

The Foundation of the King James Version of the Bible

The New Testament of the King James Version was taken from the Greek text, 'Textus Receptus,' which used manuscripts from the 12th to the 15th century. (The majority of this article has been taken from the web site, <http://www.skypoint.com/~waltzmn>)

Text-Types Of The New Testament Manuscripts: Alexandrian ("Neutral"), Western, Caesarean & Byzantine

1. Introduction

The "local texts" of the New Testament gradually developed in the early centuries of the expansion of Christian Churches. In and near the large cities such as Antioch, Alexandria, Rome, Carthage, Constantinople etc., the newly established Churches were provided with the copies of the scriptures in the form which were current in that area. As additional copies were made to cope with the expansion of the Christianity, the number of special readings and renderings would be both conserved and, to some extent, increased, so that eventually a type of text germinated which was typical of that locality.

Modern scholars have identified the type of text preserved in the New Testament manuscripts by comparing their characteristic readings with the quotations of those passages in the writings of the Church Fathers who live near or in the chief ecclesiastical centres.

The characteristics of the local text did dilute when it got mixed with other types of the text. However, in the earliest manuscripts, the tendency to develop and preserve a peculiar type of the text prevailed over the tendencies leading to a mixture of texts.

Here we will describe some of the most important distinctive kinds of the New Testament texts. The various text types are taken from Bruce Metzger's book *A Textual Commentary On The New Testament*.

2. Alexandrian Text (or "Neutral" Text)

The *Alexandrian text* [the manuscripts the Rotherham Emphasized Bible was translated from], which Westcott and Hort called the *Neutral text* (a question-begging) is usually considered to be the best text and the most faithful in preserving the original. Characteristics of the Alexandrian text are brevity and austerity. That is, it is generally shorter than the text of other forms, and it does not exhibit the degree of grammatical and stylistic polishing that is characteristic of the *Byzantine* [the manuscripts the King James Version of the Bible were translated from] and, to a lesser extent, of the *Caesarean* type of text. Until recently, the two chief witnesses to the *Alexandrian text* were codex¹ Vaticanus (B) and codex Sinaiticus (S) (See Appendix B) parchment manuscripts dating from about the middle of the fourth century. With the acquisition, however, of the Bodmer Papyri, particularly P⁶⁶ and P⁷⁵, both copied about the end of the

¹ The early Christians were among the first to use the form of a book called a codex, instead of a scroll. A codex was constructed much like our modern books, by folding sheets of papyrus or vellum (treated animal hide) in the middle and then sewing them together at the spine. *The Origin of the Bible* by Philip W. Comfort, pg. 42.

second or beginning of the third century, evidence is now available that the *Alexandrian* type of the text goes back to an archetype that must be dated early in the second century. The Sahidic and Boharic versions frequently contain typically *Alexandrian* readings.

3. Western Text

The *Western text*, which was widely current in Italy and Gaul as well as in North Africa and elsewhere (including Egypt), can also be traced back to the second century. It was used by Marcion, Tatian, Irenaeus, Tertullian and Cyprian. Its presence in the Egypt is shown by the papyri P³⁸ (about A.D. 300) and P⁴⁸ (about the end of the third century). The most important Greek manuscripts that present a *Western* type of text are codex Bezae (D) of the fifth or sixth century (containing the Gospels and Acts), codex Claromontanus (D) of the sixth century (containing the Pauline Epistles), and, for Mark 1:1 to 5:30, codex Washingtonianus (W) of the late fourth or early fifth century. Likewise the old Latin versions are noteworthy witness to a *Western* type of text; these fall into three main groups, the African, the Italian, and the Hispanic forms of Old Latin texts.

The chief characteristics of *Western* readings is fondness for paraphrase. Words, clauses, and even whole sentences are freely changed, omitted or inserted. Sometimes the motive appears to have been harmonization, while at other times it was the enrichment of the narrative by the inclusion of the traditional or apocryphal material. Some readings involve quite trivial alterations for which no special reason can be assigned. One of the puzzling features of the *Western text* (which generally is longer than the other forms of text) is that at the end of the Luke and in few other places in the New Testament certain *Western* witnesses omit words and passages that are present in other forms of text, including the *Alexandrian*. Although at the close of the last century certain scholars were disposed to regard these shorter readings as original (Westcott and Hort called them "Western non-interpolations"), since the acquisition of the Bodmer Papyri many scholars today are inclined to regard them as aberrant readings.

In the book of Acts, the problems raised by the Western text become most acute, for the Western text of Acts is nearly ten percent longer than the form which is commonly regarded to be the original text of that book.

4. Caesarean Text

The *Caesarean text*, which seems to have originated in Egypt (it is attested by Chester Beatty Papyrus P⁴⁵), was brought, perhaps Origen, to Caesarea, where it was used by Eusebius and others. From Caesarea it was carried to Jerusalem, where it was used by Cyril and by Armenians who, at an early date, at a colony at Jerusalem. Armenian missionaries carried the Caesarean text to Georgia, where it influenced the Georgian version as well as an uncial Greek manuscript of about the ninth century (Q, codex Koridethi). Furthermore, perhaps Euthalius's scholarly edition of Pauline Epistles was made at Caesarea.

Thus it appears that *Caesarean* type of text has had a long and checkered career. According to the view of most of scholars, it is an Eastern text, dating from the early part of the third century, and is characterized by a distinctive mixture of *Western* readings and *Alexandrian* readings. One may also observe a certain striving after elegance of expression, a feature that is especially typical of the *Byzantine* type of text.

Another Eastern type of text, current in and near Antioch, is preserved today chiefly in Old Syriac witnesses, namely the Sinaitic and the Curetonian manuscripts of the Gospels and in the quotations of Scripture contained in the works of Aphraates and Ephraem.

5. Byzantine Text

The *Byzantine* text [the manuscripts the King James Version of the Bible was taken from], otherwise also called the *Syrian text* (so Westcott and Hort), the *Koine text* (so von Soden), the *Ecclesiastical text* (so Lake), and the *Antiochian text* (so Ropes) is, on the whole, the latest of the several distinctive types of text of the New Testament. It is characterized chiefly by lucidity and completeness. The framers of this text sought to smooth away any harshness of language, to combine two or more divergent readings into one expanded reading (called conflation), and to harmonize divergent parallel passages. This conflated text, produced perhaps at Antioch in Syria, was taken to Constantinople, whence it was distributed widely throughout the Byzantine Empire. It is best represented today by codex Alexandrinus (in the Gospels; not in Acts, the Epistles, or Revelation), the later uncial manuscripts, and the great mass of minuscule manuscripts. Thus, except for an occasional manuscript that happen to preserve an earlier form of the text, during the period from about the sixth to seventh century down to the invention of printing with moveable type (A.D. 1450-56), the *Byzantine* form of text was generally regarded as *the* authoritative form of text and was one of the most widely circulated and accepted.

After the Gutenberg's press made the production of books more rapid and therefore cheaper than was possible through copying by hand, it was the debased *Byzantine text* that made the standard form of the New Testament in printed editions. This unfortunate situation was not altogether expected, for the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, which were readily available to early editors and printers were those than contain corrupt Byzantine text.

6. Appendix: Note On Western Non-Interpolations

One of the features of the *Western* text is the occasional omission of words and passages that are present in other types of text, including the *Alexandrian*. How should one evaluate such omissions from a form of text which is generally much fuller than other text-types? According to one theory, popularized at the close of the last century by Westcott and Hort, such readings, despite their being supported by the generally inferior Western witnesses, ought to be preferred rather than the longer readings, though the latter are attested by the generally superior manuscripts, **B** and **Ⲙ**. Nine such reading were designated by Westcott and Hort as "Western non-interpolations," on the assumption that all extant witnesses except the *Western* (or, in some cases, some of the Western witnesses) have in these passages suffered interpolation.

In recent decades t his theory has been coming under more and more criticism. With the acquisition of the Bodmer Papyri testimony for the *Alexandrian* type of text has been carried back from the fourth to the second century, and one can now observe how faithfully that text was copied and recopied between the stage represented by P⁷⁵ and the stage represented by codex Vaticanus. Furthermore, scholars have been critical of the apparently arbitrary way in which Westcott and Hort isolated nine passages for special treatment (enclosing them within double brackets), whereas they did not give similar treatment to other readings which are also absent from *Western* witnesses.

The Textus Receptus

Introduction

Textus Receptus, or "Received Text," (abbreviated TR) is the name we use for the first published Greek text of the New Testament. For many centuries, it was *the* standard text of the Greek Bible. The name arose from the work of the kinsmen Bonaventure and Abraham Elzevir, who said of their 1633 edition, "Textum ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus receptum" -- "So [the reader] has the text which all now receive."

The irony is that the Received Text is not actually a single edition, but a sort of text-type of its own consisting of hundreds of extremely similar but not identical editions. Nor do any of its various flavors

agree exactly with any extant text-type or manuscript. Thus the need, when referring to the Received Text, to specify *which* received text we refer to.

If this all sounds complicated, it is because of the complicated history of the *Textus Receptus*. Let's take it from the beginning.

The Origin of the Textus Receptus

Although printing with movable type was in use no later than 1456, it was many years before a Greek New Testament was printed. This is not as surprising as it sounds; the Greek minuscule hand of the late fifteenth century was extremely complicated, with many diverse ligatures and custom symbols. Cutting a Greek typeface required the creation of hundreds of symbols -- far more than a Latin typeface. Printers probably did not relish the idea. (It is worth noting that the Complutensian Polyglot *invented* a new type of Greek print for its edition.)

It was not until the early sixteenth century that Cardinal Ximenes decided to embark on a Greek and Latin edition of the New Testament -- the famous Complutensian Polyglot. The New Testament volume of this work was printed in 1514 -- but it was not published until after 1520. This left a real opportunity for an enterprising printer who could get out an edition quickly.

Such a printer was John Froben of Basle. Apparently having heard of the Complutensian edition, he was determined to beat it into print. Fortunately, he had the contacts to pull this off.

Froben decided to approach Desiderius Erasmus, one of the most notable (if rather humanistic) scholars of his generation. The proposal appears to have been transmitted on April 17, 1515. Work began in the fall of that year, and the work was pushed through the press in February of 1516.

For a project that had taken fifty years to get started, the success of Erasmus's edition (which contained his Greek text in parallel with his own Latin version) was astonishing. The first printing soon sold out, and by 1519 a new edition was required. Three more would follow, each somewhat improved over the last.

It is sad to report that such a noble undertaking was so badly handled (all the more so since it became the basis of Luther's German translation, and later -- with some slight modifications -- of the English King James Version). The speed with which the book went through the press meant that it contained literally thousands of typographical errors. What is more, the text was hastily and badly edited from a few late manuscripts.

The History of the Textus Receptus

Erasmus's first edition was a great success; some 3300 copies of his first two editions were sold. The success of Erasmus's edition soon called forth new Greek testaments, all of them based largely on his. The first of these was published by Aldus Manutius in 1518 -- but although it contained an independent text of the Septuagint (the first such to be printed), its New Testament text was taken almost verbatim from Erasmus, including even the typographical errors. Hence the first truly new publication was Erasmus's own edition of 1519. This featured almost the same text as the 1516 edition, but with the majority (though by no means all!) of the errors of the press corrected. It also features some new readings, believed by Scrivener to come from 3^{cap} (XII; classified by von Soden as e: K^x a: I [K]; c: K).

Erasmus's third edition of 1522 contained one truly unfortunate innovation: The "Three Heavenly Witnesses" in 1 John 5:7-8. These were derived from the recently-written Codex 61, and (as the famous

story goes) included by Erasmus "for the sake of his oath." Sadly, they have been found in almost every TR edition since.

There followed a great welter of editions, all slightly different (based on such figures as I have seen, it would appear that editions of the *Textus Receptus* typically vary at between one hundred and two hundred places, though very few of these differences are more than orthographic). None of these editions were of any particular note (though the 1534 text of Simon Colinaeus is sometimes mentioned as significant, since it included some variant readings). It was not until 1550 that the next great edition of the *Textus Receptus* was published. This was the work of Robert Stephanus (Estienne), whose third edition became one of the two "standard" texts of the TR. (Indeed, it is Stephanus's name that gave rise to the common symbol Ⲛ for the *Textus Receptus*.) Stephanus included the variants of over a dozen manuscripts -- including Codices Bezae (D) and Regius (L) -- in the margin. In his fourth edition (1551), he also added the verse numbers which are still used in all modern editions. The Stephanus edition became the standard *Textus Receptus* of Britain, although of course it was not yet known by that name. (The esteem in which the *Textus Receptus* was already held, however, is shown by Scrivener's report that there are 119 places where all of Stephanus's manuscripts read against the TR, but Stephanus still chose to print the reading found in previous TR editions.)

Stephanus's editions were followed by those of Theodore de Bèza (1519-1605), the Protestant reformer who succeeded Calvin. These were by no means great advances over what had gone before; although Beza had access to the codex which bears his name, as well as the codex Claromontanus, he seems to have made little if any use of them. A few of his readings have been accused of theological bias; the rest seem largely random. Beza's editions, published between 1565 and 1611, are remembered more for the sake of their editor (and the fact that they were used by the translators of the King James Bible) than for their text.

The next great edition of the *Textus Receptus* is the Elzevir text already mentioned in the [Introduction](#). First published in 1624, with minor changes for the edition of 1633, it had the usual minor variants from Stephanus (of which Scrivener counted 287), but nothing substantial; the Elzevirs were printers, not critics.

The Elzevir text, which became the primary TR edition on the continent, was the last version to be significant for its text. From this time on, editions were marked more by their marginal material, as scholars such as Mill, Wettstein, and later Griesbach began examining and arranging manuscripts. None of these were able to break away from the TR, but all pointed the way to texts free of its influence.

Only one more TR edition needs mention here -- the 1873 Oxford edition, which forms the basis of many modern collations. This edition is no longer available, of course, though some editions purport to give its readings.

Beginners are reminded once again that not all TR editions are identical; those collating against a TR must state very explicitly *which* edition is being used.

The Text of the *Textus Receptus*

Erasmus, having little time to prepare his edition, could only examine manuscripts which came to hand. His haste was so great, in fact, that he did not even write new copies for the printer; rather, he took existing manuscripts, corrected them, and submitted *those* to the printer. (Erasmus's corrections are still visible in the manuscript 2.) Nor were the manuscripts which came to hand particularly valuable. For his

basic text he chose 2^e, 2^{ap}, and 1^r. In addition, he was able to consult 1^{cap}, 4^{ap}, and 7^p. Of these, only 1^{cap} had a text independent of the Byzantine tradition -- and Erasmus used it relatively little due to the supposed "corruption" of its text. Erasmus also consulted the Vulgate, but only from a few late manuscripts.

Even those who favour the Byzantine text cannot be overly impressed with Erasmus's choice of manuscripts; they are all rather late (see table):

Manuscript	Date	Von Soden Classification (in modern terms)
1 ^{cap}	XII	e: family 1; ap: I ^{a3}
1 ^r	XII	Andreas
2 ^e	XII/XIII	K ^x (Wisse reports K ^{mix} /K ^x)
2 ^{ap}	XII	I ^{b1}
4 ^{ap}	XV	
7 ^p	XI/XII	O ^{□18}

Not only is 1^r an Andreas manuscript rather than purely Byzantine, but it is written in such a way that Erasmus could not always tell text from commentary and based his reading on the Vulgate. Also, 1^r is defective for the last six verses of the Apocalypse. To fill out the text, Erasmus made his own Greek translation from the Latin. He admitted to what he had done, but the result was a Greek text containing readings not found in *any* Greek manuscript -- but which were faithfully retained through centuries of editions of the Textus Receptus.

The result is a text which, although clearly Byzantine, is not a good or pure representative of the form. It is full of erratic readings -- some "Caesarean" (Scrivener attributes Matt. 22:28, 23:25, 27:52, 28:3, 4, 19, 20; Mark 7:18, 19, 26, 10:1, 12:22, 15:46; Luke 1:16, 61, 2:43, 9:1, 15, 11:49; John 1:28, 10:8, 13:20 to the influence of 1^{cap}), some "Western" or Alexandrian (a good example of this is the doxology of Romans, which Erasmus placed after chapter 16 in accordance with the Vulgate, rather than after 14 along with the Byzantine text), some simply wild (as, e.g., the inclusion of 1 John 5:7-8). Daniel B. Wallace counts 1,838 differences between the TR and Hodges & Farstad's Byzantine text (see Wallace's "The Majority Text Theory: History, Methods, and Critique," in Ehrman & Holmes, *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research, Studies & Documents*, Eerdmans, 1995. The figure is given in note 28 on page 302.) This, it should be noted, is a *larger* number than the number of differences between the UBS, Bover, and Merk texts -- even though these three editions are all eclectic and based largely on the Alexandrian text-type, which is much more diverse than the Byzantine text-type.

Thus it will be conceded by all reputable scholars -- even those who favour the Byzantine text -- that the Textus Receptus, in all its various forms, has no textual authority whatsoever. Were it not for the fact that it has been in use for so long as a basis for collations, it could be mercifully forgotten. What a tragedy, then, that it was the Bible of Protestant Christendom for close to four centuries!

Addendum I: The King James Version

Authorized in 1604 and published in 1611, the King James version naturally is based on the TR. When it was created, there was no demand for critical editions. (Though in fact the original KJV contains some

textual notes. These, like the preface, are usually suppressed in modern versions, making the version that much worse than it is. In addition, editions of the KJV do not print precisely the same text. But this is another issue.)

Even accepting that the KJV derives from the TR, and has most of its faults, it is reasonable to ask *which* TR it is based on. The usual simplistic answer is Stephanus's or Beza's. F.H.A. Scrivener, however, who studied the matter in detail, concluded that it was none of these. Rather, it is a mixed text, closest to Beza, with Stephanus in second place, but not clearly affiliated with any edition. (No doubt the influence of the Vulgate, and of early English translations, is also felt here.) Scrivener reconstructed the text of the KJV in 1894, finding some 250 differences from Stephanus. Jay P. Green, however, states that even *this* edition does not agree entirely with the KJV, listing differences at Matt. 12:24, 27; John 8:21, 10:16 (? -- this may be translational); 1 Cor. 14:10, 16:1; compare also Mark 8:14, 9:42; John 8:6; Acts 1:4; 1 John 3:16, where Scrivener includes words found in the KJV in *italics* as missing from their primary text.

Addendum II: The "New TR"

The phrase "The New TR" is sometimes applied to editions, which threaten to dominate the field of textual criticism. Thus the edition of Westcott & Hort [the Rotherham Emphasized Bible was translated from this text] was a sort of "New TR" in the late nineteenth century, and in the twentieth century the name is sometimes applied to the United Bible Societies edition. In terms of number of copies printed this description of the UBS text may be justified -- no complete new edition has been issued since its publication -- but no reputable textual scholar would regard it as the "final word."

Another sort of "New TR" is found in the Majority Text editions of Hodges & Farstad and Robinson & Pierpont. These are attempts to create a true Byzantine text (as an alternative to the TR, which is a very bad Byzantine text), but they have received relatively little critical attention -- less, probably, than they deserve (though few would consider them to contain the original text). Thus they cannot be considered truly "received" texts.

Westcott & Hort

(The New Testament of the Rotherham Emphasized Bible was taken from this text.)

Editors. Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901) and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892)

Date of Publication. The text was published in 1881 (under the title *The New Testament in the Original Greek; an Introduction [and] Appendix*, authored by Hort, appeared in 1882 (revised edition by F. C. Burkitt in 1892).

The Text. The WH text is a very strongly Alexandrian text -- so much so that Hort has been accused of constructing his text simply by looking for the reading of Codex Vaticanus. The situation is not that simple; a better statement would be to say that the edition used B as a proof text. Hort (who was the chief architect of the textual theory of the book) would follow other witnesses if the internal evidence was sufficiently strong. The most noticeable instance of this is the famous Western Non-Interpolations. Still, it is fair to say that Hort's text falls closer to B than that of any other critical edition. It is, in fact, the one New Testament edition, which approaches the method, used in some forms of non-Biblical criticism, of editing from a proof text.

The Apparatus. The WH edition has no true critical apparatus; not one manuscript is cited in the main body of the edition. There are a few variant readings in the margin; these are readings where the editors disagreed on the text or were very uncertain of the original readings. They also have a list of "interesting" variants. In neither apparatus do they supply a list of witnesses. The only textual evidence they give is in

the discussion of readings in their *Introduction [and] Appendix*, and even these are difficult to use as manuscripts are (inevitably) cited using Tischendorf numbers.

The lack of an apparatus in WH has been criticised by some. This is rather unfair in context. They worked very shortly after Tischendorf published his eighth edition; they had nothing to add to it. (As both men were caught up in academic and pastoral duties, they did not have the leisure to go and examine manuscripts in odd places. In any case, all manuscripts known to be valuable, save B itself, had been studied by Tischendorf.) The problem with the WH edition is not its lack of an apparatus, but the fact that the coordinated apparatus (Tischendorf's) is now hard to find and hard to read.

The WH edition has another interesting feature: Some dozens of readings are obelized as "primitive errors" -- i.e. passages where the original reading is no longer preserved in the extant manuscripts. Westcott and Hort did not see fit, in these cases, to print conjectural emendations (they printed what they regarded as the oldest surviving reading), but the presentation of their data makes it clear that they felt it to be needed in these passages.

Copy Texts

It has been said that F. J. A. Hort, in constructing the text of the Westcott & Hort edition, simply looked for the readings of B (codex Vaticanus) and followed those.

This is just about precisely backward. Hort did not start from some anonymous text and then start looking for ways to correct it toward B. Rather, he started from B and then looked for places where it should be rejected. In other words, he used B as a "copy text."

It is curious to note that the copy text (also known as a copy text), one of the fundamental devices of most classical textual criticism, doesn't even seem to be *mentioned* in most manuals of NT criticism. Simply put, the copy text is the starting point for an edition. An editor, after examining the various witnesses, picks a particular manuscript as the best source and then, in effect, collates against it looking for places where a better text presents itself. As G. Blakemore Evans puts it in the textual introduction to the *Riverside Shakespeare*, "an editor today, having chosen for what he considers sound reasons a particular copy-text, will adhere to that copy-text unless he sees substantial grounds for departing from it" (p. 37).

This, we should note, does not mean slavishly following the copy text. Hort didn't follow B closely; a good editor will be open to good readings from any source. But the copy text is the starting point. One follows it in the absence of reasons to depart from it. So, for example, one would tend to follow the copy text spelling of various proper names, or on points of Attic versus non-Attic usage, or on inflected versus non-inflected Semitic names. And, of course, in the case of readings where the canons of criticism offer no clear point of decision, you follow the copy text. It gives you a fallback if you have no other grounds for decision.

Codex Vaticanus

(The codex (book) Westcott and Hort based their text on.)

(CODEX B), a Greek manuscript, the most important of all the manuscripts of Holy Scripture. It is so called because it belongs to the Vatican Library (*Codex Vaticanus, 1209*). "This manuscript had been in the Vatican's library since at least 1481, but it was not made available to scholars, like Tischendorf and Tregelles, until the middle of the nineteenth century."²

² The Origin of the Bible by Philip Comfort, pg. 44

This codex is a quarto volume written in uncial letters of the fourth century, on folios of fine parchment bound in quaterns. Each page is divided into three columns of forty lines each, with from sixteen to eighteen letters to a line, except in the poetical books, where, owing to the stichometric division of the lines, there are but two columns to a page. There are no capital letters, but at times the first letter of a section extends over the margin. Several hands worked at the manuscript; the first writer inserted neither pauses nor accents, and made use but rarely of a simple punctuation. Unfortunately, the codex is mutilated; at a later date the missing folios were replaced by others. Thus, the first twenty original folios are missing; a part of folio 178, and ten folios after fol. 348; also the final quaterns, whose number it is impossible to establish. There are extant in all 759 original folios.

The Old Testament (Septuagint Version, except Daniel, which is taken from the version of Theodotion) takes up 617 folios. On account of the aforementioned lacunae, the Old Testament text lacks the following passages: Gen., i-xlvi,28; II Kings, ii,5-7,10-13; Pss. cv,27-cxxxvii, 6. The order of the books of the Old Testament is as follows: Genesis to Second Paralipomenon, First and second Esdras, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticle of Canticles, Job, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Esther, Judith, Tobias, the Minor Prophets from Osee to Malachi, Isaias, Jeremias, Baruch, Lamentations and Epistle of Jeremias, Ezechiel, Daniel; the Vatican Codex does not contain the Prayer of Manasses or the Books of Machabees. The New Testament begins at fol. 618. Owing to the loss of the final quaterns, a portion of the Pauline Epistles is missing: Heb., ix,14-xiii,25, the Pastoral Letters, Epistle to Philemon; also the Apocalypse. It is possible that there may also be some extra-canonical writings missing, like the Epistle of Clement. The order of the New Testament books is as follows: Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, Catholic Epistles, St. Paul to the Romans, Corinthians (I-II), Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Thessalonians (I-II), Hebrews.

In the Vatican Codex we find neither the Ammonian Sections nor the Eusebian Canons (q.v.). It is, however, divided into sections, after a manner that is common to it with the Codex Zacynthius (Cod. "Zeta"), an eighth-century Scriptural manuscript of St. Luke. The Acts of the Apostles exhibits a special division into thirty-six chapters. The Catholic Epistles bear traces of a double division, in the first and earlier of which some believe that the Second Epistle of Peter was wanting. The division of the Pauline Epistles is quite peculiar: they are treated as one book, and numbered continuously. It is clear from this enumeration that in the copy of the Scriptures reproduced by the Vatican Codex the Epistle to the Hebrews was placed between the Epistle to the Galatians and the Epistle to the Ephesians.

The Vatican Codex, in spite of the views of Tischendorf, who held for the priority of the Codex Sinaiticus, discovered by him, is rightly considered to be the oldest extant copy of the Bible. Like the Codex Sinaiticus it represents what Westcott and Hort call a "neutral text", i.e. a text that antedates the modifications found in all later manuscripts, not only the modifications found in the less ancient Antiochene recensions, but also those met with in the Eastern and Alexandrine recensions. It may be said that the Vatican Codex, written in the first half of the fourth century, represents the text of one of those recensions of the Bible, which were current in the third century, and that it belongs to the family of manuscripts made use of by Origen in the composition of his Hexapla.

The original home of the Vatican Codex is uncertain. Hort thinks it was written at Rome; Rendel Harris, Armitage Robinson, and others attribute it to Asia Minor. A more common opinion maintains that it was written in Egypt. Armitage Robinson believes that both the Vaticanus and the Sinaiticus were originally together in some ancient library. His opinion is based on the fact that in the margins of both manuscripts is found the same special system of chapters for the Acts of the Apostles, taken from the division of Euthalius, and found in two other important codices (Amiatinus and Fuldensis) of the Latin Vulgate. Tischendorf believed that three hands had worked at the transcription of the Vatican Codex. He identified (?) the first hand (B1), or transcriber, of the Old Testament with the transcriber of a part of the Old Testament and some folios of the New Testament in the Codex Sinaiticus. This primitive text was revised,

shortly after its original transcription, with the aid of a new manuscript, by a corrector (B2 -- For the Old Testament B2 is quoted by Swete as Ba). Six centuries after (according to some), a third hand (B3,Bb) retraced the faded letters, leaving but very little of the original untouched. According to Fabiani, however, this retracing was done early in the fifteenth century by the monk Clemens (*qui saeculo XV ineunte floruisse videtur*). In modern times (fifteenth-sixteenth century) the missing folios were added to the codex, in order, as Tregelles conjectures, to prepare it for use in the Vatican Library. Old catalogues show that it was there in the fifteenth century. The addition to the New Testament was listed by Scrivener as Cod. 263 (in Gregory, 293) for the Epistle to the Hebrews, and Cod. 91 for the Apocalypse. Napoleon I had the codex brought to Paris (where Hug was enabled to study it), but it was afterwards returned to the Holy See, with some other remnants of Roman booty, and replaced in the Vatican Library. There are various collations, editions, and studies of the Vatican Codex. The collations are:

- that of Bartolucci (Giulio di S. Anastasia), formerly librarian of the Vatican; it was done in 1669 and is preserved in manuscript -- Gr. Suppl. 53 of the Bibliothèque Natonale -- at Paris (quoted under the *sigla*: Blc);
- that of Birch (Bch) published at Copenhagen in 1798 for the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, in 1800 for the Apocalypse, in 1801 for the Gospels;
- that executed for Bentley (Btly) by the Abbate Mico about 1720 on the margin of a copy of the Greek New Testament which was published at Strasburg, 1524, by Cephalaeus; this copy is among Bentley's books in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge -- the collation itself was published in Ford's appendix to Woide's edition of the Codex Alexandrinus in 1799;
- a list of the alterations executed by the original copyist or by his correctors, edited at the request of Bentley by the Abbate Rulotta with the aid of the Abbate de Stosch (Rlt); this list was supposed to have perished, but it is extant among the Bentley papers in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, under the *sigla*: B. 17.20;
- in 1860 Alford, and in 1862 Cure, examined a select number of the readings of the Vatican Codex, and published the results of their labours in the first volume of Alford's Greek Testament.

Many other scholars have made special collations for their own purposes e.g. Tregelles, Tischendorf, Alford, etc. Among the works written on the Vatican Codex we may indicate: Bourgon, *Letters from Rome* (London, 1861). In the second volume of the Catalogue of Vatican Greek manuscripts, executed according to the modern scientific method for the cataloguing of the Vatican Library, there is a description of the Codex Vaticanus.

As to the editions of this codex, the Roman edition of the Septuagint (1587) was based on the Vaticanus. Similarly, the Cambridge edition of Swete follows it regularly and makes use of the Sinaiticus and the Alexandrinus only for the portions that are lacking in the Vaticanus. The first Roman edition appeared in 1858, under the names of Mai and Vercellone, and, under the same names, a second Roman edition in 1859. Both editions were severely criticized by Tischendorf in the edition he brought out at Leipzig in 1867, "Novum Testamentum Vaticanum, post A. Maii aliorumque imperfectos labores ex ipso codice editum", with an appendix (1869). The third Roman edition (Verc.) appeared under the names of Vercellone (died 1869) and Cozza-Luzi (died 1905) in 1868-81; it was accompanied by a photographic reproduction of the text: "Bibliorum SS. Graecorum Cod. Vat. 1209, Cod. B, denou phototypice expressus, jussu et cura praesidium Bibliothecae Vaticanae" (Milan, 1904-6). This edition contains a masterly anonymous introduction (by Giovanni Mercati), in which the writer corrects many inexact statements made by previous writers. Until recently the privilege of consulting this ancient manuscript quite freely and fully was not granted to all who sought it. The material condition of the Vatican Codex is better, generally speaking, than that of its contemporaries; it is foreseen, however, that within a century it will have fallen to pieces unless an efficacious remedy, which is being earnestly sought for, shall be discovered.

Appendix A

Comparison of the Greek Texts Textus Receptus and Westcott and Hort,

The Textus Receptus Text (First Line)
Westcott and Hort Text (Second Line)

Gospel of Mark, Chapter 1

(Out of 45 verses there are 4 verses that are identical; verses 3, 12, 17 and 22.)

- 1 αρχη του ευαγγελιου ιησου χριστου υιου του θεου (Textus Receptus)
1 αρχη του ευαγγελιου ιησου χριστου (Westcott and Hort)
- 2 ως γεγραπται εν τοις προφηταις ιδου εγω αποστελλω τον αγγελον μου προ προσωπου σου ος κατασκευασει την οδον σου εμπροσθεν σου
2 καθώς γεγραπται εν τω ησαια τω προφητη ιδου αποστελλω τον αγγελον μου προ προσωπου σου ος κατασκευασει την οδον σου
- 3 φωνη βοωντος εν τη ερημω ετοιμασατε την οδον κυριου ευθειας ποιειτε τας τριβους αυτου
3 φωνη βοωντος εν τη ερημω ετοιμασατε την οδον κυριου ευθειας ποιειτε τας τριβους αυτου
- 4 εγενετο ιωαννης βαπτιζων εν τη ερημω και κηρυσσων βαπτισμα μετανοιας εις αφεσιν αμαρτιων
4 εγενετο ιωαννης ο βαπτιζων εν τη ερημω κηρυσσων βαπτισμα μετανοιας εις αφεσιν αμαρτιων
- 5 και εξεπορευετο προς αυτον πασα η ιουδαια χωρα και οι ιεροσολυμιται και εβαπτιζοντο παντες εν τω ιορδανη ποταμω υπ αυτου εξομολογουμενοι τας αμαρτιας αυτων
5 και εξεπορευετο προς αυτον πασα η ιουδαια χωρα και οι ιεροσολυμιται παντες και εβαπτιζοντο υπ αυτου εν τω ιορδανη ποταμω εξομολογουμενοι τας αμαρτιας αυτων
- 6 ην δε ιωαννης ενδεδυμενος τριχας καμηλου και ζωνην δερματινην περι την οσφυν αυτου και εσθιων ακριδας και μελι αγριον
6 και ην ο ιωαννης ενδεδυμενος τριχας καμηλου και ζωνην δερματινην περι την οσφυν αυτου και εσθιων ακριδας και μελι αγριον
- 7 και εκηρυσσεν λεγων ερχεται ο ισχυροτερος μου οπισω μου ου ουκ ειμι ικανος κυψας λυσαι τον ιμαντα των υποδηματων αυτου
7 και εκηρυσσεν λεγων ερχεται ο ισχυροτερος μου οπισω [μου] ου ουκ ειμι ικανος κυψας λυσαι τον ιμαντα των υποδηματων αυτου
- 8 εγω μεν εβαπτισα υμας εν υδατι αυτος δε βαπτισει υμας εν πνευματι αγιω
8 εγω εβαπτισα υμας υδατι αυτος δε βαπτισει υμας πνευματι αγιω
- 9 και εγενετο εν εκειναις ταις ημεραις ηλθεν ιησους απο ναζαρετ της γαλιλαιας και εβαπτισθη υπο ιωαννου εις τον ιορδανην
9 και εγενετο εν εκειναις ταις ημεραις ηλθεν ιησους απο ναζαρετ της γαλιλαιας και εβαπτισθη εις τον ιορδανην υπο ιωαννου
- 10 και ευθεως αναβαινων απο του υδατος ειδεν σχιζομενους τους ουρανους και το πνευμα ωσει περιστεραν καταβαινον επ αυτον
10 και ευθως αναβαινων εκ του υδατος ειδεν σχιζομενους τους ουρανους και το πνευμα ως περιστεραν καταβαινον εις αυτον
- 11 και φωνη εγενετο εκ των ουρανων συ ει ο υιος μου ο αγαπητος εν ω ευδοκησα

- 11 και φωνη [εγενετο] εκ των ουρανων συ ει ο υιος μου ο αγαπητος εν σοι ευδοκησα
- 12 και ευθως το πνευμα αυτον εκβαλλει εις την ερημον
12 και ευθως το πνευμα αυτον εκβαλλει εις την ερημον
- 13 και ην εκει εν τη ερημω ημερας τεσσαρακοντα πειραζομενος υπο του σατανα και ην μετα των θηριων και οι αγγελοι διηκονουν αυτω
13 και ην εν τη ερημω τεσσαρακοντα ημερας πειραζομενος υπο του σατανα και ην μετα των θηριων και οι αγγελοι διηκονουν αυτω
- 14 μετα δε το παραδοθηναι τον ιωαννην ηλθεν ο ιησους εις την γαλιλαιαν κηρυσσων το ευαγγελιον της βασιλειας του θεου
14 και μετα το παραδοθηναι τον ιωαννην ηλθεν ο ιησους εις την γαλιλαιαν κηρυσσων το ευαγγελιον του θεου
- 15 και λεγων οτι πεπληρωται ο καιρος και ηγγικεν η βασιλεια του θεου μετανοειτε και πιστευετε εν τω ευαγγελιω
15 [και λεγων] οτι πεπληρωται ο καιρος και ηγγικεν η βασιλεια του θεου μετανοειτε και πιστευετε εν τω ευαγγελιω
- 16 περιπατων δε παρα την θαλασσαν της γαλιλαιας ειδεν σιμωνα και ανδρεαν τον αδελφον αυτου βαλλοντας αμφιβληστρον εν τη θαλασση ησαν γαρ αλιεις
16 και παραγων παρα την θαλασσαν της γαλιλαιας ειδεν σιμωνα και ανδρεαν τον αδελφον σιμωνος αμφιβαλλοντας εν τη θαλασση ησαν γαρ αλιεις
- 17 και ειπεν αυτοις ο ιησους δευτε οπισω μου και ποιησω υμας γενεσθαι αλιεις ανθρωπων
17 και ειπεν αυτοις ο ιησους δευτε οπισω μου και ποιησω υμας γενεσθαι αλιεις ανθρωπων
- 18 και ευθεως αφεντες τα δικτυα αυτων ηκολουθησαν αυτω
18 και ευθως αφεντες τα δικτυα ηκολουθησαν αυτω
- 19 και προβας εκειθεν ολιγον ειδεν ιακωβον τον του ζεβεδαιου και ιωαννην τον αδελφον αυτου και αυτοις εν τω πλοιω καταρτιζοντας τα δικτυα
19 και προβας ολιγον ειδεν ιακωβον τον του ζεβεδαιου και ιωαννην τον αδελφον αυτου και αυτοις εν τω πλοιω καταρτιζοντας τα δικτυα
- 20 και ευθεως εκαλεσεν αυτοις και αφεντες τον πατερα αυτων ζεβεδαιον εν τω πλοιω μετα των μισθωτων απηλθον οπισω αυτου
20 και ευθως εκαλεσεν αυτοις και αφεντες τον πατερα αυτων ζεβεδαιον εν τω πλοιω μετα των μισθωτων απηλθον οπισω αυτου
- 21 και εισπορευονται εις καπερναουμ και ευθεως τοις σαββασιν εισελθων εις την συναγωγην εδιδασκεν
21 και εισπορευονται εις καφαρναουμ και ευθως τοις σαββασιν εισελθων εις την συναγωγην εδιδασκεν
- 22 και εξεπλησσοντο επι τη διδαχη αυτου ην γαρ διδασκων αυτοις ως εξουσιαν εχων και ουχ ως οι γραμματαις
22 και εξεπλησσοντο επι τη διδαχη αυτου ην γαρ διδασκων αυτοις ως εξουσιαν εχων και ουχ ως οι γραμματαις
- 23 και ην εν τη συναγωγη αυτων ανθρωπος εν πνευματι ακαθαρτω και ανεκραζεν
23 και ευθως ην εν τη συναγωγη αυτων ανθρωπος εν πνευματι ακαθαρτω και ανεκραζεν
- 24 λεγων εα τι ημιν και σοι ιησου ναζαρηνη ηλθες απολεσαι ημας οίδα σε τις ει ο αγιος του θεου
24 λεγων τι ημιν και σοι ιησου ναζαρηνη ηλθες απολεσαι ημας οίδα σε τις ει ο αγιος του θεου
- 25 και επειτιμησεν αυτω ο ιησους λεγων φιμωθητι και εξελθε εξ αυτου
25 και επειτιμησεν αυτω ο ιησους [λεγων] φιμωθητι και εξελθε εξ αυτου
- 26 και σπαραξαν αυτον το πνευμα το ακαθαρτον και κραξαν φωνη μεγαλη εξηλθεν εξ αυτου
26 και σπαραξαν αυτον το πνευμα το ακαθαρτον και φωνησαν φωνη μεγαλη εξηλθεν εξ αυτου
- 27 και εθαμβηθησαν παντες ωστε συζητειν προς αυτοις λεγοντας τι εστιν τουτο τις η διδαχη η καινη αυτη οτι κατ εξουσιαν και τοις πνευμασιν τοις ακαθαρτοις επιτασσει και υπακουουσιν αυτω
27 και εθαμβηθησαν απαντες ωστε συζητειν αυτοις λεγοντας τι εστιν τουτο διδαχη καινη κατ εξουσιαν και τοις πνευμασιν τοις ακαθαρτοις επιτασσει και υπακουουσιν αυτω
- 28 εξηλθεν δε η ακοη αυτου ευθως εις ολην την περιχωρον της γαλιλαιας
28 και εξηλθεν η ακοη αυτου ευθως πανταχου εις ολην την περιχωρον της γαλιλαιας
- 29 και ευθεως εκ της συναγωγης εξελθοντες ηλθον εις την οικιαν σιμωνος και ανδρεου μετα ιακωβου και ιωαννου
29 και ευθως εκ της συναγωγης εξελθοντες ηλθον εις την οικιαν σιμωνος και ανδρεου μετα ιακωβου και ιωαννου

- 30 η δε πενθερα σιμωνος κατεκειτο πυρεσσουσα και ευθεως λεγουσιν αυτω περι αυτης
 30 η δε πενθερα σιμωνος κατεκειτο πυρεσσουσα και ευθυσ λεγουσιν αυτω περι αυτης
- 31 και προσελθων ηγειρεν αυτην κρατησας της χειρος αυτης και αφηκεν αυτην ο πυρετος ευθεως και διηκονει αυτοις
 31 και προσελθων ηγειρεν αυτην κρατησας της χειρος και αφηκεν αυτην ο πυρετος και διηκονει αυτοις
- 32 οψιας δε γενομενης οτε εδου ο ηλιος εφερον προς αυτον παντας τους κακως εχοντας και τους δαιμονιζομενους
 32 οψιας δε γενομενης οτε εδυσεν ο ηλιος εφερον προς αυτον παντας τους κακως εχοντας και τους δαιμονιζομενους
- 33 και η πολις ολη επισυνηγμενη ην προς την θυραν
 33 και ην ολη η πολις επισυνηγμενη προς την θυραν
- 34 και εθεραπευσεν πολλους κακως εχοντας ποικιλαις νοσοις και δαιμονια πολλα εξεβαλεν και ουκ ηφιεν λαλειν τα δαιμονια οτι ηδεισαν αυτον
 34 και εθεραπευσεν πολλους κακως εχοντας ποικιλαις νοσοις και δαιμονια πολλα εξεβαλεν και ουκ ηφιεν λαλειν τα δαιμονια οτι ηδεισαν αυτον [χριστον ειναι]
- 35 και πρωι εννυχον λιαν αναστας εξηλθεν και απηλθεν εις ερημον τοπον κακει προσηυχετο
 35 και πρωι εννυχα λιαν αναστας εξηλθεν [και απηλθεν] εις ερημον τοπον κακει προσηυχετο
- 36 και κατεδιωξαν αυτον ο σιμων και οι μετ αυτου
 36 και κατεδιωξεν αυτον σιμων και οι μετ αυτου
- 37 και ευροντες αυτον λεγουσιν αυτω οτι παντες ζητουσιν σε
 37 και ευρον αυτον και λεγουσιν αυτω οτι παντες ζητουσιν σε
- 38 και λεγει αυτοις αγωμεν εις τας εχομενας κωμοπολεις ινα κακει κηρυξω εις τουτο γαρ εξεληλυθα
 38 και λεγει αυτοις αγωμεν αλλαχου εις τας εχομενας κωμοπολεις ινα και εκει κηρυξω εις τουτο γαρ εξηλθον
- 39 και ην κηρυσσων εν ταις συναγωγαις αυτων εις ολην την γαλιλαιαν και τα δαιμονια εκβαλλων
 39 και ηλθεν κηρυσσων εις τας συναγωγας αυτων εις ολην την γαλιλαιαν και τα δαιμονια εκβαλλων
- 40 και ερχεται προς αυτον λεπρος παρακαλων αυτον και γονυπετων αυτον και λεγων αυτω οτι εαν θελης δυνασαι με καθαρισαι
 40 και ερχεται προς αυτον λεπρος παρακαλων αυτον [και γονυπετων] λεγων αυτω οτι εαν θελης δυνασαι με καθαρισαι
- 41 ο δε ιησους σπλαγχνισθεις εκτεινας την χειρα ηψατο αυτου και λεγει αυτω θελω καθαρισθητι
 41 και σπλαγχνισθεις εκτεινας την χειρα αυτου ηψατο και λεγει αυτω θελω καθαρισθητι
- 42 και ειποντος αυτου ευθεως απηλθεν απ αυτου η λεπρα και εκαθαρισθη
 42 και ευθυσ απηλθεν απ αυτου η λεπρα και εκαθαρισθη
- 43 και εμβριμησαμενος αυτω ευθεως εξεβαλεν αυτον
 43 και εμβριμησαμενος αυτω ευθυσ εξεβαλεν αυτον
- 44 και λεγει αυτω ορα μηδενι μηδεν ειπης αλλ υπαγε σεαυτον δειξον τω ιερει και προσενεγκε περι του καθαρισμου σου α προσεταξεν μωυσης εις μαρτυριον αυτοις
 44 και λεγει αυτω ορα μηδενι μηδεν ειπης αλλα υπαγε σεαυτον δειξον τω ιερει και προσενεγκε περι του καθαρισμου σου α προσεταξεν μωυσης εις μαρτυριον αυτοις
- 45 ο δε εξελθων ηρξατο κηρυσσειν πολλα και διαφημιζει τον λογον ωστε μηκετι αυτον δυνασθαι φανερω εις πολιν εισελθειν αλλ εξω εν ερημοις τοποις ην και ηρχοντο προς αυτον πανταχοθεν
 45 ο δε εξελθων ηρξατο κηρυσσειν πολλα και διαφημιζει τον λογον ωστε μηκετι αυτον δυνασθαι φανερω εις πολιν εισελθειν αλλ εξω επ ερημοις τοποις [ην] και ηρχοντο προς αυτον παντοθεν

Appendix B

Codex Sinaiticus

(The symbol is the Hebrew character (א) Aleph, though Swete and a few other scholars use the letter S.)

A Greek manuscript of the Old and New Testaments, of the greatest antiquity and value; found on Mount Sinai, in St. Catherine's Monastery, by Constantine Tischendorf. He was visiting there in 1844, under the patronage of Frederick Augustus, King of Saxony, when he discovered in a rubbish basket forty-three leaves of the Septuagint, containing portions of I Par. (Chron.), Jer., Neh., and Esther; he was permitted to take them. He also saw the books of Isaias and I and IV Machabees, belonging to the same codex as the fragments, but could not obtain possession of them; warning the monks of their value, he left for Europe and two years later published the leaves he had brought with him under the name of Codex Friderico-Augustanus, after his patron. They are preserved at Leipzig. On a second visit, in 1853, he found only two short fragments of Genesis (which he printed on his return) and could learn nothing of the rest of the codex. In 1859 he made a third visit, this time under the patronage of the Czar, Alexander II. This visit seemed likewise fruitless when, on the eve of his departure, in a chance conversation with the steward, he learned of the existence of a manuscript there; when it was shown to him, he saw the very manuscript he had sought containing, beyond all his dreams, a great part of the Old Testament and the entire New Testament, besides the Epistle of Barnabas, and part of the "Shepherd" of Hermas, of which two works no copies in the original Greek were known to exist. Thinking it "a crime to sleep", Tischendorf spent the night copying Barnabas; he had to leave in the morning, after failing to persuade the monks to let him have the manuscript. At Cairo he stopped at a monastery belonging to the same monks (they were of the Orthodox Greek Church) and succeeded in having the manuscript sent to him there for transcription; and finally, in obtaining it from the monks as a present to the Czar, Tischendorf's patron and the protector of their Church. Years later, in 1869, the Czar rewarded the two monasteries with gifts of money (7000 and 2000 roubles each) and decorations. The manuscript is treasured in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. Tischendorf published an account of it in 1860; and, under the auspices of the czar, printed it in facsimile in 1862. Twenty-one lithographic plates made from photographs were included in this edition, which was issued in four volumes. The following year he published a critical edition of the New Testament. Finally, in 1867, he published additional fragments of Genesis and Numbers, which had been used to bind other volumes at St. Catherine's and had been discovered by the Archimandrite Porfirius. On four different occasions, then, portions of the original manuscript have been discovered; they have never been published together in a single edition.

The Codex Sinaiticus, which originally must have contained the whole Old Testament, has suffered severely from mutilation, especially in the historical books from Genesis to Esdras (inclusive); the rest of the Old Testament fared much better. The fragments and books extant are: several verses from Gen., xxiii and xxiv, and from Num., v, vi, vii; I Par., ix, 27-xix, 17; Esdras, ix, 9 to end; Nehemias, Esther, Tobias, Judith, Joel, Abdias, Jonas, Nahum, Habacuc, Sophonias, Aggeus, Zacharias, Malachias, Isaias, Jeremias, Lamentations, i, 1-ii, 20; I Machabees, IV Machabees (apocryphal, while the canonical II Machabees and the apocryphal III Machabees were never contained in this codex). A curious occurrence is that Esdras, ix, 9 follows I Par., xix, 17 without any break; the note of a corrector shows that seven leaves of I Par. were copied into the Book of Esdras, probably by a mistake in the binding of the manuscript from which Codex Sinaiticus was copied. Our Esdras is called in this codex, as in many others, Esdras B. This may indicate that it followed Esdras A, as the book called by Jerome III Esdras (see ESDRAS) is named in ancient codices; the proof is by no means sure, however, as IV Machabees is here designated Machabees D, as was usual, although the second and third books of Machabees were absent from the manuscript. The New Testament is complete, likewise the Epistle of Barnabas; six leaves following Barnabas are lost, which probably also contained uncanonical literature: the "Shepherd" of Hermas is incomplete, and we cannot tell whether other works followed. In all, there are 346 1/2 leaves. The order of the New Testament is to be noted, St. Paul's Epistles preceding Acts; Hebrews following II Thess. The manuscript is on good parchment; the pages measure about 15 inches by 13 1/2 inches; there are four columns to a page, except in the poetical books, which are written stichometrically in two columns of greater width; there are 48 lines to a column, but 47 in the Catholic Epistles. The four narrow columns give the page the appearance of an ancient roll; it is not impossible, as Kenyon says, that it was in fact copied from a papyrus roll. It is

written in uncial characters, well formed, without accents or breathings, and with no punctuation except (at times) the apostrophe and the single point for a period. Tischendorf judged that there were four hands engaged in the writing of the manuscript; in this he has been generally followed. He has been less happy in obtaining acceptance of his conjecture that one of these scribes also wrote the New Testament of the Vatican Codex. He recognized seven correctors of the text, one of them contemporaneous with the writing of the manuscript. The Ammonian Sections and the Eusebian Canons are indicated in the margin, probably by a contemporary hand; they seem to have been unknown to the scribe, however, who followed another division. The clerical errors are relatively not numerous, in Gregory's judgment.

In age this manuscript ranks alongside the Codex Vaticanus. Its antiquity is shown by the writing, by the four columns to a page (an indication, probably, of the transition from the roll to the codex form of manuscript.), by the absence of the large initial letters and of ornaments, by the rarity of punctuation, by the short titles of the books, the presence of divisions of the text antedating Eusebius, the addition of Barnabas and Hermas, etc. Such indications have induced experts to place it in the fourth century, along with Codex Vaticanus and some time before Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Ephræmi Rescriptus; this conclusion is not seriously questioned, though the possibility of an early fifth-century date is conceded. Its origin has been assigned to Rome, Southern Italy, Egypt, and Caesarea, but cannot be determined (Kenyon, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, London, 1901, p. 56 sqq.). It seems to have been at one time at Caesarea; one of the correctors (probably of seventh century) adds this note at the end of Esdras: "This codex was compared with a very ancient exemplar which had been corrected by the hand of the holy martyr Pamphilus [d. 309]; which exemplar contained at the end of the subscription in his own hand: `Taken and corrected according to the Hexapla of Origen: Antonius compared it: I, Pamphilus, corrected it'." Pamphilus was, with Eusebius, the founder of the library at Caesarea. Some are even inclined to regard Codex Sinaiticus as one of the fifty manuscripts which Constantine bade Eusebius of Caesarea to have prepared in 331 for the churches of Constantinople; but there is no sign of its having been at Constantinople. Nothing is known of its later history till its discovery by Tischendorf. The text of Codex Sinaiticus bears a very close resemblance to that of Codex Vaticanus, though it cannot be descended from the same immediate ancestor. In general, Codex Vaticanus is placed first in point of purity by contemporary scholars and Codex Sinaiticus next. This is especially true, for the New Testament, of the Gospels. The differences are more frequent in the Old Testament where the codices Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus often agree.