Luke xiii 31–33? According to this passage the Pharisees say 'Get thee out and go hence, for Herod would fain kill thee'. The answer gives the reason for the actual course taken by our Lord. He accepts the warning and leaves the territory of Antipas, concealing Himself and keeping quiet when it was necessary to pass through Galilee, because He was determined that the inevitable crisis should come at Jerusalem and nowhere else. If this general view be accepted, it affords a fresh and welcome proof that the Gospel according to St Mark is a document in touch with the facts of history, and not merely concerned with the ethical needs of some Christian community of later times.

F. C. BURKITT.

READINGS SEEMINGLY CONFLATE IN THE MSS OF THE LAUSIAC HISTORY.

THERE is no need to dwell on the importance of the rôle played by Conflate Readings in textual work in general, and in the textual criticism of the New Testament in particular. That Conflation is a corruption of frequent occurrence is unquestionable, and the deductions drawn from it, when it is detected, are in general valid. This Note is intended only to serve as a warning of the circumspection that is necessary in the employment of one of the textual critic's best instruments.

In the passages to be discussed all the references are to the recent edition of the *Historia Lausiaca* (Cambridge *Texts and Studies* VI 2), and the nomenclature is that which is there employed. In order fully to understand and control what follows, it would be necessary to examine the full apparatus to the various passages, and to master the discussions in the *Introduction* on the character and relations of the MSS and versions; but I hope to be able here to supply information which will roughly but sufficiently indicate the textual facts, and make intelligible the line of argument in each case. The terms 'best MS' and 'second best MS' are of course relative, and vary in denotation according to the MSS extant for each passage.

(1) P. 41, 14.

τῶν ἐπισκόπων μετὰ τὸ εὔξασθαι ἐξερχομένων

best MS (W, p. 173) and all the versions (two Latin, two Syriac).

τῶν ἐπισκόπων μετὰ τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν ἐξερχομένων

second best MS (P).

τῶν ἐπισκόπων μετὰ τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν εὐξαμένων καὶ μετὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἐξιόντων

inferior MSS (B).

There can be no doubt that the reading of W and the versions is the true one. The variant ἐπίσκεψιν has come from l. 12, where we read: ἐπιτηρήσας ἑπτὰ ἐπισκόπων ἁγίων ἐπίσκεψιν. Now the corrupt or metaphrastic form of the text found in the 'inferior MSS'—the vast majority—and called B, was already formed certainly in the sixth century, and almost certainly in the fifth. On the other hand, W and P are closely akin, having in common a number of corruptions found nowhere else and clearly of a relatively late origin; some of them indeed are due to contamination from a B text, so that the proximate archetype of W P is posterior in date to the archetype of B. Hence it follows that any divergence of P from W in the way of corruption is later than the formation of the B text. And therefore the ἐπίσκεψιν in the B MSS cannot have been derived from P, nor was the B reading conflated out of those of W and P. The B reading is made up, after the manner characteristic of the metaphrastic reviser, out of the true reading (preserved in W) and the ἐπίσκεψιν of l. 12. The reading of P either is due to the influence of B, a phenomenon whereof clear traces are to be found elsewhere in P; or else, as seems more probable, ἐπίσκεψιν has come in from l. 12, so that its presence in P and in B is a case of mere coincidence in error.

It is certain that we are not here in the presence of a Conflate Reading in B.

(2) P. 89, 3, 4.

τὰ ἄτονα τοῖς ἀτονωτέροις ἐγχείριζε ἔργα

best MS (P) and Ethiopic version (apparently).

τὰ ἄτονα τοῖς ἀσκητικωτέροις ἐγχείριζε ἔργα

second best MSS (T O 47) and Sozomen (τὰ δὲ εὐχαρῆ τοῖς ἀσκουμένοις).

τὰ ἄτονα τοῖς { ἀτονωτέροις καὶ ἀσκητικωτέροις ἐγχείριζε ἔργα / ἀσθενεστέροις }

inferior MSS (B) and Latin and Syriac versions.

Here ἀτονωτέροις, being supported by P and a good independent witness, must be accepted as belonging to the text; and the attestation of ἀσκητικωτέροις—the three next best MSS (which are unrelated to each other), and Sozomen, the earliest witness to the text—compels us to accept it also as belonging to the text. The support given to the double reading by the two versions is strong; and I think it is reasonable to suppose that Sozomen also had the double reading before him, in view of his treatment of a similar sentence a little lower down:

p. 91, 1–3: καὶ τοῖς μὲν ἁπλουστέροις καὶ ἀκεραιστέροις ἐπιθήσεις τὸ ἰῶτα,
Soz. ἁπλουστέρους μὲν ἰῶτα ἀποκαλοῦντας,
τοῖς δὲ δυσχεραστέροις καὶ σκολιωτέροις προσάξεις τὸ ξῖ.
Soz. σκολιοὺς δὲ ζ ἢ ξ.

Besides Sozomen only a pair of Greek MSS and the Ethiopic version omit *διαφωνούντων*, so that its authenticity cannot be doubted; while *δυσχωρεστέρους* is in every single authority for the text, except Sozomen: on the other hand, *στωμυλτέρους*, which is attested by Sozomen and an array of witnesses that place it beyond suspicion, is omitted by P and the Ethiopic version (also the Syriac and some of the B Greek MSS): so that this passage, where the two pairs of double readings are certainly authentic, seems to present a perfectly analogous situation to that of the passage under consideration.

Thus the double reading which is found in the inferior Greek MSS, but also in two versions, is seen not to be conflate, but the original reading, which has fallen asunder into its two halves in the best Greek MSS.

(3) P. 116, 5.

τελευτᾷ -- ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Ῥώμῃ ταφείς
five best MSS (P T A V C) and Syriac version.

τελευτᾷ -- ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐρήμῳ ταφείς
inferior MSS (B) and Latin version.

τελευτᾷ -- ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐρήμῳ ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων κηδευθείς
one sub-group of the inferior MSS (14–18).

τελευτᾷ -- ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐρήμῳ ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων κηδευθεὶς καὶ ταφείς
one sub-group of the inferior MSS (12, 13).

In this case the apparent conflation has arisen in certain sub-groups of the inferior (B) MSS and has no claim to represent even the authentic B text. The sub-groups of B represented by MSS 12, 13 and 14–18 are closely related, and are the common offspring of a single archetype, having a number of corruptions in common. In the case before us I at first thought that the reading of 12, 13 was evidently conflated out of the normal B reading *ταφείς*, and the reading of 14–18 *ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων κηδευθείς*. But fuller examination of the text of 14–18 shewed it to be an abridged redaction, rewritten on the principle of pruning away superfluous words and clauses; and I have no doubt that here also the text of 14–18 has been formed from that of 12, 13 by cutting out *καὶ ταφείς*.

(4) P. 132, 2.

ὑγιῆ ἀπέδωκε ---- τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ
best and third best MSS (P and A), some of the inferior MSS (B†), and a Latin version (l).

ὑγιῆ ἀπέδωκε ---- τῇ αὐτοῦ μητρί
some of the inferior MSS (B †) and a Latin version (l_2).

ὑγιῆ ἀπέδωκε – – – – τῇ αὐτοῦ μητρὶ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ

second best MS (T), some of the inferior MSS (B †), and the Syriac version.

The agreement of T and the Syriac version shews that the double reading existed in the sixth, probably in the fifth century. There can be no doubt that it is the original reading of the B text; so that the absence of one or other clause in certain B MSS is due to omission, doubtless on account of the extreme harshness of the full text. To the same cause must, I think, be attributed the absence of either clause in P and A and the two Latin versions. Here, therefore, again there seems little doubt that the double reading is not conflate but original, and has been broken up into its parts.

(5) P. 152, 10–12.

ἔλεγεν ἡμῖν ὅτι Νοῦς ἀποστὰς θεοῦ ἐννοίας ἡ κτῆνος γίνεται ἡ δαίμων· καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐπιθυμίαν ἔλεγε κτηνώδη, τὸν δὲ θυμὸν δαιμονιώδη

the two best MSS (W and P).

ἔλεγεν ἡμῖν ὅτι Νοῦς ἀποστὰς θεοῦ ἐννοίας περιπίπτει ἐπιθυμίᾳ· καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐπιθυμίαν ἔλεγε κτηνώδη, τὸν δὲ θυμὸν δαιμονιώδη

the third best MS (T), and the fourth (A, but with a slight variant), and the Syriac version (but om. *τὸν δὲ θ. δαιμ.*).

ἔλεγεν ἡμῖν ὅτι Νοῦς ἀποστὰς θεοῦ ἐννοίας ἡ δαίμων γίνεται ἡ κτῆνος. ἡμῶν δὲ φιλοπευστούντων τὸν τρόπον ὃν εἶπεν, ἔλεγεν οὕτως ὅτι Νοῦς ἀποστὰς θεοῦ (ἐννοίας) ἐξ ἀνάγκης περιπίπτει ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἢ θυμῷ· καὶ τὴν μὲν ἐπιθυμίαν ἔλεγεν εἶναι κτηνώδη, τὸν δὲ θυμὸν δαιμονιώδη

inferior MSS (B) and Latin version.

The passage before us has perplexed me not a little. In the first draft of the text I adopted the double reading—which is not precisely that of the metaphrastic text (B), but a reconstruction of that of the MS used by the metaphrastic reviser for his rewriting of the text: this was in the fifth century (see *Introduction* pp. lxii, xxxiii–xxxiv, xliii, xliv). Next, on discovering W and finding that it agreed with P, I preferred the reading of W and P, and that is the one that stands in the text. Later on, when reviewing the evidence as a whole in the *Introduction*, I reverted to the double reading, regarding the other two as due to its breaking asunder on account of the repetition: and so in the List of Alterations and Corrections (p. 180), I direct its adoption. Now I find myself wavering again; for the longer reading may well be an explanatory expansion of the reading of W and P, intended to bring out more definitely the nexus between the two clauses of W P.

Be that as it may, it is hardly conceivable that the reading of T A s could have originated independently and have so well fitted in with

that of W P as to produce the double reading by conflation. In other words, the genesis of the three readings may be

W P	*or*	B l	*but hardly*	W P
B l		W P : T A s		T A s
T A s				B l

On either of the hypotheses that seem likely, T A s is derived from B l, so that the latter is not conflated out of T A s and W P.

Thus, in spite of appearances, two of these seemingly conflate readings (2 and 4) are certainly, and a third (5) is possibly, the genuine reading: while not one of the five is in reality conflate.

I should not like it to be supposed that I think what has been brought forward touches in any way the discussion of Conflate Readings in Hort's *Introduction*, or affects the validity of the arguments there developed: there is no parity or analogy in the distribution of the documents in his instances and in those just discussed. But it does seem worth while to point out by means of concrete examples, that it must not simply be taken for granted that readings with the appearance of being conflate, really are such; and also that the breaking asunder of a text into parts is a phenomenon that does occur and must be taken count of in textual work.

E. C. BUTLER.

THE INTERPOLATIONS IN ST CYPRIAN'S *DE UNITATE ECCLESIAE.*

WHILE I am grateful to Mr. Watson (in *J. T. S.* April 1904 p. 432) for his over-flattering appreciation of my work on Cyprianic questions, I am yet trespassing on the Editor's kindness in order to reply to some criticisms.

I admit that my 'Il serait difficile en Afrique ou même à Rome de trouver quelqu'un qui puisse écrire si bien' was too general. I am sorry.

But I certainly consider that I 'strengthened my case by a minute search for likenesses'. It is very difficult to imagine a forger so clever as to combine harmoniously in one sentence so many of St Cyprian's own expressions as occur in the substituted passage. There is certainly in the pseudo-Cyprianic treatises no passage so Cyprianose in character —witness the *pastores multi, grex unus, una cathedra, primatus, unanimi consensione, super quem fundata est ecclesia.* To me it seems one of those occasional passages where a writer's style is unmistakeable. But this may be a matter of feeling.