Cod. Ev. 561.—Codex Algerinæ Peckover.

BY PROF. J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A.

THE manuscript of the Gospels referred to in the following notes seems to deserve a degree of notice beyond that which is involved in the correction of erroneous descriptions of it which are current, and its various readings acquire, upon a close investigation, a singular importance. I have already, in the *Sunday-School Times* for Nov. 6, 1886, made some of the necessary corrections for the N. T. Catalogue, and given a few of the more striking readings, a sufficient number, at least, to remove it from the commonplace Byzantine codices and set it in excellent, though somewhat eccentric, company. There can be no doubt that amongst the unsolved problems in New Testament MS. propagation which are the bone of contention between the opposing schools of textual criticism, a number will be found to attach themselves to the so-called Ferrar-group, consisting of four MSS., which are generally held by all parties to be the surviving progeny of a lost common original.

These four are, as is well known, the MSS. designated by the numbers 13, 69, 124, 346, of which the first is at Paris; the second belongs to the borough of Leicester, England; the third is at Vienna; and the fourth is in the Ambrosian Library, at Milan. The text of the common lost original was editorially reconstructed, partly by the late Professor Ferrar, of Dublin, and partly after his death, by Prof. T. K. Abbott. The text of this restoration has been so reverentially handled by New Testament critics, that it has even been assumed to be equal to an uncial copy of the first dimensions, and the proposition has been made to vote it one of the few remaining letters of the Greek alphabet. Without assenting to the right of the lost copy to be thrust in among the other gentlemanlike uncials, we admit its importance and desire its better acquaintance.

For this reason M. l'Abbé Martin deserves the heartiest gratitude of New Testament scholars for his recent researches into the origin of these four valuable copies. Now the Abbé's results amount briefly to this: he shows first that three out of the four have com-

mon paleographic properties which indicate an origin in a single calligraphic school, so to speak; that they contain notes or traces of ownership which indicate that they were obtained from a common locality, — say Calabria or Sicily, — from which it is not difficult to infer that they have perpetuated local peculiarities of reading which may have been current among the Greek colonies of Southern Italy. The fourth MS. of the group, the Leicester Codex, was not examined by the Abbé, but it is generally agreed to be so closely related to the Paris copy (Cod. 13) as to be either a copy of it or its nearest ancestor, so that we might easily assume that it went back into the same root with the other three.

In order to demonstrate this, or at least to make the way for others to demonstrate it, I have made a special study of the Leicester Codex, in which I determine that it was originally in the possession of the Franciscan Convent, at Cambridge, England, in the fifteenth century, and that it may have been imported thither along with other MSS. which I describe in the investigation, from Northern Italy. It will be seen that my results, thus briefly stated, contain nothing that is especially antagonistic to the theory of M. Martin. Where I question his results is on the point that we may abandon the theory of the single lost original for the four, and substitute instead the theory of a local peculiarity of transcription. This aversion to genealogy strikes me as unnecessary: it is indeed conceivable that such a feature as the transposition of the passage describing the agony in the garden, from Luke to Matthew, might result from a local lectionary usage of Greek churches; but no such theory will ever explain why four given MSS. agree together to spell the name of Moses in one way in one verse, and in a different way three verses later. Genealogy must still be the soul of our criticism, wherever it is accessible or probable. I reject, therefore, M. Martin's theory of locally propagated peculiarities, except in such cases as might fairly be referred to the manner in which Greek accentuation and word-division, to which perhaps not a few cases of itacism should be added, may be possibly traced to a local origin.

In the next place, I disagree with M. Martin over the assumption which is implied in his valuable tract, that he has introduced important simplification into the manner of handling N. T. documents. No doubt it would be very valuable if we could trace all the eccentric MSS. of the New Testament to a common locality, and then, having given them a single neck, apply to them a decollation which should make further collation unnecessary. The theory of the Abbé

tends this way. The title of his book is "Quatre Manuscrits importants . . . auxquels on peut en ajouter au cinquième." But before he reaches the end of his pamphlet, suspicions arise of a sixth and a seventh, which seem to belong to the same textual family. The fifth is Cod. Ev. 348, of the Ambrosian Library, whose Calabrian origin M. Martin satisfactorily demonstrates; the sixth is Cod. Ev. 556, which was imported by the Baroness Burdett-Coutts from Janina in Epirus; the seventh is Cod. Ev. 211, of the Library of St. Mark, at Venice. My contribution to the list is perhaps the eighth; and I have no doubt that besides Cod. Algerinæ Peckover, to which I invite attention, there are numbers of other MSS. containing similar peculiarities of text and arrangement, which will, when taken together, present not a single lost, yet recoverable, head, but as many necks as the hydra.

But while I think the amount of simplification introduced has been overestimated, we are none the less indebted to the Abbé for his careful and important investigations; and my way of showing gratitude is to give a description of the new MS., which I believe to bear some remote relation to the group in question, although its text generally is not much out of harmony with the received text. Its singularities would thus constitute a very significant survival from earlier times.

Description of Codex. — Cod. 561 of the Gospels is a small quarto volume in the possession of Miss Algerina Peckover, of Wisbech, England, and is stated to have been originally derived from Athens (? by Quaritch the London bookseller). At the beginning and end there are 17 (3+14) leaves which are part of a palimpsest uncial apostolos, the upper writing being the letter to Carpianus and a picture of St. John the Evangelist, while the end of the book has a synaxarion and menology. These prefixed and affixed leaves should have been detached from the MS. proper, which would then have contained 348 leaves, distributed as follows:

1–4. κεφάλαια prol. and pict. of Matt.
5–107. Matt.
108–110. κεφ. prol. and pict. of Mark.
111–175. Mark.
176–178. κεφ. prol. to Luke.
179–277. Luke.
278–279. κεφ. prol. and pict. (2d time) of John.
280–340. John. The MS. is defective from John x. 27 κἀγω to xi. 14 λέγει (both incl.) = two leaves, and again in John xi. 29 καὶ ἔρχεται to xi. 42 ἤδειν = one leaf.

The text contains the notes of the beginnings and ends of lessons, and a marginal liturgical apparatus for defining and prefacing the lessons: on the margins will also be found the usual Ammonian and Eusebian numerals: and at the head of the pages the titles of the chapters. Occasionally we find the top of the pages decorated with words that remind one of lectionary usage such as *ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ ματθαῖον*.

Amongst the liturgical notes there are some which are of especial importance; in the absence of a synaxarion and menology to which we can refer for indications of origin (for as intimated above the menology of this MS. does not really belong to it) these notices furnish us with fragments of a synaxarion, etc., from which we may conclude something as to the place of production of this MS. For instance, at the head of the page which contains Matt. v. 14 is the note:

ἡ λλ
μ ἰου ις' τῇ μνήμῃ τῶν ἁγίων χλ' πρων τῶν ἐν καλχηδ καὶ τ τιη' ἐν νικαίᾳ καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει καὶ τῶν ἐν ἐφέσῳ.

The city referred to is evidently Constantinople, where two of the general councils were held: and the book was therefore adapted to lectionary use in one of the churches of Constantinople. The fact that the book was in actual use in some church appears also in the following note accompanying the title to Matt. xvi. 15:

λγ. περὶ τῆς ἐν καισαρείᾳ ἐπερωτήσεως· τῇ μνήμῃ τῶν ἐγκαινίων ταύτης τῆς μεγάλης ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων πέτρου καὶ παύλου.

The use of the expression 'this great church' is very striking: we can hardly apply it to any other building than the Church of St. Sophia, and the dedication referred to will then be that of the church as rebuilt by Justinian in 562. The point is a very important one, because if we can show that the MS. formerly belonged to the principal church in Constantinople, and if we demonstrate its affinity in any form with the Ferrar-group, we shall at once see that the Calabrian origin to which the Abbé Martin would refer all such codices cannot be used as a weapon against many of their singularities. A MS. might indeed move eastward from Calabria in the course of time: it is scarcely conceivable that in its earliest days a Calabrian MS. should be able to influence a MS. which was in use in the leading church of Constantinople. Nor will it be maintained that such singularities of ecclesiastical lection as the transfer of the Agony in the Garden from Luke to Matthew are mere localisms in

the light of what has been stated above. In fact the rubricator of our MS. has carefully noted every place where there was a discontinuity in the lesson to be read by such notes as ζήτει ἔμπροσθεν τὸ σημεῖον τοῦτο. καὶ ἐπισυνάψας πλήρωσον ἐκεῖσε. But he adds no such note, I think, in Matt. xxvii. or Luke xxii. from which we may infer that he did not find the arrangement foreign to the custom of the church; it must then have been more than a *local* peculiarity of arrangement. And indeed it is well known to be a common lection-order. Assuming that the original home of the MS. has been rightly defined, it may be interesting to note a few of the festivals which are kept, in order that comparison may be made with what is commonly called Constantinople usage: for example, we have

Matt. ii. 13–23. Sunday after Christmas.	David the prophet, Joseph who was warned of God, and James the Lord's brother.
Matt. iv. 17–23. (January —.)	Gregory of Nyssa.
Matt. vi. 14–21.	S. Flavianus & Leo, Pope of Rome.
Matt. x. 16–25.	Maccabees and other martyrs.
Matt. x. 37–xi. 1.	S. Timotheus.
Matt. xi. 2–15.	Finding of the head of the Baptist.
Matt. xi. 25–30.	SS. Saba and Euthymius καὶ εἰς σχῆμα μοναχοῦ.
Luke xxi. 8–? (Sept. 20).	S. Eustathius.
John xiv. 15–? (May 11).	εἰς τὸ γενέθλιον τῆς πόλεως.
John xv. 1–16. (Sept. 2).	S. Mamas.
John xv. 17–? (April 26).	S. Basil martyr.
John xvii. 11–?	λέγεται μετὰ τὴν κυριακὴν τῶν ἁγίων πρων εἰς τὴν γενομένην σύνοδον τῶν ἁγίων πρων κατὰ Σευήρον: (memorial of the synod of Constantinople of 536).

The above are some of the scattered liturgical notes; it will be seen that they are quite consistent with the statements previously made, for Constantinople is just the city to have its birthday kept, and the Synod against the Monophysites to which allusion is made was held in that city. The same synod is commemorated shortly after July 16th in the menology transcribed on the palimpsest leaves of the book, but here it is μνημὴ τῆς ἐν Κ|πόλει συνόδου κατὰ Σεβήρου τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς; the omission of the name is therefore suggestive. Notice also in John x. 21 a special lesson εἰς μνημὴν τῶν ἐν ἁγίοις

βασιλέων κωνσταντίνου καὶ ἑλένης. While we are on this point, the structure of the menology, it may be worth while to notice that the memorials preserved on the palimpsest leaves of Cod. 561 seem to indicate that they came from a Cretan MS. At all events we find

Sept. 18. Eumnius, Bishop of Gortyna.
Dec. 23. The holy martyrs in Crete.
July 4. Andreas, Bishop of Crete.

But these are perhaps insufficient as indications, for the menology is a full one, and commemorates a bishop from Gaza, one from Catania, martyrs of Cyzikus, etc. The fact is, the whole subject of these ecclesiastical calendars needs sifting to the bottom, and the more we look into the matter, the less shall be likely to build upon single and isolated points.

To return to our description of the body of the MS. There are 16 lines to the page. The handwriting may be referred to the eleventh century, or a little later. We come now to the consideration of the possible relations subsisting between this MS. and the Ferrar-group. The first similarity is the already indicated transposition of Luke xxii. 43, 44 into Matthew xxvi. between 39 and 40. In this it follows the reading of the groups with some itacisms corrected, but adds the words at the end καὶ [ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς] ἔρχεται which belong to Luke xxii. 45, and are found there even in our copy. Here then we have an important question. Are we justified in inferring from the additional fragment, that the whole passage is a lectionary transposition from Luke; or should we say that the passage does not really belong to Luke, and the added words are a scribe's reminiscence. To avoid introducing the whole discussion of the verses in Luke, it is sufficient to remark that in the additional verse our text does but follow the custom of many lectionaries: and I am inclined to believe, though I cannot prove it, that it represents in this the earlier form from which the Ferrar-group is derived. It would thus confirm the general belief that the transposition is due merely to lectionary usage, but would furnish no additional evidence for the verses in times earlier than the earliest lectionaries. It should be noted that the Eusebian number belonging to the passage is found at the right place in Luke just as it is in so many other MS.

Tischendorf has stated in his note on Matt. xxvi. 40 that the Leicester Codex has also carried over the additional verse in Luke; this must be a mistake, and is expressly denied by Scrivener, and not mentioned by Ferrar. So much for the most striking peculiarity

in our MS. The next point to notice is that it deviates from the Ferrar-group in its total omission of the Pericope de adultera, which they insert at the end of Luke xxi. This is probably an intentional correction: in fact, we shall find that in a very large number of cases our copy has been reduced into close relationship and agreement with the common texts, so that we have to trace its affinity with the Ferrar-group in curious points of harmony, which survive rather than in the insertion of whole sections, or the consensus of a mass of readings. For example, Ferrar makes a great point of the fact that in Luke ix. 30 his four codd. have *μωυσῆς*, while in verse 33 they all read *μωσῆς*: now our MS. shows the same peculiarity. In fact, it agrees with 13–69–346 in its spelling of Moses in 16 cases which I have noted as against eight cases in which it differs from them. It should not be forgotten that our collations of the Ferrar-group need revising, according to the Abbé Martin; and the agreement may often be closer than we assume.

Another point of interest is the singular and suggestive reading in Matt. xiii. 35, *ὅπως πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου*, which is found in 13–124–346 (69 hiat), and according to the critical apparatus of Tischendorf the only other authorities extant are the Sinaitic Codex, the cursives 1, 33, 253 (Ferrar gives the last as 230, probably by mistake) and some Ethiopic MSS.

In Mark xiv. 41 it agrees with the Ferrar-group in reading *ἀπέχει τὸ τέλος*. This reading is found in several other cursives (six in Tisch.) and with expansion in Codex Bezæ.

In Mark xii. 7 we have *ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ εἶπον θεασάμενοι αὐτὸν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς ἑαυτούς*, which is almost exactly the reading of the Ferrar-group.

In Luke xiv. 24 the addition is made of the sentence *πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσι κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί*, with the same company.

In Luke xxii. 47 our cod. adds *τοῦτο γὰρ σημεῖον δεδώκει αὐτοῖς. Ὃν ἂν φιλήσω, αὐτός ἐστιν*. With the single substitution of *δέδωκεν*, this is the reading of the Ferrar-group.

These instances, however, are no sufficient proof of any internal connexion between Cod. 561 and the Ferrar archetype; for many of them are supported by other good authority, uncial and cursive; what they do suffice for is to show that at any rate the readings of the Ferrar-group cannot be despatched with the word Calabrian.

There are not a few remarkable readings in which Cod. 561 agrees with single members of the Ferrar-group: the following may be taken as examples. It agrees with the Milan MS. in adding Matt.

vii. 7 at the close of Mark xi. 26, and in Matt. vii. 27 in reading προσέκοψαν, in Matt. xviii. 11 in adding ζητῆσαι καὶ before σῶσαι, in inserting ἐνώπιου τῶν μαθ. αὐτοῦ in John xxi. 24, and in many other places.

It agrees with the Leicester Codex in reading οἰκίας for θεραπείας in Matt. xxiv. 45, a reading which is also found in the Sinaitic Cod.

It shows also the diffusion of many forms which one would be tempted to think mere localisms; supported in many cases by members of the Ferrar-group, such are the combination of a preposition into a single word with its object, as διατοῦτο (Matt. xxiii. 34 *et passim*, cf. Cod. Leic.), προπροσώπου (Mark i. 2 *et passim*), μεταταῦτα (John iii. 22, and elsewhere with Leicester Codex).

Cf. πρινὴ (Mark xiv. 72), ἕωσότου (Luke xii. 50 *et passim*), and sometimes the unnecessary decomposition of a word, as διὑλίζοντες (Matt. xxiii. 24), ἐξἀπέστειλαν (Luke xx. 11), μεθ'ἑρμηνευόμενον (John i. 39 *et passim*), μὴδὲν (Matt. xxviii. 18, and frequently), μὴκέτι, μὴδὲ, (Mark ii. 2, and frequently), οὐδὲ μίαν (Mark vi. 5, and so Leicester and Milan Codd.). And although the text is singularly clear of itacism, it preserves a few which are very peculiar, such as αἰχιδνῶν (Matt. xii. 34; xxiii. 33; Luke iii. 7), θροῆσθε (Matt. xxiv. 6), ἔδηραν (Matt. xxi. 35), φοβῆσθε (almost always), ἀξήνη (Luke iii. 9 (with Cod. 13), and Matt. iii. 10), δαίροντες (Luke xxii. 63), δαίρεις (John xviii. 23). γράφητε for γράφηται in John xxi. 24, with Leicester and Vienna Codices.

Amongst those readings which are most its own we may mention John vii. 8, ὁ κλῆρος ὁ ἐμός for ὁ καίρος ὁ ἐμός where the error involves an uncial text with itacisms. In Luke xvi. 6 the MS. has κάβους for βάτους, the scribe having either directly substituted one Hebrew measure (the cab) for another (the bath), a dry measure for a liquid one, or having corrected with some intelligence a faulty text. The latter supposition seems the more correct one, if we compare the Vienna MS., which has κάτους corr. to βάτους. It is easy to see how κάτους could arise in any text; and a β placed over the line to correct might easily be put in the wrong place. This would show some affinity in origin between the two MSS. referred to. The same reading κάβους is found in Codex Bezæ (as a correction), and in the lectionary 48^{w} (from Mt. Athos).

In John v. 2 our MS. reads βηθζαθὰ with XL. 33 and Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort. This reading is the more astonishing as our text goes on with the troubling of the water after the manner of the Textus Receptus.

But the strangest of all is an inserted passage attached to the account of the paying of the tribute money in Matt. xvii. 24–27, which runs as follows:

Ἐλθόντων δὲ αὐτῶν εἰς Καπερναοὺμ προσῆλθον οἱ τὰ δίδραγμα λαμβάνοντες τῷ Πέτρῳ καὶ εἶπον· ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν οὐ τελεῖ τὰ δίδραγμα; λέγει ὁ Πέτρος· ναὶ· καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν προέφθασεν αὐτὸν ὁ Ις λέγων· τί σοι δοκεῖ, σίμον· οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς ἀπὸ τίνων λαμβάνουσι τέλη ἢ κῆνσον; ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτῶν ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων; λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος· ἀπὸ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων· ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ις· ἄραγε ἐλευθεροί εἰσιν οἱ υἱοὶ; ἔφη Σίμων· ναί· λέγει ὁ Ις· δὸς οὖν καὶ σὺ ὡς ἀλλότριος αὐτῶν· ἵνα δὲ μὴ σκανδαλίσωμεν αὐτοὺς, πορευθεὶς εἰς θάλασσαν βάλε ἄγκιστρον καὶ τὸν ἀναβάντα πρῶτον ἰχθὺν ἆρον καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν εὑρήσεις ἐκεῖ στατῆρα ἐγκείμενον· ἐκεῖνον λαβὼν δὸς αὐτοῖς αντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ.

The foregoing passage has many singularities; in the 25th verse it comes very near to the Curetonian reading (which has *Simon*) in adding the name of the speaker; it agrees again with the Curetonian and a number of other authorities in reading ὅτε εἰσῆλθον. At the close of the last verse we again find a Western reading in the inserted ἐκεῖ, which, however, seems only an anticipation of the word ἐκεῖνον, which follows. The following points will be noticed as unique: (α) the addition of ἐγκείμενον after στατῆρα; (β) the turning of the sentence "Then are the children free" into a question; and (γ) the addition of the sentences "Simon said Yea. Jesus saith, Then do thou give also as being an alien to them."

This last passage, if a gloss, is one of the most remarkable that I have ever seen; and it deserves very careful consideration, especially in view of the fact that our MS. presents no other expressions or paraphrases worth notice but has been throughout brought into close agreement with the common tradition.

The first question that arises concerns the meaning of the added passage. To this the answer seems to be that there was a want of harmony between the question "Does not *your Master* pay didrachma?" and the conclusion "Give to them *for thee* and *for me*." Something seemed necessary to explain why Peter should pay, and this is furnished by the sentence in our text. While, however, we may admit this as a possible explanation, viz., that Peter pays because he also is outside a certain circle (ἀλλότριος αὐτῶν), we have no further light thrown upon the nature of the tribute, the mode of its collection, nor its destination. This temple-tax or soul-money was made over by law to Jupiter Capitolinus after the fall of Jerusalem.

The following are the principal variants found in the first fifteen chapters of Matthew, the standard of reference being the Stephen's edition of 1550 (Scrivener's reprint).

Matt. i. 5, Ὠβηδ | Ἰωβηδ *bis.*
" i. 7, Ἀβια | Ἀβιαδ *bis.*
" i. 22, *om.* του before κυριου
" ii. 1, παραγενοντο | παραγινονται
" ii. 8, εἰπε | εἰπεν αυτοις
" ii. 13, αὐτων | των μαγων
" ii. 15, *om.* του before κυριου
" ii. 22, ἐπι της Ἰουδαιας | ἐπι Ἰουδαιαν
" iii. 8, καρπους ἀξιους | καρπον ἀξιον
" iii. 10, *om.* και before ἡ ἀξηνη
" iv. 10, add ὀπισω μου after ὑπαγε
" iv. 13, παραθαλασσιαν | παρα θαλασσαν
" iv. 18, *om.* ὁ Ἰησους
" iv. 19, add γενεσθαι after ὑμας
" iv. 23, ὁλην την γαλ. ο. ις | ὁ ις ὁλ. την γαλ.
" iv. 24, ἀπηλθεν | ἐξηλθεν
" v. 4, πενθουντες | add νυν
" v. 12, *om.* οὑτω . . . ὑμων
" v. 13, ἐαν δε | add και
" v. 28, αὐτης | αὐτην
" v. 30, βληθη εἰς γε. | εἰς γε. ἀπελθη
" v. 32, ὁς ἀν ἀπολυση | πας ὁ ἀπολυων
" v. 33, ἐρρεθη | ἐρρηθη
" v. 39, *om.* σου
" v. 40, ἱματιον | add σου
" v. 43, ἐρρεθη | ἐρρηθη
" v. 44, τους μισουντας | τοις μισουσιν
" v. 47, ἀδελφους | φιλους
" v. 48, ἐν τοις οὐρανοις | οὐρανιος
" vi. 1, προσεχετε | + δὲ
" vi. 5, των πλατειων ἑστωτες προσευχεσθαι | των πλατιων ἑστωτες και προσευχομενοι (*sic*)
" vi. 12, ἀφιεμεν | ἀφιαιμεν
" vi. 18, *om.* ἐν τῳ φανερω
" vi. 32, ἐθνη | add του κοσμου
" vii. 6, ρηξωσιν | ρηξουσιν
" vii. 9, *om.* ἐστιν
" vii. 12, οὑτος | οὑτως

Matt. vii. 14, ὁτι στενη | τι στενη
" vii. 18, ποιειν | ποιησαι *bis.*
" vii. 21, ἐν οὐρανοις | ἐν τοις οὐρανοις, add at the end οὑτος εἰσελευσεται εἰς την βασιλειαν των οὐρανων
" vii. 24, την οἰκιαν αὐτου | αὐτου τ. οἰ.
" vii. 27, μεγαλη | add σφοδρα
" vii. 28, τους λογους | παντας τους λογ.
" vii. 29, add at the end αὐτων και οἱ φαρισαιοι
" viii. 2, ελθων | προσελθων
" viii. 5, εἰσελθοντι δε τῳ ιῦ | εἰσελθοντος δε αὐτου
" viii. 9, πορευθητι | πορευου
" viii. 10, ἀκολουθουσιν | add αὐτω
" viii. 11, ἀνακλιθησονται | ἀνακληθησονται
" viii. 13, ἑκατονταρχῳ | ἑκατονταρχη, add at the end και ὑποστρεψας ὁ ἑκατονταρχος εἰς τον οἰκον αὐτου ἐν αὐτῃ τῃ ὡρᾳ εὑρεν αὐτον ὑγιαινοντα
" viii. 14, βεβλημενην | add ἐπι κλινης
" viii. 15, αὐτοις | αὐτῳ
" viii. 20, κλινῃ | κλινειν
" viii. 21, ἀπελθειν και θαψαι | ἀπελθειν θαψαι
" viii. 27, *om.* και before ἀνεμοι
" viii. 28, ἐλθοντι αὐτῳ | ἐλθοντος αὐτου Γεργεσηνων | Γαδαρηνων
" ix. 18, *om.* αὐτοις after λαλουντος ἀρχων ἐλθων | ἀρχων τις εἰσελθων
" ix. 22, ἐσωθη | ἰαθη
" ix. 27, υἱε δᾶδ | κυριε υἱε δᾶδ
" ix. 31, ἐν ὁλη τη γη ἐκ. | εἰς ὁλην την γην εκ.
" ix. 36, ἐκλελυμενοι | ἐσκυλμενοι
" x. 4, κανανιτης | κανανιος Ἰουδας | add ὁ
" x. 8, λεπρους καθαρ. νεκ. εγειρ | νεκ. εγ. λεπ. καθ.
" x. 10, ραβδον | ραβδους

Matt. x. 12, add at end λεγοντες εἰρηνη τῳ οἰκῳ τουτῳ
" x. 15, και Γομορρων | ἡ Γομορρας
" x. 19, παραδιδωσιν | παραδωσωσιν
" x. 26, ἐστι κεκαλυμμενον | συγκεκ. ἐστιν
" x. 28, φοβηθητε | φοβησθε φοβηθητε (*sec*) | φοβεισθε
" x. 33, αὐτον καγω | καγω αὐτον
" x. 42, ψυχρου | ψυχρουν (*sic*)
" xi. 16, παιδαριοις | παιδιοις ἐν ἀγορ. καθημ. | καθημ. ἐν ἀγορ. ἑταιροις | ἑτεροις
" x. 21, Βηθσαιδαν | Βηθσαιδα
" x. 23, ἐγινοντο | ἐγινετο
" xii. 2, ἰδοντες | add αὐτους
" xii. 6, μειζων | μειζον
" xii. 8, και του σαββ. ὁ υἱος του ἀν | ὁ υἱος τοῦ ἀν. και του σαββ.
" xii. 10, την χειρα ἐχων ξηραν | ἐκει ἐχων την χειρα εξηραμμενην
" xii. 12, ποσῳ ουν | add μαλλον
" xii. 13, ἐκτεινον | ἐκτεινε
" xii. 14, συμβ. ἐλ. κατ' αὐ. ἐξελθ. | ἐξελ. συμβ. ἐλ. κατ' αὐτ.
" xii. 20, οὐ σβεσει | οὐ μη σβεσῃ
" xii. 21, ἐν τῳ ὀνομ. | *om.* ἐν
" xii. 22, προσηνεχθη | add τῳ ιῦ τὐφλον και κωφον | κω. και τυφ.
" xii. 29, διαρπασει | διαρπαση
" xii. 34, ἐχιδνων | αἰχιδνων
" xii. 35, της καρδιας | add αὐτου τα αγαθα | *om.* τα
" xii. 44, σεσαρωμενον | σεσσαρωμενον (*sic*)
" xiii. 2, εἰς το πλοιον | *om.* το
" xiii. 3, ἐλαλησεν αὐτοις πολλα | ἐλαλει αὐτοις σπειρειν | σπειρει
" xiii. 4, τα πετεινα | add του οὐρανυ
" xiii. 7, ἐπεσεν | ἐπεσαν
" xiii. 14, ἐπ' αὐτοις | αὐτοις
" xiii. 15, ὠσι | ὠσιν αὐτων ἐπιστρεψωσι και ἰασωμαι | ἐπιστρεψουσι και ἰασομαι
" xiii. 16, ἀκουει | ἀκουουσιν

Matt. xiii. 19, συνιεντος | συνιοντος
" xiii. 21, γενομενης δε | εἰτα γεν.
" xiii. 22, του πλουτου | του κοσμου added on margin by first hand
" xiii. 23, add at end ὁ ἐχων ὠτα ἀκουειν, ἀκουετω
" xiii. 25, ἐσπειρε | ἐπεσπειρε
" xiii. 28, εἰπον | λέγουσιν
" xiii. 29, *om.* τα ζιζανια εκριζωσητε
" xiii. 30, ἀφετε συναυξανεσθαι | ἀφετε· συναυξανεσθε εἰς δεσμας | δεσμα
" xiii. 33, αὐτοις | add λεγων
" xiii. 34, δια του προφ. | δια Ἡσαιου του προφ.
" xiii. 40, κατακαιεται | καιεται
" xiii. 42, βαλουσιν | βαλλουσιν
" xiii. 43, οἱ δικ. ἐκλαμ. | ἐκλαμ. οἱ δικ.
" xiii. 49, οἱ ἀγγελοι | add του θεου
" xiii. 52, εἰς την βασ. | ἐν τῃ βασ.
" xiii. 55, Ἰωσης | Ἰωση
" xiii. 56, *om.* τούτω
" xiv. 12, σωμα | add αὐτου· note that the margin has by the first hand πτωμα for σωμα.
" xiv. 13, ἀπο των πολεων | ἀπο πασων των πολ.
" xiv. 15, κωμας | add κυκλῳ
" xiv. 19, και λαβων | *om.* και εὐλογησε | ηὐλογησε
" xiv. 25, ἀπηλθε | ἠλθε
" xiv. 26, ἐπι την. θαλ. περιπ. | περιπ. ἐπι την θαλ.
" xiv. 28, προς σε ἐλθειν | ἐλθειν προς σε
" xiv. 35, αὐτον | τον ῑ̄ν
" xiv. 36, μονον | κἀν μονον
" xv. 18, ἐξερχεται | ἐξερχονται
" xv. 25, προσεκυνει | προσεκυνησεν
" xv. 30, κωφους κυλλους | κυ. κω.
" xv. 31, τους ὀχλους | του ὀχλου
" xv. 32, εἰπε | εἰπεν αὐτοις ὀχλον | add τουτον
" xv. 33, ἐρημια | ἐρημιαις
" xv. 36, *om.* ἐπτα ἐδωκε | ἐδιδου τῳ ὀχλῳ | τοις ὀχλοις
" xv. 38, τετρακισχιλιοι ἀνδρες | ὡσει ἀν. τετ.
" xv. 39, ἐνεβη | ἀνεβη