

by our Lord. There is much plausibility indeed in the inference that the doxology is a marginal gloss—an old addition from the liturgy. The variety of ancient forms leads to such an inference—*e.g.* (a) *ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμήν.* (b) *ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία, καὶ ἡ δύναμις, καὶ ἡ δόξα, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμήν.* (c) *ὅτι σοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία, καὶ ἡ δύναμις, καὶ ἡ δόξα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.* But as the doxology is in our common version, and as there are some indications that it may be genuine even though there are doubts, why, as the evidence *pro* and *con* seems to be rather evenly balanced, should it not be retained? As to the value of the Latin Vulgate as a voucher, it might be asked, Why it is so good an authority for the exclusion of the doxology, and so poor authority for the retention of the trinity passage, 1 John v. 7, 8? But this question is asked only to show that the Vulgate has little authority when not corroborated by other testimony. If the doxology of the Lord's Prayer were in the Vulgate alone, or only in very late Greek mss., its genuineness might well be suspected, as the "three witnesses" passage is suspected, and little objection would be made to expunging it from the text. But on account of the testimony of ancient versions, objection is made to the expunging of the Lord's Prayer doxology not only, but also to expunging Matt. xvii. 21;\* for the revisers of 1881 tell us in a footnote of the revision that "many authorities, some ancient, insert the verse." As then it is in our common version, and rests on some ancient authorities, why should it be expunged?

Moreover, in the view of many scholarly ministers, and even of some critics of note, there does not appear to be any absolute necessity of reading *ὅς* instead of *Θεός* in 1 Tim. iii. 16—*i.e.*, of reading *ὅς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί*, etc., instead of *Θεός ἐφαν.*, etc. Undoubtedly most critics of eminence in textual criticism prefer the relative reading; but there is not perfect unanimity even among critics of note. "Dr. Scrivener"—as a critic certainly *primus inter pares*—"says in his second edition, 1874, 'We must consider it highly probable that *Θεός*, of the more recent many mss., must yield to *ὅς* of the ancient few.' In his third edition, 1883, he repeats the statement, but adds: 'Yet even, then, the force of the Patristic testimony remains untouched,' and closes by saying: 'I dare not pronounce *Θεός* a corruption.'"† It is conceded that Aleph—the Sinaitic ms.—reads *ὅς* here, and possibly C—the Ephraem ms.; but this is doubtful, as C is a palimpsest, and as such could hardly be so deciphered as to make this matter certain. B—the Vatican ms. is out of the count, as it wants the pastoral epistles. D, has *μυστήριον, ὃ ἐφαν.*, etc.; but *Θεός* is the reading, according to Myer, of D\*\*\*, K, L; of nearly all the cursives; and of Chrysostom, Theodoret, *et al.* Now, over against

\* The passage is: "But this kind goeth not out save by prayer and fasting," which the revisers of 1881 have dropped from our English version.

† Vide President Dwight's note on this passage, Meyer's Commentary.