

# 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 *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

# JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

TWENTY-FIRST YEAR — 1902 — PART II.

---

## Unto Romans: XV. and XVI.

PROFESSOR WILLIAM BENJAMIN SMITH.

TULANE UNIVERSITY.

### II.

**I**N treating of the codical conditions that prevail in these chapters, we shall studiously put aside from our mind the inner relations already examined, and let our judgment be warped as little as possible by conclusions thus far attained. However, our final verdict must, of course, combine, if possible, the two sets of facts into one harmonious whole.

Proceeding from the general to the special, we ask in the first place, What is the earliest testimony to the existence of these chapters? The answer is not without significance. Neither Marcion, nor Tertullian, nor Irenæus, nor Cyprian affords any quotation from either.

Of course, the argument from silence is not decisive, but it is not worthless; indeed, in this case it is most valuable, and so far as it tells at all, it tells against the presence of these chapters in this Epistle as known to these writers. It is not enough to say, "Neither do they quote from 1 Cor. 16." There is no comparison in importance between the two pericopes: 1 Cor. 16 contains nothing beyond personal matters that could hardly be quoted by a Father; whereas in both these chapters there is much matter of extraordinary dogmatic importance, some of it without parallel elsewhere in the New Testament, doctrines to which it seems strange that none of these authorities ever allude. Besides, the antiquity and Pauline authorship of at least part of 1 Cor. 16 are very far from secure; but into this matter we cannot now enter.

Since Cyprian belongs to the middle of the third century, it would have little significance, even if he did quote from these chapters; however, as a mere matter of fact, he does not. Fell has been able to detect only one possible echo: in 16<sup>18</sup> we read *δουλεύουσιν . . . κοι-*

λά; and in Cyprian, *Ep.* 65, § 3, "Nec ante se religioni sed *ventri* potius et quæstui profana cupiditate *servisse*." Now Riggenbach does indeed insist that the two italicized words are certainly a quotation, but with no reason whatever. The notion of 'serving the belly,' or the lower appetites, is common and near-lying, and has doubtless occurred independently to hundreds of writers. The expression itself is widely diffused in pre-christian literature. Thus *δουλεύειν γαστρί* occurs in the Anthology (11, 410, 4), also in Xenophon (*Mem.* 1, 6, 8); the equivalent Latin *abdomini servire* is found in Seneca (*De Ben.* 7, 26, 4), and *ventri obedientia* is found in Sallust (*Cat.* 1, 1), while kindred notions of serving passions and pleasures abound in Xenophon, Plato, Polybius, Herodian. To trace Cyprian's use of such a familiar phrase to our Scripture seems little less than ludicrous. But why dwell on this matter, when even Hort admits that the "reference is very doubtful"? It shows only how strong is the prepossession of Riggenbach, and how little we may trust his judgment when he maintains that Tertullian's reference to 15<sup>14</sup> and to 16<sup>4</sup> "must be regarded as certain."

Roensch (p. 350) does indeed cite from Tertullian seven alleged correspondences with Rom. 15, 16. All of these, Hort has the candor to admit, are only "imaginary." This would seem sufficient, but since Mangold and Riggenbach still hold that two of them are "sure," we are bound to dwell on the matter a moment. Tertullian speaks (*Præscr.* c. 27, p. 33) of "those churches in whose faith and knowledge and conversation the Apostle rejoices" (*ecclesias . . . illas . . . de quarum fide et scientia et conversatione apostolus gaudet*). In the single word *scientia* these critics detect an allusion to Rom. 15<sup>14</sup>, where the writer says he knows his correspondents are filled with all the knowledge (*πάσης τῆς γνώσεως*); nothing is said of rejoicing, or of faith, or of conversation. It seems amazing that Mangold and Riggenbach should lean so heavily on such a broken reed. In 1 Cor. 1<sup>43</sup>, the Apostle, writing apparently to the churches of Achaia, thanks God because they are enriched in all speech and all knowledge (*ἐν παντί λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνώσει*). To this passage the reference would be far more natural. Again, the whole paragraph 2 Cor. 8<sup>1-7</sup> is a rejoicing over the churches of Macedonia and, by anticipation, of Achaia, because "even as ye abound in everything, faith and speech and knowledge and all zeal and the love, etc." To this passage the allusion seems as fitting as possible. *Quid multa?* Such Apostolic rejoicings are commonplaces in the New Testament.

The second "certain" (!) reference is also in a single word.

Tertullian (*Fug. c. 12, p. 194*) says: "*Quando Onesiphorus aut Aquila aut Stephanus hoc modo eis in persecutione succurrerunt?*" Here Mangold and Riggenbach and even Zahn (who abandons all the other "citations") find allusion to Rom. 16<sup>3,4</sup>: "Salute Prisca and Aquila . . . who for my life laid down their neck." This seems to have more plausibility, but we observe: Either Prisca and Aquila did or did not this deed of devotion; if they did not, then this passage might be the source of such a notion, but in that case it was not written by Paul, and our contention is established, for we cannot think of Paul as writing such a falsehood. But if they did dare such self-sacrifice, then the report of it could not have been confined to this passage, it must have obtained the widest circulation among Christians, and Tertullian must have been referring to what was common report. It is well known how piously the traditions of such heroism were cherished and embellished among the early Christians. Hence it appears that this allusion is quite as "imaginary" as the other.

It is not necessary, yet it may not be out of place, to observe that the association of Onesiphorus as first, with Aquila as second, would naturally point to 2 Tim. 1<sup>16</sup> 4<sup>19</sup>, since Onesiphorus is there mentioned as justifying his name by ministry to the Apostle; and, since Aquila is joined with him in salutation, it was natural for Tertullian to associate them in his rhetoric, nor was it at all necessary for him to have heard or read of any such actual ministry on Aquila's part. In fact, the passage in Tertullian seems rather to exclude than to imply any knowledge of the passage in Romans. For Aquila's laying down his neck so far transcends the beneficence of Onesiphorus that it seems strange that the latter should be mentioned first; and why was Prisca omitted? Surely her magnanimity surpassed even Aquila's, and she maintains her precedence throughout the Scriptures.

But the case is stronger still. When did Stephanus succor the Apostles in persecution? Where is any such record found in the New Testament? Zahn, to our amazement, cites Acts 6, 7! But there is nowhere in these chapters the vaguest hint of anything of the kind. If then Tertullian could mention Stephanus without scriptural warrant, why not Aquila as well? We may conjecture, however, that Stephanus is an error for Stephanas. This latter had some more or less intimate relations with Paul, as appears from 1 Cor. 1<sup>16</sup> 16<sup>15,17</sup>; nowhere else is he mentioned, but these latter verses might form a basis for Tertullian's remark; certainly they are the only basis in the New Testament. But if so slight a hint could lead Ter-

tullian to such a remark about Stephanus, why should we seek for anything more, to justify the same remark about Aquila, than Acts 18<sup>2-18, 26</sup>, 1 Cor. 16<sup>19</sup>, 2 Tim. 4<sup>19</sup>? Should it not be clear as the sun to such an eye as Zahn's that when Tertullian indignantly asks, "When did Onesiphorus, or Aquila, or Stephanus by this means [bribery] succor them (the Apostles) in persecution?" he does not imply that they did succor them by any means, but merely uses these names as those of conspicuous coworkers in the Apostolic ministry? It is indeed an interesting and instructive spectacle to behold this "strong swimmer in his agony," grasping at straws.

The absolute silence of writers so rich in quotations from Romans as Tertullian, Irenæus, and Cyprian, is ominous. The full force of this stillness is felt only by comparison. While the three Fathers never quote these chapters, Clement and Origen each quote them six times, excluding the Doxology. Hereby an earlier acquaintance with these chapters in the East than in the West seems to be indicated. The frequent use of them by the two great Alexandrians is noteworthy, and the example annuls completely the easy-going explanation of Sanday and Headlam, that Tertullian, Irenæus, and Cyprian did not quote from these chapters, because there was so little in them to quote!

But Tertullian affords us confirmatory evidence, positive if not decisive. In *Adv. Marc.* 5<sup>14</sup> we read: "*Bene autem, quod et in clausula [epistolæ] tribunal Christi comminatur.*" Here the reference is to Rom. 14<sup>10</sup> (τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ), which accordingly is spoken of as in *clausula* [epistolæ]. Even Hort admits that this must mean "in the close of the Epistle," and that it is "natural" to conclude that such a phrase would not have been used had the 15th and 16th chapters been present. The verse in question is in fact distant just one-fifth of the whole Epistle from the end. Hort attempts to escape this "natural" inference by saying that "if 14<sup>10</sup> is included in a section of the Epistle, however large, which can fairly be called in any sense its close, the point of the remark is saved." Then he thinks the rhetorical eye of Tertullian saw in all that followed 13<sup>10</sup> only personal and hortatory contents, and hence lumped all together as the close; but he admits that 15<sup>3f</sup> and 12 are "partial exceptions"! Our readers may take such special pleading at its worth. To us he seems a queer rhetorician who could lump together into one "close" such entirely and admittedly heterogeneous elements. Hort himself is not satisfied, but adds that Tertullian (*De fuga in pers.* 6) speaks of Paul's rebuking those who urged him not to go up to Jerusalem

"in the close of his ministry" (*in clausula officii*); but this seems not strange, since his ministry as a free missionary might indeed be said to have closed with his capture in Jerusalem.

More plausible than Hort's is the suggestion of others, that Tertullian is dealing only with the Marcionitic text, which certainly lacked the last two chapters. But while Tertullian's argument does indeed require him to use only the portions admitted by Marcion, it certainly did not require him to employ a mutilated text, and we can hardly think such a one lay before him. However, certainty is not here attainable. We must be content with the admitted fact that Tertullian's language naturally, but not necessarily, implies that the Epistle closed with 14.

Our next witness is Origen, and his testimony is important. In Rufinus's reproduction of Origen's Commentary on Romans, at 16<sup>23, 27</sup>, we read: *Caput hoc Marcion, a quo Scripturæ evangelicæ atque apostolicæ interpolatæ sunt, de hac epistula penitus abstulit; et non solum hoc, sed et ab eo loco ubi scriptum est, "omne autem quod non est ex fide peccatum est," usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit. In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est in his quæ non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput diverse positum invenimus. In nonnullis etenim codicibus post eum locum quem supra diximus, hoc est "omne quod non est ex fide peccatum est," statim cohærens habetur, "ei autem qui potens est vos confirmare"; alii vero codices in fine id, ut nunc est positum, continent.*

Now it is well known that the work of Rufinus is avowedly not a translation of Origen. Rufinus says that in all library copies of Origen important sections of this Commentary were wanting, for some unknown reason (*incertum sane quo casu*); these lacunæ he professes to have filled up, and the rest he shortened by half. On comparing Rufinus's redaction with a fragment of the original Origen preserved in *Philocalia* c. 24, expounding ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ, it appears that Rufinus has merely summarized his author, omitting the dialectic process and reproducing not one sentence exactly. Of course, then, the question arises, In our quotation is it Origen or Rufinus that speaks? And if their voices are mingled, in what *ratio*? Inasmuch as Origen elsewhere quotes seven times from these chapters, there seems no good reason to suppose that he did not treat them, and that it is Rufinus himself who is here supplying freely; on the other hand, it seems plain on its face that Rufinus is not translating literally, but is drawing together observations originally far apart. Such is his admitted habit; and what we read now is not at all in the

discursive manner of Origen, but in the compendious manner of his editor. Who can believe that Origen (if he thought it worth notice at all) would discuss in such a brief, allusive, and obscure fashion such an important matter as the omission of these chapters by Marcion, and that merely in such a remote and accidental connection as this discussion of the Doxology? Besides, the form of speech seems to point distinctly to the pen of a compiler; the words "*et non solum hoc sed et*" appear forced and unnatural in a firsthand work, but exactly like an artificial link inserted by a compiler between two clauses primarily unrelated. Also the difference in phrase, *penitus abstulit* and *cuncta dissecuit*, seems to indicate a difference in consciousness hard to understand in a single writer at a single instant.

Herewith we indeed assume that these phrases mean the same, that *dissecuit* means 'cut away.' This has been questioned, but without grounds. Neither Berthold's suggestion that *dissecuit* = 'separated' (14<sup>23</sup> by an interval from 15<sup>1</sup>), nor Reiche's that *dissecuit* = *laceravit*, has any probability, not to say rationality. *Cuncta* means 'the whole,' *laceravit* would call for *omnia*; and since Marcion "lacerated" (according to Rufinus's and Origen's tradition) all parts of the Epistle, there would be little point in making such an observation here about these two chapters. This common-sense view of the matter is corroborated by the St. Gall Codex 88, which has *desecuit*, which must mean 'cut off.' If this be the original reading, the question is settled; but if not, it still shows that *dissecuit* was taken in the sense of *desecuit*. It seems to us practically certain, then, that Rufinus is here summarizing according to his wont, that his "*penitus abstulit*" and "*cuncta dissecuit*" are simply the cores of two discussions by Origen, and that these attest for us unmistakably that in Origen's time there existed manuscripts not containing chapters 15 and 16.

Rufinus certainly, and Origen probably, ascribed this absence to the profanity of Marcion; but this forms no evidence, much less proof, that Marcion actually cut them away, for it is well known that the general charge against him rests wholly on *ex parte* testimony. Could we hear the other side, the counter-charge would be equally resonant and confident. The deposition of Origen and Rufinus merely shows that from some manuscripts these chapters were missing; but whether by act of Marcion or not, is left undecided. In treating this latter question we must remember, first, that Tertullian never hints that Marcion had cut them off, nor in any way betrays

knowledge of their existence. In the second place, it seems strange (as Hort admits) that Marcion should have destroyed two whole chapters, the great bulk of which could certainly have given him no offence. Granted that he might have recoiled from the Scripture allusions and Judaism in 15<sup>a. 4. 8-12. 21. 27</sup>, and 16<sup>28</sup>, yet it was extremely easy to excise or modify these verses, as it is claimed he elsewhere systematically did; and we are at a loss to perceive why he should have butchered such a revered Apostolic memento so awkwardly and needlessly. Besides, the lofty music of "according to revelation of mystery for times eternal kept in silence" must have charmed his ear exceedingly. The supposition that Marcion deleted these chapters cannot indeed be disproved with the means now at our command; but neither can it be proved, and it remains devoid of inherent verisimilitude.

Hort, who is keener logically than some other scholars, has scented the danger of admitting the obvious implication of the Rufinus-Origen passage, that there were in Marcion's time copies of Romans without the debated chapters; hence he has striven by a desperate conjecture to confine the reference to the Doxology. Observing from De La Rue's notes that the Paris MS. Reg. 1639, of the twelfth century but of high authority, contains the reading "*in eo loco*" instead of "*ab eo loco*" (as does also the St. Gall Codex 88, of the ninth century), he changes the preceding *hoc* into *hic* and obtains the following: "*et non solum hic sed et in eo loco ubi scriptum est 'omne etc.'*" So that the whole stands thus: "This paragraph Marcion, by whom the Evangelic and Apostolic Scriptures were falsified, removed entirely from this Epistle; and not only here but also in that place where it is written, 'But all that is not of faith is sin,' he cut away everything quite to the end." How inane the whole statement: this paragraph he removed entirely from the Epistle, and somewhere else he cut everything away! There is no antecedent for "here" (*hic*), there is no sense in the phrase "in that place." We see clearly what is meant when we read, "and not only this (paragraph he removed), but also from that place where it is written 'all that is not of faith is sin,' even to the end he cut everything away." But how could Marcion in one passage, "all, etc. . . . sin," cut away quite to the end everything of an entirely different passage? As well say, In the first chapter of Luke he cut off all the second! Moreover, "*ab*" is the natural antecedent of "*usque ad*," while "*in*" is very unnatural; we say *from* A even to Z, but not *in* A even to Z. Still further, there is no just sense for the words "*usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit*" ("he



cut away everything quite to the end") if the reference is only to this paragraph of three verses, and not to the end of the Epistle. Once more, as Lightfoot has noticed, the following word "*ipsum*" ("*hoc ipsum caput*") loses all force in the absence of contrast with other portions, a contrast destroyed in Hort's reading. Finally, the arguments of Hort as to the strangeness of the ordinary construction lose all their force on reflecting that it is not Origen we are reading, but a free compiler, Rufinus, who has in his fashion here bridged together two statements unrelated in the original.

It is needless to pursue Hort's conjecture any further. It has met with no acceptance, Lightfoot, Zahn, and Riggensbach perceiving its emptiness. It has interest only as showing to what straits such an ingenious master of manuscripts finds himself reduced in defending the genuineness of these chapters.

Up to this point, therefore, the case stands thus :

Tertullian, Irenæus, and Cyprian betray no knowledge of these chapters ; but Clement and Origen each quote them seven times.

Tertullian mentions 14<sup>10</sup> as "in the close of the Epistle."

In Marcion's time there were copies lacking these chapters.

When we ask, "Why lacking?" the voice of Origen (a hundred years later), as echoed by Rufinus (a hundred and fifty years later still), answers, "Marcion excised them." When we ask for proof, there is silence ; when we seek for motives, none are found. In fact, so far as we know, Marcion supremely valued this Epistle to Romans ; how, then, can we believe that he would thus wantonly cut off both feet of his idol?

These facts indicate — none of them unequivocally, but all together clearly — that these chapters formed no part of the Scriptures as known to Tertullian.

Passing over now to the argument from manuscripts, the fact confronts us of the general textual uncertainty of these chapters, the like of which is hardly found elsewhere in the New Testament. This general fact is made up out of many details, which must now be studied separately. First of all we must note a circumstance which has not received due attention, that, especially in chapter 15, the great Vatican Codex B seems to part company with its former associates and veers visibly toward the so-called Western Text. In the foregoing fourteen chapters this Codex is found but rarely on the side of DFG, or any of these against the other authorities, and even in these rare cases it is often in some insignificant detail, a mere matter of scribal error. There are about twenty such cases, viz. :



- 1<sup>27</sup>, *αρσενες* BD\*G, 73, 137 against *αρρενες*  $\aleph$ ACD<sup>c</sup>LP.  
 3<sup>2</sup>, omit *γαρ* BD\*G, 76 *et al.* against others.  
 3<sup>11</sup>, omit *ο*<sub>(1)</sub> ABG against others.  
 3<sup>11</sup>, omit *ο*<sub>(2)</sub> BG against others.  
 4<sup>22</sup>, omit *και* BD\*FG *et al.* against others.  
 5<sup>2</sup>, omit *τη πιστει* BDFG *et al.* against others.  
 5<sup>14</sup>, *αλλα* BD against others (*αλλ*).  
 7<sup>6</sup>, omit *ημας* BFG against others.  
 7<sup>20</sup>, omit *εγω*<sub>(1)</sub> BCDFG *et al.* against others.  
 8<sup>11</sup>, omit *Ιησουν* after *Χριστον* BD<sup>c</sup>FG against others, and *δια το ενοικουν αυτου πνευμα* BDFGKLP\* against others.  
 8<sup>24</sup>, omit *και* B<sup>2</sup>DFG against others, but omit *τι και* B\*, 47<sup>mg</sup>.  
 8<sup>34</sup>, omit *Ιησους* BDK *et al.* against others.  
 9<sup>4</sup>, *η διαθηκη* BDFG *et al.* against others.  
 9<sup>19</sup>, *τι ουν ετι* BDFG *et al.* against others.  
 10<sup>20</sup>, *ευρεθην εν* BD\*FG *et al.* against others (*ευρεθην*), and add *εν* before *τοις* BD\* *et al.* against others.  
 11<sup>20</sup>, omit *εξ* BD\*FG against others.  
 11<sup>28</sup>, *ανεξερευνητα* B<sup>c</sup>DFGL against  $\aleph$ AB\* (*ανεξεραυνητα*).  
 13<sup>9</sup>, omit *εν τω* BFG *et al.* against others.  
 14<sup>5</sup>, omit *γαρ*  $\aleph$ <sup>c</sup>BDFG *et al.* against  $\aleph$ <sup>c</sup>ACP *et al.*  
 14<sup>12</sup>, omit *ουν* ; add *απο-* before *δωσει* BD\*FG *et al.* against others.

This seems to be the complete list, and only a few are of much significance. Here are represented about 730 lines. Now consider the corresponding list for chap. 15 :

- 11, add *λεγει* BDFG *et al.* against others.  
 13, *πληροφορησαι* BFG against others (*πληρωσαι*).  
 20, *φιλοτιμουμαι* BD\*FGP *et al.* against others (*φιλοτιμουμενον*).  
 22, *πολλακις* BDFG against others (*τα πολλα*).  
 24, *απο νμων* B, *αφ νμων* DFG *et al.*, against others (*υφ νμων*).  
 31, *δωροφορια* BD\*FG *et al.* against others (*διακονια*).  
 31, *η εν* BD\*FG 213, against others (*η εις*).  
 32, *ελθω* BDFGLP *et al.* against others (*ελθων*),  $\aleph$ <sup>c</sup> *ελθων*,  $\aleph$ <sup>c</sup> *ελθω*.  
 32, *κυριου Ιησου* B, *χριστου Ιησου* DFG *et al.*, against others (*θεου*).  
 32, B omits *συναναπανσωμαι νμιν* ( $\aleph$ ACLP), D has *αναψυξω μεθ νμων, FG αναψυχω μεθ νμων*.

Besides, there are really three other cases, in vv.<sup>5-8</sup>, where BD(F)G agree against the others, but where C<sup>2</sup> and C\* oppose each other, and v.<sup>17</sup>, where BC<sup>1d</sup>DFG 37 oppose the others. Here, then, are thirteen



conspetus of the whole, to call a pictorial representation to our aid. Accordingly, we shall divide two facing pages into columns representing the narrow strips of manuscript, and shall place in these columns the text in question, or so much of it as may be necessary for our purpose, and shall head each column with the authorities for the text as given below. These columns will be numbered and cited as I, II, III, IV. In this way, the whole situation may be comprehended at a glance. Details that cannot well find place in this tabulation will be noted, and if need be, discussed separately. We begin each column with the last element common to all, 14<sup>28</sup>.

We now come to the discussion of the whole state of this case, than which nothing more intricate has ever presented itself in a court of justice. We do not indulge any fond hope of completely mastering the huge bulk of evidence at hand, of reducing its chaos to perfect order, or of presenting vividly to the reader all the issues in this wide field of controversy ; but we do expect to discover certain hinges

III.	IV.
<p>                     MBCD(?), 16. 80. 137. 186. d(?) f,                      vg., pesh., cop., aeth., ar., Orig., Ambr.,                      Pelag., <i>alii codices</i> (Orig.).                 </p>	<p>                     AP, 5. 17. 109. 37. 31(?). 73(?).                      arm edd et Zoh.                 </p>
<p>                     14<sup>28</sup> ΠΑΝΔΕΟΟΥΚΕΚΤΙC-                      ΤΕΥC                      ΑΜΑΡΤΙΑΕCΤΙΝ                 </p>	<p>                     παν δε ο ουκ εκ πιστewς αμαρτια 14<sup>28</sup>                      εστιν τω δε δυναμενω . . . . . Dox.                      . . . . . εις τουc αιωvαc                 </p>
<p>                     15<sup>1</sup> ΟΦΕΙΛΟΜΕΝΔΕΗΜΕΙC                      . . . . .                      . . . . .                      . . . . .                      . . . . .                      . . . . .                 </p>	<p>                     αμην οφειλομεν δε 15<sup>1</sup>                      ημειc . . . . .                      . . . . .                      . . . . .                      . . . . .                      . . . . .                 </p>
<p>                     16<sup>20</sup> ΟΔΕΘΕΟC . . . ΤΑΧΕΙ                      ΗΧΑΡΙCΤΟΥΚΥΗΜΩΝ                      ΎΜΕΘΥΜΩΝ                      ΑCΤΑΖΕΤΑΙΥΜΑCΤΙΜ                      . . . . .                 </p>	<p>                     ο δε θεοc . . . . . ταχει 16<sup>20</sup>                      η χαριc του κυριου ημων                      Ιηου μεθ υμων                      αcπαζεται υμαc Τιμ . . . . .                      . . . . .                 </p>
<p>                     16<sup>28</sup> . ΚΟΥΑΡΤΟCΟΑΔΕΛΦΟC                      16<sup>28</sup> ΤΩΔΕΔΥΝΑΜΕΝΩ . . .                      Dox.                      ΕΙCΤΟΥCΑΙΩΝΑCΤΩΝ                      ΑΙΩΝΩΝΑΜΗΝ                 </p>	<p>                     . . Κουαρτοc ο αδελφοc 16<sup>28</sup>                      τω δε δυναμενω υμαc . . . . . 16<sup>28</sup>                      . . . . . Dox.                      ειc τουc αιωvαc των                      αιωνων αμην                 </p>

of argument on which the general verdict must hang, and to exhibit them clearly, unmistakably, convincingly.

First, then, we observe that the forms of manuscripts are essentially four: those in which the Doxology is entirely absent; those in which it is at the end of 14; those in which it is at the end of 16; those in which it is present in both places. This fact in itself is very significant. If the Doxology be an original part of the Epistle, it has been transposed in nearly half of the manuscripts, it has been doubled in many, it has been dropped out of at least a few. Moreover, this transposition has not been over a few verses only, but over two whole chapters, and it has taken place in no one single family of manuscripts, but has spread itself, and that, too, at a comparatively early date, over all Christendom. Nothing like this has taken place in any other New Testament document. To be sure, there is a *Wanderstelle* in John 7<sup>33</sup>-8<sup>11</sup>, but it is no longer recognized as original. There seems to be a slight dislocation in 1 Cor. 14<sup>34, 35, 40</sup>; but it is not to be compared with the present one, and itself points almost certainly to interpolation. Undoubtedly, when a passage occurs now here, now there, now in both places, now in neither, the first suggestion is that it is a later addition. That such an addition, written perhaps at first on the margin, should be wedged in at this point, at that, at both, or left out altogether, seems so natural as to call for no explanation. Such would be our conclusion, or at least our very strong suspicion, even if the passage were perfectly in accord with the style and thought of the rest of the composition, and even if it fitted in easily and naturally into one or both of the positions, for the displacement, the repetition, and the omission would be hard to account for, even under the most favorable circumstances.

However, the circumstances, far from being favorable, are one and all as unfavorable as possible, and this by the admission of the ablest and most ardent defenders of the genuineness of this Doxology. We have seen that such masters as Alford and Lightfoot despair of making it intelligible as composed by Paul at the time of writing the rest of the Epistle, not to mention more independent critics like Reiche, Delitzsch, Weizsäcker, and numerous others. Whether or not the style and thought be impossibly Pauline, it is confessed and indubitable that they are surprising and can be understood in their connection only with extreme difficulty.

Moreover, even if we admit the paragraph to be intelligible in itself as a Pauline product of the time in question, it remains impossible to place it satisfactorily either at the end of 14 or of 16. Here

again we forbear to advance our own conviction of its ineptness in either context, for our opinion might be thought biased by our general critical tenets. No such objection holds against the great conservative masters. Zahn is the latest and certainly one of the ablest. He maintains with insistence that the Doxology is entirely out of place at the end of 16, and that it must stand after 14. He urges (pp. 269, 270) five reasons that seem convincing against the advanced position of the Doxology, at the close of 16; in particular he finds it "*schwer denkbar*" that Paul, after wandering farther and farther from his fundamental thought through a long series of "personals" (15<sup>14</sup>–16<sup>23</sup>), should suddenly pen these important sentences; and still more is it "*erst recht unbegreiflich*" that immediately upon resuming a thread of thought long since dropped, he should fall into such excitement as would explain the irregular construction of the paragraph. Furthermore, he finds that the confusion of text is scarcely explicable if the Doxology was originally at the close, and that the transposition to the end of 14 admits of no natural explanation. It is impossible for any one to deny the force of Zahn's reasoning, and we must admit that even the most enlightened ultra-conservatism finds the Doxology in its final position impossible to comprehend.

But when we turn to Zahn's positive arguments for the other (retired) position, we cannot suppress a smile. He thinks he discerns in this inflated, ecclesiastical torso of a sentence a full preparation for the following thirteen verses, and a wide-sweeping retrospect of the preceding chapters. These allusions to the past and hints of the future are of the finest, subtlest, and most covert type, so exceedingly recondite and cautiously veiled that only Hofmann and Zahn have been able to detect them. Thus he finds in τῷ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι (16<sup>25</sup>) a delicate finger pointing back to στήκει, σταθήσεται, δυνατεῖ ὁ κύριος στησαι αὐτόν — of course! For do not *stand* and *stablish* begin with the same triplet of letters, *sta*? And how visibly does δυναμένῳ in the Doxology stand as a daysman with outstretched arms of mediation between δυνατεῖ in 14<sup>4</sup> and δυνατοῖ in 15<sup>1</sup>! How impossible to make any one of these three stand without the support of the other twain! Moreover, it is blindingly clear that κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ is the necessary logical precursor of the historical (!) details of 15<sup>2, 8</sup>, while "the very surprising *διά τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν*" is the proper anticipation of 15<sup>4, 9-12</sup>!

Meantime, however, Zahn has failed to perceive the fact that the address in the Doxology seems to be to the Weak, who need to be

“established,” while both in 14<sup>20-24</sup> and in 15<sup>1</sup> it is to the Strong. How improbable that Paul would turn abruptly away from the Able to the Unable and then turn with equal abruptness back to the Able again!

Hofmann was far bolder and more thorough-going. He found it imperative to connect τῷ δυναμένῳ and μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ directly with ὀφείλομεν, so as to obtain such a structure as this: “Now to him that is able to stablish you according to my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery which has been kept in silence through times eternal, but now is manifested, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the command of the Eternal God, is made known unto all the nations unto obedience of faith; to the only wise God, through Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory forever, Amen! we owe it, we that are able, to bear the infirmities of the unable and not to please ourselves.” With justice Zahn recoils before this “*ungeheuerliches Satzgebilde*.” But Hofmann’s reasoning is far more stringent than Zahn’s. He shows that these verses are no “Doxology,” that the common interpretation assumes the “wholly impossible,” grammatically and actually, as well as the “incredible” (that the Apostle should close a Doxology to God with a Doxology to Christ), and that the aberration in syntax commonly allowed is “unthinkable” (*Die Heilige Schrift N.T.*, iii. pp. 577-582). Nevertheless, the syntactic monster that Hofmann has formed is certainly nothing but a chimera.

We must admit the strength of the arguments brought by both critics against the possibility of understanding these verses at the close of 16; but this strength is merely negative,—it helps not the least to comprehend them at the end of 14. On the contrary, even Hofmann admits that, as a Doxology, they are “*nothwendig an dieser Stelle unangemessen*,” and finds the “*Zusammenhang unleidlich durch sie unterbrochen*.” So he would account for their transposition to the end of the Epistle, and hence he is forced to treat them as “no Doxology.” Later, though not abler, expositors despair of making these verses intelligible where Hofmann and Zahn find it necessary to place them, but they make scarcely any effort to break the force of the negations of these great masters.

What, then, must we affirm as clearly made out through this controversy? So much at least: that either position of the Doxology is surprising, unnatural, bewildering, and not to be vindicated save by the utmost reach of subtlety. Even as the case now stands, then, it may be closed against the genuineness of the Doxology, unless we are to reverse all the accepted canons of criticism; for a passage

that fluctuates in position, that is repeated in some manuscripts and omitted in others, that surprises and perplexes equally by its matter and its manner, that is incomplete in its grammatical structure, and that is declared by the greatest conservative exegetes to fit in neither context, — such a passage has nothing to recommend and everything to oppose its claims to be genuine.

Before we can further advance the argument, we must raise the question, What was the earlier position of the Doxology? As is well known, the authoritative editors place it at the end of the Epistle, though Griesbach put it after 14<sup>28</sup>. This they do on the authority of the great Uncials  $\aleph$ BCD, a few cursives, versions, and Fathers, but it is especially the weighty Alexandrines<sup>1</sup>  $\aleph$ BC that turn the scale. Against such authority the later Uncials, the 172 Minuscules, the versions, the Fathers, plead in vain. Yet we have seen that such masters as Griesbach, Hofmann, and Zahn are unconvinced. Have they any good reason?

In answer we observe first that the antiquity of  $\aleph$  and B counts hardly anything in this matter. For they take us back scarcely further than A.D. 400, whereas the varying position of the Doxology is proved for at least a hundred and seventy years earlier. Origen tells us that he found it "*in nonnullis codicibus*" after "whatsoever is not of faith, is sin"; "*alii vero codices in fine id, ut nunc est positum, continent.*" Hence it is certain that the double position was held for not less than a hundred and seventy years before the date of  $\aleph$  or B; hence, so far as age is concerned, their testimony is neither more nor less weighty than that of many other mss. They were copied from mss. that contained this Doxology at the end of the whole; the cursives and L were copied from mss. that contained it before 15. If the double position could not be traced back beyond A.D. 400, the testimony of  $\aleph$  and B would be invaluable as the oldest testimony, and might be accepted as raising at least a probability that the other position was taken later. But as it was certainly taken earlier, the agreement of the Alexandrines has not that significance.

On the other hand, the almost unanimous testimony of the minuscules proves the wide prevalence of the position of the Doxology before 15, so that we may confidently affirm that the diplomatic evidence up to this point at least does not incline toward the Vatican reading. On its face it favors the Antiochian reading, and a fair interpretation of Origen-Rufinus does likewise. For when he says,

<sup>1</sup> Not, of course, necessarily written in Alexandria, but under her influence, reflecting her thought and culture.



"But other codices contain it at the end, as it is now placed," the word *now* (*nunc*) unavoidably suggests an opposition to an implied *then*, at some earlier date, at which it was *not* placed as it is *now*. This inference may not be necessary, but it is certainly the only natural one. Moreover, it is corroborated by the further reflection that Origen could not have meant that *now* it was placed *only* at the end, whereas formerly it was placed diversely; for the position at the end never became nearly universally recognized, and countless authorities later than Origen place it before 15.

These considerations are by no means weakened, but are rather strengthened, if we ascribe the words "*ut nunc est positum*" not to Origen at all, but to Rufinus (A.D. 380). For that is near the date of the great Alexandrian uncials, which do place the Doxology at the end. Now Origen was himself an Alexandrian, and nothing seems more natural than to understand that he (or Rufinus) was speaking of the text as it was coming to be established in Alexandria, in divergence from an elder text which placed the Doxology at the close of 14 and furnished the archetype to L and the countless cursives.

But even if this scale of codical evidence were level or tipped toward the advanced position of the Doxology, it would turn heavily to the other side on throwing the versions into the balance. The Arabic, the Coptic, the Æthiopian, one and all show the Alexandrian preference, which favored the Doxology at the end on grounds of mere propriety. Their testimony illustrates merely the influence of Alexandria on the construction of the New Testament; it does not take us beyond the charmed circle of her dominance. So, too, the Fathers Clement and Origen are the chief representatives of the Alexandrine school, while Hieronymus, in his Vulgate as in his Commentaries, is often hardly more than an echo of the latter. Hence the centre of gravity of all this testimony is found in the Egyptian capital; there the idea of placing the Doxology at the end found, if not its cradle, at least its home, and thence it radiated over Christendom. We readily grant this Alexandrian tradition its claims to superior intelligence, but this implies not so much its originality as the contrary.

On the other hand, the versions under II indicate a widespread prevalence of the other position of the Doxology, East, North, and West, and cannot be traced back to a single source. Worthy of special mention is the Philoxenian Syriac (made A.D. 508, revised by Thomas of Heraklea, A.D. 616, at Alexandria, "by aid of 2 (or 3) accurate Greek mss. in the monastery of the Antonians"). This cir-



cumstance is important, because it records a deliberate judgment at an early date by competent authority against the Alexandrines in Alexandria itself. It is well known that this version is the "abject slave" of the mss., the most servile extant, continually changing the Peshitto to conform to the Greek, often ludicrously, and for this very reason of absolute authority as to the form of the early Greek mss. from which it was made.

The testimony of the older Latin<sup>2</sup> versions is so important and so complicated as to call for distinct treatment. Of these it is now common to distinguish three successive types: the African, the European (called "Communis" by Zimmer), and the Italic. The first exists for us only in the citations of Tertullian and Cyprian, and is hence unavailable for the present discussion, since neither cites either of the two contested chapters. The second seems best represented by d, g, and the citations of Ambrosiaster and Victorinus. The third appears in the Itala of Augustine.

The oldest documentary evidence concerning "Communis" seems to be found in the Breves (called also Brevis Epistola, Capitula Tituli), or chapters of the ancient capitulation of Romans, a list of which is often prefixed with summaries of their contents to the text of the Epistle. These Breves are found thus far only in mss. of the Vulgate, but are themselves based not on the Vulgate, but on much older versions, as is admitted, being proved in various ways that need here no repetition. They had, in fact, a long history behind them before they entered the Vulgate mss., and had suffered many things at the hands of time. The oldest ms. that preserves them entire is the Codex Amiatinus. The Codex Fuldensis contains two quite different Breves, the second corresponding to the Amiatinian, but only half preserved. Corssen has called attention to the fact that the Amiatinian Breves correspond often to the sections in D and sometimes in F, but he deals only with the number of the chapters (in Romans) placed on the margin of the text, and neglects the contents. The agreement of number and content is not always exact; the catalogue of Thomasius shows that in different mss. the numbers are attached somewhat differently—an evidence of the great age of these Breves, for it is time that has brought about such disloca-

<sup>2</sup> The following account of the Old-Latin versions is largely an abridgment of the discussion in Riggenbach's article on the Doxology, in *Neue Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie*, I. 1892, pp. 530-558. That the conclusions here reached are directly opposed to Riggenbach's results is believed to justify so much reproduction.

tions. But, not to lose ourselves in too many details, the important point is this: The whole number of chapters in the Codex Amiatinus of Romans is LI; Capitulum L reads thus: '*De periculo contristante fratrem suum esca sua, et quod non sit regnum dei esca et potus sed iustitia et pax et gaudium in spiritu sancto.*' Here the reference to Rom. 14<sup>15-17</sup> is unmistakable, but the following verses 18-23 may very well have been included, since the Capitulum does not in general give the full content, but only the main features. The last Capitulum (LI) reads: "*De mysterio domini ante passionem in silentio habito post passionem vero ipsius revelato.*" Undoubtedly this must refer to 16<sup>23</sup>, though the specifications *ante passionem* and *post passionem* may point to a text slightly different from any that we know; or the first may possibly have crept in from Cap. 9 of Ephesians: "*De mysterio domini quod ante passionem . . .*" Herewith then is proved that in the text, certainly a very ancient one, that lay at the basis of the Amiatinian Breves, the Doxology was placed immediately after 14<sup>23</sup>.

Of course, many attempts are made to escape this conclusion. It is objected that in the Amiatinian text the number LI is placed opposite 15<sup>4</sup> and not immediately after 14<sup>23</sup>; but similar slight displacements are common and tell nothing against the plain indication of the contents. It is surmised that originally other Capitula stood between L and LI but have fallen out, — an utterly baseless conjecture. Or it is imagined that the capitulator neglected chapters 15 and 16 as unimportant, and passed over at once to the Doxology, 16<sup>23-27</sup>. Another vain imagining; for 15 in any case is far from being negligible, but is personally, historically, and dogmatically of the weightiest import. What an untutored fancy, that a third-century cataloguer could regard any part of Paul's Epistles as negligible or unworthy of his attention!

Moreover, there are three mss. thus far known that do contain additional chapters. One of these (Brit. Mus., Add. 28107, A.D. 1097) leaves out LI and adds nine others, the last referring to Rom. 16<sup>21</sup> <sup>a</sup> (*Salutatio timothei et cæterorum etiam et ipsius pauli qui epistolam in domino se scripsisse dicit*), where it is noteworthy that *pauli* is boldly put for *terti*. This complement is clearly the work of a later hand (as Ruggenbach points out), the Latin being much better than in the rest of the Breves and dependent wholly on the Vulgate. The second capitulation (Brit. Mus., Reg. 1. E. VIII, of the tenth century), not Amiatinian but based on the Amiatinian, has only twenty-nine chapters; the Amiatinian LI is broken up into XXVI and

XXVII, while XXVIII (*Obsecratio pauli ad dominum ut liberetur ab infidelibus*) refers to XV, and the last, XXIX (*Salutatio pauli ad fratres*), to XVI. The third (B. 5. 1, Trin. Coll. Camb., twelfth century) combines two early Amiatinian chapters into one, so that L is: '*De mysterio, etc.*'; it then adds

LI: *Obsecratio pauli ad dominum, etc.*

LII: *Salutatio pauli ad fratres.*

The reader will ask no proof that the two added capitula proceed in both cases from a later hand. The brief and perfunctory way in which chapters of widely varying contents are lumped together in a few words is sufficient indication. Herewith is refuted the theory of Riggenbach (p. 544) that some ignorant scribe, copying the Breves from an old Latin ms. into a Vulgate ms., may have omitted the Capitulation after the Doxology, because in the Vulgate he read the Doxology at the close of the Epistle!

The Amiatinian testimony is further strengthened by that of the concordance given by Vezzosi as found in a ms. in the Murbach Monastery, bearing the title, '*De his quæ aliquid epistolis repetit et aliquoties comprehendit.*' Following the analogy of Priscillian, Riggenbach prefers the name "Canones Murbacenses." These "Canons" are based on the Amiatinian Breves, and the four consecutives XL, XLI, XLII, XLIII, the last that refer to Romans, make it plain that LI refers to the Doxology and that this latter followed immediately upon 14<sup>23</sup>. For we read, XLII: '*Quod regnum Dei non sit esca et potus, ad Rom. L, ad Cor. prima XI.*' XLIII: '*De abscondito sacramento a sæculo, ad Rom. LI, ad Eph. IX, ad Col. III, ad Tit. I, ad Hebr. II.*' Here the Latin *sacramento* has displaced the Greek *mysterio*, but the reference to the Doxology is indubitable.

This is not all, however. An Old-Latin codex Carolinus (gue), edited by Tischendorf in *Anecdota sacra et profana*, contains in parallel columns an Old-Latin and a Gothic version, the former nearly related to d and g. Only four leaves of Romans are preserved, containing 11<sup>33</sup>-12<sup>5</sup>, 12<sup>17</sup>-13<sup>5</sup>, 14<sup>3-20</sup>, 15<sup>3-13</sup>. Plainly a leaf (or two pages) has fallen out between 14<sup>20</sup> and 15<sup>2</sup>, inclusive. An easy reckoning shows both for the Gothic (Hort) and for the Latin (Riggenbach) that the missing verses, including the Doxology, would fill out two pages exactly, while without the Doxology there would be too much for one page and not enough for two. Either both Gothic and Old Latin contained the Doxology here between 14 and 15, or one or both left a space for it. Another fragment (Codex Ambrosi-

anus) proves that the Gothic text ended with Rom. 16<sup>24</sup>, thus: *Ansts frauins unsaris Jesusi Xristaus miþ ahmin izwaramma. Amen. Du Rumonim ustauh. Du Rumonim meliþ ist us Kaurinþon.*<sup>3</sup> Herewith, then, it is not indeed proved, but rendered highly probable, that the Old Latin as given in this Codex Carolinus contained the Doxology before 15<sup>1</sup>.

Another fragment of thirty-one pages, from the Biblioteca capitulare of Monza, designated by I.<sup>2</sup>/<sub>8</sub>, written a little before or a little after A.D. 900, closes thus: *Gratia domini nostri ihesu christi cum omnibus vobis: amen. Explicit ad romanos.*—The Doxology was not, then, at the close in this ms. Was it before 15<sup>1</sup>? A quaternion, from 10<sup>2</sup>–15<sup>10</sup>, has been torn away, but enough of the edges remains to show that pages 25 and 26 of Romans began with 12<sup>13</sup> and 13<sup>7</sup>. Page 27 began on the left with

*domino m . .  
sum . . .  
veni . . .  
T . . .,*

which Varisco completes into Rom. 14<sup>8</sup>. Page 28 began on the right with

. . . . . *ne au*  
. . . . . *bur*  
. . . . . *uan*  
. . . . . *la*

The . . . *ne au* suggests *omne autem quod* . . . ; the *bur* may be for *bor* in *roborare* (instead of *confirmare*); the *uan* seems to represent *euangelium*; the *la*, *revelationem*. A text somewhat different from any we know seems to be thus dimly shadowed forth, but nothing like these syllables can be found near the beginning of 15, and the Received Text from 14<sup>8</sup> to 15<sup>10</sup> would not nearly fill out pages 27, 28 in this fragment. We may confidently conclude, then, with Riggenbach that this ms. had a version of the Doxology before 15<sup>1</sup>. This Codex Modiciensis is a Vulgate, but mixed, and seems to represent an older form, much like d and g.

Much stronger is the testimony of the Codex Bobbiensis of the ninth or tenth century, now in Milan and marked E 26 *inf.* This

<sup>3</sup> According to Moritz Heyne, 1874.

ms., also Vulgate in the main, leans still more notably toward *d* and *g*, and seems to represent a still earlier tradition. The noteworthy fact is that it *does not contain the Doxology at all*. Hereby, then, our subsequent conclusion with respect to DdGgF is greatly strengthened. Since it is thus decisively proved that *some* Old Latin versions did not contain the Doxology, there remains no reason at all for insisting, against all appearances, that *d* or *D* did contain it.

When, now, we come to the Itala (and Vulgate), the testimony is very scanty. In the Paulines only a single ms. of fragments (the Freisinger) of the Itala has been preserved (denoted by *r*, of fifth or sixth century, edited by Ziegler). This contains Rom. 14<sup>10</sup>-15<sup>13</sup>, without the Doxology, so that it is certain that the Doxology did not appear before 15<sup>1</sup>. The fragment is on the two pages of the 17th folio; also 1 Cor. begins on the first page of the 20th folio; hence from 15<sup>14</sup> to the close must have occupied two folios, the 18th and 19th, or four pages. An easy calculation shows that these four pages would be just enough for 15<sup>13</sup> to 16<sup>24</sup>, the subscription to Romans, and the title to 1 Cor., but not enough for the Doxology. Even if we suppose *v*.<sup>24</sup> omitted, which is possible, there would still not be space enough for the Doxology, the subscription for Romans, and the superscription for 1 Cor. But if we suppose both *v*.<sup>24</sup> omitted and the Corinthian superscription also omitted, then there might be found space for the Doxology. Either, then, the Doxology was entirely wanting in this ms., or else both *v*.<sup>24</sup> and the Corinthian superscription were wanting. The absence of this last is very unlikely. True, there is a precedent in Dd, but we shall see that it testifies not to the presence, but to the absence, of the Doxology in the mater of Dd. It is not enough to reply that the superscription to 2 Cor. is wanting for lack of space under the subscription to 1 Cor., and is not made good on the next page, for both these Epistles were to Corinthians, and were not always kept apart as First and Second in the ancient mind, but were thought as one. While then we cannot be sure, yet the scale of probability seems to nod toward the supposition that the Doxology was never present in this Itala ms.

Of the Latin Fathers, Augustine prefers the Itala and cites the Doxology, but from what position we cannot say; Ambrosiaster (fourth century) reads it at the close of 16.

It is said by Riggenbach that Hieronymus would not have placed the Doxology at the end unless the prevailing Itala had it there. But why? This position is undoubtedly far preferable, and since there was certainly a divided testimony it was left open to Hierony-

mus, without offence, to place it where it seemed least out of place. For this the learned Alexandrian tradition was sufficient warrant.<sup>4</sup>

We may now sum up the situation as it concerns the Latin versions thus :

African : Tertullian and Cyprian the witnesses ; neither quotes from 15 and 16.

European : The Amiatinian Breves, based on some lost but very ancient Latin text, supported by the Canones Murbancenses, place the Doxology before 15<sup>1</sup> and omit 15 and 16.

The Codex Carolinus probably had in either Latin or Gothic column or both the Doxology or space for it before 15<sup>1</sup>.

The Gothic of Ulfilas closes with the Benediction, 16<sup>24</sup>, without the Doxology.

The Codex Modiciensis almost certainly placed the Doxology before 15<sup>1</sup>.

The Codex Bobbiensis did not contain the Doxology at all.

Italic : The Freisinger ms., r, certainly did not contain the Doxology before 15<sup>1</sup>, and most probably not after 16<sup>23</sup> (24).

Augustine's evidence does not touch the position of the Doxology ; Ambrosiaster testifies to its position after ch. 16.

In the presence of this evidence it seems impossible to resist the conclusion that the oldest and most widely recognized position of the Doxology in the Latin versions was immediately after 14<sup>23</sup>. Also the Gothic version certainly did not have the Doxology at the close of the Epistle. This witness of the versions is exceeding strong. The Gothic dates from about A.D. 350 ; the Latin versions are of unknown antiquity, but even the Vulgate of Jerome, which displaced them, dates back to A.D. 383 ; they must have been a century, it may be nearly two centuries, older. At such a remote epoch the position of the Doxology before 15<sup>1</sup> was firmly established and widely recognized. Unless every indication misleads, the movement was away from this location toward the end of the Epistle. A plain trace of

<sup>4</sup> After all, it is not easy to join sharp issue as to how the Latin texts read in the days of Hieronymus ; because, in his oft-quoted phrase, "*quot codices tot exemplaria.*" The most we can establish concerns particular mss., and these were at no time perhaps a unit in their witness.

this movement is yet preserved in the trilingual minuscule 109 of the eleventh century or later. Here the Doxology appears in Greek at the close of 14, but in Latin at the close of 16; however, a later hand has also inserted it after 14<sup>23</sup>. This insertion may have been made in order to conform the Latin to the Greek; but it shows both how careful were the scribes that nothing should be lost and also that the original Greek ms. in possession of the scribe had the Doxology in its earlier position.

In the light of these facts, how shall we judge the statement of Rigenbach, that all the oldest Greek mss. placed the Doxology at the end? True, even Lucht lends sanction to this dictum, but it is plain that by "all" they can mean nothing but **ABC**. For D's witness will be proved to be against the Doxology in either position, as also that of F and G, and their ancient original; while A, P, and 17 (as good as an uncial) annul their own witness by placing the Doxology in both positions. The case stands, then, **ABC** against **DFGL**. The weight of the trio is certainly great, but they represent after all only the one Alexandrian tradition, whereas the range of the four is far greater. For our part, we cannot see that in the mere matter of uncials there is much to choose between the two groups; but when the testimony of the versions is considered along with the internal probabilities, the scale turns unmistakably against the Alexandrines. All their support, both in the versions (except perhaps Peshitto) and in the Fathers, is practically geographically one. The case, then, is narrowed down to this: The Alexandrine tradition, and no other independent authority, places the Doxology at the close. But the head of this tradition is Origen, and Origen himself admits that he found it placed variously, and implies apparently that the other position, before 15<sup>1</sup>, was the earlier. If we can estimate at all the weight of evidence, there can hardly be any question but that Zahn is right in preferring this, the retired position.

An interesting and important confirmation of this conclusion will be found in the study of the Benediction, v.<sup>24</sup>. It is wanting in **ABC**, a few cursives, the Coptic, important Vulgate mss., perhaps in the text of Origen. Of course, then, it is rejected by Westcott and Hort and Tischendorf as a doublet of 16<sup>20b</sup>. Nevertheless, Zahn rightly regards the witness in its favor as "*ganz überwiegend*": **DFGL**, nearly all cursives, the Antiochian interpreters, Gothic and Philoxenian versions, many Vulgate mss., Pelagius; also (as after 16<sup>27</sup>) P, a few cursives, Peshitto, Armenian, Ambrosiaster. In a word, the Alexandrian tradition calls for rejection, all else for reten-



tion. Of course, two hypotheses are here possible: (*a*) that this v.<sup>24</sup> was inserted when the Doxology was removed back to 15<sup>1</sup>, to supply a formal ending to the Epistle; (*b*) that it was omitted when the Doxology was transferred forward from its earlier position before 15<sup>1</sup> to the end of the Epistle, as being no longer necessary but in fact disturbing, the Doxology itself now furnishing the fitting close. Which hypothesis shall we prefer?

We hold firmly that in general a strong presumption favors the shorter text: omissions are in most cases far less likely than insertions. In this instance, however, a number of circumstances seem to render our second supposition more probable than the first.

(1) If this Benediction were inserted to take the place of the Doxology removed to 14<sup>23</sup>, since this insertion has taken place in an immense number of mss. and versions representing the most far-spread traditions, — in fact, the whole circuit of Christendom, Alexandria and its dependencies excepted, — it seems strange that precisely the same form should everywhere have been used when there were many forms to choose from. It is very unlikely that so many widely separated and broadly diverse mss. and versions, East and West, should have sprung from a single original after the year, say, 200, and still more unlikely that independent interpolators should agree so perfectly.<sup>5</sup>

(2) The position of the Benediction after 16<sup>27</sup>, which is very respectably attested, is not at all explained by the hypothesis (*a*) of insertion. Of course, we can devise some other supposition, and combine the two; but such a massing of hypotheses is always repulsive.

(3) If our argument (pp. 151–160) against the genuineness of the Dd Doxology be sound, then the case appears well-nigh decided against the Doxology; but if not, if the apologists be correct, then the presence of this v.<sup>24</sup> in Dd, along with vv.<sup>25–27</sup>, makes very strongly against the hypothesis (*a*) that the Benediction (v.<sup>24</sup>) was removed to make way for the Doxology.

(4) Similar remarks apply to the similar case of f.

(5) The authorities that place the Doxology before 15<sup>1</sup> all give the shorter form *εις τους αιωνας*; only those that place it after 16<sup>23</sup> give the longer form *εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων*. It is strange that the *των αιωνων* should be cut off in transferring from the end back to 14<sup>23</sup>;

<sup>5</sup> The Gothic form, "with your spirit" (p. 136), is a partial exception. This may be intentional conformity with Gal. 6<sup>18</sup>, or it may be a mistake of ΤΑΝ-ΤΩΝ for ΤΟΥΤΗΝ, aided perhaps by stenography.

it is very natural that it should be added on transference to the close of the Epistle, to round off the whole with a sonorous phrase.

(6) The two uncials (AP) that put the Doxology in both places, give it the shorter form before 15<sup>1</sup>, the longer after 16<sup>23</sup>. Now, however, both B and C give the Doxology in its shorter form, while  $\aleph$  (and D) give it in the longer form, at the close of the Epistle. The shorter form is then far more strongly attested, and it is this form that belongs properly and unvaryingly to the earlier position, after 14<sup>23</sup>. We see the change from the short form after 14<sup>23</sup> to the long form after 16<sup>23</sup> going on gradually under our own eyes. This last argument has also been driven home by Zahn.

These difficulties make it hard or impossible to accept the hypothesis of insertion (*a*); but not one of them, nor indeed any other, is encountered by the hypothesis of omission (*b*).

Does the scale still tremble? If so, then we may still throw into it this argument: *it is impossible to account for the transposition of this Doxology over two chapters backwards*. If it stood originally written by Paul at the very close, why was it retired to a distant and far more unfitting location? The ablest conservatives, as Hofmann, Zahn, Sanday, and Headlam, admit that this question is unanswerable. The reasons invented by others are pitiable in their infirmities. Thus, some will have it that a church reading lesson closed with 14<sup>23</sup>, Πᾶν δὲ ὁ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἁμαρτία ἐστίν, that the ending was thought to be too solemn and dispiriting and even ill-omened, and that the Doxology was thus thrown in as a consolation: "*videntur Græci, ne lectio publica in severam sententiam desineret, hanc ei clausulam attexuisse.*" Such an empty conceit as this of Bengel does not call for refutation; and yet a master like Nestle thinks it the only explanation worth mentioning, though he admits it is not satisfactory (*nicht ganz befriedigt*). Why should the condemnation of unfaith so frighten the faithful? What is there in the Doxology to drown the alleged minatory note in question? Why reach forward two chapters to such a long and inappropriate Doxology, when so many words of comfort lay so much nearer at hand, as in 15<sup>13</sup>, for example — a verse incomparably more cheering, and in every way more fitting? Why not change the reading lesson itself? This pretence is interesting only as showing the desperation of critics when called upon to account for the transposition of the Doxology from the close of the letter.

Another frequent device of not less hopeless ingenuity is to throw the responsibility on the broad shoulders of Marcion. Sanday and Headlam, following Gifford, but running counter to their great leader,

Hort, will have it that Marcion cut away 15 and 16, and that in adapting the Epistle for church use it was thought advisable to omit these last chapters as too personal, and to make the break just where the arch-heretic had made it! This is about as if the Pope or an ecumenical council should omit the Epistle of James from its church service because Luther did not like its doctrine of justification by works, and called it an epistle of straw. Even if there had existed otherwise acceptable reasons for omitting these chapters from the church service, the very fact that they had suffered martyrdom from Marcion would have endeared them to Orthodoxy, and any other division rather than that of the arch-heretic would have been chosen. But it is not true either that there was any reason for omitting them, or that they were actually omitted where known to be existent in the mss. For 15<sup>1-13</sup> are in no sense personal, but are dogmatic and important and highly edifying; the rest of the chapter is no more personal than the average of Galatians and Corinthians, and is in various parts of first-class significance, and the same may be said of the paragraph 16<sup>17-20</sup>. Only the list of salutations might possibly be omitted, but nothing more. Moreover, it is a fact that the Synaxaria actually give 15<sup>1-7</sup> for the seventh Sunday, and 15<sup>30-33</sup> for Saturday before the tenth Sunday after Pentecost. Also an Alexandrian Table of Lessons in a Vatican ms. edited by Zacagni gives Rom. 15<sup>1-6, 13-19, 30-33</sup>, consecutively. This evidence is fragmentary, but it disposes of the fiction that these chapters would be felt as too personal for public service—a fiction that has already met with rejection, as by Hort, where it might have hoped to find favor.

The real worth of all the attempted explanations of the backward transposition of the Doxology is vividly seen in this fact: Riggenbach considers carefully all those offered by his predecessors, and is reluctantly compelled to reject them, one and all, as entirely insufficient; he then devises<sup>6</sup> one himself, only to have it rejected with prompt decision by the mighty master Zahn. But this theory of Riggenbach deserves examination, if for no other reason, because it is the latest and most carefully wrought out, and represents the very best that can be said in defence of the present edited position of the Doxology at the end of the Epistle. What then does Riggenbach offer for our acceptance? He claims that the matter is, after all, "very simple," if you look at it thus:

The original position of the Doxology was its present edited posi-

<sup>6</sup> Not exactly; his theory is in truth little else than Fritzsche's revamped, but unimproved.

tion at the close of the composition. But there was felt a strong desire to have this Epistle end, as all the others, with the Benediction. Accordingly the Western copyists undertook to correct the Apostle, by translating the Doxology to the end of the 14th chapter.

Undoubtedly this explanation is quite as "simple" as could be desired; few critics, however, will be found simple enough to accept it. Of all explanations yet offered it seems the least plausible, the most manifestly insufficient. Not the semblance of proof does Riggenbach advance. The facts he alleges have no logical bearing whatever. Thus he says the Western Texts are the first to show the Doxology after 14. But even if this be so, what can it signify, since we know from Origen, and since Riggenbach himself avows,<sup>7</sup> that the double position antedates by centuries even any codical evidence, Western or Eastern? The retired position of the Doxology after 14 established itself firmly in the East, as at Antioch, where it prevailed more completely than in the West, and there is no shred of evidence that it was placed there first by Western copyists.

It is true, as Riggenbach affirms, that some Western texts placed the Benediction (16<sup>24</sup>) after the Doxology; but this gives not even the feeblest support to his contention, but rather overthrows it, for it shows that if the objection which he alleges to having the Epistle close with a Doxology was really felt, the way to remove it was the simplest and easiest possible; namely, to transpose the Benediction. Zahn has of course perceived this, and rightly regards it as decisive against Riggenbach. Moreover, we must remember that this perception by the copyist of the irregular (?) position of the Doxology at the close of the Epistle, and his determination to improve on the Apostolic order, must have been made long before he reached the close, at least as early as the 14th chapter; for if he had merely copied down what lay before him until he passed 15<sup>1</sup> or even reached 16<sup>25</sup>, it would have been too late to make the improvement, since no space would have been left between 14 and 15. Whereas, at the close he might easily have comprehended vv.<sup>24. 25-27</sup> in a glance, have

<sup>7</sup> Riggenbach admits the displacement of the Doxology far antedates all extant mss., reaching back, he imagines, to the beginning of the second century, nearly a hundred years before the Doxology was probably written! This admission, however extravagant, is yet invaluable; for if the Doxology was transposed over two centuries before  $\aleph$  or B or C was written, how is it possible to know, or what right have we to presume, that they have preserved the original position? And yet Riggenbach's elaborate argument rests with all its weight upon the testimony of these mss.!

felt the ineptness if there was any, and have made the transposition if deemed best. Or still more simply, if a Benediction really seemed necessary at the close, nothing would have been easier or more natural than to add the words Ἡ χάρις μετ' ὑμῶν, which would have solved the whole difficulty, as in Colossians and 1, 2 Timothy. To transpose a Doxology back two chapters in order to bring the Benediction last, seems unnatural and in the highest degree improbable, like lifting an anvil to crush a gnat; in view of the fact that the space between 14 and 15 was already closed up, it seems almost impossible.

This last objection falls with decisive weight against every attempted explanation of the transfer of the Doxology backward two chapters. Besides all else, such a transfer presumed a foresight in the scribe that is not easily credible. Furthermore, why did he throw it back to this point rather than to some other? Rigggenbach says because between 14<sup>23</sup> and 15<sup>1</sup> there is an "*unverkennbarer Abschnitt.*" But it is plain that the 15th chapter continues, or at least is meant to continue, the general subject of the immediately foregoing, the forbearance of the strong toward the weak. Several other points of insertion in 15 and 16 (as 16<sup>2-3, 16-17</sup>) would do at least as well. Still again, such a transposition is without any parallel in the New Testament. Rigggenbach can find none, though he seek for it diligently.

There seems, then, to be everything against this latest and most learned explanation, and nothing whatever in its favor but the confident assurance of its author. We should not have dwelt upon it, so wanting on its face in every feature of likelihood, did it not show to what critics must finally come who essay the impossible task of explaining the transit of the Doxology from its later to its earlier position. — The attempt of Sanday and Headlam, which merely combines the notions of Hort and Völter, has already been considered.

We conclude, then, not only has the present accepted location of the Doxology no adequate documentary authentication, but it leaves the other and better attested location unexplained and unexplainable.

Shall we then adopt Zahn's better reasoned view that the position after 14<sup>23</sup> is the earlier in time as well as in place? We do not see how to escape this conclusion. The documentary evidence certainly points that way, and we have seen that the backward translation is inexplicable. A forward movement of the verses may be hard, but surely not *so* hard, to understand. They might have been accidentally omitted and subsequently appended. Zahn appears every way at advantage in his contention for the earlier location; nevertheless, the obstacles he encounters are insuperable. Here are some of them:

1. In the first place, the projection of the verses over chapters 15 and 16, if these be an original integral portion of the Epistle, is without any parallel in the New Testament, and while not unthinkable is yet extremely improbable. The hypothesis would be at all acceptable only as a last resort, in case nothing better were imaginable. Zahn himself can bring forward no positive explanation. He contents himself with exposing the vanity of all hitherto suggested. For him the case stands thus :

The Doxology is genuine, so are 15 and 16 ; therefore the Doxology must stand at the end either of 14 or of 16 ; but it cannot stand at the end of 16 ; therefore it must stand at the end of 14. It makes no difference to this argument, nor to Zahn, whether we can understand the transposition or not ; he accepts it merely as a fact. But so soon as we call in question the genuineness of either the Doxology or the two chapters, the major premise in Zahn's syllogism is removed, and his reasoning collapses.

2. The anterior position of the Doxology is a most surprising and unnatural one. The great majority of critics and of readers feel this instantly. The passage has no obvious connection either with 14 or with 15. Zahn's and Hofmann's speculations are interesting only as illustrating the desperation of these critics. It was in all probability the irrepressible sense of the unfitness of the Doxology in this context that originally forced it down to the end of the Epistle, where anything might be attached. Zahn himself and Hofmann admit as much. It is an element of strength in their pleading that we can understand the motive for removing the verses from the end of 14 to the end of 16, but not reversely.

3. It is inconceivable that the Apostle in the midst of such practical commonplaces, while visibly at the very nadir of his inspiration, should suddenly soar vertically aloft to such a zenith of dogma and speculation. Even the mere grammatical structure deviates too widely from the context to be intelligible. Zahn admits we cannot believe that the Apostle could be thus instantaneously rapt away at the close of the Epistle ; still less, then, here, in the mid-region of minor moralities. In 14<sup>19-23</sup> his feet are planted solidly on the earth, and again in 15<sup>1</sup> we find him on *terra firma*. Why this incontinent flight beyond the clouds, and why this immediate return ? There is none can answer.

4. If we reject, as we must, Hofmann's grammatical prodigy, it remains only to construe the verses as a Doxology proper, and then they are without any parallel in such a position anywhere in the

New Testament. We may indeed find strewn through the Scriptures short Doxologies and Benedictions in number, as Rom. 7<sup>25</sup>, 9<sup>5</sup>, 1<sup>25</sup>, 11<sup>36</sup>, even as the pious intersperse their speech to-day with the like. All this is natural, and calls for no remark. But the case is quite another when it comes to six lines, to fifty-five words, of concentrated extract of dogmatic theology, having the form of a Doxology, ponderous in phraseology, mystical in meaning, inconsequent in structure. Nothing closely resembling such an ascription of praise is anywhere thrown into the general current of New Testament discourse, and to us such an unmotivated interjection seems psychologically impossible. Lightfoot, to be sure, makes out an apparently formidable list of a dozen (*Biblical Essays*, p. 298). But of these only two, Eph. 3<sup>20-21</sup>, Heb. 13<sup>20-21</sup>, deserve mention. The attentive reader will perceive that neither stands in the same line with the Doxology in question; moreover, the one is practically at the end of Hebrews and is not a Doxology, and the other forms the sequence of the preceding prayer and closes a section of the Ephesian Epistle so distinct and complete in its construction and aim as to form a unit in itself, if not indeed originally quite separate from what follows. Neither of these, then, can break the force of our contention.

Such considerations seem in their turn to be decisive against the anterior location of the Doxology, if 15 and 16 be genuine. What then is left us? Certainly the most natural, the unavoidable, suggestion is that the Doxology belongs in neither place, that it is the addition of some other hand. But is there any documentary evidence to hint as much? This brings us to the consideration of the Western Text DFG dfg. The facts are these: The Boernerian Codex Gg, written interlinearly, Greek and Latin, *does not contain the Doxology at all*. There is no space left at the bottom between the ἀμην of v.<sup>24</sup> and the subscription Προς ρωμαίους Ἐτελεσθη. But at the close of 14 there is left a space of five lines before the following 15<sup>1</sup>. Corssen says of this space, *tantum quantum ad doxologiam capiendam sufficiat*. But it seems hardly enough; at least six or seven lines would be required. The five lines just opposite this blank space, on page 1 of folio 18, are among the most closely written in the whole ms., but they contain only 215 letters, while the Doxology contains 256. However, admit that the parsimonious monk thought he was leaving space enough for a Doxology. But why did he not insert it? It seems wholly impossible to believe that he had any prejudice against it, or cherished any critical misgivings of his own. His writing is rude and his ignorance conspicuous. Far more, however, a minute

examination of this Codex proves incontestably the punctilious fidelity of the scribe, and that he took no liberties with the text whatever. Let one example suffice. In Tit. 2<sup>s</sup> the original of G read *κατασχηματι*, which F has faithfully though ignorantly copied. The G scribe knew enough to correct this into *κατα σθηματα*, but he was careful to write on the margin R *σθηματα* thus preserving his original above his own correction.<sup>8</sup>

If then the ms. before him contained the Doxology at all, we must believe that he would have inserted it in one or the other of its possible positions. As he has omitted it both here and there, the conclusion seems inevitable, that *the archetype of G did not contain the Doxology*. Herewith, then, the argument for its genuineness drawn from the antiquity of its sponsors *ABC*, is at one stroke shorn of its strength; for it may very well have been that the archetype of G was older than the archetype of B.

This conclusion would still face us, even if we should grant that the archetype of G did contain the Doxology, and that its omission was merely a critical procedure on the part of the copyist, though this seems to be a wholly improbable supposition. For we should then ask, what aroused his critical faculty? Why did he suspect such a paragraph? Why did he refuse to follow the sacred copy set before him? Surely not because of its contents. It is unbelievable that such a pious and truly Catholic paragraph could have stirred scruples in the breast of the monk, and that these could have been shared by the authorities of the Swiss cloister. What was good enough for the whole Christian church of antiquity, and for Zahn and Lightfoot among enlightened moderns, was certainly good enough for the dim cells of the medieval convent. No! If the monk really declined to follow the copy before him (which seems incredible) and left out the Doxology, it could only have been because he had documentary reasons; he must have known of other mss. that did not contain it, and these must have possessed for him superior authority. Either then the archetype of G or some other ms. still more highly revered did not contain this Doxology. To our minds this latter alternative seems most unlikely, though entirely favorable to our argument. Incomparably more likely it is that the monk followed his original faithfully. Why then did he leave the space? Only because he knew of other mss. that did contain the Doxology at that point. He

<sup>8</sup> Whence it appears certain that the absence in G of P<sup>W</sup>M<sup>H</sup> (17. 15) is due neither to accident nor to design, but faithfully reflects the original.



did not feel warranted in inserting it there, so he left the blank in question. But he did not leave any blank at the end of the Epistle. The weight of evidence for any Doxology anywhere inclined his mind in favor of the anterior position.

What testimony is borne by the kindred ms. F? As we have already noted (p. 126), this famous codex — appreciated by Bentley, though not by Wetstein, beautifully written in double column by a German<sup>9</sup> monk of the ninth century, in the monastery of Augia Major, near Constance, in the renovated minuscule of the Caroline period — *does not contain the Doxology at all*; neither is there any gap left after 14<sup>28</sup> as in G. On the other hand, the Latin translation f does give the Doxology at the close of the Epistle. A blank space is left opposite this Latin, but it cannot be said to have been left for the Greek. For it was quite natural to continue writing the Latin in its own column; there was no reason for extending it across under the Greek, since there was room enough and to spare in its own column, and the page (the 31st) was not quite filled out anyway. We may say then, with all confidence, that the original of F did not contain the Doxology. With respect to the Latin version f, which does contain the Doxology, it is hard or impossible to speak confidently. The Latin originals from which f was drawn seem to have been fuller than the Greek originals of F; thus, the whole Epistle to the Hebrews is given in Latin, none of it in Greek; but this circumstance does not allow any sure conclusion.

At this point, however, we are met by the confident contention of Hort, Zimmer, Riggenbach, and Zahn, that F is nothing but a bad copy of G. Wetstein, as early as 1752, maintained the interdependence of F and G, regarding F as possibly derived from G, but most probably G from F. Semler (1769) rejected both views. Matthäi, the editor of G, agrees with Wetstein in a footnote (*verissime, ut arbitror, iudicat Wetstenius*). Scrivener, the transcriber of F, rejected Wetstein's views, and held that both mss. have a common parentage. Hereto Tregelles assented and Tischendorf still more positively. Hort, following a suggestion of Westcott, on the basis of a superficial examination, decided that G was the original of F. Corssen gave the matter more careful scrutiny (1887, 1889), and declared unhesitatingly that F could not be a copy of G. Zimmer followed (1887-1890) with an ostensible demonstration of the proposition that "the Greek text of F is nothing else than an incorrect

<sup>9</sup> As appears from the German word *unaltet* written over *ἐξουσιάζει*, 1 Cor. 7<sup>A</sup>.

copy of G." Riggenbach and Zahn accept Zimmer's conclusions with eagerness, but add no proof whatever; Nestle's judgment, however, remains adverse.

The matter is certainly a very important one, and inasmuch as none of the foregoing studies can lay any just claim to thoroughness or decisiveness, and inasmuch as Riggenbach and Zahn feel justified in rejecting F entirely and passing over it without any notice, it has seemed worth while to investigate the question anew and in every detail, and to devote a separate memoir to its presentation. Some of the results thus reached may here be stated:

1. F is NOT a copy of G, but of an ancient uncial written continuously.

A clear proof of this proposition is found in the fact noted by Scrivener and emphasized by Corssen that both *F* and *G* divide the words in countless cases improperly, but not in the same way; what is rightly divided in *G* being often wrongly divided in *F*. Thus,

- animalis*
- 1 Cor. 2<sup>14</sup>, G has plainly and correctly Ψυχικός, but F ψυχει · κος ;
- de puro*
- 1 Tim. 1<sup>3</sup>, G εκ καθαρως (very distinctly), but F εκκαθαρως ;
- non ficta*
- 1 Tim. 1<sup>6</sup>, G αν ὑποκριτων, but F ανηποκριτων ;
- intelligenter affirmant*
- 1 Tim. 1<sup>7</sup>, G νοουντες . . . διαβιβαιουνται, but  
F νο ουντες . . . δια βαι βαι ουνται.

Many still more striking examples might be cited, but we have preferred to use only the facsimile pages given by Matthäi. The only rational explanation of this constantly recurring phenomenon is that both scribes were copying from an uncial written continuously, which neither quite understood.

A decisive proof of F's independence of G is found in the passage already cited, Tit. 2<sup>3</sup>. In order for the F scribe to have copied G's Κατα σθηματι into his own κατα · σχηματι, he must have misread τ as χ, which was well-nigh impossible, since G's τ is very distinct, and not the least like his χ; and he must have failed to see the marginal note σθημα

σθημα. Each of these conditions is in itself very unlikely, and their concurrence is practically impossible.

Still more, however, we have in Tit. 1<sup>6</sup> an ocular demonstration of our thesis. For G reads correctly Ει τις etc., but F has the monster

*si quis*

Επισ. No genius of perversity could produce this latter from the G text ; but if the F scribe was copying from an uncial written continuously, then it was the most natural thing in the world for him to read IT as Π. In A, for instance, IT is often scarcely distinguishable from Π. So in Rom. 7<sup>10</sup>, G has correctly παρακειται, but F has the impossible παρακεται, where has taken place precisely the same fusion of IT into Π.

To clinch this proof, we have procured through the kindness of Herr Schnorr von Carolsfeld, Director of the Royal Library at Dresden, a facsimile of the line in question (f. 96, p. 1, 18), whence 'it is unmistakable that the writer of the original intended to leave an interval unoccupied between Ει and τις.'<sup>10</sup>

The foregoing are only specimens of proofs that abound. All the counter combinations of Zimmer, some of them very ingenious, dissolve on close analysis. It is absolutely certain then that F is *not* derived from G, but from an ancient continuously written uncial.

2. This is not all, however. It is equally certain that the F scribe has done his work with almost incredible fidelity. He knew scarcely anything about Greek, he was often grossly ignorant of the sense of the words he was putting down, he was almost wholly guiltless of any feeling for case, gender, number, mood, tense, or person, and he was quite incapable of correcting the Greek text that lay before him. There is, in fact, no little amusement in studying F. One can but smile at the simplicity that detected the article (or conjunction? or relative?) in ηυξανεν, and wrote it η·υξανεν, that could resolve γαγγραυα into γαγγρα·ιν, and that took no offence at such a combination as περ·η·ωδινεις·εν·γαστρι·εχουση. But in this very ignorance and simplicity we find the surest guaranty of the transcriber's fidelity. He seems to have put down everything precisely as he found it, save that in attempting to distribute the letters into words he often confounds the persons, and divides the substance.

Such being the case, we may be certain that F represents accurately its ancient uncial prototype, due allowance being made for such obvious blunders. In authority, therefore, F takes its place along with the great uncials, whether a little before or a little behind we cannot say.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Further, absolutely to exclude every ghost of a chance to err, a copyist from G would have had the Latin translation *si quis* before him, and he not only copied but also revised with the utmost care.

<sup>11</sup> It seems certainly worthy of remark that F contains no indication whatever of the address of Romans. All the other Epistles are subscribed (ε.g.) thus:

Now this Codex does not contain the Doxology, so that we are positively certain that its original did not contain it. Herewith, then, the Doxology is proved to be not genuine; for it is extremely improbable that such a paragraph, so long and so important, could have fallen out either by accident or by design, leaving no trace of its existence in the ancient original, and taken in connection with the numerous other evidences adduced or to be adduced, this improbability becomes indistinguishable from an impossibility.

We might here close the case against the Doxology, but the testimony is yet far from exhausted. We now call to the witness stand the venerable Codex Claromontanus, commonly known as D<sub>2</sub>, the most interesting (along with its mate, Codex Bezae) of all New Testament mss. This noble ornament of the National Library at Paris does indeed contain the Doxology, but in a form triply condemned, both by the original scribe, and by the correctors D\*\* and D\*\*\*. By the original scribe the whole Epistle is written stichometrically, whereas in this Doxology the stichometry is dropped. Now the abandonment of the stichometric form is a clear indication of an original codical difference; in fact, it shows that the scribe is not copying from the same original before him, but is supplementing from some other source. If the Doxology existed in the archetype of D on the same footing as the rest of the text, why should the copyist write the body of the text stichometrically, but the Doxology in ordinary full lines? It is impossible to imagine. The difficulty is equally great whether we suppose (as is most likely) that the mater of D was itself stichometric, or that the D scribe himself introduced the stichometry. It is the difference in the manner of writing that points unerringly to an original difference of codical footing, which is unintelligible and inexplicable so long as we think of the Doxology as written by Paul or by any one else along with the rest of the Epistle.

It is vain to allege that the scribe wished to save space and so

Ετελεσθη επιστολη προς γαλατας	<i>Explicit epistola          ad galatas,</i>
or	
<i>Explicit Ad colosenses</i>	ετελεστη · προς · κολοσσαεις;

then follows the superscription to the next Epistle. But there is at the close of Romans only a blank space of two lines (enough for the subscription) at the foot of the Latin column (2, fol. 31) and of thirteen lines at the foot of the Greek column. Can it be that the original of F contained *no* indication, either in the text or in the subscription, of the destination of the "Epistle"? If so, then this original was perhaps much older than any uncial extant.

lengthened his lines in order to get all on the one page. Such was not his practice. Nowhere else is there any such compression. He was not frugal of his precious parchment. He has many lines containing only a single word, and he does not shrink from carrying the close of an Epistle to another page and leaving nearly that whole page a blank. Thus, the last page of Philippians contains besides the subscription only two lines, 1 and 2 Timothy only three lines each, and Titus only one line. Had the Doxology been written stichometrically as the rest, it would have extended over into the next page certainly quite as far as Philippians or Titus. How such a Doxology would have appeared in stichometry we may learn from the nearest parallel, Eph. 3<sup>20, 21</sup>:

ΤΩΔΕΔΥΝΑΜΕΝΩ	<i>EIAVTEMQVIPOTEST</i>
ΠΑΝΤΑΤΟΙΗΘΑΙ	<i>OMNIAFACERE</i>
ΥΠΕΡΕΚΤΕΡΙCCOY	<i>SVPERABVNDANTER</i>
ΩΝΑΙΤΟΥΜΕΘΑΗΝΟΟΥΜΕΝ	
	<i>QVAEPETIMVSAVTINTELLEGIMVS</i>
ΚΑΤΑΤΗΝΔΥΝΑΜΙΝ	<i>SECVDVMVIRTVTVM</i>
ΤΗΝΕΝΕΡΓΟΥΜΕΝΗΝ	<i>QVAEOPERATVR</i>
ΕΝΗΜΕΙΝ	<i>INNOBIS</i>
ΑΥΤΩΗΔΟΞΑΕΝΧΩΙΥ	<i>IPSIGLORIAINΧΡΩΙΗΥ</i>
ΚΑΙΤΗΕΚΚΛΗCΙΑ	<i>ETINECCLESIA</i>
ΕΙCΠΑCΑCΤΑCΓΕΝΕΑCΤΟΥΑΙΩΝΟC	
	<i>ETINOMNIAEAECVLA</i>
ΤΩΝΑΙΩΝΩΝΑΜΗΝ	<i>SAECVLORVMAMEN</i>

Contrast with this the Doxology in Romans :

ΤΩΔΕΔΥΝΑΜΕΝΩΥΜΑCΤΗΡΙΑΙ	
	<i>QVIAVTEMPOTESTVOSCONFIRMARE</i>
ΚΑΤΑΤΟΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝΜΟΥΚΑΙΤΟΚΗ	
	<i>SECVDVMEVANGELIVMMEVMET</i>
ΡΥΓΜΑΙΥΧΥΚΑΤΑΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΝΜΥC	
	<i>PRAEDICATIONEMIHVΧΡΙSECVMAPOCALYPSEM</i>
ΤΗΡΙΟΥΧΡΟΝΟΙCΑΙΩΝΙΟΙCCECΙΓΗ	
	<i>SACRAMENTITEMPORISAETERNI</i>
ΜΕΝΟΥΦΑΝΕΡΩΘΕΝΤΟCΔΕΝΥΝ	
	<i>TACITVRNITATISINNOTESCERETAVTEMNVNC</i>
ΔΙΑΓΡΑΦΩΝΤΡΟΦΗΤΙΚΩΝ	
	<i>PERSCRIPTVRASPROFETARVMIVXTA</i>

ΚΑΤΕΠΙΤΑΓΗΝΤΟΥΑΙΩΝΙΟΥΘΥΕΙCΥΤΤΑ  
*IVSSIONEMAETERNIDĪINOBOEDIEN*  
 ΚΟΗΝΤΙCΤΕΩCΕΙCΤΑΝΤΑΤΑΕΘΝΗ  
*TIAFIDEMINOMNESGENTES*  
 ΓΝΩΠΙCΘΕΝΤΟCΜΟΝΩΘΩCΟΦΩΔΙΑΙΥΧΥ  
*DECLARASSETSOLODOSAPIENTIPERIHMXPM*  
 ΩΗΔΟΞΑΕΙCΤΟΥCΑΙΩΝΑCΤΩΝΑΙΩΝΩ  
*CVIVSGLORIAINSAEVLASAECVLORVM*  
 ΑΜΗΝ *AMEN*  
 ΤΤΡΟCΡΩΜΑΙΟΥC *ADROMANOS*

It is also in vain to urge that other passages or single lines in the Epistles are not written stichometrically. Of these by far the most noteworthy is 1 Cor. 9<sup>20, 21</sup>, embracing six or seven lines. But precisely this passage stands on very uncertain feet; it is more than likely that it does not proceed from the *mater* proper of D, but is supplied from elsewhere.<sup>12</sup> That at least part of this passage is suspicious is proved by the fact that it has been placed in brackets, whether by D\*\* or D\*\*\* is uncertain. Says Tischendorf, "MH WN AYTOC YTTO NOMON: *hæc lunulis circumdata æoque modo improbata sunt.*" Moreover, the general ring of the passage marks it as not of a piece with its context. There are other lines, generally single, where the stichometric form has been abandoned, but in all cases there is some special codical reason or some mere momentary lapse. But there is no non-stichometric passage like the Doxology, and this broad fact with its implication remains unshaken.

This is not all, however. The learned correctors of this Codex, D\*\* and D\*\*\*, have gone through and revised the Greek text carefully. The former, dating most probably from the seventh century, has introduced countless grammatical and orthographic modifications as well as transpositions and other changes. The latter, of the ninth century, has revised even these revisions still more carefully and has supplied accents and breathings throughout, before him used only sporadically. But neither of these paid any attention to the Doxology, save to put accents on the first four words τῶ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς. To quote Tischendorf, who has edited D in his own masterly fashion, "*nullum invenitur correctorum D\*\* et D\*\*\* vestigium.*" Now,

<sup>12</sup> A stichometry has been preserved in G, as indicated by capitals: INα ι. κ. T. υ. ρ. ω. υ. Μη ω. α. υ. INα. τ. υ. κ. Τοισ α. ω. α. μ. ω. α. Θυ. Αλλεν ρ. χυ. INα κ. α. . . . etc.

everywhere else in the Codex such reserve on the part of these revisers has one and only one meaning, namely, that they disapproved of the words in question, regarding them as at best suspicious. It is only perverse ingenuity that can find any other meaning here. On this point we cannot do better than accept the verdict of the ultra-conservative Tischendorf: "*Hinc etsi non dici potest D\*\* aut D\*\*\* delevisse extremos versus, tamen dubitari nequit quin pro suspectis habuerint.*" Why they regarded the verses as "suspected" we cannot of course say, except that their grounds must have been documentary; for we cannot think of such medieval scribes as objecting to the content of the "glorious Doxology," which must, on the contrary, have pleased them at least as well as its modern champions. Nor can it have been because the lines were not stichometric, for elsewhere the astichometric lines are corrected and furnished with breathings and accents. Neither can it be said that the Doxology was thus stamped with disapproval because it was known to be placed in other mss. after 14<sup>th</sup>; that knowledge would at most have provoked a transposition or marginal observation. Here, then, we have the independent testimony, not of one, but of three witnesses against the Doxology.

But even this is not yet all. The Latin version d bears also its witness; for it is not only written astichometrically, but its Latin is distinctly worse than the Latin of the rest of the Codex, excepting only the Epistle to the Hebrews, which "*vitiositate eminet*" (Tischendorf) and formed no part of the original *mater* of D. Here are the blunders that deform it: *secum* for *secundum*; *sacramenti temporis æterni taciturnitatis*, which is scarcely intelligible; *innotesceret*, which is without subject and untranslatable; *declarasset*, which is likewise; *fidem* for *fidei*; *solo* for *solī*, a gross solecism. Such errors and so many occur nowhere else in the Codex (unless perhaps in Hebrews) in the like space of three verses. The Latin of this paragraph is in fact a great deal worse than what goes before or what follows. What has Riggenbach to say in answer? He appeals to Tischendorf, who cites a large number of blunders, all from Hebrews, and adds: "*sed similia nec in reliquis epistulis rara sunt.*" Certainly; if one or two were to be found on each page, there would be about a thousand in all, and no one would say that blunders were rare that numbered a thousand or even a hundred. But the Doxology has six gross blunders on half a page; it is at least ten times as faulty as the rest of the Epistles. And what are the blunders not rare in d proper? Such as *praophetae* (1 Cor. 14<sup>th</sup>), *nonvissimos*

*inimicos destruitur mors* (1 Cor. 15<sup>30</sup>), *quod spiritalis est* (1 Cor. 15<sup>40</sup>), *aborentur* (2 Cor. 3<sup>11</sup>); and Riggenbach adds from *Romans*: *o homo omnes* (2<sup>1</sup>), *sine paenitentiam* (2<sup>5</sup>), *per lege* (2<sup>12</sup>), *infirmatus in fidem* (4<sup>10</sup>), *siveritatem* (11<sup>22</sup>), *Neream* (16<sup>15</sup>), *vestra enim ob . . . dientiam in omnes provulgata est* (16<sup>19</sup>). These examples prove what is not denied, that the Latin of d is often faulty, but they do not show any other one passage as long as the Doxology that is nearly so often faulty, and they do not adduce any errors of the type found in the Doxology. It remains, then, that the Doxology is preëminent above the rest of the Codex in the viciousness of its Latin, a fact that Riggenbach seeks in vain to explain away or minimize.

Two other peculiarities mark the Latin of these verses: the word *apocalypsem* and the spelling *profetarum*. The word ἀποκάλυψις is found in twelve other passages in Codex D; uniformly it is rendered by *revelatio*; only here is the Greek form retained. There was no reason for not translating the Greek; in fact, d\*\* has actually corrected *apocalypsem* into *revelationem*. If the Doxology in d was copied from the same ms. as the rest of the Epistle, it is inexplicable why the Greek ἀποκάλυψις was not rendered here as elsewhere by the familiar *revelatio*.

The spelling *profetarum* is without any parallel in this Codex. Everywhere, in fourteen cases, the Greek προφήτης is transliterated into *prophetis*; Tit. 1<sup>12</sup> is not a real exception; there the form is *prophetat*. This may be an intentional masking of the word, the scribe being unwilling to use the word *propheta* of the Cretan; or it may be a mere *lapsus calami*. In any case there is no *f* in the spelling; the scribe began to spell the word with a *ph*, as everywhere else. The noun προφητεία and the verb προφητεύειν appear abundantly in our Codex; they are uniformly spelled in the Latin (d) with a *ph*, with a single exception: in Rom. 12<sup>6</sup> we find *profetiam*, a strange misspelling, which we cannot explain. In all the other nineteen cases the spelling is always with a *ph*. While then it is possible that the spelling *profetarum* in the Doxology is a mere lapse, it is highly improbable as over against the supposition that the Doxology is copied from another source than is the body of the codex.

There remains yet another fact that strongly suggests the same supposition; the subscription is markedly different from that found at the close of the other letters. Thus at the end of Galatians we find:



ΠΡΟΣ ΓΑΛΑΤΑΣ            *AD GALATAS*  
 ΕΠΛΗΡΩΘΗ ΑΡΧΕΤΑΙ    *EXPLICIT INCIPIT*  
 ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ        *AD EPHESIOS*

Precisely this form is maintained throughout, three lines being each time left vacant as above. But the subscription to *Romans* is simply:—

ΠΡΟΣ ΡΩΜΑΙΟΥΣ        *AD ROMANOS*

Unquestionably the natural explanation is that this close was copied from another ms. than that which was followed elsewhere. How do Riggensbach and Zahn seek to break the force of this argument? They say that there was no space at the bottom of the page for the full subscription, and the scribe was unwilling to carry it over to another page, and so lose two more pages of his costly vellum. Ingenious, certainly! But observe, first, that had the scribe desired to save space for the subscription, he could have written the AMHN, which now occupies a full line, in the last line of the Doxology, as is commonly done in the other Epistles. That line, then, would not have been too long; it would have had only 31 letters, whereas many lines in D exceed this number. Thus, lines 7, p. 107, and 17, p. 168, have each 34; line 20, p. 480, has 35; line 1, p. 394, has 36; line 4, p. 510, has 37; line 7, p. 499, has 37; line 15, p. 342, has 42! There would then have been left four lines for the subscription. Moreover, the scribe is not bound down to three times seven lines to a page; he can exceed this number if there be any occasion. Thus, on p. 179, there are 23 lines, on p. 514, 22 lines, and on p. 327, in

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΦΕΣΙΟΥΣ        *AD EPHESIOS*  
 ΠΡΟΣ ΚΟΛΟΚΚΑΕΙΣ      *AD COLOSSENSES*

the last line is one space below the ordinary last line, and the two are only half spaced. There was left in fact after the

ΕΝΑΦΘΑΡΚΙΑΑΜΗΝ      *INCORRUPTIONE AMEN*

only *two* lines; hence the compression and the omission of the middle line in the normal subscription. But in *Romans* there was actually left the space of *three* lines, and there might just as well have

been left the space of *four* lines, as we have seen ; so that the scribe might have written the full subscription without crowding the lines so much as on p. 327, or without any crowding at all had he done as he did on p. 179. Lastly, that there was room for the full subscription is decisively evidenced by the fact that the corrector (D\*\*) has actually added ΕΓΡΑ, ΑΤΤΟ ΚΟΡΙΝΘΟΥ, and instead of the Latin subscription (erased) has put

*EPISTVLA PAVLI APOST·EXPLICIT  
SCRIBENS A CORINTHV M*

So it appears that the explanation of Zahn and Riggenbach refuses to explain.

It is hardly necessary, and yet it may be in place, to add that the full subscription is not given to *Philemon*, but only the first half, the manifest reason being that the *mater of D* closed with that *Epistle*; the following stichometric table of Scriptures, and the *Hebrews* that follows it, are plainly derived from some other source.

The testimony of the great Claromontanus would, then, seem to be most strong against the Doxology. But has Riggenbach found no means to discredit or otherwise interpret this testimony? To be sure he has, but with what justice, we shall see.

The absence of accents from the Doxology, with its implied condemnation by D\*\*\*, is a sharp thorn in the flesh of this critic, which he strives hard to wrench out. On p. 565 he thinks it "entirely sufficient" (and herein he is followed by Zahn) to assume that D\*\*\* was correcting according to a ms. that had the Doxology not at the end of 16, but at the beginning of 15. But how would *merely this* be any reason for omitting accents? Riggenbach does not even hint. But he thinks he finds a precedent in the omission of accents from the clause *και αι εκκλησαι πασαι του χυ*, which appears in D at the end of 16<sup>21</sup>, but in other mss. at the end of 16<sup>10</sup>. Riggenbach thinks D\*\*\* omitted the accents here solely because he thought the clause misplaced. He fails to mention that D\*\* had already included the clause in brackets, which was a far better, simpler, and nearer lying reason for D\*\*\* to pass over it. Tischendorf says of the words, *et a D\*\* et a D\*\*\* improbata sunt*. It must be added that D\*\* has put a critical mark after the word ΑΓΙΩ, v.<sup>10</sup>, but his note, if he made any, has been cut off. It is thought he must have called attention to the fact that other mss. inserted here the clause in question. This fact, however, has no evidential value.

Riggenbach gives no reason why he thinks the ms. according to which D\*\*\* corrected had the Doxology in its earlier position, save that Tischendorf says that his text nearly resembles the text of Chrysostom and Theodoret, who read the Doxology before 15. This would have little perceptible force even were it exact, but it is not. Speaking of the corrections of D\*\*\*, Tischendorf says that the form which the D-text itself received from him most nearly approaches the type of two uncials, L (misprinted I) and K, of the ninth century, concerning which Chrysostom and Theodoret *testes esse solent*. Now it is true that L contains the Doxology after 14<sup>23</sup>, but K is defective and one knows not where it contained the Doxology, if at all. So that we are reduced to this, — that the corrections of D\*\*\* most nearly resemble L, from which it would be hard to draw any conclusion.

However, that Riggenbach's reason is not the true one is plain from the fact that D\*\*\* did actually accent the first four words of the Doxology. We do not see why he should have done this, if he omitted the accents for Riggenbach's reason, because his own text contained it in another place. But that Riggenbach himself puts no faith in his own reason, though he says it "*genügt vollständig*" (p. 565), is shown in the fact that on pp. 566-67, he alleges an entirely different reason; namely, that the Doxology was not stichometric. This reason we have already exploded. He says that D\*\*\* accented "the four first words which together make a line," and then in the next line perceived the division of a word KH-, and hence abandoned the accenting. But the "four first words" do not "make out a line," the line contains a fifth word *σρηρίξαι*. This second reason of Riggenbach's is no better than his first, — it is, indeed, even worse.

It is not possible to know certainly why D\*\*\* accented the first four words of the Doxology. Our mind can see in the phenomenon only a mark of vacillation not uncommon to mortals. The corrector perhaps hesitated at first to condemn so long and important a passage, though convinced it was spurious, and said: "Well, I'll accent it anyway;" as he proceeded, however, the returning wave of conviction rushed upon him stronger than before, and swept away his pen at the end of the fourth word. This seems like human nature and human life, whereas the discrepant reasons surmised by Riggenbach appear unnatural, far-fetched, and inadequate.

A fine illustration of the captious cavilling that critics find necessary in defending the Doxology is given in Riggenbach's treatment

of the critical mark attached to ΑΓΙΩ. If D\*\*\* left the Doxology unaccented solely because he thought it misplaced, nothing would have been more natural than to affix a mark somewhere, as at ἀμαρτία (14<sup>23</sup>), indicating the proper place of the "glorious Doxology," even as such a mark is affixed to ΑΓΙΩ (16<sup>16</sup>). But, objects Riggenbach (against Lucht),<sup>13</sup> that mark was affixed by D\*\*, not by D\*\*\*. Certainly! But would you expect both D\*\* and D\*\*\* to affix the same mark? And in leaving it affixed and untouched, did not D\*\*\* approve of it? It is well known that he has altered and even reversed the annotations and corrections of his predecessors when he did not approve.

Lastly, this Codex Claromontanus has the Benediction, v.<sup>24</sup>, in fullest form just before the Doxology:

HXAPICTOYKYHMWN̄IYXY  
METATANTWNYMWNAMHN

It would be hard to conclude an Epistle more formally or solemnly, and it is extremely hard to believe that the writer intended that eleven lines of Doxology should follow. Riggenbach seems to feel the force of this fact, yet still finds it impossible to rid himself of the thought that the Doxology was originally in the archetype of D! There was never a plainer case of the wish father to the thought.

Briefly recapitulating, then, we find the following marks to indicate that the Doxology formed no part of the original of D, but was copied from another source:

1. It is not written stichometrically, like the rest of D.
2. It is not corrected by D\*\*, though offering material for correction.
3. It is not accented and not aspirated by D\*\*\*.
4. The Latin d has an excessive number of peculiarly grave blunders both in form and in syntax.
5. The spelling *profetarum* is against the practice of the translator.
6. The word *apocalypsem* instead of *revelationem* is without parallel in the Codex.

<sup>13</sup> Being more exceedingly zealous for the traditions of the Fathers, Riggenbach has here allowed himself an injustice to Lucht. The latter says (p. 55), "*Dies ist erst von zweiter Hand geschehen,*" and by "*zweiter Hand*" he correctly means D\*\* and not D\*\*\*, as he states on p. 58, ll. 27-32. Second hand = first corrector (D\*\*). It is Riggenbach, and not Lucht, who "*hat dabei übersehen.*"

7. The unnecessarily abbreviated subscription is without parallel in the Codex.

8. The Epistle has already been brought to an end formally and solemnly by the immediately preceding Benediction of v.<sup>24</sup>.

It is not one, it is all, of these *indicia* that point to a conclusion against the Doxology. It is a case of circumstantial evidence particularly strong and concurrent. Even if each and every one of these indications could be plausibly explained separately, the far severer task would remain of explaining them collectively. It is their union that lends them irresistible strength. Why do so many strange and perplexing circumstances conspire to discredit such a notable paragraph? Why do so many meridians, at least seemingly, converge upon the same pole, if there be really no such pole at all? This is the capital and decisive aspect of the whole matter, and of this the defenders of the Doxology take not even the slightest notice!

We must now examine the testimony of Hieronymus, who says, commenting on Eph. 3<sup>5</sup>: *Qui volunt prophetas non intellexisse quod dixerint, et quasi in ecstasi loquutos, cum praesenti testimonio illud quoque quod ad Romanos in plerisque codicibus invenitur, ad confirmationem sui dogmatis trahunt legentes: "Ei autem qui potest vos roborare. . ."* Since Hieronymus here declares that the Doxology is found in *most* mss., it must be concluded that it was wanting in some; yes, we may say, in many; for Hieronymus, himself holding to the Doxology, would certainly not understate and would almost certainly rather overstate the case with his *plerisque*. What reply have Hort, Zahn, and Riggensbach to make? One only: that the mss. in which the Doxology was not present were all Marcionitic! What proof of this? Why, Hieronymus in his preface acknowledges dependence in part on Origen, and comparison of Hieronymus and Origen (in preserved fragments) shows this dependence to have been great; whence the apologist concludes that the former is practically quoting the latter. This is not proved, but cannot be disproved; let us grant it. Origen, then, declares that the Doxology was found only in the *majority* of Codices. But, as represented by Rufinus, he also says that Marcion removed the Doxology; hence it is concluded that only in the Marcionitic copies was it wanting.

But this notion is decisively condemned by no less (and who is a greater?) authority than Hort himself, in these words: "Though copies of his (Marcion's) Apostolicon were seemingly current here and there in the church, no extant document can be shown to have been affected by any of his wilful alterations. Indeed 'copies cor-

rupted by Marcion' need mean to us no more than 'copies agreeing in a certain reading with Marcion's copy'; and Marcion's copy, prior to his own manipulations, appears by various signs to have had much in common with the authorities associated with him in the omission of the Doxology. On the whole, it is reasonably certain that the omission is his only as having been transmitted by him; in other words, that it is a genuine ancient reading." Whereby it appears that all the Hort-Riggenbach-Zahnian ingenuity is, at the very best, worthless! Of what avail to show, even if it could be shown, that Jerome's language does not necessarily imply a reference to non-Marcionitic copies without the Doxology, when it is certain, quite independently of Jerome, that such copies did actually exist? And in the presence of F and G and the Codex Bobbiensis, to say nothing of D and others, this certainty is absolute and incontestable.

Some one may object that Hort has already used the interpretation in question to prove that "most mss.' here are identical with those copies which have not been corrupted by Marcion," and has inferred "that this (omission of the Doxology), and this alone, constituted Marcion's offence." To be sure he has. Can it be a fact, then, that he actually overthrows on pp. 350, 351, the structure so ingeniously raised on pp. 333, 334? Undoubtedly it is a fact, but not a single or isolated one; on the contrary, such contradictions are characteristic, as already observed, of the most persuasive apologetic of all these doughtiest champions of tradition—Hort, Lightfoot, Zahn, Riggenbach, Sanday, *et id omne genus*.

Herewith, then, we rest the case against the Doxology, not indeed for lack of argument—we might take up of fragments yet twelve baskets full<sup>14</sup>—but because the time is nigh out, and the mind that remains unmoved would hardly be moved by aught additional. It must be said, however, that the over-balance of critical authority in favor of the advanced position of the Doxology, like the over-balance of uncial, is merely imaginary. The great majority of critics that have recognized the earlier position of the Doxology as between 14 and 15, have at the same time perceived that the Doxology is not genuine, and so have ranged themselves not in favor of this earlier

<sup>14</sup> *E.g.* admittedly the double position of the Doxology is Alexandrine; so also the advanced position; how, then, could the displacement have been from the advanced position to the retired? We pass over the wide-reaching combinations of Lucht, touching the Doxology and Hebrews, which are interesting and suggestive, but not convincing; and likewise the Commentary of Ephraem Syrus, since "*Etwas Gewisses lässt sich hier nicht ermitteln*" (Riggenbach).

position, but against any position at all, on the side of DFG and their allies. In fact, almost the whole weight of independent criticism falls against the genuineness, while many able conservatives abandon its defence as hopeless. Witness such names as Clemen and Baljon; even Hort himself (not to recall Lightfoot and Alford) at the close (pp. 350-51) is almost persuaded against his own thesis, and defends the Doxology in a thoroughly half-hearted fashion. Rigenbach has seen the necessity of putting on a bold front and maintaining the advanced location at all hazards, but Zahn has recognized that this is hopeless, and he battles successfully for the retired location as the earlier, — a Cadmeian victory, for in this context (between 14 and 15) the Doxology is on its face by no possibility genuine. It was the keen and unescapable perception of this fact that forced Lightfoot to his theory of a Shorter Recension.

Viewed, then, from what quarter you will of the critical heavens, the Doxology is visibly ungentine. But its spuriousness cannot stand alone, but carries with it irresistibly the spuriousness of both the debated chapters. For the very early location of the Doxology before 15 is undeniable and un-denied. But how can we imagine any one interpolating any such paragraph at such a point in such a discussion? If critics like Zahn and Hofmann find it inconceivable that such an actually existing Pauline Doxology should be moved back two chapters, long before the division into chapters, still more inconceivable is it that any one should invent such a Doxology and wedge it in, for absolutely no purpose, where it is confessedly most unfitting and manifestly interrupts the thought; and the supposition that it was first appended at the close, and then moved backward two chapters, remains quite as improbable as before. The Doxology is in fact a wedge of steel, and driven in between 14 and 15 it detaches the latter forever from the bulk of the Epistle.

We must conclude, then, that *at some time* the discussion closed with the oracle: "All that is not of faith is sin." Hereto the Doxology was at some time appended, and afterwards the two chapters were appended also, not as a whole, most probably, but in parts, and so the grand type of mss. (II) came into being. But to other mss. the two chapters were appended first, yielding type I, and afterward the Doxology. From I by addition and from II by transposition of the Doxology was born the grand type III. The type IV arose most probably from a conflation of these two. Such would seem to be the natural, though not precisely the necessary, course of events. In any case, types I to IV are seen to imply with certainty

a still older type (O) from which the two chapters were entirely absent.

But some one will say that it is impossible that Paul should have closed an Epistle with "All that is not of faith is sin," and that our construction breaks down immediately. To be sure, Paul would never have closed an *Epistle* that way; but neither is the foregoing an Epistle. It is *demonstrably* a cento of more or less closely related discussions, of moral and religious essays. Any such discussion, not an Epistle, is closed admirably by the oracle in question, so admirably indeed that any continuation would be rhetorically offensive. This reflection removes the objection of Zahn completely.

But it will again be urged, as by the same honored master, that if these chapters were really a later addendum, then there would be some clear trace, some "*sichere Spur*," of the existence at some time or place of such a shorter form of the Epistle. We answer, first, that of this we cannot be certain. Why should any such sure trace be left behind? It is impossible to say. If the additions in question took place near A.D. 200, as seems likely, why may not all traces of the earlier form have perished? How many similar products of antiquity have similarly vanished utterly! The literary and artistic remains of the Old World are at best but an archipelago. And what motive would the early Christians have had for preserving a form which on its face revealed the fact that the chief Epistle of Paul was not really an Epistle at all? To our mind, the wonder would be if there were preserved any "*sichere Spur*," if the constructors of early Christian literature had not covered their tracks perfectly. How vigorously the Old Catholics annihilated whatever documents might make against them, may be seen from such facts as this, that Theodoret of Cyros informs us that he destroyed in his own diocese two hundred copies of Tatian's Diatessaron!

But what are the facts? The 'sure trace' desiderated by Zahn and his confrères does actually exist; it has escaped the ravages of

"The Goth, the Christian, Time, War, Flood, and Fire,"

safeguarded by its own insignificance and inconspicuity. It is still distinctly visible to every eye but the eye that refuses to see it. We refer to the Amiatinian Breves.

It has already been observed that this famous Capitulation is based, not on the Vulgate to which it is prefixed, but on an Old Latin version, how much older it is impossible to say. One single peculiarity among many similar establishes this fact, which indeed is not dis-



puted: Capitulum XLII has "*de tempore serviendo*," which implies the reading "*tempori* (τῷ καιρῷ) *servientes*," Rom. 12<sup>11</sup>; this is well known to be the Old Latin version, whereas the Vulgate reads "*Domino* (τῷ κυριῷ) *servientes*," and Jerome notes this fact as forming a special reason why he wished by his Vulgate to recall the Latin to the Greek original: "*illi* (the Old Latin codices) *legant spe gaudentes, tempori servientes, nos legamus domino servientes.*" Now this most ancient capitulation ends with L (the close of the 14th chapter) and LI (the Doxology); it does not include either 15 or 16. The inference is immediate and irresistible that the ancient text on which this Capitulation was based did not contain these chapters. It seems needless to be insistent at this point, — the case argues itself. We may exempt ourselves from any amplification, especially since Light-foot has elaborated the matter.

What possible reply can be made to this argument? There seem to be two only: Zahn imagines that a leaf may have been torn off from the original Capitulation — the leaf containing these chapters! Undoubtedly, leaves are sometimes torn away. But is it not passing strange that of all places in the world the tearing-off should take place precisely where it was so inconvenient and misleading? Precisely where Marcion is said to have set his knavish knife? Precisely where Tertullian and Irenæus and Cyprian all cease to quote? Precisely where so many and varied authorities placed a formal close — the Doxology? Surely it would seem as if man himself, with all the elements, and all moving accidents by flood and field, had conspired with more than Mephistophelean malice to produce the impression that somewhere and somewhen the Epistle closed with the 14th chapter.

More than this, however, the Amiatinian Capitulation appears to have been very widely used, and widely copied. Mss. containing it have come down to us in number. Originally there must have been hundreds, there may have been thousands. Was the leaf torn away from the very first Capitulation ever written? And before any copy of it was ever made? Why, then, did the author condone such a mutilation? Why did he not repair it? Why did no one observe the absence of an eighth of the whole? Why did none attempt to fill up that which was lacking? Such questions throng upon us and cry out for answer — but find none. Or was it torn off not so early, but after other copies had been made? Why, then, did these completely vanish, leaving no trace behind them? Why did the imperfect copies increase and multiply and fill the whole earth with their torsos? Such

an extraordinary supposition as this of Zahn's is fit to prop up nothing but a fact that is equally supposititious.

It is still more idle, if possible, to fancy that the ancient Capitulator omitted these chapters because he found in them nothing to capitulate. We refer to our page 117, and merely add that for no other New Testament Scripture does the Capitulation stop short of the end.

The witness of the Amiatinian Breves is confirmed, if confirmation were needed, by the Fuldensis. In this Codex there are two Capitulations, one of twenty-three chapters extending apparently through chapter 14, and ending thus: "XXIII. *Quod fideles dei non debeant invicem judicare cum unusquisq. secundum regulas mandatorum ipsa se debeat divino iudicio præparare ut ante tribunal dei sine confusione possit operum suorum præstare rationem.*" Here we are in chapter 14 certainly. The twenty-fourth Capitulum, however, is the same as the twenty-fourth Amiatinian, and so on to the end—all Amiatinian. Apparently the copyist has merely tacked on the Amiatinian Capitulation of 9-14 to the other Capitulation of 1-14, so as to get the full number of Capitula, LI. If so, then we have here an entirely different and independent Capitulation of only twenty-three sections, but again extending only through 14. Of course, we may imagine that this Capitulation had still other numbers, and that these have been merely supplanted in part by the Amiatinian. Possibly! But the old questions recur instantly: Why did the copyist cut off the Fuldensian Capitulation exactly at the same old critical point, the end of the 14th chapter? Why was the Fuldensian Capitulation, which was good enough for fourteen chapters, not good enough for the other two? And why, after all, were these not added from the Fuldensian, since the Amiatinian omitted them? There is silence.

Of course, Riggenbach has been equal to this emergency. He excogitates the hypothesis that in the original that lay before the Fuldensian copyist the Amiatinian Capitulations were present, but alas! the first leaf had been torn away containing the first twenty-three Amiatinians. Fortune was thus impartial in her favors to Zahn and Riggenbach; she tore away the first leaf for the one, the last leaf for the other! The copyist hastened to supply this defect from another Capitulation. Disregarding content entirely he put down just twenty-three, and lo! these carried him once more to that fatal focus of disorder, the end of the 14th chapter! Hereby Riggenbach claims to have shown that the original Fuldensian Capitulation may possibly (*kann*) have contained the last two chapters. Yes, possibly. But

did not chance at length her error mend? How did it happen that exactly twenty-three Amiatinians were torn away, and not twenty-two or twenty-four? Why should every fickleness of fortune tend to conjure up one and the same idea, that the Epistle once ended with the 14th chapter?

The Fuldensian Codex is very old (*circa* A.D. 543), and no one knows how much older is the original of its Capitulation. Its witness is very strong, though not in itself so decisive and convincing as the Amiatinian. Against their concurrent evidence all the ingenuity of Zahn and Riggensbach is seen to be unavailing.<sup>15</sup>

Herewith, then, the course of our argument, "*nie geschlossen oft geründet*," returns upon itself. We began with showing:

1. That the 15th chapter does not stand codically on the same footing as the preceding.
2. That Tertullian, Irenæus, and Cyprian apparently know nothing of the two chapters.
3. That according to Origen (Rufinus) there were codices lacking both the Doxology and the two chapters.

We then compassed a wide circuit of inquiry touching the Doxology, with this result:

4. The witness of the ancients is every way contradictory.
5. But the great preponderance of authority and critical opinion either places the Doxology before 15, or omits it altogether.
6. The Doxology is unintelligible in either position, but far better placed after 16 than after 14.
7. It is hard to understand its forward movement, but to understand its backward movement is impossible.
8. The retired position (before 15) must, for every reason, be accepted as the earlier.
9. But in this earlier position it is by no possibility genuine.
10. An imposing array of the very best authority and opinion rejects it.
11. When the Doxology is thrown out of its earlier position as spurious, the following chapters 15 and 16 are loosened, and fall away of their own weight.

<sup>15</sup> In view of their explanations, one is at a loss to conceive what these critics would accept as a really "*sichere Spur*." G is pushed aside as having attempted a critical procedure; F is drummed out of court as a foolish and faithless copy; one Capitulation is spurned as having lost its head; another, as having lost its tail; and no matter how many codices may be found that lack the two chapters, they must all be rejected as mutilated by Marcion!

12. Finally, this result is confirmed beyond contradiction by the unshakable deposition of both the Amiatinian and the Fuldensian Capitulations, neither of which knows anything of the contested chapters.

In conclusion, we must call attention to the sole method of defence adopted by the protagonists of tradition. It consists in devising ingenious hypotheses by which each count of the general indictment may be evaded separately. For scarcely any of these hypotheses can more be claimed than mere possibility; few, if any, have any inherent likelihood.

In framing them these critics do not hesitate before sharp antitheses. Thus, to explain a conflation, Riggenbach says (p. 596): "A scribe who found Rom. 16 in his *Vorlage* in its original form, observed that the Doxology in another ms. stood at the end of 14, and as he could not make sure at which place it had stood originally, he wrote it in both places, in order in any case not to rob the holy text of any portion that belonged to it." Good! That sounds very like a reverent and typical copyist. But harken now to Riggenbach, on page 557, informing us, "how the absence of the Doxology from some mss. is to be explained. A scribe who read it in one ms. at the close of 14, but in another in 16, might thereby be provoked to some suspicion of its genuineness, and on that account leave it out altogether." This scribe is exactly the opposite of the other, and we submit that he is proportionately unnatural and improbable.

But even if these defensive suppositions were intrinsically probable, by their great number and variety they are hopelessly condemned. This is a consideration that needs to be repeated, and cannot be emphasized too strongly. Zahn and Riggenbach are continually urging that neither this nor that nor the other is in itself a sure and decisive proof against their position. What they demand is some one single fact that shall of itself, independently of everything else, once and for all settle the matter. But such is not nature, such is not life. Their demand is quite unreasonable. It amounts to a rejection *in toto* of circumstantial evidence. It ignores the dictates of common sense. It may be easy to break a hundred rods singly, but impossible to bend them in a bundle. These critics take no thought of the first principles of probability. They forget that in multiplying their hypotheses they are dividing their chance of being correct. This is true, however likely the hypotheses might be — *individually*. If we throw up a dozen pennies, the chance that any one will turn up "heads" is  $\frac{1}{2}$ , one in two; but the chance that all will turn up "heads"

is only  $\frac{1}{4000}$ , about one in four thousand! Now the defensive guesses of Zahn and Riggenbach are not only intrinsically improbable, but they are independent, and in order to be effective they must all simultaneously hit true. Such a concurrence is almost incalculably unlikely.

The task of the Pyrrhonist is not difficult. One may easily put up a "Defence of Philosophic Doubt." Who can prove that the sum of the angles of a plane triangle is a straight angle? But probability is the guide of life. In shaping our beliefs, no less than our conduct, we neglect not indeed accidents themselves, but their higher powers, their extraordinary combinations, the accidents of accidents to the tenth degree. True, in shooting at a mark one *may* miss it a thousand miles; but who has ever done it? These infinitely small possibilities are practically impossibilities. They are not only negligible, but it is also our sacred duty to neglect them. Otherwise we hem our life, we dwarf our souls. What should we say of the man who would not go into the harvest field lest he be struck by lightning, or board an ocean liner for fear of shipwreck, or take a volume from a library because it might harbor some deadly germ? And yet such accidents are not less unlikely than the collective failure of all the consentient tokens we have massed together, than the simultaneous verification of all the indispensable Riggenbach-Zahnian conjectures.

For be it carefully observed that now at the last moment we *must* load the scale of argument against the two chapters with all the weight of the accumulated internal evidence already presented. Can it be that so many indicia, independent and unrelated, both within and without, have thus leagued themselves together with intent to deceive us? We cannot believe it.

Even so much is not all, however. For the arguments and conclusions of this paper, though held strictly apart, though resting on a wholly alien basis, do nevertheless support and strengthen the results of our former study, and in their turn are equally strengthened and supported. We now perceive with vivid distinctness that the body of the great Roman Epistle is really what it is apparently, an august theological treatise, a picture of the mind of Christ as it slowly took form in early Christian literary consciousness. Round this striking pictorial composition there has been thrown the historical framework of the introduction and the closing chapters. This framework we have now detached in its two great portions, and we see that the one process is the logical complement of the other. If either portion be detachable, we should naturally expect the other to be detachable also. So that our argument can hardly be unsound in one part

without being unsound in the other, being "fitly framed and knit together."

Closing, then, this preliminary discussion, we ask of the reader not a decision upon any one point, or any two or three, but a collective judgment upon the whole body of evidence. It is three wholly independent paths that have led us to the same result. If it is unlikely that all the indications of the introduction have misled us, that all the internal marks of the two chapters were deceptive, and that all the outward diplomatic evidence was equally misleading, it is still far more unlikely that any two of these have proved treacherous; and in view of the consensus of all the three, there is piled Ossa on Olympus and on Ossa's top the Pelion of Improbability.