and the Syriac called Peshito. The testimony of these witnesses to the genuineness of the evangelic text, from the time when they first appeared to the present day, has already been considered.² As witnesses for the integrity of the Gospel record in all essential respects their evidence is equally weighty, dating, as it does, from a period not later than the last half of the second century.

But do not Jerome and Augustine complain, it may be asked, of the corrupt state of the text in the Old Latin version? Yes, in very strong language. "If," says Jerome, "we are to rely upon the Latin texts, let them tell us which. For there are almost as many texts as codexes."³ Augustine's words, so often quoted and discussed, are as follows: "For they who have rendered the scriptures from the Hebrew language into Greek can be counted; but it is impossible to count the Latin interpreters. For whenever in the early days of the Christian faith a Greek manuscript fell into the hands of any one, and he thought himself to have a little skill in each tongue, he presumed to interpret."⁴ And elsewhere he speaks of "the infinite variety of the Latin interpreters,"⁵ of "the great number of interpreters," and how their renderings help to explain each other, while one says thus, another thus, etc.⁶ It is not necessary to our

¹ Tregelles in Horne, Vol. iv. chapter 5.

² See in the preceding Article, Vol. xxvi. pp. 101-103.

³ Si Latinis exemplaribus fides est adhibenda, respondeant quibus? Tot enim sunt exemplaria pæne quot codices. — Praef. in iv. Evangelia. *Exemplaria*, that is, *models* or *patterns*, mean here different patterns of text, not different independent versions.

⁴ Qui enim scripturas ex Hebraea lingua in Graecam verterunt numerari possunt; Latini autem interpretes nullo modo. Ut enim cuique primis fidei temporibus in manus venit codex Graecus, et aliquantulum facultatis utriusque linguae habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari. — De Doct. Christ. ii. chap. 11.

⁵ Latinorum interpretum infinita varietas. — De Doct. Christ. ii. chapter 11.

⁶ Plurimum hic quoque juvat interpretum numerositas collatis codicibus. — De Doct. Christ. ii. chapter 12.

present purpose that we inquire whether by these interpreters we are to understand independent translators, or revisers of a former translation. The latter is the more prevalent opinion among those who have made the question a matter of thorough investigation. They assume that there was originally a single Latin version which lay at the foundation of all the various forms to which the ancient Fathers refer, and that these forms, though they might be considered and spoken of as versions, were not made each independently from the original Greek, but were rather different recensions of the same original translation.

But the question with which we are concerned is: Do these Fathers mean to affirm that this great variety of texts is of such a nature as to change, mutilate, or obscure the essential facts and doctrines of the evangelic record? We answer unhesitatingly in the negative. They are not defending Christianity against corruptions and mutilations. They write as textual critics, just as modern critics might discuss the variety in our English versions and revisions from Wiclif to the present authorized version. Even had we no specimens of these Old Latin texts, we might infer from the connection in which Jerome and Augustine write that their words had no reference to essential corruptions. But fortunately quite a number of manuscripts containing the text of the Old Latin in various forms have come down to us. Blanchini has published four texts side by side with readings from others,¹ and still other codices have been edited by Sabbatier, Tischendorf, and other learned men. If one read a few pages of these codices side by side, he will comprehend at once the force and pertinence of the language used by Augustine and Jerome. Variations will offer themselves in almost every verse, but not such variations as corrupt or change the facts and doctrines of Christianity. Let him read for example the Gospel of John in the various texts published by Blanchini. Barbarisms he will find in abun-

¹ In his *Evangeliarium Quadruplex Latinae versionis antiquae seu veteris Italicae*, etc. Romae, CICDCCXLVIII.

dance, and various readings of greater or less importance. But in them all will appear the same Saviour, the same essential facts, and the same way of salvation. We must regard, therefore, the Old Latin version as an unimpeachable witness for the essential integrity of the previously existing Greek text from which it was executed ; and this carries us very far back towards the middle of the second century.

The old Syriac version called Peshito belongs to the earliest period of the Syrian churches, and cannot be placed later than the latter part of the second century. Rivaling, as it does, the Old Latin version in antiquity, its testimony to the integrity of the Greek text from which it was made is of the same decisive character. Here, then (to pass by the Egyptian and other old versions), we have two independent witnesses to the integrity of the Greek text as it existed from about the middle of the second century, certainly from the last quarter of this century. It is worthy of special notice, also, that the more ancient the Greek manuscripts the closer is their agreement in respect to characteristic readings with the Old Latin version. Tischendorf adds arguments to show that the Syriac-Peshito version, the text of which has not come down to us in a very pure state, had for its basis substantially the same form of text as the Old Latin and Sinai Codex. But we are not speaking now from the position of textual criticism. We proposed to show the substantial integrity of the evangelic text from the latter part of the second century and onward. This has been demonstrated from the substantial agreement of the existing Greek manuscripts from the fourth century and onwards ; from the abundant quotations of the church Fathers, and from the unimpeachable testimony of ancient versions.

The Earlier Text.

We now take our position somewhere past the middle of the second century, and we proceed to inquire whether the text from which the Old Latin and Syriac versions was executed, and with which the oldest manuscripts as well as the

quotations of the Fathers have a substantial agreement, was in all essential respects the same as that which proceeded from the authors of the Gospels. Here the candid critic will discard at once all groundless suppositions, whether made in the interest of the Christian faith or of scepticism. He will inquire after the known facts in the premises, and adhere strictly to these.

The first fact to be noticed is the *public reading of the Gospels* in the Christian churches, a custom prevalent in Justin Martyr's day as a regular part of the service, and which must, from the nature of the case, have arisen in very early times. "And in the day called Sunday," says Justin, "there is an assembly of all who dwell in the cities or country; and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read as long as the time allows. Then, when the reader has ceased, he who presides admonishes and exhorts by word of mouth to the imitation of these good precepts. Then we all rise in common and offer prayer; and, as we said, when we have ceased from praying, bread and wine and water are brought; and he who presides offers in like manner thanksgivings and prayers to the best of his ability, and the people respond, amen," etc.¹ The connection of this notice in reference to the reading of "the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets" is of the highest importance. From it we learn that "the memoirs of the apostles," which have been shown in the previous Number to be our canonical Gospels, were regarded as co-ordinate in value with "the writings of the prophets," and that they were read in the Christian assemblies not casually, but regularly, as a part of the Sunday service. This fact is of the highest importance; for it shows that the witnesses and guardians of the sacred text were not a few individuals, but the great body of believers; so that no systematic corruption of their contents could have taken place without their knowledge and consent.

¹ Larger apology near the end.

But it is certain that such consent could never have been obtained. For a second fact is the high value which the primitive Christians set upon their sacred records, and their consequent zeal for their uncorrupt preservation. Earnestness and sincerity are qualities which no fair-minded man will deny to them. To them the Gospels were the record of their redemption through the blood of Christ. For the truths contained in them they steadfastly endured persecution in every form, and death itself. Could we even suppose without evidence, that private transcribers altered their copies of the Gospel at pleasure, the churches would never have allowed their public copies, which were read in their assemblies every Lord's day, to be tampered with. Marcion, according to the testimony of the ancient Fathers, mutilated the Gospel of Luke to suit his doctrinal views; but the determined resistance which he encountered shows with what watchful jealousy the believers of that day guarded the evangelic record against corruption.¹

A third fact, intimately connected with the stated public reading of the Gospels, is the *great multiplication of copies*. Every local church would, as a matter of course, be anxious to possess a copy, and private Christians who had the requisite means would provide additional copies for their own private use. Norton has gone into an elaborate calculation based upon the supposition that in the latter part of the second century there were at least three millions of Christians, or one in forty of the hundred and twenty millions estimated as composing the Roman empire. Allowing one copy of the Gospels to fifty Christians, we have for these three millions sixty thousand copies. The estimate does not

¹ The attempt made in Germany to show that the gospel of Luke, as we now have it, is corrupted by interpolations, and that Marcion had it in its true form, has given rise to a voluminous discussion, which orthodoxy has no occasion to regret. For the result is that the advocates of this new view have been fairly driven from the field, and the old position, that Marcion's gospel was a mutilated form of our present canonical gospel, is more firmly established than before. For a list of some of the principal writers on this subject, see in Smith's Bible Dictionary, Article "Luke, Gospel of." The most exhaustive treatise is that of Volkmar, *Das Evangelium Marcions*.

appear to be extravagant. But allowing only a single copy to every three hundred, we shall still have ten thousand copies. That such a multitude of copies, the contents of which were regularly read every Lord's day, could have been essentially changed or mutilated, is an impossibility. If we suppose one or more of them to have undergone corruption, the numerous uncorrupt copies would have remained as witnesses of the fraud.

A still further fact is the *want of time* for essential corruptions like those now under consideration. That such corruptions could have taken place during the apostolic age no one will venture to maintain. It is certain, moreover, that they could not have been introduced during the age next succeeding, while many presbyters and private Christians yet survived who had listened to the apostles and knew the history of the Gospels written by them or their companions. But this brings us down into the first part of the second century. Leaving out of view the Apostle John, who probably survived till near the close of the first century, and assuming that the martyrdom of Peter and Paul took place somewhere between A.D. 64 and 67, we may place the beginning of the age now under consideration at A.D. 65. Of the numerous Christians who were then thirty years of age or less many must have survived till A.D. 110 and even 120. Polycarp, a disciple of the Apostle John, suffered martyrdom A.D. 167, and doubtless others of his hearers survived till the middle of the second century. The time, then, during which such a corruption as that now under consideration can be supposed to have taken place is so narrowed down that it amounts practically to nothing. It is, moreover, the very time during which Justin Martyr wrote his apologies, and Marcion was frustrated in his attempt to mutilate the gospel history.

The conclusion at which we arrive is, that whoever assumes the essential corruption of the early evangelic record does so without proof, and in the face of conclusive evidence to the contrary. Marcion's attempt called forth warm opposition,

and of this we have abundant notices. According to Theodoret, Tatian also, in his Diatesseron (that is fourfold gospel, as being a combination of the four Gospels in one), mutilated the evangelic record, "having cut away the genealogies and the other things which show that the Lord was of the seed of David according to the flesh." Of these books he found more than two hundred in his churches, all of which he caused to be removed and replaced by the four genuine Gospels. Respecting other like attempts the early Fathers are silent, and their silence is conclusive proof that they were not made. Had we the original autographs of the Gospels we should, with good reason, esteem them most highly. But there is no ground for supposing that their text would differ in any essential respect from that which we now possess.

More Important Variations, Real or Alleged.

Under this head will be examined the passages which Professor Norton thinks may "be regarded as spurious, or as lying under suspicion";¹ but, as being more convenient, in the reverse order, from John to Matthew.

We begin with the passage of John's Gospel which relates to the troubling of the waters of Bethesda. The received text reads as follows, the suspected part being marked with brackets.

"In these lay a great multitude of the diseased — blind, lame, withered — [waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel went down at a certain time in the pool and troubled the water. Whosoever therefore first went in after the troubling of the water became whole, by whatever disease he was held]. And a certain man was there," etc. (John v. 8-5).

The Sinai Codex omits all of the above passage that is included in brackets, reading thus: "In these lay a multitude of the diseased — blind, lame, withered. And a certain man was there," etc. With the Sinai Codex agree the Vati-

¹ Genuineness of the Gospels, Vol. i. Part i. chapter 1, and additional note A.

can and Ephraem (first hand), the Curetonian Syriac, the Coptic Codex Bezae, and the Sahidic Version. The Alexandrine Codex (first hand) and the Codex Regius (of the eighth or ninth century) with some cursive manuscripts, omit only the last clause of v. 3, "waiting for the moving of the water." The fourth verse alone is wanting in the Codex Bezae, the important cursive manuscript 38, and some other cursive manuscripts, and the paraphrase of Nonnus (fifth century), and is marked as doubtful in some other manuscripts. The last clause of v. 3 is inserted in the Alexandrine Codex by a second hand, and the whole passage in the Codex Ephraem by a third hand. Tertullian about the close of the second century found the passage in his manuscripts, for he refers to it (*De Bapt.* chap. 5), and it is quoted by later Fathers. Arguments against the genuineness of the passage have also been drawn from its peculiar diction, "seven words used either here only, or here only in this sense" (Alford), and from the number of various readings. To such internal marks, taken by themselves, the cautious critic will not attach much weight. But in connection with the testimony of the manuscripts above adduced they certainly add something to the evidence against the genuineness of the words in question. A passage which has against it, wholly or in part, the testimony of the very oldest manuscripts and the Curetonian Syriac must certainly "be regarded as lying under suspicion." Further than this our purpose does not require us to go, since we do not propose to decide whether the words under consideration should be inserted or omitted in a critical edition of the Gospels.

The next passage is that relating to the woman taken in adultery (*John* vii. 53-viii. 11). The whole is wanting in the Sinai Codex, the twelfth verse of the eighth chapter following the fifty-second of the seventh. With the Sinai Codex agree many of the oldest and best manuscripts — the Alexandrine, Vatican, Ephraem, Regius, Borgianus, Monacensis, San Gallensis — more than fifty cursive manuscripts, among which is No. 33; also the Peshito, Curetonian, and Harclean

Syriac, the Old Latin codices, Vercellensis and Brixianus, the Coptic (in most manuscripts), Armenian, and Gothic versions. Also Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theophylact, Nonnus (in his paraphrase), and others of the Fathers are silent concerning this passage; while Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, and others refer to it. Of the manuscripts which contain it, the Codex Basileensis, and many cursive manuscripts mark the passage as spurious. To these external testimonies may well be added the difference of style as compared with that of John, and the existence of several distinct and independent texts, presenting many varieties of reading. In view of all this evidence the candid critic must say that the passage cannot well be admitted as a part of the text of John's Gospel. The position taken by Augustine (de Conjug. adult. 2, 7) is, that the passage was expunged by some on account of the supposed license given by it to sin. But, aside from the internal difference of style, we should be slow to believe that a "pious fraud" of this kind could have obtained such wide currency in the primitive church. Were the omission found in only here and there a manuscript, the explanation of Augustine (in which he is followed by Nikon in the thirteenth century) might have more plausibility. We must admit, however, that the passage bears the marks of being a true narrative. "The early church," as Wordsworth remarks, "would never have invented such a history as this. Its tendencies were in the other direction." How it became incorporated into the Gospel of John in this particular place must remain a mystery. Perhaps it was because the tradition connected it with this part of our Lord's history.

Norton does not specify the last chapter of John's Gospel as among the suspected passages. Some regard this chapter as a sort of appendix. But if so, it must have been added by the apostle himself, and apparently very early, since it bears the impress of his style, is found in all the copies, and was received from the beginning as an integral part of the Gospel. Norton thinks, however, that the concluding words

of this chapter, "And we know that his testimony is true. And there are many other things that Jesus did, which, if they were severally written, I do not think that the world itself would contain the books written," could hardly have been written by the apostle; who would not, as he judges, have said of himself, "*We know* that his testimony is true," nor have employed "the extravagant hyperbole in the second sentence," which is "foreign from the style of St. John." But Meyer and others take no offence at the plural number (*οἶδαμεν*), which expresses the common interest that all believers — *we know* — have in his testimony; and has a parallel, moreover, in xix. 35, where we read, "And he knoweth that he speaketh what is true, that ye also may believe." The transition here from *he* to *ye* is certainly as abrupt as that from *we* to *his* in the passage under consideration. As to the last verse, it expresses an admitted truth, that it would be an endless task to write all the Saviour's words and deeds, in the form of an hyperbole, which was never yet misunderstood by any one. But suppose it be conceded that this last verse was added by another hand, say by one of those to whom the apostle committed his Gospel for circulation and use in the churches, what then? The addition must have been made in good faith, and from the very outset; for it has, as Norton admits, the authority of all the manuscripts and versions, with no exception worth naming.¹ It is, then, for all practical purposes, a part of the gospel.

Passing now to the Gospel of Luke, we read in the received text, ix. 54-56, as follows:

"And when his disciples, James and John, saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them [as also Elias did]? But he turned and rebuked them [and said, ye know not of what

¹ "There is no external authority, properly speaking, for rejecting this passage. In one manuscript [the cursive manuscript marked 63] the last verse is omitted, and in several others it is said to have been thought by some to be an addition." Additional Note A, No. 9.

spirit ye are. For the Son of Man came not to destroy souls, but to save]. And they went to another village.”

The words in brackets are wanting in the Sinai manuscript. The second bracketed clause is wanting in the Alexandrine, Vatican, Ephraem, and Beza manuscripts; also in the palimpsest Codex Zacynthius referred by Tregelles to the eighth century, and many other manuscripts uncial and cursive. On the other hand, they are found, with some variations, in the Latin, Syriac, and Gothic versions (the Syriac Curetonian included), and are recognized by several of the Fathers. The external testimony against the first bracketed clause, “as also Elias did,” though preponderating, is not so strong as against the latter clause.¹ The case stands thus: although the words are in entire harmony with our Lord’s spirit and teaching, and as such, commend themselves to our reception, they cannot on critical grounds be regarded as certainly constituting a part of the original text of Luke.

The next passage occurs in the account of our Lord’s agony in Gethsemane, Luke xxii. 43, 44. These two verses are wanting in the Alexandrine and Vatican manuscripts, in the Codex Borgianus (probably of the fifth century), in the Syriac Codex Nitriensis (said to be of the sixth century), in a few cursive manuscripts, in some Lectionaries, and in the Coptic Codex Diez, and the Sahidic. Some other manuscripts that contain them mark them as doubtful. From Hilary, Jerome, and Epiphanius we learn that they were wanting in some ancient copies. On the other hand they are found in the Sinai Codex, and the uncial codices generally, with the exception of those above specified; in the Latin and Syriac versions, and two Coptic manuscripts (Alford). The Leicester manuscript, marked 69, and many Lectionaries insert them after Matt. xxvi. 39. They are also expressly recognized by Justin Martyr and Irenaeus as a part of the true text. The weight of external testimony preponderates in their favor, and there is some ground here

¹ See in Alford’s Commentary in loco.

for the supposition that they were omitted by certain copyists as derogatory to our Lord's deity.

We come now to the important passage, Mark xvi. 9-20, over which hangs a mystery that no one has thus far been able to dissipate. The question of its claim to be a part of the original Gospel of Mark is discussed with great fairness and ability by Tregelles in his *Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament* (pp. 246-261). Since this work was published, however, a weighty witness against the passage has appeared in the Sinai Codex. For details the reader may consult the above discussion of Tregelles. Tischendorf's *Nov. Test.*, eighth ed.; and, on the other side, Hug's *Introd. New Test.*, § 75, Wordsworth's *New Test.* in loco. We notice only the main points of importance.

The passage is wholly wanting in the Sinai and Vatican manuscripts, in the Old Latin Codex Bobbiensis (fifth century), in old manuscripts of the Armenian, and in an Arabic version in the Vatican (marked 13). The Codex Bobbiensis adds (see in Tregelles and Tischendorf) a very different conclusion. The same conclusion is appended by the Codex Regius to v. 8, with the introductory note: *φεπερέ* [i.e. *φερεται*, Tregelles] *που καὶ ταῦτα*, *the following words are current to some extent (που)*. After this the manuscript goes on to say: *ἔστιν* [i.e. *ἔστιν*, Tregelles] *δὲ καὶ ταῦτα φερόμενα μετὰ τὸ Ἐφοβοῦνται γάρ*, *but the following words are also current after*, For they were afraid; and then adds, vs. 9-20, as in our received text. The same is done by the cursive manuscript 274, and by the Harclean Syriac in the margin. A considerable number of cursive manuscripts add a note stating that the words in question are wanting in some, in many, or in the most current copies. Several of the Fathers, among whom are Eusebius and Jerome, notice the absence of the passage in many copies. Eusebius says: *the accurate among the copies* (*τὰ γ' οὖν ἀκριβῆ τῶν ἀντιγράφων*) and *almost all the copies* (*σχεδὸν ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς ἀντιγράφοις*); Jerome, in an earlier writing, says they are found in few Gospels (*in raris fertur evangeliiis*); in a later work he

gives a peculiar variation, as found in some copies, and especially in Greek codices.¹ Finally, of the manuscripts which insert the passage, several uncial and many cursive manuscripts do not insert the numbers of Ammonius and Eusebius beyond v. 8 (see Tregelles, pp. 247, 248). Among good manuscripts which insert the passage without the canons Tregelles specifies the codices Alexandrinus and Amiatinus. See others in Alford.

On the other hand, the passage is found in many uncial manuscripts, and in the cursive manuscripts generally. The uncial manuscripts are the Codex Alexandrinus (without the Eusebian canons), Ephraemus, Bezae, Monacensis, Sangallensis, etc., thirteen in all. It exists in copies of the Old Latin (the best manuscripts are defective here and give no testimony), in the Vulgate, in the Curetonian,² and other Syriac versions, in the Coptic, Gothic, Ethiopic versions, and recent manuscripts of the Armenian. The earliest of the Fathers who testify unequivocally to its existence are Irenaeus and Hippolytus. Later witnesses are Cyril of Jerusalem, Ambrose, Augustine, Nestorius.

From the above brief synopsis it appears that the external documentary testimony preponderates in favor of the section in question, yet not so as to exclude grave doubts. As to internal evidence, we must say that, were there no outward testimony against the passage, its internal character could not warrant us in rejecting it, or even in regarding its genuineness with suspicion. More especially would it be an uncritical procedure to reject it on the ground of alleged inconsistency with the narratives of the other evangelists. And as to peculiarities of diction, these are, in so short a passage, an uncertain ground of judgment. But, looking at the internal character of this section in the light of the divided outward testimony concerning it, we are constrained

¹ See the passages in Tregelles, as above referred to.

² The Curetonian Syriac wants the whole of Mark, except the last four verses of the last chapter, beginning with *τοῖς πικροῦσιν*, v. 17. But the testimony of this fragment is decisive.

to say that it makes against the supposition of its having constituted a part of the original Gospel of Mark. It has clearly the aspect, not of a continuation of the narrative of the resurrection, but of a supplementary adoption. As to the difference in phraseology, see Tregelles, pp. 256, 257; Davidson, *Introd. to New Test.* Vol. i. pp. 164–172. On the other hand, it is difficult to believe that the original Gospel ended abruptly with v. 8. More probable is the suggestion of some, that the closing section of Mark's autograph (probably a papyrus manuscript) was by some means lost, and that vs. 9–20 were added as a substitute for it. Yet this is only a conjecture. Here we must leave the question, preferring to the less favorable judgment of Davidson that of Tregelles, which is expressed in the following words:

“I. That the book of Mark himself extends no further than *ἐφ' ὅσοντο γάρ*, v. 8.

“II. That the remaining twelve verses, by whomsoever written, have a full claim to be received as an authentic part of the second Gospel, and that the full reception of early testimony on this question does not in the least involve their rejection as not being a part of canonical scripture” (*Ubi supra*, p. 258).

With the exception of the doxology appended to our Lord's form of prayer (*Matt.* vi. 13), which is wanting in the Sinai, Vatican, Beza, and Dublin manuscripts, the Latin versions, and most of the Fathers, and which Wordsworth, with the critical editors generally, rejects as an early addition from the church liturgy — with this exception there are no sections of Matthew's Gospel which can be regarded as doubtful on the ground of external documentary testimony. In arguing against the genuineness of three passages of Matthew, — (1) i. and ii.; (2) the notice of Judas, xxvii. 3–10; (3) the notice of the resurrection of the saints, xxvii. 52 (last clause) and 53 — Professor Norton changes his ground entirely. He admits that there is no doubt that these passages have always formed a part of our Greek translation, but maintains that this does not decide whether they were in the Hebrew original,

Yet he elsewhere admits that he is "not aware of any consideration that may lead us to suspect that the Greek is not a faithful rendering from the Hebrew copy or copies used by the translator, or that the exemplar he followed did not essentially correspond with the original."¹ He may well make this admission, for the primitive churches unanimously received the Greek form of this Gospel as authentic, and allowed the Hebrew form (if, as seems altogether probable, this was its primitive form) to go into disuse and perish. The only natural explanation of this fact is the supposition that the Greek form of the Gospel came to the churches with apostolic authority, and that it received this form at the hand, if not of Matthew himself, yet of an apostolic man; that is, a man standing to the apostles in the same relation as Mark and Luke. No reasonable suspicion can rest on its integrity on the ground of its being a version from an earlier Hebrew text. The critic who, judging from the internal character of the passage alone, says, in the face of the united testimony of manuscripts, versions, and Fathers: This passage was interpolated by the translator, departs from all sure rules of biblical criticism, and stands on the subjective ground of rationalism. This, in the case of Professor Norton, is a great inconsistency. If, however, one should concede (without any legitimate evidence, as we contend) that all the passages specified by Norton are spurious or at least doubtful, it still remains true that the integrity of the Gospels as a whole remains unassailable, that not one of the great facts or doctrines contained in them has even a shade of suspicion thrown over it.

¹ Vol. 1. Part 1. chapter 2.