

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 its-os 01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

The explanation of the b text seems to me clear; the scribe's eye wandered from the 'Dixit autem maria' of column I to the same line in column 3, and he wrote as far as 'uerbum tuum' without discovering his mistake; he then started his next line ('Et respondens') from the first column (the 'angelus' may have recalled him) and copied his exemplar correctly to the end of v. 37; on arriving at 38 he found that he had written its opening sentence a few minutes before, and so he simply omitted the words, and added 'et discessit ab illa angelus' after 'omne uerbum' instead of after 'uerbum tuum'.

After I had settled this to my own satisfaction, I turned again to Professor Clark's examination of Luke xxii 17-22 and saw—what I had completely forgotten after first reading it—that he too finds the solution of his problem in an ancestor of DLS written in two columns of 15 lines. This may of course be mere coincidence, and no doubt even stranger cases of coincidence have occurred; but I may be pardoned if I think that it is something more, and that there is now a great deal to be said for the genuineness of the longer text in each of these passages, and for the hypothesis that the ancestor of b was a MS written in double columns of 15 lines.

H. J. WHITE.

ERRATUM.

Vol. xv p. 319 l. 14, for oxon read oxon