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## THE NEW CODEX "W."

When we pass quire 1 at John $\nabla .12$, we come back to quite a different recension, agreeing in the main with the character visible in the rest of the work. For, after eliminating " Greek" readings, we pick up e several times, also Coptic, and twice the cursive 28 (in two chapters).

There is again most distinct and unmistakeable Latin retranslation.

Observe the details:-
Jo. v. 15. $+\delta \epsilon b f q r$ fossat syr ( + ov D , etc., copt) [non sah].
Ibid. $+\kappa a \iota \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon \nu$ avtoıs. New thus and a conflate, but arising out of the ${ }^{-} \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon \nu$ for av$\eta \gamma \gamma \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon$ of $a$ eqboh syr and Gk. N CL and few curs.
16. $+\tau \omega$ (ante $\sigma a \beta \beta a \tau \omega$ ). 237, 251, 264 (copt), is no doubt due to retransl. from Latin. [The addition of articles is just as much a sign of translation as is their omission.] In hardly any case in the section examined does it come from syr. Sah is II CABBATON.
18. aтоктєьขa oı covסaloı. change of order with Greek 107 and Ambrose only
19. - rt. 245, 511 s ad eqTert.

Ibid. ○ (pro a). Epiph Hil Ambr only (cf. sah); oย 17; ámєp Didym.
20. $\delta \in \iota \xi \eta$ (pro $\delta \in \iota \xi \in \iota$ ), 511, $513 q$ (ostendet); ostendit $e$; $\delta \in \iota \kappa \nu v \sigma \iota \nu ~ D ~ 28 ; ~ d e m o n-~$ stravit Latt.
21. rous veкpous eyelpel o $\overline{\pi \eta \rho}$. Change of order for which no Latins vouch nor Greeks. o тaтทр, however, is omitted by a few;
and Tert in an exceptionally long quotation; hence perhaps this order change.
 bably ex copt.
จ. 36. $\mu a \rho \tau v \rho o v \sigma \iota \nu$ (рro $\mu a \rho \tau v \rho \epsilon \iota$ ). No Greeks at all, but $q$ exactly, " testificantur " (copt) ; $a=$ " test. dicunt," $e$, " test. sunt," $b f_{2} r$, etc., Tert = " test. perhibent," all in the plural.
37. - autov sec. No Greeks, syr, or copt, but br* and $r_{2}$ of the Latins, Ath., and they alone.
vi. 2. $\theta \in \omega \rho o \nu \nu \tau \epsilon \mathrm{~s}$. Chrys. Nonn. (Retransl. from the " qu. videbant" of all Latt.) See 131 and Scholz' note.
16. - o८ $\mu a \theta \eta \tau a \iota ~ a v \tau o v . ~ N o ~ s u p p o r t . ~(S e e ~$ change or order, syr.)
28. aut (pro троs avtov). No Greek support. Either ex copt or a clear case of retransl. from Latins, who all agree in ad eum.
44. $+\pi \rho o s \mu \epsilon$ (ante кає єy $\boldsymbol{c}$ ). So only e boh [not sah], but with Hil, Ambr, Hier, Vigil. Clearly illegitimate.
46. aủtos (pro oútos), 71. All Latins "hic." Clearly retransl. from Latt (or syr or copt).
53. - $\mu \eta$, but this is * and is corrected. Cf. sah (299 tis pro $\mu \eta$ ).
58. tov aptov tovtov. Order supported by the Latins eq only; but brgive the order with the expression "carnem meum," while $a c v g$ write merely " me."
Ibid. $\zeta \eta \sigma \eta$ (pro $\zeta \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota) . A l . \quad \zeta_{\eta \sigma \in \iota}$; vivet $a c e f_{2}$ $q$ rvg.
60. - єбт८v. No support apparently, yet I seem to recollect some one who doen this.
62. ei $\delta \eta \tau a \iota$ (pro $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \eta \tau \epsilon$ ). Only 28 i $\delta \eta \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{e}$ (cf. copt). Epiph Eus. cf. lat.
vii. 3. +кal (-ovv). Syr. Non copt ( $=O T N$ ), non sah $=\sigma \epsilon=o \nu \nu$ (one sah MS. 73 = $\delta \epsilon$ ). But $48=\delta \epsilon$ with Latt and vg autem.
6. ov $\delta \in \pi \omega$ (pro out $\omega$ ). No support. Clear retransl. All Latins nondum, but $\mathrm{Z}^{*}$ and $v g$ necdum.
17. $\left.\begin{array}{l}-\theta \epsilon \lambda \eta . \\ \pi o \iota \eta \text { (pro } \pi o \iota \epsilon \iota \nu) .\end{array}\right\} 254$ only (and boh ut vid.)
28. - кa८ (ante $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu$ ). Of Greeks 28 only, but $a f_{2}$ aur with sah and eight boh MSS. against Horner's text.
 o $\chi^{\lambda o v}$ ). Impossible order, but ouv vouched for by $27,28,42,299,507$, and order of most Latins. ( 28 joins a small Greek group as 507, 517, 570, with the order.) [See other sympathy with 299, vi. 53.]
39. є $\lambda a \mu \beta a \nu \circ \nu$ (pro $є \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda o \nu \lambda a \mu \beta a \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ ). So defvg Cypr Vigil. A few Greeks omit $\epsilon \mu \in \lambda \lambda o \nu$ with some Latins, but only the above go wholly with Freer.
45. + av (post $\epsilon \iota \pi \sigma \nu$ ). Cf. copt.
46. + avtols (post a $\pi \epsilon \kappa \rho$ ). Evan 892, Evst 234
(c) foss and syr only. ( $+\pi \rho o s$ tous $a \rho \chi$. $\kappa a \iota$ фар. post vтŋрєта८, 69).
But we must pass to the other Gospels.

## St. Matthew.

In St. Matthew is to be observed the same Coptic or Sahidic influence as in the other Gospels from copying a diglot copt-gr. It seems to me a shade more boh than sah
here, but not very much. Just about what one would expect after going over the rest, for I took Matthew after Mark.

But I pick up $k$ distinctly in Matthew more than the other Latins thus:-

Matt. * ix. 9. Vocabatur $k$. All other Latins have nomine, as copt and syr. This is important for it does away with what might be an error of homoiotel in $W$ in another place, viz. :
vi. 20. - ov $\delta_{\epsilon} e \lambda \epsilon \pi \pi o v \sigma \iota \nu$, for $k$ also omits. So that the parent of $i \mathrm{~W}$ and not the scribe is responsible. Again :
xii. 48. - $\epsilon \iota \sigma \iota \nu$ Evan, 440 ; Evst, 259. c $k$ Tert bis and boh (2 MSS.) not sah. Truly " African," but very early African, before Cypr. Now to show that vocabatur comes straight from an early Latin observe-
ix. 15. $a \phi \epsilon \rho \eta \theta \eta$ ( $p r o a \pi a \rho \theta \eta$ ). W only ( 28 wanting). All the Latins have auferetur, which was basic. d, however, reads tollatur over against D 1, 25, 71, 273, Evst, 222, ap $\theta_{\eta}$; Tert alluding, " ablatus est" twice (copt and sah use different words).
$k$ ends at xiv. Testing beyond in e I do not find particular sympathy (as in Mark). Probably $k$ might show $+\epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$ xiv. 30, or фayect xv. 32 ( $e q$ ).
$r_{2}$ is missing also xiv. 1-xvi. 13, but testing beyond, I find-
 all Greeks т $\eta \nu \pi o \nu \eta \rho \iota a \nu$, and all the Latins have the abl. abs. except vg.

[^0]T. And $r_{2}$ is nearest with cognoscens

Again :
xxvi. 49. W reads alone $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \eta \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu \kappa a \iota$ for $\epsilon \lambda \theta \omega \nu$. Only ${ }^{-} r_{2} a$ and syr read thus, accessit . . et. No other Latins. Sah and copt have " came," but no ral.
Note also Matthew xii. 48. - $\tau \omega$ єıाovi九 avt $\mathrm{X}^{\sigma}$. Dimma $E^{\text {uat }}$ a notable conjunction with $\mathrm{W}^{\text {or. }}$. (hiat $r_{2}$ ).

Testing Luke I find no $e$ in the unique readings of the first three chapters, but observe $b c e$ at i. 65.

It is in St. Mark that $e$ comes out so very strong, where available.

In St. Matthew, then, we have more of the $k-r_{2}$ base.
In St. Mark $e$ is dominant in the first four chapters, followed by $c$ and $k$, and beyond chap. viii. $k$ comes in strong.

In St. Luke there is distinct Latin and Coptic running, as before, upon the surface.

St. Luke must be considered more deeply and throughout in the light of ii. 7, iii. 7, iii. 24-38. But $e$ does not seem to be at all the base here, nor $c$ particularly, and we must press on to consider St. Mark.

## St. Mark.

Here we are face to face with something very strange and very significant. Mr. Sanders goes so far as to say (p. 139), "Certainly some one had to send to North Africa for the beginning of Mark, and the Hesychian recension, which should have been the favourite one in Egypt at this time, seems to have been in large part inaccessible." See also remarks on p. 67.

This is not the way I should put it, for a similar Latin text like $e$ (which is that to which he refers) underlies parts of the Greek MS. N, and that in Gospels other than that of S. Mark.

It seems more likely that the text of $e$ was in Egypt already for a long while (having come viá Carthage), and that for the reason that $W$ does not only show us $e$, but also $c$ (and $c$ we know is closely and sometimes alone allied to aethiopic readings) and also $b$ (as well as $\mathrm{D} d$ ), and beyond all this the common base of $b c e$ and sometimes of $b c d e$. Of these, $b$ never left Italy. How account for it all?

This seems to be the history of it. $d$ represents a Roman base if not the original text, at any rate with $b$ [apart from a few cases of harmonisation] a base as old as we can get, $b$ sometimes controlling later revision in $d$. The $b d$ base went to Latin Africa very early, and there was modified to $e$. Adding the glosses of $c$, we find this $b d c e$ Latin text reappearing in Greek Egypt in Greek dress in the MS. W with and apart from D.

The hardest thing to explain is that after the fifth chapter of St. Mark, W rather drifts away from both $e$ and $D d$, while sometimes retaining sympathy with them.

Here is the overlying Coptic influence to begin with :Mark i. 6. $+\boldsymbol{\eta \nu}$ (ante a८б $\theta \omega \nu$ ), 514 ( $\nabla^{\mathrm{gcr}}$ ) and boh. (Mr. Sanders does not notice this.)
Then note-
i. 20. $\mu \epsilon \tau a \tau \omega \nu \mu \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \omega \nu \epsilon \nu \tau \omega \pi \lambda \circ \iota \omega$. New order with syr $\sin , \epsilon \in \nu \tau \omega \pi \lambda o \omega \omega$ being added. Note that $b$ omits $\epsilon \nu \tau \omega \pi \lambda_{0} \omega \omega$ with syr pesh [mut. sah, but boh agrees with the usual order].
(Mr. Sanders gives four other examples of $W$ with $s y r \sin$ in the first four chapters.
Next we plunge into the Latinbase ( $e$ only begins at i. $21^{*}$ ).
i. 25. $+\kappa a \iota \epsilon \iota \pi \epsilon \nu$ b c e syr [non boh $=\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu$, mut. sah].

[^1]26. - то акаӨaртоv ет.
$\kappa a \iota a \pi \eta \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$ (pro $\epsilon \xi \eta \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$ ). No Greeks, but so exactly $e$ and $f r$.
27. єӨavرa\}ov (pro є $\theta a \mu \beta \eta \sigma a v$ ). So the Latins, and evidently Greek retranslation. Here $e$ conflates with both.
Ibid. Instead of the usual texts (the Greeks vary),
 oıa⿱宀тıкך aurov. Cf. e quænam esset doctrina haec inpotentabilis. W e alone together thus.
31. avtc (pro avtovs), e and d [contra Der].

for adprehensa, but here $e$ has tenens.
37. - ка८ єข $\rho o \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$ avtov $b c$.

- оть се.
 predicare ( -ut et ibi).

39.     - кає $\tau a \delta a \iota \mu о \nu \iota a \epsilon \kappa \beta a \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$. Alone.

* 42.         - кає єкаөє $ө \iota \sigma \theta \eta$. b с е.
* 43. Om. vers. cum b c (e om. кац $\epsilon \mu \beta \rho$. avт $\epsilon \in \theta v \varsigma)$.
ii. 1. - $\delta c^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \omega v$. No Latins but Evg, yet omitted by $E v .245$ and nINe Greek lectionaries.
So having established the deep and old Latin base above in the first chapter, including very ancient retranslation and reflex action by Latin on Greek, we now see the Greek lectionaries omitting this, which is a pure lectionary omission, and due to nothing else. This not only carries our Greek lectionary use very far back, but shows the lectionaries were Graeco-Latin. $\dagger$

[^2]Following this in the next verse we have a beautiful illustration of how old our text is, for at
Mark ii. 3. we add ıסov avסpes with Evan $282^{\text {pe }}$ alone and $s a h$.
Now if this were an omission we could not as safely deduce certain facts. But, being an addition, we see clearly now how old a text we have in 28, which I have tried to point out before. So that concurrently with our old Græco-CopticLatin base, and lectionary use,'we point to the Græco-Syriac intertwined with it all. (Syr sin is wanting here.)

Note further as regards sah-
 avtov), fam. 13, and saH only. (Ex Luc viii. 53.)

Next consider ii. 3, which is interesting. Instead of

 $\tau \epsilon \sigma \sigma a \rho \omega \nu$, we have $\kappa a \iota \downarrow \delta o v a \nu \delta \rho \epsilon \varsigma \epsilon \rho \chi$ оעтal
 таралитькоv.
$b=$ et veniunt ad illum ferentes paralyticum in grabatto.
$c=$ Venerunt autem ad eum portantes in lecto paralyticum.
$e=$ et venerunt ad illum portantes in grabatto paralyticum.
$f=$ et venerunt ad eum portantes in grabato paralyticum inter quatuor
(while $d$ is like the rest : et venerunt ad eum. adferentes paralyticum qui a quattuor portabatur).

Nearest in order to $W$ are $e$ and $c$ (but $c$ uses lecto); ßaбтaYodtes = clearly portantes of cef(against berentes), but this word is,made to serve for both $\phi \in \rho o v \tau e s$ and alpo $\nu \pi о$ тєббараш. $f$ using portantes but once retains alone of the four Latins named inter quatuor (uto $\tau \epsilon \sigma \sigma a \rho \omega v)$. We go then with $c e(b)$ against all else. But we supply $\iota \delta o v a v \delta \rho \in \varsigma$
with 28 and $s a h$, yet 28 and $s a h$ retain the common Greek and Latin longer version of the verse!

All this Mr. Sanders can only hint at in his notes. We must work it out for ourselves.* It shows first that W 28, $2^{p e}$ did not influence the Latin of $b c ; e$, for where is the $i \delta o v$ $a v \delta \rho \epsilon s$ ? It shows that $b c e$ did influence W and chiefly $e$ here.
Mark ii. 3. т $\quad 0 \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon \iota \nu$ (pro тробє $\gamma \gamma \iota \sigma a l$ ). Cf. accedere $i t$, but offerre $v g$.
Ibid. aто тov ox $\lambda \circ 0$ (pro $\delta \iota a$ тov o $\chi \lambda o \nu$ with D (præ turba latt).
8. - $\epsilon \nu$ єautots $c$ e.
$\dagger$ 11. - бoc 入eva. Eivst 259 (yscr) e.
12. $\theta a \nu \mu a \xi \epsilon \iota \nu$ autovs (pro є $\xi \iota \sigma \tau a \sigma \theta a \iota$ тaעtas). No Greeks support. Cf. ut admirarentur ( - тavtas) $e$; ut adm. turbae $c$; ut mirantes ( $-\pi a \nu \tau a s$ ) $b$.
17. $\epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda \nu \theta_{\epsilon \iota}$ (pro $\left.\eta \lambda \theta o v\right)$. Not e. An old error of $\eta \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$ come back viâ.?
But we must hurry on. The strongest agreement continues in chapters iii.-iv. between W and $e$ and W and $b c e$. In $v .3$ we pick up $r_{2}$ poterant with $W$ alone $\epsilon \delta v v a y \tau o$ for e $\delta$ vvaro. But I wish to exhibit one more place in full at iv. $1 . \ddagger$


* P. 67, Mr. Sanders says : "Does W represent the original Greek from which the N. African translation was made, or is it a retranslation from the N. African Latin or can we find an intermediate explanation?" The explanation seems to be that it is a basic Latin of $b c e$ conjoined = Italy and N. Africa, being translated into Greek in Egypt. See iv. 1.
$\dagger \mathrm{Mr}$. Sanders does not chronicle this.
$\ddagger$ On p. 66 Mr . Sanders exhibits this but partially and the true picture does not appear.

W. $\quad$ кal $\pi a s \circ$ ox $\lambda o s$ ev $\tau \omega$ acyıa $\omega \quad \eta \nu$.

This is sheer, clear retranslation from ad litus of $b e$ (proxime litus $c f_{2}$, circa litus maris $a$, super mare $q$, circa mare $d$. and Dgr $\pi \epsilon \rho a \nu \tau \eta s \theta a \lambda a \sigma \sigma \eta s)$; and secondly, in litore of $b c$ $e f f_{2} r$ (circa mare $a d l q$ ). And this took place in Greek Egypt, among Coptic surroundings about A.D. 350, or perhaps much earlier.

After chapter $\nabla$. we drift from $e$ and $e$ ceases at vi. 9.
Between chapters vi. and viii. observe-
Mark vi. 13. є $\xi \in \pi \epsilon \mu \pi о \nu$ pro $\epsilon \xi \in \beta a \lambda \lambda \frac{1}{}$ alone. Translation of some kind probably influenced by the Coptic, which has a variety of words to express emittere and ejicere.
vi. 29. кฑঠєvбaє pro кає $\eta \rho a \nu . W$ and 28 only.
vii. 3. $\pi \cup \kappa \nu a$ pro $\pi 兀 \gamma \mu \eta$. $W$ joins $N$ alone of Greek uncials for this reading. See evidence in my edition of the Morgan Gospels, p. lviii. Here $b$ has subinde alone of the Latins.
6. arata (pro тıцa). W with $\mathrm{D}^{\text {er }} a b c$ (contra $d$ honorat). In St. Matthew it is rima, but Clem. Alex., quoting five times, exhibits $\tau \iota \mu a$ but twice, giving araтcuv $\frac{2}{5}$ and $\phi i \lambda o v \sigma \iota \frac{1}{5}$.
9. $\sigma \tau \eta \sigma \eta \tau a \iota(p r o ~ \tau \eta \rho \eta \sigma \eta \tau \epsilon) . \mathrm{W}$ with $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{Er}} 1,28$, $2^{\text {pe }}$ (Cronin) and itala.
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { 10. aधєт } \omega \nu \text { (pro какодоушу) } \\ \text { 19. } \delta \iota a \nu о \iota a \nu \text { (pro карঠсаע) }\end{array}\right\} \mathrm{W}$ alone.
13. тоע $\lambda$ оуov $\tau \eta \nu$ evto $\eta \eta$. $W$ alone, for тоע $\lambda o y o v$, but fam 1 substitutes $\tau \eta \nu$ єขтo $\lambda \eta \nu$. A curious old conflation of W.

Passing to the eighth chapter, where $k$ is available and $e$ is wanting, notice-
Mark viii. 2. + avt $\omega \nu$ post exovtcu. D and $2^{\text {pe }}$ only (not mentioned by the editor in his selected list of readings).
10. $\pi \rho \circ$ то тороs (pro єıs $\tau a \mu \epsilon \rho \eta$ ) $=28$ syr $\sin$ (complicated by $\mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{gr}} \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{sr}}$ ), N ets ta op $\eta$, D eıs ta opıa.
11. $a \pi^{\prime}\left(\right.$ pro $\left.\pi a \rho^{\prime}\right)=$ copt or lat.
 order, not lat.
20. - $\kappa \lambda a \sigma \mu a \tau \omega \nu$. (346) $k$ and 1 boh MS. and Horner's translation, but not his text nor sah (which omits "full" 1 of 4 MSS. only).
23. єעाтtvaas (pro $\pi \tau v \sigma a s)$. Cf. lat.
25. таvтa т т入avyos. syr sin pesh $f$. [non Goth]. Cf. sah.
34. - avtocs. D $\mathbf{D X}$ itpl.
38. - 入oyovs. $k$ sah and $v q^{D}$.
ix. 6. $\lambda a \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$. (syr sin).
11. $\tau \iota$ ovv (pro oт८). c.
18. $\eta \delta \nu \nu \eta \theta \eta \sigma a \nu(p r o ~ \iota \sigma \chi \nu \sigma a \nu) . ~ 604$ (latt).
24. то $\overline{\pi \nu a}$ (pro o $\pi a \tau \eta \rho$ ). Possible error from copt, or sah rather: $\pi \iota \omega \tau$ for Father.
25. $\sigma v \nu \tau \rho \in \chi \in$. 511. Ex lat ? Dropping emı perforce.
27. - кal avє $\sigma \tau \eta$. $k$ and syr pesh (syr sin omits, but substitutes " and he delivered him to his father'").
31. $\lambda e \gamma \in \iota$ (pro eגeyєv). Cf. $k$ dicens $=s a h$.
36. - $\epsilon v . \quad$ Cf. $k:$ immedio sic.
x. 8. ouк (pro очкетı). Evan 71, Evst 222, $k$ and d (contra $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{F}}$ ) and ff , with DL vulgates.
14. twv oupaval (pro tov $\theta \epsilon o v$ ). Again from proximity of boh " kingdom " $\mu \in \tau о \cup p o-$ or confusion of sah words for God and Heaven.
26. $\delta v \nu \eta \sigma \epsilon \tau a l$. Cf. $k$ poterit with $a b$ and $d$ (contra $\mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{sr}}$ ).
32. $+\operatorname{av\tau \omega }$ (fam 13). $k c f$ and vulgates G X* with sah.
33. - autov $\sec c r_{2}$.

Mark x. 45. $\lambda_{\text {out }}$ (pov (pro $\lambda \nu \tau \rho o \nu$ ). Cf. $k=$ prolium (that is: "profluvium"?) for redemptionem. Absolutely alone of Greeks and Latins.
46. - Baptımalos. Cf. $k$, who gives this verse in very condensed form.
49. - avt $\omega$. $\boldsymbol{c} k$.
xi. 2. - $\nu \mu \omega \nu . ~ N k$.
12. $\epsilon \iota$ B $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\eta} \theta a v \iota a \nu . r_{2}$ and boh ( 6 MSS.) syr pesh (1).
14. $\eta \kappa a v \sigma a \nu$ (pro $\boldsymbol{\eta} \kappa o v o \nu) . ~ C f ~ k ; ~ a u d i e r u n t . ~$ Other Latins, audiebant.
29. $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \omega \tau \omega$ (pro eтєрळт $\eta \sigma \omega$ ). Cf. $k$ with $a b c f f_{2} i$ : interrogo and $M$ of vulgates.
Ibid. tıvı (pro moıa). Clear retransl. [in qua latt ; cf. copt].
хii. 3. + каı aiteктıval (post e $\delta \epsilon \iota \rho a \nu$ ). 346 [non 13-69-124]. (Cf. $k$ occiderunt pro ceciderunt.)
6. - $-\operatorname{\tau \tau }$ ovv $2^{\text {pe }} c k$.
26. aveүעшкатє (pro avєүvштє). Retransl.
30. - єvто入ך. 28, $2^{\text {pe }} k$ Eus ${ }^{\text {wicell. }}$.
31. + oнows. Cf. $k$ "seounda similis"; al. "secundum simile vel similem."
33. - tav prim. Ex lat.
34. + oть (ante ov $\mu a \kappa \rho a v$ ). $157,2^{\mathrm{pe}}=$ copt.
38. + tals (ante $\sigma \tau 0 \lambda a t s$ ). Retransl.
44. - тavta oбa єlגev. Cf. $k$ om. odov or $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{a}$.
So much for $k$; now observe other features -
Mark xiii. 8. - yap. 245, 247, Evst 259, sah, Aug and other Fathers ( 245 is deeply Latin).
Ibid. - a $\quad$ Х $a \iota \omega \delta \iota \nu \omega \nu$ таутa. $c$.
12. aעaбтךбоעтa८ (pro єтavaбт.). Retransl.
16. та ıцатıa. 61, 435. Retransl. (syr. 61 indeterminate).
17. - taıs sec. Retransl. "Pregn. et nutrientibus."
20. - кupıos. 435 again, 513, Evst 259, with syr sin. No Latin ut vid.
$22+\pi o \lambda \lambda o \iota . ~ S a h$ alone (3 out of 5 MSS. (Again this "overlying" Egyptian influence from error oculi in copying the diglot, probably in third century.)
Mark xiii. 22. $\pi \lambda a \nu a \nu$ (pro amoтлavav). 124 [non 13-69346], 234,* 299 (which sympathizes elsewhere), while $28=\pi \lambda a v \eta \sigma a \iota$, and 512 $=a \pi о \pi \lambda a \nu \eta \sigma a \iota$. Thus we trace three Greek lines of transmission. $k$ Cypr $=$ "errorem faciendum" against the others' "seducendos"; and "evertandos," Tert; " seducendum" acff .
25. -at sec. Latt.
 alone, against all others, and against the parallel in Matthew ( $\epsilon \pi \iota \sigma v \nu a \xi o v \sigma \iota$ FLM al decem arm aeth (colligent $e$, congregabunt $\mathbf{Q} g_{2}$ for congregabit most and colligit $k$ ).
xiv. 5. - touto. Nk syr.
6. котоу. Confused, but cf. $k$ "illic aedium facitis."
10. - avtoıs. acd ff $i k$ Orig. Drr 28, 91, $299,2^{\text {pe }}$ syr $\sin$. Perhaps originally from Lat. commencement of verse 11. "Ad illi." See $i d$.
13. + $\epsilon \iota \epsilon \lambda \theta o \nu \tau \omega \nu \nu \mu \omega \nu$. $s a \hbar$ (cf. 13-69-124346, 28, 91, 299, $2^{\text {pe }}$ ).
14. - кaı. prim, sah lect. $\mathrm{m}^{1}$ and $f_{2}$. (Cf. $f_{2}$ and W in John.)
16. + єтоццабаı (post є $\xi \eta \lambda \theta o v$ ). 28, 124, [non 13-69-346], 299 (d) and sah (3 MSS. out of 4 ).
18. $\mu е \pi а р а \delta \omega \sigma e \iota . ~ C f . ~ b o h ~[n o n ~ s a h] . ~$
22. - avtшv. Ex Latt. Only $k$, however, suppresses illis, saying "et dum manducant." Cf. syr retaining illi.
Ibid. - є $\sigma \tau \iota v$. Syr. (Cf. copt.)
23. toıs $\mu \mathrm{A} \mathrm{\theta}_{\boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \mathrm{L}}$ (pro aytoıs). New ex Matt. Cf. 69, 235, in ver. 22.
27. $\sigma \kappa о \rho \pi \iota \sigma Ө \eta \sigma е \tau а \iota ~(р г о ~ \delta \iota а \sigma к о р \pi.) . ~ R e t r a n s l . ~$
28. + єк עєкрау. New ut vid., but cf. syr elsewhere.
30. apı $\quad$ O . Orig. Retransl. (order B 346).
31. + oтı. copt, 13-69-124-346. See c "quod."
41. ı $\delta o v-$ кal. Matter of order. $+\tau e \lambda o s$ Latt: Sah syr. order with lat and pesh (syr sin gives re入os after $\omega \rho a$ with $q$ ).
47. таребт $\omega \tau \omega \nu$. Retransl.
56. - кa८ . . . $\eta \sigma a v . ~ 435,440,511$ (see above with 435 in thirteenth chapter.
57. - кaı tıves . . . avtov. 435, 440, 511.
 ov $\delta \boldsymbol{\iota}$ атокрьข 28.
Ibid. oтı (pro тi). $\mathrm{B}^{\text {er }} \Psi$ [non L] (тос 346), de his $k$ or ad ea some Latt.

Ibid. єv 58, both retranslations, one early and one late. All Latins benedicti.
62. $\tau \eta \varsigma \delta \nu v a \mu \epsilon \omega s$ (pro $\tau \omega \nu \nu \epsilon \phi \in \lambda \omega \nu$ ). Possible copt or sahid confusion or from Greek line above or from Syr.
64. $\phi$ аıvєтa८ $v \mu \iota v$. Copt; and sah syr order but - oкı'copt for фаıvetal, as D 28, Evst 150 סокєь (videtur $d$ ).
xv. 1. + autov. copt sah and syrr and Diatess, with 157, 15-69-346-556 [non 124]. This looks basic, but Latt are without it, not even $\mathrm{D}^{\text {sr }} d$. ( + auta 511).
4. $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{0} \boldsymbol{v}$ moбa. New. Confusion of eye in copt, 7. Bapvaßas. $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { (Cf. 69* Z*lat. in Matt. xxvii. } \\ 16,17 . \text { Bapaßas } 511 \text { al. } \\ \text { pauc. and Bapaßav verse } 11 \\ \text { by[69. One sah MS. in Luke } \\ \text { Bapvaßas. }\end{array}\right.$
11. Bapvaßav.

Leaf lost between xv. 11-39.

41. $\delta \iota \eta \kappa о \nu о \nu \sigma a \nu$ (рго $\delta \iota \eta \kappa о \nu о \nu \nu$ ). (28: $\delta \iota а к о \nu \eta \sigma a \iota$ avta ministrabant latt, ministrant $q$.
 222 sem.
40. + $\epsilon \nu \theta \epsilon \omega \rho \eta \nu \in \gamma \kappa \epsilon \nu$ (post $\sigma \iota \nu \delta o \nu a$ ). Cf. copt $s y r-\epsilon \nu \theta \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}$.
xvi. 1. è é $\sigma \in \lambda$ Oovoal. (om. ıva e $\lambda$ Өovacal cd $f_{2}$ ).
5. $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho o v \sigma \iota \nu$ (pro $\epsilon \iota \delta o v$ ). Late. Half of a bohairic conflation; see Horner's notes. [mut sah.]

Ibid. + aytov eбtıv. ksyr + illius, $c f_{2} q+$ ejus, + autov D (hiat d).
7. $\pi \rho o a \gamma \omega$ (pro т $\quad$ оarধє $)$. $\mathrm{D} k$ (hiat d).
8. + aкоvбaбaı $\epsilon \xi \eta \lambda \theta o \nu$
$\left.\begin{array}{c}\kappa \alpha_{\iota} \\ (\text { pro } \epsilon \xi \in \lambda \theta \text { ovaaı). }\end{array}\right\} \operatorname{syrr}$ sah [non latt]

15. $+a \lambda \lambda a$ (following the long addition) $+\Delta E$ copt ,
One word more as to the opening of St. Luke.
Testing at the beginning of St. Luke, we obtain different results, but they are interesting as far as they go.

Luke i. 5. $A \beta \iota \lambda$ (pro $A \beta \iota a$ ), perhaps from immediate proximity of $\epsilon \beta$ o $\lambda$ in copt in line above, or from $\epsilon \beta 0 \lambda$ in sah in line below.
5. $a v \tau \eta$ (pro avt $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ ). 300.
45. ка८ $\eta$ карঠьа (pro кає $\mu а к а р \iota a) ~ i n i t . ~ v e r s . ~$ Clearly from sah. $\quad S a h$ ends verse 44 with $\bar{N} Z H T$ or $Z \bar{N} Z H T$, for $\epsilon v \tau \eta$ $\kappa о \iota \lambda \iota a$, as $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{gr}} \epsilon^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \tau \eta \kappa \pi \rho \delta \iota a$. [M ${ }^{\mathrm{gr}}$ shows relationship to $E v .28$ in Mark.]
68. tov $\lambda a 0 v$, ex lat. genet., but not $e$.
70. avtov $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \omega v$. Cf. latt and copt.
77. - tov (ante סovvat). All latt have ad dandam including $e$, but $d=$ dare against " $\tau$ ov $\delta$ ovpal." Cf. copt.
ii. 7. - тоv тлютотокоข. This is rather vicious. Only support Auct de prom.
26. - rov. $570=$ Lat. ; and cf. boh "Christ the Lord," but sah "the Christ of the Lord."
37. $+\eta v$. Moling gat $r$ with sah and boh. No others. See how with gat $\mu$ this proves the Coptic base for this Irish school.
 "with." As at Matt. xxii. 10, movnpous $\tau \epsilon \kappa a \iota a r a \theta o u s$ the $\tau \epsilon \kappa a \iota$ becomes $N E M$ in copt.
49. - $\mu$ ov. syr cu only; not syr sin nor latt nor Greek.
ii. 51. eт $\eta \rho \epsilon \iota$ (pro $\delta \iota \epsilon \tau \eta \rho \epsilon \iota$ ). 435 (our old friend in Mark). Possibly due to proximity of the word for " all," THPOT in copt.
iii. 11. e८тev (pro $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota$ ). Latt e goth; e入eyev BLX fam. 1, fam. 13, 33,892 latt. c, etc. dicebat. Om. boh.
iv. 4. - $\quad$ ova. Tertull $\frac{1}{2}$; syr pesh (13) aeth.
5. $\quad \gamma \eta \mathrm{s}($ pro o<коv $\mu \in \nu \eta \varsigma)=$ terrae $W^{\text {lat }}$ and Vigil. тои кобноv D 5 245, $f$ Orig. ${ }^{\text {com. [Copt. }}$ sah OIKOTMENH.]

After even this very brief and fragmentary exhibition, I do not think I shall be blamed any more for my tendency to see polyglot influences intruding everywhere. But I hope it will stimulate others to take up W and go through it carefully, not being content with the say-so of any one as to its date or its character.
H. C. Hoskier.


[^0]:    * 28 is wanting here, but has кa入ovesyos for $\lambda$ (eyouevos in $\mathbf{x}$. 2 alone.

[^1]:    * At Mark i. 3 we have the long addition by W in Greek, only known in the Latin of $c$. Probably e had it also.

[^2]:    * Here b c omit with W more than e.
    $\dagger$ Oboerve in Marl i. 27,-Tt ectur touro omitted by D, and it (prceter f) is also omitted by W and three Greek llectionaries, not by boh [hiat sah] nor by others, except aeth syr sin, which here probably replece sah.

