There are no very difficult textual problems in this passage, so I will only briefly mention the principal points of criticism. I believe that the integrity and genuineness of the passage is admitted by all. The Textus Receptus contains a number of words which are omitted by the Neutral Text. The Neutral text stands the test of intrinsic and transcriptional probability throughout. Hence it is the text on which I have commented.

V.15. According to K, B,D, and G, J should follow Mw υσεί, v.16. Λ', B,D, and G, have έλεωντυ, an unusual form, but surely to be accepted with this attestation.

v.18.Inconsistently with the usage in v.16, $\hat{\xi}^{\lambda} \mathcal{EC}$, the form adopted by the Syrian recension, is upheld by both \bigwedge^{λ} and B. Only D¹,F, and G have the competing $\hat{\xi}^{\lambda} \mathcal{EQ}$. We will follow \bigwedge^{λ} and B, and assume, with most commentators, but despite Meyer's protest, that Paul used inconsistent forms here and in v.16.

v.19.D,G, and the Syrian puts μ after \hat{ov} , but we will follow K^c and B in reversing that order.

v.19 (2). B follows D and G in putting a second of after (, but the Syrian revisers followed and rejected it. Here we will stick to the Textus Receptus. (In this case the Syrian revisers seem to have done the right thing).

The Western reads $\widehat{\omega}$ $\mathring{\mathcal{A}} V \mathscr{P} \omega \pi \varepsilon$ MEVOUVE.

The Syrian reads $\mathcal{M} \mathcal{N} \mathscr{P} \omega \pi \varepsilon$.

The Syrian reads $\mathcal{M} \mathcal{N} \mathscr{V} \mathscr{P} \omega \pi \varepsilon$.

Transcriptional probability here favors the neutral v.23.B, several minuscules, Vulg. Boh. Sah., Orig.-lat.3/3 omit Kal.

This makes the construction easier, but probably for that very reason