5

JOURNAL

OF

BIBLICAL LITERATURE

Volume XXVIII Part II 1909

The Text of the Epistle of James

JAMES HARDY ROPES

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THE following investigation of the text of the Epistle of James is an experiment made in the belief that a thorough study of a strictly limited field in the great problem of the text of the New Testament might lead to valuable results, and that a body of observed facts could be assembled which would have permanent objective validity. The study is incomplete, but the results so far attained have proved interesting to the writer, and the present article is now published with the hope that others may be led to take up similar investigations in limited fields.

The elaborate investigations and statistics on the text of the New Testament published by Bernhard Weiss in the *Texte und Untersuchungen* are undoubtedly of much value, but the method is not always easy to understand, and the argument is not wholly convincing, while they are subject to the obvious, though only partly justified, criticism, that it is unsatisfactory to restrict the discussion arbitrarily to the uncial manuscripts. They represent, however, the only important systematic attempt to set forth the fundamental process of weighing the value of the several witnesses to the text. Such a process underlay the work of Westcott and Hort, and they ought to have given to the world the careful lists and statistics which they made, in addition to the com-

pact statements of results which are contained in Hort's *Introduction*. But any one who makes the attempt will discover at once why Dr. Hort was deterred from such an undertaking. Even in cases where the evidence is clear and indisputable, it is often impossible to make exact numerical statements that can be depended on. Unimportant complications in the state of the facts, the necessary subjectivity of the decision in some of the cases, and the difficulty of attaining absolute accuracy without an expenditure of time out of all proportion to any possible value which might accrue in a matter where only large differences of number can have any significance — all these things will inevitably unite to discourage the scholar from venturing upon anything beyond a summary statement, the weight of which will rest solely on the confidence which other students have in his personal power of judging evidence correctly. Yet, if the results are to be permanently convincing, some adequate statement of the evidence must be made.

In the following discussion perfect accuracy is not claimed for the statistics. The figures are presented as approximate only, and it has been sought to make only such use of them as their approximate character would justify. It has been attempted to use as evidence only those judgments about the nature of variants (for instance, in deciding whether a particular reading should be regarded as a deliberate emendation, or as an error, or as probably the true reading) which would seem likely to commend themselves to any scholar, and to treat doubtful matters as doubtful.

The textual problem of the New Testament has usually been approached through those books in which the facts are most complicated — and therefore most interesting. Would it not be well to begin with the simpler aspects of the problem and thence proceed to those which present greater difficulties? In the Epistle of James the problem is simplified by the absence of representatives of the "Western text." In the second century the book was so little known that the earliest clear references to it are those of Origen; it was not used by Cyprian, and no version is known to have been made

earlier than the fourth century. No witness presents the characteristic marks of the "Western text" in any recognizable degree. At the same time the amount of evidence for the text is large and varied. Further, the book is short enough for the material to be easily mastered and the facts kept in mind, while the number of variants is sufficient to provide an adequate body of facts for study. Tischendorf's apparatus registers variation at about 335 points; and even so it properly omits a large number of isolated and unimportant variants found in single minuscules and known from published collations.

It may be added that the epistle must have had in the third and fourth centuries a history somewhat distinct from that of the other books of its group (the Catholic Epistles and Acts), so that it is right in the first instance to study its text without reference to the textual problems of those books.

The practical results to which the investigation of the relative value of the witnesses to the text of James has thus far led, and which are given more fully below, may be here mentioned in brief. It will be observed that the study of the versions is not complete.

1. No Ms. or version gives an untouched, "neutral," text free from emendations. Therefore, "transcriptional probability," when it is clear, is a sufficient reason for rejecting the testimony even of the best Ms.

2. Codex B, though not perfect, presents a better text than any other Ms. or group of Mss. Hence, in cases where evidence from transcriptional probability is indecisive, the reading of Codex B is to be accepted, provided it can be shown from some ancient witness that the reading of B is not a mere individual eccentricity, peculiar to B alone.

3. The genealogical relations of the other older uncials and of the text underlying the Egyptian versions, and the question of the "Alexandrian Text," are still obscure.

4. The "Syrian Text" of K L P and most minuscules contributes nothing to the formation of a correct text.

5. The Old-Latin version was made from a text closely resembling that of B, but somewhat more emended.

These results tend, so far as they go, to confirm the main conclusions of the textual criticism of Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and B. Weiss. It is to be observed that they apply only to the Epistle of James, and that many of the questions now at issue in the text of other parts of the New Testament do not arise here.

I. Authorities

1. *Uncials.* The following uncials contain James:

B ℵ	cent. iv.
A C 048 (ב) 0166	cent. v.
ℵ^{c}	cent. vii.
Ψ 049 (S)	cent. viii or ix.
K^{ac} L^{ac} P^{ac}	cent. ix.
056 0142	cent. x.

Of the above no information is at hand concerning the text of Ψ, 049, 056, 0142.

2. *Minuscules.* Gregory's lists (*Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, 1908; *Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes*, iii. 1909) include 478 minuscules ranging in date from cent. ix to cent. xviii, which contain, or may be presumed to contain, James. Of these no less than 139 are in the various libraries of Mt. Athos, 40 are in Paris, 39 in Rome, 31 in London. Minuscules are referred to by the numbers assigned in Gregory's latest list. The only minuscules known to be important are

33 (formerly 13^{ac}), cent. ix or x.
69 (formerly 31^{ac}), cent. xv (the Leicester codex).

Others than these two doubtless exist which contain interesting remains of ancient texts not wholly eliminated by conformation to the later standard. The present writer hopes to secure collations of all the minuscules of James, and would be grateful to any one who can furnish him with such collations.[1]

3. *Versions.* The following ancient versions come in question:

(1) Egyptian versions:
  (*a*) Sahidic,
  (*b*) Akhmimic,
  (*c*) Middle Egyptian,
  (*d*) Bohairic;
(2) Ethiopic version;
(3) Syriac versions:
  (*a*) Peshitto,
  (*b*) Harclean,
  (*c*) Palestinian;
(4) Armenian version;
(5) Latin versions:
  (*a*) Old-Latin:
    ff. Cod. Corbeiensis,
    s. Cod. Bobiensis,
    m. Speculum;
  (*b*) Vulgate.

Not all of these versions are at present accessible in trustworthy editions. In the present study it has been possible to include only the Latin and Bohairic versions.

4. *Fathers.* Early patristic quotations from James are meagre, and do not contribute much to the establishment of the text. Later quotations have not yet been sufficiently studied to clear up the later history of the text.

[1] Since the above was written I have received from Mr. Martin Sprengling, of the University of Chicago, collations of all the Mss. of James at Jerusalem, Mt. Athos, Serres, and Kosinitza.

II. The Individual Character of the Chief Authorities

Note. — In the following discussion the numbers are in nearly all cases only *approximate*, even when the word "about" has not been prefixed. They are, however, sufficiently accurate and complete to form a basis for the inferences here drawn.

1. *Codex B.*

Codex B, as will be shown below, has been adopted by all recent critical editors as the main basis of their text. It is probably the oldest Greek Ms. of James.[2] A thorough examination of the peculiarities of B by a competent philologist is perhaps the most pressing need of New Testament textual criticism at the present day.

B is written with many errors (*e.g.* Jas. 2 6 καθισται), and has many noteworthy spellings (*e.g.* 3 14 ερειθιαν, 3 16 ερειθειαν), in which a certain degree of consistency seems to have been observed, as if it represented a definite formal recension of the text.[3]

It is notoriously characterized throughout the New Testament by many omissions of single words or short phrases found in other types of text and even in other Mss. of the same type. Thus out of 88 cases in which ℵ and B are at variance, 29 are cases of omission in B. On the other hand, the other older uncials very seldom omit words or phrases found in B.

The following are the only cases observed where other Mss. omit words found in B:

1 7 *om.* τι ℵ C
1 15 *om.* η [επιθυμια C (*tantum*)
3 7 *om.* τε A
4 9 *om.* και ℵ A

[2] Ezra Abbot, 'On the Comparative Antiquity of the Sinaitic and Vatican Manuscripts of the Greek Bible,' in *Critical Essays*, 1888, pp. 140–154.

[3] Bousset, 'Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament' (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, xi. 4), 1894, pp. 102–110.

4 12 *om.* ο [δυναμενος A (*tantum*)
4 12 *om.* εκει A
5 5 *om.* και A
5 10 *om.* εν A 048 K L
5 12 *om.* μου 048

If we disregard purely orthographic and unessential grammatical details, B is in James decidedly more free from deliberate emendation than any other known document. This is shown by the following evidence:

(*a*) When B stands alone among all uncials, it is in most instances wrong; but only the following four out of thirteen such readings seem fairly to be classed as due to emendation (other than orthographic or grammatical), and of these the first two may very possibly give the right reading after all:

1 22 *ακροαται μονον for μονον ακροαται*
2 3 *στηθι η καθου εκει for στηθι εκει η καθου*
2 26 *om.* γαρ
4 14 *επιστασθε της αυριον (sine το, τα)*

The following is a complete list of the other cases of every kind where B stands alone among uncials. They are either the true reading, or due to accidental error, or cases in which no clear decision can be reached from the internal evidence of the readings.

1 9 *om.* ο [αδελφος
1 11 *om.* αυτου [απωλετο
1 26 χαλινων *for* χαλιναγωγων
2 4 *om.* ου
3 4 + τα [τηλικαυτα
3 6 *καθισται for καθιστατε*
3 14 *ερειθιαν*
3 16 *ερειθεια*
4 2 *δαπανησετε*
4 14 *om.* η [ζωη
5 11 *om.* ο [κυριος
5 14 *om.* του κυριου
5 20 + αυτου [και καλυψει

On the other hand, when the other older uncials stand alone among uncials, they show many demonstrable emendations;[4] thus:

[4] The numbers are of course approximate, and mere orthography and grammar is not included.

ℵ 21 emendations out of 28 such singular readings,
A 23 emendations out of 43 such singular readings,
C ($\frac{2}{3}$ of epistle) 5 emendations out of 12 such singular readings;
while B has but 4 emendations out of 13 such singular readings.

(*b*) When the groups B ℵ, B A depart from other uncials, there is no case where the group containing B offers a tolerably clear emendation. The group B C does show four small and somewhat doubtful emendations, viz.:

B C 1 26 καρδιαν] εαυτου *for* αυτου
2 14 *om.* το [οφελος
2 16 *om.* το [οφελος
2 19 (ο) θεος εστιν *for* εστιν ο θεος

On the other hand groups not containing B, viz.: ℵ A, AC, show a fair number of clear emendations, *e.g.*

ℵ A 2 5 βασιλειας
2 20 νεκρα
2 22 συνεργει
4 9 μεταστραφητω
A C 3 4 οπου αν βουληται

The group ℵ C appears only once against B A, and in that instance (1 7 *om.* τι) the reading of ℵ C seems to be an accidental error.

A complete examination of all the readings of B and their relationships will show that the text of B, while not perfect (perfection would imply something like a miracle), is on the whole the best text of James. Where detectable emendations are present in the text of the older uncials, the variant readings found in B evince themselves as corrupt less often than those of any other witness or group. No group among the uncials, and no group including uncials and early versions, is superior to B, provided B is supported by any other credible witness.

The authority nearest in text to B is the Old-Latin ff,[5]

[5] Substantially the same Greek text as that of ff is exhibited in the Latin excerpts of the *Speculum* (m). The Vulgate differs more from B. Whereas ff departs from B in but 21 out of 129 significant loci of variation, the Vulgate departs from B in 36 of these.

which is discussed below. It stands much closer to B than does ℵ. It is, however, inferior to B, and in at least 14 instances the text of ff shows emendations which it shares with other uncials, but from which B is free. In no single case (omitting eccentricities where B has no Greek support whatever) has ff (with ℵ^c A K L P, etc.) preserved a reading clearly preferable to that of B. The text of ff is thus next to B in value. The adhesion of ff strengthens the argument for any reading; but ff does not, in fact, unite with any other witness to form a group superior to B *al.*

The text of the ancient base of Codex P was also closely related to B.

The outcome of these facts is that we have in B a text whose ancestry was kept free from the influence of much of the emendation which was practiced in the third and fourth centuries. Further, those who determined its character seem for some reason regularly to have preferred the *shorter* readings. By this practice they were probably preserved from adopting some emendations (which habitually enlarge), while on the other hand they were led to perpetuate some errors. The resemblance of the text of ff to that of B is due to the fact that the ancestor of ff was translated from a text (of a date not later than about 300 A.D.) which likewise had received but little emendation, although it had been exposed to some influences which did not touch the ancestry of B.

2. *Other older uncials.*

NOTE. — In the following examination of ℵ A C the absence of C in Jas. 4 *s–fin.* makes it necessary to divide the epistle into two parts and to treat the two divisions separately. In statistics relating to the second division (4 *s–fin.*) readings are not counted in which the variation is a peculiarity of one single uncial.

(1) Codex Sinaiticus. ℵ.

Differs from B	88 times
of which:	
longer reading is in ℵ	22 "
shorter " " " "	6 "

mere orthographic or grammatical difference	15 times
ℵ wholly alone	12 "
" supported only by minuscules or versions	16 "
	28

Of these 28 cases all appear to be wrong. About 7 are errors (all but one being unique readings of ℵ); the rest are emendations.

B ℵ alone among Greek Mss.	4 times

Two of these are the noteworthy readings

1 17 τροπῆς αποσκιασματος

5 4 αφιστερηματος

in both of which B ℵ probably have the true reading.

B ℵ with only minuscule support	5 times
B ℵ against A C (1 1–4 2)	10 "
of which: B ℵ probably right	5 "
doubtful	5 "

Of the doubtful cases 3 are small changes of order, 2 are mere spelling.

B ℵ against A *al.* (4 3–*fin.*)	about 11 times
of which: B ℵ probably right	7 "
" " wrong	1 "
doubtful	3 "

Of the doubtful cases 2 are small changes of order.

It thus appears that ℵ shares with B some freedom from emendations which have influenced other uncials, but that B ℵ do not constitute a well-marked group among the older uncials. ℵ is more emended than B; and (whether in consequence of that, or partly through a different deliberate purpose on the part of those who controlled its ancestry) it is not so strongly affected by the preference for the shorter reading.

(2) Codex Alexandrinus. A.

Differs from B about	117 times
of which:	
longer reading in A	35 "
shorter " " "	9 "
A wholly alone	13 "
" supported only by minuscules or versions	31 "

Of the 44 cases in which A has no uncial support, 35 seem by internal evidence to be probably wrong, 9 are doubtful; the great majority of the probably wrong readings are to be classed as emendations, but perhaps 8 are thoughtless errors.

The most striking fact about A is its connection with Codex 33 (formerly 13^{ac}; cent. ix or x). The mutilated condition of 33 makes complete statistics impossible, but out of about 155 readings of Cod. 33 given by Tregelles (*Greek Testament*, 1865) 92 show agreement of Cod. 33 with A. The relationship is still more clearly shown by the following instances in which the readings of A 33 stand with no uncial, and but little minuscule, support:

1 17 *καταβαινων for -ον*
1 19 *και εστω for εστω δε*
1 21 *περισσευμα for περισσειαν*
2 3 + *των ποδων*
2 7 *και for ουκ*
2 11 *εγενου for γεγονας*
2 13 *κατακαυχασθω for κατακαυχαται*
2 16 *και ειπη for ειπη δε*
3 3 *μεταγομεν αυτων for αυτων μεταγομεν*
3 9 *γεγενημενους for γεγονοτας*
4 11 *αδελφοι μου αλληλων for αλληλων αδελφοι*
4 13 *om. εκει*
5 3 *εν ημεραις εσχαταις for εν εσχαταις ημεραις*
5 10 *om. λαβετε*
5 18 *εδωκεν υετον for εδωκεν τον υετον or υετον εδωκεν*

Such a set of readings as 2 10,

πληρωσας τηρησει	33
πληρωσει	A
τηρηση	B ℵ C ff vg
τηρησει	K L P,

where conflation is apparent, is also of much interest.

For statistics about 33 see below.

The peculiar common readings of A 33 are nearly all due to deliberate emendation, and would seem to belong to a definite recension. May not the concurrence of A 33 represent the text of Hesychius? 33 contains the LXX prophets

(Holmes and Parsons 198) in a text which may be Hesychian (cf. Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, p. 80).

(3) Codex Ephraem. C. (Jas. 1 1–4 2, about two thirds of the epistle.)

Differs from B	48 times

In this proportion the number for the whole epistle would be 72. In Jas. 1 1–4 2 ℵ differs from B 49 times, and in the whole epistle 88 times.

Of which:

longer reading in C	13 times
shorter " " "	4 "
C wholly alone	8 "
C supported only by minuscules or versions	9 "

Of these 17 cases where C has no uncial support, about 8 are probably emendations, 8 are thoughtless errors.

C thus shows characteristics almost exactly parallel to those of ℵ.

(4) Codex Patiriensis. 048 (ב). Jas. 4 14–5 20, palimpsest.

In this portion of James occur 20 variant loci. In 10 of these 048 stands opposed to the unanimous testimony of ℵ A B (C being deficient), but in 9 of the others it agrees with one or more of these older uncials. It shows no strong tendency to agree with K L P, or with any special type of text as yet distinguishable.

048 was formerly at Rossano in southern Italy, but bears no sign of having originated in the West. It probably represents a type of text current in the East, possibly at some locality other than Alexandria. Sanday correctly describes it as "*codd.* ℵ A C P *non multo dissimilem.*"

(5) Corrector of Codex Sinaiticus. ℵ^{c}.

ℵ^{c} (cent. vii) has evidently made his laborious corrections in order to bring ℵ into harmony with some current standard text. So far as James is concerned, nothing is known which would forbid the view that this standard was the Cæsarean text of Pamphilus, as is suggested by the well-known colophon introduced by ℵ^{c} at the close of Esther. The corrector

used a standard which seems to have been much like C, although the number of available instances in James is too small for certainty. It was more like A than like B, and as much like P as like A. It had no special resemblance to the text of K L P, except as that agrees with older uncials. With ℵ it is not easy to compare it, because it cannot be assumed that the standard always agreed with ℵ in those cases where the corrector has left no mark. Of readings unsupported by an uncial the corrector has introduced practically none in James. The text used by ℵ^{c} was one of many eclectic texts; whether it has special historical significance has not at present been determined.

3. *Later uncials:* K L P.

Of the text of Ψ and 049 (formerly S^{ac}), both being uncial Mss. of cent. viii or ix, nothing is known; for 056 and 0142 (both of cent. x) the accessible collations are inadequate.

The uncials K L P, all of cent. ix, offer the earliest attestation of the text which prevails among later Mss. From the readings attested by two of the three Mss. K L P, the Textus Receptus (ed. Stephen, 1550) departs in only 28 instances. Of these 9 are either of trifling importance or are obvious accidental errors on the part of K L, leaving only 19 readings to be considered in reconstructing from those four authorities the genuine text of the Antiochian recension. Such a reconstruction, however, it is not worth while to attempt until a complete apparatus of the readings of all the minuscules has been assembled. In the meantime a sufficiently close approximation to the true text of this recension can be reached, by assuming that the agreement of any two of the three ninth-century uncials gives the reading of the recension. The amount of error introduced by this assumption will not be sufficient to affect the general conclusion reached.

The readings of this later text fall into two groups, (1) those which are not attested by any older uncial or by the Old-Latin, Vulgate, or Syriac version, (2) those which are so attested. Of the first class there are in James only about 32 instances. Of these are

internally doubtful	10
errors	3
emendations	19
	32

The emendations were made for fullness, clearness, grammatical and orthographical improvement, etc. Among the most noteworthy are

2 1 2 9 3 1 omission of -μ- in *προσωπολημψια, λημψομεθα.*

In 1 7 1 13 K L P are supported in this reading by C.

2 18 *εκ for χωρις*

2 24 + *τοινυν*

3 12 *ουδεμια πηγη αλυκον και γλυκυ for ουτε (al. ουδε) αλυκον γλυκυ.*

4 14 *δε και for* ℵ A B K *και*, 048 *δε*, perhaps a conflation of two readings.

No reading of this text without other uncial support has any strong internal probability of genuineness. But it is also evident that no considerable part of this text came into existence later than the fifth century.

The readings of the other class, in which the text of K L P is supported by older authorities, do not, when wrong, differ in essential character from those just discussed. Thus:

1 12 *ληψεται* C K L P

4 4 *μοιχοι και μοιχαλιδες* ℵ K L P, *for μοιχαλιδες*

5 7 + *υετον* A K L P

K L P do not show any close affiliation with any one, or with any group of two, of the older uncials, but their ancestor appears to have had rather more readings in common with A than with any other older Ms. They agree least often with B.

Whether, as commonly supposed, the agreement of K L P with older uncials is due to contamination of the ancestry of these older Mss. (cent. iv and v) from the Antiochian recension of the beginning of the fourth century, cannot be determined from the study of the text of James. It is equally possible that the agreement is due to the fact that the texts

of the several older uncials and that of K L P drew alike from a common body of current variants. The fact that, when K L P agree with one older uncial against the others, the reading is in nearly every case wrong, would merely prove that the authors of this recension consistently followed wrong principles of judgment about the readings which they found in existence, and so accumulated false readings.[6]

With regard to the Mss. K L P taken individually, the investigations of Weiss seem to show that no reading attested by one of them alone (or with very little minuscule support) against all other uncials is probably genuine. There is reason for thinking that L is perhaps the truest of the three to the type of the recension.

P stands by itself. In many instances it departs from K L, and agrees with older uncials, and in such cases often has the right reading. It is evidently the descendant of a Ms. of the type of B ℵ A C into which had been introduced by correction a large part, but not the whole, of the readings of the Antiochian text. The result is a mixture, in which the two elements can be easily separated, and in which the readings not derived from the Antiochian recension are often correct.

[6] Weiss, *Die katholischen Briefe*, pp. 56, 76 f., holds that many of the false readings of ℵ A C come from the emended text seen in K L P, on the ground that these readings have a homogeneous character, but his argument is too subjective to be convincing. Hort, *Introduction*, pp. 151 f., conceives that whereas it may well be that ℵ is not *influenced* by the "Syrian" recension, but only "analogous in composition" to it, A and C have a text containing a distinct "Syrian" element. But in James, at least, there is no means of proving that A and C differ in this respect from ℵ. Unless certain readings can be shown to have originated with the Antiochian revisers, or unless the great number of Antiochian readings in any Ms. betrays its ancestry, there seems no positive reason for assuming direct influence in the case of early Mss. The result of direct but incomplete influence by the Antiochian recension on an older text can be instructively studied in P, 33, and 69. The sporadic nature of the agreement of ℵ A C individually with K L P speaks against rather than for the view of Weiss and Hort. The case of A in the Gospels (Hort, p. 152) is different, and might serve as an argument for assuming some degree of direct Antiochian influence in other parts of that Ms.

The affinities of K L P are clearly shown by the following statistics:

P departs from K L	66 times
Of which:	
P agrees with B	41 "
" " " no uncial	11 "
" " " ℵ	30 "
" " " A	31 "
" " " C	14 "
" " " ς	6 "
P B agree against all other uncials	11 "
P ℵ " " " " "	3 "
P A " " " " "	2 "
P C " " " " "	3 "

The ancestor of P into which the Antiochian recension was corrected was thus a good Ms. which bore much closer resemblance to B than to any other extant uncial.

4. *Minuscules.*

The only minuscules which are thoroughly known are

33 (formerly 13^{ac}), cent. ix or x.
69 (formerly 31^{ac}), cent. xv, the Leicester codex.

The readings of both of these are accurately given by Tregelles, *Greek Testament.* The Mss. are both to be classed with P, as containing many readings which have survived from ancestors into which the Antiochian recension was incompletely introduced by correction.

The facts are as follows:

33 departs from K L P (or from two of them)	73 times
Of which:	
33 agrees with no uncial	20 "
" " " A	43 "
" " " B	21 "
" " " ℵ	27 "
" " " C	20 "
" " " P	20 "

69 departs from K L P (or from two of them) 33 times
Of which:

69 agrees with			no uncial	13	"
"	"	"	B	9	"
"	"	"	✠	9	"
"	"	"	A	8	"
"	"	"	C	7	"
"	"	"	P	10	"

It thus appears that the ancient base of 33 was very closely related to A, but not specially akin to any other older uncial; and that the base of 69 was an eclectic text about equally near to all the older uncials. Survivals of the ancient text are to be found in less degree in other minuscules.[7] But it hardly seems likely that any genuine readings in James have been preserved in minuscules only, and such a reading, if it existed, would be recognizable only in a minuscule which was positively known to contain a considerable element of ancient readings not conformed to the Antiochian or any other late standard. The Textus Receptus was drawn from two or more Mss. (one being Codex 2) taken at random, not critically chosen for their text, but both Erasmus and the Complutensian editors present substantially the text of K L P.

5. *Latin versions.*

(1) Old-Latin.

ff. Codex Corbeiensis, cent. ix.

m. *Speculum Pseudo-Augustini.*

Excerpts from the Scriptures, perhaps made in cent. iv, and preserved in several Mss., of which the best is of cent. viii or ix. Includes 29 verses of James.

s. Codex Bobiensis, cent. v or vi.

(2) Vulgate.

In the following discussion Codex Amiatinus (c. 715 A.D.) is provisionally taken as representing the Vulgate.

The extraordinarily numerous variations found in the text of the Old-Latin Bible were due largely to differences of local Latin usage and to caprice, but probably also in some measure

[7] Hort, *Introduction*, pp. 154 f., 156.

to learned revisions similar to that which produced the Vulgate, and were effected with the aid of Greek copies. In James, ff is substantially a pure Old-Latin text, not mixed with Vulgate readings,[8] but its close kinship with the copy which was corrected in order to make the Vulgate is shown by the abundant agreement of ff and Vg, not only in vocabulary, but especially in the structure of sentences and the order of words.[9] With these inferences corresponds the fact that Chromatius of Aquileia († c. 406), the friend of Jerome, uses the Latin version of James found in ff,[10] and that the only probable allusion to James in the writings of Ambrose agrees with ff against Vg. The date of the version found in ff is thus not later than cent. iv.[11] Sanday (*Studia Biblica*, i. 1885, p. 258) thinks ff a local recension of North-Italian origin.[12]

The Latin version found in m (*Speculum Pseudo-Augustini*) is substantially that of Priscillian (Spain, † 385). It stands farther removed from both ff and Vg than they do from each other, but presents complicated relationships to these two. It is believed by Sanday to represent "a late African text," that is, "an African base . . . corrupted partly by internal development and partly by the admission of European readings."[13] There is no sufficient evidence that m and ff rest upon two independent translations of James into Latin.[14] On the con-

[8] Wordsworth, *Studia Biblica*, i. pp. 126 f.

[9] Sanday, *Studia Biblica*, i. pp. 258 f.

[10] Chromatius, *Tract. in ev. S. Matth.* ix. 1, xiv. 7; quoted in full by Wordsworth, *Studia Biblica*, i. p. 135.

[11] Heer, *Die versio latina des Barnabasbriefes*, 1908, pp. xlv f., thinks that the translation of Barnabas contained in the Codex Corbeiensis was made after Tertullian and before Cyprian and Novatian, and points out that in the version of James the use of *salvare*, together with other indications, suggests a somewhat late date.

[12] P. Thielmann, *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie*, viii. 1893, p. 502, holds that ff is probably of African origin.

[13] Sanday, *Classical Review*, iv. 1890, pp. 414–417; *Studia Biblica*, i. pp. 244 ff.

[14] Sanday, *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, No. II. 1887, p. cclv; cf. *Studia Biblica*, i. pp. 250, 259. Wordsworth's view (*Studia Biblica*, i. pp. 133 f.) that ff, Vg, m, and the quotations in Jerome's writings represent four distinct translations is wholly untenable.

trary, the identity of the Greek text underlying the two, as exhibited below, points to a single original translation, which has been modified in the interest of Latin style and local usage, and not in order to conform it to current Greek Mss. Since sufficient allowance of time must be made for the divergence of m and ff, the patristic evidence from the latter part of the fourth century shows that the original translation of James into Latin was made certainly not later than 350 A.D.[15]

That James was translated into Latin separately from other books (and probably later) is indicated by the peculiarities of the version itself,[16] by the unique phenomenon of its inclusion with patristic treatises in Cod. Corbeiensis (ff),[17] and also by the complaint of Augustine[18] at the unusual badness of the translation of James, as well as by the fact that Cassiodorus, who in other cases took the Old Latin as the basis of comment in his *Complexiones in epistolas et acta apostolorum et apocalypsin*, in James found it best to use the Vulgate form.[19]

The Latin version found in s is so close to Vg that it is a question whether it ought not to be classed as a Vulgate Ms. (so Hort, *Appendix*, p. 83). It differs from Codex Amiatinus of the Vg scarcely more than Codex Fuldensis does, but is nearer to Am than to Fu. On the ground of resemblances to the Latin version used by Fulgentius of Ruspe († 533) and Facundus of Ermione († c. 570) White surmises that the elements in s which are divergent from the Vulgate "represent a stream of late African text."[20]

Jerome probably revised the Latin version of the Acts and

[15] Hilary of Poitiers, *De trin.* iv. 8, writing in the Greek East in 356–358, seems to make his own translation of Jas. 1 17 (Zahn, *Grundriss der Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, p. 68).

[16] Westcott, *Canon of the New Testament*,[7] pp. 270 f. The case with 2 Peter is similar; cf. Westcott, *l.c.* pp. 269 f.

[17] Zahn, *Geschichte des neutest. Kanons*, i. p. 324.

[18] Augustin., *Retract.* ii. 32, Adiuvant (*sc.* Augustine's *adnotationes*, now lost) ergo aliquid, nisi quod ipsam epistolam, quam legebamus quando ista dictavi, non diligenter ex Graeco habebamus interpretatam.

[19] Cf. Zahn, *ibid.*

[20] *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, No. IV. 1897, p. xxi.

epistles, in 384–385 A.D., as he had that of the gospels in 383 A.D., but his revision of the former books was superficial and imperfect; it "does not represent the critical opinion of Jerome, even in the restricted sense in which this is true of the text of the Gospels."[21] It is noteworthy that in Jerome's own quotations from James he does not follow the Vulgate.[22]

With regard to the Greek text underlying the several forms of the Latin version of James the following may be said.

(1) The text of ff is of the same type as that of the older Greek uncials, and resembles B in particular more closely than does any Greek Ms. In 129 loci where variation is attested by Greek uncial Mss., it is possible to determine the Greek text underlying ff. In only 21 of these does the text of ff differ from B.[23] From ✠ it differs at least twice as many times, and from A and C still more often. It shows no affinity to the text of K L P.

The 21 cases of divergence may be classified as follows:

Eccentricities of B	3
Emendations in ff	15
Error " "	1
Doubtful	2
	21

It thus appears that ff shows a text considerably more emended than that of B. These emendations are in agreement with readings of one or another of the uncials, but show no particular relation to any one of them.

The following readings of ff are of special interest:

1 17 *vel modicum obumbrationis*, cf. B ✠ η τροπης αποσκιασματος.

[21] Westcott, 'Vulgate,' in Smith, *Dict. Bible*, p. 3479, cf. p. 3460; cf. J. Wordsworth, *Studia Biblica*, i. p. 128, H. J. White, 'Vulgate,' in Hastings, *Dict. Bible*, iv. pp. 874, 883.

[22] Wordsworth, *l.c.*, p. 134.

[23] In addition to these I have noted 5 cases (4 being omissions) where the only Greek support of ff is one (or a very small number) of the minuscules. These cases may well be due to carelessness, or freedom, on the part of the translator. Similarly, certain cases where ff is only supported by versions are not included in the above count.

2 18 *tu operam habes ego fidem habeo*, an unfortunate, and unique, emendation.

5 20 *animam de morte sua*, cf. B (*tantum*) ψυχην εκ θανατου αυτου.

(2) The Greek text underlying m is substantially the same as that of ff. It agrees with ff in 34 cases where there are attested Greek variants, and differs from it in only 13. Of these 13, 7 (isolated, or nearly isolated, aberrations) are probably due to error in m, not to underlying Greek text, 1 probably is due to such error in ff. In the remaining 5 cases ff and Vg (Cod. Amiat.) agree against m; but these cases are not sufficient in number or character to justify any inference.

(3) The Greek text underlying Vg is largely the same as that of ff and m. The facts are as follows:

Cases noted where variation actually found among Greek uncials would show in the Latin translation [24]	about 130
Among these:	
ff and Vg agree	about 102 times
" " " differ	" 28 "

In these 28 cases Vg is supported 8 times by B, always by one or more uncials, but only twice by the text of K L P against the older uncials.

The case is similar with m, which covers in its excerpts only a portion of the epistle.

Significant cases	about 40
m and Vg agree	27 times
" " " differ	13 "

Among these 13 cases Vg is supported by C in 5 out of 6 possible instances; by B ℵ in 7 cases; but only once by the text K L P against the older uncials.

[24] In this enumeration are omitted at least 2 cases where ff and Vg agree against all uncials with support only from a Greek minuscule or from versions; also 3 cases where ff has no uncial support, and 9 cases where Vg has no uncial support. Most of these are probably due to the Latin translator and revisers, not to any Greek variant. In any case they are too few to affect the bearing of the evidence.

The general inferences to be drawn from these facts are plain. (1) Since these three forms of the Latin version go back to substantially the same Greek text, it is highly unlikely that they represent two independent translations. As between ff and m later influences from current Greek texts have not been at work to any considerable extent to draw them apart, for even in their present late form they show an almost identical underlying Greek text. Their many mutual divergences are internal to the Latin version, and do not represent Greek variants.

(2) On the other hand, while the Vulgate is clearly a revision of a Latin text closely like ff, the Greek text which it represents differs somewhat from both ff and m; the greater part of these differences are doubtless due to the learned revision of Jerome.

(3) The third-century Greek source of this Latin translation may have contained original readings not preserved in any extant Greek Ms., but it would be unsafe to accept any readings on Latin evidence only, so long as there were a possibility of explaining them as idiosyncrasies of the translator or of a Latin reviser.

6. *Bohairic version.*

The Bohairic version, as found in the text of Horner's edition, clearly belongs with the text of B ℵ A C, and shows no kinship to that of K L P. But it betrays no special relation to any one, or to any group, of the older uncials. It is another eclectic text parallel to ℵ, A, and C.

III. History of the Text, and Use of the Authorities

1. *History.*

Of the four types of text distinguished by Westcott and Hort the "Western text" drops out in James. The book was too little known in the second century to suffer the textual alteration which then befell other parts of the New Testament; and neither can any witness or group of witnesses be called "Western," nor does any series of readings clearly exhibit the special characteristics of that text. The other three types are easily distinguished. The "Syrian text" is represented by the ninth-century uncials K L (P) and by

the mass of minuscules; the "Neutral text" by B and ff; the "Alexandrian text" by ℵ A C and the Bohairic version. A study of these groups leads, however, to a somewhat different statement of their relations from that made by W H. It is to be borne in mind that the following observations relate solely to the Epistle of James, taken by itself, without reference even to the other Catholic epistles.

The outlines of the history of the text of James can be made out as follows:

At the date when the Epistle of James first comes clearly to light, early in the third century, the explicit statements of Origen[25] show that the text of the New Testament had already fallen into much confusion, and that many variant readings were in circulation. In the text of James we have from the fourth century direct evidence (B ℵ, ff m Vg) of a great number of variants, and from these the many other variants attested by fifth-century witnesses (A C 048, Peshitto) do not differ in any essential character. These early variants, in existence before 500 A.D., but for which the precise date of origin cannot be determined, are mostly due to more or less deliberate emendation. Accidental errors, however, also occur. These latter are, indeed, more common in earlier than in later Mss., for in the later texts the process of careful copying naturally tended to eliminate obvious errors.

Of the authorities, no one is "neutral," in the strict sense of being wholly free from these emendations, although this is more nearly true of B than of any other document.[26] Nor is it possible to isolate any single and distinct "Alexandrian text," of the sort which Westcott and Hort believed to have proceeded from a learned and skillful hand at or before the beginning of the third century.[27] What we have is rather a great mass of early emendations, most of them, it is true, found in Alexandrian documents (B ℵ A C, Cyril, Bohairic), but equally present in 048 (which is not known to be connected with Alexandria), the Vulgate, and the Peshitto.

[25] *Comm. in Matth.* tom. xv. 14. *νυνὶ δὲ δηλονότι πολλὴ γέγονεν ἡ τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφορά, εἴτε ἀπὸ ῥαθυμίας τινῶν γραφέων, εἴτε ἀπὸ τόλμης τινῶν μοχθηρᾶς τῆς διορθώσεως τῶν γραφομένων, εἴτε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τὰ ἑαυτοῖς δοκοῦντα ἐν τῇ διορθώσει προστιθέντων ἢ ἀφαιρούντων.*

[26] Next to B in this respect stands the Old-Latin ff.

[27] See Hort's statement in Gregory, *Textkritik*, ii. p. 919.

From this store of readings, genuine, emended, and erroneous, the several documents evidently drew according to individual taste and preference, and thus produced a number of eclectic texts. The recension of Hesychius of Alexandria († 312) is historically attested,[28] but has not as yet been satisfactorily identified among the readings of our documents for James. The same is to be said of the recension of Pamphilus of Cæsarea († 309), although this may perhaps be represented in part[29] by the corrections of ℵ^{c}. The common readings of A 33 seem to point to the deliberate recension of some definite editor (Hesychius?).

The only influential recension of the text of James which can be traced with any confidence is that represented by the ninth-century uncials K L P, by the Textus Receptus, and probably by most minuscules. From the analogy of other parts of the New Testament where evidence from the Antiochian fathers is more abundant,[30] it may be assumed that in James also this text goes back to the fourth century and to Antioch, and the conjecture which associates it with the recension of Lucian of Antioch († 311) is very likely correct.[31]

This recension became the prevailing text of the Greek church, superseding all others, and many Mss. must have been corrected to conform to it. A good idea of what such a Ms. would be like may be gained from the present state of ℵ, to which an analogous process of correction has been applied. The result, however, was that in many lines of textual transmission a part only of the Antiochian readings were introduced; and accordingly, when such Mss. as P and many minuscules (notably 33 and 69) were copied, a large

[28] Jerome, *Praef. in vers. paralip.; Apol. contra Rufinum*, ii. 26; *De viris ill.* 77; *Ad Damas. praef. in evv.;* Decretum Gelasianum, vi. 14, 15. See Bousset, 'Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament' (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, xi. 4), 1894.

[29] Bousset, 'Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament' (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, xi. 4), 1894, pp. 44–73; cf. esp. pp. 71–73.

[30] The quotations from James in Chrysostom yield no result for textual criticism.

[31] Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, p. 138.

number of non-antiochian readings, which had not been eliminated from their ancestors, were perpetuated in these mainly Antiochian descendants. Whether the uncials ℵ A C betray influence from the Antiochian recension, or only show accidental agreement with it, is at present impossible to say. Of the later history of this text and its ramifications and local forms nothing is at present known, although the materials are abundant.[32]

2. *Use of the authorities.*

Since most of the important variants were thus in existence as early as the fourth century,[33] it is evident that the value of the documents is not mainly to be determined by their date, or even by the date of the recension which they may represent. Ancient documents must be treated like modern editions; their worth depends on the materials available for them and on the soundness of the principles or tastes which guided their formation. The main task of textual criticism is to discover the character of these principles or tastes.

In the text of James genealogical relationship between Mss. (or even between types of text), which would serve as an external guide to the value of the evidence, is wholly lacking. In the investigation of the internal evidence but limited help is to be had from "groups"; the only groups that can at present be treated as distinct critical entities are B ff, A 33, K L P *al.* (the "Antiochian recension").

The practical outcome of the investigation is as follows.

As in the rest of the New Testament, the Antiochian text of K L P *al.* proves on examination to contain no distinctive readings which commend themselves as probably original. This is due not to its lateness, but to the systematic preference of its editor (or of a series of editors and copyists) for textual improvements which had been made at various

[32] H. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, i. 1902–7, has undertaken to trace this for the gospels.

[33] The isolated variants of the minuscules (variants many of which, even when known, are very properly left unmentioned in Tischendorf's apparatus) do not in most cases come seriously into question.

times in the interest of "lucidity and completeness."[34] We are therefore tolerably safe in refusing to accept its testimony in the comparatively few cases where its distinctive readings might in themselves have some degree of plausibility. The peculiar common element of A 33 is also due to emendation.

On the other hand, the text of B ff, while not absolutely free from obviously emended readings, proves to be much freer from them than is that of any other document. Moreover the text of B shows less trace of emendation than that of ff. Accordingly, if due precaution is taken against admitting unsupported errors due to the eccentricity of B, it is a sound rule, and indeed the only possible one, that in cases where "internal evidence of readings" is not decisive the reading of B should be followed. Since, however, B is by no means free from error and even emendation, positive evidence from "transcriptional" or other internal probability will outweigh the authority of B.

The use of the witnesses other than B is thus twofold. First, when they disagree with B, their readings may positively commend themselves by their internal character as superior. Secondly, when they agree with B, they serve as guarantee that the reading of B is not due to the idiosyncrasy of that Ms., and also, by affording evidence of the wider currency of the reading, they somewhat strengthen confidence in it.

The statement of Hort (*Introduction*, p. 171), which seems to mean that the authorities for the Catholic epistles stand in order of excellence B ℵ 33 C A P, is substantiated (at any rate for the uncials) in the Epistle of James.

The rule above stated cannot be presumed to yield a perfect text. The result will probably include some undetectable errors.[35] It will, however, certainly contain fewer

[34] Hort, *Introduction*, pp. 134 f., "Entirely blameless on either literary or religious grounds as regards vulgarized or unworthy diction, yet showing no marks of either critical or spiritual insight, it [the Antiochian recension] presents the New Testament in a form smooth and attractive, but appreciably impoverished in sense and force, more fitted for cursory perusal or recitation than for repeated and diligent study."

[35] Cf. Burkitt, 'The Rules of Tyconius' (*Texts and Studies*, iii), 1894, p. cxviii: "The general character of the 'Neutral' text, so often represented by B alone, stands on a sure basis, but B may here and there desert that text by an interpolation or by a substitution which may not necessarily be self-betraying.

"These, however, are but secondary considerations compared with the general result, that in the Old Testament as in the New the text of our oldest Mss. as a whole is proved by the evidence of the versions to be im-

emended readings than would be introduced by following the guidance of any other document or group of documents; and this is the chief requisite of a sound text, since in texts of the New Testament false readings, if supported by more than one document, are much more frequently due to emendation than to accident.

IV. Critical Editions

As the Textus Receptus of James is founded on Codex 2, so the critical text of the nineteenth-century editors (Tregelles, 1865; Tischendorf, eighth edition, 1872; Westcott and Hort, 1881; B. Weiss, 1892, [2]1902) is founded, in varying proportions, on Codices B and ℵ. Of readings found neither in B nor in ℵ, only 6 (apart from mere divergences of spelling) seem to have been included in one or more of these editions:

1 17 *αποσκιασμα* Tr T WH Ws
2 19 *εις ο θεος εστιν* Ws
4 8 *δαπανησητε* Tr T WH
4 13 *ερα* Ws[2]
4 14 *ποια γαρ* Tr T
5 18 *εδωκεν υετον* Tr T

Tregelles departs from B (omitting spelling) 33 times.

Tischendorf, eighth edition, departs from B 38 times, in 30 of which he agrees with Tregelles, by whom in general he appears to have been influenced. When Tregelles and Tischendorf depart from B, they adopt the reading of ℵ, except in the 4 cases given above.[36]

Westcott and Hort depart from B in only 12 readings (besides 3 cases of mere spelling), and in all except 2 of these they follow ℵ. In 10 out of the 12 cases B stands alone among Greek Mss.

Weiss departs from B 19 times and adopts the reading of ℵ in all but 3 of these.

mensely superior to the later eclectic texts commonly used in the Greek-speaking churches from the middle of the fourth century. These later revisions sometimes preserve valuable fragments of older texts which would otherwise have been lost altogether, but it is for such fragments alone that these recensions are valuable, and not for their continuous text."

[36] B and ℵ differ in about 88 instances, of which at least 12 are mere spelling.