

VARIOUS READINGS IN THE EPISTLE TO  
THE ROMANS.

I PROPOSE in this paper to select a few of the various readings which occur in the principal manuscripts of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and to set them before the general reader in such a way as may possibly lead him to see the interest and importance of that study of textual criticism which, during late years, has been so largely developed. It is probable that before another year is over we may receive from the hands of the Revision Committee that revised translation, at any rate of the New Testament, which will demand the serious attention of all who love the Word of God. The decisions of the Committee are wisely regarded as private, nor have I ventured to inquire as to the readings which they adopt in any of the passages at which we shall here briefly glance. But this paper—though I designedly abstain from entering into minute and intricate details—may at least serve to shew to some, who may not have turned their attention to the subject, that questions of considerable magnitude are involved in the endeavour to determine the sacred text. Even in modern books and speeches much may often depend on a very slight variation. Some of us may remember the commotion excited in France, not many years ago, by a speech in which a certain prince was reported to have exclaimed in the Senate, *A bas les prêtres!* and how that excitement was allayed by his declaration that he had said, not *prêtres*, but *traitres*. Instances might be multiplied in which the alteration of a word or a letter, accidentally misreported, has led to conclusions which were never intended by the

speaker or writer ; but if accuracy is necessary in publishing the words of ordinary statesmen, how incomparably more important is it that we should, as far as possible, recover the exact words used in the sacred oracles of our religion by men inspired to teach the world.

That the actual autographs of the Apostles and Evangelists have perished is universally admitted. So absolutely is this the case that, strange to say, even among all the myriads of spurious relics of all kinds scattered over Christendom, no Church or reliquary so much as professes to own the authentic manuscript of any Gospel or Epistle. Further than this, it is almost certain, both from the direct allusions of St. Paul, and from the circumstances of the case, that the thirteen of his epistles which have come down to us by no means include all that he wrote. It is *a priori* inconceivable that one so active-minded as he was, and one who seized every favourable opportunity to write to his converts and to his Churches, should have allowed many vigorous months and years of his career to slip by between the various groups of his epistles, without dictating to Timothy or Luke or Tertius the thoughts and messages of which his heart was full. We may indeed be sure that the providence of God has preserved for us all that was essential, all that was of primary importance in what he wrote ; and when we consider how many invaluable letters of the world's greatest thinkers are now hopelessly lost, how many books, and portions of books, which would have had for us the deepest interest, have perished or disappeared even during the last five hundred years ; when, too, we bear in mind how slight and fugitive was the papyrus

on which the originals of the apostolic letters were probably written—we may well see a special Providence in the preservation of such brief compositions amid the numberless physical catastrophes and political revolutions of eighteen hundred years. Whole decades of Livy, whole books of Tacitus, have been lost; the poems of Gallus, the tragedies of Pollio, the memoirs of Agrippina, even the works of deified autocrats like Claudius and Nero, have been absorbed by “the iniquity of oblivion;” and yet the few lines which St. John wrote to the well-beloved Gaius, and the few verses which St. Paul sent to Philemon with his runaway slave, Onesimus, have survived conflagrations and earthquakes, and “the drums and tramlings of a hundred triumphs.”

I think, too, that we may see another most distinct trace of the providence of God in the preservation of the text from all *material* corruptions. Hundreds of influences were at work which might well have tended to pollute the stream of religion at its very fount. Forgery was by no means unknown to the earliest centuries, by no means unknown even to the age of the Apostles. Apart from wilful forgery, neither the Jews, nor even the early Christians, regarded the adoption of some famous name as a literary crime. It may be said of the Jewish literature of the apostolic age that it was normally pseudonymous; and in early Christian literature we should hesitate to attribute conscious dishonesty to the author of the Epistle of Barnabas or the interpolators of the Epistles of Ignatius. Besides this, dogmatic bias bore with tremendous force on the honesty of transcribers, even when they were writing with a genuine work before them, as it

has done in every age on the honesty of translators and commentators ; and if it be but too clear that even the Fathers are often led by theological prejudice to insincere handling of the Word of God, and if the turn of some phrases even in Luther's and our own Authorized Version is distinctly traceable to religious prepossession, we might well have expected that, again and again, we should have to deal with perplexities of reading which were due, not to the sacred writers, but to the doctrinal or ecclesiastical convictions of the scribes who multiplied the copies of their works. When we add to these sources of error those which arise from human infirmity ; from weariness ; from momentary inattention ; from involuntary repetition ; from mispronunciations whether of the dictator or writer ; from reminiscence of parallel passages ; from the unconscious influence of words of a similar sound ; from marginal glosses creeping into the text ; from abbreviations ; from the similarity of letters ; from slight changes introduced for the purposes of the lectionary ; from the tendency to substitute hortative for categorical forms ; from the desire to get rid of difficulties or harmonize discrepancies ; from the substitution of commoner for rare words, and of easier for more difficult constructions,—we may well imagine that the number of variations which have found their way into different manuscripts, in spite of the sacred reverence and exceptional care of the writers, may be counted by tens of thousands. Errors of sight, hearing, memory, have all tended to unconscious mistakes ; dogmatic, critical, monastic, religious, moral, and exegetic prepossessions have all produced intentional changes. Every one of these influences might receive ample illustration from

the Received Text used for our English Version ; and when we bear in mind the fatal magic and force of words ; the superstitions and fetish-worship which in all ages have marred the true interpretation of Scripture ; the dangerous opinions which actually *have* been stereotyped by the turn of phrases or the accidental connotation of ill-chosen words ; the fatal tendency of theologians to build up inverted pyramids of scholastic system ; the temptation of preachers innumerable to darken the air with the spiral fumes of inference evolved in endless "therefores" from "the narrow aperture of single texts ;" when we bear in mind how easily the many tendencies towards a corrupted text at which I have glanced might have been the source of fatal perils,—we may well believe that, but for a divine guidance, the New Testament would have become, in many passages, a terrible enigma—an enigma capable of being used with tremendous force against the free consciences and saving hopes of mankind. From this grave peril we have been saved by the superintending care of God over the fortunes of the Church. For what is the fact ? Prejudice, accident, system, have done their utmost ; in some passages the conflict of evidence is such that we can arrive at no certain conclusion ; even dogmatic bias, and interpolation, and ecclesiastical interests, and marginal annotations, have here and there left traces of their perceptible influence ; and yet not only are we, year by year, approaching with greater certainty to the determination of the original reading—not only are the disputable passages becoming constantly minimized—not only are the materials on which a decision must be formed so numerous as to render all con-

jectural emendations superfluous—but it may even be said without hesitation, that in no single instance does the uncertainty or error of reading introduce any doubt or difficulty respecting the essential doctrines of our faith. Vast as has been the extension of the science of textual criticism since the days of Bentley, we need not alter a word of the celebrated remark which he made 150 years ago: “The real text of the sacred writers does not now (since the originals have been so long lost) lie in any manuscript or edition, but is dispersed in them all. It is competently exact, indeed, in the worst manuscript now extant; nor is one article of faith or moral precept either perverted or lost in them. Choose as awkwardly as you will, choose the worst by design, out of the whole lump of readings, . . . make your 30,000 (variations) as many more, if numbers of copies can ever reach that sum: all the better to a knowing and a serious reader, who is thereby more richly furnished to select what he sees genuine. But even put them into the hands of a knave or a fool, and yet, with the most sinister and absurd choice, he shall not extinguish the light of any one chapter, nor so disguise Christianity but that every feature of it will still be the same.”<sup>1</sup>

But if this be the case, it may be asked what is the use of all the infinite labour which has been undergone in the collation of manuscripts and balancing of authorities? It would be hardly possible for any one to feel the full force of the answer who has not given some time and thought to the subject. If the classification of readings led to no results of any value whatever, it

<sup>1</sup> “Remarks on Discourse of Freethinking,” by Phileleutherus Lipsiensis (1813), i. § 32.

would still furnish a rich source of illustration to various psychological questions ; and the determination of the right reading often requires a delicate exercise of judgment and insight which is in itself no mean training. But it is quite a mistake to suppose that the certain results of textual criticism are few or unimportant. They sometimes throw a flood of light on Church history and the tendencies of early thought. How instructive, for instance, are the few demonstrable interpolations into the text, especially when taken in connection with the omissions. When we see the word "fasting" added to prayer, with set purpose—probably in such passages as Matthew xvii. 21 ; Mark ix. 29 ; Acts x. 30 ; and certainly in 1 Corinthians vii. 5—we detect the same ascetic sternness which took offence at the mercy shewn by our Lord, and therefore omitted the *pericope adulterae*. In the interpolation of the three heavenly witnesses into 1 John v. 7—probably from a marginal annotation—we trace the systematic development of the doctrine of the Trinity into that rigidly dogmatic form which it assumes in the *Quicumque vult*. In the inserted confession of faith in Acts viii. 37, we observe the growth of an ecclesiastical system. In the reading *μνείαις* ("memorials") for *χρειαίς* ("necessities") in Romans xii. 13, we can hardly fail to detect the growth of that tendency which ended in the adoration of saints. In the triple repetition of the undying worm and quenchless flame in the metaphorical description of Gehenna, in Mark ix. 44, 45, we observe the tendency to dwell upon, and to emphasize, the imagery of retribution and despair. These are marked instances ; but there are very many passages where the restoration of the true reading adds very greatly to

the force, passion, beauty, or significance of our present inferior text. Perhaps some of the instances which I shall proceed to give, with as much simplicity and in a manner as little technical as possible, will deepen this impression in the reader's mind. Let me add that we may hail as a hopeful omen for the future, the transparent desire for truth in this matter which is now so prevalent in the minds of all learned men. No amount of difference of opinion, even on fundamental questions, was deemed sufficient to exclude from our Revision Committee any scholar who on other grounds was selected as eligible. No text, no reading, however important for doctrinal controversy, is allowed to stand if the balance of evidence is against it. We believe that this would still be the case even if either of the disputable or spurious passages was the sole support for some current opinion, since all wise men who have learned the inmost spirit of Christianity have seen that truth only suffers by being defended with weapons of error, and that lying for God is *more* and not *less* culpable than any other form of falsehood. Truth, however, has in no instance suffered from the abandonment of dubious readings. The doctrine of the Trinity is established on grounds so sure, that the text about the three heavenly witnesses is not in the least required to prove it. If "fasting" has no business to appear in 1 Corinthians vii. 5, it is on the other hand undoubtedly sanctioned, and even recommended, in Matthew ix. 15. The worm and flame were really introduced in Mark ix. 48, though probably not in the other two repetitions. The necessity for some confession of faith before admittance to adult baptism is too obvious to require the factitious support of Acts viii. 37. In all these cases,



and many more which might be easily adduced, the cause of religion, even in the eyes of its most timid defenders, can only gain by the rejection of dubious or unauthorized supports. My object, then, will not be to enter exhaustively into lists of various readings, but only to illustrate the interest and importance of the questions to which some of them give rise. For this purpose I shall confine my references to the chief Uncial Manuscripts which range from the fourth to the ninth century. For the reader's convenience, the letters by which the chief MSS. of the Pauline Epistles are now distinguished are repeated in the note.<sup>1</sup> A good and full account of the manuscripts themselves, their history and their value, will be found in Mr. Scrivener's "Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament."

I will confine myself in this paper to a few various readings in St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

1. "Even in the salutation we are met by a most interesting and valuable phenomenon. It is that the words "*in Rome*" are deliberately omitted by G, and by one not unimportant cursive (No. 47). The fact, until recently, received little or no notice, because the words are found in all the other uncials and cursives, and therefore the *diplomatic* evidence (*i.e.*, the evidence of MSS.) in their favour would seem to be simply overwhelming. And yet, although the reading "*in Rome*" is perfectly genuine and justifiable, the omission of this specification by G is probably also justifiable,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> N, Codex Sinaiticus, fourth century; A, Codex Alexandrinus, fifth century; B, Codex Vaticanus, fourth century; C, Codex Ephraemi, fifth century; D, Codex Claromontanus, sixth century; E, Codex Sangermanensis, tenth century; F, Codex Augiensis, ninth century; G, Codex Boernerianus, ninth century; H, Codex Coislilianus, sixth century; K, Codex Mosquensis, ninth century.

<sup>2</sup> The close affinity of G with F makes it all but certain that *εν Ρώμη* would also have been omitted by that very valuable Codex, which here is deficient.

and adds great force to a conjecture which removes a multitude of difficulties. It is known that, similarly, in Ephesians i. 1, the words "*in Ephesus*" are omitted by two manuscripts of such immense authority as  $\aleph$  and B; that Marcion did not read them; that St. Jerome and Tertullian found them omitted in some MSS.; and that St. Basil tells us that they did not exist in the ancient copies. In this instance, therefore, there is strong reason to believe that the words are not necessarily authentic, and the hypothesis that the Epistle to the Ephesians was *encyclical*, and not addressed to Ephesus alone, receives strong confirmation. Further, this omission of the words "*in Ephesus*" accounts for the fact that Marcion seems to have read, and not to have invented, the reading, "*in Laodicea*;" and it tends to establish the genuineness of the Epistle by accounting for its impersonal character, and the absence of all salutations to the members of a Church in which St. Paul had so long laboured. While therefore the vast majority of MSS. were perfectly correct in reading "*in Ephesus*," because that reading would actually have been inserted in the copy despatched to that city,— $\aleph$  and B are no less correct in *omitting* it, because a blank would have been left to be filled up by Tychicus, Onesimus, or whoever carried duplicate copies of the letter to others of the Asian Churches. The establishment of this result would alone suffice to make us examine respectfully the reasons which led the transcriber of G to omit the words "*in Rome*" in Romans i. 7. The letter was undoubtedly sent to Rome, and meant for the Roman Church; but is it not nearly certain on other grounds that the most elaborate of all St. Paul's writings, the one which is the most dis-

tinct and developed expression of "*his* gospel," would have been sent, with slight and appropriate variations in the salutation and in the final greeting, to *other* Christian Churches besides? This hypothesis elucidates several curious facts. It explains why the final doxology (Rom. xvi. 25-27) is also placed at the end of Chapter xiv. in K, in nearly all the cursive MSS., in various Versions, and in manuscripts mentioned by Rufinus and several of the Fathers; why it is read twice over (after Chapters xiv. and xvi.) in A; why it is omitted altogether in F, G, and other ancient copies mentioned by the Fathers; and why Chapters xv. and xvi. were apparently unknown to Marcion. It may also account for the curious change of tone which marks the later Chapters of the Epistle, so unlike the careful and almost distant courtesy of the first twelve chapters. It also serves to explain why the Epistle seems to conclude three times over (Chapters xv. 33; xvi. 20, 27), and even four times, if we accept as partially correct the otherwise unaccountable transposition of the final doxology to the end of Chapter xiv. Finally, it furnishes a fresh reason for the belief that Chapter xvi. (where in Verse 5 the true reading is "*of Asia*," not "*of Achaia*") was really addressed to the Church of Ephesus, and not to the Church of Rome. This latter hypothesis, for which I shall give reasons elsewhere, not only removes a host of difficulties, but prevents us from forming very mistaken conclusions about the Church in Rome—conclusions which it would be almost impossible to reconcile with the references to it in the Acts, and in the Epistles written during the first and second captivity of the Apostle. If then, on

wholly independent grounds, we are led to see how reasonable is the supposition that, when St. Paul wrote this greatest and most formal of his Epistles, he sent copies of it, with special terminations and greetings, to other of his Churches—and that our present text preserves more than one of these different exemplars—we find a strong and valuable confirmation of this theory in the omission which is peculiar to the *Codex Boernerianus* (G). We see in that omission (which cannot conceivably be a mere arbitrary innovation, since no influence, critical, dogmatic, or exegetical, could possibly account for it) the traditional recognition of a deeply interesting fact.

2. Romans i. 32: "Who knowing fully the just decree of God, that they who practise (*πράσσοντες*) such things are worthy of death, not only do (*ποιούσω*) them, but," &c.

Here, in D, E, G, and various Latin manuscripts, the verse runs, "Who, *fully knowing* the just decree of God, *did not know* that they," &c., "for (or, 'but') they not only do them," &c. The Received Text, which is best supported, implies the defiant *willingness* of their iniquity, in that the heathen, while they *knew* the sentence of God, deliberately *ignored* it by their actions. The various reading only *points* the antithesis, "*Knowing, they ignored* that," &c. This is the exact reading of G, and is in entire accordance with St. Paul's style. If we accept the reading as possibly genuine, its omission from so many good MSS. may be accounted for by the bold oxymoron which also led other MSS. to read, "did not *perceive*," or, "did not *understand*." But such passages as Romans i. 20; xii. 11; 1 Thes-

salonians iv. 11 (in the Greek), shew us that oxymoron (the effective contrast of words apparently opposite, as in Shakespeare's—

Dove-feather'd raven, fiend angelical)

was one of the rhetorical figures in which the intensity of the Apostle's mind found natural expression.

3. Romans ii. 17: Our Received Text has, "*Behold* (*ιδε*) thou art called a Jew," &c. This is only the reading of one good uncial, though found in some of the Fathers, and in the Syriac Version. It is a point in which the testimony of MSS. is of little importance, because of what is called *itacism*, *i.e.*, the pronounciation of  $\eta$  and  $\epsilon$  as though they were  $\iota$ . There cannot however be the shadow of a doubt that the true reading is, "*But if* (*ει δε*) thou art called a Jew." Bearing in mind the intense and admirable, yet perfectly courteous and kindly, sarcasm of the picture of a Jewish Pharisee in this paragraph of the Epistle, the reader will see at once with what far more crushing force the half-veiled irony bursts into terribly plain interrogative, by the substitution of the true reading. The passage is then as follows: "*But if* thou proudly bearest the name of Jew, and makest thy pillow of the law, and thy boast in God, and dost recognize the will (omit 'his'), and discriminate things transcendent, being instructed out of the law, and art confident that thyself art a leader of blind men, a light of them in darkness, an instructor of fools, a teacher of babes, having a form of knowledge and of truth in the law"—then, breaking off the assumption by a fine and common idiom, he suddenly confounds the highly self-satisfied Sir-oracle by the awful charges: "Thou then that teachest another, dost thou not teach thyself? Preacher against theft, art thou a thief? For-

bidder of adultery, art thou an adulterer? Loather of idols, dost thou rob temples?"

4. Passing over the numerous but not specially significant variations in Romans iv. 1, we may notice that in Chapter iv. 19 the true reading probably is, "And not being weak in faith *he considered his own body already deadened*, being about a hundred years old, but as to the promise of God he doubted it not through unbelief." Our Version follows the reading, "He considered *not* his own body," &c. ; but this is, on the one hand, in disaccord with fact, for Abraham we are told<sup>1</sup> *did expressly call attention* both to his own extreme age and the deadness of Sarah's womb; and, on the other hand, it seems to give a less forcible aspect to the power of Abraham's faith. The omission therefore of the negative (*οὐ*) in κ, A, B, C, and the Coptic and Syriac Versions, if not an absolutely *certain* reading, is one which is at least extremely probable.

5. In Romans v. 1, we come to one of those variations about which it is almost impossible to feel any confidence. Should the reading be, "Being then justified by faith, *we have peace* towards God," or, "*let us have peace*"? The latter reading is very strongly supported. It is found in κ, A, B, C, D, K, in at least three important Versions, and in a number of the Fathers. This is however exactly an instance in which *diplomatic* evidence is almost valueless, because (1) the carelessness of pronunciation which prevails in the decadence of a language repeatedly obliterates the distinction between *ο* and *ω*, so that there would be little difference in sound between "we have" (*ἔχομεν*) and "let us have" (*ἔχωμεν*); and (2) there seems to have been a liturgical

<sup>1</sup> Gen. xvii. 17.

tendency "to improve an assertion into an ethical exhortation." Since then the exhortation is here ruinous to the sense of an argumentative passage, we shall probably be right in following E, F, G, in this instance, and retaining the reading adopted in our English Version. We find similar specimens of this error (whether due to itacism or to a hortative tendency) in Romans vi. 2, 8, 17; 1 Corinthians xv. 7, 9, &c.

6. In Romans vii. 6, our Version has, "But now we are delivered from the law, *that being dead* wherein we were held." The reading here followed is ἀποθανόντος, which seems to have *no MS. authority at all*, but to be a mere conjectural emendation of Beza's to simplify the construction. The true reading almost certainly is ἀποθάνοντες—"We are delivered, *having died to that in which* we were held." D, E, F, G, read, "We are delivered from the law of death (τοῦ θανάτου) in which we were held;" which yields an easy sense, but has against it the almost unanimous testimony of the Versions. The variations are here simply due to the difficulty and brevity of the construction; but it is a rule of criticism that *faciliori lectioni praestat ardua: i.e.*, when the evidence between two constructions is evenly balanced *the more difficult is almost certainly the genuine reading*. Scribes are often tempted to remove, but never tempted to create, a difficulty.

7. In Romans vii. 25, our Version has, "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? *I thank God* (εὐχαριστῶ) through Jesus Christ our Lord." It will be observed that the Apostle does not answer his own question, but in the rush of thought only implies the answer in the thanksgiving. Owing to this, some MSS. read, *The grace of God* (D, E, F, G). Here again we

apply the rule to which we have just alluded, that the more difficult construction is, *ceteris paribus*, to be preferred. The true reading probably is, *Thanks to God* (χάρις τῷ θεῷ).

8. The variations in the rendering of Romans ix. 5, are very remarkable, but depend on the punctuation rather than the reading. Our Version adopts the punctuation, "*Of whom according to the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever.*" Here many commentators would put the full stop at "over all," and make the rest of the sentence an ejaculation. If the rendering of our Version were *demonstrably* correct, the verse would be absolutely decisive against all Socinian views. That it is correct I myself believe, because (1) it is the most natural way of taking the words; because (2) it was so understood by the early Church; and because (3) in all liturgical ascriptions to God the Father, the word "blessed" (εὐλογητός) comes *before*, and not (as here) *after*, the word "God" in the original. But since in *most* uncials there is no punctuation worth speaking of, and in some cursives the stop is placed after "according to the flesh," so as to make the following words an utterance of praise (*God who is over all be blessed for ever!*); and since Julian positively asserted that Paul has nowhere directly called Jesus God; many eminent modern commentators reject the punctuation of our Authorized Version. Whichever view be adopted, the proofs from the New Testament of our Lord's Divinity are far too overwhelming to be in the least affected by the decision.

9. In Romans xi. 6, the latter half of the verse—"*But if of works, it is no more grace; otherwise work is no more work*"—is probably a *marginal gloss*, which



has crept into the text, being omitted by  $\kappa$ , A, C, D, E, F, G, and several important Versions. It might easily have been written by some thoughtful reader to complete the symmetry of the antithesis; but had it really come from the Apostle, it is most unlikely that any copyist would have ventured to omit it.

10. In Romans xii. 11, "Serving the Lord" ( $\kappaυ\rhoί\omega$ ) is certainly correct. Another reading (D, F, G) is, "Serving the opportunity" ( $\kappaαι\rho\omega$ ), like the Latin phrase, *tempori inservire*—"to seize the occasion"—which may be compared with Ephesians v. 16, "buying up the opportunity." But the reading of the text is not only the best supported, but also yields the best sense, and the variations very likely arose from merely mistaking the abbreviation  $\overline{\kappa\rho\omega}$ , or  $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ , for  $\kappaαι\rho\omega$ , instead of  $\kappaυ\rhoί\omega$ .

11. The Verse, Romans xiii. 5, offers some interesting readings. Our Version reads, "It is necessary to submit ourselves" ( $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta\eta\ \iota\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ); but D, E, F, G, perhaps from the hortative tendency, read, *Submit yourselves* ( $\iota\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ ), and there are traces of the reading,  $\nu\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta\eta\ \iota\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$  (*Ye are subject to necessity*). In questions affected by *itacism*, the evidence of MSS. becomes merely orthographical, and the Received Text is probably right.

12. In Romans xiv. 6, we have one of those nicely balanced questions of reading in which the diplomatic and internal evidence are in conflict. "He that regardeth the day, to the Lord he regardeth it." Those words St. Paul dictated to Tertius; but did he add the other half of the antithesis—"and he who regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it"? If we went solely by the authority of the MSS., we should say at once that these words are not genuine, but arise

from one of those pragmatic glosses which are not unfrequently added by readers peculiarly alive to a sense of literary symmetry. For the clause is entirely omitted by  $\alpha$ , A, B, C, D, E, F, G, by some of the Versions, and by many of the Fathers. And yet, in spite of this apparently overwhelming authority against it, the sentence is almost certainly genuine, because it is more difficult to account for its insertion than for its omission. If it be said that it might be inserted because any positive statement of a truth naturally suggests a negative statement of the same truth, we must, on the other hand, observe that the clause savours of that bold liberty in which St. Paul towers above whole generations of his followers. The *omission* of the clause may have been due (1) to the accident which is constantly caused by what is called *homœoteleuton* ("when a clause ends with the same word as the preceding clause, and the transcriber's eye wanders from the one to the other, to the omission of the whole passage lying between"). The fact, then, that both clauses end with the same Greek word ( $\phi\rho\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ ), may have misled the copyist.<sup>1</sup> But perhaps (2) the clause was suppressed in the lectionaries owing to dogmatic prejudice, because it may have been thought that the words diminished the obligation of observing the Christian holy days. Considering the structure of the entire verse, and the *extreme unlikelihood that any early scribe would insert so thoroughly Pauline an assertion of Christian liberty*, it seems to me certain, in spite of uncial, Versions, and Fathers, that the clause is genuine.

13. Romans xvi. 5: "Epænetus, who is *the first-fruits of Achaia*." Here our Version has followed a

<sup>1</sup> For similar instances of clauses perhaps omitted by *homœoteleuton*, see 1 John ii. 23; Luke xvii. 36.

reading which is probably a mere *error of memory* on the part of some early transcriber. Stephanas, not Epænetus, was "the first-fruits of Achaia." The true reading is, undoubtedly, "of Asia" (κ, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, and most of the Versions). It is interesting to know the name of the first convert in the Churches of Asia, and it is more probable that he would be mentioned and saluted in a letter to Ephesus (if the hypothesis about Romans xvi., to which I have alluded, be correct) than in a letter addressed to Rome.

I hope that these specimens of various readings, the questions which they suggest, and the principles of criticism on which the selection of the true reading depends, will not have been without interest. There are, of course, multitudes of other readings in this Epistle to which I might have alluded. I have contented myself with selecting instances which appear to be more or less typical in their character, and which may serve to give the general reader some glimpse into the subject. I may perhaps be able in a future paper to call attention to important readings in the rest of St. Paul's Epistles. Even those who have minutely studied the Greek Testament may not dislike to hear a perfectly unbiassed opinion; and there may be many readers of THE EXPOSITOR who, by noticing these questions, may be led to await with deeper and more sympathetic interest the forthcoming revision of the New Testament which, in all probability, is destined even to supersede that dear and celebrated Authorized Version which now, for two centuries, has lived on the ear like a music which can never be forgotten; into which the memory of the dead has passed, and in whose verses the potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped.