

# 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)

parable Isaiah, with a grave and earnest irony, indicated the evils of the nepotism and favouritism from which even statesmen of the better class (Bacon occurs to one's thoughts as a memorable instance) are not always exempt. It was not long before a new crisis presented itself in the foreign politics of Judah in which the two parties took, as might be expected, their natural lines of action, Isaiah standing apart from, and above them both, as in a solitary greatness.

E. H. PLUMPTRE.

---

*TEXTUAL CRITICISM ILLUSTRATED FROM THE  
PRINTING-OFFICE.*

III. AWKWARD READINGS.—The second of the great critical canons which we have to consider is the one which states, under a variety of forms, that the reading which has about it something difficult, or apparently untrue, or harsh, ungrammatical, or in any way awkward or unlikely, is *more* likely to be correct than the one which naturally appears so. And do I really suppose, it will be gravely asked, that a law which is stamped with the authority of Bengel and Griesbach and of all the great critics since criticism began, can be overthrown by a statement deduced from the mistakes of modern compositors? No, I do not; but unless human nature has itself changed in the interval, I do think that it has been made a very great deal too much of. It seems to assume, in fact—and that in the most downright opposition to all other textual phenomena but the particular one with which it happens to be engaged—that all our various readings came about by editorial operation alone! Did the homœotels come about editorially, or were they not rather the most mechanical of transcribers' oversights and requiring editorial care to set them right? And if Codices B and N enjoyed least of any of this editorial care, and one of them at any rate has great numbers of

these most glaring of all errors left wholly uncorrected, is it rational to persist in treating these two codices as if practically pure from copyists' defects? I do not dispute the probability of editors having altered numbers of hard readings into easier ones—for even compositors do this, far oftener than would be supposed, when it appears to them that an author has made a clerical mistake. But this I assert without any misgiving, that when they thus go out of their way to make, as editors, one change for the better, they go on in their own way, as copyists, to make twenty or fifty changes for the worse. It surely cannot be reasonable, then, whenever any question between smoothness and awkwardness occurs, to jump to the conclusion that it is a case of editorial change to the former, when so many times the number of copyists' errors result demonstrably the other way.

It may be fair however to notice that upon one point which falls under this heading—that of substituting a common word for an uncommon one (which often *introduces* the “awkward” for the sake of avoiding the “unlikely”)—compositors would supply the modern school with a large and unquestionable measure of support. If then to a rapid glance an unusual word has the appearance of a very familiar one, the change to the latter is found to be made, shall I say, in about as many instances as not. Thus in a geological work that has just passed through my hands I have again and again had such sentences as, “The Permian strata lie *unconformably* upon the Carboniferous,” and it is not very surprising that until the men themselves got habituated to the term they almost invariably expressed it that the one lay *uncomfortably* upon the other. Still more laughable was a sentence in which we were told of a woman who “married her *unfortunate sister*,” for which the writer had intended “her importunate suitor.” But instances of this kind are familiar enough, and I need not extend this paragraph by

adding to them now. Their mention may however conduct us to the first subdivision of the class—a class not dealing exclusively with what is “awkward,” but which I may more comprehensively term “copyists’ substitutions other than those designed for the purpose of improvement.”

1. *Indistinctness of Copy.*—This is of course a very different phenomenon, as it prevails in the rapid manuscript of the present day, and such element of an analogy thereto as might occasionally trouble the ancient calligraphers. I need not give a single modern instance; the fact is really too notorious. What did prevail in the case of the early codices was perhaps all but confined to instances of faded strokes or actual defacement of the parchment—though the clumsily formed letters of lay transcribers would tend very considerably to aggravate these obscurities. In such a case we may suppose that sometimes editorial skill would be brought to bear to restore the passage by the best available means—possibly by actual reference to another manuscript; but at other times the copyist element would have its way, and almost the first guess that was at all plausible would be acted upon. The famous case of **OC** and **ΘC** will occur to every mind, and there are disputed readings in numbers to which a similar mode of explanation may be found to apply; though unfortunately sometimes, as here, it is a question as to whether something had really faded, or whether the supposition that it had faded was the cause of its first insertion. Then we have “short readings,” resulting apparently from this cause (belonging therefore strictly to our Division II.). By remarking the ease with which an indistinct **H** and **T** could be confused (from the fineness with which horizontal strokes were usually written) we may perceive a possible explanation for the omission by **B** **N** of Matthew xviii. 11, ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός—where, as **τί** immediately follows, the verse (having **η** for its opening letter) may have been simply

skipped over from homœoarchy. But a still more important instance seems reasonably to fall under this section, and thereby to assist us in banishing the suspicion which rests upon "the first word from the cross," or the prayer for the murderers (omitted by the scribe of B, and erased by him from **Ν**—absent also from D). Relying upon the effort shewn in the codices to begin sentences with *lines*, and the preference for ending these as far as practicable with *words*, we may think it likely that in some early copy the passage, with the line preceding, stood as under :—

ΕΞΑΡΙΣΤΕΡΩΝ  
 ΟΔΕΙΣΕΛΕΓΕΝ  
 ΠΑΤΕΡΑΦΕΣΑΥ  
 ΤΟΙΣΟΥΓΑΡΟΙΔΑ  
 ΣΙΝΤΙΠΟΙΟΥΣΙΝ

Now if the end of the first of these lines was considerably faded, its final letters might present almost the same appearance as the **CIN** or even **YCIN** which terminates the last; and though the *ἀριστερῶν* was of necessity rightly deciphered, the fact of the resemblance might none the less cause the four following lines to be skipped over by homœotel. A lithograph would be necessary for making this obviously clear, but in spite (perhaps in consequence) of the high central stroke of the **Ω** as we find it in very early copies, the confusion of that letter with **CI**—both being faded, and somewhat uncouthly formed—is one of the easiest mistakes in the world. I may be told of course that this is mere guess-work; but no one experienced in any kind of copying can doubt for a moment that cases of *this kind* did occur over and over again, and I would rather adhere to the guess in reference to this particular reading than consent to admitting the faintest aspersion on one of the most treasured passages in the Gospel narrative—the bare marginal hint at the non-genuineness of which has sufficed to cast upon the Revised Version a slur which will perhaps never be wiped away.

2. *Influence of Neighbouring Words.*—The exact form of a word becomes frequently transmuted by means of a mental influence exerted upon the copyist by some other word either before or after it. We have already seen (First Article, II. 1. c) how a recurrent termination may operate mentally to cause an omission; now we have to observe how a termination or other portion of a word may itself be made recurrent by a sort of mental-mechanical sympathy. Thus it occasionally happens in printing that the *s* which forms the plural of a noun is followed up by the same letter being incongruously appended to a verb. Similarly I have had letters doubled so as to resemble those in a contiguous word, *e.g.* “*ann inn*” and “*soo too*,” whilst I have also had instances, too many to be mere chance “*literals*,” of an initial being conformed to that of the word before or after. Here is a batch of miscellaneous examples: “*children of Ammon*,” “*inspired Scriptured*,” “*it is virtually identically*,” “*to beging by clearing*,” “*a pamphlet of which the main object*,” and (I hope I shall be forgiven for citing it, but it has happened *twice* over, and the second time from print copy) “*Westcott and Hott*.” Yet one more, and it is a very striking case, in a reprint too: “*wonders and sons done by the Apostles*”—where the conformation of “*signs*” to the spelling and sound of the words both preceding and following is so precisely analogous to the altering of the last vowel of *καθαρίζον* by A B N in *εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκπορεύεται καθαρίζων πάντα τὰ βρώματα* (Mark vii. 19), that though even Canon Cook approves of the change, I cannot help preferring to account for it in this manner. Terminations shew this influence the most, and in a language like the Greek, with its continual recurrences of *-αι* and *-ει*, *-ας* and *-αις*, *-οις* and *-ους*, *-αν* and *-εν*, *-τε* and *-σθε*, and a host besides, the scribes must have been incessantly liable to this aberration and thus have very frequently allowed one word unconsciously to metamorphose another. If the result was

nonsense it would be detected by the first person who read over the passage; but there would be now and then an instance in which a sense, though a difficult and awkward one, would still be educible from the corrupted form, and I beg to offer two or three other typical instances in which I believe this fact to lie at the foundation. The first is the famous *εὐδοκία* or *εὐδοκίας* in the song of the angels, where it seems extremely probable that the appended *ς* of A B D **N** may be nothing more than a mechanical repetition of the one at the end of the preceding *ἀνθρώποις*. Another is that of 2 Corinthians iii. 3, where the critical reading (A B C D **N**) is *οὐκ ἐν πλαξίν λιθίναις ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξίν καρδίαις σαρκίνοις*, but where the vast superiority in sense of the old reading *καρδίας* seems to make it reasonably certain that the string of datives led the copyist in the other case into this easy and common error. Scarcely different is the *συγκεκερασμένους* (A B C D) of Hebrews iv. 2, which is only separated by the little word *μή* from the preceding *ἐκείνους* to which the accusative plural for nominative singular is apparently due. And then, to take an instance of change in the middle of a word, is it not likely that the strange *λίθον* for *λίνον* in Revelation xv. 6 (A C) was simply brought into being from the effect of the *θ* in the following *καθαρόν*? Yet again, Dr. Scrivener's "Collation of Codex Sinaiticus" supplies me with a case of transmuted initials, the *σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς* of 1 Peter i. 23 appearing in A C **N** as *φθορᾶς φθαρτῆς* (I cannot agree, however, with the learned Doctor that this was due to the scribe's *eye* passing from one word to the other; such changes are seldom due to misreading the copy, but are effected in the *mind* during the actual process of transcription).

3. *Confusion by Sound*.—The examples which fall under this self-explanatory heading are at first suggestive of writing from dictation; so common however are they in the work of compositors—who never under any circumstances proceed upon that system—that the occasional instances to

be found in the codices must not be taken as evidence of its having been adopted in their case. With the one as with the other it may be set down as due to nothing more than a mental confusion occurring between the two acts of reading over the words in a string and putting that particular one into type or ink. Within a few days I have noted as examples—"referring" for "recurring," "service" for "surface," "zeal" for "seal," and "death" for "depth;" also, as illustrating the blending of two words—"seemed to" for "seem to," and "once such" for "one such." The first of these examples may help to shew that there is nothing serious in the *καυχῆσθαι* for *καυθήσθαι* read by A B  $\aleph$  in 1 Corinthians xiii. 3.

4. *Haste to conclude a Word.*—Just as a copyist is apt to fix his mind upon the end of a clause (II. 2), so he fixes it upon the end of a word, and is thus liable to cut this down, especially if when so mutilated it makes a word still. The examples I have actually noted are "hour" for "honour," "defence" for "deference" and "easy" for "easily," but I have certainly met with others, similar in kind to "advise" for "advertise," "press" for "process," and "purse" for "purpose." Of the same nature I suspect was the *ἀναβάς* for *ἀναβοήσας* in Mark xv. 8 (B D  $\aleph$ ), and the *χρηστός* for *χρηστότερος* in the much-quoted passage "The old is better" (B  $\aleph$  in Luke v. 39). In this last case we have a kind of *mental homœotel of letters* (o to o); just as a compositor, in the setting of the present paper, cut down "containing" to "containg" by jumping from *n* to *n*.

5. *Changes to Cognate Words.*—This is a feature which in its results has something of an editorial appearance, but which is nevertheless wholly unintentional and sometimes produces effects simply disastrous. Among compositors it seems a habit of occasional individuals only, and this circumstance may warn us, in reference to the Greek, to apply to it only as a *dernier ressort*. Sometimes I have found



words substituted which were nearly or quite identical in meaning, as "appears" for "seems," "alteration" for "change," and even "snakes" for "serpents;" then there has been a shade of variation, as "altogether" for "unconditionally," "ordinary circumstances" for "existing circumstances," and "France and Germany" for "France and Belgium." Neither of these examples, which are all actual and recent, could possibly have come about from misreading of the copy, so that they can only be explained as a slight wandering of the mind from the definite words just read over to others more or less closely similar. I remember, too, a dramatic critique in which the plainly written name "Oxenford" was changed into some ordinary one like "Smith" or "Harris"—in which case nothing seems so probable as that the compositor happened at the moment to hear a comrade of the name in question addressed. I caught myself not long ago, when having to write a compositor's name on a proof and close against it to correct a name in the proof itself, in the act of confusing the one with the other; and doubtless many a one who has never entered a printing-office will be able from personal experience to supply further examples. Now it is evident to the slightest thought that a mistake of this kind, if not detected at the time, is extremely likely to escape observation altogether; and I therefore greatly prefer to extend the occasional incidence of this habit to the ancient copyists rather than to rearrange the course of Gospel history because in some of the oldest manuscripts (BCQRN) we find *Ἰουδαίας* for *Γαλιλαίας* in Luke iv. 44. What is there more extraordinary than the above in some early scribe having thought of Judæa when he found mention of Galilee?

6. *One Error obscuring Another.*—This is a point more especially concerning the correcting reader, whom the vexatious discovery is continually awaiting that, after having given the compositor the trouble of altering a line for a

certain mistake, there was all the while, as broad as the day, a second error by the side of the first. Why did we not notice this before, we fretfully ask ourselves; and others, with larger measure of indignation, ask the same as to errors which we fail altogether to observe. But neither fretting nor fuming will alter the fact that the mental impression of having discovered a word or phrase to be *wrong* is in itself sufficient to throw higher individuals than printers' readers off their guard as to the depth to which that wrong extends. Thus it continually transpires that in the case of such double mis-spellings as "dissappointed" or "immaginery" we are extremely likely to mark one of the two letters and not notice the other till that one has been rectified by altering the type. But there was no altering the type in the case of the ancient codices, so I beg to offer this as a general caution in regard to passages which appear to have been only partially set to rights.

7. *Confusion of Separate Words.*—This habit has comparatively little to do with modern printing, though I may mention having lately noticed the words "of four" instead of "of one," evidently through the *f* having been so written that it was made to do duty with the following word also. A like illustration is notified to me by the Editor, in which his own words "they conceive" came back from the printer "they *can* conceive" (the *con* having doubtless been written slightly disjoined). But in the Greek codices, where there was absolutely no separating of words, this has become a most serious matter—so well recognized as a fact that I need only make a remark or two as to its application. It frequently displays itself in exactly such cases as the former of the two just cited—a final or initial letter, which chances to be applicable in both capacities, becoming a source of confusion as to whether it was originally single or double, as in the well-known instances *Καφαρναούμ ἢ* or *μή*, and *μηδέν* or *μηδένα ἀπελπίζοντες* (Luke x. 15 and

vi. 35). I think it will be generally conceded that when a letter is really written doubly, as in **ΚΑΦΑΡΝΑΟΥΜΜΗ**, there is a strikingness about it which renders it extremely improbable for a copyist to mistake it for a single one, though I grant that, after reading it correctly, he still *might* so cut it down in writing; while in the other case, as he would not give a thought to the question of single or double at all, it would be exceedingly easy for him, especially if he paused after the first word, to connect the letter in question with both. Thus *à priori* reasoning tends rather to support the Received Text in both these cases, and just so with the *πορεύεσθαι ὡς* or *ἕως* of Acts xvii. 14, where itacism probably caused the words to be written **ΠΟΡΕΥΕCΘΕΩC**. But we cannot make so sure in cases like the *second* of the two English ones above—for instance, in such a reading as the *ἐγὼ δὲ ᾧδε* (of D R and, with a transposition, B **Ν**) in Luke xv. 17—as the repetition of *three* letters is a totally different phenomenon from the doubling of *one*, not possessing any approach to the same certainty of being perceived at a single glance. Instead, therefore, of assuming, as Dean Burgon does, that **ΕΓΩΔΕΩΔΕ** is a “transparent error,” simply because the Received Text happens to be without the *ᾧδε*, it would have been just as reasonable to assert—as he would probably allow that he would himself have done had but the parties been reversed—that the *omission* of this word was a transparent case of *homœotel*. The parties *are* reversed, as it happens, in Acts i. 19, and there accordingly he cites as one of the glaringly corrupt readings of B and **Ν** the omission in τῆ [ιδίᾱ] διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν, whereas the last stroke of the **H** in τῆ with the first three letters of διαλέκτῳ will account for the *ιδίᾱ* at once. Moral—Refrain from dogmatising in regard to either passage.

8. *Corrections in Wrong Places*.—This heading introduces us to what is probably the most subtle and ultimately the most mischief-fraught of all the seductive influences in the

printing-office. I do not mean the altering of a wrong letter in the same word, for, frequent as that is, it can hardly fail to be detected at once. What I refer to is the perhaps yet commoner circumstance when, having some word to insert or to alter, the compositor is misled by one or other of the phenomena of homœotopy into performing the operation in the wrong place (*e.g.* I have just had an instance of an entire line being taken out in place of another which was seven lines lower down). It will readily be perceived that if an error of this kind is made after the proof has received its final reading, it is often almost a matter of chance as to whether it is perceived at all; the reader upon revising sees that the correction has not been made in the proper place, so he marks it there again, and it either may or may not occur to him to search all round and see whether it has been made in an improper one. And even in manuscripts such mistakes do happen—the writer or possessor having determined to make a certain alteration, and then writing it over the wrong word or line. Does not the double instance of a disputed *μου* towards the close of Hebrews x. proclaim itself to be a case in point? In ver. 34 we have in the Received Text *τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου*, while four verses further on A N read *ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου*: so that it seems to me approximately certain that some early scribe at first omitted this latter *μου*, and then either he or some one after him saw reason to believe it correct and proceeded to make its insertion, but appended it by mistake to the very similar-looking word *δεσμοῖς* or *δεσμίοις* just above.

Again, many various readings have probably resulted from misunderstanding of the exact place at which a word written in the margin was to be taken into the text. John xiv. 10 seems to me a case of the kind, the Received Text reading *αὐτὸς ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα*, while B D N omit *αὐτός* and give *ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*. Now if the three undisputed words

happened to form a line, as is perhaps more than probable, then if *αὐτός* had been supplied in the margin near the end of that line, its insertion at that end (where it actually stands in LXX and in the Alexandrian Cyril), and then its slight alteration, make the problem accounted for at once. Further, there is the strong probability of marginal insertions having been sometimes taken for substitutions and *vice versâ*, as alluded to under the reading *αἰνοῦντες καὶ εὐλογοῦντες* in my first Article (II. 2). I cannot but think that the double doubt in Mark v. 36, *Ἰησοῦς εὐθέως παρακούσας*, is due to this misapprehension, for though *εὐθέως* and the prefix *παρ-* are in no way substitutes the one for the other, we find AC and the Received Text inserting *only the former*, and BLΔN *only the latter* (no single manuscript containing both, and D alone containing neither).

I would add that in printing this mishap is not absolutely confined to the process of correcting, for I have lately had an instance of a compositor setting up the words "its true meaning," when he had obtained the word "true" through his eye wandering three lines lower down, and his mind then associating the words from the mere readiness with which they lent themselves to the process. And by just the same mode, may I not suggest, the scribe of the archetype of BD wrote *ἐβδομήκοντα δύο* in Luke x. 1, through catching sight of *ἀνὰ δύο* in the same verse, and then combining the two numerals from mechanical familiarity with the traditional number of the Septuagint translators?

—CONSECUTIVE ILLUSTRATIONS OF II. AND III.—To bring out more forcibly the bearing of the preceding observations, and the extent to which printers' errors actually occur, I have gone through a series of recent proofs for the concluding volume of a well-known biographical work, and marked for my own purpose all the errors, more than mere "literals," which were not owing to real indistinctness of manuscript. After rejecting, on the ground of inferior

intelligence, the work of one of the men, I had left me a good sixty pages of royal octavo double-columned small type, set by twelve compositors all thoroughly up to their work. After summing up the results I found that the *substitutions* (of single words or terminations) amounted to 101 instances; the *omissions* to 98, comprising 256 words ( $4\frac{1}{4}$  to a page); the *doubles* to 14 instances, of 30 words; and the *insertions* to 8 instances, all of single words. Substitutions and omissions therefore occurred in all but exactly the same number of instances, but the latter were two and a half times as serious as the former, as considered by the number of words affected; whilst the *doubles* were but a seventh part as numerous as the omissions, and the *insertions* only a twelfth of their number and a thirty-second of their bulk—a point which I thus emphasize in connexion with my engagement in the previous Article to shew that the presence of doubling in a codex is presumptive proof of a much larger presence of the opposite vice. Taking up first the omissions I found that the most prolific cause of all appeared to be *non-essentiality to construction* (II. 3), in which ten out of the twelve men participated, committing between them no less than 34 instances comprising 60 words. Ten compositors also made omissions through *turning of lines* (II. 4), the collective instances being 20 and the words 29; while the analysis of *doubling* from the same cause brings out the lower numbers of four compositors, 6 instances, 10 words. As to *homæotel*, the best workmen are too alive to its dangers, and therefore it stands comparatively low down in the present list: five of the twelve men only were concerned, and the *omissions* were but 13, though comprising 98 words (5 of the instances being lengthy ones); while of *doubles* from this cause there was one out of the above five compositors, he in 1 instance repeating 6 words. From *homæoarchy* (II. 1. a) I find 4 *omissions* and 1 *double*—a single instance apiece by five

separate men, as to whom it is a singular fact that they are all different from the five who are noticed under homœotel. To these totals I have to add the following: *omissions*—of an *entire line*, 2 instances; from *mental homœotel* (II. 1. c), 1 instance; from mental influence of *following word* (II. 2), 3 instances; from trivial *oversight*, 16 instances (by seven men);—*substitutions*—by influence of *neighbouring words* (III. 2), probably 12 instances (by five men); by hasty *misreading* when the copy was really clear, 33 instances (by ten); by slight *mental confusion*, 27 instances (by seven);—and from the same cause 1 *double* and 5 *insertions* of little words not in the copy. There are 3 other instances, to be noticed presently, in which words were thus mentally supplied; but, as might naturally be expected, these cases of actual insertion have shewn themselves extremely few. I have in fact to set against them the circumstance that just the same number of compositors made *omissions* of striking words for which I can supply no imaginable explanation.

But this analysis, to serve its full purpose, must go into some details respecting the idiosyncrasies of the workmen; for the striking differences thereby exhibited, as to kind rather than degree, will, if very slightly studied, serve to explain the mystery, if mystery it be, of one of the early scribes having made numerous mistakes of one class while being comparatively pure from those of another. One of the twelve, then, has set three pages without being booked for anything more than the omission of 1 word at the turning of a line; another, setting three times that quantity, has 3 omissions from the same cause, 2 from homœotel, and 6 from non-essentiality, but is chiefly distinguished for trivial hasty substitutions, of which he makes no less than 11; a third, setting six pages, is notable the other way, having nearly everything right which he does set, but making 16 omissions from the three above causes, the 6 homœotels comprising 55 words; a fourth again, also

setting six pages, has not a single omission from homœotel and only 1 each from the other two sources, but leaves out 6 unimportant words from oversight and 2 highly important ones for which I can assign no cause—also making 8 substitutions from hasty misreading, and 9 from trivial mental changes (wrong particles, etc.); a fifth, a foreigner, who set eight pages, made 6 omissions from the above three causes, 5 substitutions from hasty misreading, and 6 wrong terminations affected by neighbouring words; whilst a sixth, with six pages, has no homœotel (though he once shews the mental effect of its influence by omitting “the dead” after “regarded”), but makes 3 omissions at turnings of lines and 7 from non-essentiality. This last however is particularly noticeable—as are the three before him in a less degree—for the singular mental changes which he makes; either he “takes in” more copy at a time than he can properly hold, or else he is of a volatile disposition and allows his mind to wander before he has put all his words into type. Thus for “direction” he prints “order,” for “unusual” “unlikely,” for “usually” “generally,” for “great” “vast,” and for “in” “during;” while, wandering more widely from the sense, he substitutes “army” for “empire,” “type” for “life,” and “connected” for “occupied.” In like manner he has made three mental *insertions*, converting “both friends and foes” into “both as friends and foes,” “questions of money” into “questions of *making* money,” and introducing “that” before a clause where it was not required, though it is quite possible that he thought it a clerical omission. He likewise makes two *transpositions* of words, neither of them affecting the sense, and actually the only ones which occurred in the course of the whole sixty pages. In a more recent proof he has, along with one transposition and three other insertions (“*very good*,” “*still larger*,” and “*are to be found*”), converted “cannot hold against truth” into “*will not hold*.”



good against the truth," and twice within twelve lines substituted "saints" for "martyrs." Of the three compositors noticed before him, one substitutes "head" for "skull" and makes a couple of doubles in which the construction is *continued* by the repetition (a very common occurrence, by the bye), *e.g.* "he found he had *found he had* divined the sense." Another for "sin-bearing" puts "sea-bearing," having apparently let the idea of "sea-bathing" get into his head at first and then returned to the copy; while with a similar watery confusion he has changed "transferred" into "transferry." The last of the three, the foreigner, set "more" for "longer," "voice" for "hymn," and "a *likely* portrait" for "a *life-like* portrait"—a capital example, by the bye, of a "harder" reading, such as, if it had occurred in some early manuscript, say of Chaucer, would have been certain to find champions to avow its vast superiority over the *commonplace* "life-like." How queer they would have felt, however, when they came to learn that it was only a slight confusion made by a Dutchman!

Herewith concludes the illustrative part of my suggestions, though some of a more venturesome character are yet to follow. One remark however must be here appended in reference to the extremely insignificant place filled in this paper by the item of TRANSPOSITION. It certainly is not quite so uncommon in printing as the allusion just above might be taken to imply, but quite as certainly it will still bear no proportion there to the position it occupies in the digests of the Greek Testament. Some special explanation must therefore be sought in the latter case, and I believe we shall find it, in great measure, in—(1) the already mentioned confusion as to the place for taking in a marginal insertion, and (2) the far greater inexperience and even carelessness of the earliest transcribers. Of this second cause indeed I could even make a point, as affording presumptive proof that the primitive copyists were *bad enough for anything!*

ALFRED WATTS.