

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

viour's character, as it flings a ray of light across those thirty years of his unwritten history, by which we are enabled to see him at home, moving, a brother, among younger brothers and sisters; tried in these common ways in which we are found wanting, "tempted in all points like as we are," "that he might be touched with a feeling of our infirmities."

ARTICLE VII.

RIVAL EDITIONS OF THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AS CONTAINED IN THE CODEX VATICANUS.¹

BY PROFESSOR T. J. CONANT, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

In the three publications named below, we have at length, after so long delay and so many fruitless attempts, a quite satisfactory representation of the text of the celebrated Vatican manuscript, so far as it can be truly exhibited in a mere transcription and with moveable types. The collation by Bartolucci (1669), and the two procured by Bentley (about 1720 and 1726), and the partial one by Birch (1788), left much uncertainty in regard to its text. The professed publication of the text of the whole MS. by Cardinal Mai (five vols. 4to., 1857; New Testament, 2d ed., 1 vol. 8vo., 1859) disappointed expectation, and added little to the knowledge of its text. The illiberal jealousy of its guardians has long imposed such restrictions on its use, that no thorough and satisfactory collation could be made. Only here and there could a disputed reading be verified, during

¹ *Novum Testamentum Vaticanum*; post Angeli Maii aliorumque imperfectos labores ex ipso codice edidit Ae. F. C. Tischendorf. 1 vol. 4to., pp. L and 284. Lips. 1867.

Bibliorum Sacrorum Graecus Codex Vaticanus; auspice Pio IX. Pontifico Maximo, collatis studiis Caroli Vercellone Sodalis Barnabitarum et Josephi Cozza Monachi Basiliani editus. (Tom. v. complectens Novum Testamentum.) 1 vol. fol., pp. 302. Romae, 1868.

Appendix Novi Testamenti Vaticani. Inest Apocalypsis ex codice unciali Vaticano 2066, etc. Edidit Const. Tischendorf. 4to. pp. 20. Lips. 1859.

a brief examination of a few minutes, or at most of a few hours. Much had to be inferred from the silence of collators; and in many cases it still remained uncertain, whether a reading, noted as a variation from the received text, was by the first hand, or by that of a subsequent and even very modern corrector. Of more minute, and yet, for purposes of criticism, most essential characteristics of the manuscript, very little was known.

In 1866, early in February, Prof. Tischendorf repaired to Rome, with letters from men of distinction in the diplomatic service, in the hope of obtaining permission from Pius IX. to publish, at his own expense, the text of the new Testament. This was refused; the Pontiff now reserving to himself the honor of giving the long withheld treasure to the Christian world. With much difficulty, by the promise of assistance in the task of the Roman editors, and of the use of the types cast for the so-called *fac-simile* of the Sinaitic text, he obtained access to the MS. for a few hours, merely to verify disputed readings; with the understanding that he should make no such use of it as would lessen the value of the Pontiff's projected publication. Though his time was very limited, he determined to examine, *ad literam*, the whole text of the New Testament. For this task he had special facilities; having with him Mai's second edition of the New Testament, where were already noted all passages about which there was still any doubt, either from discrepancies in previous collations, or from disagreement with the *Codex Sinaiticus*. Moreover, his long and varied experience in deciphering ancient MSS., and a quick eye, trained to detect the most minute peculiarities of the written page, specially fitted him for such an undertaking.

"But while I was comparing the written with the edited text," he says,¹ "I could not refrain from transcribing many whole pages." This was reported by a spy upon his actions;²

¹ Prolegomena in Novum Testamentum Vaticanum, p. viii.

² In his Appendix Codicum Celeberrimorum, Sinaitici, Vaticani, Alexandrini, 1867, he says this man was a Prussian, and a member of the Society of Jesus

and before he had quite gone over the first three Gospels, the further use of the MS. was denied him, on the ground that it was wanted by those to whom the Pontiff had committed the preparation of his own work.

He had labored three hours a day (the time allowed for daily access to the library) during eight days, when he was thus interrupted. By the promise of still further aid to the Roman editors in their work,¹ he obtained the use of the MS. eighteen hours longer, Cardinal Vercellone being present to see that he transcribed nothing more, while comparing the text of the MS. with the edited copy. Forty-two hours in all were spent by him in examining the MS.; namely, three hours a day between the twenty-eighth of February and the twelfth of March, and between the twentieth and twenty-sixth of March. During this time he compared all the books of the New Testament now remaining of the ancient manuscript, marking in the edited copy the beginning and end of each page in the MS., and transcribed twenty entire pages.² His method of transcribing was to note, in the edited copy, the first and the last letter of each word, carefully indicating also the form of the letter at the close of each line. In the latter portion of the New Testament he was not able, for want of time, to mark as carefully as he had intended the unusual spaces between words, as well as the points and other signs used in the MS.

In 1867 he published the result of this collation, giving the entire text of the ancient MS. of the New Testament in

(*Borussus natione, societati Jesu addictus*). There he stands, in his nameless insignificance. But how great a work a little man may hinder.

¹ This aid was so highly valued, that Cardinal Vercellone, the chief editor, said to him at parting: "If anything is done, we owe it to you" (*si quid fit, tibi debemus*; App. p. ix, l. 14); referring also, quite probably, to the impulse given by Tischendorf's proposal to edit the MS. Vercellone had some years before (Preface to Mai's 2d ed. of the New Testament, p. iv, last lines of the foot-note) expressed his earnest desire that the text of the MS. might be faithfully edited. He had also, by letter, encouraged Tischendorf to apply for permission to perform this service.

² Nineteen pages of the New Testament, and one of the Old Testament, from the book of Job.

common Greek type. Nineteen pages, from different parts of the New Testament, are printed in perpendicular columns, three on a page, as in the MS., each column containing the same number of lines, and each line the same number of words and parts of words, as in the MS., thus representing the verbal text and its arrangement on the page. The other pages also contain the same matter as the corresponding pages in the MS., each of the three columns being printed by itself in lines that cross the page, the division of the columns being made horizontally, instead of vertically as in the MS. The ancient divisions of the text are everywhere indicated by corresponding spaces, and marginal enumeration. In the lower margin are the corrections, by the first, second, and third hands.

To the printed text is prefixed a valuable critical Commentary of fifty pages. A careful inspection of only a few pages suffices to show how great a service is here rendered to textual criticism. Taking a few at random, twenty-six errors of previous collations have been counted on one page, thirty-nine on another, forty-eight on another, fifty-one on another, and a similar range in others. Some are mere variations in orthography; but many materially affect the sense, and still others the palaeographic character, and the critical value of the text itself.

In March 1868, a programme was issued at Rome, announcing the second of the works referred to in this Article, as in course of preparation, with two accompanying specimen-pages of the text. According to the conditions of this programme, the work will be completed in six volumes; five volumes exhibiting the entire text of the MS., and a sixth containing critical notes, plates, and apparatus. Cardinal Vercellone and Joseph Cozza are the responsible editors.

It is stated in the programme, that this edition of the Codex will exhibit its very appearance and form (*ipsissimam ejus speciem formamque*), with new types in imitation of the ancient manuscript. This statement is the more remarkable, as the subjoined specimen-pages were printed with

types made in imitation of the characters of the Sinaitic MS., larger and heavier than those of the Codex Vaticanus, and consequently making a much larger page; since each page must conform to that of the MS. in the number of columns, of lines in each column, and of words or parts of words in each line. It does not, therefore, truly exhibit the *speciem formamque* of the Codex, as any one familiar with its appearance in actual *fac-simile* may see at a glance. In view, moreover, of the signal failures in the past to meet the just demands of critical scholarship, it would have been more modest, as well as more discreet, if the allusion to "morose critics" (*quae morosioribus criticis satisfacere posset*) had been omitted.

The plan of the editors is well expressed in the following words: *Scripturam, quae ab ipso priori codicis auctore ortum habuit, totidem ac simillimis literarum ductibus ita perpetuo exhibere nituntur, ut quoties aliquid ab antiquis correctoribus emendatum apparet aut suppletum vel interpositum, id ipsum eadem omnino ratione, qua in ipso manuscripto prostat, representent atque proponant; exceptis locis non paucis, in quibus lectio a posteriori manu inducta typis exhiberi non poterat, quin prioris amanuensis scriptura pene occultaretur aut certe implexione perturbaretur Si quid ab altera vel tertia manu ita castigatum erat in codice, ut sine aliquo impedimento vel confusione per typos reddi nequiret, id necessario monendum denique atque declarandum esse censuerunt in apparatu critico, cui postremum volumen reservatum est.*

As a general statement of the objects to be attained, nothing could be better conceived or expressed. The difficulties lie in the details of the plan, and in their execution, requiring a degree of knowledge and skill acquired only by long familiarity with ancient documents, and with all the details of textual criticism.

The volume is issued without preface or notes, or explanation of any kind. It contains the entire text of the ancient MS. of the New Testament, on two hundred and eighty-four

pages, three columns on a page, as in the MS. The corrections, by the first, second, and third hands, are not noted in the margin, as was done in Tischendorf's edition. This is a serious inconvenience to the reader, who is not aware of any correction of a passage till he has consulted another volume. A part of the missing portion at the end, namely, Hebrews from the middle of the fourteenth verse of the ninth chapter, and the Apocalypse, is quite needlessly supplied in modern characters, as in the Codex.¹

The third of the publications referred to in this Article was announced by Tischendorf in September 1868, as about to be issued near the end of the following month. It appeared early in the present year, the prolegomena being dated December 1868. It contains the text of an important uncial manuscript of the Apocalypse, of the seventh or eighth century, belonging to the Vatican library (Cod. Bas., formerly 105, now 2066). Tischendorf published its text in the *Monumenta Sacra* in 1846, and now republishes it after a more careful collation made in 1866. In this corrected edition it is an important contribution to the still comparatively meager apparatus for the text of the Apocalypse.²

Prefixed to the printed text of this MS. is a catalogue of the numerous errors in Cardinal Mai's edition of it. This

¹ The ancient writing now ends with the letters *καθα* of the word *καθαριει*, in the fourteenth verse of the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The leaves now lost contained the rest of Hebrews, first and second Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and the Apocalypse. These are supplied in the Codex by a MS. of the fifteenth century.

² In the *Monumenta Sacra Inedita*, Vol. v., 1865, Tischendorf gave an interesting account of a palimpsest MS., in which he discovered, under a writing of about the thirteenth century, an ancient uncial text of a large portion of the New Testament. This was in 1862, the MS. having just been brought from the East. There was no suspicion of the treasure concealed in it, till Tischendorf detected a few traces of the ancient writing, and restored the rest by a chemical process; the owner exclaiming, as he saw the ancient characters reappear, *Eccce Lazarus sepulchro rediit!* Of this MS., which he calls the "Porphyrian Palimpsest," from the name of its owner, he published in that volume the text of Paul's Epistles and of the Catholic Epistles, reserving for another volume the Apocalypse and Acts of the Apostles. Vol. vi. of the *Monumenta Sacra Inedita* is now published, containing this venerable copy of the ancient text of the Apocalypse, and the Acts of the Apostles, so strangely brought to light.

is followed by a critical examination of the Roman edition of the Vatican manuscript of the New Testament, and the correction of some oversights and typographical errors in his own edition of it. His criticisms of the Roman edition may be arranged under the following heads :

1. The mechanical execution. This, as he frankly admits, is in general excellent. He justly objects to the size of the types (already spoken of,) as not truly representing the smaller and more neatly formed characters of the Vatican MS., or the size and general appearance of its page. But in regard to their shape, he admits that there is no form in the vatican MS., at least in the New Testament, which has not its corresponding one in the Sinaitic.¹ He objects also to the occasional irregular spacing of letters, especially in such connections as *AT*, *AT*, *AT*, as on p. 116, 1, 3 ;² p. 122, 1, 15, and many others. But since there is no such coherence in the manuscript characters as is represented by types, it is only the irregular spacing in these instances that offends. Some letters, as the character for Alpha, are often badly printed, those in red ink almost uniformly so. The characters for τ , κ , ν , θ , ψ , are in many instances imperfectly represented, from injury to the types ; and the horizontal stroke for final ν ($\tau\sigma$, etc.), at the end of a line, is often too faint, and is sometimes wholly wanting.³ For examples of the latter and more important defect, he refers to p. 54, 2, 17 ; p. 56, 1, 39 ; p. 62, 3, 24 ; p. 90, 2, 10 ; p. 150, 2, 18 ; p. 155, 2, 34 ; p. 162, 2, 13. In the copy before us, the horizontal stroke in the first example referred to is barely discernible, and would escape the notice of an unpracticed eye, unless

¹ Tischendorf expresses his belief (*Prolegom. Nov. Test. Vat.* pp. xxi-xxiii) that the writer of the New Testament part of the Vatican MS. was one of the scribes employed on a part of the Sinaitic ; a fact, if it be one, of no small interest in textual criticism.

² The page, column, and line of the Roman edition are given in this Article. Tischendorf, in his references, usually gives only the page and line of his own edition.

³ It is but just to say, that, in these respects, Tischendorf's own specimen of twenty pages, in his *Appendix Codicum Celeberrimorum, Sinaitici, Vaticani, Alexandrini*, 1867, is much superior to the Roman copy.

attention were particularly directed to it. In the second it is partially expressed; in the third a small trace of it is discernible on close inspection; in the fourth and fifth it is clearly though rather faintly expressed; in the sixth there is no trace of it, even under a powerful lens; in the seventh it is clearly discernible, though but partially expressed. It must be admitted that there is ground here for Tischendorf's criticism, sharpened though it may be by the competition of a rival publication. In a professedly scientific representation of the text of an ancient manuscript, such blemishes are not of small account.

Under this head may be included typographical errors; first, in single letters corrected by hand. On p. 203, 2, 30, in the abbreviation \overline{XT} (for $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$), the letter X is substituted by hand for some other letter erased, and the erasure is very plainly seen in the copy before us. On p. 250, 3, 41, where $HMIH$ ($\eta\mu\iota\eta$) was printed by mistake for $HMIN$ ($\eta\mu\iota\nu$), the horizontal line in the final H is erased, and an oblique line somewhat awkwardly substituted to make N . On p. 225, 1, 24, in the word $ONEIAIZONT\Omega N$, the letter Z is quite unskilfully substituted for Δ erased. Nine other similar examples are given; and it is to be presumed, after Tischendorf's careful search, that there are no more. Secondly, typographical errors remaining uncorrected. The letter Θ , he says, has wholly fallen out in the word $\epsilon\chi\theta\upsilon\alpha\varsigma$ on p. 52, 3, 2, and in $\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ on p. 127, 1, 18. In the copy before us there is an irregular fragment of the lower part of the broken letter in the former case; and in the latter, only the cross line of the Θ is defective, being nearly effaced. Such accidents cannot easily be guarded against in printing so large a work. Other examples are: on p. 15, 3, 28, $\Pi\Lambda\Lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\alpha\iota\varsigma$, for $\Pi\Lambda\Lambda\epsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\alpha\iota\varsigma$; on p. 34, 3, 39, $META$ for $META$; on p. 228, 3, 31, $\Delta TNAMEI$ for $\Delta TNAMEI$; all occasioned by the near resemblance of Δ to A . Such oversights cannot be excused in such a work. But we may be quite sure that we have them all.

Unskilfulness in imitating corrections, is another objection

that falls under this head. Tischendorf's representation of this blemish, it must be allowed, is slightly exaggerated in some of his examples, though the fault is sufficiently apparent in all of them. The most objectionable one occurs on p. 40, 1, 26; where the original writing is $\Gamma\text{ΟΜΕΝΗΣ}$, and between $\Gamma\text{Ο}$ the letters EN have been inserted in very small characters, making the correct form $\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$. In the copy, a wide space is left between Γ and O for the insertion of these letters, as though the original scribe anticipated the correction of his own oversight, and left a convenient space for it.

2. Inaccuracy in representing the unusual spaces that occasionally occur in the MS. Tischendorf acknowledges that he could not himself indicate them in his own edition of twenty pages (*Appendix codicum celeberrimorum*, etc.), except in cases of special importance, on account of the haste with which he was compelled to execute his task. But the Roman editors have no such excuse; and he avers, that they have made these spaces very arbitrarily, misrepresenting the MS. much oftener than they represent it. Only one example is given, from p. 36, 1, 12 (Matt. xxv. 11), where there is an unusual space in the MS. after the word $\epsilon\rho\chi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, but none is indicated in the Roman copy.

3. Want of proper discrimination in regard to punctuation, diacritic points over ι and ν , and the use of the apostrophe. The copy, he says, is entitled to little confidence in its representation of these things, which require a most practised eye, and an accurate knowledge of palaeography, to detect them, and to distinguish additions made many ages after the first writing. He himself, as far as his very limited time would permit, gave special attention to the most ancient punctuation of the MS., and noted much that does not appear in the Roman copy. Of this neglect he quotes many instances; and adds others in which the Roman copy gives what he regards as clearly the punctuation of a third very modern hand, concluding with the words: "As, therefore, the Roman edition often omits the punctuation of the first

hand, so it often adopts one against his authority." On this delicate point there can be no question that Tischendorf is the more competent judge.

Of his fairness in dealing with controverted points, even where he is personally concerned, Prof. Tischendorf has given so many proofs, that it ought not to be lightly questioned. But in one instance it seems difficult to acquit him of at least a bias in his own favor; and unhappily it occurs in a question between him and a man so eminently fair as Cardinal Vercellone. In his own edition, p. 124, line 28 (not line 8, as he says by mistake, in referring to it) Tischendorf gave *μετα αλληλων* as the reading of the MS., following Mai's editions and Mico's collation for Bentley. Soon after its publication, and before the Roman edition appeared, Cardinal Vercellone informed him by letter, that he had found the reading of the MS. to be *μετ αλληλων*; and this is given in the Roman copy. In the same letter, however, the Cardinal said that on p. 143, 3, 6, the reading of the MS. is *απεκριθης*, and not *απεκριθη* as in Tischendorf's edition; and yet the Roman edition, afterward published, has *απεκριθη*, without the final *ς*. There is space for it, however, and the type may have dropped out. Under these circumstances, one can hardly think Tischendorf justified in expressing his hesitation as to the Cardinal's accuracy in the one case, on the ground of an imputed error in the other.¹

To a similar accident may be attributed the defect on p. 160, 3, 8 (Appendix, p. xi, last line of the text), where instead of *ΕΞΕΦΝΗΣ*, the reading of the MS. by the first hand, the Roman copy has *ΕΞ^{ΑΙ} ΦΝΗΣ*, with a space between *Ξ* and *Φ*, and over this vacant space is the reading of the third hand, *ΑΙ* in small characters. On this Tischendorf says, *Quod si consulto fecerunt, error est*; with questionable fairness, for there is sufficient space in the line for the *Ε* of the first hand, which may have fallen out.²

¹ Quid rei sit 124, 8, [28], non satis scio, is his language; and he refers to the facts stated in the text, as the ground of his hesitation.

² To the common reader, many of the points noticed in this Article may

4. Admission of a correction, in place of the first writing of the MS. On p. 54, 1, 16, (Mark vii. 23) the first writing is **KOINON**. A corrector has erased in the final **N** the second perpendicular line and the oblique connecting line, leaving the first perpendicular line, so as to make the correct reading, **KOINOI**. This corrected reading the Roman editors have given instead of the original one; and have been still further unfaithful to the MS. by neglecting to indicate in their printed copy the space left in the MS. by the erasure of a part of the letter **N**. On p. 244, 3, 37, (2 Cor. ii. 17) they

give **EIAIKPINEIAS**, with ^Nn over the space between **N** and **EI**. But the MS. has, by the first hand *ειλικρηγεις*, by the second *ειλικρινειας*, and by the third *ειλικρινειας*. On p. 145, 1, 31 (John xix. 31), they give **EKEINOT**, the reading of the third hand, instead of the original **EKEINH**. Here, and in other cases referred to by Tischendorf, they have acted the part of critical editors of the text of the New Testament, instead of simply editing the text of their MS. In this they have not only mistaken their proper function, but have failed to redeem their own pledge, to give us *scripturam quae ab ipso priori codicis auctore ortum habuit*, admitting subsequent corrections only when they would not conceal or obscure the original writing. Their judgment as to the true reading, whether correct or not, is not what is wanted, but the material furnished by their MS. to aid in forming a critical judgment. The errors of a scribe are often important elements of criticism; and inherited defects, even manifest blunders, if at all characteristic, are invaluable as means of tracing family relationships among MSS.

5. Occasional failure to distinguish the hand-writing of different scribes. It was in this most delicate and difficult part of their task that Tischendorf's skill in palaeography was of greatest service to the Roman editors; and he frankly appear to be of trifling interest. But he is not aware of their diplomatic value, and that much often depends on them in estimating the critical worth of an ancient document. Hence the want of strict exactness in such things is a fatal defect, in a professed copy.

acknowledges that they profited by it. Of this he gives two very interesting illustrations on p. xiii of the Appendix. But in some cases they betray their unskilfulness, by failing to distinguish the different hands employed on the MS. Among many other instances, Tischendorf refers to p. 186, 3, 14 (Acts xxv. 24), where instead of *αυτον* (the reading of the first hand) they give *αυτον ζην*; a correction which Tischendorf thinks can hardly have proceeded from the first scribe.¹ But by retaining the minute *ο* with which the first scribe ended the line, and adding *ΝΖΗΝ* in smaller characters extending beyond the line, as in the MS., they seem to have sufficiently marked them as an addition, and in this instance the criticism appears not to be well grounded.

6. Failure to indicate clearly the reading intended by the corrector. On p. 91, 1, 27 (Luke x. 34), the copy gives as the reading of the MS., *ΚΑΙΕΜΕΜΕΛΗΘΗ*, with the correction, *επ*, in small characters over the space between *I* and *E*. "The corrector," says Tischendorf, "when he wrote *επ*, signified that *με* in the second place was to be omitted; but as edited, it is a monstrous reading." How the omission was signified, and in what the Roman editors have failed, he does not say; and he makes no allusion to it in the prolegomena to his own edition. On p. 188, 3, 35 (Acts xxvii. 14), the Roman copy has *ΕΤΡΑΚΤΑΩΝ*, with *τ* over *A*, and *λ* over the space between *K* and *Τ*. On this Tischendorf says: "But for *ευρακυλων* the third hand substituted *ευρυκλυδων*"; the *λ* having also been changed to *Δ* by the third hand, as Tischendorf long ago asserted, against Mai, in both of his editions, and Vercellone in Prolegom. vi. to Mai's second edition, and as Vercellone himself admitted when examining the passage with him in 1866'. So far, Tischendorf has gained his point. It is not quite fair, however, to censure the Roman copy as faulty in this instance, since it could not fully exhibit the text of the corrector,

¹ Pro *αυτο* B² (*vix enim ipse**) reposuit *αυτων ζην* (Nov. Test. Vat. p. 186, margin).

without at the same time obliterating that of the first scribe. The editors did what was possible in the printed text, and the rest must be told in explanatory notes.

7. Omission of breathings and accents in connection with readings of the third hand. For example, on p. 230, 2, 6 (1 Cor. iv. 6), over the space between the first and second letters of *ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝ* the third hand has written *no*, so as to read *ἀπο πολλῶν*, with the breathing and accent, which the copy omits.

8. The subscriptions to Paul's Epistles in the copy are inferior to the corresponding characters in the MS., though the latter fall far short of the elegance of the more ancient writing.

Tischendorf concludes this searching examination with the just concession, that "the thanks of theologians are due to Pius IX., the distinguished patron of the work, and to the learned editors for their care and labor." The reader will doubtless add, that they are due to Tischendorf himself, for his generally fair and very instructive criticisms. No other man of the age is as competent to review such a work; and we may be sure that it has few faults that have escaped his quick and practised eye, and his thorough mastery of the whole subject. That the Roman editors have intended to be faithful to their great trust, and have executed their difficult and responsible task to the best of their ability, can not now be doubted. They have intentionally perverted nothing; they have aimed to conceal nothing; and they have given us, substantially, the text of their long and justly famed manuscript, which must still be regarded, notwithstanding Tischendorf's natural partiality for his own discovery, as the highest single authority for the text of the New Testament.

By the aid of the Roman edition, Tischendorf corrects a considerable number of typographical errors, and some oversights, in his own; acknowledging his indebtedness to it for six important readings, which had escaped his attention and that of all previous collators, and are due to the diligence

of the Roman editors. With these corrections, Tischendorf's edition is the most reliable representation of the text of the New Testament in the *Codex Vaticanus*. In this we now have the true text of the manuscript, so far as we can trust the most careful transcription by different and competent hands, and so far as it can be exhibited by types, supplemented by description of what types cannot express.

For this we may well be thankful. But this is not enough. Modern science and art furnish means for copying ancient documents with unerring precision, even to the minutest stroke of the pen. The age ought not to be satisfied with less perfect and reliable representations of those ancient texts, on which we rest the truth and certainty of our inspired writings. The time will come when these ancient texts will have perished with the mouldering material on which they are written, leaving behind disputed copies without the means of verification. In this country we have a special interest in the subject. Our scholars ought not to be dependent on those of other lands for the materials of textual criticism. We shall probably never have original ancient manuscripts. But we can have copies, as valuable for criticism, in most respects, as the original documents; in some respects more valuable, as being more convenient of access, and capable of indefinite multiplication.

The first volume of the Roman edition, containing the text of the Pentateuch, is announced, and may soon be expected here.