Lecture II: History of Early Bible Manuscripts

Earl Clement Davis

Questions.

One question has been asked concerning the difficulties of translation. Are there any cases where a passage in the original is capable of such variations in translations as would give different meanings?

The answer is that there are many such.

For Example in that passage in the Acts XVII 22. which in the Autherized version was translated ,"Then Paul stood up in the midst of Mar's Hill , and said,-'Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious."

The revised version says,- "And Paul stood in the midst of the Areopagus , and said, ' Ye men of Athens, in all things I perceive that ye are somewhat superstitious."

Whereas a perfectly proper translation of the passage would be " And Paul stood up in the midst of the Areopagus, and said,9 ' Ye men of Athens, In all things I perceive that ye are more than ordinarily devout."

The Roman Catholic Bible translates,

"Do penance , for the kingdom of God is at hand."

instead of,

"Repent ; for the kingdom of God is at hand."

Luke 16-9 Authorized version,-

"Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness

Revised Version,-

" Make to yourwelves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness."

Or in John,- 4,24 "Pneuma O theos" is translated "God is a Spirit." with marginal rendering,"God is spirit" . Another possible rendering is "God is life."

A 2.

Or to use a more debatable case.

In Mark 2,10 and 2,28 , and Matthew~~xxxxxx~~ 12-8, 12-32, and 16,13/ the greek phrase " ὁ υἱος τοῦ anthropoῦ" is translated "the son of man." with a special meaning of a messianic character attached. Yet there are certai very ~~xxxxx~~ pressing considerations which have been recognized by many scholars since at least 1569 which point to the simple word "man" as the proper translations of this phrase. In fact it is doibtful if the aramaic word Bar Nasha which Jesus must have used, could have any other meaning than simply "Man"

all these passages are concerning events and sayings alleged to have occurred ~~after~~ prior to the diffused Messianic Declaration at Caesarea Philippi, Matthew 16th fol,

History of the Bible.

The Search for the Original Bible. "Textual Criticism.

In following out the account of the translation of the Bible into English, we came upon a very complicated problem which Bible scholars have not found, up this time, and probably never will find a final answer to.

Wycliffe translated ~~xxx~~ the Bible from the Latin Vulgate.

Tyndale. "The Newe Testament dylygently corrected and compared with the Greek by William Tindale,.."

Coverdale. "Faithfully and Truely translated out of Douche and Latin."

~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ Coverdale's Five Interpreters.

1-Swiss -German by Swingli.

2- Luther's German.

3- The Vulgate.

4- The latin Bible of 1528 by Pagninus.

5- Either Tyndale's or some German Version.

Great Bible. "Truly translated after the veryte of the Hebrew and Greek texts."

Edition of 1611. "Translated out of the Original Tongues."

Even these old introductions to translations indicate the difficulty of even so simple a task as translating. The moment one begins translating the Bible, or for that matter, reading it seriously, he is confronted by great number of varied readings, and varied translations , and corruptions in the text. While such errors in the text do not seriously effect the person who takes a modern view of the Bible, they are ~~xxxx~~ incompatable with the doctrine of peculiar inspiration. For even if the original Bible were absolutely correct, and might be worthy of unquestioning confidence in case we had it, yet the fact remains that while we have

B 2

what may be regarded as a substantially ~~xxxxxx~~ true text, ~~yet the fact remains, that~~ so much of error has beem proved in the text and mms as they exist that an element of uncertainty pervades the entire text. All through Christian History, and in pre-christian history scholars, translators, and scribes have been working on this task of ~~xxxxxx~~ either keeping the text pure, or searching for the pure original text.

This is what is called Textual Criticism. It is often spoken of by people who do not know, as if"Textual Criticism" were the device of some heretical devil to destroy faith in the scripture. Such is not the case. Textual Criticism is the attempt to find, or to reproduce the oldest and most primitive copy of the Bible.

While Textual Criticism applies to the entire Bible, both old and New Testament, the fact of a fairly well defined Old Testament text, although very much subject to serious errors, makes the story of the New Testament text most interesting and illuminating for our purposes.

The Canon of Pope Galasius. A.D.492--94.

"Likewise the order of the Scriptures of the New Testament, which the Holy Roman Catholic Church receives and venerates : Four books that is of the Gospels;,Matthew, one book; Mark, one book ; Luke, one book; John, one book . Likewise the Acts of the Apostles , one book; The Epistles of Paul fourteen in Number ; the Apocalypse , one book,; Apostolic Epistles , in number seven ; of Peter the Apostle, in number two; of James the Apostle , in number one ; of John the Apostle, in number three ; of Jude the Zealot, (in number one)."

Thus so far as the Western Chruch is concerned ended a controversy which had been going on for two hundred years, -- namly as to what books should be included in the New Testament, or New Covanent, to be read and used as Scripture.

In the Syrian branch of the Christian Church only the four

B 3

Gospels and the Epistles of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles were recognized as Bible. A manuscript has been found as late as 1470 in which the scribe says "~~Xexappexx~~ after the Epistles of Paul , "We append also letters of apostles not acknowledge by all."

When Wycliffe Translated the New Testament into English, and a half
and a Century/later when Tyndale did the same thing, the translation was of these 27 books from the ~~Latinxxxxxxx~~ Vulgate in the case of Wycliffe, and from the Greek and Latin in the case of Tyndale. The Complutensian Polyglot of 1520 had the Hebrew, Greek and the Latin. Now Hebrew was the language ~~was~~ the Old Testament Originals. While Jesus and probably most of the disciples used the Aramaic language, yet all the written sources of the New Testament were in greek, with the possible exception of one source that has been lost. So, for our interests, the task of Textual Criticism of the New Testament has been to discover the oldest and the most accurate copy of the the New Testament or any portion of it.

Textual Criticism.

Prior to the discovery of the art of printing around 1453 , the copies of the Bible were made by scribes. The books were copied letter by letter. Parchment and papyrus were used, ~~xxx~~ This was very exacting work. In spite of the closest watch many errors crept in. Most of these were unintentional. Some of them bear the evidence of well-intentioned editing, and in a few cases of late date, the suggestion of over confident supplementary notes.

Of the vast number of manuscripts that were made during the ~~eleven or 12~~ 13 hundred years , only about 3ooo have come to light. Doubtless there are many others stored away in ~~some~~ corner of the ecclesiastical buildings, and libraries of the East. It is beleived by many that there are still many very valuable MMs in Constantinople and that they will come to light if ever Constantinople ~~xx~~comes under the control of Christians again.

The oldest of these manuscripts ~~xxxx~~ dates to somewhere in the fourth Century, perhaps around 330 A.D. ~~Many~~ of the others are very late, and most of them after the year 1000.

Of this number many are merely fragments, some simply a scrap of a manuscript.

They are divided into two classes .

a-- The large Letter Greek Manuscripts.

b-- Small letter Greek Manuscripts.

Of the 3000 greek Manuscripts, all but about 125 are ~~xxxx~~ written in the samll letter. That immediately settles the question as to the date of their making for the use of the ~~small~~ letters or Minuscules did not develop until the ~~xxxx~~ 9th? Century. But it must be noted that the fact of a late date of a Manuscript does not of necessity determine its value, for it may have been copied from a very old and very good MMS since lost.

There are about 125 Large Letter Greek Manuscripts, or Uncials as they are called.

C 2

These Large Letter Manuscripts are the oldest and come the nearest to what may be called an Original Bible. Of the 125 Manuscripts of this class many are merely fragments, one leaf or two leafs. This group boils down to five that are regarded as the oldest and most important.

1-- Aleph. Codex Sinaiaticus .	4th Century.	St. Petersburg.
2-- A. Codex Alexandrinus	5th "	Brittish Museum.
3-- B. Codex Vaticanus	4th "	Vatican Library.
4-- C. Codex Ephraemi	5th "	Paris.
5-- D. Codex Bezae.	6th "	Cambridge.

Of these the first one, Aleph , is the only one that contains the New Testament Complete, and in addition The Epistle of Barnabas, and the Shepherd of Hermas. The task of editing a text of the Bible or New Testament, is the task of taking these manuscripts and by a process of comparison get at the probable true reading in any passage in question.

The nature of this task is seen when the fact that there are something like 200.000 variations in reading in these manuscripts. Of these 200.000 variations most of them are very small and unimportant. There are only about four hundred where the meaning is very much involved, and perhaps less than 2o where there is ~~any considerable difference of considerable~~ vital issue.

There are three passages found in the Authorized version that ought not to be there at all, if the oldest mms are to be the guide. John 5,7-8. Mark 16,9-20, John 7, 53-8,11.

Three other passages that probably should go. ~~John~~

Luke 22,43-44. Matthew 16,2-3 and John 5,3-4

Romans 9,5 Punctuation determines meaning.

Romans . Chapter 15-16.

All these are simply questions of the text. Which MMS is right, and which is nearest to the earliest B

The Manuscripts'

The examination and study of all these manuscripts upon the text of the New Testament has been a very great work. Many a great scholar has given his life to it. Into the detail of it we cannot go here. But it is important to point out that as a result of this study the Manuscripts are found to group themselves into certain families. They are distinguished by the peculiar reading , and characteristic variations. The discovery of this relationship of Manuscripts has simplified the task of criticism very much indeed In fact,as I will illustrate later, the task comes down to one of judgement concerning readings of the two big letter Manuscripts which I have spoken of, and then checking with certain other MMs. The amount of work involved in this is perfectly enormous. Among those who have given their lives to the work may be mentioned Lachmann, Tragelles, Tichendorf, and Messrs Westcott and Hortt . These last English Churchmen are the Editors of what is commonly regarded as the best Text of the Greek Bible. Their edition in Greek is based upon Aleph and B or Vaticanus. Where these two agree , they prevail over all others. and B/ prevails over Aleph.

In this edition of Westcott and Hort at the end of the book they give a list of readings that are included in the Authorised version, and which they have rejected from this edition because they are not to be found in the oldest and best MMS, and which are of enough importance to be called"noteworthy rejected readings . There are 335 of them. In addition there are 65 noteworthy suspected readings. A little later these most of important of these will be referreed to again in detail.

Aleph. Codex Sinaiticus. fourth Century

D 2

The history of the finding of some of these MMs. is often very interesting. For example the story of Aleph is almost a romance. In 1844 Constantine Tichendorf visited the Monastary of St. Catherine at Mount Sinai. "While there he found in a waste basket forty three leaves of an old manuscript." He also saw some more leaves , but they refused to let him have them, so he copied one of them. These forty three leaves contained parts of the Old T. Tichendorf at once saw the value of this fragment, and kept still about about it. In 1853 , nine years later, he made another visit ot the monastary in hopes of getting some more of the same MMS. He found only a few leaves of Gensis. In 1859 he went again to look for the manuscript. After spending several days in fruitless search, he was on the point of leaving. In fact the camels had already been ordered to take him away when one of the monks took down from a shelf some old leaves of a MMS. Tichendorf recognized it at once. He took the MMs to his room, spent the entire night copying the Epistle to Barnabas, He tried to get the monks to let him have the MSS, but iwthout avail. The next morning he left and returned to Cairo where the same monls have another Monastary. Here the head monk sent for the MMS, and it was presented to Tichendorf. Presented in the usual Oriental understanding that a gift wqs to follow. The gift did follow , and in the course of time the MMS was placed in 1869 in Library of St Petersburg.

This proved to be practically a complete MMS. of old and N. T. It is the only complete N.T. known to be in existance. There are 346 1/2 leaves in all. of these 147 1/2 are given over to the N.T. including Epistle of Barnarbas and Shepherd of Hermas. The date is very old. I will enumerate the reasons that Gregory gives for believing it to be old. 1-fine parchment. 2-4colums on page. 3 - forms of letters old. 4- Initial letter thrust out. 5-Rarity of punctuation.

6-less pure forms in spelling. 7-Short titles. 8-large chapters. 9-- Epistles of Paul after Gospels. 10- Mark 16,9-2o not included. 11-- Epistle of Barnabas, and Shepherd of Hermas included.

As to the exact date and source of the MMs there has been much speculation. Many scholars believe ~~xxxxx~~ that it is early fourth Century, and others put it late fourth century. Some of the ~~xxxx~~ scholars carry it back to the time of Constantine. Whether the connection is merely imaginary or not, it is hard to say. ~~xxxxx~~ Eusebius , the great Church Historian wrote a life of Constantine. He says,in that life,that in the year 331, Constantine caused Eusebius to have 50 bibles made by the best Scribes and given to the nearest Churches. Eusebius says that these books were written 'three wise and fourwise.' Just what is meant by this phrase is not certain but Gregory and others suppose it to refer to the number of colums to a page, and he and others believe that in this MMS Aleph found in the Monastary on Mount Sinai in 1844 and 59 we have one of those books ordered by Constantine in ~~xx~~ 331.

The Codex Alexandrinus A.

Fifth Century. Brittish Museum.

When and hwere it was written is not known, but all evidences point to the fifth century.

In the year 1098 this book was presented to the Patriarch at Alexandria.

In 1628 it was presented by Cyril Lucar who was patriarch at Constantinople, presented it to Charles I , king of England. It has been issued in photographic edition.

B. Codex Vaticanus.

Fourth Century, Vatican library.

759 leaves. 142 for new Testament. 3 colums.

Both old and New Testament. not including Macabbes. 46 chapters in genesis are lacking. From Hebrews 9,25 to the end, in N.T. leaves are gone.

The vatican Library had this MMS in 1475 when a catalogue of the library was made. But it was not until the 19th Century that the value of the book was discovered. A phptographic Edition was published in 1889.

Rejected passages.

Just to show what effect this long process of investigation has had on the the meaning of the Bible, it will be worth while to take up some of the Important Passages of the Authorized version that have been effected.

In giving the evidence of these passages I am tiving the evidene accepted by practically all scholars.

First Mark 16,9-20.

Omitted in the two oldest MMs. Although space is left for it in the Vatican MMS. It is included in Uncial MMS of the 5th and 6th Cent Westcoot and Hort devote 23 pages of fine print to the discussion of the point , and conclude that it did not belong to the original Mark. Gregory, whose work on the N.T. is one of the best of the conservative sort, says, "Mark 16,9-20 is neither part nor parcel of that Gospel."

"A few years ago no one could answer that question" (Where the passage came from) "Now we can answer it, for Frederick Cornwallis Coneybeare found an old Armenian MMS. that named these verses as frm the Presbyter Aristion, and thus far no good reason has been found for doubting his authorship. Aristion is called by Papias a disciple of the Lord." In MMS 14, 12th century, ay Paris dontains this after 16,8.
very interesting note written in Gold, "b In some of the copies, up to this point the evangelist is finished, but in many this also is added."

It is the concunsus that whatever may be the value of this passage it does not belong to Mark.

Rejected passages.

John 7,53 --8,11.

This is the story about the owman taken in Adultery. It is one of the most commonly read passages in the Early Christian Church. Eusebius says that it was in the Gospel according to the Hebrews . Gregory says that no other group of verses show such manifold variations in reading. In other words this is one of the beloved of the early Church? So far as all evidences go to show it was not in the early copies of the Gospel of John. ~~Is found in the text~~ ~~in MSS, and where it is found the~~ ~~that it is very doubtful as to what the true text is~~

Says Westcott and Hort. "It is absent from all extant Greek MMS containing any considerable pre-syrian ~~reading~~ element of any kind except western D. and from all extant Greek MMS earlier than Cent. VIII with the same exception. In the whole range of Greek Patristic Literature before the Century X or XII there is but one trace of knowledge of its Existance."

In the Latin Texts it is absent from the earliest MSS.

"Thus the first seven centuries supply no tangible evidence for it except in D. Greek MSS. , the Latin Vulgate.

I John V, 7-8

"Westcott and Hort.

" There is not evidence for the inserted words in Greek, or in any language but Latin before Century XIV, when they appear in a greek work written in defense of the Roman communion , with clear marks of translation from the Vulgate. For at least the first four centuries and a half Latin evidence is wanting. " Said Gregory, "The on passage in the New Testament of our ancestors which had not the slightest claim to a place in it was the passage to which I alluded a while back, in the First Epistle of John." 509.

It defense it is said that the ~~xxxxxxx~~ is found in three Greek MSS.

One of these is 61, Codex Montfortianus at Dublin.

Greek test here changed to donfirm to Latin text which contained the ~~xxxx~~ passage.

Also the second place the Epistles of the MSS were written about the time Erasmus , in accord with a promise, inserted the passage into the third edition of ~~the~~ his Greek New Testament.

~~MSS~~ Second, MMS in Greek in which the passage appears is a fourteenh century double Column MSS, with the left hand column latin, and the right hand greek. The test of the two languages corresponds line for line. The scribe has translated the latin words of this passage into Greek and thus supplied the void.

Third ~~Mssxxxxxxx~~ Greek MSS which contains this passage is one at Naples. It is a straight Greek MSS, and does not contain this passage in the text, but some modern hand has written the passage in an the Margin.

Luke XXII 43-44. In some of the old documents this appears. In others it is omitted, and in others marked as spurious.

Matthew XVI 2-3. When it is evening ye say, fair weather for the sky is growing red. And in the morning ; A storm to-day . For the sky is growing red and lowering. Ye know how to tell the face of the sky , but the signs of the times ye cannot."

While no special significance is involved in these words, yet there has been serious objection to dropping them , even thought the MSS would seem to demand it Leading MSS. Against Aleph, B.V.X Gamma . Most MSS known to Jerome.

Westcott and Hort. ""Both documentary evidence and the impossibility of accounting for omission prove these words to be no part of the text of Matthew. " Aleph A.B.R.T. against. Very many early MSS.

Hogn 5, 3-4

Another Angel passage. All old MSS. Against it.

Romans 9,5

This is a question of punctuation. The oldest MSS Aleph B.and A have no punctuation in the passage. C and some good cursives have a perios after Sarka. Just the difference in this punctuation makes a difference in the meaning as follows. In the one case the phrase ,"Who is over all, refers to Christ, and in the other case to God.

[The Origin and History of the Bible]

[Lecture II: History of Early Bible Manuscripts]

Earl C. Davis

1. A: Questions

One question has been asked concerning the difficulties of translation. Are there any cases where a passage in the original is capable of such variations in translation as would give different meanings?

The answer is that there are many such.

For example, in that passage in the Acts, 17:22, which in the authorized version was translated,

> Then Paul stood up in the midst of Mars' Hill, and said, "Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious."

Whereas a perfectly proper translation of the passage would be

> And Paul stood up in the midst of the Areopagus, and said, "Ye men of Athens, in all things I perceive that ye are more than ordinarily devout."

The Roman Catholic Bible translates,

> Do penance, for the kingdom of God is at hand.[1]

Instead of:

> Repent; for the kingdom of God is at hand.

Luke, 16:9, authorized version:

> Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness.

Revised version:

---

[1] Matthew 3:2.

> Make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness.

Or in John, 4:24, "Pneuma O theos" is translated, "God is a spirit" with a marginal rendering, "God is spirit." Another possible rendering is, "God is life."

Or to use a more debatable case. In Mark 2:10 and 2:28, and Matthew 12:8, 12:32, and 16:13, the Greek phrase, "o uios tou anthropou," is translated, "the son of man" with a special meaning of a messianic character attached. Yet there are certain very pressing considerations which have been recognized by many scholars since at least 1569 which point to the simple word, "man," as the proper translation of this phrase. In fact, it is doubtful if the Aramaic word, "Bar Nasha," which Jesus must have used, could have any other meaning than simply, "man." All these passages are concerning events and sayings alleged to have occurred prior to the supposed messianic declaration at Ceasarea Phillippli, Matthew 16:13ff.

2. B: The Search for the Original Bible, "Textual Criticism"

In following out the account of the translation of the Bible into English, we came upon a very complicated problem which Bible scholars have not found, up [to] this time, and probably never will find, a final answer to.

Wycliffe translated the Bible from the Latin Vulgate.[2]

Tyndale. "The New Testament dylygently corrected and compared with the Greek by William Tindale,…"[3]

Coverdale. "Faithfully and Truly translated out of Douche and Latin."[4] Coverdale's five interpreters:

---

[2] John Wycliffe (c.1328-1384) English scholastic philosopher who provided the first translation of the Bible into English in 1384.

[3] William Tyndale (c.1494-1536) English Biblical scholar and linguist. Here Davis provides the original title to Tyndale's translation of the New Testament, first published in 1534, *The New Testament diligently corrected and compared with the Greek,* see David Daniell's *A Modern-spelling edition of the 1534 Translation,* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

[4] Part of the title to Myles Coverdale's (1488-1569) 1535 translation of the Bible.

1. Swiss-German by Swingli.[5]
2. Luther's German.[6]
3. The Vulgate.[7]
4. The Latin Bible of 1528 by Pagnini.[8]
5. Either Tyndale's or some German version.

Great Bible. "Truly translated after the veryte of the Hebrew and Greek texts."[9]

Edition of 1611. "Translated out of the Original Tongues."[10]

Even these old introductions to translations indicate the difficulty of even so simple a task as translating. The moment one begins translating the Bible, or for that matter, reading it seriously, one is confronted by [a] great number of varied readings, and varied translations, and corruptions in the text. While such errors in the text do not seriously affect the person who takes a modern view of the Bible, they are incompatible with the doctrine of peculiar inspiration. For even if the original Bible were absolutely correct and might be worthy of unquestioning confidence in case we had it, yet the fact remains that while we have what may be regarded as a substantially true text, so much of error has been proved in the text and manuscripts as they exist that an element of uncertainty pervades the entire text. All through Christian history, and in pre-Christian history, scholars, translators, and scribes have been working on this task of either keeping the text pure or searching for the pure original text.

This is what is called "Textual Criticism." It is often spoken of, by people who do not know, as if "Textual Criticism" were

---

[5] Ulrich Zwingli (1484-1531) Swiss leader of the Reformation in Switzerland.
[6] Martin Luther (1483-1546) German priest and seminal figure of the Reformation.
[7] A fourth-century Latin translation of the Bible produced primarily by St. Jerome (c.342-420) early Christian priest born in the area now identified as modern Croatia or Slovenia.
[8] Santes Pagnino (1470-1541) Italian Dominican friar and Biblical scholar.
[9] The Great Bible of 1539 was the first authorized edition of the Bible in English, authorized by King Henry VIII. It was prepared by Myles Coverdale working under commission from Thomas Cromwell.
[10] The Bible edition of 1611, commonly referred to as the King James Bible, still in wide use today.

the device of some heretical devil to destroy faith in the scripture. Such is not the case. Textual Criticism is the attempt to find, or to reproduce, the oldest and most primitive copy of the Bible.

While Textual Criticism applies to the entire Bible, both Old and New Testaments, the fact of a fairly well-defined Old Testament text, although very much subject to serious errors, makes the story of the New Testament text [the] most interesting and illuminating for our purposes.

The Canon of Pope Gelasius, A.D. 492-494.[11]

> Likewise the order of the Scriptures of the New Testament, which the Holy Roman Catholic Church receives and venerates: Four books of the Gospels, that is Matthew, one book; Mark, one book, Luke, one book; John, one book. Likewise the Acts of the Apostles, one book; the Epistles of Paul, fourteen in number; the Apocalypse, one book; Apostolic Epistles, in number, seven; of Peter the Apostle, in number, two; of James the Apostle, in number, one; of John the Apostle, in number, three; of Jude the Zealot, in number one."[12]

Thus, so far as the Western Church is concerned, ended a controversy which had been going on for two-hundred years, namely as to what books should be included in the New Testament, or New Covenant, to be read and used as Scripture.

In the Syrian branch of the Christian Church only the four Gospels and the Epistles of Paul and the Acts of the Apostles were recognized as Bible. A manuscript has been found as late as 1470 in which the scribe says, after the Epistles of Paul, "We append also letters of apostles not acknowledged by all."[13]

When Wycliffe translated the New Testament into English, and a century and a half later when Tyndale did the same thing, the

---

[11] Pope Gelasius I bishop of Rome from 492-496, birthdate unknown, likely in Roman North Africa, died, 496.

[12] This Papal declaration is quoted in Henry Clay Vedder (1853-1935; American Baptist church historian), *Our New Testament: How Did We Get It?,* Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1908, p. 379.

[13] This line is quoted in Edward Caldwell Moore's (1851-1943, American theologian) *The New Testament in the Christian Church, Eight Lectures,* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1904, p. 189.

translation was of these 27 books from the Vulgate in the case of Wycliffe, and from the Greek and Latin in the case of Tyndale. The Complutensian Polyglot of 1520 had the Hebrew, Greek and the Latin. Now Hebrew was the language of the Old Testament originals. While Jesus and probably most of the disciples used the Aramaic language, yet all the written sources of the New Testament were in Greek, with the possible exception of one source that has been lost. So, for our interests, the task of Textual Criticism of the New Testament has been to discover the oldest and the most accurate copy of the New Testament or any portion of it.

3. C: Textual Criticism [: The Manuscripts]

Prior to the discovery of the art of printing around 1453, the copies of the Bible were made by scribes. The books were copied letter by letter. Parchment and papyrus were used. This was very exacting work. In spite of the closest watch, many errors crept in. Most of these were unintentional. Some of them bear the evidence of well-intentioned editing, and in a few cases of late date, the suggestion of over-confident supplementary notes.

Of the vast number of manuscripts that were made during these thirteen-hundred years, only about 3,000 have come to light. Doubtless there are many others stored away in some corner of the ecclesiastical buildings and libraries of the East. It is believed by many that there are still many very valuable manuscripts in Constantinople and that they will come to light if ever Constantinople comes under the control of Christians again.

The oldest of these manuscripts dates to somewhere in the fourth century, perhaps around 330 A.D. Many of the others are very late, and most of them after the year 1000.

Of this number, many are merely fragments, some simply a scrap of a manuscript.

They are divided into two classes:
   a. Large Letter Greek manuscripts;
   b. Small Letter Greek manuscripts.

Of the 3,000 Greek manuscripts, all but about 125 are written in the small letter. That immediately settles the question as to the date of their making for the use of the small letters, or "miniscules," did not develop until the 9th century. But it must be noted that the fact of a late date of a manuscript does not

of necessity determine its value, for it may have been copied from a very old and very good manuscript since lost.

There are about 125 Large Letter Greek manuscripts, or "Uncials," as they are called. These Large Letter manuscripts are the oldest and come the nearest to what may be called an "original Bible." Of the 125 manuscripts of this class many are merely fragments, one leaf or two leaves. This group boils down to five that are regarded as the oldest and most important:

1.	Aleph. Codex Sinaiaticus	4th century	St. Petersburg
2.	A. Codex Alexandrinus	5th century	British Museum
3.	B. Codex Vaticanus	4th century	Vatican Library
4.	C. Codex Ephraemi	5th century	Paris
5.	D. Codex Bezae	6th century	Cambridge

Of these, the first one, Aleph, is the only one that contains the New Testament complete, and, in addition, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Shepherd of Hermas. The task of editing a text of the Bible or New Testament, is the task of taking these manuscripts, and by a process of comparison, getting at the probably true reading in any passage in question.

The nature of this task is seen in the fact that there are something like 200,000 variations in reading in these manuscripts. Of these 200,000 variations, most of them are very small and unimportant. There are only about four hundred where the meaning is very much involved, and perhaps less than 20 where there is [a] vital issue.

There are three passages found in the Authorized version that ought not to be there at all, if the oldest manuscripts are to be the guide: John 5:7-8; Mark 16:9-20; John 7:53-8:11.

[There are] three other passages that probably should go: Luke 22:43-44; Matthew 16:2-3 and John 5:3-4.

[In] Romans 9:5 punctuation determines meaning.

Romans, chapters 15-16. [sic]

All these are simply questions of the text. Which manuscript is right, and which is nearest to the earliest.

4. D: The Manuscripts

The examination and study of all these manuscripts upon the text of the New Testament has been a very great work. Many a great scholar has given his life to it. Into the detail of it we cannot go here. But it is important to point out that as a result of this study, the manuscripts are found to group themselves into certain families. They are distinguished by the peculiar reading, and characteristic variations. The discovery of this relationship of manuscripts has simplified the task of criticism very much indeed. In fact, as I will illustrate later, the task comes down to one of judgement concerning readings of the two Big Letter manuscripts which I have spoken of, and then checking with certain other manuscripts. The amount of work involved in this is perfectly enormous. Among those who have given their lives to the work may be mentioned Lachmann, Tragelles, Tichendorf, and Messrs Westcott and Hort.[14] These last English churchmen are the editors of what is commonly regarded as the best text of the Greek Bible. Their edition in Greek is based upon Aleph and B, or Vaticanus. Where these two agree, they prevail over all others, and B prevails over Aleph.

In this edition of Westcott and Hort, at the end of the book, they give a list of readings that are included in the authorized version, and which they have rejected from this edition because they are not to be found in the oldest and best manuscripts, and which are of enough importance to be called, "noteworthy, rejected readings." There are 335 of them. In addition, there are 65 "noteworthy, suspected readings." A little later, the most important of these will be referred to again in detail.

The history of the finding of some of these manuscripts is often very interesting. For example, the story of Aleph is almost a romance. In 1844 Constantine Tischendorf visited the Monastery of St. Catherine at Mount Sinai.

---

[14] Karl Konrad Friedrich Wilhelm Lachmann (1793-1851) German philologist and critic. Samuel Prideaux Tregelles (1813-1875) English biblical scholar, lexicographer, Christian Hebraist. Lobegott Friedrich Constantin Tischendorf (1815-1874) German biblical scholar who discovered the oldest complete Bible dated to the mid-4th century. Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901) English bishop and biblical scholar. Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892) Irish-born theologian and editor. Together, Westcott and Hort edited a *New Testament in the Original Greek,* first published in 1891.

While there he found in a waste basket forty-three leaves of an old manuscript.[15] He also saw some more leaves, but they refused to let him have them, so he copied one of them. These forty-three leaves contained parts of the Old Testament. Tischendorf at once saw the value of this fragment and kept still about it. In 1853, nine years later, he made another visit to the monastery in hopes of getting some more of the same manuscripts. He found only a few leaves of Genesis. In 1859, he went again to look for the manuscript. After spending several days in fruitless search, he was on the point of leaving. In fact, the camels had already been ordered to take him away when one of the monks took down from a shelf some old leaves of a manuscript. Tischendorf recognized it at once. He took the manuscripts to his room, spent the entire night copying the Epistle to Barnabas. He tried to get the monks to let him have the manuscript, but without avail. The next morning, he left and returned to Cairo where the same monks have another Monastery. Here the head monk sent for the manuscript, and it was presented to Tischendorf. Presented in the usual Oriental understanding that a gift was to follow. The gift did follow, and in the course of time the manuscript was placed in 1869 in the Library of St. Petersburg.

This proved to practically a complete manuscript of Old and New Testaments. It is the only complete N.T. known to be in existence. There are 346½ leaves in all. Of these, 147½ are given over to the New Testament, including [the] Epistle of Barnabas and [the] Shepherd of Hermas. The date is very old. I will enumerate the reasons that Gregory gives for believing it to be old. 1. Fine parchment. 1. 4 columns on page. 3. Forms of letters, old. 4. Initial letter thrust out. 5. Rarity of punctuation. 6. Less pure forms in spelling. 7. Short titles. 8. Large chapters. 9. Epistles of Paul after Gospels. 10. Mark 16:9-20 not included. 11. Epistle of Barnabas, and Shepherd of Hermas included.

As to the exact date and source of the manuscript there has been much speculation. Many scholars believe that it is early fourth century, and others put it late fourth century. Some of the scholars carry it back to the time of Constantine. Whether the connection is merely imaginary or not, it is hard to say. Eusebius, the great Church Historian, wrote a life of

---

[15] This paragraph and the next one follow closely, but do not exactly quote, Harold Bruce Hunting (1879-1958), *The Story of Our Bible: How It Grew to be what it is,* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915, pp. 269-270.

Constantine. He says, in that life, that in the year 331, Constantine caused Eusebius to have 50 bibles made by the best scribes and given to the nearest churches. Eusebius says that those books were written, "three-wise and four-wise." Just what is meant by the phrase is not certain, but Gregory and others suppose it refers to the number of columns to a page, and he and others believe that in this manuscript Aleph, found in the Monastery on Mount Sinai in 1844 and 1859 we have one of those books ordered by Constantine in 331.

The Codex Alexandrinus A. Fifth Century. British Museum. When and where it was written is not known, but all evidences point to the fifth century. In the year 1098 this book was presented to the Patriarch at Alexandria. In 1628 it was presented by Cyril Lucar, who was the Patriarch at Constantinople, earlier of Alexandria, to Charles I, King of England. It has been issued in photographic editon.

B. Codex Vaticanus. Fourth Century. Vatican Library. 759 leaves. 142 for the New Testament. 3 columns. Both Old and New Testament, not including Maccabees. 46 chapters in Genesis are lacking. From Hebrews 9:25 to the end, in New Testament leaves are gone. The Vatican Library had this manuscript in 1475 when a catalogue of the library was made. But it was not until the 19th century that the value of the book was discovered. A photographic edition was published in 1889.

5. E: Rejected Passages

Just to show what effect this long process of investigation has had on the meaning of the Bible, it will be worthwhile to take up some of the important passages of the authorized version that have been effected.

In giving the evidence on these passages I am giving the evidence accepted by practically all scholars.

First, Mark 16:9-20. Omitted in the two oldest manuscripts. Although space is left for it in the Vatican manuscript. It is included in the Uncial manuscript of the 5th and 6th centuries. Westcott and Hort devote 23 pages of fine print to the discussion of the point and conclude that it did not belong to

the original Mark.[16] Gregory, whose work on the New Testament is one of the best of the conservative sort, says, "Mark 16:9-20 is neither part nor parcel of that Gospel."

> A few years ago, no one could answer the question (Where the passage came from). Now we can answer it, for Frederick Cornwallis Conybeare found an old Armenian manuscript that named these versus as from the Presbyter Aristion, and thus far no good reason has been found for doubting his authorship. Aristion is called by Papias a disciple of the Lord…[17]

In manuscript 14, 12th century, Paris, contains this very interesting note written in Gold after 16:8. "In some of the copies, up to this point the evangelist is finished. But in many this also is added."[18]

It is the consensus that whatever may be the value of this passage, it does not belong to Mark.

John 7:53-8:11. This is the story about the woman taken in Adultery. It is one of the most commonly read passages in the Early Christian Church. Eusebius says that it was in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Gregory says that no other group of verses show such manifold variations in reading. In other words, this is one of the beloved of the early church. So far as all evidences go, they show it was not in the early copies of the Gospel of John. Says Westcott and Hort:

> It is absent from all extant Greek manuscripts containing any considerable Pre-Syrian element of any kind except western D; and from all extant Greek manuscripts earlier than Cent. VIII with the same exception. In the whole range of Greek patristic literature before the Century (X

---

[16] See Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek, Introduction, Appendix,* London: Macmillan and Co., 1896, pp. 29-51.

[17] Caspar René Gregory (1846-1917, American-born German theologian) *Canon and Text of the New Testament,* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907, p. 511.

[18] This quotation is provided in Caspar René Gregory, *Canon and Text of the New Testament,* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907, p. 372.

> or) XII there is but one trace of knowledge of its existence.[19]

In the Latin texts it is absent from the earliest manuscripts.

> Thus, the first seven centuries supply no tangible evidence for it except in D, Greek manuscript, … the Latin Vulgate.[20]

1 John 5:7-8. Westcott and Hort:

> There is no evidence for the inserted words in Greek, or in any language but Latin before Century XIV, when they appear in a Greek work written in defense of the Roman communion, with clear marks of translation from the Vulgate. For at least the first four centuries and a half Latin evidence is equally wanting.[21]

Said Gregory:

> The one passage in the New Testament of our ancestors which had not the slightest claim to a place in it was the passage to which I alluded a while back, in the First Epistle of John. 509.[22]

In defense it is said that the [passage] is found in three Greek manuscripts. One of these is 61, Codex Montfortianus at Dublin. Greek text here changed to conform to Latin text which contained the passage.

Also, the second place the Epistles of the manuscripts were written about the time Erasmus, in accord with a promise, inserted the passage into the third edition of his Greek New Testament.

---

[19] Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek, Introduction, Appendix,* London: Macmillan and Co., 1896, p. 85.

[20] Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek, Introduction, Appendix,* London: Macmillan and Co., 1896, pp. 85-86.

[21] Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek, Introduction, Appendix,* London: Macmillan and Co., 1896, p. 104.

[22] Caspar René Gregory, *Canon and Text of the New Testament,* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907, p. 509.

Second. Manuscripts in Greek in which the passage appears is a fourteenth century double column manuscript with the left-hand column Latin and the right-hand Greek. The texts of the two languages corresponds line-for-line. The scribe has translated the Latin words of this passage into Greek and thus supplied the void.

Third. [The] Greek manuscript which contains this passage is [the] one at Naples. It is a straight Greek manuscript, and does not contain this passage in the text, but some modern hand has written the passage in the margin.

Luke 22:43-44. In some of the old documents this appears. In others it is omitted, and in others marked as spurious.

Matthew 16:2-3.

> When it is evening ye say, fair weather, for the sky is growing red.
>
> And in the morning; A storm today. For the sky is growing red and lowering. Ye know how to tell the face of the sky, but the signs of the times ye cannot.[23]

While no special significance is involved in these words, yet there has been serious objection to dropping them, even though the manuscripts would seem to demand it. Leading manuscripts. Against Aleph, B.V.X. Gamma. Most manuscripts known to Jerome. Westcott and Hort:

> Both documentary evidence and the impossibility of accounting for omission prove these words to be no part of the text of Matthew.[24]

John 5:3-4. Another angel passage. All old manuscripts [are] against it.

Romans 9:5. This is a question of punctuation. The oldest manuscripts, Aleph B and A, have no punctuation in the passage. C and some good cursives have a period after Sarka. Just the difference in this punctuation makes a difference in the meaning

---

[23] Matthew 16:2-3.

[24] Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek, Introduction, Appendix,* London: Macmillan and Co., 1896, p. 13.

as follows. In the one case, the phrase, “Who is over all,” refers to Christ, and in the other case, to God.[25]

[25] Romans 9:5: “Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came<<,>> who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen”