

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX I

### THE ORIGIN OF VARIOUS READINGS

It is often forgotten that the ancients did not wear spectacles, and that, therefore, the profession of scribe must have been proportionately more trying to the eyes. Now one of the commonest defects of eyesight is "astigmatism," as a result of which lines drawn in one direction appear much fainter than lines drawn in another. This, obviously, would tend to make it easy to confuse one letter with another; but a confusion easy to one scribe would not affect another. Again, any weakening of the power of concentration renders it easy to make an error of position—and so to pass from a word in one line to a similar word in a line below. Omissions of lines from this cause are technically described as due to "homoioteleuton"—literally "like end," though as a matter of fact omission from this cause quite as often takes place in the middle of a line as when the identical letters stand at the end of a line. Evidence of this can be found in ancient MSS. It may not be irrelevant to remark that in a type-written copy of one chapter of this book I found no less than three cases of omission, two of one and one of two lines, occurring from the eye of the typist passing about two-thirds from the beginning of a line to similar words in a lower line. Besides this, we must remember that between reading the exemplar and writing there is always a short interval during which the invincible tendency of the human mind to modify anything it apprehends has time to operate, especially if the attention of the scribe wanders or if he has not had special training. At the present day the

difference between the standard of accuracy of one copyist and another, especially in the matter of omitting or misreading individual words, varies immensely. But absolute accuracy is an ideal never attained over a long piece of writing.

It will be worth while to consider briefly how mistakes, other than intentional additions or corrections, most naturally occur.

(1) Variations in the relative order of the words in a sentence in different MSS. are very common. Alterations of order would originate in this way: a scribe accidentally omits a word; if he notices it before he has finished writing the next word, he puts it in himself, sometimes as a marginal or overline correction, but sometimes, in order to avoid an unsightly mess, at the next place in the sentence where it makes sense. This latter alternative was specially attractive to a Greek scribe, since in that language, much more easily than in English, the order of the words in a sentence can be rearranged without materially altering the meaning. If the original scribe does not notice an omission, a corrector puts it in the margin. In that case the next copyist may easily insert it in the text *in the wrong place*—this is one of the commonest mistakes in MSS.

(2) Marginal notes, sometimes consisting of various readings derived from another MS., often led to corruption, through something being copied into the text by a scribe who supposed what he saw in the margin to be words accidentally omitted.

(3) Another frequent phenomenon is the substitution of synonyms. We can see at least four ways in which this might arise. (a) The attention of the scribe may wander in the interval between reading and writing and he may reproduce the sense rather than the actual words of his model. (b) He may omit a word, or at some subsequent time a drop of water or a flaw in the papyrus may cause it to be obliterated. The next copyist will have to make a guess at the missing word. For example, in Mt. xxvii. 4 the sense requires a word meaning "innocent" to follow *αἴμα*; suppose the original text had *δίκαιον*, the reading of L, but that in some early copy the word was

omitted; the owner makes a guess at the "missing word," and ἀθῶον, the reading of B & etc., is the result.<sup>1</sup> (c) Occasionally we come across cases where it looks as if a literary word has been deliberately substituted for a slang one in order to improve the style.

(4) In the Gospels, the commonest of all corruptions is the result of "assimilation." This occurs when a word or phrase in the original text has been replaced by one which occurs in the parallel passage in another Gospel.

(5) Many variations consist in the substitution of a participle for καί with a finite verb, or the use of different prepositions, conjunctions, or particles. These may be due to any of the above-mentioned causes—wandering attention between the moment of reading and writing, omission and subsequent correction, influence of the recollection of parallels in another Gospel, or the attempt, unconscious or deliberate, to improve grammar or style.

In the earliest period of all—so the phenomena of the Western text especially suggest—scribes seem occasionally to have attempted quasi-editorial improvements similar to, but much slighter than, those which Matthew and Luke make in reproducing Mark.

In order to illustrate the exact nature of the problem we have to deal with, I set out and discuss briefly the readings of the leading MSS. in three passages in Luke.<sup>2</sup>

Lk. viii. 9, "what this parable might be?"

τίς αὐτη εἶη παραβολή;	B 579.
τίς αὐτη εἶη ἡ παραβολή;	Σ W 33 700.
τίς εἶη αὐτη ἡ παραβολή;	1 &c.
τίς αὐτη ἡ παραβολή	L Ξ.
τίς εἶη ἡ παραβολή αὐτη	A D Θ Ψ.
τίς ἡ παραβολή αὐτη	Γ.
περὶ τῆς παραβολῆς	R.

The seven readings quoted above present an unusually compli-

<sup>1</sup> A similar instance is Lk. ix. 35 ἐκλελεγμένος Σ B L versus ἀγαπητός D Byz.

<sup>2</sup> I have selected these from an immense list drawn up for another purpose by H. C. Hoskier, *Codex B and its Allies*, Quaritch, 1914.

cated instance of diversity in order; they also illustrate two other points. (a) Remembering that all the older MSS. were written in capitals, *with no division between the words and without accents or breathings*, we see that difference between the first two of the list depends on the letter H (=η) being written once or twice before *παραβολή*. If **κ** is right, the error of B is that technically known as "haplography" (*i.e.* writing only once what should be repeated twice); if B is right, **κ** is guilty of "dittography" or mistaken repetition. (b) The reading of R is particularly instructive. The probable explanation is that *τίς αὐτη εἴη ἡ* had formed a complete line in an ancestor which had accidentally been omitted in the exemplar copied by R. (MSS. exist with eleven letters to the line). Something had to be done to make grammar and sense of the nominative *παραβολή* left without a construction. The scribe makes the obvious guess *περὶ τῆς παραβολῆς*. Note that the differences between the first six variants cannot possibly be reproduced in English.

Lk. xi. 10, "It is (or "shall be") opened."

<i>ἀνοίγεται</i>	B D.
<i>ἀνοιγήσεται</i>	κ C L.
<i>ἀνοιχθήσεται</i>	A E etc.
<i>ἀνηχθήσεται</i>	W.

The first three variants illustrate the tendency towards grammatical improvement; the fourth is probably due to defective eyesight of the scribe of this MS. or its ancestor, or possibly, if the scribe wrote from dictation, to an error of hearing.

Lk. ix. 10.

<i>πόλιν καλουμένην Βηθσαιῶν</i>	B L 33 etc.
<i>κώμην λεγομένην Βηθσαιῶν</i>	D.
<i>κώμην καλουμένην Βηθσαιῶν· εἰς τόπον ἔρημον</i>	Θ.
<i>τόπον καλούμενον Βηθσαιῶν</i>	Ψ.
<i>τόπον ἔρημον</i>	κ 69, 157 Syr. C.
<i>ἔρημον τόπον πόλεως καλουμένης Βηθσαιῶν</i>	A 13, 346.
<i>τόπον πόλεως καλουμένης Βηθσαιῶν</i>	1 &c. 700.
<i>τόπον ἔρημον πόλεως καλουμένης Βηθσαιῶν</i>	W and Byzantine.

The whole clause *καὶ παραλαβὼν . . . Βηθσαιῶν* om. 579.

This is an exceptionally complicated, and also an exceptionally instructive, set of variants; since, in spite of the bewildering diversity of attestation, we can by the application of sound principles of criticism ascertain with practical certainty what Luke originally wrote. The apparently hopeless confusion begins to disappear the moment we glance at a Synopsis of the Gospels and note that in Matthew (xiv. 13) and Mark (vi. 12) ἔρημον τόπον "a desert place" takes the place of "city called" or "village named, Bethsaida." We conclude that the reading τόπον ἔρημον may be dismissed as due to "assimilation" of the text of Luke to that of the other Gospels. It follows that all the readings which contain the word τόπον represent attempts of scribes or editors to combine the readings of two MSS., one containing τόπον ἔρημον, the other a reading mentioning a city or village Bethsaida. We are thus left to choose between the first three readings which give the name Bethsaida.

πόλιν καλουμένην Βηθσαιῖδά	B.
κώμην καλουμένην Βηθσαιῖδάν	Θ.
κώμην λεγομένην Βηθσαιῖδά	D.

Here we have a double instance of "substitution of synonyms." It would be most simply explained on the hypothesis that the text presupposed by Θ is original, while κώμην was changed to πόλιν in one local text, and καλουμένην to λεγομένην in another.

This conclusion is shown to be one of high probability by "internal" considerations. Bethsaida is classed among "cities," Mt. xi. 21 = Lk. x. 13; a scribe, therefore, who wished to replace an original κώμην that had fallen out, or to emend the text, would inevitably conjecture πόλιν. On the other hand, the context makes it extremely unlikely that Luke wrote πόλιν. "He took them and withdrew apart (κατ' ἰδίαν) into a . . . called Bethsaida." One does not retire for privacy to a "city"; but one may do so to a country village. Again, two verses later the disciples say, "Send the multitude away that they

may go into the villages and country round about and lodge, and get victuals : for we are here in a desert place." But this would be absurd language to use if they were anywhere near a "city." Again, there can be no reasonable doubt that Luke wrote *καλουμένην* and not *λεγόμενην*. The word *καλούμενος* to introduce a name or appellation is used 11 times in his Gospel ; but it does not occur at all in the other Gospels. On the other hand, *λεγόμενος*, in this usage, while it occurs 13 times in Matthew, is only twice found in Luke (xxii. 1 and 47), and the second of these two cases is doubtful, since D Old Lat. 1 157 support the alternative reading *καλούμενος*.

There remains to make our choice between the form *Βηθσαϊδά* B D Old Lat. and *Βηθσαϊδάν* Θ A and the Byzantine text. Every time the name occurs in the Gospels there is a variation in the MSS. But we note that B, where the name occurs in Matthew and Mark, uses the form with the final *ν* ; but in Luke, B, both here and in Lk. x. 13, has the form without the *ν*. But *κ* has the final *ν* not only in Mark but in Lk. x. 13. Now, since the tendency of scribes is towards "assimilation," a reading which makes the Gospels differ is the one more likely to be original. But Θ has the form with *ν* here, and in Lk. x. 13 *κ* is supported by 1 &c., 13 &c., 28, 700 etc. This shows that the reading with *ν* must have arisen long before the date of writing of *κ*. We conclude, then, that *Βηθσαϊδά* is the true reading, but that *Βηθσαϊδάν* is a very ancient variant. Not only that ; from the fact that it is preferred elsewhere in Luke by *κ* we may reasonably conjecture that it stood in the text of *κ* in Lk. ix. 10 before the words *κώμην* (or *πόλιν*) *καλουμένην* *Βηθσαϊδά* were turned out to be replaced by *τόπον ἔρημον* from the other Gospels. Here, surely, we are on the track of the explanation of this assimilation in *κ* of the text of Luke to Matthew. (*κατ' ἴδιαν* . . . (*Βηθσα*)*ιδαν* is a combination of letters which invited omission by homoioteleuton. The intervening words amounting to 26 letters, *i.e.* probably two lines, were omitted in a remote ancestor of *κ* ; then, in order to make

sense, the words *τόπον ἔρημον* were conjecturally inserted from the parallel passage Mt. xiv. 13. The fact that 579 has actually omitted this very passage (only beginning the omission six words earlier)—apparently through homoioteleuton between (*ἐποίησ*)*αν* and (*Βηθσαϊδ*)*αν*—shows the plausibility of this explanation of the apparently drastic alteration of the text made by  $\aleph$ , a MS. which as a rule is usually exceptionally free from corruption by assimilation to parallels in other Gospels.

Between them the three passages of Luke above discussed exhibit the main influences which resulted in the production of variants in the text. And since they are influences which would operate in every locality, but in regard to a different set of readings in every locality, in the course of time they would inevitably give rise to local texts differing from one another very little in regard to readings materially affecting the sense, but very considerably in minute points.



## APPENDIX II

### THE TEXT OF THE Θ FAMILY

#### THE TEXTUAL HOMOGENEITY OF THE Θ FAMILY

No early MS. has a text entirely homogeneous. Even B, as Hort insists, has not escaped "sporadic" corruption, while  $\aleph$  has a considerable infusion of "Western" readings. In view of the statistics as to the differences of these two Alexandrian MSS., which nevertheless are the most closely related of all MSS. earlier than A.D. 500, given on p. 329, the hypothesis that the various members of *fam.*  $\Theta$  represent a single local text would not be seriously imperilled unless the number of variants within the family exceeded the number of the differences between  $\aleph$  and B. So far, however, as I have been able to test it, they are very few; from which we may infer that the extent to which the leading MSS. of *fam.*  $\Theta$  have been crossed by any text, other than the Byzantine, is very small.

Lake's Table<sup>1</sup> of readings in Mk. i. exhibits 102 variants; but in only 5 of these do members of the family give a reading found in any text other than that of the family or, of course, in the Byzantine text. In regard to the same set of 102 variants  $\aleph$  differs from B 16 times. In the Table for Luke ii. 1-25 at the end of this Appendix there appear 44 departures of *fam.*  $\Theta$  from the T.R.; out of these 44 variants there are 5 in which members of this family differ from one another, and 6 in which  $\aleph$  differs from B. The similar Table for John xii. 1-6

<sup>1</sup> *Harvard Journal of Theology*, July 1923, p. 270 ff.

shows 3 differences between  $\aleph$  and B, but not a single instance of one member of *fam.* Θ opposing another in any non-Byzantine reading. The Table of variants common to the family and the text used by Origen in his *Commentary on Matthew* tells the same tale. It may, however, be worth while to supplement this evidence by the result of a few preliminary tests which I essayed before drawing up these tables.

(a) The lists of classified readings in the Introduction to Lake's *Codex 1 and its Allies* afforded another means of testing the relation of Θ to *fam.* 1. List G in the Introduction (p. lxxi) contains readings peculiar to *fam.* 1. In Matthew there are 8 of these. I find that Θ agrees with *fam.* 1 in 3 of these readings, but in the other 5 has been conformed to the Byzantine text. According to von Soden 2 of the 5 not supported by Θ are found in 1424, and 2 more in one of the Purple MSS. List F gives readings "which are supported by a few other MSS., but cannot be identified with any authority generally recognised as primary." I checked this list against Θ for the part of Matthew which is extant in that MS. (much of Matthew i.-v. is lost). Twenty-four readings of *fam.* 1 are concerned. Ten of them appear in Θ; in all the other instances Θ gives the Byzantine reading. List E gives readings in which *fam.* 1 agrees with B  $\aleph$  against D Old Lat., Old Syr., and Byz. In Matthew there are 23 of these; 12 of them are found in Θ, which otherwise follows the Byzantine text. List B gives the readings found in *fam.* 1, for which the Old Latin is the chief ancient authority. In Matthew there are 11 of these, 4 of which are found in Θ. It appears, then, in whatever direction we look for the readings which are in some special way characteristic of *fam.* 1, we find that a large proportion of them appear in Θ; and, where that does not happen, the occurrence of the Byzantine reading in Θ shows that in these passages it does *not* represent its own characteristic text.

(b) Proceeding to test the relation of Θ and *fam.* 13, I at once noted that Θ exhibits the famous Ferrar reading (found in

346—826—828)  $\delta$  *μνηστευθείσα κτλ.*, Mt. i. 16. Then, by way of a fair test, I opened my copy of Beerman and Gregory's edition of  $\Theta$  at a venture in that part of the volume which gives a collation of the readings of  $\Theta$  with the other MSS. The book opened at p. 657, and I worked through the next six pages, which happened to include Mt. xviii. 25 to xxiii. 2. In this short section there are a very large number of readings of  $\Theta$  in support of which one or more members of the Ferrar group are quoted; but since the majority of these are also found in at least two of the great uncials B  $\aleph$  L D, they afford no evidence of a *special* connection between  $\Theta$  and *fam.* 13. There are, however, 9 readings in which  $\Theta$  is the only uncial (apart from fragments) supporting the reading of *fam.* 13; 4 readings found in both  $\Theta$  and *fam.* 13 but supported by B only of uncials; 4 ditto supported by D only; 2 ditto supported by D  $\Delta$ , and 2 ditto supported by inferior uncials. This seems strong evidence of a very close relation between the text of  $\Theta$  and that of *fam.* 13.

(c) To test the text of these MSS. in Luke, I turned to the Introduction to Hoskier's collation of 700, in which he gives the MS. support for all variants of this MS. that are in any sense uncommon. In the first chapter of Luke there are 26 such variants. I found that, if the readings of  $\Theta$  were added to those of the MSS. cited by Hoskier, every single one of these readings of 700 was supported by at least one other member of the family.

(d) So far as Mark is concerned, 565 would appear to be slightly superior to  $\Theta$ ; but in the other Gospels it has suffered more from Byzantine revision than any other of the group with which we are concerned. It was for that reason that I selected Luke ii. 1-25, John vi. 55-vii. 3, and John xii. 1-6 for the Tables in the Text and Appendix. A glance through Belsheim's collation had shown me that the proportion of non-Byzantine readings in 565 was above the average in these passages, and therefore their character could be most easily tested here. It so happens, however, that all these are passages in which  $\Theta$  and 700 have suffered rather heavily from Byzantine correction,

so that the Tables somewhat understate the value of these two MSS. as compared with other members of the family,

Theoretically, of course, no proposition as to the homogeneity of the texts of these MSS. can be held to be proved until every reading in all four Gospels in each MS. has been compared. Practically, the chances are very small that the various tests enumerated would have come out as they did unless the fundamental text were unusually homogeneous.

#### THE PURPLE MSS., *FAM.* 1424, AND N<sup>o</sup>

There are four MSS. of the sixth century, N—Σ—O and Φ, written on purple parchment in letters of silver—except O, which is in letters of gold. O contains only a fragment of Matthew; Φ and Σ contain Matthew and Mark almost complete; N contains portions of all four Gospels. N—Σ—O are so much alike that Mr. H. R. S. Cronin, who has made a special study of the group, believes that they were copied from the same exemplar.<sup>1</sup> In general they present the Byzantine text; but there is a small proportion of earlier readings. The text of Φ is closely allied to that of N—Σ—O, but with an additional infiltration of D readings.

When I first began testing the homogeneity of *fam.* Θ there happened to be on my table Mr. Cronin's edition of Codex N (*Texts and Studies*, v. 4). Recollecting that the books speak of a connection between this MS. and the Ferrar group, it occurred to me to use some of his lists to test the text of Θ, choosing Luke for the investigation. One list (p. lix) gives the readings in which N agrees with *fam.* 13, against the T.R. and all the leading uncials. There are 7 such readings in Luke. Of these 3 occur in Θ; of the remaining 4, 1 occurs in 131 (*fam.* 1), 1 in 565, and 1 in M (*fam.* 1424). Another list (p. lx) gives agreements of N with the texts of the "Better Uncials"—meaning either B or ⋈ L combined—against the majority of MSS. In Luke 22

<sup>1</sup> *Texts and Studies*, v. 4 (1899), and *J.T.S.*, July 1901, p. 590 ff.

instances are given ;  $\Theta$  supports N in 10 of them. Noticing that for most of the 22 Mr. Cronin quotes the support of *fam. 1* or *fam. 13*, I proceeded to test the cases where he does not quote such support by means of von Soden's Apparatus, which of course gives the readings of some new members of the Ferrar group and of 700. It then appeared that in only 3 of the 22 readings did N lack the support of either  $\Theta$  or one of the  $\Theta$  family. That is to say, N hardly ever agrees with  $\aleph$  B L except where these support *fam.  $\Theta$* .

The early date of the Purple MSS. made it seem specially worth while to explore still further the relation between their pre-Byzantine element and the text of *fam.  $\Theta$* . And, as Mark is the Gospel where the characteristic text of both groups of MSS. is best preserved, I proceeded to test the text of N in that Gospel.

Mr. Cronin gives (p. li f.) a list of 48 readings in Mark where N and  $\Sigma$  agree together, and are supported by a very few MSS. against all the leading uncials and also against the Byzantine text; in each he cites the MSS. which support them. From these it appeared that 31 of the 48 readings in N  $\Sigma$  occur in one or more then known members of *fam.  $\Theta$* . But, checking the list by the new evidence of  $\Theta$  700 and von Soden's revised collations, I found the number rose to 37. This struck me as remarkable. I then noticed that, of the remaining 11 readings, 9 were supported by the group of MSS. which von Soden classes together under the symbol I<sup>\*</sup>, but which on the analogy of the accepted usage in similar cases I have called *fam. 1424*. This group he defines as one intimately related to *fam. 1* and *fam. 13*, but preserving a few readings which have been eliminated from these MSS.

The next step was to test the combination N  $\Sigma$  by the Table of readings characteristic of *fam.  $\Theta$*  given in the article by Lake and Blake in the *Harvard Theological Review*. N is not extant for the beginning of Mark, but  $\Sigma$  is. The results of a scrutiny of the 102 variants in Mark i. there tabled, tested against the collation of  $\Sigma$  by Gebhardt and Harnack, may be succinctly presented as follows :

Agreements of Σ with T.R. . . . .	84
	—
Agreements of Σ with <i>fam.</i> Θ . . . . .	14
Conflations of text of <i>fam.</i> Θ and T.R. . . . .	2
Agreement of Σ with <i>fam.</i> 1424 in a reading not preserved in other members of <i>fam.</i> Θ	1
Agreements with other MSS. (A 33) . . . . .	1
	—
	18

These figures materially strengthen the conclusion that the ground text of N Σ was identical with that of *fam.* Θ, only that it has suffered a much larger amount of revision to the Byzantine standard. Obviously, however, they would amount to demonstration if it could be shown that von Soden was right in view of the relation of *fam.* 1424 to *fam.* 1 and *fam.* 13.

Accordingly I proceeded to test the character of *fam.* 1424 by reference to Lake and Blake's Table for Mark i. Assuming that where von Soden fails to cite the evidence of any of these MSS. it agrees with the Byzantine text, it appears that in 52 of the 102 variants cited *fam.* 1424 represents the T.R., but in 40 it goes with one or other member of the Θ family; 9 times it has readings differing from the T.R. but not found in any of the six representatives of *fam.* Θ cited in the Table. One of them, however (the omission of *εὐθύς* i. 43), is found also in 828, a Ferrar MS. quoted by von Soden but not included in Lake's citations; and one is practically the *fam.* Θ reading (*i.e.* the addition *καὶ τεσσαράκοντα νύκτας* i. 13, only with a transposition of the last two words); and two are found only in one MS. of *fam.* 1424 and look like errors of the individual scribe. In one *fam.* 1424 agrees with D, but all members of *fam.* Θ except Θ itself here go with T.R., and the reading of Θ *ἦλθον* for *ἀπῆλθον*, found in no other MS., is probably a slip, so that here *fam.* 1424 may well preserve the original *fam.* Θ reading. In all other variants, so far as one can infer from von Soden's general system of citing (and I know of no collation by which to check him), *fam.* 1424 gives the Byzantine reading.

The Tables of readings in Luke and John, given p. 83 and p. 582 ff., show similar results, and justify us in treating *fam.* 1424 as a genuine and important constituent of *fam.* Θ. I may add that in the course of writing this book I have had to study the MS. evidence given by von Soden in innumerable cases up and down the Gospels, and have found nothing to conflict with the results obtained above. Accordingly, though it may be that a few of the less important of the twenty-eight MSS. which he groups as I<sup>9</sup> ought not to be included, he has discovered a real group; and *fam.* 1424 must be treated as an important constituent of the Θ family. I have also found reason to accept his view that 544 (ε 337) is a true member of the same family.<sup>1</sup>

It occurred to me to test the readings of the corrector of  $\aleph$  whom Tischendorf cites as  $\aleph^c$  or  $\aleph^{ca}$ , and who probably<sup>2</sup> belongs to V or VI<sup>cent.</sup>. The chapters of Matthew which I tested showed a predominantly Byzantine text with a sprinkling of readings definitely of the *fam.* Θ type. This is interesting, as in the O.T. and in the Epistles  $\aleph^c$  seems to have used a MS. in the hand of Pamphilus.<sup>3</sup> Unless, as is possible, but not probable, Pamphilus in prison copied a MS. of Lucian's recension, this shows the Byzantine text dominant in Caesarea by V or VI<sup>cent.</sup>

#### THE K II GROUP

von Soden classes M, which has a very small non-Byzantine mixture, as an inferior member of *fam.* 1424; Bousset (*Text-kritische Studien*, chap. iv.) regards M as a poor relation of K II. The lists of the readings in his chapter on "The K II Group" favour von Soden's view that these two uncials (which are supported by a number of cursives) have the same relation as have N Σ to the *fam.* Θ text, except that they are more

<sup>1</sup> A partial collation of 544 is given in Scrivener's *Adversaria Critica*, p. l-liv (Cambridge, 1893), under the number 557.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the facsimile edition of  $\aleph$  by K. Lake (Clarendon Press, 1911), p. xvii f.

<sup>3</sup> Bousset, *op. cit.* p. 45 ff.

predominantly Byzantine and have a smaller admixture of the older text. von Soden classes A, the famous Codex Alexandrinus, with K II; and, so far as I have tested the suggestion, I think he is probably right in supposing that the non-Byzantine element in A represents mainly, if not wholly, the *fam.* Θ text. W. C. Braithwaite (*Expository Times*, xiii. pp. 114 ff.) says that the recently discovered uncial Y has affinities with K II; and a hurried look at the collation of the MS. given in Gregory's *Textkritik* (pp. 1928 ff.) seemed to show that its non-Byzantine element (perhaps 10 %) is at any rate closely connected with *fam.* Θ. Since, however, all the sub-families of *fam.* Θ overlap one another, it is not of much importance, especially where the non-Byzantine element is small, whether in border-line cases, like A or M or Y, a MS. is included in one sub-family or another, or regarded as forming a class by itself. The same consideration applies to the question (discussed p. 80, note) whether 22 should be included in *fam.* 1 or not. What does matter is to know whether the non-Byzantine element in a mixed MS. belongs mainly or entirely to the Θ family.

The K II group is regarded by von Soden as a definite recension; he styles it the K<sup>a</sup> text, and holds that it was used by Chrysostom in his Homilies on John and in the so-called "Antiochene Commentary" on Mark (by ? Victor of Antioch ±420), and on Luke by Titus of Bosra, 370. I am a little sceptical as to the clear-cut distinctions within the Byzantine text which von Soden believes he can detect; but, if the K<sup>a</sup> text was used by these fathers and is that of the V<sup>cent.</sup> MS. A, may not this be the text of Lucian? The K<sup>1</sup> text in other works of Chrysostom may be due to scribal revision to the VI<sup>cent.</sup> Byzantine text.

#### U A, ETC.

Two other sub-families of MSS., regarded by von Soden as authorities for his "I text," are headed respectively by U and A. The non-Byzantine element in *fam.* U (in which he



includes the interesting cursive 1071<sup>1</sup> (ε 1279) seems to be about as large as that in the Purple MSS.; and, so far as I have observed, it represents the *fam.* Θ text. *Fam.* Λ seems to have a smaller non-Byzantine element, and therefore is more difficult to test; but I do not happen to have noticed any readings which suggest that this element is other than the *fam.* Θ text; and I would say the same thing of 1604 (ε 1353).

An immense number of MSS. are assigned by von Soden to the I text. Unfortunately, however, his inclusion of DW<sup>Mk</sup>, Old Lat., Old Syr. in the I text vitiates his principle of classification; for it would justify his assigning to that text a MS. containing a considerable mixture of specifically Syriac or Western readings. This consideration precludes one from the simple expedient of classing as authorities for the text of *fam.* Θ all MSS.—merely excepting DW<sup>Mk</sup> 1-v, Old Lat., Old Syr.—cited in von Soden's Apparatus as authorities for the I text. They must be scrutinised again in every case. And this caution is the more necessary as von Soden is over-anxious to enlist MSS. in support of the I text. For example, 157 is reckoned as an I MS., and it undoubtedly has a number of readings characteristic of *fam.* Θ; but a much more striking feature of this curiously mixed MS. is its support of the Alexandrian text. The fragments P Q and R von Soden classes as authorities for the I text; Γ also is claimed as a weak supporter of the same text—perhaps rightly, but it also has some striking Alexandrian readings.<sup>2</sup>

One naturally asks if all traces of the old text of Antioch have disappeared. If we are right in surmising that this was the Greek original of the Old Syriac, a predominantly Byzantine MS. in which the remnants of such a text survived as a small

<sup>1</sup> Described and collated by K. Lake in *Studia Biblica*, v. p. 132 ff., Oxford, 1903.

<sup>2</sup> My confidence in von Soden's classifications was seriously shaken by testing the VI<sup>cent.</sup> fragment 089 (ε 28 = Tischendorf's Θ<sup>e</sup>) containing Mt. xxvi. 2-4, 7-9, which he quotes (vol. i. p. 1350) as "a pure I text." Tischendorf gives 8 variants from this fragment, of which 7 occur in B<sup>N</sup> and the remaining 1 in B Δ.

element of mixture might easily be mistaken for a weak member of *fam.* Θ, since *fam.* Θ and the Old Syriac have so much in common. Again, there must have been early local texts in Asia Minor and Macedonia—the parts of the world in which the majority of our later MSS. were probably produced—and it would be very strange if no readings at all from these texts had crept into the later MSS. The astonishing thing is that, of the sporadic non-Byzantine readings that survive in later MSS., there are so few which are not also found in one or other of the great texts which we can identify. I can only account for this by supposing that, at the time when the transition from papyrus to parchment was made, the smaller churches, instead of copying their local texts, obtained their new parchment copies from the larger centres. This change of material seems to have taken place early in the fourth century, that is to say, just after the revisions by Lucian and Hesychius were accepted at Antioch and Alexandria. And we know that the copies of the text of Caesarea with which Eusebius supplied Constantine (from which we have suggested many representatives of *fam.* Θ are descended) were written on parchment.

In order further to illustrate both the essential homogeneity of *fam.* Θ and the curiously sporadic and unsystematic character of the assimilation of earlier texts to the Byzantine standard, I append two Tables modelled on that drawn up by K. Lake to which reference has been so often made.





John xii. 1-6

	READINGS OF THE FAMILY	Θ	jam. 1	jam. 13	28	655	700	jam. 1424	READINGS OF 5
NBBD	1 + ó (ante Is <sup>10</sup> )	5	5	í	5	5	5	5	NBD - ó
	+ ó Is (p. vekpaw)	5	5	í	5	5	5	5	- ó Is
D	2 και έτοιμασας	5	5	í	5	5	5	5	έτοιμασας οδυ
	- αυτη <sup>10</sup>	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	+ αυτη <sup>10</sup>
NBBD	3 και δεκτων	5	5	í	5	5	5	5	δεκτων εκει
	Μαρια	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	Μαρια
B	- δε (a. Δαξ.)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	+ δε
	αυακ. συη (αυτη)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	συνανακτημενων
NBBD	4 Μαριαμ	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	Μαρια
	- παδου	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	+ παδου
D	5 πολυτελους	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	πολυτελουσ
	ηλειθε	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	ηλειθεσ
NBBD	6 απεμαξεν	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	εξεμαξεν
	απεμαξ. (p. αυτης)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	εξελμ. a. ταισ θρ
B	+ ταισ 2 <sup>o</sup> (p. θηξεν)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	- ταισ 2 <sup>o</sup>
	εαυτης	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	αυτης
NBBD	αυτου τουσ ποδασ	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	τουσ ποδασ αυτου
	ομ. 7. π. α.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	+ 7. π. α.
N	- αυτου	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	+ αυτου
	+ ολη (p. οικια)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	- ολη
N	4 - Σικωπος (p. Ιουδασ)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	+ Σικωπος
	+ ó (a. Ιορκ.)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	- ó
NBBD	5 διακοστων	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	διακοστων
	δηπ. τριακοστων	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	τριακοστων
D	+ τουσ (a. πτωχουσ)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	- τουσ
	6 εμελεσεν	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	εμελεσεν
NBBD	εχων	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	εχων και
	ετηπει	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	εβασταξεν

\* = in one (or two) MSS. only.

† εχων και, a conflation.

† Tisch. and von Soden say that 655 supports the family reading; but this is not to be found in Beisheim's collation of 655. N.B.—Great care has been bestowed on these Tables: but absolute accuracy is not guaranteed.

### APPENDIX III

#### THE TEXT USED IN ORIGEN'S "COMMENTARY ON MATTHEW"

OF this work a portion is preserved in Greek, another portion in an old Latin translation ; they overlap to some extent. The Latin and Greek differ in a way which shows that they represent a different line of textual transmission. The quotations from the Gospel of Matthew, which in the earlier part are short fragments, towards the end become almost a continuous text of the Gospel. I therefore select chaps. xxii. (1-36) and xxv., the one extant in Greek, the other only in Latin, as favourable specimens for testing both traditions of this work of Origen. The edition cited is that of Lommatzsch.

The Tables include all variants in which the text as quoted by Origen differs from the Textus Receptus, and show how far his text is supported by either B,  $\aleph$ , D, or by any member of *fam.*  $\Theta$ . Since our object is to test the nature of the non-Byzantine element in *fam.*  $\Theta$ , readings of individual members of the family are not cited when they agree with the T.R. Readings in which Origen agrees with the T.R. against two or more members of *fam.*  $\Theta$  are not set out at length in the Tables. It seemed sufficient to state that in chap. xxii. there are 8 such, and 6 in chap. xxv. There are also altogether 11 variants in which Origen agrees with the T.R. against a reading which, since it occurs in only one of the six authorities  $\Theta$ , 1 &c., 13 &c., 23, 565, 700, may possibly not be a true "family reading." The readings of  $\Theta$  1, 13—69—124—346, 565 and 700, also 22, have been derived

direct from the editions or collations of the several MSS. by Gregory, Lake, Ferrar, Belsheim, Hoskier, and Sanders. For other MSS. I follow Tischendorf or von Soden. The readings of Σ, the new members of the Ferrar group (*e.g.* 983), and *fam.* 1424 are only given where the better-known members of *fam.* Θ give the Byzantine reading.

TABLE I

MSS. supporting.	Text of Origen's <i>Commentary on Matthew</i> (xxii.).	MSS. against.
22 33 Latt. 1, 69, 124 N B D	1. και ἀποκριθεις ὁ Ἰησους εἶπε παλιν ἐν παραβολαῖς αὐτοῖς.	(παλιν εἶπεν) N B D 5 (αὐτοῖς ἐν π.) 5 (om. αὐτοῖς) Θ
Θ 1, 22	2. ὁμοιωθη ἡ βασιλεια των οὐρανων ἀνθρωπω βασιλει, ὅστις ποιων γαμος τω υἱῷ αὐτου.	(ἐποίησε) N B D 5
1	4. ἴδου το ἀριστον (-μου). ἤτοιμασα, οἱ ταυροι μου και τα σιτιστα τεθυμενα, και (1 <sup>ο</sup> ) τα παντα [(2 <sup>ο</sup> ) παντα] ἔτοιμα, δευτε εἰς τους γαμος.	(+μου) N B D 5
None		(-τα) All known MSS.
Θ 1, 22, 13 &c., 700 N B Θ 13 &c. N B D	5. οἱ δε ἀμελησαντες ἀπηλθον, ὅς μεν ἐπι τον ἰδιον ἀγρον, ὅς δε ἐπι την ἐμποριαν αὐτου.	(οἱ . . . οἱ) } D 5 (ὁ . . . ὁ) } 5 (eis)
None	6. οἱ δε λοιποὶ κρατησαντες αὐτου τους δουλους ὑβρισαν και ἀπεκτειναν.	(τους δουλους αὐτου) All known MSS.
1, 22 D 1, 22	7. και πεψας το στρατευμα αὐτου ἀνείλε τους φορεις ἐκείνους, και την πολιν αὐτων ἐνεπρησε.	(τα στρατευματα) N B 5 (ἀπώλεσεν) N B D 5
Σ 983 (=fam. 13) D	8. τοτε λεγει τοις δουλοις αὐτου ὁ μεν γαμος ἔτοιμος (-εστιν) οἱ δε κεκλημενοι οὐκ ἦσαν ἀξιοι.	(+εστιν) N B 5

TABLE I—(continued)

MSS. supporting.	Text of Origen's <i>Commentary on Matthew</i> (xxii.).	MSS. against.
Θ 1	15. <u>τοτε πορευθεντες οι Φαρισαιοι συμβουλιον ελαβον κατ' αυτου</u> οπως αυτον παγιδευσωσιν εν λογω.	(- κατ' αυτου) <b>Ν B D</b> 5
Θ 1, 28, 565, 700	16. <u>διδασκαλε, οιδαμεν</u> οτι αληθης ει, και την οδον του θεου εν αληθεια διδασκεις, και ου μελει σοι περι ουδενος· ου γαρ βλέπεις εις προσωπον ανθρωπου.	(ανθρωπων) <b>Ν B D</b> 5
700	18. <u>γρους δε ο 'Ιησους την πανουργιαν.</u>	(πονηριαν) <b>Ν B D</b> 5
253	20. <u>τινος η εικων (- αυτη)</u> και η επιγραφη.	(+ αυτη) <b>Ν B D</b> 5
Θ 565, 700	21. <u>αποδοτε τα καισαρος τω καισαρι,</u> και τα του θεου τω θεω.	(- τω) <b>Ν B</b> 5
1, 13, 28, 700 <b>Ν B D</b>	23. εν εκεινη τη ημερα προσηλθον αυτω Σαδδουκαιοι <u>(- οι)</u> λεγοντες μη ειναι αναστασιν.	(+ οι)    5
Θ 1, 22, 700 <b>Ν B</b>	25. ησαν δε γαρ ημιν επτα αδελφοι και ο πρωτος <u>γημας</u> ετελευτησε.	(γαμησας) <b>D</b> 5
22 Θ 124, 700 1	30. εν τη γαρ αναστασει ουτε γαμουσιν, ουτε <u>(1<sup>ο</sup>, 2<sup>ο</sup>) γαμιζονται (3<sup>ο</sup>, 4<sup>ο</sup>) γαμισκονται</u> αλλ' <u>εισιν ως</u>	(εγκαμιζονται)    5 (εισιν after ουρανω) <b>Ν B D</b> 5 (εισιν before εν ουρανω) <b>13 etc.</b>
Θ 1, 22 Θ 1, 700 <b>B D</b>	<u>οι αγγελοι (- του θεου)</u> εν	(- οι) <b>Ν B D</b> 5 (+ του θεου)    5 (+ θεου) <b>Ν 13 etc.</b>
1, 13 etc. <b>Ν B</b>	<u>τω ουρανω.</u>	(- τω) <b>D</b> 5



TABLE II

MSS. supporting.	Text of Origen's <i>Commentary on Matthew</i> (xxv.) (Old Latin Translation).	MSS. against
Θ 1, 124 D	1. . . . quae . . . exierunt obviam sponso <u>et sponsae.</u>	(omit) N B 5
Θ 1, 124, 700 N B D	2. <u>quinque</u> autem ex iis erant	(ἦσαν ἐξ αὐτῶν) 5
Θ 1 N B D	<u>fatuae, et quinque prudentes.</u>	(φρονιμοὶ . . . μωροὶ) 5
Θ 1 28 N B D	6. Media autem nocte clamor factus est: ecce sponsus venit, <u>exsurgete</u> obviam ei.	(ἐξερχεσθε) N B D 5
	9. <u>Ite</u> (- autem) magis ad venditores.	(+ δε) 5
Θ 1, 565 N B D	13. Vigilate ergo quia nescitis diem et <u>horam.</u>	(+ ἐν ἡ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται) 5
M, F <sup>1</sup>	14. Homo <u>quidam</u> peregre proficiscens vocavit servos suos.	(- τισ) 5
Θ 1, 69, 124 B D	16. Abiit autem qui <u>quinque talenta</u> acceperat . . . et <u>lucratus est alia</u> quinque talenta.	(ἐποίησεν) N 5
Θ N D	17. Similiter (- et) qui <u>duo accepit,</u> lucratus est	(+ και) B D 5
	(- et ipse) in iis alia duo.	(- λαβῶν) N B 5
Θ 1, 13, 700 N B D	19. Post multum temporis venit dominus servorum illorum.	(+ και αὐτος) D 5
	20. Domine, quinque talenta mihi <u>dedisti,</u> ecce alia quinque superlucratus sum	(- ἐν αὐτοῖς) N B D 5
1	(- ab illis).	(χρονὸν πολλὸν) 5
Θ 124, 700 N B D	21. Ait (- autem) ei dominus ejus: euge, serve bone et fidelis.	(παρεδωκας) N B D 5
Θ 124, 700 N B D		(+ ἐπ αὐτοῖς) 5
		(+ δε) 5

<sup>1</sup> M is an inferior member of *fam.* 1424; F is one of Soden's K<sup>1</sup> MSS., i.e. Byzantine with a small admixture of readings characteristic of *fam.* 13.

TABLE II—(continued)

MSS. supporting.	Text of Origen's <i>Commentary on Matthew</i> (xxv.) (Old Latin Translation).	MSS. against.
Θ 124, 700    ⑈ B D	22. Accedens autem et qui duo talenta acceperat, ait: domine, duo talenta mihi dedisti, ecce alia duo lucratus sum. (- ab illis)	(+ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς)                    5
Θ	24. Accedens autem et qui unum talentum acceperat, ait: domine, scio (- te) quia homo durus es.	(+ σε)                            ⑈ B    5
	25. Et timens abii et abscondi talentum tuum in terra: ecce habes tuum.	(+ ἀπελθων)                    ⑈ B    5
Θ 1, 565            ⑈ B D	31. Cum venerit Filius hominis in gloria sua, et omnes angeli (- sancti) cum eo.	(+ ἅγιοι)                            5
	39. Aut quando te vidimus infirmum aut in carcere?	(+ ποτε δε)                        ⑈ B    5
1, 22	41. Discedite a me, maledicti, in ignem aeternum, quem praeparavit Pater meus diabolo et angelis ejus.	(+ το ἡτοιμασμενον)            ⑈ B    5

The above Tables give all the readings in these two chapters in which Origen differs from the T.R.—45 in number. It will be observed that in 37 of these Origen is supported by one or more members of *fam.* Θ; while he is supported by D 24 times, by B only 16. Thus in sharp contrast to the steady support by *fam.* Θ is the way in which ⑈ B D jump from side to side, now supporting, now opposing, the text of Origen. The conclusion is irresistible: the text upon which Origen was lecturing represented neither an Alexandrian nor a "Western" text, but almost identically that of *fam.* Θ.

## APPENDIX IV

### JEROME AND THE CODEX SINAITICUS

IN the Preface to the Vulgate Gospels, which takes the form of an open letter to Pope Damasus, Jerome defends the principles he has adopted in revising the text of the Old Latin. Of the Latin, he says, no two copies are alike, but we have a standard of authenticity, since for the New Testament, unlike the Old, the Greek was indubitably the original. Hence the discrepancy between the different Latin copies can only be corrected by reference to the Greek original. But the MSS. of the Greek text which are named after Lucian and Hesychius, both in the Old and the New Testament, have been badly edited and interpolated—as may be seen by comparing them with ancient vernacular translations. He has, therefore, used, as a standard by which to correct the Latin, Greek MSS. which are really old.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> “Si enim Latinis exemplaribus fides est adhibenda, respondeant, quibus; tot enim sunt exemplaria quot pene codices. Sin autem veritas est quaerenda de pluribus, cur non ad Graecam originem revertentes, ea quae vel a vitiosis interpretibus male edita, vel a praesumptoribus imperitis emendata perversius, vel a librariis dormientibus aut addita sunt, aut mutata, corrigimus? Neque ego de Veteri disputo Testamento. . . . De Novo nunc loquor Testamento: quod Graecum esse non dubium est. . . . Hoc certe quum in nostro sermone discordat, et diversos rivulorum tramites ducit, uno de fonte quaerendum est. Praetermitto eos codices, quos a Luciano et Hesychio nuncupatos, paucorum hominum asserit perversa contentio: quibus utique nec in Veteri Instrumento post septuaginta interpretes emendare quid licuit, nec in novo profuit emendasse: quum multarum gentium linguis Scriptura ante translata, doceat falsa esse quae addita sunt. Igitur haec praesens praefatiuncula pollicetur quattuor tantum evangelia, quorum ordo” (he means the Greek as opposed to the Old Latin order) “est iste, Matthaeus, Marcus, Lucas, Johannes, codicum Graecorum emendata collatione, sed veterum.”

Seeing that Jerome is writing a careful and considered Preface to a revised version of the Four Gospels, and that he only mentions the Lucianic and Hesychian versions in order to contrast their inferior text with that of the "ancient codices" he has himself used, I simply cannot understand why some scholars have raised doubts as to whether the Lucianic and Hesychian recensions included the New Testament as well as the Old.

But why, we may ask, was Jerome so contemptuous of the work of Lucian and Hesychius? I suggest two reasons: (1) Jerome at this date was quite convinced that the true text of the O.T. was only to be found in Origen's Hexapla<sup>1</sup>; it was only later in his life that he had recourse to the original Hebrew. But the Hexapla had been published a generation before Lucian and Hesychius began their work. What then but native perversity, "a cantankerous wrongheadedness" (*perversa contentio*), could have induced these worthies to insist on producing a text of their own? (2) Jerome had just returned to Rome from Constantinople, where, as he tells us, the recension of Lucian was accepted. Now, if we accept the suggestion (cf. p. 102 ff.) that the MSS. with which Constantine had provided his new capital represented the *fam.* Ⓞ text, the Lucianic text must have been a recent importation. Inevitably, then, there would have been some conservatives at Constantinople who grumbled at the innovation; and these might have very pertinently appealed to the Old Syriac (*multarum gentium linguis scriptura antea translata, doceat falsa esse quae addita sunt*), as evidence that the many striking passages absent from both *fam.* Ⓞ and Syr S. (cf. p. 88) but found in the Lucianic text, were interpolations. If Jerome had heard from someone at Constantinople some general statement to this effect, it would only confirm his *a priori* suspicion of anyone who dared to think he could improve upon Origen's text of the LXX, and, with his hasty temperament, he would forthwith conclude—without any really careful study—that Lucian's temerity had had equally

<sup>1</sup> Cf. passages quoted by Swete, *op. cit.* p. 76 f.

fatal results on the New Testament. Nor would he wait for further evidence before including Lucian's fellow offender, Hesychius, in the same sweeping condemnation.

The question, however, in regard to which we should have liked Jerome to have made a clear statement is the type of text represented by those ancient MSS. which he himself so much preferred. Can we identify the Greek text which Jerome preferred? The materials on which an answer to this question must be based are collected in Wordsworth and White's edition of the Vulgate Gospels and Acts.<sup>1</sup>

(1) In his *Commentary on Matthew* Jerome seven times discusses various readings in MSS. known to him. Each time he quotes with approval a reading found in  $\aleph$ . In two of the seven readings  $\aleph$  differs from B, and in two of them it differs from *fam.*  $\Theta$ . The fact that Jerome had a MS. agreeing with  $\aleph$  seven times out of seven would, even if it stood alone, be a remarkable coincidence. But it does not stand alone.

(2) When in the Acts Jerome departs from the text of the Old Latin version, two-thirds of his alterations are in the direction of agreement with the Alexandrian text which for Acts is represented by B  $\aleph$  A C. Where  $\aleph$  and B differ he usually goes with the one which is backed by the other MSS. of the family; but six times he agrees with  $\aleph$  alone, but only twice (*sic*) with B alone.

(3) For the Gospels Wordsworth and White give (p. 665) a table showing 39 readings, in which Jerome's Vulgate agrees with extant Greek MSS. against the Old Latin. Of these 25 are found in one or more of the MSS.  $\aleph$  B L  $\Delta$ <sup>Mk.</sup>; but the significance of this figure is altered when we note that only 11 of the 25 seem to be exclusively Alexandrian readings.

Everything, however, depends on their estimate of Codex *f* (Brixianus), the text of which is a sort of half-way house between that of Old Latin MSS. of the type of *b* and the Byzantine. In *f* occur a very large number of readings in which Jerome's

<sup>1</sup> Wordsworth and White, *Nov. Test. Lat. sec. ed. S. Hieronymi* (Oxford, 1889-98, 1905).

text and the Byzantine agree against the other Old Latin MSS. Wordsworth and White hold that the Latin MSS. which Jerome started with before he began his revision must have had a text very similar to *f*; that is to say, that Jerome used a form of the Old Latin version which had already been partially revised by Greek MSS. of the Byzantine type. They conclude that the Greek MSS. which he employed must have been of the  $\aleph$  B L type, but most closely related to  $\aleph$ .

On this view most of the agreements of the Vulgate and the Byzantine text were due, not to Jerome, but to the previous revision by an unknown person which is most nearly represented by *f*. Burkitt, on the other hand (*J.T.S.* i. p. 129), thinks that the Old Latin which Jerome attempted to revise was more like *b*. The agreements between the Vulgate and *f* he explains on the hypothesis that *f* is a text very largely Vulgate which has been copied from the Latin side of a bilingual Gothic-Latin MS., the Latin text of which had been sometimes conformed to that of the Gothic. I cannot pretend to the knowledge of the Old Latin version which would entitle me to express an opinion on this controversy. I believe, however, that the majority of experts incline to Burkitt's view.

But if *f* is, not the parent of Jerome's version, but its child, and is therefore not to be reckoned as an Old Latin MS. at all, then, so far as the Vulgate Gospels are concerned, the case for Jerome's use of MSS. of the  $\aleph$  B L type collapses. As Wordsworth and White point out (p. 671), from Luke xvii. to the end of the Gospel, and in a large part of John, Jerome's alterations of the Old Latin are almost entirely into conformity with the later Greek MSS.; and they cite 27 instances of the same thing for Matthew, Mark, and the earlier part of Luke. It would look then as if the MSS. used by Jerome had a text something like A—mainly Lucianic but with a sprinkling of Alexandrian and other earlier readings. That Jerome, *without knowing it*, should have used a text almost identical with the Lucianic recension, about which he is so scornful, is really funny. I can only suppose that one of the

MSS. he possessed looked so old that he imagined it antedated Lucian.

There still remains, however, the far more impressive evidence quoted above that, in his *Commentary on Matthew* and in his revision of the Acts, Jerome used a text akin to  $\aleph$ . I suggest that this is to be explained by his visit to Alexandria, which took place in 386, that is, between the publication of the Vulgate Gospels and the work on Matthew.<sup>1</sup> At Alexandria he listened with enthusiasm to the lectures of the famous Origenist teacher Didymus. What more likely, then, than that he should seize the opportunity to acquire a copy of the N.T. in the text which the school of Origen approved. I would relate this surmise to three facts. (a) Our actual MS.  $\aleph$  was, perhaps, forty years old when Jerome was in Alexandria; (b) Jerome died at Bethlehem in 420; (c) not many years later  $\aleph$  was in Palestine in the library at Caesarea. This we learn from a marginal note by a (probably) fifth-century corrector, who says that he collated some parts of the Old Testament with the autograph of Pamphilus which was there preserved. Historically, therefore, there is no difficulty in supposing that  $\aleph$  was brought to Palestine by Jerome.

The hypothesis that our  $\aleph$  was actually one of the MSS. used by Jerome would remove a great difficulty. In Jerome's *Commentary on Matthew*, in addition to the seven variants alluded to above, there is a long discussion of the reading  $\omicron\upsilon\delta\grave{\epsilon} \acute{o} \nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , Mt. xxiv. 36. Jerome asserts that the words were absent from the approved copies of Origen and Pierius. But we know that as a matter of fact the words in question did stand in the text used by Origen. For Origen, in his *Commentary on Matthew*, discusses at considerable length the theological difficulty raised by them. He gives two alternative ways of meeting it; but he never suggests, as he does elsewhere under similar circumstances, that he knew of any MS. which omitted

<sup>1</sup> Whether his revision of the Acts and Epistles took place before or after the visit to Alexandria is unknown. His text of the Catholic Epistles is closely allied to that of A.

the offending words. Moreover, we have other evidence that they stood in all the texts likely to have been known to Origen; for they occur, not only in B & D Old Lat., but also in 13 &c., 28, Φ Arm., from which we may presume their presence in the text of *fam.* Θ. But if Jerome used &, and supposed it to represent the text of Origen and Pierius, his statement is explained; for although the words οὐδὲ ὁ υἱος were written by the original scribe, they were deleted by a very early corrector.

The deletion was made—according to the usual practice—by a row of dots above the word. A subsequent corrector has erased the dots. & was corrected by two scribes, who seem to belong to the fifth century and whose corrections can usually be distinguished by minute differences in handwriting and in the colour of the ink they used. But a row of dots, all but obliterated, cannot by these criteria be assigned to one corrector rather than another. And Tischendorf, in the notes to his four-volume edition of &, in assigning the dots to the corrector &<sup>ca</sup>, and their erasure to his successor &<sup>cb</sup>, does so with the qualification *ut videtur*. So far as I can see, there is no reason for identifying the person who deleted οὐδὲ ὁ υἱος with the corrector &<sup>ca</sup>, except that &<sup>ca</sup> was the first *systematic* reviser who worked on the MS. after the original διορθωτής. But this particular reading was one which might well have stimulated the activity of an earlier owner of the MS. who was not concerned to revise it throughout. Origen had already found the words theologically embarrassing; during the Arian controversy the Son's knowledge of the Father was near the centre of the point at issue: the words are not found in Syr. S. nor in the Byzantine text; what is even more significant, they are absent from L 33 and from both the Egyptian versions. That is to say, we have evidence that even in Egypt, the home of the B & text, the words were being discredited as an heretical interpolation. I suggest, therefore, that the deletion in & was made when the Arian controversy was at its height, and, therefore, before the time of Jerome. Indeed, even if the MS. used by Jerome was not & itself but a sister MS.,



the probability that the words in question had there also been deleted is by no means low.

On the only other occasion on which Jerome refers to the copies of Origen, the reading quoted (Gal. iii. 1) as Origen's is one supported by B  $\aleph$  against the great majority of Greek MSS. This affords some evidence for the view that Jerome regarded the type of text represented by  $\aleph$  as that approved by Origen. But if so, we must ask the question: How exactly did he connect his MSS. with those of Origen? I would hazard the suggestion that Jerome's phrase *exemplaria Adamantii et Pierii* (Adamantius was a second name of Origen) does not mean two different codices, any more than the text of Westcott and Hort means two different editions. Pierius may well have attempted to popularise the text of the Gospels on which Origen lectured, much in the same way as Pamphilus did for the LXX column of the *Hexapla*. In favour of this view two considerations may be advanced. (a) Origen stoutly affirms his belief that the Shepherd of Hermas is an inspired work; Athanasius definitely excludes it from the Canon. Now  $\aleph$  contains the Shepherd; whether B also did we do not know, as the end of the MS. is missing. (b)  $\aleph$  is written in four columns to the page, B in three, A in two, C in only one—which last became the common type, though two is not unusual. The larger number of columns reproduces the format of the papyrus roll which preceded the codex; B is transitional;  $\aleph$  represents the most antiquated style of all. Thus, though it is slightly the younger MS., in this respect  $\aleph$  reproduces an older tradition than B. This would be accounted for if  $\aleph$  was a conservative copy of a MS. of Pierius.

The conjecture that  $\aleph$  represents the recension of Pierius is in no way incompatible with the view that B represents that of Hesychius. Hort's arguments,<sup>1</sup> especially if supplemented

<sup>1</sup> W.H. ii. p. 213 ff. It is worth noting that K. Lake, in his Introduction to the facsimile reproduction of  $\aleph$ , refutes Tischendorf's suggestion (here alluded to by Hort) that a portion of B and  $\aleph$  were written by the same scribe.

by a study of the immense list of minute differences between B and  $\aleph$  drawn up by Hoskier,<sup>1</sup> makes it difficult to accept von Soden's view that their common ancestor was at all recent. It is more probable that they represent, either two independent traditions of the oldest text of Alexandria, or recensions by two scholars each of whom based his text on the oldest MSS. obtainable in Egypt.

<sup>1</sup> *Codex B and its Allies*, pt. ii. (Quaritch, 1914).

## APPENDIX V

### W AND THE CAESAREAN TEXT

IN 1926, in time to add this Appendix to the second impression, I discovered that the Washington MS. W—dated *c.* A.D. 400—is, for two-thirds of St. Mark's Gospel, a member of *fam.* Θ. The evidence submitted below has been amplified by Profs. Lake and Blake and Mrs. New (*Harvard Theological Review*, Oct. 1928). They confirm my conclusion, while finding that W has suffered more from Byzantine revision than I had supposed. It appears that, for Mark, the Greek MSS., as regards relative freedom from Byzantine readings, stand as follows:—565, Θ, 28, 700, W, *fam.* 1, *fam.* 13.

Prof. Sanders in his edition of W shows that for Mk. i. 1-v. 30 the text of W is the Greek equivalent of the Old Latin version, agreeing more particularly with the "African Latin" MS. *e.* He goes on to say: "In the second part of Mark there is still a decidedly close relationship between W and the Old Latin MSS., but the special Latinisms . . . have mostly disappeared. . . . The most interesting feature . . . is the increase in the number of agreements with *fam.* 13 (Ferrar group) and the other Syriacising MSS. *fam.* 1, 565, and 28."<sup>1</sup>

A study of his collation led me to suspect that Sanders had underestimated the extent of the change in the type of text; and it occurred to me to investigate closely the relationship, in Mk. v. 31-xvi. 8, between the text of W and the six chief authorities for the Caesarean text, *i.e.* Θ, 1 &c., 13 &c., 28, 565, and 700.

<sup>1</sup> *The Washington Manuscript of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection* (The Macmillan Co., New York, 1912), p. 73. The MS. was bought in 1906 from an Arab dealer, and seems to have been found in the ruins of a monastery in Egypt.

Selecting for the test the three chapters vi., x., and xv., and ignoring mere mistakes of spelling, I found a total of 260 readings in which W differs from the T.R. In 37 of these the reading of W is supported by no other MS. or version. Most of these seem to be mistakes by the scribe of W or an immediate ancestor; but on any view "singular readings" can be ignored where the purpose of an investigation is to discover the affinities of a MS. with one or other of the main types of texts found elsewhere. Ignoring these, there remain 223 readings. Of these 189, *i.e.* all but 85%, are, I found, supported by at least one, and usually by several, of the six above-named authorities for *fam.* ⊕.

The converse of this relationship—*i.e.* the exact proportion of the non-Byzantine readings in *fam.* ⊕ which also occur in W—can only be satisfactorily investigated by drawing up Tables similar to those on p. 582 ff.—an extremely laborious process. With the kind assistance of Mrs. J. V. Brook I prepared for my own use such a Table for the whole of Chap. XI. From this I deduce the following statistics.

In this chapter W differs from the T.R. in 67 readings, of which 8 are "singular." Out of the remaining 59, W is supported in 47 by one or more members of the ⊕ group. There are 17 readings which are not found in W, but in which at least 2 members of *fam.* ⊕ (reckoning 1 &c. and 13 &c. each as one) agree against the Byzantine text. But in 14 out of these 17 cases W has the Byzantine reading; in 1 it clumsily mixes *fam.* ⊕ and Byz., and in 1 it has a singular reading. Thus only in 1 case out of the 17 does W side with any other MS. against both *fam.* ⊕ and the Byzantine text. Clearly, we have in W a member of the ⊕ family, the text of which has suffered, but not too greatly, from Byzantine revision.

In Mk. v. 31-xvi. 8, then, W is the oldest, but not quite the purest, authority for this ancient and interesting type of Eastern text; and it is so ancient that in conjunction with the quotations by Origen and Eusebius it makes the existence of such a text no longer an hypothesis but an ascertained fact.

But how can we account for the sudden change at Mk. v. 30 from a Western to an Eastern text? An answer is suggested by the following facts. (1) In W, as in D and most Old Latin MSS., the Gospels stand in the Western order (cf. p. 11 *n.*)—Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. (2) The paragraph divisions in Matthew found in W are practically identical with those in D (Sanders, *op. cit.* p. 17). (3) Scattered through the predominantly Byzantine text of Matthew and Lk. viii. 13 to end, and the Alexandrian text of John and Lk. i. 1-viii. 12, occur a large number of distinctively Western readings, best explained as survivals of an earlier text which have escaped the notice of the revisers. We conclude that an ancestor of W came from the West—probably from Rome, the ultimate fount of the “African” Latin text.

Let us suppose that its owner moved to Caesarea. The end of a MS. is frequently damaged; where the Gospels are arranged in the Western order, this entails the loss of the latter part of Mark. This has actually occurred in MSS. *a, b, e* and *f*. Suppose this happened to the ancestor of W. Its owner would get a Caesarean scribe to replace the lost leaves from a local MS. This would explain the Caesarean text of the latter part of Mark. Marginal correction during a stay at Caesarea would also account for the sprinkling of Caesarean readings found in the other Gospels. Then the MS., or a copy of it, went down into Egypt. The Alexandrian reviser began with John, the favourite Gospel in Alexandria, and went straight on to Luke, which immediately follows John in this MS.; but he gave over his work at Lk. viii. 12. The next corrector used a Byzantine MS.; later papyri show that this text did ultimately invade Egypt. But, finding the central part of the MS. already smothered in corrections, he supposed that these had been made from a good text. He therefore only troubled himself to correct Matthew and the uncorrected part of Luke, scamping the revision, as we have seen (p. 63 *f.*) so often happened, when he came to Mark. Of this much revised MS. our W (except for Jn. i. 1-v. 11, which is a later addition) is a copy.