

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1861.

No. I.

ARTICLE I.—*The State of the Country.*

THERE are periods in the history of every nation when its destiny for ages may be determined by the events of an hour. There are occasions when political questions rise into the sphere of morals and religion; when the rule for political action is to be sought, not in considerations of state policy, but in the law of God. On such occasions the distinction between secular and religious journals is obliterated. When the question to be decided turns on moral principles, when reason, conscience, and religious sentiment are to be addressed, it is the privilege and duty of all who have access in any way to the public ear, to endeavour to allay unholy feeling, and to bring truth to bear on the minds of their fellow-citizens. If any other consideration be needed to justify the discussion, in these pages, of the disruption of this great confederacy, it may be found, not only in the portentous consequences of such disruption to the welfare and happiness of the country and to the general interests of the world, but also in its bearing on the church of Christ and the progress of his kingdom. Until within a few years there was no diversity of opinion on this subject. It was admitted that the value of the union of these states did not admit of calculation. As no man allowed himself to count the worth of

lands. The native ministry, moreover, had passed into the second generation; and from our schools and orphan asylums, the native apostles would arise, whose crown of rejoicing would be multitudes of Christian converts. They ought not, therefore, to indulge in a spirit of despondency, but rather lift up their hearts in devout gratitude to Almighty God, for the great success with which he has so far blessed missionary labours; and indulge in the joyful hope of still greater blessings in days to come.

ART. VI.—*Codex Alexandrinus. Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ.*
 Novum Testamentum Græce ex Antiquissimo Codice Alexandrino a C. G. Woide olim descriptum: ad fidem ipsius codicis denuo accuratius edidit B. H. Cowper. Londini, MDCCCLX. 8vo. pp. 503. Leipzig: Printed by B. G. Tuebner.

Notitia editionis Codicis Bibliorum Sinaitici auspiciis Imperatoris Alexandri II. susceptæ. Accedit Catalogus Codicum nuper ex Oriente Petropolin perlatorum. Item Origenis Scholia in Proverbia Salomonis partim nunc primum, partim secundum atque emendatius edita, cum duabus tabulis lapidi incisis. Edidit Aenoth. Frid. Const. Tischendorf. Lipsiæ. 1860. 4to. pp. 124.

BIBLICAL criticism has already made vast advances toward the accomplishment of its task, and is still urging its way steadily forward. The first printed editions of the Greek Testament, like those of classic authors, were necessarily inaccurate, for they were based upon whatever manuscripts chanced to be accessible to the editors. And the texts of Stephanus and of the Elzevirs—the latter of which became the *textus receptus* upon the Continent, and the former, as adopted by Mill, the *textus receptus* in England—owed this distinction more to a beautiful typography and the repute of the publishers, than to their inherent excellence or superior accuracy. But little was in fact known of the comparative value of manuscript authorities, the extent of agreement or divergence between their several

readings, or the best methods of detecting and eliminating their errors.

Nevertheless copies of the original Scriptures existed in the libraries of Europe, which had never yet been read nor examined. Many more lay hid in the convents of Egypt and the East, which might be recovered from their obscurity. Translations had been made into various languages at a very early period. The writings of the Christian Fathers abound in citations from the sacred volume, exhibiting the text which they respectively had before them. The materials for ensuring accuracy in an edition of the inspired volume are ample. They are sufficient, if not to restore every word and letter as it appeared in the original handwriting of the evangelists and apostles, at least to approximate indefinitely such a result. But the task was herculean; the very abundance of materials was appalling. To examine not cursorily but with careful accuracy these enormous accumulations of ages, to ascertain and record their contents, digesting them within a manageable compass, to determine their respective affinities, judge intelligently of their comparative value, and by the thorough sifting of the entire mass of testimony, to discriminate the true from the false, and the genuine reading from every rival claimant, is a work which seems to be almost endless. Not one nor fifty lives were adequate to complete it. Mill spent thirty years most laboriously upon it, and yet never advanced beyond the threshold of the undertaking.

It is true that all this expenditure of toil may have no very direct or palpable effect upon theology or morals. If the most inaccurate Greek Testament that ever was issued were to be accepted as the standard, the creed of Christendom would undergo no material change, nor would any of the great facts or teachings of revelation be invalidated. The ascertaining of this was, however, worth a great deal. If the whole multitude of various readings and inaccuracies of transcription cannot shake anything that is really precious in Christianity, who would grudge the expenditure of the time and the industry necessary to demonstrate this fact, and thus settle the convictions of the Christian world upon a firmer basis for all time to come?

But the intelligent Biblical student must necessarily look upon it as a matter of high and serious concern to have restored to him the very words of inspiration; to have its surface cleansed from the rust and accretions of ages, which dim its brightness and deform its beauty, even if they do not seriously impair its solidity or value; to have every alteration of an apostle's language, whether made by accident or design, whether it be in itself considered trivial or not, corrected into its original form. If it be a mere question of the collocation of words, or of the substitution of an equivalent expression, or the vindication to each verse of its own precise language, as distinguished from other and parallel passages of equal authority and inspiration, still let it be pressed to a satisfactory answer. Why should there be a careful investigation of all available sources in order to a faithful reproduction of every turn of expression in the writings of Plato, and it be esteemed a matter of indifference what were the precise words of Matthew or of Paul, provided the general sense is not seriously affected? If the point involved were so minute that it could not be made to appear in any translation, yet let us have it as it was written by the pen of inspiration rather than otherwise. Questions, however, are perpetually arising which possess a real intrinsic consequence. Unexpected light has often been thrown upon an obscure clause or a difficult word, by correcting its inaccuracy and restoring its original form. The beauty or meaning of an incident, the value of a note of time for purposes of chronological reckoning, and the bearing of a passage, may depend upon the use of a preposition or an article, or the presence or absence of a single letter, or even a single line of a letter.

In computations of the duration of our Lord's ministry, for example, it is of some moment whether John v. 1, should read *a feast* or *the feast*. If the latter be the correct reading, the passover is, in all probability, the one intended, as that was the principal festival of the Jews; and, in that case, as three other passovers are mentioned in the same gospel, the ministry of our Lord must have lasted for upwards of three years. If the former be the true reading, it becomes an open question whether it was not the feast of Tabernacles or of Purim

or some other of the inferior festivals, and then his public work may be reduced by a year. Tischendorf inserts the definite article η $\xi\omicron\rho\tau\eta$, and finds this, with a great number of other readings of his previous editions, confirmed by the important manuscript which he has recently discovered.

The famous critical puzzle in 1 Tim. iii. 16, rests upon a single stroke. The presence of a horizontal stroke in the centre of the letter, or its absence, will decide whether we are to read *OC* or *θC*, the abbreviation for *θEOC*, who was manifest in the flesh, or *God was manifest in the flesh*. It is well known what a conspicuous part the Alexandrine Manuscript has borne in this discussion, how it has been examined again and again by the naked eye and by the aid of powerful lenses, to ascertain whether its testimony was given in favour of one letter or the other, whether the appearance of a horizontal stroke was real or imaginary, whether it is an original part of the letter or is a subsequent addition, and whether it actually belongs to the letter or is due to the thinness of the parchment, and the existence of a corresponding stroke upon its opposite side. The present editor of this important Codex, who appears to have executed his task with the most scrupulous regard to accuracy, says that the reading at present is unquestionably *θC*, but in the existing state of the manuscript it is impossible to ascertain by any diligence of inspection whether this, or *OC*, was the word as originally written. The transverse line is only what may be called a mere shadow, as if a pen almost dry had touched it, and that recently. Woide quotes authorities for the existence of the line, but it is, they say, no more than can be seen now, a mere shadow across the letter, nearly at its centre, rather above than beneath it. On the opposite side of the vellum are the two letters *TE*, of the words *KATEΥCEBEIAN*, 1 Tim. vi. 3, in inverse order of course, so that *E* comes under *θ* and *T* under *C*. The perpendicular line of the *T* is coincident with the centre of curve of *C*, and at the point of coincidence is a small hole passing through both letters, and caused by the corrosive power of the ink in both. The *E* falling under what we read as *θ*, although not absolutely coincident with it, increases the difficulty of deciding. The mere absence or invisibility of the cross line of the theta would not of itself

be demonstrative, because it has disappeared in a number of cases about which no question ever has been, or ever will be, raised. There is a line drawn over the disputed letters as a sign of contraction, which would certainly decide in favour of *ΘEOC*, were it not that this is plainly modern, and it is impossible to say whether it overlies a more ancient one, because of its extent, and because it is visible on the other side of the vellum, which is here extremely thin. The editor adds in this connection: "It can never be sufficiently regretted that some comparatively modern pen has been rashly employed upon the manuscript, and that modern fingers have been applied to it here with equal discredit to their owners, and the almost entire obliteration of a number of the letters. Certainly no fingers ought to be allowed to play upon these pages save, perhaps, those of *ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς*. We hope that henceforth there will be no more endeavours *demonstrare digito* the true reading of this passage; and, indeed, that the Museum authorities will studiously resist all who wish to have the clause at their fingers' ends." According to Tischendorf, his recently discovered Sinaitic Manuscript originally read *OC* in this passage, but some corrector, of comparatively modern date, has changed it to *θC*, so cautiously, however, as to have left the original writing intact. Whether this judgment shall be held to be final and decisive, we shall learn when others have reported the results of their examination.

All critics are agreed that the oldest manuscript is *caeteris paribus* the most reliable; since in proportion as it approaches the age of the original work, the opportunity for the admission of transcriptural errors is reduced. This general principle is so liable to be modified by particular circumstances, that the most varying estimates have been put upon the manuscripts conceded to be of the greatest age. The most recent investigations have tended strongly to increase the esteem in which they are held. Lachmann went so far as to exclude all authorities from any voice in the determination of the text which were later than about the fourth century. Tischendorf, who is the prince of living Biblical critics, adopts a less rigorous rule; he bases his text exclusively on the most ancient manuscripts, and includes under this expression such as were

written before the ninth century. Tregelles proposes to admit later manuscripts of approved value as collateral witnesses, but not to adopt any reading on their testimony alone. Such a preponderance accorded to the most ancient manuscripts as a class, immensely increases the weight attached to each of them individually, inasmuch as they are few in number compared with the multitudes of more modern date.

Priceless as these jewels are, they are exceedingly frail, increasingly so in proportion to their antiquity and value; and a slight casualty might now deprive the world of what has escaped the risks of thirteen or fourteen centuries. Manuscripts known to have been in existence at a comparatively recent period, which have in fact been consulted and described since the labours of modern critics began, have been lost or wholly disappeared. Some have been subjected to wanton injury, and thievish collectors of curiosities have gratified their itching propensity by carrying off a page of some world-renowned Codex. Some have lost their outer leaves through the negligence of those who had them in charge for want of proper binding. Others have been rebound, and thus exposed to fresh hazards. A notable instance is afforded by a valuable palimpsest in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, whose fate Tregelles thus describes:* “The pages have been unmercifully strengthened in parts by pasting paper or vellum over the margins; leaving indeed the cursive writing untouched, but burying the uncial letters of so much greater value. Also in places there were fragments all rough at the edges of the leaves; and these have been cut away so as to make all smooth and neat; and thus many words and parts of words are now gone irrecoverably. And besides, the binder seems to have taken the traces of the ancient writing for dirt marks, and thus they have been in parts industriously obliterated; and in those places in which the writing instrument of the ancient copyist had deeply furrowed the vellum, a new surface of size or something of the kind has been superadded.” The Codex Alexandrinus has suffered in this way since it came to England, so far as to have had two or three letters cut off in many places from the inner margin of its leaves. To this must be added the

* Account of the Printed Text of the Greek New Testament, p. 167.

attrition of the leaves and of the letters necessarily attendant upon handling it, even if the greatest care were taken, which unfortunately has not always been the case. The New Testament has been read and consulted far more than the Old at all times, and is therefore more worn. The frequent manipulation to which the volume was formerly subjected, apart from direct contact with the fingers, seems to have caused minute particles of ink to fly off in an impalpable and imperceptible powder. Not only the ink but the vellum itself has gone off in the same form, adding to the number and magnitude of the minute holes occasioned by the silent corrosion of the ink, and which in some places assume the appearance of lace work. Some things are now illegible, which must have been visible even down to the time of Woide; and he noticed the difference of the Codex in some particulars from what it had been at an earlier date.

This subject, as it well might, early engaged the anxious thoughts of Biblical critics, and led to making copies of important codices, not only for private use, but for publication. If this were done with sufficient care, it would obviate the necessity of a fresh collation by every successive critic, thus saving the codex itself from additional damage, and increasing its usefulness by making it accessible and available to numbers who could not personally consult it, besides preventing the needless expenditure of time and labour in doing over what had already been performed before. It would definitely fix all the readings which, in the existing state of the codex, could be ascertained, and some of which, in the inevitable course of events, must shortly disappear; and, what is of the greatest consequence, it would preserve these venerable texts from irreparable loss in case of the destruction or injury of the manuscripts themselves. We learn from Bentley's letter to Mill, that the latter critic had it in contemplation, among his various plans, to publish several of these ancient texts together, after the manner of Origen's Hexapla or of a modern polyglott. The volume was to exhibit at each opening the Codex Alexandrinus and the bilingual Codex Bezae, or where the latter failed, the Codex Laudianus or Codex Claromontanus. The death of Mill within a fortnight after the completion of his critical edition of the New Testament, prevented this project from being carried out.

The texts of these manuscripts and many others have, however, been published since, a work in which Tischendorf has been singularly diligent. Some have even, for the sake of absolute accuracy, been photographed in whole or in part.

The earliest of these publications was that of the Greek and Latin Codex Laudianus of the Acts of the Apostles, issued by Hearne at Oxford in 1715. The New Testament portion of the Alexandrine was first edited by Woide in 1786 in fac-simile. That now before us is not a fac-simile but a reprint of the text in the current Greek letter, like the long-promised and recently issued edition of the Vatican manuscript, by Cardinal Mai. The peculiar orthography of the manuscript, in which it strikingly resembles that of the Vatican, and others of great age, has been scrupulously retained. The plan of the editor was, to alter the text nowhere, however erroneous or defective it may seem to be. Whatever insertions have been made are all in brackets, even when a single letter only has been supplied; and they occur only where there has been a mutilation of the codex, and not where there is an omission in its text. Even manifest *lapsus calami* are retained in the text, though corrected in notes at the foot of the page, where mention is likewise made of corrections in the Codex proceeding from a later than the original scribe, whether erasures, alterations, or additions. Paragraphs are noted in the manuscript by initial letters of a greater than the ordinary size set out in the margin. When a paragraph begins in the middle of a line, it is the first letter of the next line which is thus treated, apparently, both for the purpose of attracting the eye and of saving space. Instances occur in which later scribes, ignorant of the intention of these medial capitals, have preserved them as part of the text. As a rule, no paragraph is admitted into this edition where there is not something similar in the Codex: if the manuscript division seems to be useless or erroneous, it is simply indicated by a capital letter, all other capitals being excluded except at the beginning of a modern chapter or in proper names.

The Ammonian sections and Eusebian canons are also noted in the margin of the Gospels. These have an independent value for purposes of criticism in a certain class of cases.

These sections appear to have been made with a view to a harmony of the Gospels, so that the parallel accounts of the different Evangelists might be arranged side by side, or, at least, ready reference be made from one to another. For still greater convenience of reference, Eusebius distributed the whole into ten canons, the first containing what was common to all the Evangelists, the second third and fourth what was common to three of them, the next five what was common to two, and the tenth what was confined to a single one. The number of the Eusebian canon attached to any particular section, will show in how many and in which of the Gospels it was found; and tables exist showing to which section in those Gospels it answers. This affords a means of correcting any dislocations of the text or transfers of passages from one Gospel to another, which may have taken place since this system of numbering was made out.

The Catholic epistles stand before those of Paul, and Hebrews is inserted in the midst of the writings of this apostle at the end of his epistles to the churches, and before Timothy, Titus, and Philemon. From a statement of the contents made at the beginning of the first volume of the manuscript, it appears originally to have contained, in addition to the proper canon of the New Testament, two epistles of Clement, and eighteen psalms ascribed to Solomon. These psalms, however, together with a part of Clement's second epistle, are now lost. The New Testament is complete, with the exception of the first twenty-four chapters of Matthew, three leaves from second Corinthians, and two from the Gospel of John; these chasms are supplied, in the edition before us, from Kuster's edition of Mill. Unfortunately the gap in John covers the disputed passage respecting the woman taken in adultery. From a computation of the extent of the pages, the editor infers that this narrative could not have formed a part of the manuscript originally. Tischendorf notes its absence from the newly found Sinaitic treasure.

The editor favours the current opinion that the Alexandrine Manuscript was written in Egypt about the middle of the fifth century. To the customary arguments of its Egyptian origin, drawn from the shape of the letters, the peculiar

orthography, the state of the text, and the testimony of tradition, he adds the following interesting corroboration: "At the end of the Catholic epistles two baskets of fruit are depicted in coloured inks. These baskets are of a peculiar form and texture, being narrower at the bottom than at the top, and apparently of fancy wicker work. Each of them is filled with fruit, and this fruit is piled up in a pyramidal form above the basket in regularly decreasing tiers or courses. Happening to visit the Egyptian gallery of the British Museum, we observed upon one of the walls, fragments of an Egyptian painting representing, among other things, baskets of fruit. The resemblance of these to those in Codex A. is so striking that we mentally uttered a *Εὐόρχα*, as we looked at them. We have repeated our comparison of the different representations and we are compelled to regard them as characteristic."

It is claimed that several errors found in Woide's fac-simile have been corrected in this reprint, besides the other advantages which it possesses over that rare and costly edition, of a more convenient size and greater legibility, at least to eyes not familiarized to the uncial character and unspaced words. A page of fac-simile would, however, in our judgment, have been an acceptable addition.

A romantic interest attaches to this volume from its exhibiting a specimen of the New Testament as it has come down to us from fourteen hundred years ago. Critical texts may in certain passages approximate more nearly to the original words of the sacred writers. But, after all, they are made up piecemeal from extracts culled from various quarters, skilfully put together indeed, and uniting in a product of exceeding value. It is, however, a combination of the critic's own, and is in all likelihood not the precise counterpart, in every particular, of any single text that ever existed before. The critical apparatus, by which it is accompanied, may exhibit the respective readings of the several leading authorities. Yet this can, from the nature of the case, only be done in a fragmentary way. But here we have a New Testament in every word and letter conformed to a copy coeval with Cyril and Theodoret, and from which upwards of forty generations of men may have read the words of everlasting life.

The recent discovery by Professor Tischendorf of a biblical manuscript of great value has been repeatedly mentioned in the papers. Our readers may be interested in a more particular account, extracted from his own statements, regarding it. His first journey to the East in 1844,* led him to the Convent of St. Catharine at Mount Sinai. As he was there rummaging in a basket of torn and mutilated fragments of manuscripts which had been thrown aside as useless, and were destined to the flames, he drew forth several pages of a very ancient copy of the Septuagint. A few, which were the least seemly, he was allowed to take with him. But the monks, who thus suddenly obtained some idea of their value, refused to part with the others, containing Isaiah entire, first and fourth Maccabees, and portions of other books. In his second visit, in 1853, he was not able to find these precious fragments, nor to learn any thing respecting them, whence he was led to suppose that some one else had obtained them and carried them to Europe. On the 31st of January, 1859, he visited St. Catharine for the third time. He had already sent his servant for camels, and made his arrangements to leave for Egypt on the 7th of February; when, upon the 4th, in a walk with the Superior of the convent, he spoke of the Septuagint, and of his own edition of it, copies of which, as well as of the New Testament, he had brought to present to the monks. On returning from the walk they entered the Superior's chamber, who remarked that he possessed the Septuagint, and laid it before him wrapped in a cloth. Upon opening it he saw what he had never ventured to hope for, the oldest Greek manuscript in existence. There were the identical pages which he had snatched from destruction in 1844, with a goodly number more, forming together a considerable portion of the Old Testament; and, what was more precious still, a perfect copy of the New Testament, *ne minima quidem lacuna deformatum*, to which was added the Epistle of Barnabas complete, and the first part of the Pastor, neither of which was previously known to be extant in Greek. The volume, or rather fragments of a volume, for many of the leaves were torn, and there was no cover but the cloth, he at

* See Biblical Repertory for January, 1857.

once took to his own room, by permission of the Superior. The first night was spent in transcribing the Epistle of Barnabas, *quippe dormire nefas videbatur*. On the next day he came to an agreement with the monks that, upon the receipt of an order from their superiors at Cairo, this manuscript should be sent thither to be transcribed.

Tischendorf reached Cairo on the 13th of February, and by the 24th he had the coveted treasure in his hands. Within two months, the whole Codex containing upwards of one hundred thousand verses was transcribed by himself, with such help as he could obtain from a couple of friends, whose work he revised letter by letter. The difficulty of the task was greatly enhanced by the careful examination necessary in about eight thousand places containing corrections, which, though ancient, were of a date posterior to the text. Meanwhile, the monks of Sinai were persuaded to offer the original manuscript to the Russian emperor, Alexander II., under whose auspices this journey was undertaken. As the archbishop of their order was dead, however, and his unanimously elected successor had not yet been consecrated, on account of the opposition of a pretender to the place, the college consented that Tischendorf might take the manuscript to St. Petersburg, in order to prepare an accurate edition of its text, and that it might be regarded as a temporary loan, until the archbishop should signify in their name that the gift was perpetual. With this understanding the manuscript was surrendered to him at Cairo, September 28.

The intervening time was spent in visiting Jerusalem, Beyrout, Laodicea, Smyrna, Patmos, and Constantinople. At the latter place, he learned from Prince Lobanow, the ambassador of the Czar, that the Sinaitic Manuscript had been seen in 1845 by Porphyry, the Superior of a Russian monastery, and described by him in a volume published at St. Petersburg in 1856, in the Russian language.

Two editions are to be issued of this ancient text. The first and most splendid will be published at St. Petersburg in 1862, the thousandth anniversary of the founding of the Russian empire. Three hundred copies only will be issued, all of which are intended for donation, none for sale, the Czar bearing the entire expense. In this the letters of the manuscript and its

whole appearance will be reproduced with the utmost possible exactness. The extant portions of the Old Testament will occupy two volumes, the first having four columns throughout; the second, which is to contain the poetical books, disposed stichometrically in two columns. The third volume will embrace the entire New Testament with the Epistle of Barnabas and the fragmentary portion of the Pastor. The fourth and concluding volume will contain twenty lithographed or photographed pages, including what is most important for purposes of criticism or palæography; also prolegomena treating of the history of the Manuscript, of its age, accompanied by representations of other ancient codices in fac-simile, and of the character of its text as compared with that of the Codex Vaticanus, Codex Ephraem, and Codex Alexandrinus; and finally a critical commentary upon the eight thousand ancient corrections, and whatever else may appear to call for palæographic remarks.

The second and minor, or manual edition, is to be published by Brockhaus, at Leipsic. This is to contain the text of the Manuscript in the ordinary Greek character, a page of fac-simile, the main portion of the prolegomena and the critical commentary. The lines, columns, and abbreviations of the Codex will be perpetuated in the reprint, but the separate words will be distinguished by intervening spaces as in modern books. The first volume, containing the New Testament, Barnabas and the Pastor, is promised in 1862, and the Old Testament is to follow in about a year after. This extraordinary dispatch in an undertaking of such magnitude, will appear the more remarkable, if it is contrasted with other enterprises of a similar nature. Baber's edition of the Old Testament portion of the Alexandrine Manuscript was fourteen years in publishing. Cardinal Mai's edition of the Vatican Manuscript, which is a simple reprint of the text, was begun in 1828, and published in 1857.

There are three hundred and forty-five and a half leaves belonging to the Manuscript at present; one hundred and ninety-nine of which contain what has been preserved of the Old Testament, the rest are devoted to the New Testament. Of the former there are, in addition to a single leaf from

1 Chronicles, the books of Tobit (from chap. ii.) Judith, 1st and 4th Maccabees, Isaiah, six leaves at the beginning of Jeremiah, the minor Prophets, with the exception of Hosea, Amos, and Micah, which stand first in the Septuagint; Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Wisdom, Sirach, Job. The books of the New Testament are arranged in the following order: the Gospels, the Epistles of Paul, with Hebrews placed between Thessalonians and Timothy, as in the Alexandrine Manuscript, Acts, the Catholic epistles, Revelation, Barnabas, Pastor.

Tischendorf's more deliberate opinion respecting the age of this Codex is the same that he expressed upon its first discovery. He regards it as unquestionably belonging to the fourth century, and is only doubtful whether it should be referred to the first or to the second half of the century. The following particulars are mentioned as conducing to this conclusion. The purity of the uncial character, and the consistency with which it is preserved even in letters much below the customary size, which are sometimes crowded in at the end of the line, show it to be earlier than the sixth century. The uncials approximate in form those of the papyri of Herculaneum and the Egyptian tombs, and have an appearance of antiquity not inferior to those of the oldest parchment known: these would consist with any date from the first to the fifth century. There are no capitals, as in the Alexandrine Manuscript, and in all writings of the fifth century and onward. Marks of punctuation are as rare as in the very oldest class of manuscripts, such as the Vatican and Papyri. It even goes beyond the Vatican and every other known manuscript in one criterion of great age. This latter is one of the very few Codices which exhibit three columns upon a page; the like occurs in the famous fragment of Dio Cassius in the Vatican library, two extremely ancient copies of the Samaritan Pentateuch at Naplous, and a fragment of the Latin Pentateuch at Lyons. These, when opened, present six columns to the eye, in this resembling the rolls which were the oldest form of books, so old that they went out of use before any existing manuscript of the Scriptures or of classic authors was written. They are consequently thought to represent the stage of transition from rolls of one continuous sheet

to the later and more convenient style of separate sheets bound together in a volume. They seem to have been written when the reading public was still accustomed to the sight and the use of rolls, and required, even in volumes of another shape, the same general appearance to be preserved. The Sinaitic Manuscript is the only one in existence, so far as is known, which has four columns on a page, thus exhibiting eight at each opening, and simulating more exactly the primitive rolls. Of course this must be associated with other evidences of great antiquity to be of any weight, as is shown by the existence of at least two tricolunar manuscripts of the eighth or ninth centuries, which perhaps owe this peculiarity to the imitation of the much more ancient copies from which they were made.

Other points more or less insisted on, are the general agreement of its orthography with the Vatican Manuscript, the order observed in the books of the New Testament, the brevity of the inscriptions and subscriptions to these books, the non-insertion of accents even by the correctors, who were some centuries later than the original scribe, the fact that the sections of Ammonius and the canons of Eusebius were not noted in the Gospels *ab ipsâ primâ manu*, whereas these came into general use about the middle of the fourth century, and are found in the oldest manuscripts except this and the Vatican.

The presence of the Epistle of Barnabas and the Pastor in a volume containing the New Testament, is thought to be best accounted for by the fact, that they appear to have been thought canonical in certain quarters in the second and third centuries. Whence Eusebius, in the early part of the fourth, reckons these two, together with the Acts of Paul and the Revelation of Peter, as *ἀντιλεγόμενα*, or books of disputed authority. The whole of these may have belonged to this manuscript originally, for six leaves are missing between Barnabas and the Pastor, and it is again defective at the end. They could hardly have been admitted after the Councils of Laodicea, A. D. 364, and Carthage, A. D. 397, had formally pronounced upon their exclusion from the canon. The presence of the two Epistles of Clement in the Alexandrine Manuscript, must, in the judgment of Tischendorf, be differently accounted

for, since even the first of these Epistles was not raised to the rank of an antilegomenon by Eusebius. It is indeed stated by Jerome that it was publicly read in some of the churches; no such honour was ever accorded, however, to the second Epistle.

There are two circumstances connected with the text of this manuscript from which its great age is likewise inferred. Eusebius states that in the generality of accurate copies, the last twelve verses of Mark are wanting. Jerome says similarly, *Omnes Græciæ libros pæne hoc capitulum non habere*. Now while the whole five hundred copies and upwards, dating from the fifth and subsequent centuries, agree in containing these verses, the Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts alone represent the text referred to by these ancient authorities. Again, the words ἐν Ἐφῆσῳ, Eph. i. 1, were not in Origen's copy; and Basil, in the middle of the fourth century, says that they were wanting in "old" copies in his day. Here again the Sinaitic and the Vatican alone correspond with these ancient texts. The words have, however, been supplied in both by later correctors.

Besides this rare treasure, Tischendorf brought back with him to Europe, as the fruits of this exploration, twelve Palimpsests, twenty Greek uncial manuscripts, eighteen codices minusculi, nine Syriac, eleven Coptic, seven Arabic, nine Hebrew, consisting of a synagogue roll of Esther, and some Jewish writings, together with a copy of Banberg's Rabbinical Bible; two very old Samaritan Pentateuchs, three Slavonic manuscripts, eleven Abyssinian, five Armenian, two papyri, a Greco-Egyptian astrolabe of the fourth century of a singular construction, and some other curiosities. One of the minusculi, which he has retained for further examination, contains several books and parts of books from the Old Testament in a translation different from the Septuagint; he suspects that it will prove to be from Theodotion, or some other of the old translators, followed by Origen in his Hexapla, and of which nothing but detached sentences has been possessed before. A second contains some marginal notes, corresponding with extracts made by Jerome from the "Gospel of the Nazarenes," and which it

is thought may throw some light upon the question of what that so-called gospel was. The concluding forty-seven pages of the volume before us, are occupied with Origen's Scholia on Proverbs, which Tischendorf spent four days in copying from a manuscript in the Convent of St. John, on the isle of Patmos. This has never been found separate before. The edition published by Cardinal Mai, in 1854, was extracted from a *Catena Patrum* in the library of the Vatican, in which it was difficult and well nigh impossible to sunder the remarks of one writer from those which belong to another. The comparison of the two shows how much Mai's edition stood in need of correction.

P. S. to the article on the "State of the Country."

We wish the sentence on page 2, of this number, at the close of the first paragraph, referring to Arnold, to be considered cancelled. On reading it in print, we see that it will bear an interpretation which the writer did not intend.