

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jts-os\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

## NOTES AND STUDIES

## VON SODEN'S TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.\*

I HAD looked for great things from Dr von Soden's final volume of the Text. The earlier volumes were very heavy reading, but I expected that his Text and critical notes would fill a gap in our studies.

Alas, he has but complicated our problems, and instead of writing a eulogy on his work I regret to have to condemn it strongly. The only redeeming feature of the whole work consists in the collations of codices at Sinai, Jerusalem, and Athos, not forgetting <sup>050</sup> at Tiflis.†

As to the presentment of the combined critical material, after making every allowance for the division of work among forty people, it can only be said that the apparatus is positively honeycombed with errors, and many documents which should have been recollated have not been touched, others only partially, and others again have been incorrectly handled.

Dr von Soden frequently opposes Schmidtke's edition of Paris<sup>97</sup>, and doubtless it is von Soden who is wrong every time. He misquotes my 604/700 (his <sup>133</sup>) and has not correctly handled 28 (his <sup>168</sup>) or 157 (his <sup>207</sup>). He does not tell us if he had Ψ recollated. If he only used Lake's edition of Mark and Collation of the other Gospels, then he has done a great wrong by printing endless false readings. If he has had it recollated then Lake's work was rather careless. I leave them to settle this matter between them.

It has been my duty to go over von Soden's text and apparatus throughout the Gospels in all passages concerning a difference between **A** and **B** (in connexion with a work which is in the press), and very soon after beginning the investigation it became clear to me that von Soden's work was a *step backward*. I have striven myself to keep textual matters on as clear a basis as possible, and here we have an editor, who, not content with throwing overboard all our previous nomenclature in an excess of pride in his forthcoming enterprise, has brought this enterprise to fruition in such a way as to befog the issue at every step.

Without further preliminaries I proceed to indict him on the most serious count of all; upon a count on which none of his predecessors have been found guilty,‡ for they handled these matters with infinite care.

\* See *supra* p. 306.

† Now published by Beermann and Gregory as the 'Koridethi' Gospels.

‡ I think Tischendorf is unwittingly guilty on one occasion only.

As regards Hort, his method had the merit of simplicity, whatever we may think of the result. When he was confronted with five or six varieties of order or three or four different readings, he chose upon occasion to follow B, even if alone, by preference. Not so von Soden. His method is that of eclecticism, carried to such a point that he *invents scripture* by conflation or combination, and instead of *reducing* our many various readings, he has actually *increased* them!

Here is the proof.

(I) *Invention of Scripture.*

He prints—

(1) Mark iii 3 καὶ λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ τὴν ἐξηραμμένην χεῖρα ἔχοντι.

There are varieties of reading here, but no MSS that I know of read as von Soden's text.

Tisch. has	τῷ τὴν ξηρὰν χεῖρα ἔχοντι
W-H „	τῷ τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντι ξηρὰν
Text. rec. „	τῷ ἐξηραμμένην ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα
D „	τῷ ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα ἐξηραμμένην
28 „	τῷ τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντι ἐξηραμμένην

[Matt. xii 13 τότε λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ *tantum*

Luke vi 8 εἶπεν δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ ξηρὰν ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα with variations (and some τῷ τὴν ἐξηραμμένην ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα)]

(2) Luke xxiv 27. Von Soden prints διερμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς [τί ἦν] τὰ περὶ ἐαυτοῦ.

In his margin he has 'om τι ην Ta K gg H<sup>δ2</sup> δ<sup>48</sup> f bo Ia<sup>060</sup> η<sup>a</sup> b 2<sup>88</sup> pa'.

Now δ2 =  $\aleph$  and δ48 = 33, plus L (= f after δ48), have τι ην but in quite a different position, viz. before ἐν. So does 1 [non fam 118-209-131] represented by von Soden as η<sup>b</sup>; so that unless Sod<sup>050</sup>, or Sod<sup>288</sup> (= Evan. 22) has his order he has grossly erred and *invented* a new order with the addition, just as other MSS did when incorporating something from the margin.

As regards 22 Mr Sanders informs me that + τι ην occurs there before ἐν, so that the matter narrows down to Sod<sup>050</sup>, but the edition just published shews τι ην before ἐν there also.

(3) Luke i 42. Another case of composite handling, without brackets. Von Soden prints: καὶ ἀνεφώνησεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ.

Now ἀνεφώνησεν is the reading of B *plur* against  $\aleph$  C F Soden<sup>050</sup> 28 892 *minn*<sup>40</sup> or <sup>50</sup> for ἀνεβοσησεν, but φωνῇ on the other hand is the reading of  $\aleph$  *plur* against the κρανηγ of B L  $\Xi$  and W 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *Origter bokh*<sup>100</sup>, so that von Soden follows B for one thing and deserts him as to the very next word. He thus tacitly accuses  $\aleph$  in one word and B in the other contiguous one of bearing false testimony. Does this justify him in *ever* following  $\aleph$  B alone elsewhere, as at Matt. xviii 24, Mark viii 32 &c.? Or does it justify him in following  $\aleph$  B L alone

at Mark xvi 4? Or in following L alone at Luke xvii 12? Or B 892 alone at Mark ii 22? Or B T 892 alone at Luke xxii 30? If *κρανύγη* of B L Ξ W 2<sup>pe</sup> Paris<sup>97</sup> *Orig<sup>ter</sup>* conjoined be wrong here in Luke i 42, how can he be convinced that the other singular or semi-singular readings of B referred to above are correct when he adopts them elsewhere?

(4) John xiii 26. Von Soden prints βαψω το ψωμιον και επιδωσω αυτω, instead of βαψας το ψωμιον επιδωσω αυτω.

But those MSS which change βαψας to βαψω . . . και, all have δωσω afterwards and not επιδωσω.

Unless I am greatly mistaken, von Soden's βαψω το ψωμιον και επιδωσω αυτω is invented, whereas βαψω το ψωμιον και δωσω αυτω is read by B C L (δω) 213 Sod<sup>851 1110 8371</sup> *boh (sah) arm aeth.*

(5) Mark x 1. I considered until I came across this passage that von Soden had simply committed *errors* in his text, but here he shews us something, for he prints '[και] [δια του] περαν', which, in its entirety, is *only exhibited by one MS*, Laura<sup>A 104</sup>. His apparatus is so constructed that you could not tell it from that, for Laura<sup>A 104</sup> (= his <sup>1278</sup>) is not cited thus.

He inserts the bracketed και because Ν B C\* L Ψ 892 read και περαν against the simple περαν of D G W Δ C<sup>2</sup> *min aliq lat syr goth arm.* He follows it with [δια του] because A N Φ *unc*<sup>11</sup> and *aeth* have this, but the general summary result is the product of conflation, in which process I arraign him as guilty with Laura<sup>A 104</sup>.

(6) Luke v 2. Von Soden prints πλοιαρια δυο. This has, as far as I know, no *Greek* authority whatever, the witness for it being only *a* of the *Latins*. Von Soden's notes are so arranged that it is impossible to observe whether any of his new Greek witnesses so read. He has conflated the *order* of B W 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> *e copt syr* W-H<sup>txt</sup>: πλοια δυο, with the δυο πλοιαρια of A C L Q R Ψ &c. (W-H<sup>mss</sup>), while D *unc*<sup>13</sup> *minn*<sup>pl</sup> read δυο πλοια. It is in this same verse that he holds απεπλυναν against W-H, with επλυνον B D W 91 892, επλυναν Ν C\* L Q X 239 299 372 Paris<sup>97</sup> Sod<sup>1416</sup>, and the simple *lavabant* of the *Latins*!

(7) Luke xxiii 8. Out of a good many varieties † von Soden chooses εξ ικανου θελων (- χρονου or χρονων). No editor had done this before because there was no uncial authority for it. There happens to be *one* uncial MS for it now, viz. Ψ (Lake *teste*), but von Soden *does not recognize it*, because he quotes δ6 (= Ψ) in his notes (and on

† Txt. rec. θελων εξ ικανου as most, or θελων εξ ικανου χρονου W al. But εξ ικανου χρονων θελων Ν B T X *aliq. c.* θελων εξ ικανου χρονων 157, εξ ικανου χρονου θελων *fam* 13, εξ ικανου χρονων L (-θελων), erat enim cupiens videre illum a (-εξ ικ. χρ.) *cf. vg<sup>8</sup>*. *Ord. ita*: θελων ειδειν αυτον εξ ικανου χρονων D d *cf. sah syr, cf. e, εξ ικανου θελων Ψ et Soden txt soli vid cum 241 et evangelistariis sex.*

page 946 of Band I, Abt. II) as reading *χρονου post ικανου* of his text, thus:—

‘Add *χρονου p ικανου* (Ac 27<sub>9</sub>) *H*<sup>014</sup> δ<sup>6</sup> *Iη*’ &c.

Thus (unless Lake is wrong, and I do not think he is) von Soden stands alone again, as far as the evidence recognized by him was concerned.

(8) Mark xv 34. Von Soden shews us how a polyglot mind among the scribes of old led to trouble, for, *without any Greek authority*, he prints in his text *και τη ωρα ενατη*. What he *means* to print (judging from his note) is *και τη ενατη ωρα* with *κ B D<sup>87</sup> FL Ψ &c.* The majority of Greeks have *και τη ωρα τη ενατη*, but *none* *και τη ωρα ενατη*, nor does he give any MS in his notes which omits *τη ante ενατη*.

(9) Luke x 42 where *D d a b c e f f i l r (syr sin) Amb Clem* omit the clause altogether, and where Hort got into difficulties and followed *C<sup>2</sup> L 1 [non fam] 33* (add now Paris<sup>97</sup>) against *B*, while *C\* A unc<sup>14</sup>* and *W Ψ 892 minn<sup>pl</sup>* give another version, von Soden elects to follow *one* Greek MS, viz. 38† (about which we hear but little generally) for *ολιγων δε εστιν χρεια*.‡ I am justified in placing this here, for I do not recollect him ever to have quoted *Evan. 38* in his apparatus (*N<sup>o</sup> 8355*). So he adopted this reading in all probability *without knowing of this solitary MS authority* because (see p. xxiv) of his rule: ‘Für die Darstellung der Lesart war die Aufgabe denkbarste *Knappheit*, leichte Übersichtlichkeit, *unmissverständliche Klarheit*.’ So, at the expense of documentary evidence, he prints *out of his head*: which incidentally is a wonderful commentary on the previous action of *Evan. 38 syr hier* and *boh<sup>duo</sup>*.

The passage involved is the famous one conveying our Lord's remarks to Martha about Mary:—

‘ένος δέ εστι χρεία. Μαρία δέ τήν αγαθήν μερίδα εξέλέξατο ήτις ούκ αφαιρεθήσεται άπ' αυτής.’

The early sentence is found

in *B* as *ολιγων δε χρεια εστιν η ενος*

in *N\** as *ολιγων δε εστιν η ενος*

in *C<sup>2</sup> L 1.33 Paris<sup>97</sup>* as *ολιγων δε εστι χρεια η ενος*.

*Clem* with *D d a b c e f f i l r Ambr (syr sin)* omit it altogether, but von Soden with 38 and *syr hier boh<sup>N?</sup> J1\** elects:—

‘ολιγων δε εστιν χρεια’

for ‘*Knappheit*’ and ‘*unmissverständliche Klarheit*’.

(10) John vii 12. Who would suppose from von Soden's text ‘*και γογγυσμος ην περι αυτου πολυς*’ (agreeing with Tischendorf's text) and from his apparently simple note

† The famous one (of four cursives only) which joins in omitting the first word from the cross. There at Luke xxiii 34 von Soden does not quote it, so he was evidently not familiar with it.

‡ *Syr hier* and *arm* are the only others to agree (partially).

‘ ~ πολυς ρ γογγυσμος Τα K gg H<sup>δ 1 014 δ 48 f 5 δ 371 I φ b 410 o 129 1246</sup>  
<sup>δ 469 K<sup>i</sup> A<sup>3</sup> C<sup>13</sup> b q Xρ, om πολυς I<sup>a</sup> δ 5 f af a ff<sup>2</sup> l | ~ περι αυτου ην</sup>  
 K gg H<sup>δ 2 δ 6 δ 48 1016 I<sup>a</sup> δ 5 337 ι<sup>a</sup> φ<sup>a</sup> 1454 c 190 f o 1279 π σ 351 ρ<sup>a</sup> C N</sup>  
 af sy<sup>80</sup> Xρ, om περι αυτου I φ<sup>a</sup> δ 30’

that he and Tischendorf (quite unwittingly I suppose) had very nearly invented scripture here also, for 33 appears to be the only witness for their case? It will be observed that <sup>δ 48</sup> (= 33) is the only MS (with an exception to be mentioned immediately) which occurs in both lists. It so happened that the differing orders which caused them so to act also misled another very ancient authority who preceded them by a thousand and half a thousand years. A close inspection will shew ‘Xρ’ also appearing twice, and a reference to Matthaei’s edition, p. 127, of St John exhibits:—

πολύς—ἦν] ἦν περι αὐτοῦ πολὺς μ ε γ λ θ

that is to say, practically all his codices of St Chrysostom!

So Chrys. and 33<sup>vid</sup> Tisch. and von Soden invite us to read: και γογγυσμος ην περι αυτου πολυς, because of trouble at that place very early.

The common text of most is και γογγυσμος πολυς περι αυτου ην, but **κ** reads και γογγυσμος πολυς ην περι αυτου, whereas B L T (X) W and a few cursives have και γογγυσμος περι αυτου ην πολυς which Hort prints.

πολυς is omitted outright by D Sod<sup>050</sup> a c d e f f l a u r f o s s a r m, and is probably basic. The order of B L T X W is opposed by syr and pers which place πολυς in the text in an early position. Περι αυτου is omitted by goth. Von Soden now adds <sup>δ 30</sup> (= 1) but does not mention goth. (127 reads και γογγυσμος ην πολυς περι αυτου.)

This muddle has misled both Tisch. and von Soden, unless they have *purposely* made a composition of the readings of **κ** and B L T X W.

At any rate their authority is Chrys. and 33 only. On p. 957 Band I, Abt. II, von Soden does not include this reading of 33 with Chrys.

Von Soden ends with εν τοις οχλοις against εν τω οχλω of 33. His clause in its entirety is absolutely alone with Chrys.

(11) Luke xii 18. Von Soden prints παντα τα γενηματα και τα αγαθα μου, omitting μου after γενηματα. I know of no Greek MSS which do this. He has apparently mixed the testimony of B L T minn aliq and the versions which substitute τον σιτον without μου for τα γενηματα μου, but this does not justify his action in the least. It is impossible for a student, not versed in these matters, to gather anything from his notes, for he states the two matters differently. Thus:—

‘ add μου ρ γενημ. Τα K gg H<sup>δ 1 6 56 1016 ff I η φ<sup>a</sup> 1444 σ 207 r δ 398 arm</sup>  
 | τον σιτον l τα γενηματα Τα Hεxc δ 2 \* δ 6 δ 48 76 I η ι σ 207 A<sup>3</sup> sy<sup>p</sup>.’

Possibly Sod<sup>144</sup> has τα γενηματα without μου, but he surely did not

follow this one MS intentionally here. He has either made another mistake (from making up his text as a 'desk-student' from the apparatus gathered and put together by others and which he did not understand himself) or has gratuitously invented scripture once more, preferring *τα γενήματα και τα αγαθα μου* to the double use of *μου*. Another instance of how 'pairs' have caused various readings in the MSS themselves.

(12) Luke xxii 64. It is a question whether among the great and heavy variations in the Greek and Latin many, or any, can be found to support von Soden's text:—

‘καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες’

for those which omit *ετυπτον αὐτου το προσωπον* also omit the *αυτον* before *λεγοντες*.

(13) John xiii 18. *ἐμοῦ τὸν ἄρτον (pro μετ εμου τον αρτον)* is an invention. The codices which suppress *μετ* read *μου*, not *εμου*. See von Soden's own note below on the subject 'μετ εμου l μου . . .'.

(14) John i 50 (49 with von Soden). Here he surely does not mean to neglect all the Greeks and go alone with the Latins *ff l gat vg* as he does. by printing *ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ [καὶ λέγει]*.

This is how it looks set out in all its aspects:—

*Ναθαναηλ tantum* (— *απεκριθη αυτω*) + *æ*: *sah<sup>unus</sup> grandiloquus*.

*Απεκριθη αυτω Ναθαναηλ* B L W 33 249 Paris<sup>97</sup> *b aur W-H txt.*

*Και ειπεν αυτω Ναθαναηλ aeth*

*Ναθαναηλ απεκριθη αυτω sah (variant plurimum boh<sup>codd</sup>)*

*Et Natanahel respondit e*

*Απεκριθη Ναθαναηλ και ειπεν*  $\aleph X^b ?$  } *syr hier arm?*  
*Respondit Nathanael et ait* *c vg<sup>E</sup>* }

*Απεκριθη Ναθαναηλ και λεγει αυτω* A Δ Π *unc<sup>9</sup> al. r (δ) Chr Cyr*

*Απεκριθη Ναθαναηλ και αυτω ειπεν* *pers [hiant D d syr cu sin]*

*Απεκριθη Ναθαναηλ και ειπεν αυτω* Γ Δ Ψ<sup>vid</sup> 28 245 435 Sod<sup>190 551 1443</sup>

*Eust* 19? 26? 49 60? (δ dixit vel ait) *q syr pesh*

*Και απεκριθη Ναθ. και ειπεν αυτω* 254

*Απεκριθη αυτω Ναθαναηλ και ειπεν* X 124 *a f arm? Epiph*

*Απεκριθη αυτω Ναθαναηλ και λεγει αυτω* Sod<sup>370 1091</sup> *vid.*

{ *Respondit ei Nathanael et ait* *ff<sub>2</sub> l gat vg*  
*Απεκριθη αυτω Ναθαναηλ [και λεγει]* Soden *txt sol inter Gr.* }

Von Soden's reading is therefore grotesque. And then immediately afterwards he proceeds to omit altogether from his notes the graphic + *fili* at the end of John ii 3 by his favourite 'af', and *b ff l* (which he follows at i 49) and *Ambrose*<sup>bis</sup> [*hiant D d syr cu sin*].

In view of the lacunae in *D d syr cu sin*, we should certainly have our attention called to this pretty addition, even if it is quite unauthorized beyond *e ff l*, for Buchanan has added *b* for it.

(15) John viii 41. Von Soden prints οὐ γεγενήθημεν without MS authority. The textus receptus, with the majority and *Orig Chr Cyr*, has οὐ γεγενήμεθα as Tischendorf and Hort<sup>ms</sup>. Hort<sup>txt</sup> has οὐκ ἐγεννήθημεν with B D\* 409, while οὐκ ἐγεννήμεθα is read by *NT L Sod*<sup>3017</sup>.

(16) Lastly, von Soden's reading in John xxi 18 in its entirety:—

καὶ ἄλλοι ζώσουσί σε καὶ ἀποίοσυσιν ὅπου οὐ θέλεις

is a complete invention.

For the first part καὶ ἄλλοι ζώσουσί σε von Soden is following *NT* alone; for the second part καὶ ἀποίοσυσιν he follows *II* alone, and ὅπου οὐ θέλεις agrees with B and the majority (against *NT*), but for von Soden's sentence as a whole there is no MS authority. The matter will be found set out fully in vol. ii of my 'Codex B and its allies' (in the press).

### (II) Von Soden's quotations of 'af'.

Having satisfied himself that his son has correctly 'restored' the African text, the elder von Soden makes a practice of quoting 'af' instead of *e* or *k* or *Cypr*, or *e k*, or *e k Cypr*, or *e Cypr*, or *k Cypr*. The viciousness of this system is obvious. I will give one illustration.

At Mark xii 4 where *e* and *k* are both extant, von Soden has in his notes 'om καὶ I<sup>a</sup> 168 af c'. He means 'om 28 ce' for *k* says *Et Iterum* against *Iterum* of *e*.

(He neglects the fact that *sah arm* and *pers* also omit the initial καὶ. It is important here, for they replace *syr sin* which omits the whole verse.)

### (III) System.

As to *system* there is none. Sometimes *NT* B are followed alone, as at Matt. xiii 36 διασαφήσον (*pro φρασον*) (+ Sod<sup>050</sup> φ<sup>a</sup>; these witnesses are deserted by Soden on countless other occasions); whereas at John iv 15 διερχομαι (*pro ερχομαι*) *NT* B, adopted by W-H and John x 18 ηρεν (*pro αιρει*) *NT* B, adopted by W-H, are put aside by von Soden.

In the former case von Soden does not even place φρασον in his upper notes or margin.

In the latter case he condemns ηρεν by placing it in his third or bottom series of notes, but takes pains to add after 'ηρεν loco αιρει H<sup>δ</sup> 1-2\*': 'gg Ωρ Διδ Ευσ' that is to say *NT* B but against Origen, Didymus, and Eusebius.

Why then at Luke vi 28 did he suppress the great Patristic testimony for υπερ (as against περι *NT* B L W  $\Xi$  604 Paris<sup>97</sup>) by *Justin Dial Clem*<sup>bis</sup> *Orig Eus*<sup>bis</sup>?

Here is his note in Luke: υπερ l περι (Mt. 5 44) K gg H<sup>δ</sup> 1-2 014 56 376f J<sup>a</sup> 133 A<sup>1</sup>.

Not one word about the Fathers. Not one single new cursive added



for *περι*, because 376=Paris<sup>97</sup> we knew already from Schmidtke's publication. 376 belongs in von Soden's limited group: *H* δ<sup>1.2.014. δ<sup>3</sup> δ<sup>6</sup> 26</sup> δ<sup>48</sup> 56 76 1016 376 δ<sup>371</sup>, that is to say **Ν B W C Ψ Z 33 L Δ 892 Paris<sup>97</sup>, 1241** (Sinai 260). The *f* then (as 1016=892 does *not* read thus) can only refer to δ<sup>371</sup>. Does this Sinai MS read *περι*? If so, it should have been mentioned by name.

It may be said as regards John x 18 that *ἦρην* there is so palpably wrong that von Soden properly rejects it, and that it is merely a change of tense. But at Matt. xviii 24, where a change of order from *προσηνέχθη αὐτῷ εἰς ὀφειλέτης* to *προσην. εἰς αὐτῷ ὀφειλέτης* does not appreciably affect the sense, yet von Soden follows the latter order in his text on the sole authority of **Ν B**.

The order is awkward. *εἰς* was probably introduced into the text of **Ν B** from the margin and put in the wrong place, for *syr sin* and *e* with 245 and Sod<sup>1388</sup> omit *εἰς* altogether. *Syr cu* holds the usual order, against **Ν B** 'before him one of them'.

Similarly at Mark viii 32, instead of *καὶ προσλαβόμενος αὐτὸν ὁ Πέτρος ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ*, von Soden, on the sole authority of **Ν B** (*sah boh syr*), adopts the order *καὶ προσλαβ. ὁ Πέτρος αὐτόν κτλ.* But *αὐτόν* is omitted by D Sod<sup>1349 1498</sup> and *pers*, and very likely here too *αὐτόν* was introduced into the **Ν B** text from the margin and put in the wrong place.

Luke xxii 30. Order *τας δωδεκα φυλας κρινοντες* of Sod<sup>txt</sup> is only supported by **B T 892 i**.

I urge that there is no system in von Soden's text. Consider among many other passages his adoption in Luke xx 27 of *αντιλεγοντες* against the *λεγοντες* of **Ν B C D L N 892 Paris<sup>97</sup> &c. d e goth copt syr**. Observe *λεγοντες* supported by *four* of his families *H* (represented by **Ν B C 892 Paris<sup>97</sup>**), *I* (by D *d* &c.), *π* (by **N**), 'af' (by *e*), besides *goth copt syr*, making *seven* groups in all. Von Soden goes against this.

But just above he follows similar, although less powerful, grouping at xx 22 **Ν A B L**, xx 23 **Ν B L**, xx 25 **Ν B L**, xx 26 **Ν B L**.

Similarly at Mark xv 1 he follows **Ν C L 892** for *ετοιμασαντες*, although **B** reads *ποιησαντες* with the majority and *εποιησαν* D Sod<sup>650 2<sup>pe</sup> al</sup>.

And even at Mark xvi 4 he follows **Ν B L** absolutely alone (not adding a single new witness) for *ανακεκλισται* instead of *αποκεκλισται* (roundly condemned by Merx).

But, as a matter of fact, **Ν** does not read with **B L**. While **B L** read *οτι ανακεκλισται ο λιθος*, **Ν** has, without *οτι*, 'ανακεκλισμενον τον λιθον'. Tischendorf's edition of **Ν** is correct but his *N.T.* note completely wrong, and von Soden has accepted this without checking it. The error has been with us for over forty years, and he has perpetuated it. It must be corrected. **Ν** really reads with the Latins *revolutum lapidem*. Only

*n* has *amotum*. Therefore, while abandoning the Greek construction of the others, **N** yet retains the *ανα*- of B L (these three still remaining alone for this) as against *απο*- of the other Greeks for D *Sod*<sup>050</sup> and 2<sup>ve</sup>, while changing somewhat the verse, write *ερχονται και ευρισκουσιν αποκεκλισμενον τον λιθον*, and not *ανακεκλισμενον τον λιθον* as **N**. The form of D *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 2<sup>ve</sup> is found in *cdffn* of the Latins:

et veniunt et inveniunt revolutum (*amotum n*) lapidem *cdn*.

et venerunt et invenerunt revolutum lapidem *ff*. 'Revolutus' of the Latins being *anceps* as to *ανα*- or *απο*- we are still left to argue this out on other lines (see Merx, p. 510 sq., and plates on Luke xxiii 52-54, but we must get the textual matters properly aligned before we can discuss it properly.

At Matt. xi 19 he has *εργων* for *τεκνων* [although his countryman Merx (p. 194) had warned him against this] with only **N**\* B 124 *Sod*<sup>1222</sup> *boh sah*<sup>un0</sup> *syr pesh* (*arm*). He seems to err by quoting *I*<sup>tb</sup> as a whole = *fam* 69, whereas only 124 reads thus. His sub-family *I*<sup>tb</sup> is composed of 69-124, 174 (his <sup>109</sup>), and his <sup>1033</sup>, an Athens codex. Do <sup>109</sup> <sup>1033</sup> read *εργων*?

At Mark ii 22 *και ο οινος απολλυται και οι ασκοι* of *Sod*<sup>txt</sup> has its only support from B 892 and *boh*.

At Luke xvii 12 he omits *αυτω* after *υπηνητησαν* with only B L. He misquotes D 157. 157 is wrong, and D has *οπου ησαν* so of course *αυτω* fell away. As a matter of fact

L only reads *υπηνητησαν* (-*αυτω*)

for B reads *απηνητησαν* (-*αυτω*),

so that von Soden is here following *one* MS L against all others. This is pretty extensive editing! Of what use then all this examination of documents?

At John iv 21 he reads *πιστευσον* against *πιστευε* of no less than **N** B C\* D L W 1 *fam* 13 22 Laura <sup>A104</sup> *Sod*<sup>110</sup> <sup>1110</sup> 2<sup>ve</sup> *Orig Ath* and *Cyr*.

At Mark v 25 he retains *τις* against **N** A B C L W Δ *latt*<sup>pl</sup> which omit, thus following D *rell d a f syr* against his usual preferred combination.

At Mark v 40, again, he prints *ο δε* against *αυτος δε* of **N** B C D L Δ 33 Paris<sup>97</sup> *Evs* 48 *it vg*, and this where the two families **N** B and D are conjoined with the Latin. If there is *one* Gospel where this conjunction should be followed it is in Mark! (*Hiat syr sin*).

On the other hand, at Mark vi 12 he goes over to and follows **N** B C L D<sup>gr</sup> Δ<sup>gr</sup> for *εκηρυξαν* against *εκηρυσσον d d it*<sup>omn</sup> *vg* W Σ Φ *unc*<sup>11</sup> *minn*<sup>omn</sup> *et* Paris<sup>97</sup>. So that he follows for a tense change the very group whose reading he had outraged above by contradicting.

Then at vii 17 he opposes *την παραβολην* of **N** B D L Δ 33 Paris<sup>97</sup> + *it vg* by printing *περι της παραβολης* of A *rell*.

But at vii 31 he accepts *ἦλθεν δια σιδωνος* of the same  $\aleph$  B D L  $\Delta$  33 2<sup>pe</sup> 604 *latt*, against *καὶ σιδωνος ἦλθεν* of A *rell*.

On p. xxviii he says, 'Stehen die Lesarten der Recensionen fest, so ist in der Regel die *von zwei Recensionen* vertretene Lesart in den Text aufgenommen'.

But how often does he break this rule! Consult, for a change of mood, Luke vii 7. Instead of ἀλλ' εἰπὲ λόγῳ καὶ ἰαθήσεται ὁ παῖς μου he prints the sentence with ἰαθήτω. This is the reading favoured by B L only against their allies  $\aleph$   $\Delta$   $\Psi$  and D, and against the rest of von Soden's *H* family including 892 and Paris<sup>97</sup>, and against all the other families. He produces one new witness  $\delta$  371 (a MS at *Sinai*) of the *H* family. His only other witness is 'bo?'. Horner indicates but *two* boh MSS for this, but *all* the *sah* codices, which von Soden omits. And behold the reading favoured by Tisch., Hort, and von Soden proves once more to be purely 'Egyptian' and of an 'improving' order.

So von Soden's text appears to be an inadequate guide in these complicated matters, and the art of navigation has not been mastered by the compilers of it; in fact their compasses were not adjusted before leaving port.

This is severe criticism, but is supported by the charges in the following section.

#### (IV) *Grave Errors.*

There are many grave errors. Observe particularly an error, from lack of referring to original sources, at Matt. xxvii 53. Von Soden says 'ὄμ καὶ ἐνεφανίσθησαν πολλοῖς *H* <sup>$\delta$ 2</sup> *I*<sup>371</sup>'. This is an important place, and the citation of *H* <sup>$\delta$ 2</sup> (=  $\aleph$ ) is quite wrong. And it is only wrong because von Soden misread Tischendorf's note and did not trouble to look up the edition of  $\aleph$  itself. Tischendorf in ed. viii N. T. says:—

'εἰσηλθον (et Or<sup>4.298</sup> et int<sup>927</sup>; D it [exc f q] vg ἦλθον:  $\aleph$  om una cum και sq'

by which he means that  $\aleph$  omits *εἰσηλθον* and the subsequent *και* (following *πολι* and before *ἐνεφανίσθησαν*). Von Soden neglects to record this — *εἰσηλθον* and — *και*, gives quite the wrong omission, and misunderstands that  $\aleph$  deliberately cut out *εἰσηλθον*, as the omission of *και seq.* shews. Here is the verse:—

Καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκ τῶν μνημείων μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ εἰσῆλθον [*om.*  $\aleph$ ]  
εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν καὶ [*om.*  $\aleph$ ] ἐνεφανίσθησαν πολλοῖς.

Thus  $\aleph$  wishes to read 'And going out from the graves after his rising into the Holy city, they appeared to many', which is quite different from the reading of *I*<sup>371</sup> which would have: 'And going out from the graves after his rising they came into the Holy city'; stopping there and eliminating 'and they appeared to many'.

Luke xxii 35. Tischendorf says as to  $\aleph$  'τινος ( $\aleph^c$ ):  $\aleph^*$  τι exeunte versu'. Von Soden (without referring to the original) has interpreted this to mean τινος omitted after μη and added *at the end of the verse* after ουθενος. So he gives in his notes [instead of τι l τινος] 'om τινος  $H^{\delta 2*}$  /... add τι p ουθενος  $H^{\delta 2*}$ '.

This is not only wrong, but by missing  $\aleph$ 's reading of μη τι υστερησατε von Soden overlooks the Latin connexion of *aliquid* by a *c f ff<sub>2</sub> l vgg*, against *alicuius* by *b d e*, so that  $\aleph$  alone among Greeks is again exhibiting its polyglot mind and text.

John xvii 12. In von Soden's notes we read εφυλασσον (*pro* εφυλαξα)  $H^{\delta 2*}$  *d r*. But *d r* do nothing of the kind. The verse is:—

στε ημην μετ αυτων (εν τω κοσμω) εγω ετηρουν αυτους εν τω ονοματι σου ους (ω, δ *al.*) δεδωκας μοι (και) εφυλαξα . . .

*d r* both have *custodivi* for εφυλαξα as all the rest. They merely substitute *custodiebam* for *servabam* as an interpretation of ετηρουν. Did von Soden really suppose that Tischendorf had missed the reading of *d*? If he had taken the trouble to quote *d* against  $D^{\text{gr}}$  here instead of simply *d r* his attention would have been called to the matter, and he would have seen that his collator had made a mistake.

John xx 17. In the important short speech of our Lord after the resurrection '*Noli me tangere*', in Greek Μη μου ἅπτου, where B alone varies with Μη ἅπτου μου (*Tert* 'ne, inquit, contigeris me'), *Eust* 47 is found to omit μου, but only this MS (and possibly *Orig* 1/2).

Now von Soden tells us that  $\aleph$  and D, W and 348, 'af' and *Orig* all omit this μου. 'Om μου<sup>1</sup>  $H^{\delta 2*}$  014 I a<sup>δ 5</sup> β a<sup>121</sup> af Ωρ<sup>1:5</sup>' is what he says. He means — μου *secund. post* πατερα *prim*, but this is lacking in his text, so that the note should read quite differently: 'add μου p πατερα *K gg H'* &c. as we find in the middle notes. This is a serious error. He neglects the real omission by *Eust* 47, because he hardly ever quotes the testimony of the Lectionaries. Had he done so he would have avoided this mistake in a peculiarly important passage.

Luke xviii 16. Von Soden says — τα B instead of — αυτα *prim*. His remark makes B omit τα *ante* παιδια.

Luke xxii 67. Von Soden quotes a b q r for the omission of υμιν in the phrase εαν υμιν ειπω. Not one of them omits. All have '*Si vobis dixero*'.

Shortly afterwards, as if to accentuate this error, he misquotes r<sub>2</sub>. Abbott had said 'xxiii 8 enim: *autem*', meaning that for 'erat enim cupiens' r<sub>2</sub> reads '*erat autem cupiens*'.

Von Soden turns this into 'γαρ l δε r<sup>2</sup>', meaning that we should read at the beginning of the verse ο γαρ Ηρωδης instead of ο δε Ηρωδης or *Herodes autem*.

Again, at John xiii 12 von Soden reproduces an error of Tischendorf. In his N.T. notes Tischendorf begins verse 12 thus: 'αυτων (N<sup>c</sup>; N\* αυτου): 13. 69. 124. 346. ante τους ποδας pon . . .' Accordingly in von Soden's lower notes to his N.T. p. 456 we read: 12. αυτου l αυτων H<sup>δ</sup>2\*, that is to say, he would with Tischendorf make N read 'ὅτε οὖν ἔνιψεν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ', referring to the washing of Peter's feet and not to that of them all. But N *does not do this*. N in reality substitutes inversely and later in the verse αυτων for αυτου after ιματια, making the sentence read ἔλαβεν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν instead of ἔλαβεν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ. Von Soden at this place records εαυτου for W and the omission of αυτου by D b e, but does not insert the true variation of N\* there as he should have done if he had really tried to bring our apparatus up to date.

Lastly at John xviii 16 von Soden quotes the variation εισηγεγεν for εισηγαγεν as read by H<sup>014</sup> 376 = W and Paris<sup>97</sup>, but N also reads thus with W, and Paris<sup>97</sup> *does not* (according to Schmidtke's edition it has εισηγαγεν with the rest). Von Soden does not report N because Tischendorf omitted to do so, but the reading is to be found duly recorded in the late Dr Scrivener's very careful collation of N published at Cambridge in small and handy form by Deighton, Bell & Co. in 1864.

This leads up to another grave indictment. Von Soden depends entirely upon Tischendorf's notes in his eighth edition of the N. T. concerning N. He has evidently not had N collated for his use, and has ignored Dr Scrivener's exceedingly accurate collation.

In order to be brief I will prove the matter in one Gospel alone. I will take St John's Gospel. Tischendorf neglects to record some *fifty-five* readings of N. In every case but one von Soden follows suit, and neglects these readings also. And it is not as if the matters were of scant importance, for observe—

vi 47 + οτι recorded for Sod<sup>050 96</sup> sy, and read also by 124 (not mentioned), is read by N after the Coptic manner.

vi 53 > το αιμα αυτου recorded for I<sup>a</sup> δ<sup>6</sup> a Hil (and read also by *Cypr Jul Firm Gelas*) is the order also of N.

xiii 34 — ινα sec. recorded for 329 is also omitted by N.

xix 8 > τον λογον τουτον recorded for 329 1385 N (and read also by 249 and bt<sup>scr</sup>) is the order of N.

But, far more important than the above omissions of Tischendorf and von Soden are the following readings of N, not only neglected by Tischendorf and von Soden, but also by Mrs Lewis, Horner, Merx, and the rest of the critics, readings of great import as to the matter of the versions, and an 'underlying Greek text':—

As to *syr sin*:

xvi 2 αποσυναγωγους + γαρ N and *syr<sup>dis</sup>*, and these only.

xx 17 + *ιδου ante αναβαινω* **κ** and *syr sin syr hier*<sup>ABC</sup> only.

This conjunction of **κ** and *syr* stands apart from all other authorities and has hitherto been unrecognized. Mrs Lewis recognizes the first (p. 256 ed. 1910 of *syr sin*) but not the second. Merx neglects **κ** in both places, although referring to the reading of *l* and *q* among the Old Latins at xvi 2 of + *στι*. 'Quia eicient vos de sinagogis' *l*, 'qūm in synagoga vos eicient' *q*, which is the only other variation there among authorities (neglected by von Soden) except that the *bohairic* joins verses 1 and 2 . . . 'if they should put you out of the synagogue'.

As to Coptic:

vi 58. The order > *οι πατερες εφαγον* by **κ** alone is the order of *sah* and of *boh*<sup>dis</sup>.

vi 52. **κ** adds *ουν* after *πως* (alone with 56-58-61). In *bohairic* we read *πως οχλον ηντα*.

x 27. For *καγω* **κ** substitutes *και* with only *e vgg*<sup>CT</sup> *Aug Chr*<sup>μ. 7.</sup> and the *sahidic* (against its usual emphatic method).

As to Latin:

xix 5. *πορφυρουν* (-*το*) **κ** alone.

As to Aethiopic:

xix 6. + *και ante λεγει* **κ** alone with *aeth*.

As to *Chrysostom*:

iii 22. > *εις την Ιουδαιαν γην και οι μαθηται αυτου κακει διετριβεν* **κ** *cum Chr*<sup>sol<sup>o</sup></sup> (instead of *και οι μαθηται αυτου εις την Ιουδαιαν γην και εκει διετριβεν* of all the rest of the Greeks and of the versions).

This is quite important as there are other traces of **κ** and *Chr*<sup>codd π. λ. μ.</sup> at i 15 *ερχομενος + ος*, iv 45 *-εδεξαντο αυτον οι γαλιλαιοι*, and St Chrysostom's copy of St John was a very ancient recension. We find *Chrysostom* and *syr sin* absolutely alone together at:

vii 32. *γογγυζοντος tantum* (- *περι αυτου* and -*ταυτα*).

viii 16. *και εαν κρινω* (-*δε* and -*εγω*),

besides being often in sympathy elsewhere.

I mention the above matters as to **κ** in justice to our late lamented countryman, Dr Scrivener, whose faithful work ill deserved to be put aside by those claiming to say the last word on these subjects. Mrs Lewis seems to be the only living critic who shews an acquaintance with Scrivener's collation of **κ**.

#### (V) *Errors of Omission.*

Errors of omission abound, as at Matt. x 16 *ιδου εγω αποστελλω υμας εις μεσον λυκων* for *εν μεσω λυκων* where B is quoted alone. To B<sup>sr</sup> should be added ff<sub>1</sub> *h vg*<sup>B</sup> and *Lucifer*. (Cf. the parallel at Luke x 3 where D<sup>sr</sup> substitutes *μεσον* for *εν μεσω* [against *d*'] and the *vgg* and

*Ambr* have <sup>lib</sup> *inter lupos* which von Soden does not mention, merely stating D and not even D<sup>gr</sup> for *μεισον*.)

Matt. ix 35. — *και ante κηρυσσων*, by *κ βοη*<sup>ES</sup>, is not mentioned by von Soden at all, not even as to *κ*. It is interesting because it is rather in the Coptic manner, and actually two *boh* MSS omit with *κ* (*teste* Horner *in vol. sah.*).

Besides omitting the *επισπαρκεν* of *κ* in Matt. xiii 25, he neglects to record B\* [see photographic edition] for *ελαλησεν* (*pro παρεθηκεν*) in xiii 24. I suppose because in the latter case Tischendorf is silent. But when *κ* alone is to be coupled with B<sup>gr</sup> for this *locutus est* for *proposuit* or *posuit* it becomes quite important.

*κ* is quite clear with *locutus est illis dicens*, and apparently B before being inked over read in similar fashion *ελαλησεν αυτοις λεγων*, instead of *παρεθηκεν αυτοις λεγων*.

Matt. xxi 17. — *εξω της πολεως κ* is given as being alone. But 28 also omits, as duly recorded by Scholz.

Matt. xxi 33. — *εν αυτω κ\** Chr. So von Soden. But *κ* only omits *εν*. Von Soden is misled by the form of Tischendorf's note and did not refer to the original.

Matt. xxii 16. Evan. 604 (700), i.e. von Soden's <sup>133</sup>, is given for *λεγοντας*. This is wrong. Apparently von Soden took the evidence from Scrivener's *Adv. Crit.* instead of from my edition, and mistook d for b, for d<sup>scr</sup> there = Evan. 66 so reads, which von Soden does not report.

Luke xi 48. *μαρτυρειτε κ B L 892* and Sod<sup>δ</sup> <sup>371</sup> *Orig*, he omits to add 604 also.

Matt. xxiv 34. Von Soden's note (foot of p. 94) says: 'add *ου* ante *ου H*<sup>1016</sup>', = 892. But B D F L *al*<sup>3</sup> *it vg syr Ps-Ath Orig*<sup>int</sup>, as well as *cop*<sup>t</sup>, all add as well; see his upper notes.

Matt. xxv 24. Von Soden quotes 209 (his <sup>δ</sup> <sup>457</sup>) for *αυστηρος* instead of *σκληρος*, but Lake definitely says not.

Matt. xxvi 50. — *ιησους κ* <sup>28cr</sup>. Von Soden neglects this altogether.

Matt. xxvi 65. *και λεγει* (*pro λεγων*). Von Soden records *κ* but fails to add *syr*.

Matt. xxvii 3. *μετεμεληθη και* (*pro μεταμεληθεις*). Von Soden records *κ* but fails to add *syr sin arm aeth pers*.

Mark vi 55. He cites *κ* only for *εν* instead of *επι*, that is to say *και ηρξαντο εν τοις κραβαττοις*, but this is the way the Latins have it 'IN grabattis', and he should have added *latt*. It is important here as to *κ*.

Mark vii 37. Von Soden's note reads 'add *ως* ante *και*<sup>3</sup> *H*<sup>δ</sup> *bo*', but whereas *sah* adds *ρωτε*, only a few *boh* add *αφρη*<sup>†</sup>, and von Soden neglects *sah*.

Mark viii 18. 'om και<sup>1</sup> H<sup>δ2\*</sup> r<sub>2</sub>'. He should add boh<sup>v</sup>, for this is the Coptic method here being illustrated by  $\aleph$ , to which attention should be called.

Luke xxiii 50. Here, where he omits altogether to record – και *tert ante* δικαιος for B, he should have quoted with sah, thus forming another link between B and sah in the Coptic manner, as above for  $\aleph$ .

Mark x 21 'add επι post εν (Lk 18<sub>22</sub>) H<sup>δ2</sup>'. But von Soden forgets that minn<sup>10</sup> and sah boh do so also.

Luke v 2. The order πλοια δυο credited to some few and boh should also indicate sah, for this is the usual Coptic order.

Luke x 35 ' ~ εδωκεν ante δυο H<sup>δ1</sup>'. To B add sah.

x 38 'om εις τον οικον αυτης H<sup>δ1</sup>'. To B add sah.

xi 36 'add εν ante τη Τα? H<sup>δ1 376</sup>'. To these, B and Paris<sup>97</sup>, add both sah and boh.

xvi 17 ' ~ κεραϊαν μιαν H<sup>δ1</sup>'. To B add sah syr.

xii 32 ' ~ υμων ο πατηρ H<sup>δ2</sup>', but to  $\aleph$  add sah boh as usual, the possessive before the noun.

Luke xxiv 38. εις την καρδιαν von Soden quotes only Aδ (= Dial.), but cde read thus in cor vestrum, and so does sah practically and syr sin (Lewis, ed. 1910).

Luke v 17. εκ πασης κωμης. He says 'add της ante κωμης H<sup>δ371</sup> bo', but he forgets B and should include δ<sup>1</sup>. It is clearly indicated in Tischendorf.

Luke ix 12. 'ηδη loco δε (Mk 6<sub>36</sub>) H<sup>δ1</sup> af'. The testimony of Paris<sup>97</sup> should be added to B af.

Luke xiii 7. To B's unique τον τοπον προ την γην the testimony of 80 should be added. Von Soden neglects 80 throughout.

Luke xiii 34. την εαυτου νοσσιαν. He cites  $\aleph$  16 Laura<sup>A104</sup> only. But sah boh make the gender of the bird masculine, and he omits to add their testimony. This is a clear Coptic reflexion in  $\aleph$  16 and Laura<sup>A104</sup> and may not be overlooked.

Luke xxii 27. + ο ante μειζων  $\aleph$ . To  $\aleph$  should be added sah boh.

John viii 55. + οτι παρ αυτον εμει (post αλλ οίδα αυτον). So T<sup>i</sup> (= Sod<sup>478</sup>). Von Soden does not mention this, but he should have done so. Every new fragment which comes from Egypt [see again immediately below] confirms editorial changes. Here is another instance of the new fragment T<sup>i</sup> improvising. Von Soden has recorded it at Luke xxiii 53 for + και θετος αυτου επεθηκαν τω μνημειω λιθον μεγαν ον μογυς εικοσι ανδρας εκυλιον (cf. D d c sah al.), but does not do so here in John.

Luke vii 47. Here again (see Amélineau *Notices des mss coptes* p. 52) the fragment of a Greek Coptic Lectionary, whose mark I do not know in von Soden or in Gregory, reports + και before ολιγον αγαπα fin.



with only B 892 and Paris<sup>97</sup>, who read:  $\omega$  δε ολιγον αφιεται και ολιγον αγαπα. Von Soden does not report this. Observe that this further support for B comes from the same source as the other T support. This fragment differs by reading: ο δε ολιγον αγαπα αφιεται και ολιγον αγαπα, as if aware of the variation of F Ξ? 28 *aeth*:  $\omega$  δε ολιγον αγαπα ολιγον αφιεται, but erring in the process of conflation.

Mark xiv 3. του ιησου (*pro* αυτου *pr.*) D *it sah boh'tres*. Neglected by von Soden. (Beermann and Gregory report *Sod*<sup>050</sup> for αυτου.)

Mark xvi 2. ανατειλαντος του ηλιου. Omitted by  $\xi$ . Not noted by von Soden.

Hans von Soden has condemned me in a recent number of the *Literaturzeitung* for bringing as it were iron to Essen, and has said that I had nothing new to shew him; and that everybody knew of the matters to which I had called attention.

I submit respectfully that much has yet to be learned by the school of von Soden in matters of textual criticism if it would make the path smoother and not harder for students of the coming generation.

#### (VI) *Unnecessary difficulties presented to Students.*

Mark i 26. In von Soden's note we find ' $\tau\omicron^1\circ\tau\omicron^2 H^{\delta 1}$ '. This means that B omits  $\tau\omicron$  πνεῦμα reading *καὶ σπαράξαν αὐτὸν τὸ ἀκάθαρτον* (that unclean one) instead of *καὶ σπ. αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον* (the unclean spirit).

By this note he seems to wish to suggest that it is an error from  $\tau\omicron$  following  $\tau\omicron$ . But this is rather fanciful here. Why inject further trouble into these troublesome matters, and force the student to waste time in seeking out what  $\tau\omicron^1\circ\tau\omicron^2$  means?

Luke xxii 6. Similarly, for the omission of *καὶ ἐξωμολογησεν* by BCN *lat syr sin*, all we find in the apparatus is ' $\kappa\alpha\iota^1\circ^2 H^{\delta 2* \delta 3} I^{\pi} \text{sy}^s \text{Evo}$ '. This is not very illuminating, and involves a great waste of time to the student.

Again, Luke viii 25, the important omission of *καὶ υπακουουσιν αυτω* by B *Sod*<sup>050</sup> 604 *aeth Tert*<sup>mare</sup>? is only noticed in the third set of notes as ' $\kappa\alpha\iota^{\circ 3}\kappa\alpha\iota_{26} H^{\delta 1} I^a$  050 \*f', f meaning 604. The arrangement of the apparatus is most misleading.

Luke xvii 6. For the omission of *ταυτη* after *τη συκαμινω* von Soden adds *syr cu* to ' $H^{\delta 2 56 376} \text{bo } I^a \delta^5 \circ 129 A^3$ ', but *syr cu* (as against *syr sin* 'to this mulberry tree') says '*to a hill*'. Why divorce the important variation from its context to explain that *syr cu* does not read '*to THIS hill*'. This kind of thing is done again and again. As a matter of fact there is no need to add *syr cu* for —*ταυτη* above, for below von Soden has: 'add post  $\alpha\nu^1$ :  $\tau\omega\omicron\rho\epsilon\iota \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\beta\alpha \epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota \kappa\alpha\iota \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\beta\alpha\iota\nu\epsilon\nu \kappa\alpha\iota$  (cf. Mk I I<sub>2</sub>, Mt I 7<sub>30</sub> 2 I<sub>21</sub>) I<sup>a</sup>  $\delta^5 \text{sy}^c$  (om  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$  und  $\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota$ ).'

Again, Luke xxiv 31,  $\aleph$  omits *και επερωσαν αυτον*. Von Soden once more dignifies this by citing 'κα<sup>1</sup>η<sup>2</sup> H<sup>δ2\*</sup>'. It is placed in so insignificant a position that one hardly sees it, and then has to worry to find out what it means.

(VII) *Carelessness as to the application of f following a Codex.*

As regards 157, at the important place Luke xxii 43-44, he has gravely misrepresented my manuscript and probably some of his own.

[He has placed 157 in his family I<sup>σ</sup> 207 351 1132 1226 377.]

At Luke xxii 43-44, in his upper notes (which constitute his 'margin') he records for omission of these verses 207<sup>σf</sup> which means the corrector of 157 plus the family or one of them.

Now in 157 there is no sign of omission by any corrector. I examined the place carefully. As to f no doubt it indicates <sup>351</sup> (= 713), but why not say so here? If the other members of the family do not omit (and it is questionable whether they all belong together as a family) we should be quite sure of the fact. An f is quite insufficient here. His <sup>377</sup> (= 291) would be the more likely MS to omit.

The worst feature as to this is outside of St Mark's Gospel. Because if f follows I<sup>αδ5</sup> it does not refer to I<sup>α</sup> 014 next in order on his list.

(VIII) *Neglect of the Aethiopic.*

Von Soden's neglect of the Aethiopic is really serious, especially as in a work up to date on the N. T. it is absolutely essential to take into consideration the readings of *aeth* and *pers*.

A case occurs at Matt. xxvii 50 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα, where he cites 'παρεδωκεν | αφηκεν (I<sup>ο</sup> 19<sub>30</sub>) Τα I<sup>1386</sup>, ανεβη syr<sup>s</sup>[c]' and stops there. He should have added *aeth* exivit.

Merx (p. 16), referring to this, says: 'Und damit wieder hängt die Erzählung Matt. xxvii 50 in Syrsin zusammen, wo es nicht heisst ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα = er sandte den Geist fort, gab ihn auf, hauchte ihn aus, sondern **αυουῖ δαλω** d. h. sein Geist stieg hinauf. Diese Lesart steht bis jetzt ganz allein; dass hier aber nicht nach äusserer Bezeugung, sondern nach dem dogmatischen Zusammenhange zu urteilen ist, das sollte einleuchten.'

Thus, von Soden could have supplemented Merx here by quoting *aeth* for *exivit*, ἐξῆλθε, as does Horner, but he does not. Nor does he use *aeth* in other places where its readings are both certain and most instructive.

So, again, at Luke ix 20, where von Soden quotes 604 for - με λεγεσθαι, he neglects not only *aeth* but also *Dial* for this omission.

Again, at Luke xvi 3, we miss *aeth* which supports *sah boh syrr* as to B's very important and unique addition among the Greeks of *και* before *σπαιται*.

At Luke vi 17, where he quotes  $\delta$  398 for *κατεβη* alone among Greeks with Marcion, he omits to record Marcion (*Epipl<sup>h</sup>is disert<sup>e</sup>*), and forgets to add to the Latins quoted the other versions *copt syr pers* and *aeth*.

(IX) *Style of note.*

Luke vi 26. Can one imagine a more inadequate note than this: 'om  $\pi$ αντες Τα Μρ Κ gg H exc<sup>014 56 ff bo</sup> Ja<sup>050 f η ι φα b 287 f 1216 c 1091 f 1098 r 72 f o σ 351 f 377 κ r 1341</sup> | 4 22 33 178 fff<sup>1353 f 1386-1443 1493</sup> A<sup>1</sup> A<sup>3</sup> K<sup>1 179</sup> K<sup>i 55 58<sup>lat</sup></sup>, ~ οι ανθρωποι παντες H<sup>δ2 bo Ir</sup>, ~ οι ανθρωποι α ειπ. Iβa<sup>1178</sup>'

The phrase is: οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι καλῶς εἰπωσιν ὑμᾶς πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι (or οἱ ἄνθρ. πάντες, or οἱ ἄνθρωποι tantum).

The inversion of order by  $\aleph$  sah boh and Iren<sup>int</sup> is stated nearly correctly, sah only being omitted. This inversion, however, points probably to the omission of  $\pi$ αντες being basic. It is therefore essential that the evidence for omission should be carefully stated. What do we find?

'Om  $\pi$ αντες Τα Μρ Κ', that is *Tatian Marcion* and *Κοινή*. But *syr sin* and *syr pesh* also omit as does *pers* confirming it. So does *aeth* ('populus') and also *arm* (*teste Rieu*) and *Macarius*, all to be found distinctly stated in Tischendorf, except as to *syr sin* since discovered. Whereas as to the *Κοινή*, the textus receptus and most cursives have it and do *not* omit. On the other hand, to the MSS cited against omission should be added 100 cursives examined by von Soden's predecessors. The uncials which omit: D F<sup>w</sup> L S V T  $\Delta$   $\Lambda$  are not stated in von Soden's list, but include D.

Could any one tell from von Soden's grouping that D omitted? D can hardly be included in Κ (*Κοινή*), and they have to be sought by a ridiculous process of elimination, or enquired after in Tischendorf.

The news which von Soden really gives us is that W (014) and the Tiflis MS (050) do not omit.

Tischendorf's note is quite clear. The important part is Irenaeus's interpreter's opposition to the Latin. Under the circumstances  $d\delta$  should be quoted against the Latin, for  $d\delta$  omit with D<sup>g</sup>  $\Delta$ <sup>στ</sup>, so that to von Soden's note add '(praeter  $d\delta\mu$  vg<sup>dx</sup> cod caraf., cor. vat vg<sup>ed</sup>)' after 'lat'. Supply also  $d\delta\mu$  vg<sup>ed</sup> in Wordsworth and White's apparatus. Supply *syr sin* in Horner's apparatus.

(X) *Error or ambiguity in quoting fam  $\pi$ , and some of the most important cursives.*

$\pi$  is a family of the purple uncials covering  $\aleph$   $\Sigma$   $\Phi$  and  $\eta$ . Very loose use is made of this. We will read  $\pi$  exc 17 [=  $\Phi$ ], whereas  $\Sigma$  may be only one extant at this place,  $\aleph$  and  $\eta$  not being available.

At Luke xx 4 and elsewhere von Soden quotes  $\pi$  as a family, whereas  $\aleph$  only is extant.

As to 2<sup>pe</sup> (Sod<sup>95</sup>), at Mark ix 28 2<sup>pe</sup> reads *ελθοντος αυτου* and thus *alone*. Von Soden adds 1<sup>scr</sup> (his<sup>350</sup>) and fam 'π exc. 17'. Both are wrong. N Σ and 1<sup>scr</sup> read *ελθοντα αυτου*. As to 'exc 17', it is right to the extent that Φ reads *εισελθοντα αυτου*.

Many errors and omissions as to 157 occur. This is the more reprehensible as I notice that von Soden had at least two Gospels recollated (Matthew and Luke, see his card). At Luke vi 40 he quotes 157 (his<sup>207</sup>) for - *πας*, the exceptional omission by N Sod<sup>448</sup> *b vg<sup>D</sup>* only. I did not note this, and I think I should have seen it. He does not quote 157 for *εστω* in the same verse which my eyes observed.

Note at Matt. xxiv 45 *επι τη οικεσια* 157 alone, for *επι της θεραπειας* (or *οικειας*, or *οικιας*). Von Soden quotes 157 for *επι τη οικια*, so that his collator was not accurate there.

And at Luke xx 46 he quotes: 'add *τους* ante *ασπασμους* Iσ<sup>207</sup>'. This is 157. To it add *sah boh*.

But to this reading should also be added that of 157 in the same verse for + *τας* ante *πρωτοκαθεδριας* as well as *sah boh* again, which von Soden neglects. Why quote one and not the other?

Similarly, Luke xxii 7 'ην loco ηλθεν (cf. Mk. 14<sub>1</sub>) Iσ<sup>207</sup>'. To 157 for this exceptional reading should be added *pers*.

Evan. 604/700 (his<sup>158</sup>) is often misquoted by von Soden. At Luke xi 47 it is added by mistake to the very small group N C *Ephiph<sup>marc</sup>* for *και οι πατερες*, whereas it should be added on the next line and in the next verse to the small group for *μαρτυρες εστε* where von Soden omits it.

Sod<sup>1226</sup> (Matthaei's o and our 245) is frequently quoted wrongly, e.g. Luke ii 21, xix 43.

Sod<sup>1016</sup> (Greg. and Scr. 892) collated by Harris. Although sometimes employed is often omitted by von Soden, as at Mark xiv 46. He says: 'om αυτω *d ff<sup>2</sup>*'; but add W 892 as well as *aeth* and *pers*, which omit *επ αυτου* of *textus receptus*, which in Soden's text is *αυτω*.

Sod<sup>978</sup> (Greg. 579 Scr. 743, Paris<sup>97</sup>). Often omitted, as at the important place Luke xvi 30 *αναστη προς αυτους* (*προ πορευθη προς αυτους*) where von Soden only quotes N. Again, Luke vii 47, where *ειπαν* for *λεγω* is read by N Paris<sup>97</sup> only, correctly reported by von Soden, in the same verse as to + *και ante ολιγον αγαπα* he only gives B and <sup>1016f</sup>. This obscures the issue. By <sup>1016</sup> he indicates 892. By *f* he may mean Paris<sup>97</sup>, but he should say so, for these three only have the reading (with an *Evs<sup>t</sup>* from Egypt published by Amélineau).

Von Soden often opposes Schmidtke's edition of Paris<sup>97</sup>, as at Luke xxii 17 *fin.*, quoting *αυτους* while Schmidtke prints definitely *εις αυτους* (with L).

Indeed, I question the appearance of Evan. 33 (Sod<sup>548</sup>) several times in the apparatus; notably at Luke vi 38 where Soden quotes <sup>548</sup> for

μετρηθησεται. Tischendorf does not. Tregelles does not. In von Soden's apparatus appears <sup>33</sup> (=our P). Did he not when copying 33 for P also add δ48 (Evan. 33) by mistake? If I am correct, this change of numbers leads to absolutely nothing but confusion.

But to state these matters is only to make a partial impression on my readers of the grievous state of things in this latest book on a most intricate subject. *Es ist zum Weinen*. I have claimed the privilege of presenting these few facts, gleaned in the course of a self-imposed task for other purposes (and not for an unfriendly review), because I am probably one of the very few who could pass an oral examination as to the numbers used by von Soden and their equivalents in the older notation.

H. C. HOSKIER.