

call in question the present policy of editors in rejecting all MSS. later than the fifth century; and deciding readings by the authority of one or two early MSS. to the exclusion of a host of others, many of them being of good authority. Again, B and D have *Gadara* in Matt., but *Gerasenes* in Mark and Luke. This may not seem very surprising, because it may be alleged that the MS. of Matthew's gospel had one reading, and that of Luke's another. But then there is a surprising uniformity in the system observed in ancient versions. They differ indeed among themselves in their readings, but each version has invariably the same readings in *all the three gospels*. The greatest number of MSS., both uncial and cursive, support the reading of *Gergesa*; and it is interesting to observe how many ancient versions concur in the same readings, namely, the Arab, Aeth, Goth, and Armen. Each of these has *Gergesa* in all the four passages. The Vulgate and the Latin versions have *Gerasenes*. The Peshito, alone, has *Gadarenes*. I have all these versions in my possession, except the Goth. and Armen, and have ascertained these facts by personal inspection. The versions of the principal languages of Europe, have all the same readings as those of the "Textus Receptus," and our own version; except the Spanish, which closely follows the vulgate in every thing: it has *Gerasenes*.

The revolutions of time made great changes in the cities on the east of Jordan. Some were destroyed and in course of time well nigh forgotten, at least by people living at a distance. This was the case with *Gergesa*. Others rose into distinction, and became well known everywhere: such was the case with the neighbouring city of *Gadara*. For this reason, transcribers who had a little geographical knowledge, but not enough to keep them from error, would be tempted to tamper with the MS. with the mistaken design of making the narrative better understood. They had some acquaintance with the locality of *Gadara*, and they might suppose, as Alford and others do to this day, that the scene of the miracle was in its near neighbourhood.

Now, our critical editors give themselves

no uneasiness about all this discrepancy in the sacred text. They proceed very coolly to determine the reading in each gospel by the greatest number of the oldest MSS. found in its favour, just as one solves a question mechanically in the Rule of Three. Thus, Lachmann and Tischendorf have *Gerasenon* in all the three gospels. Alford has *Gergasenon* in Mark, *Gadarenon* in Matt., and *Gerasenon* in Luke. Bloomfield, 5th, Amer. Edit has *Gadarenon* in all the passages: very bad this, and unjustifiable! Doubtless, objective evidence is the best authority, when it is judiciously employed. And it may be said what can an editor do but follow his MSS. That is the sole ground they go upon! Tregelles says: "the geographical difficulty need not to be discussed here." But why not? It is an important element in the settlement of the question. If there be corruption in the MSS. will not the adjustment of this point greatly aid in purging out the corruption? Alford says: "although the fact may be confirmed of *Gergesa* having been a name actually used for a town near the lake, that determines nothing as to the reading here, which must be settled purely on objective evidence." This rule is very objectionable. Surely in the case of a difficulty, internal evidence is entitled to be consulted; and where the question turns upon a topographical enquiry, like the present, surely that ought also to be discussed. Dr. Bloomfield freely admits the existence of such a city as *Gergesa*, near the sea, though he gives his own admission the go by. Alford says: "it appears very doubtful whether there ever was a town named *Gergesa* near the lake." In fact, all these editors, contrary to very good objective authority, incline to give their verdicts in favour of *Gadara*, for no other reasons that I can see, than the fact that it was best known in early times.—And so they seem to take pleasure in augmenting the discrepancies in the gospels, rather than removing them.

Now, in this dilemma, it is due to the purity of the sacred text, to direct our enquiries to the topographical indications which may have any bearing on the problem, and to consider the internal evidence