Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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:

Buy me a coffee — https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

PATREON — 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:

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

left blank. All goes to shew that the single leaf which once began with 'galileam' and has now disappeared cannot have sufficed for the Longer Ending, unless both very drastic methods of compression were employed in the text itself, and also there was a complete absence of colophon or subscription.

It may of course be asked why four leaves were cut out, when it was only the last which needed cancelling. Perhaps the original intention was to preserve the first three, and bind them up again with the new fourth leaf: perhaps the instructions for removing the last leaf were misunderstood as being instructions for removing the last gathering. But whatever answer we may give to this question, the reasons for supposing that there was a definite intention to replace a last leaf which did not contain the Twelve Verses with a leaf[1] which copied verses 7 *b*, 8 from the cancelled leaf and verses 9–20 from the Vulgate do not seem to be affected. *a* in fact must have had either the Shorter Ending or none at all.

<div align="right">C. H. TURNER.</div>

THE MICHIGAN FRAGMENT OF THE ACTS.

THESE remarks occurred to me after I had read Prof. H. A. Sanders' paper upon 'A Papyrus fragment of Acts in the Michigan Collection', reprinted from the *Harvard Theological Review*, vol. xx no. 1, Jan. 1927.[2] I had no other object in writing them except to clarify my own impressions, but several friends have suggested to me that they might be worth printing, and after some hesitation I have complied with their request. My hesitation was due to the fact that I have for a long time been engaged upon a critical edition of the Acts based upon *codex Bezae* (*D*) and its allies, in which I have ventured to make certain modifications in the traditional *sigla*. The reasons for so doing will be set out in my edition, which I hope before long to offer to the Press. I did not like to desert my *sigla* on this occasion, but I fear that some readers may object to them as unfamiliar. I therefore add a brief explanation of them. I denote the Greek MSS in general as Γ (δ = minn. 383, 614), and use *Z* as a general sign for *D* and its various allies, Greek, Latin, and Syriac. I use Λ to denote old Latin MSS, e. g. Λ^d = the Latin side

---

[1] The new leaf is written in much longer lines than the original scribe of *a* had used (17 letters to the line or so instead of about 10), and so the matter of the Longer Ending is easily got into one complete page, and one column of the second page, of a single leaf.

[2] I have to thank Prof. Sanders for his great kindness in sending me a copy of his article.

of D, Λ^g = Gigas, Λ^h = Floriacensis, Λ^p = Perp. So also in references to Evv. I use Λ^e and Λ^k for the MSS generally called e and k. I refer occasionally to two Vulgate MSS, which in the Acts contain a number of Z readings, viz. the book of Armagh and the Wernigerodensis of Blass, as vg^a and vg^w respectively. Controversy rages around the Syriac text and marginalia printed by J. White in 1799. I can only say that I accept in its plain sense the colophon of Thomas of Harkel—who states that he took the marginalia from a Greek MS belonging to the Enaton near Alexandria—and I refer to his MS as *codex Thomae*. I regard the text to which they are appended as Philoxenian, also on the evidence of the colophon, and call it S^{ph}. I denote the agreement of S^{ph} and S^{vg} (= Peschitta) by S.

A number of references will be found in this paper to the arrangement by στίχοι in D, since this throws great light upon the history of the text. This is a subject upon which I have touched in chh. xi and xii of a previous work, *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford, 1914).

The discovery of the new papyrus, which contains Acts xviii 27–xix 6 and xix 12–16 can only be described as sensational. Recent critics have been extremely unwilling to credit the statement of Thomas that his marginalia were drawn from a Greek MS, arguing on *a priori* grounds that such a MS was not likely to be found in Egypt. Their ingenious hypotheses are upset by the appearance of the papyrus which shews that a Greek text of the Z type was in use in Egypt, as elsewhere, at a very early date.

Sanders is of opinion that the papyrus was written between A. D. 200 and 250. It is only fair to mention that others have ascribed to it a somewhat later date, viz. cent. iv. This is a question which must be decided by papyrological experts. The papyrus may safely be regarded as prior to our oldest Greek MSS $\aleph$ and B.

The chief affinities of $\mathfrak{P}$ are with D and $c. Thom.$ Unfortunately Thomas gives only three quotations from the verses in question, so the evidence is incomplete so far as his MS is concerned. The silence of Thomas, of course, proves nothing, since his collation was very imperfect.

Sanders is at pains to ascertain the relation of $\mathfrak{P}$ to the other MSS, especially to D and $c. Thom.$, and collates it with D throughout (pp. 11–12). He then employs a method which has been used by many critics, notably by H. Meusel in his treatise upon the chief authorities for Cicero's *Verrines* iv and v, viz. the Vatican palimpsest (V) and Paris. 7774 (R). This is to put together in one table all variants, not distinguishing between those of real importance and trivial errors which prove nothing: to add up the results, and to operate with the

figures thus obtained.   Peterson in his preface to the *Verrines* (p. xiii)
says of Meusel:

dum litterarum, syllabarum, verborum permutationes, additiones, omis-
siones quasi in trutina expendit, rem nimis ad calculos videtur revocasse.

Sanders thus discovers 'perfect agreement' between 𝔭 and *c.
Thom.* against *D* four times (p. 12), and later on says that these
agreements prove Ropes's contention that *c. Thom.* is regularly right
against *D*. I shall have something to say shortly about these sup-
posed agreements, but before doing so I venture to rearrange the
evidence according to another method.

(A) I take first the passages in which we have the evidence of
c. Thom. as well as that of *D* and 𝔭.

xix 1 *D* has :

> Θελοντος δε του παυλου
> κατα την ιδιαν βουλην
> πορευεσθαι εις ιεροσολυμα
> ειπεν αυτω το π̄να υποστρεφειν εις την ασιᾱ
> 5 διελθων δε τα ανωτερικα μερη
> ερχεται εις εφεσον.

C. Thom. agrees exactly with *D*, except that in στ. 4 it gives *converte
te* for ὑποστρέφειν. This may be a Syriacism, so I do not take it into
account.

𝔭, as supplemented by Sanders, has :—

> Θελοντ[ος δε]
> [του π]αυλου κατα τη[ν ιδιαν βου̅]λη[ν πορευ]
> [εσθα]ι εις ιεροσολυμα [ειπεν αυτω] το [π̄να]
> [υποστρ]εφειν εις τ[ην ασιαν διελθων δε τα]
> [ανωτ]ερικα μερ[η ε]ρχετα[ι εις εφεσον[και]

It will be noticed that with *D* it gives ὑποστρέφειν. In l. 1 Θελονι is
a trivial error for Θελοντ.

Γ, *cett.* give :—

> ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν Ἀπόλλω εἶναι ἐν Κορίνθῳ Παῦλον διελθόντα
> τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἔφεσον.

Here a tame abbreviation has taken the place of στ. 1–4, with a con-
sequential change of διελθών to διελθόντα.

v. 2 *D* has :—

οι δε προς αυτον αλλ ουδε π̄να αγιον λαμβανουσιν τινες ηκουσαμεν.

Here οὐδέ is a scribal error for οὐδ' εἰ.

c. Thom. has (sed neque si) accipiant aliqui (spiritum sanctum).

𝔭 has :

> [αλλ ου]δ᾽ ει πνα αγιον λαμβαν[ουσιν τι]νες η
> [κουσα]μεν

Sah. gives 'We heard not even that any one is wont to receive holy *spirit*' (Horner).

Γ. *cett.* have : ἀλλ᾽ οὐδ᾽ εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐστιν ἠκούσαμεν.

v. 14 *D* has :—

> εν οις και υιοι σκευα τινος ιερεως
> ηθελησαν το αυτο ποιησαι
> εθος ειχαν τους τοιουτους εξορκιζειν
> και εισελθοντες προς τον δαιμονιζομενο
> 5 ηρξαντο επικαλεισθαι το ονομα λεγοντες
> παραγγελλομεν σοι εν ιῆυ
> ον παυλος εξελθειν κηρυσσει
> τοτε απεκριθη το πνα το πονηρον ειπεν αυτοις.

In στ. 7 ἐξελθεῖν κηρύσσει is a scribal error for κηρ. ἐξ. Such inversions are common in all MSS, and *D* has other instances in the Acts.

The quotation from *c. Thom.* is as follows. I employ White's Latin, but for purposes of comparison arrange it in στίχοι like those of *D*.

> in quibus filii septem Scevae cuiusdam sacerdotis
> qui voluerunt id ipsum facere
> qui soliti erant adiurare super eos qui tales.
> et cum ingressi erant ad demoniacum
> 5 coeperunt invocare nomen dicentes
> praecipimus tibi per Iesum
> quem Paulus praedicat exeas.
> respondens autem spiritus ille malus dixit.

Sanders gives the reading of 𝔓 as follows :—

> εν οις και υ[ιοι]
> ϊο[υ]δαιου τινος αρχιερεως ηθ[ελη]
> σαν[το α]υτο ποιησαι εθος εχοντες [εξορκι]
> ζειν τους τοιουτους και εισελθο[ντες]
> 5 προς δαιμονιζομενον ηρξ[αντο επι]
> καλεισθαι το ονομα λεγοντες π[αραγγελ]
> λομεν σοι εν ιῆυ ον Παυλος ο [αποστο]
> λος κηρυσσει εξελθειν απο[κριθεν]
> δε το πνα το πονηρο[ν ειπεν αυτοις   ]

The reading of l. 2 is very uncertain. Sanders says that 'iota with the diaeresis is sure, and also omicron, of which one half is preserved'. He thinks that there was 'either a small place in the papyrus on which the scribe could not write, or else an error immediately crossed out, which took the space of two letters'. It is hard to believe that the papyrus did not contain Σκευᾶ with all other MSS, while ἑπτά, possibly

in the form ζ', may have come after υἱοί, as in *c. Thom.* In l. 5 the omission of τόν after πρός is a *proprius error* of no importance. There are some minor points which I reserve for the moment, so as not to confuse the argument.

Γ, *cett.* give :—

ἦσαν δέ τινος Σκευᾶ Ἰουδαίου ἀρχιερέως ἑπτὰ υἱοὶ τοῦτο ποιοῦντες· ἀπο-κριθὲν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.

They omit all the extra matter furnished by *D, c. Thom.,* 𝔭 (ἔθος . . . κηρύσσει), which occupies five στίχοι in *D.* At the beginning of the verse there are two notorious cruces in the reading of Γ, viz. the sons of Sceva are said to be seven in number, while in *v.* 16 ἀμφοτέρων is used of them, and Sceva is called a high priest, ἀρχιερεύς. It is impossible to explain the presence of a Jewish High-Priest at Ephesus. On the other hand the reading of *D* is free from all difficulties. The number of Sceva's sons is not stated, but it is to be inferred from ἀμφοτέρων.

The reading of *c. Thom.* has been given above. It will be seen that it agrees with Γ in reading ἑπτά and with *D* in reading ἱερέως. That this is so is clear, since in the lemma, taken from 𝔖ᵖʰ, White gives *principis sacerdotum* and in the quotation of Thomas *sacerdotis. D* and *c. Thom.,* therefore, agree in this most important variant. It is somewhat singular that Sanders on p. 12 assigns ἀρχιερέως to 'all' MSS except *D*, and on p. 16 definitely ascribes ἀρχιερέως to *c. Thom.* On p. 17 he also says : 'We may disregard the variant ἱερέως of cod. Bezae, as it is due to the influence of the Latin parallel *sacerdotis*'. That this is not so, is clear from its occurrence in the Syriac as well as in *D.*

The theory that ἱερέως in *D* is due to *sacerdotis* in the Latin (Λᵈ) was started by Zahn and adopted by Ropes, while Sanders states it as a fact. It is, therefore, well to point out that it is groundless.

It is indeed true that ἀρχιερεύς is sometimes rendered by *sacerdos* in Latin. Thus *sacerdos* occurs four times in Λᵏ of Evv., viz. Matt. ii 4 : Mark xiv 47 : xv 11, 31. As against this, Λᵏ has seventeen examples of *pontifex*, all in Mark, and one of *princeps* (without *sacerdotum*) in Mark xv 10. *Sacerdos* as = 'high-priest' or 'bishop' occurs not infrequently in Cyprian (so also *magnus sacerdos*), who used a text resembling that of Λᵏ. In the Palatinus (Λᵉ), a MS which has traces of affinity with Λᵏ, there are six examples of *sacerdos*, as against sixteen of *princeps sacerdotum* (+two of *principes et sacerdotes*), and eleven of *pontifex.* Apart from these cases, the use of *sacerdos* (= ἀρχιερεύς) is rare both in MSS and authors. The consecrated renderings are *princeps sacerdotum, pontifex* and *summus sacerdos.*

The renderings in Λ^d are as follows :—

{ princeps sacerdotum	Evv. 38 exx. : A. none	
{ princeps sacerdos	Evv. 3 exx. : A. none	
summus sacerdos	Evv. 18 exx. (all in Mark) : A. none	
pontifex	Evv. none : A. 7 exx. (also iv 6 pontificalis = ἀρχιερατικός).	

Sacerdos, without *summus*, is not found in Λ^d except in the sense of ἱερεύς. Zahn's theory therefore is perverse. *Sacerdotis* in Λ^d does not stand for ἀρχιερέως ; for this purpose *pontificis* would have been used. It is the normal rendering of ἱερέως in the Greek.

Before going further, I would state what I conceive to be the natural interpretation of these facts. This is that *D* preserves the *Z* reading in its pure form, while *c. Thom.* which otherwise agrees with it, viz. in giving ἐν οἷς for ἦσαν δε (Γ), in omitting 'Ιουδαίου (Γ), in reading ἱερέως for ἀρχιερέως (Γ), has incorporated in its text a single variant from Γ, viz. ἑπτά. I have elsewhere suggested [1] that ἑπτά owes its origin to a marginal note ζη, or ζτ (= ζήτει), indicating a corruption in the text—viz. the mention of a high priest at Ephesus—which was subsequently confused with ζ (= ἑπτά).

I now come to the papyrus. In the first place it has ἐν οἷς with *D, c. Thom.* In the next line, if Sanders' reconstruction is correct, which must be considered doubtful, it omits both ἑπτά with *D sol.* and Σκευᾶ which is found in all other MSS, and in place of them has 'Ιουδαίου with Γ (*om. D, c. Thom.*). His view is that 'Ιουδαίου was the original reading, and that Σκευᾶ 'came in as a gloss to 'Ιουδαίου, supplanting the latter in cod. Bezae and its relatives but uniting with it elsewhere'. To this I reply that Σκευᾶ cannot be a gloss. It supplies necessary information. On the other hand 'Ιουδαίου looks extremely like a gloss of the most ordinary kind, drawn from the context, viz. τῶν περιερχομένων 'Ιουδαίων ἐξορκιστῶν in the previous verse. If, therefore, the papyrus really has 'Ιουδαίου, it has incorporated a gloss from Γ, against *c. Thom.* as well as *D:* I say no more, since the reading of $\mathfrak{P}$ is so doubtful. On the other hand ἀρχιερέως with Γ, against *D, c. Thom.* is certainly the reading of $\mathfrak{P}$. I have already given my view of this variant.

In the sentence which follows, viz. ἔθος . . . ἐξελθεῖν, we are entirely dependent in *D, c. Thom.*, $\mathfrak{P}$, as the whole passage is omitted by Γ, *cett.* The most important variant in $\mathfrak{P}$ is the addition of ο[ἀποστο]λος after Παῦλος, where Sanders' supplement seems certain. It has, however, all the appearance of a gloss, and does not enhance the authority of $\mathfrak{P}$.

Sanders finds in 𝔓 four examples of what he calls 'perfect agreement' (p. 12) between 𝔓 and *c. Thom.* against *D*. Of these three occur in this sentence. One of them seems certain, viz. ἐξορκίζειν τοὺς τοιούτους 𝔓 as against τοὺς τοιούτους ἐξορκίζειν in *D*. White gives as the reading of *c. Thom.*, *adiurare super eos qui tales*. This, therefore, may be granted, though it is not an important variant. Another is not so certain, viz. for ἔθος εἶχαν (*D*) 𝔓 has ἔθος ἔχοντες. White renders the reading of *c. Thom.* as *qui soliti erant*, and Sanders says that this equals ἔθος ἔχοντες. It might, however, represent οἳ ἔθος εἶχον, or, in view of the fact that in the same sentence White gives *qui voluerunt* for ἠθέλησαν, might stand for ἔθος εἶχον with *D*. The third example is one which is quite valueless, viz. the inversion of κηρύσσει and ἐξελθεῖν in *D*, which is a *proprius error* and makes nonsense.

Sanders' fourth example is taken from *v.* 15, where we have the evidence of Γ as well as *c. Thom.* *D* here has :—τοτε απεκριθη το πνα το πονηρον ειπεν αυτοις. Γ gives ἀποκριθὲν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. Here *D* shews signs of conflation with Γ, i. e. καί was struck out before εἶπεν, as if ἀποκριθέν had preceded. The reading of *c. Thom.*, as given by White, coincides with that of Γ. It will be seen from the transcript that the papyrus is somewhat defective. It certainly has not got τότε, and it is very probable that Sanders' supplements are correct, in which case 𝔓 = *c. Thom.*, Γ. This, however, is a different case from those previously treated, owing to the entry of Γ into the problem. Generally speaking, when one member of *Z* has a reading agreeing with Γ, while another has one which disagrees with Γ, it is held that the agreement has been brought about by conflation with Γ. I am inclined to believe that there were two variants, viz. τότε ἀπεκρίθη . . . καὶ εἶπεν (*Z*) and ἀποκριθὲν δέ . . . εἶπεν (Γ). This then is a case where *c. Thom.* and 𝔓 have been corrected from Γ.

The only clear case, therefore, which I can find of 'perfect agreement' between 𝔓 and *c. Thom.* is the variant in collocation (ἐξορκίζειν τοὺς τοιούτους). I regard with some doubt that of ἔθος ἔχοντες. The other two seem to me beside the point.

(B) I now come to the portions of the papyrus for which no readings of *c. Thom.* are quoted. Here also I shall mention first the points which appear to be important.

(a) Agreements of 𝔓 with *D*, or *D*+ other representatives of *Z*.

xviii 27 εἰς τὴν ’Αχαΐαν *D*, δ, Λᵍ, 𝔖ᵖʰ : [. . .]θεῖν αχαϊα 𝔓 (?): *om.* Γ, *cett.* Aug.

πολὺ συνεβάλλετο *D*, Λᵍ, 𝔓, *Aug.* : συνεβ. πολύ Γ, *cett.* ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις *D*: *om.* Γ, *cett.* The papyrus is here very defective, but Sanders seems right in filling up the gap with ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλ.

The next variant, which is one of great importance, has been omitted by Sanders in his list (p. 11), viz.

D has πολυν συνεβαλλετο εν ταις εκκλησιαις

  ευτονως γαρ τοις ιουδαιοις διακατηλεγχετο

omitting the words τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν διὰ τῆς χάριτος (*om. διὰ τῆς χάριτος* 614, Λᵍ, *vg.*, 𝔖ᵖʰ, *Aug*), which occur in Γ, *cett.* after συνεβ. πολύ.

The omission of *D* is shared by 𝔭.

I do not on this account wish to reject the words omitted by *D*, 𝔭, since they have a genuine ring, and a dative seems to be required after συνεβάλλετο. As *D* frequently omits στίχοι, I prefer to think that a στίχος containing these words has dropped out of a common ancestor of *D*, 𝔭, arranged in στίχοι similar to those found in *D*, i. e. after ἐκκλησίαις.

28 διαλεγόμενος καί *D*, δ : διᾳ[λεγομεν]ος, without καί 𝔭 : *om.* Γ, *cett.*, *Aug.* (The omission of καί by 𝔭 is an insignificant error.)

xix 3 ἔλεγον *D*, 𝔭 : εἶπον (-αν) ΓΕδ : responderunt Λᵍ, *Hier.*

5 εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν *D*, δ, 𝔖ᵖʰ : [εις α]φεσιν αμαρτιων 𝔭 : *om. cett.*, *Petil. Hier. Ambr.* There can be no doubt that Sanders' supplement is correct.

6 εὐθέως ἐπέπεσεν *D*, *Hier.* : επε[πεσεν] 𝔭 : ἦλθεν Γ, *cett.*, *Petil. Cass.*

(*b*) Agreement of 𝔭 with δ, against *cett.* (*D*).

xix 13 ὁρκίζω] ἐξορκίζομεν δ, 𝔭 (*pluralem tuentur vg*ᵃ, 𝔖).

(*c*) Original contributions of 𝔭.

xviii 28 τὸν Ἰησοῦν εἶναι Χριστόν *D*, 𝔖, *Aug.* : εἶναι τὸν (*om.* τόν *E*) Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ΓΕδ : χρν [ειναι] ιην 𝔭.

Any one of these collocations is equally possible.

2 καὶ εὑρών τινας μαθήτας εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς *D* : καὶ εὑρεῖν τινας μαθήτας εἶπέν τε (ὁ δὲ εἶπεν) πρὸς αὐτούς Γ. Sanders ascribes to 𝔭 και [ειπεν τοι]ς μαθηταις. If so, it is clear that 𝔭 had a shorter reading than that found in other MSS. It is, however, very abrupt to say that St Paul spoke to the disciples in Ephesus, without first mentioning that he found disciples there. Either 𝔭 has left something out or has abbreviated the text.

After πιστεύσαντες 𝔭 has an addition which Sanders reads as το ιδιο [το]υ κυ εινα[ι]. He explains τὸ ἴδιον as meaning 'characteristic property or quality' and translates 'having believed that it is the characteristic quality of the Lord'. If this is really the reading of 𝔭, it is a surprising variant. A better sense would be produced if 𝔭 had τὸν υἱόν τοῦ θυ εἶναι, but even this addition would be suspicious, since πιστεύσαντες (= 'when ye believed') gives an excellent sense by itself.

3 ο δε παυλος προς αυ[του]ς 𝔭. The nearest approach to this is

εἶπέν τε (δέ) πρὸς αὐτούς 383, 𝔖ᵛᵍ, Sah., Hier.   The other readings are :
εἶπεν δὲ (τε) D B Λᵍ, Petil. : ὁ δὲ εἶπεν ℵAE : εἶπεν οὖν 614, 𝔖ᵖʰ.
None of them give ὁ Παῦλος, which has the appearance of a gloss.

12 ἀπὸ τοῦ χρωτὸς αὐτοῦ cett. (D) : 𝔭 omits αὐτοῦ.

13 ὃν Παῦλος κηρύσσει cett. (D) : ον [κηρυ]σσει ο παυλος 𝔭.

To these may be added an instance mentioned in a previous section
of this paper, viz. xix 14, where, in a passage omitted by Γ, 𝔭 inserts
ο [αποστο]λος after Παῦλος against D and c. Thom.

Sanders is not enthusiastic about the additions in 𝔭 and thinks them
'rather additions by an intelligent reader than survivals of the original
text'. He, however, considers them to be 'excellent illustrations' of
the way in which what he calls the 'Western paraphrase' arose. I agree
with his first remark, but disagree with the second, since I hold an
entirely different view of the Z text and its relation to that of Γ.

I have not included in these lists certain cases in which the supple-
ments adopted by Sanders seem to be insecure, viz.

xix. 5 Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ D : τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Γ.   Sanders
ascribes to 𝔭 του κ̄[υ ῑη̄ῡ του χριστου].   It is a grave objection that
Χριστοῦ has to be written in full in order to fill up the vacant space,
instead of the usual abbreviation (χ̄ρ̄υ).   I suspect that 𝔭 in addition to
χ̄ρ̄υ inserted ἡμῶν after κ̄ῡ[1].   It may be added that Χριστοῦ is here sup-
ported by δ, Λᵍ, 𝔖, Sah., as well as by D.   No MS adds ἡμῶν here,
but the word frequently occurs after κύριος, in some, or all, MSS.

6 καὶ ἐπιθέντος αὐτοῖς χεῖρα τοῦ Παύλου D, Λᵍ, vgᵃ, 𝔖vg, Petil. :
καὶ ἐπιθέντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ Π. χεῖρας Γ, cett.   Sanders ascribes to 𝔭 κ̣[αι επι-
θεντος αυτοις το]υ πα[υλου χειρα], remarking that enough is preserved to
shew that the order of the words is not that of D, but that 'the space
is exactly right for the singular χεῖρα' and that 'the addition of another
letter would crowd the space'.   I should hesitate to claim an agree-
ment with D on this evidence.

13 τινες ἐκ τῶν D, Λᵍ : τινες καὶ τῶν Γ, cett.   Sanders gives τινες
κ̣[αι εκ των περιερχομενω]ν as the reading of 𝔭 and says (p. 7) that 'this
is clearly the original out of which both the "Western" and the
common text arose by the omission of a single word'.   If the supple-
ment is correct, which I doubt, I should be disposed to say that in 𝔭
the two strains were conflated.

16 Sanders gives as the reading of 𝔭 :

[υ]μ̣[εις δε τινε]ς εσ̣[τε και εφαλομενος
[ο ανθρωπος ε]π ạ[υτους. . . .

He here adopts ἐφαλόμενος (Γ) in preference to ἐναλλόμενος (D) and

---

[1] Prof. Hunt has made the same suggestion, and I gather from him that it is
accepted by Sanders.

ἐφαλλόμενος (*E* δ). The difference between these variants consists of a single letter, which is not much to go upon when the text is so defective. In l. 2 *D* has εἰς αὐτούς, Γ δ ἐπ' αὐτούς, and *E* ἐπ' αὐτοῖς. If the π is certain in Ƥ, it supports Γ against *D*, but it remains uncertain, whether it had αὐτούς or αὐτοῖς.

There remain a few trivial variants connected with the use of the article, which are best taken together. I need hardly say that I attach no importance to them, as the MSS are capricious in such matters, and *D* is notoriously lax. The instances which I have noticed are xix 4 ὁ *D* : *om.* Γ *E* δ, Ƥ : 5 τοῦ (before Κυρίου) *cett.* Ƥ : *om. D* (so also in *v.* 13): 12 τά (before πονηρά) cett. Ƥ (so also in *v.* 13): *ib.* ὁ (before Παῦλος) Ƥ : *om. cett.*, 14 τόν (after πρός) *D* : *om.* Ƥ. To these may be added two doubtful cases, viz. xix. 7, where Sanders in his supplement, on grounds of space, ascribes to Ƥ the omission of τό before πνεῦμα, and 15, also in a supplement, where for the same reason he gives ιῆν for τον ιῆν as the reading of Ƥ.

I conclude with a few remarks upon the lost portion of Ƥ between xix. 6 ἐπ' αὐτούς and 12 ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας. Sanders points out that this would form part of the first page, and occupy sixteen lines of the papyrus. I do not doubt the accuracy of his conclusion, but his method of comparing the portions lost and preserved with lines in Ropes' edition is not very exact. In such a case I prefer to count the letters.

The figures which are yielded by his transcript of p. i (I exclude l. 21 as imperfect) are :

40, 38, 33, 33, 32, 32, 33, 34, 34, 38, 33, 34, 33, 31, 33, 34, 33, 32, 33, 34 = 677.

This gives an average of 34 letters to a line (34 × 20 = 680). In l. 1 I have taken the six dots at the beginning to represent letters, but the line is curiously long. Line 21, which is imperfect, requires 14 more letters to bring it up to the average. If Sanders is correct in supposing that 16 lines have perished, their contents should be 34 × 16 = 544 letters.

In Γ, allowing for abbreviations of *nomina sacra* ($\overline{\theta s}$, $\overline{\kappa s}$), the total number of letters between αὐτούς in *v.* 6 and ἐπί in *v.* 12 is 448. From this must be deducted 14 letters required to complete l. 21 after αὐτούς, so the total is reduced to 434. The differences between this and 544 is considerable.

D does not differ greatly from Γ, the only extra matter being :—

v. 8 + ὁ Παῦλος, with Λᵍ, Ᵹᵛᵍ : + ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλῃ, with *c. Thom.*

9 + αὐτῶν, with Λᵍ, Ᵹᵛᵍ : + τῶν ἐθνῶν τότε (*om.* τότε *E*), with *E*, Ᵹ : + ὁ Παῦλος, with Ᵹᵛᵍ : + τινος, with most authorities (*om.* Γ, *Sah.*) : + ἀπὸ ὥρας ε´ ἕως δεκάτης, with δ, Λᵍ, *vg*ᵃʷ, Ᵹᵖʰ, *Ambst.*

Allowing for *nomina sacra* the number of letters is 514, from which we have to deduct 14 on account of l. 21, i.e. we get a total of 500.[1] This still falls short of 544.

I now come to *c. Thom.*, which in *v.* 6 has a famous variant. Γ *cett.*, including *D* and $\mathfrak{S}$ph, give ἐλάλουν δὲ γλώσσαις καὶ ἐπροφήτευον. The reading of *c. Thom.* is given in White's edition as :

Et loquebantur linguis aliis et sentiebant in se ipsis quod et inter-pretarentur illas illi ipsi; quidam autem prophetabant. The extra matter after γλώσσαις represents :—

ἑτέραις καὶ ἐπεγίνωσκον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὥστε καὶ ἑρμηνεύειν αὐτὰς ἑαυτοῖς· τινὲς δέ (= 66 letters).

Λp has above the line and out of place, viz. after ἐπροφήτευον *ita ut ipsi sibi interpretarentur*. This represents ὥστε καὶ ἑρμ. αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς (= 30 letters), omitting the other additions given by *c. Thom.* The same variant is found in several Vulgate MSS, which have incorporated readings from *Z.* Ephrem's words in *Cat.*arm. 'they spoke with tongues and interpreted of themselves' may be quoted in connexion with this shorter reading. It is easy to see how, if an ancestor written in στίχοι had :

<div style="text-align:center">

και επεγινωσκον εν εαυτοις

ωστε και ερμηνευειν αυτας εαυτοις

</div>

one of the στίχοι might drop out.

If we credit $\mathfrak{P}$ with the whole of the extra matter given by *c. Thom.* in *v.* 6 we get a total of 500 + 66 = 566, which is near enough to 544 to make it probable that $\mathfrak{P}$ had here something like the reading of *c. Thom.* If so, this is an important agreement between $\mathfrak{P}$ and *c. Thom.* against *D*, which has been brought into conformity with Γ.

There is a curious circumstance which I mention with all reserve, viz. that if $\mathfrak{P}$ omitted the words καὶ ἐπεγίνωσκον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (23 letters) for which there is no Latin evidence (*cf. Ephrem*), otherwise reading with *c. Thom.*, the total becomes 500 + 43 = 543, which may be de-scribed as absolute agreement with the desired number 544. This, of course, is merely a suggestion, as so much is uncertain.

<div style="text-align:right">ALBERT C. CLARK.</div>

---

[1] In this calculation I treat γ̄ in *v.* 8 (τρεῖς Γ) and ε̄ (= πέμπτης) in *v.* 9 as single letters.