

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 Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles expositor-series-1.php

THE NEW CODEX "W."

When we pass quire 1 at John v. 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. + $\delta \epsilon b f q r fossat syr (+ ouv D, etc., copt)$ [non sah].
 - Ibid. + και ειπεν αυτοις. New thus and a conflate, but arising out of the ειπεν for ανηγγειλε of a e q boh syr and Gk. N CL and few curs.
 - 16. + τω (ante σαββατω). 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 Π CABBATON.
 - 18. αποκτειναι οι ιουδαιοι. change of order with Greek 107 and Ambrose only
 - 19. τι. 245, 511: a d e q Tert.
 - Ibid. o (pro a). Epiph Hil Ambr only (cf. sah);
 οὐ 17; ἀπερ Didym.
 - 20. δειξη (pro δειξει), 511, 513 q (ostendet); ostendit e; δεικνυσιν D 28; demonstravit Latt.
 - τους νεκρους εγειρει ο πηρ. Change of order for which no Latins vouch nor Greeks.
 σ πατηρ, however, is omitted by a few;

- and Tert in an exceptionally long quotation; hence perhaps this order change.
- 24. ουκ ερχεται εις κρισιν. Non latt, non syr; probably ex copt.
- v. 36. μαρτυρουσιν (pro μαρτυρει). No Greeks at all, but q exactly, "testificantur" (copt); a = "test. dicunt," e, "test. sunt," b ff₂ r, etc., Tert = "test. perhibent," all in the plural.
 - 37. autou sec. No Greeks, syr, or copt, but br^* and r_2 of the Latins, Ath., and they alone.
- vi. 2. θεωρουντες. Chrys. Nonn. (Retransl. from the "qu. videbant" of all Latt.) See 131 and Scholz' note.
 - 16. οι μαθηται αυτου. No support. (See change or order, syr.)
 - aυτω (pro προς αυτον). No Greek support.
 Either ex copt or a clear case of retransl.
 from Latins, who all agree in ad eum.
 - 44. $+ \pi \rho o \kappa \mu \epsilon$ (ante $\kappa a \iota \epsilon \gamma \omega$). So only e boh [not sah], but with Hil, Ambr, Hier, Vigil. Clearly illegitimate.
 - aὐτος (pro οὐτος), 71. All Latins "hic."
 Clearly retransl. from Latt (or syr or copt).
 - 53. $\mu\eta$, but this is * and is corrected. Cf. sah (299 $\tau\iota\varsigma$ pro $\mu\eta$).
 - 58. τον αρτον τουτον. Order supported by the Latins e q only; but b r give the order with the expression "carnem meum," while a c vg write merely "me."
 - Ibid. ζηση (pro ζησεται). Al. ζησει; vivet a c e $f_{\mathbf{r}}$ q \mathbf{r} vg.
 - 60. εστιν. No support apparently, yet I seem to recollect some one who does this.

- 62. $\epsilon \iota \delta \eta \tau a \iota$ (pro $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \eta \tau \epsilon$). Only 28 $\iota \delta \eta \tau \epsilon$ (cf. copt). Epiph Eus. cf. lat.
- vii. 3. $+\kappa a\iota (-o\upsilon\nu)$. Syr. Non copt (=OTN), non sah $= \sigma\epsilon = o\upsilon\nu$ (one sah MS. $73 = \delta\epsilon$). But $48 = \delta\epsilon$ with Latt and vg autem.
 - ουδεπω (pro ουπω). No support. Clear retransl. All Latins nondum, but Z* and vg needum.
 - 17. $-\theta \epsilon \lambda \eta$. $\pi o \iota \eta \; (pro \; \pi o \iota \epsilon \iota \nu)$. $\}$ 254 only (and boh ut vid.)
 - και (ante λεγων). Of Greeks 28 only, but aff₂ aur with sah and eight boh MSS. against Horner's text.
 - 31. εκ του ουν οχλου πολλοι (pro πολλοι δε εκ του οχλου). Impossible order, but ουν 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.]
 - ελαμβανον (pro εμελλον λαμβανειν). So de f vg
 Cypr Vigil. A few Greeks omit εμελλον
 with some Latins, but only the above go
 wholly with Freer.
 - 45. $+ a\nu \ (post \ e \iota \pi o \nu)$. Cf. copt.
 - 46. + αυτοις (post απεκρ). Evan 892, Evst 234
 (c) foss and syr only. (+ προς τους αρχ.
 και φαρ· post υπηρεται, 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. ουδε ελεπτουσιν, for k also omits. So that the parent of W and not the scribe is responsible. Again:
 - xii. 48. εισιν 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. αφερηθη (pro απαρθη). W only (28 wanting). All the Latins have auteretur, which was basic. d, however, reads tollatur over against D 1, 25, 71, 273, Evst, 222, αρθη; 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 $\phi a \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ xv. 32 $(e \ q)$.
 - r_2 is missing also xiv. 1-xvi. 13, but testing beyond,

 I find—
 - xxii. 18. $r_2 = \text{nequitias} = \tau as \pi ovn \rho \iota as$ of Wagainst all Greeks $\tau \eta \nu \pi ovn \rho \iota a \nu$, and all the Latins have the abl. abs. except vg.

^{* 28} is wanting here, but has καλουμενος for λεγομενος in x. 2 alone.

T. And r_2 is nearest with cognoscens ($\gamma \nu o \nu \varsigma$) and nequitias.

Again:

xxvi. 49. W reads alone προσηλθεν και for ελθων.
Only r₂ a and syr read thus, accessit . .
et. No other Latins. Sah and copt have "came," but no και.

Note also Matthew xii. 48. — $\tau \omega$ $\epsilon \iota \pi \sigma \nu \tau \iota$ $a \nu \tau \omega$ X^{σ} . Dimma $E^{\iota a \iota}$ a notable conjunction with W^{σ} . (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. \aleph , 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 $vi\hat{a}$ 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 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 Dd, while sometimes retaining sympathy with them.

Here is the overlying Coptic influence to begin with:— Mark i. 6. $+ \eta \nu_i$ (ante $a\iota\sigma\theta\iota\omega\nu$), 514 (vec) and boh. (Mr. Sanders does not notice this.)

Then note-

μετα των μισθεντων εν τω πλοιω. New order with syr sin, έν τω πλοιω being added. Note that b omits εν τω πλοιω with syr pesh [mut. sah, but boh agrees with the usual order].

(Mr. Sanders gives four other examples of W with syr sin in the first four chapters.

Next we plunge into the Latin base (e only begins at i.21*).

i. 25. + kai $\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \nu$ b c e syr [non boh = $\lambda \epsilon \gamma \omega \nu$, mut. ϵh].

^{*} At Mark i. 3 we have the long addition by W in Greek, only known in the Latin of c. Probably s had it also.

- 26. το ακαθαρτον e r.
 - και απηλθεν (pro εξηλθεν). No Greeks, but so exactly e and f r.
- εθαυμαζον (pro εθαμβησαν). So the Latins, and evidently Greek retranslation. Here e conflates with both.
- Ibid. Instead of the usual texts (the Greeks vary),
 W has τις η διδαχη η κενη αυτη η εξουσιαστικη αυτου. Cf. e quænam esset doctrina haec inpotentabilis. W e alone together thus.
 - αυτω (pro αυτοις), e and d [contra D^{ar}].
 Ibid. και επιλαβομενος (pro κρατησας). Retransl. for adprehensa, but here e has tenens.
 - 37. кан вирочтеς анточ b c. отн c e.
 - 38. κηρυσσιν (pro κηρυξω) ινα κακει = b c s prædicare (— ut et ibi).
 - 39. και τα δαιμονια εκβαλλειν. Alone.
- * 42. $\kappa a \iota \epsilon \kappa a \theta \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \theta \eta$. b c e.
- * 43. Om. vers. cum b c (e om. και εμβρ. αυτω ευθυς).
- ii. 1. $-\delta\iota$ ' $\delta\mu\epsilon\rho\omega\nu$. No Latins but E^{vg}, yet omitted by Ev. 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.†

^{*} Here b c omit with W more than e.

[†] Observe in Mark i. 27,—τι εστιν τουτο omitted by D, and it (præter f) is also omitted by W and three Greek [lectionaries, not by boh [hiat sah] nor by others, except aeth syr sin, which here probably replace sah.

Following this in the next verse we have a beautiful illustration of how old our text is, for at

Mark ii. 3. we add ιδου ανδρες with Evan 28 2pe alone and sah.

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-Coptic-Latin base, and lectionary use, we point to the Græco-Syriac intertwined with it all. (Syr sin is wanting here.)

Note further as regards sah-

Mark v. 40. + ειδοτες οτι απεθανεν (post και κατεγελων αυτου), fam. 13, and sah only. (Ex Luc viii. 53.)

Next consider ii. 3, which is interesting. Instead of και ερχονται φεροντες προς αυτον (οτ προς αυτον φεροντες) παραλυτικον αιρομενον υπο τεσσαρων, we have και ιδου ανδρες ερχονται προς αυτον βασταζοντες εν κρεβαττω παραλυτικον.

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); $\beta a\sigma\tau a\zeta o\nu\tau e\varsigma = {\rm clearly}\ portantes$ of c e f (against b ferentes), but this word is made to serve for both $\phi e\rho o\nu\tau e\varsigma$ and $a\iota\rho o\mu e\nu o\nu \nu \pi o\ \tau e\sigma\sigma a\rho \omega \nu$. f using portantes but once retains alone of the four Latins named interquatuor ($\nu\pi o\ \tau e\sigma\sigma a\rho \omega \nu$). We go then with c e (b) against all else. But we supply $\iota\delta o\nu$ ard $\rho e\varsigma$

with 28 and sah, yet 28 and sah 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^{po} did not influence the Latin of b c e, for where is the $\iota\delta\sigma\nu$ ard $\rho\epsilon$? It shows that b c e did influence W and chiefly e here.

- Mark ii. 3. προσελθειν (pro προσεγγισαι). Cf. accedere it, but offerre vg.
 - Ibid. απο του οχλου (pro δια τον οχλον with D (præ turba latt).
 - 8. $-\epsilon\nu$ $\epsilon a \nu \tau o \iota \varsigma c e.$
 - † 11. σοι λεγω. Evst 259 (y^{scr}) e.
 - 12. θ auμαζειν αυτους (pro εξιστασθαι παντας). No Greeks support. Cf. ut admirarentur ($-\pi$ aντας) e; ut adm. turbae c; ut mirantes ($-\pi$ aντας) b.
 - 17. $\epsilon \lambda \eta \lambda \nu \theta \epsilon \iota$ (pro $\eta \lambda \theta o \nu$). Not ϵ . An old error of $\eta \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$ come back $\nu i \hat{a}$.?

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 $\epsilon \delta \nu \nu a \tau \sigma$ for $\epsilon \delta \nu \nu a \tau \sigma$. But I wish to exhibit one more place in full at iv. 1.‡

^{*} 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 c conjoined - Italy and N. Africa, being translated into Greek in Egypt. See iv. 1.

[†] Mr. Sanders does not chronicle this.

[‡] On p. 66 Mr. Sanders exhibits this but partially and the true picture does not appear.

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 D^{gr} $\pi \epsilon \rho a \nu \tau \eta s$ $\theta a \lambda a \sigma \sigma \eta s$); 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 v. we drift from e and e ceases at vi. 9. Between chapters vi. and viii. observe—

- Mark vi. 13. εξεπεμπον pro εξεβαλλον alone. Translation of some kind probably influenced by the Coptic, which has a variety of words to express emittere and ejicere.
 - vi. 29. κηδευσαι pro και ηραν. W and 28 only.
 - vii. 3. πυκνα pro πυγμη. 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.
 - aγaπa (pro τιμα). W with D^{gr} a b c (contra d honorat). In St. Matthew it is τιμα, but Clem. Alex., quoting five times, exhibits τιμα but twice, giving αγαπων ²/₈ and φιλουσι ¹/₈.
 - στησηται (pro τηρησητε). W with D^{gr} 1, 28,
 2^{pe} (Cronin) and itala.
 - 10. αθετων (pro κακολογων) 19. διανοιαν (pro καρδιαν) } W alone.
 - τον λογον την εντολην. W alone, for τον λογον, but fam 1 substitutes την εντολην.
 A curious old conflation of W.

Passing to the eighth chapter, where k is available and e is wanting, notice—

- Mark viii. 2. + αυτων post εχοντων. D and 2^{pe} only (not mentioned by the editor in his selected list of readings).
 - 10. $\pi \rho o \circ \tau o \rho o \circ \circ \circ \circ \circ \tau a \mu \epsilon \rho \eta = 28 \text{ syr sin}$ (complicated by N^{gr} D^{gr}), $N \epsilon \iota \circ \tau a o \rho \eta$, $D \epsilon \iota \circ \tau a o \rho \iota a$.
 - 11. $a\pi'$ (pro $\pi a\rho'$) = copt or lat.
 - 12. ταυτή τη γενεα (pro τη γεν. ταυτή). Copt order, not lat.
 - κλασματων. (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. ενπτυσας (pro πτυσας). Cf. lat.
 - παντα τηλαυγος. syr sin pesh f. [non Goth]. Cf. sah.
 - 34. autois. $D\Delta X it^{pl}$.
 - 38. $\lambda o y o v s$. $k sah and v g^{v}$.
 - ix. 6. λαλει. (syr sin).
 - 11. τι ουν (pro οτι). c.
 - 18. ηδυνηθησαν (pro ισχυσαν). 604 (latt).
 - 24. $\tau o \overline{\pi \nu a}$ (pro $o \pi a \tau \eta \rho$). Possible error from copt, or sah rather: $\pi \iota \omega \tau$ for Father.
 - συντρεχει. 511. Ex lat? Dropping επι perforce.
 - 27. και ανεστη. k and syr pesh (syr sin omits, but substitutes "and he delivered him to his father").
 - 31. Leyel (pro eleyel). Cf. k dicens = sah.
 - 36. $-\epsilon v$. Cf. k: immedia sic.
 - x. 8. ουκ (pro ουκετί). Evan 71, Evst 222, k and d (contra D^x) and ff, with DL vulgates.

- 14. των ουρανων (pro του θεου). Again from proximity of boh "kingdom" μετουροσος confusion of sah words for God and Heaven.
- 26. Surngeral. Cf. k poterit with a b and d (contra D^{gr}).
- 32. $+ av\tau\omega$ (fam 13). k c f and vulgates $G X^*$ with sah.
- 33. autov sec c r_2 .
- Mark x. 45. $\lambda o \nu \tau \rho o \nu$ (pro $\lambda \nu \tau \rho o \nu$). Cf. k= prolium (that is: "profluvium"?) for redemptionem. Absolutely alone of Greeks and Latins.
 - 46. Βαρτιμαίος. Cf. k, who gives this verse in very condensed form.
 - 49. $av\tau\omega$. c k.
 - xi. 2. $-\nu\mu\omega\nu$. $\aleph k$.
 - 12. $\epsilon i \in B_{\eta} \theta a v i a v$. r_2 and boh (6 MSS.) syr pesh (1).
 - 14. $\eta \kappa o u \sigma a v$ (pro $\eta \kappa o u \sigma v$). Cf k; audierunt. Other Latins, audiebant.
 - 29. επερωτω (pro επερωτησω). Cf. k with $a b c f ff_2 i$: interrogo and M of vulgates.
 - Ibid. $\tau i \nu i \ (pro \ \pi o i a)$. Clear retransl. [in qua latt; cf. copt].
 - xii. 3. + κai $a\pi \epsilon \kappa \tau i vav$ (post $\epsilon \delta \epsilon i \rho av$). 346 [non 13-69-124]. (Cf. k occiderunt proceederunt.)
 - 6. $-\epsilon \tau \iota o \upsilon \nu 2^{pe} c k$.
 - 26. ανεγνωκατε (pro ανεγνωτε). Retransl.
 - 30. εντολη. 28, 2^{pe} k Eus^{Moell}.
 - 31. + ομοιως. Cf. k "secunda similis"; al. "secundum simile vel similem."
 - 33. $-\tau\omega\nu$ prim. Ex lat.

- 34. + $o\tau\iota$ (ante $ov\ \mu a\kappa\rho av$). 157, $2^{pe}=copt$.
- 38. $+ \tau ais$ (ante $\sigma \tau o \lambda ais$). Retransl.
- 44. παντα οσα ειχεν. Cf. k om. ολον or παντα.

So much for k; now observe other features —

- Mark xiii. 8. γαρ. 245, 247, Evst 259, sah, Aug and other Fathers (245 is deeply Latin).
 - Ibid. αρχαι ωδινων ταυτα. c.
 - 12. αναστησονται (pro επαναστ.). Retransl.
 - 16. τα ιματια. 61, 435. Retransl. (syr. 61 indeterminate).
 - 17. τais sec. Retransl. "Pregn. et nutri-
 - 20. κυριος. 435 again, 513, Evst 259, with syr sin. No Latin ut vid.
 - 22 + πολλοι. Sah 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. $\pi \lambda avav$ (pro $a\pi o\pi \lambda avav$). 124 [non 13-69-346], 234,* 299 (which sympathizes elsewhere), while $28 = \pi \lambda av\eta \sigma a\iota$, and 512 $= a\pi o\pi \lambda av\eta \sigma a\iota$. Thus we trace three Greek lines of transmission. k Cypr = "errorem faciendum" against the others' "seducendos"; and "evertandos," Tert; "seducendum" $a c fl_2$.
 - 25. -ai sec. Latt.
 - 27. επισυνστρεψουσιν (pro επισυναξει) with 28 alone, against all others, and against the parallel in Matthew (επισυναξουσι FLM al decem arm aeth (colligent e, congregabunt Q g₂ for congregabit most and colligit k).

- xiv. 5. τουτο. Nk syr.
 - 6. κοπον. Confused, but cf. k "illic aedium facitis."
 - αυτοις. a c d ff₂ i k Orig. D^{gr} 28, 91, 299, 2^{pe} syr sin. Perhaps originally from Lat. commencement of verse 11. "Ad illi." See i d.
 - 13. $+ \epsilon \iota \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta o \nu \tau \omega \nu \nu \mu \omega \nu$. sah (cf. 13-69-124-346, 28, 91, 299, 2^{pe}).
 - 14. κai . prim, sah lect. m¹ and f_2 . (Cf. f_2 and W in John.)
 - + ετοιμασαι (post εξηλθον). 28, 124, [non 13-69-346], 299 (d) and sah (3 MSS. out of 4).
 - 18. με παραδωσει. Cf. boh [non sah].
 - 22. αυτων. Ex Latt. Only k, however, suppresses illis, saying "et dum manducant." Cf. syr retaining illi.
 - Ibid. $-\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$. Syr. (Cf. copt.)
 - 23. τοις μαθηταις (pro aυτοις). New ex Matt. Cf. 69, 235, in ver. 22.
 - 27. σκορ πισθησεται (pro διασκορπ.). Retransl.
 - 28. + εκ νεκρων. New ut vid., but cf. syr elsewhere.
 - 30. αρνηση. Orig. Retransl. (order B 346).
 - 31. + oti. copt, 13-69-124-346. See c "quod."
 - 41. ιδου και. Matter of order. + τελος

 Latt: Sah syr. order with lat and

 pesh (syr sin gives τελος after ωρα

 with q).
 - 47. παρεστωτων. Retransl.
 - 56. $-\kappa ai$. . $\eta \sigma av$. 435, 440, 511 (see above with 435 in thirteenth chapter.
 - 57. και τινες . . . αντου. 435, 440, 511.

- ουκ αποκρινη ουδεν. (Cf. f_2 q —ουδεν), 60. ουδεν αποκρινη 28.
- Ibid. οτι (pro τι). Ber Ψ [non L] (τοι 346), de his k or ad ea some Latt.
- ο αρχιερευς. c ff_2 . 61.
- Ibid. ευλογημενου (pro ευλογητου). 28, 511 and 58, both retranslations, one early and one late. All Latins benedicti.
- της δυναμεως (pro των νεφελων). Possible 62. copt or sahid confusion or from Greek line above or from Syr.
- 64. φαινεται υμιν. Copt; and sah syr order but Δοκι'copt for φαινεται, as D 28, Evst 150 δοκει (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 D^{gr} d. $(+ a \nu \tau \omega 511)$.
 - 4. $\sigma o \nu \pi o \sigma a$. New. Confusion of eye in copt, (Cf. 69* Z*lat. in Matt. xxvii. 16, 17. Βαραβας 511 al. pauc. and Βαραβαν verse 11 by 69. One sah MS. in Luke

 - 11. Βαρναβαν.

Leaf lost between xv. 11-39.

- **xv.** 39. o sec. (-o prim. 69*). παρεστως Setransl.
 - 41. διηκονουσαν (pro διηκονουν). (28: διακονησαι aυτω ministrabant latt, ministrant q.
 - και διηκονουν αυτω 508, Evst 150 sem 222 sem.
 - 46. $+ \epsilon \upsilon \theta \epsilon \omega \varsigma \eta \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa \epsilon \nu (post \sigma \upsilon \nu \delta \upsilon \nu a)$. Cf. copt syr - $ev\theta \epsilon \omega c$.

- xvi. 1. $\epsilon \iota \sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta o \upsilon \sigma a \iota$. (om. $\iota va \epsilon \lambda \theta o \upsilon \sigma a \iota c d f_2$).
 - θεωρουσιν (pro ειδον). Late. Half of a bohairic conflation; see Horner's notes. [mut sah.]
 - 6. τον $Na\zeta$. ζητειτε. c ff_2 k syrr.
 - Ibid. + autou estiv. $k \, syr + illius, c \, f_2 \, q + ejus,$ + autou D (hiat d).
 - 7. $\pi \rho o a \gamma \omega$ (pro $\pi \rho o a \gamma \epsilon \iota$). D k (hiat d).
 - 8. + ακουσασαι εξηλθον και (pro εξελθουσαι). syrr sah [non latt]
 - 10. και κλαιουσιν. Alone (mut sah syr).
 - 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 $\epsilon\beta\circ\lambda$ in copt in line above, or from $\epsilon\beta\circ\lambda$ in sah in line below.
 - 5. αυτη (pro αυτης). 300.
 - 45. και η καρδια (pro και μακαρια) init. vers.

 Clearly from sah. Sah ends verse 44

 with NZHT or ZN ZHT, for εν τη κοιλια, as M^{gr} εν τη καρδια. [M^{gr} shows relationship to Ev. 28 in Mark.]
 - 68. του λαου, ex lat. genet., but not e.
 - 70. $au\tau ou \pi \rho o\phi \eta \tau \omega v$. Cf. latt and copt.
 - 77. του (ante δουναι). All latt have ad dandam including e, but d = dare against "του δουναι." Cf. copt.
 - ii. 7. τον πρωτοτοκον. This is rather vicious.
 Only support Auct de prom.

- 26. τον. 570 = Lat.; and cf. boh "Christ the Lord," but sah "the Christ of the Lord."
- 37. $+ \eta \nu$. Moling gat r with sah and boh. No others. See how with gat μ this proves the Coptic base for this Irish school.
- Ibid. νηστιαις τε και δεησεσιν. Cf. copt NEM

 "with." As at Matt. xxii. 10, πονηρους
 τε και αγαθους the τε και becomes NEM
 in copt.
 - 49. μου. syr cu only; not syr sin nor latt nor Greek.
- ii. 51. ετηρει (pro διετηρει). 435 (our old friend in Mark). Possibly due to proximity of the word for "all," THPOT in copt.
- iii. 11. ειπεν (pro λεγει). Latt e goth; ελεγεν BLX fam. 1, fam. 13, 33, 892 latt. c, etc. dicebat. Om. boh.
- iv. 4. $-\mu ov\omega$. Tertull $\frac{1}{2}$; syr pesh (13) aeth.
 - γης (pro οικουμενης) = terrae W^{lat} and Vigil.
 του κοσμου D 5 245, f Orig.^{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.