

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION

PAR.	PREFATORY REMARKS	PAGES
I—4.		I—3
1.	Purpose of this edition. Four heads of the Introduction	I
2.	Textual criticism not needed for most words in most texts;	I
3.	and always negative in nature, consisting only in detection and removal of errors	3
4.	Reservation of emendation, as but slightly needed in the N. T. owing to comparative abundance and excellence of documents	3

PART I

THE NEED OF CRITICISM FOR THE TEXT
OF THE NEW TESTAMENT 4—18

5.	Need of criticism for text of the N. T. explained by the circumstances of its transmission, first by writing, and then by printing	4
A. 6—14.	<i>Transmission by writing</i>	4—11
6.	Loss of autographs	4
7.	Cumulative corruption through transcription	5
8.	Variability of corruption under different conditions: relation of date to purity	5
9.	Special modifications of average results of transcription: as	6
10.	(a) by transition from 'clerical' errors into mental changes (intended improvements of language)	6
11.	as in the earlier, and only the earlier, centuries of the N. T.;	7
12.	(b) by 'mixture' of independent texts, which prevailed in the N. T. in Cent. (iii) iv,	8
13.	such mixture having only fortuitous results;	8
14.	and (c) by destruction and neglect of the older MSS	9

viii

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION

PAR.	PAGES
B. 15—18. <i>Transmission by printed editions</i>	11—16
15. Disadvantages of Erasmus, the first editor: his text substantially perpetuated in the 'Received Text'	11
16. Preparatory criticism of Cent. (xvii) xviii, ending with Griesbach	12
17. Lachmann's text of 1831, inspired by Bentley's principles, the first founded directly on documentary authority. Texts of Tischendorf and Tregelles	13
18. Table showing the late date at which primary MSS have become available	14
19. Recapitulation	15
C. 20—22. <i>History of present edition</i>	16—18
20. Origin and history of the present edition	16
21. Nature of its double authorship	17
22. Notice of the provisional private issue	18

PART II

THE METHODS OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM 19—72

23. Successive emergence of the different classes of textual facts	19
SECTION I. INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF READINGS (24—37)	19—30
24. The rudimentary criticism founded on Internal Evidence of Readings, which is of two kinds, Intrinsic and Transcriptional	19
A. 25—27. <i>Intrinsic Probability</i>	20—22
25. First step, instinctive decision between readings by the apparently best sense:	20
26. its untrustworthiness as leading in different hands to different conclusions,	21
27. and as liable to be vitiated by imperfect perception of sense	21
B. 28—37. <i>Transcriptional Probability</i>	22—30
28. Second step, reliance on the presumption against readings likely to have approved themselves to scribes	22
29. Relative fitness of readings for accounting for each other, not relative excellence, the subject of Transcriptional Probability;	22
30. which rests on generalisations from observed proclivities of copyists ('canons of criticism')	23
31. Its uncertainty in many individual variations owing to conflicts of proclivities	24
32. and its <i>prima facie</i> antagonism to Intrinsic Probability	26
33. Apparent superiority and latent inferiority the normal marks of scribes' corrections	26

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION		ix
PAR.		PAGES
34.	Fallacious antagonisms due to difference of mental conditions between scribes and modern readers	27
35.	Contrast of cursory criticism of scribes and deliberate criticism of editors: real excellence of readings often perceptible only after close study	28
36.	Ultior value of readings that are attested by Intrinsic and Transcriptional Probability alike	29
37.	Insufficiency of Internal Evidence of Readings proved by the numerous variations which contain no readings so attested . . .	29
SECTION II. INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF DOCUMENTS (38—48)		30—39
38.	Transition from immediate decisions upon readings to examination of the antecedent credibility of the witnesses for them. (<i>Knowledge of documents should precede final judgement upon readings.</i>)	30
39.	Presumptions, but not more, furnished by relative date	31
40.	The prevailing textual character of documents, as learned from readings in which Internal Evidence is decisive, a guide to their character in other readings	32
41.	A threefold process here involved: (1) provisional decision or suspense on readings; (2) estimate of documents by this standard; and (3) final decision (or suspense) on readings on comparison of all evidence	33
42.	Relative weight of documentary authority variable	34
43.	Greater security given by the combined judgements of Internal Evidence of Documents than by the isolated judgements of Internal Evidence of Readings	34
44.	Uncertainties of Internal Evidence of Documents due to the variously imperfect homogeneousness of texts; as shown in	35
45.	(a) concurrence of excellence of one kind and corruptness of another kind in the same document;	36
46.	(b) derivation of different books within the same document from different exemplars;	37
47.	(c) simultaneous derivation of different elements of text in the same document from different exemplars (Mixture)	38
48.	Moreover Internal Evidence of Documents difficult to apply in texts preserved in a plurality of documents wherever there is a cross division of authority	38
SECTION III. GENEALOGICAL EVIDENCE (49—76)		39—59
A. 49—53. <i>Simple or divergent genealogy</i>		39—42
49.	Transition from character of individual documents to genealogical affinities between documents. (<i>All trustworthy restoration of corrupted texts is founded on the study of their history</i>)	39
50.	Variable relation of each of ten MSS to the rest according as (a) the genealogy is unknown;	40

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-00709-2 - The New Testament in the Original Greek, Volume 2

Edited by Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort

Table of Contents

[More information](#)

X

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION

PAR.	PAGES
51. (b) or descent of nine from the tenth is ascertained;	40
52. (c) or descent of the nine from one lost MS is ascertained;	41
53. (d) or descent of some of the nine from one lost MS and of the rest from another is ascertained	42
B. 54—57. <i>Genealogy and number</i>	43—46
54. The authority of number indeterminate apart from genealogy	43
55. Confusion between documents and votes the only ground for the supposed authority of mere number;	43
56. except so far as extreme paucity of documents may introduce the chance of accidental coincidence in error	44
57. Variability of multiplication and preservation renders rival probabilities derived solely from relative number incommensurable	45
C. 58, 59. <i>Manner of discovering genealogy</i>	46, 47
58. Identity of origin inferred from identity of reading	46
59. Successive steps of divergent genealogy shown by subordination of arrays of documents having identical readings	46
D. 60—65. <i>Complications of genealogy by mixture</i>	47—52
60. Detection of mixture by cross combinations of documents	47
61. Deceptive comprehensiveness of attestation given by mixture to readings originally of narrow range	48
62. Mode of disentangling texts antecedent to mixture by means of conflate readings;	49
63. the attestations of which interpret the attestations of many variations containing no conflate reading	51
64. Inherent imperfections of this process;	52
65. and its frequent inapplicability for want of sufficient evidence antecedent to mixture	52
E. 66—72. <i>Applications of genealogy</i>	53—57
66. Summary neglect of readings found only in documents exclusively descended from another extant document	53
67—69. Process of recovering the text of a lost document from its extant descendants; and its various steps;	53
70. ending in the rejection and in the ratification of many readings	55
71. Two uncertainties attending this process; one occasional, due to mixture with a text extraneous to the line of descent;	56
72. the other inherent, the irrelevance of genealogical evidence in ultimate independent divergences from a common original	56
F. 73—76. <i>Variable use of genealogy according to unequal preservation of documents</i>	57—59
73. Where extant genealogy diverges from a late point, the removal of the later corruptions often easy, while the earlier remain undiscovered	57
74. Detection of earlier corruptions rendered possible by preservation of some ancient documents, but the application of the process always imperfect for want of sufficient documents	58

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION xi

PAR.	PAGES
75. Presumption in favour of composite as against homogeneous attestation increased by proximity to the time of the autograph ; . . .	58
76. but needing cautious application on account of possible mixture . . .	59
SECTION IV. INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF GROUPS (77, 78) 60—62	
77. Inference of identical origin from identical readings applicable to groups of documents ;	60
78. and thus available for separating the elements of mixed documents, and determining their respective characters	61
SECTION V. RECAPITULATION OF METHODS IN RELATION TO EACH OTHER (79—84) 62—66	
79. The threefold process and the results of the Genealogical method	62
80. This method the surest basis of criticism, wherever sufficient evidence is extant for tracing genealogical relations	63
81, 82. Subordinate verification by other kinds of evidence, more especially Internal Evidence of Groups	63
83. Sound textual criticism founded on knowledge of the various classes of facts which have determined variation, and therefore governed by method	65
84. Personal instincts trustworthy only in virtue of past exercise in method	65
SECTION VI. CRITICISM AS DEALING WITH ERRORS ANTECEDENT TO EXISTING TEXTS (85—95) 66—72	
A. 85—92. <i>Primitive errors</i>	66—70
85. Agreement or disagreement of the most original transmitted text with the autograph indeterminable by any documentary evidence	66
86. Occasional paradox of readings authenticated by Genealogical and Transcriptional Evidence, yet condemned by Intrinsic Evidence (<i>a</i>) ;	67
87. explained by the inability of documentary evidence to attest more than relative originality ; which does not exclude corruption	67
88. Such readings sometimes further condemned by decisive Internal Evidence for rival readings, which are in fact cursory emendations by scribes (<i>b</i>)	68
89. Variations falling under these two types not really relevant as to the value of the preceding methods	69
90. Two other cases of primitive corruption, (<i>c</i>) with variants apparently independent of each other, and the best attested variant condemned by Intrinsic Evidence, and (<i>d</i>) with no variation, and the one extant reading condemned by Intrinsic Evidence	69
91. In all four cases the use of Intrinsic Evidence as the basis of decision exactly analogous to its use in ordinary cases ;	69

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION

PAR.	PAGES
92. (a) (b) and (d) identical in principle, the best attested reading of (a) and (b) corresponding to the one reading of (d); while in (c) decision rests on both Intrinsic and Transcriptional Evidence . . .	70
B. 93—95. <i>Removal of primitive errors by conjecture</i>	71, 72
93. Necessity of distinguishing recognition of primitive error from correction of it	71
94. Conjectural emendation founded on combination of Intrinsic and Transcriptional Evidence	71
95. The N. T. but slightly affected by the need of it	72

PART III

APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES OF CRITICISM
TO THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT 73—287

96. Identity of methods for the N. T. and for other books, with difference of evidence	73
--	----

CHAPTER I. PRELIMINARY CHRONOLOGICAL
SURVEY OF DOCUMENTS (97—128) 73—90

97. Greek MSS, Versions, Fathers	73
A. 98—106. <i>Greek MSS</i>	
98. The four great uncial Bibles	74
99. Contents of other uncials	75
100. Chronological distribution of other uncials	75
101. Bilingual uncials	76
102. Cursives	76
103. Greek Lectionaries	76
104. Imperfect knowledge of cursives;	76
105. within what limits more complete knowledge could affect the text	77
106. Uncials almost completely known	77
B. 107—122. <i>Versions</i>	78—86
107. The chief groups, Latin, Syriac, Egyptian	78
108. The Old Latin, (1) African,	78
109. (2) European,	78
110. (3) Italian	79
111. The Vulgate Latin	80
112. Corruption of the Latin Vulgate by mixture, and successive attempts to purify it	81
113. The extant Old Latin documents for the Gospels	81

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION		xiii
PAR.		PAGES
114.	Mixed Vulgate Gospels	82
115.	The factitious Latin texts of bilingual MSS	82
116.	The extant Old Latin documents for the Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse	83
117.	Latin Fathers	83
118.	The Old Syriac and the Vulgate Syriac: Syriac Fathers	84
119.	The Philoxenian or Harklean Syriac and the Jerusalem Syriac	85
120.	The Egyptian versions, Memphitic, Thebaic, and Bashmuric	85
121.	The Armenian and the Gothic	86
122.	The versions of later times	86
C.	123—126. <i>Fathers</i>	87—89
	123. Various forms of patristic evidence	87
	124. Patristic statements about variations or MSS	87
	125. The range of extant patristic evidence limited, especially as regards continuous commentaries	87
	126. Collections of biblical extracts	88
127, 128.	<i>Documentary preparation for this edition</i>	89, 90
	127. Distinctness of the three processes, collection of documentary evidence, discussion of its bearings, and editing of a text	89
	128. In this edition collection of fresh evidence inconsiderable, though sufficient for the acquisition of personal experience	89
CHAPTER II. RESULTS OF GENEALOGICAL EVIDENCE PROPER (129—255)		90—186
SECTION I. DETERMINATION OF THE GENEALOGICAL RELATIONS OF THE CHIEF ANCIENT TEXTS (129—168)		90—119
	129. Exploration of ancient ramifications the starting-point	90
A.	130, 131. <i>Priority of all great variations to Cent. v</i>	91—93
	130. The text of Chrysostom and other Syrian Fathers of Cent. iv substantially identical with the common late text	91
	131. The text of every other considerable group of documents shown by analogous evidence of Fathers and Versions to be of equal or greater antiquity	92
B.	132—151. <i>Posteriority of 'Syrian' (δ) to 'Western' (β) and other (neutral, α) readings shown</i>	
	(1) <i>by analysis of conflate readings</i>	93—107
	132. Enquiry how far whole groups of documents have been affected by mixture	93
	133. Illustrations of conflation from single documents	94
	134. Conflation in groups of documents, as in Mark vi 33, which has three principal variants, α, β, δ:	95
	135. attestation of α, β, δ in this place:	96

PAGE.		PAGES
136.	Transcriptional Probability marks out δ as a combination of α and β ;	96
137.	and, less clearly, α as the parent of β :	97
138.	Intrinsic Probability condemns β , and on examination commends α as far preferable to δ :	98
139.	hence the provisional conclusion that the common original of the documents attesting δ was later than either that of the documents which attest α or that of those which attest β .	99
140.	Similar results in Mark viii 26	99
141.	„ „ ix 38	100
142.	„ „ ix 49	101
143.	„ „ Luke ix 10	102
144.	„ „ xi 5	102
145.	„ „ xii 18	103
146.	„ „ xxiv 53	104
147.	Table of distribution of the chief MSS and versions in α , β , or δ in these eight variations	104
148.	Concordant testimony of these variations to the conflate character of the δ readings, and the originality of the α readings	104
149.	What documents habitually attest the α , β , and δ readings respectively	105
150.	No exceptions being observed elsewhere, the original scribes of δ must have in some manner used α documents and β documents in these conflate readings;	106
151.	and so may be inferred to have used them elsewhere	106
C.	152—162. <i>Posteriority of 'Syrian' to 'Western' and other (neutral and 'Alexandrian') readings shown</i>	
	(a) <i>by Ante-Nicene Patristic Evidence</i>	107—115
152.	The next step to observe the attestations of 'distinctive' readings of the several groups: special value of patristic evidence here as chronological	107
153.	Designation of group β as 'Western', with explanation of the term; of group δ as 'Syrian'; and of another group (γ) as 'Alexandrian'	108
154.	How far the several groups can be traced in the Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse:	109
155.	their relations analogous throughout, so far as extant evidence allows them to be traced	110
156.	Preliminary cautions as to uncertainties of patristic quotations; (1) as liable to incorrect transmission;	110
157.	(2) as originally lax, and so liable to misinterpretation	111
158.	Most of the pertinent patristic evidence confined to the 75 years ending about A.D. 250, though with partial exceptions on each side	112
159.	In the period ending A.D. 250 Western readings abundant and widely spread;	113
160.	and also Alexandrian and other Non-Western readings: but no Syrian readings found	113
161.	Origen's testimony specially significant on account of his peculiar opportunities	114
162.	Importance of this external and independent evidence of the relative lateness of Syrian readings	114

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION		XV
PAR.		PAGES
D.	163–168. <i>Posteriority of Syrian to Western, Alexandrian, and other (neutral) readings shown</i> (3) <i>by Internal Evidence of Syrian readings</i>	115–119
163.	General inferiority of distinctive Syrian readings as tested by Internal Evidence;	115
164.	seen most clearly where other texts differ among themselves, when the Syrian reading is often found to be a modification of a reading not itself original	116
165.	Summary of the various modes of Syrian procedure in relation to the earlier texts	116
166.	The Patristic and the Internal Evidence shew the Syrian text not only to have been formed from the other ancient texts, as the evidence of conflation proved, but to have been formed from them exclusively; so that distinctive Syrian readings must be rejected as corruptions	117
167.	Similarly the Syrian element of attestation adds no appreciable authority to the Non-Syrian element of attestation for earlier readings adopted by the Syrian text (non-distinctive Syrian readings);	118
168.	though sometimes the elements cannot be sufficiently distinguished owing to Non-Syrian mixture	118
SECTION II. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CHIEF ANCIENT TEXTS (169–187)		119–135
169.	Concurrence of the Pre-Syrian texts having been accepted as decisive authority, the several differences of reading between them can be dealt with only by ascertaining the characteristics of each text	119
A.	170–176. <i>Western characteristics</i>	120–126
170.	Prevalence of obvious corruption in the Western text, chiefly owing to bold licence of treatment;	120
171.	distinctive Western readings and non-distinctive Syrian readings originally Western bearing the same testimony	121
172.	The Western text not single and created at once, but various and progressive	122
173.	Its two chief characteristics boldness of paraphrase and readiness to adopt extraneous matter;	122
174.	other tendencies found at work in other texts, but specially exuberant here, being (1) to incipient paraphrase, as shown in petty changes of form,	123
175.	and (2) to assimilation, especially of parallel or similar passages (harmonistic corruption)	124
176.	Similar licence found in the texts of other literature much read in early Christian times, and probably due in the N. T. to inconsiderate regard for immediate use and edification	125

xvi CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION

PAGE.	PAGES
B. 177—180. <i>The neutral text and its preservation</i>	126—130
177. The patristic evidence for Non-Western Pre-Syrian readings chiefly Alexandrian, and the evidence of versions in their favour chiefly Egyptian; as was natural from the character of the Alexandrian church:	126
178. but they often have other scattered Pre-Syrian attestation, Greek Latin and Syriac, chiefly in the very best Western documents; shewing that the Non-Western text in remote times was not confined to Alexandria:	127
179. and Alexandria can hardly have furnished all the Non-Western readings found in Fathers and Versions of the fourth and fifth centuries	128
180. Fallacy of the term 'Alexandrian' as applied to all Non-Western Pre-Syrian texts and documents; still more, to Pre-Syrian texts or documents generally	129
C. 181—184. <i>Alexandrian characteristics</i>	130—132
181. Existence of a distinct class of truly Alexandrian readings	130
182. Their derivation from the rival Pre-Syrian readings attested by Internal Evidence. Their documentary attestation, and the circumstances which obscure it	130
183. Temperate forms of incipient paraphrase and of skilful assimilation, with careful attention to language, and without bold paraphrase or interpolation from extraneous sources, the chief Alexandrian characteristics	131
184. Instructiveness of ternary variations in which a single cause has occasioned two independent changes, Western and Alexandrian. Alexandrian readings sometimes adopted by the Syrian text	132
D. 185—187. <i>Syrian characteristics</i>	132—135
185. The Syrian text due to a 'recension' in the strict sense, being formed out of its three chief predecessors, used simultaneously, with an elaborateness which implies deliberate criticism	132
186. Its probable origin the inconvenient conflict of the preceding texts, each of which had claims to respect; the only guide in the choice of readings being probably a rough kind of Intrinsic Probability	133
187. Lucidity and completeness the chief qualities apparently desired: little omitted out of the earlier texts, much added, but chiefly expletives and unimportant matter: the general result to introduce smoothness and diminish force	134
SECTION III. SKETCH OF POSTNICENE TEXTUAL HISTORY (188—198)	135—145
A. 188—190. <i>The two stages of the Syrian text</i>	135—139
188. Probable connexion between the Greek Syrian revision or 'recension' and the Syriac revision to which the Syriac Vulgate is due	135

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION xvii

PAR.	PAGES
189. Two stages in the Greek Syrian text indicated by minor differences of reading, the first being probably followed by the Syriac revision, the second alone being perpetuated in Greek	137
190. The first Syrian revision of uncertain date, between 250 and 350; possibly made or promoted by Lucianus of Antioch in the latter part of Cent. III	137
B. 191–193. <i>Mixture in the fourth century</i>	139–141
191. Destruction of early texts under Diocletian, and diffusion of mixed texts to the loss of local peculiarities through the circumstances of Cent. IV	139
192. Similar mixtures in Latin texts, with revisions in partial accordance with Greek MSS, sometimes containing a Syrian text	140
193. Similar mixtures, with progressive disappearance of the Pre-Syrian texts, in patristic texts of this period	140
C. 194, 195. <i>Final supremacy of the Syrian text</i>	141–143
194. Notwithstanding the long persistence of mixed texts, eventual triumph of the (almost unmixed) Syrian text;	141
195. due partly to the contraction of the Greek world, and the destruction of copies by invaders in outlying regions, partly to the centralisation of Greek Christendom round Constantinople, the heir of the Syrian text of Antioch	142
D. 196, 197. <i>Relics of Pre-Syrian texts in cursives</i>	143–145
196. Substantial identity of text in the mass of cursives, along with sporadic, or occasionally more extensive, occurrence of Pre-Syrian readings in some cursives	143
197. Such readings in effect fragmentary copies of lost ancient MSS	144
E. 198. <i>Recapitulation of the history of the text</i>	145, 146
198. Continuous course of textual events from the rise of the Western text to the attempt made to remedy the confusion of texts by the Syrian revision, and the disappearance of the unmixed Pre-Syrian texts; and thence to the gradual supersession of rival mixed texts by the Syrian text of Constantinople	145
SECTION IV. RELATIONS OF THE PRINCIPAL EXTANT DOCUMENTS TO THE CHIEF ANCIENT TEXTS (199–223) 146–162	
A. 199, 200. <i>Nature of the process of determination</i>	146–148
199. Application of the history to criticism of readings begins with determination of the ancient text or texts represented by each principal document	146
200. The process of finding by readings of clearly marked attestation whether a document follows this or that ancient text, or a mixture of two, or a mixture of more	147
B	

xviii CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION

	PAGES
PAR.	
B. 201—212. <i>Texts found in Greek MSS</i>	148—155
201. Preliminary	148
202. D a Western MS of the Gospels and Acts	148
203. D ₂ G ₃ Western MSS of St Paul's Epistles. No purely Alexandrian MSS extant	149
204. B Pre-Syrian, not Alexandrian, nor (except within narrow limits) Western	150
205. K Pre-Syrian, with large Western and Alexandrian elements	151
206. All other extant MSS mixed, and partially or wholly Syrian: three heads of difference in respect of mixture.	151
207. The mixed text of A: Syrian predominance in the Gospels of A, not in the other books: affinity of A with the Latin Vulgate	152
208. The mixed text of C	152
209. Various mixed texts of other uncial MSS of the Gospels,	152
210. and of the other books;	153
211. also of some cursive MSS of the Gospels,	154
212. and of the other books.	154
C. 213—219. <i>Texts found in Versions</i>	155—159
213. Mixed Latin texts	155
214. The Old Syriac Pre-Syrian, chiefly (as far as known) Western: the Vulgate Syriac incompletely Syrian	156
215. The Harklean Syriac chiefly Syrian: its secondary ancient element	156
216. Peculiar mixture in the Jerusalem Syriac	157
217. The Egyptian Versions Pre-Syrian, predominantly neutral and also Alexandrian, with Western elements of uncertain date; the Æthiopic partly the same, partly Syrian	157
218. The Armenian mixed, having various very early as well as Syrian elements; the Gothic mixed, chiefly Syrian and Western, re- sembling the Italian Latin	158
219. General correspondence of the textual elements of versions with the dates of versions	
D. 220—223. <i>Texts found in Greek Fathers</i>	159—162
220. Compound evidence (author's text and translator's text) furnished by Greek works extant in translations, as (Latin) the treatise of Irenæus,	159
221. and various works of Origen;	
222. and (Syriac) the <i>Theophania</i> of Eusebius, and Cyril on St Luke	
223. Later Greek writers having texts with large Pre-Syrian elements	
SECTION V. IDENTIFICATION AND ESTIMATION OF READINGS AS BELONGING TO THE CHIEF ANCIENT TEXTS (224—243)	162—179
A. 224. <i>Nature of the process of identification</i>	162
224. Assignment of readings to particular ancient texts frequently pos- sible through knowledge of the constituent elements of the attesting documents	162

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION xix

PAR.	PAGES
B. 225, 226. <i>Identification and rejection of Syrian readings</i>	163, 164
225. Documentary criteria for detecting Syrian readings	163
226. Causes and limitations of their occasional uncertainties	164
C. 227–232. <i>Identification of Western and of Alexandrian readings</i>	164–169
227. Assignment of Pre-Syrian readings to the several Pre-Syrian types a larger task	164
228. Documentary criteria of distinctively Western readings;	165
229. and of distinctively Alexandrian readings;	166
230. and also of Western readings which became Syrian, and of Alexan- drian readings which became Syrian	167
231. The attestation of Non-Western and Non-Alexandrian readings essentially residual	167
232. Causes of occasional uncertainty of assignation	168
D. 233–235. <i>Identification of neutral readings</i>	169–172
233. In ternary variations Pre-Syrian readings by the side of Western and Alexandrian readings may be either modifications of the others or independent and neutral	169
234. The attestation of neutral readings ascertained partly by direct in- spection of ternary readings, partly by comparison of the two chief types of binary readings	170
235. Details of neutral attestation	170
E. 236–239. <i>Suspiciousness of Western and of Alexandrian readings</i>	172–175
236. Western and Alexandrian texts, as wholes, aberrant in character	172
237. The possibility that individual Western or Alexandrian readings may be original not excluded by any known genealogical relations;	173
238. but internal character unfavourable to the claims of all but a few	173
239. The apparent originality of some Western readings due to derivation from traditional sources	174
F. 240–242. <i>Exceptional Western non-interpolations</i>	175–177
240. Certain apparently Western omissions in the Gospels shown by in- ternal character to be original, <i>i. e.</i> non-interpolations	175
241. The probable origin of the corresponding Non-Western interpolations	176
242. No analogous exceptional class of genuine Alexandrian readings	177
G. 243. <i>Recapitulation of genealogical evidence proper</i>	178, 179
243. Results of genealogical evidence proper summed up in five proposi- tions	178

XX		CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION	PAGES
SECTION VI. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS CRITICISM WITH REFERENCE TO ANCIENT TEXTS (244—255)			179—186
A. 244—246. <i>Foundation of historical criticism by Mill, Bentley, and Bengel</i>			179—181
244.	The necessity of considering the studies of Cent. XVIII on ancient texts		179
245.	Mill's detached criticisms: importance of Bentley's principle of Greek and Latin consent; not directly embodied in a text before Lachmann;		180
246.	but instrumental in suggesting Bengel's classification of documents by 'nations' or 'families'		180
B. 247—249. <i>Development of historical criticism by Griesbach, in contrast with Hug's theory of recensions</i>			181—183
247.	Bengel followed by Semler and others, but especially Griesbach: misunderstandings arising from the ambiguity of the term 'recension'		181
248.	Hug's comparatively true view of the Western text, and his fanciful theory of recensions founded on words of Jerome		181
249.	Griesbach's disproof of the existence of the supposed Origenian recension: the Syrian recension perhaps due to Lucianus: the possibility of a recension by Hesychius		182
C. 250—253. <i>Defects of Griesbach's criticism</i>			183—185
250.	Griesbach's confusion between classification of ancient texts and of extant documents, and consequent inadequate sense of mixture, and neglect of groupings;		183
251.	his confusion of Alexandrian readings with readings preserved chiefly at Alexandria, and consequent failure to detect neutral readings;		183
252.	his excessive confidence in Transcriptional Probability: and his use of the Received Text as a basis		184
253.	The limitations of view in Griesbach, and in the critics of Cent. XVIII generally, due to the slenderness and the peculiar character of the materials accessible to them		185
D. 254, 255. <i>Permanent value of Griesbach's criticism</i>			185, 186
254.	Griesbach's greatness as a critic: his criticism historical in character, and derived from classification of the actual phenomena: the validity of its principle and chief results not affected by his later observations		185
255.	Disregard of the genealogical basis laid down by Griesbach an element of insecurity in the texts of his successors		186

<i>CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION</i>		xxi
		PAGES
CHAPTER III. <i>RESULTS OF INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF GROUPS AND DOCUMENTS</i> (256—355) 187—271		
SECTION I. DOCUMENTARY GROUPS AS LIMITED BY REFERENCE TO PRIMARY GREEK MSS GENERALLY (256—280) 187—206		
A.	256—260. <i>General considerations on Documentary Groups</i>	187—191
	256. Internal Evidence of Documents already taken into account for the great ancient texts, in reference to their internal character ; . .	187
	257. and this process equally applicable to any group of documents that recurs in isolation from the rest,	188
	258. on the assumption that the text of the group is homogeneous . . .	189
	259. Isolation a necessary condition, because readings attested by other documents as well as by the group exhibit the character not of the group's special ancestor but of an earlier ancestor of all . . .	189
	260. Virtual identity of groups found to be compatible with a certain amount of variation in their composition	190
B.	261—264. <i>Progressive limitation of Groups with reference to Primary Greek MSS</i>	191—194
	261. Groups worthy of attention found to be comparatively few, being marked by the presence of one or more primary Greek MSS . . .	191
	262. Enumeration of primary Greek MSS	192
	263. Internal excellence of readings attested by all the primary Greek MSS ;	193
	264. or by all except D or D ₄ G ₃	193
C.	265—267. <i>Relation of Primary Greek MSS to other documentary evidence</i>	194—196
	265. The need of determining whether Primary Greek MSS can be decisive as to a reading opposed by all or nearly all other documents of any class	194
	266. The chief means of determination (a) Internal Evidence of the Groups thus formed by Primary Greek MSS, to be discussed hereafter, and (b) the textual character of the several classes of secondary documents, to be considered now	195
	267. Important fragmentary documents to be noticed in variations for which they are extant, that it may be ascertained whether their absence has to be allowed for elsewhere	196
D.	268. <i>Absence of Secondary Greek MSS from Groups containing Primary Greek MSS</i>	196, 197
	268. The large amount of various mixture in all secondary Greek MSS sufficient to account for their opposition to many genuine readings of Primary Greek MSS	196

	PAR.	PAGES
E.	269—273. <i>Absence of Versions from Groups containing Primary Greek MSS</i>	197—201
	269. Versions are liable to be found supporting wrong Western readings in consequence of the wide range of Western corruption among them;	197
	270. and the versions most free from Western corruption are the versions oftenest found supporting the Primary Greek MSS	198
	271. Apparent dissent of versions is not always a mark of difference of text, their apparent renderings being often due to inability to express Greek distinctions, or to freedom of diction,	198
	272. or to love of paraphrase, found in translators even more than in scribes	199
	273. The existence of true cases of opposition of all versions to genuine readings of Primary Greek MSS is consistent with the textual composition of the versions, as given above; and the absence of attestation by versions is not accompanied by suspiciousness of internal character	200
F.	274—279. <i>Absence of Fathers from Groups containing Primary Greek MSS</i>	201—205
	274. Negative patristic evidence irrelevant against a reading except in the few cases in which quotation would have been morally inevitable;	201
	275. even when it is supported by positive Post-Nicene patristic evidence, the force of which is weakened by the prevalence of mixture in Post-Nicene patristic texts	201
	276. The force of the apparent opposition of Ante-Nicene patristic evidence is weakened (1) by the assimilation of patristic texts to the current texts in transcription or printing, which is often indicated by varieties of reading or by the context;	202
	277. or even in the absence of such marks, conscious or unconscious recollection of the current texts being virtually inseparable from transcription and editing:	203
	278. (2) by laxity of quotation, which naturally follows in most cases the same lines as laxity of transcription:	203
	279. and (3) by the large Western element in the texts of even the Alexandrian Fathers	204
G.	280. <i>Absence of Versions and Fathers from Groups containing Primary Greek MSS</i>	205, 206
	280. Versions and Fathers, as representative of lost MSS, are not generically different in ultimate authority from MSS: nor is there any inherent improbability in the supposition that all Versions and Fathers may occasionally coincide in complete defection from a right reading	205

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION xxiii

	PAGES
SECTION II. DOCUMENTARY GROUPS AS LIMITED BY REFERENCE TO THE BEST PRIMARY GREEK MSS (281—355)	207—271
A. 281—283. <i>Relation of variations between Primary Greek MSS to the chief ancient texts</i>	207—209
281. Natural harmony between a true interpretation of the relations between important groups and the known relations between the chief ancient texts	207
282. Its apparent violation by the apparent opposition of composite attestation to probable readings;	208
283. explained by the early adoption of Western readings in eclectic texts, and by the mixed texts of most extant MSS.	209
B. 284—286. <i>General relations of B and N to other documents</i>	210—212
284. Preeminence of NB combined, and comparative preeminence of B alone, ascertained by Internal Evidence of Groups;	210
285. as it was virtually by analysis of the texts of documents in relation to the chief ancient texts	210
286. Substantial independence of the two processes, and consequent mutual verification	211
C. 287—304. <i>Origin and character of readings of NB combined</i>	212—227
287. Enquiry into the preeminence of NB combined	212
288. Question as to the independence of their respective texts; not answered by the participation of the scribe of B in the writing of N	213
289. Community of readings in any two MSS insufficient for deter- mining the proximity or distance of the common source, which may even be the autograph	214
290. The hypothesis of a proximate common origin of N and B, obviously incredible in its literal sense, has now to be examined as limited to a common element in N and B	215
291. Their texts being simplified by neglect of readings evidently due to mixture and of 'singular' readings,	215
292. the remaining discrepancies, in which each has very ancient support, are unfavourable to the hypothesis	216
293. Community of manifestly wrong readings in any two MSS is a proof that the common original was not the autograph, but is indecisive as to degree of remoteness	216
294. Community of a succession of mere blunders is a sign of proximate- ness of common source: but only one such is found in NB com- bined, and that easily explicable by accidental coincidence	217
295. Positive indications of the remoteness of the common source are furnished by the genealogical relations of N and B under two heads.	219
296. (a) The identity of internal character between the least attested and the better attested readings of NB combined is a reason for re- ferring both to the same common source, which in the latter case cannot be proximate	219

P.A.R.	PAGES
297. The primitiveness of text thus established for the common source of $\kappa\beta$ is compatible with either (1) the primitiveness and consequent extreme remoteness of the actual common source, or (2) transcription from a primitive MS, or (3) inheritance from a singularly incorrupt ancestry	220
298. But (2) the two latter alternatives are excluded by the second kind of genealogical considerations; that is, each MS is shown by readings having a small very ancient accessory attestation to contain a separate text of its own, at once analogous in character to the other and distinct from it;	221
299. these two separate texts being likewise perceptible in ternary variations:	221
300. so that it is unnatural to take the text of $\kappa\beta$ as a third independent text rather than as representing the coincidences of the independent texts of κ and of β	222
301. Hence κ and β are descended through separate and divergent ancestries from a common original not far from the autographs	222
302. Readings of $\kappa\beta$ are virtually readings of a lost MS above two centuries older. The strong presumption of relative purity due to this high antiquity is confirmed by Internal Evidence of Groups	223
303. Absolute purity is negated by Western non-interpolations, possible concurrences of κ and β in wrong Western readings in St Paul, and 'primitive' errors, besides accidental coincidences in <i>e.g.</i> itacistic errors. With these exceptions, readings of $\kappa\beta$ should be accepted when not contravened by strong internal evidence, and then only treated as doubtful	224
304. Illustrative examples of good but <i>prima facie</i> difficult readings of $\kappa\beta$	226
D. 305—307. <i>Binary uncial combinations containing β and κ respectively</i>	227—230
305. Peculiar excellence of the binary combinations BL, BC, BT &c.	227
306. Exceptional and variable character of BD ₂ in the Pauline Epistles	228
307. Questionable character of most binary combinations containing κ	229
E. 308—325. <i>Singular and subsingular readings of β</i>	230—246
308. Definition of 'singular' and 'subsingular' readings	230
309. The authority of the singular readings of any document variable according to the number and genealogical relations of all the extant documents: in a complex pedigree no presumption against singular readings of a document known to have an exceptional ancestry	230
310. Separation of the singular readings of the proper text of a document, due to its ancestry, from its mere 'individualisms' originating with the scribe	231
311. Use of the determination of characteristic individualisms, whether clerical or mental, in the examination of singular readings	232
312. Individualisms of β chiefly slight mechanical inaccuracies:	233

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION XXV

PAR.	PAGES
313. groundlessness of the supposition that its scribe was addicted to arbitrary omissions, (its supposed omissions being due only to an inverted view of the interpolations of the 'Received' and the intermediate texts,)	234
314. except perhaps as regards petty words, as articles and pronouns:	235
315. its other individualisms simple and inartificial (chiefly easy assimilations), such as would proceed from a dull and patient but sometimes negligent transcriber	237
316. Subsingular readings of B various in character according to the accessory attestation	237
317. Singular readings of B often individualisms only, but also often probably right	238
318. Excellence of singular and subsingular readings of B in ternary and especially in composite ternary variations, made up of two or more binary variations with varying distributions of attestation	239
319. Reasons why the readings of B in such cases cannot be the result of skilful choice,	240
320. which must not be confounded with the incomplete adoption of composite Western readings in the Pauline Epistles, due only to negligence	240
321. Examples of the excellence of subsingular readings of B in ternary variations; whether of the simpler kind (James v 7);	241
322. or composite, consisting of a single phrase (Mark vi 43);	242
323. or formed by a series of separate variations (St Mark's account of the denials of St Peter)	243
324. Excellence of many subsingular and even singular readings of B in binary variations, though many have to be rejected	244
325. Many genuine readings in the Acts and Epistles virtually subsingular readings of B with the Syrian attestation added	245
F. 326—329. <i>Singular and subsingular readings of K and other MSS</i>	246—250
326. Individualisms of K bold and careless: subsingular readings of K mostly suspicious, but a few possibly or probably right	246
327. Probability that the reading of the archetype of KB is usually preserved in either K or B where they differ	247
328. Hence subsingular readings of either MS may be either virtually equivalent to subsingular readings of KB or early corruptions of limited range: subsingular readings of B frequently the former, subsingular readings of K usually the latter	248
329. Internal Evidence of Groups and Documents unfavourable to singular and subsingular readings of all other MSS, and to all binary combinations of other MSS	250
G. 330—339. <i>Determination of text where B and K differ</i>	250—256
330. Erroneous results obtained by simply following B in all places not containing self-betraying errors	250
331. Use of Secondary documentary evidence and Internal evidence in conflicts of B and K	251

PAR.	PAGES
332. Value of Secondary documentary evidence as proving readings not to be individualisms, and throwing back their age:	252
333. its special value when it includes mixed documents (<i>e.g.</i> cursives) having an ancient element;	252
334. recognition of their weight in Non-Syrian readings being consistent with neglect of their Syrian readings	253
335. Illustration of the composite texts of mixed documents from E_3 , a transcript of the Western D_2 made after D_2 had been partially assimilated to the Syrian text by correctors,	254
336. as exemplified by Rom. xv 31 ff., which shews incomplete copying of an incompletely assimilated text; and consequent survival of some Western readings:	254
337. comparison of E_3 as interpreted by D_2 with E_3 as it would appear if D_2 were lost a key to the doubleness of text in other mixed documents, warranting neglect of all readings not discrepant from: the current or Syrian text;	255
338. such neglect being the only means of avoiding much positive error	255
339. Cumulative absence of attestation by late mixed documents proved unimportant by the numerous certain readings which have no such attestation	256
H. 340–346. <i>Determination of text where B is absent</i>	256–263
340. Three portions of text in which B (or its fundamental text) is wanting	256
341. (1) <i>Variations including Western readings supported by B in the Pauline Epistles</i> : difficulty of distinguishing Alexandrian from genuine readings opposed to largely attested readings of BD_2G_3 :	257
342. possible but rarely probable Western origin of readings of $\aleph BD_2G_3$	258
343. (2) <i>Parts of Pauline Epistles for which B is defective</i> : difficulty noticed under the last head repeated; also of detecting readings answering to subsingular readings of B: absolute authority of \aleph not increased by its relative preeminence	259
344. (3) <i>Apocalypse</i> : obscurity of documentary relations: \aleph full of individualisms, and otherwise of very mixed character: relative excellence of A, and special value of AC combined: lateness of text in most versions: internal evidence	260
345. Need of further examination of documentary genealogy in the Apocalypse	262
346. Anomalous relation of the ‘Received’ to the Syrian text in the Apocalypse	262
I. 347–355. <i>Supplementary details on the birth-place and the composition of leading MSS</i>	264–271
347. Uncertainty as to the birth-place of the chief uncials except the bilingual MSS: absence of evidence for the supposed Alexandrian origin of some	264
348. Slight orthographical indications suggesting that B and \aleph were written in the West, A and C at Alexandria;	265

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION xxvii

PAR.		PAGES
349.	supported as regards B and N by their exhibition of a Latin system of divisions in Acts, though not due to the first hands . . .	266
350.	Other indications from divisions of books altogether uncertain . . .	266
351.	Surmise that B and N were both written in the West, probably at Rome, but that the ancestry of N contained an element transmitted from Alexandria: the inclusion of Hebrews about the middle of Cent. iv compatible with this supposition . . .	267
352.	Similarity of text throughout B and (except in the Apocalypse) throughout N probably due to sameness of average external conditions, the greater uncials being probably copied from MSS which included only portions of the N.T. . . .	267
353.	Various forms and conditions of corrections by the different 'hands' of MSS	269
354.	Changes of reading by the second hand (the 'corrector') of B: worthless character of the changes by the third hand	270
355.	The three chief sets of corrections of N. Erasures	270

CHAPTER IV. SUBSTANTIAL INTEGRITY OF THE
PUREST TRANSMITTED TEXT (356-374) 271-287

356.	The ultimate question as to the substantial identity of the purest transmitted text with the text of the autographs to be approached by enquiring first how far the text of the best Greek uncials is substantially identical with the purest transmitted text	271
A.	357-360. <i>Approximate non-existence of genuine readings unattested by any of the best Greek uncials</i>	272-276
357.	The preservation of scattered genuine readings by mixture with lost lines of transmission starting from a point earlier than the divergence of the ancestries of B and N is theoretically possible: . . .	272
358.	but is rendered improbable, (a) as regards the readings of secondary uncials, by the paucity and sameness of their elements of mixture, and by the internal character of readings	273
359.	There is a similar theoretical possibility as regards (b) readings wholly or chiefly confined to Versions and Fathers, which exist in great numbers, and <i>a priori</i> deserve full consideration: . . .	274
360.	but they are condemned by Internal Evidence of Readings, with a few doubtful exceptions	274
B.	361-370. <i>Approximate sufficiency of existing documents for the recovery of the genuine text, notwithstanding the existence of some primitive corruptions</i>	276-284
361.	The question as to the possibility of primitive error not foreclosed by any assumption that no true words of Scripture can have perished, nor by the improbability of most existing conjectures . . .	276

PAR.	PAGES
362. Presumption in favour of the integrity of the purest transmitted text derived from the small number of genuine extant readings not attested by N or B	277
363. Absence of any contrary presumption arising from the complexity of attestation in the N.T., which is in fact due to unique advantages in the antiquity, variety, and excellence of the evidence;	278
364. and yet more in the preeminent excellence of two or three existing documents	279
365. The existence of primitive errors, with variety of evidence, illustrated by 2 Pet. iii 10;	279
366. and not to be denied even where there is no variation, especially if the existing text gives a superficial sense	280
367. Impossibility of determining whether primitive errors came in at the first writing by the author or amanuensis, or at a very early stage of transmission: transitional class of virtually primitive errors in places where the true text has a trifling attestation	280
368. Paucity of probable primitive errors, and substantial integrity of the purest transmitted text, as tested by Internal Evidence	281
369. Total absence of deliberate dogmatic falsification as an originating cause of any extant variants, notwithstanding the liability of some forms of bold paraphrase to be so interpreted	282
370. Dogmatic influence limited to preference between readings antecedently existing: baselessness of early accusations of wilful corruption, except in part as regards Marcion. Absence of dogmatic falsification antecedent to existing variations equally indicated by Internal Evidence	283
C. 371—374. <i>Conditions of further improvement of the text</i>	284—287
371. Future perfecting of the text to be expected through more exact study of relations between existing documents, rather than from new materials, useful as these may be:	284
372. but only in accordance with principles already ascertained and applied	285
373. Inherent precariousness of texts constituted without reference to genealogical relations of documents	286
374. Certainty of the chief facts of genealogical history in the N. T., and of the chief relations between existing documents	287

PART IV

NATURE AND DETAILS OF THIS EDITION 288—324

A. 375—377. <i>Aim and limitations of this edition</i>	288—290
375. This text an attempt to reproduce at once the autograph text;	288
376. limited by uncertainties due to imperfection of evidence, and by the exclusive claims of high ancient authority in a manual edition;	289

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION xxix

FAR.	PAGES
377. and thus modified by alternative readings, and by the relegation of probable but unattested or insufficiently attested readings to the Appendix	290
B. 378—392. <i>Textual notation</i>	291—302
378. Three classes of variations or readings, with corresponding notation: forms of variation also three. Omission, Insertion, Substitution	291
379. <i>First class.</i> Alternative readings proper, placed without accompanying marks in margin, or indicated by simple brackets in text	291
380. <i>Second class.</i> Places where a primitive corruption of text is suspected, marked by <i>Ap.†</i> in margin (or † in text)	292
381. <i>Third class.</i> Rejected readings of sufficient special interest to deserve notice;	293
382. (1) Rejected readings worthy of association with the text or margin, classified as follows	294
383. Nine Non-Western interpolations in Gospels retained in the text within double brackets, to avoid omission on purely Western authority;	294
384. and five apparently Western interpolations, containing important traditional matter, likewise enclosed in double brackets	295
385. Other interesting Western additions (interpolations) and substitutions in Gospels and Acts retained in the margin within peculiar marks	295
386. (2) Rejected readings not worthy of association with the text or margin, but interesting enough to be noticed in the Appendix, indicated by <i>Ap.</i>	298
387. Explanation of the course adopted as to the last twelve verses of St Mark's Gospel;	298
388. the Section on the Woman taken in Adultery;	299
389. the Section on the Man working on the Sabbath;	300
390. the interpolations in the story of the Pool of Bethzatha;	300
391. the account of the piercing by the soldier's spear, as inserted in the text of St Matthew;	301
392. and the mention of Ephesus in the beginning of the Epistle to the Ephesians	302
C. 393—404. <i>Orthography</i>	302—310
393. Determination of orthography difficult, but not to be declined without loss of fidelity and of the individual characteristics of different books	302
394. The orthography of classical writers as edited often conventional only; and the evidence for the orthography of the Greek Bible relatively large	303
395. Most of the unfamiliar spellings in the N. T. derived from the popular language, not 'Alexandrine', nor yet 'Hellenistic';	303
396. illustrated by other popular Christian and Jewish writings and by inscriptions	304
397. Most spellings found in the best MSS of the N.T. probably not introduced in or before Cent. IV, but transmitted from the autographs; and at all events the most authentic that we possess	305

	PAGES
398. Orthographical variations treated here in the same manner as others, subject to defects of evidence, and with much uncertainty as to some results	306
399. Orthographical change was more rapid than substantive change, but followed the same main lines of transmission: the fundamental orthographical character of documents is disguised by superficial itacism	306
400. Western and Alexandrian spellings: habitual neutrality of B	307
401. Tabulation of recurring spellings indispensable for approximate determination, notwithstanding the impossibility of assuming an absolute uniformity	307
402. Orthographical alternative readings reserved for the Appendix	308
403. Digression on itacistic error as diminishing but not invalidating the authority of the better MSS as between substantive readings differing only by vowels that are liable to be interchanged;	308
404. with illustrations of the permutation of \omicron and ω , ϵ and α , ϵ and η , ϵ and η , and η and ψ	309
D. 405–416. <i>Breathings, Accents, and other accessories of printing</i>	310–318
405. No transmission of Breathings (except indirectly) or Accents in early uncials	310
406. Evidence respecting them extraneous, that is, derived from grammarians and late MSS, whether of the N. T. or of other Greek writings	311
407. Peculiar breathings attested indirectly by aspiration of preceding consonants	311
408. Breathings of proper names, Hebrew or other, to be determined chiefly by their probable etymology:	312
409. difficulty as to the breathing of Ιουδας and its derivatives	313
410. Special uses of the Iota subscript	314
411. Insertion of accents mainly regulated by custom, with adoption of the frequent late shortening of long vowels	314
412. Syllabic division of words at end of lines generally guided by the rules of Greek grammarians and the precedents of the four earliest MSS	315
413. Quotations from the O.T. printed in uncial type, transliterated Hebrew words in spaced type, titles and formulæ in capitals	315
414. Distinctive use of Κύριος and $[\delta] \text{κύριος}$;	316
415. of Χριστός and $[\delta] \text{χριστός}$;	317
416. and of Ψυιστος and $\delta \text{ψιστος}$	318
E. 417–423. <i>Punctuation, Divisions of text, and Titles of books</i>	318–322
417. No true transmission of punctuation in early uncials or other documents; necessity of punctuating according to presumed interpretation	318
418. Simplicity of punctuation preferred. Alternative punctuations	319
419. Graduated division and subdivision by primary sections, paragraphs, subparagraphs, and capitals	319

CONTENTS OF INTRODUCTION xxxi

PAR.		PAGES
420.	Metrical arrangement of passages metrical in rhythm	319
421.	Peculiar examples and analogous arrangements	320
422.	Order of books regulated by tradition, that is, the best Greek tradition of Cent. iv: position of the Pauline Epistles in the N. T., and of Hebrews among the Pauline Epistles	320
423.	Traditional titles of books adopted from the best MSS. The collective GOSPEL. The forms <i>Colassae</i> in the title, <i>Colossae</i> in the text	321
F. 424, 425.	<i>Conclusion</i>	322—324
424.	Acknowledgements	322
425.	Last words	323