

to date. The lexical aspect of the papyri and the inscriptions is here presented with great skill and the result of wide research. The book will be a help to all who wish to use the new knowledge of New Testament words.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

Codex B and Its Allies. A Study and an Indictment. By H. C. Hoskier. Two Volumes (497, 412 pp). London: Bernard Quaritch. 1914.

Mr. Hoskier has spent an enormous amount of time and labor to show that B does not always represent the Neutral Text. Volume one is devoted to B and Volume II to Aleph. There is an enormous amount of detail much of which will be of service in the comparison of these manuscripts. Mr. Hoskier seems a bit aroused by some criticisms of Dr. A. Souter, into which it is not necessary to enter. There is, I think, no doubt that Tischendorf shows an excessive fondness for Aleph as Hort does for B. Neither manuscript is an absolute guide for the true text. It is well to have all the data offered by Mr. Hoskier. All that scholars wish is the truth and such a study as this will help towards that end. On page 92 Mr. Hoskier insists on a difference of mood between *παράδοι* and *παράδῃ* (Mk. 4:29). Both forms are aorist active subjunctive.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts. By Albert C. Clark, Corpus Professor of Latin. The Clarendon Press, Oxford, England. 112 pp. 4s net.

The author has been led by his study of the text of Cicero to conclude that scribes more frequently omit lines than they add to them. This is the opposite of Hort's view. He has applied this principle to the text of the Gospels and Acts with the result that he finds the Western Text to be the true text since it is longer than the text of Aleph and B. Professor Clark does not claim to be an expert in New Testament Textual Criticism and uses only one method in his study, the breaking of the lines into sense clauses. His work is interesting, but cannot