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 ε 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. + δε b f q r fossat syr (+ ουν D, etc., copt)

Ibid. + και ευπευ αυτοις. New thus and a conflate, but arising out of the ευπευ for ανηγγειλε of α ε q boh syr and Gk. Ν 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. αποκτεναι οι ουνδαιοι. change of order with Greek 107 and Ambrose only

19. — τι. 245, 511: a d e q Tert.

Ibid. ο (pro a). Epiph Hil Ambr only (cf. sah); ου 17; ἀπερ Didym.

20. δειξη (pro δειξει), 511, 513 q (ostendet); ostendit ε; δεικνυσιν D 28; demonstravit Latt.

21. τους νεκρους εγειρει ο πηρ. Change of order for which no Latins vouch nor Greeks. ο πατηρ, however, is omitted by a few;
and Tert in an exceptionally long quotation; hence perhaps this order change.

24. οὐκ ἔρχεται εἰς κρίσιν. Non latt, non syr; probably ex copt.

v. 36. μαρτυροῦντων (pro μαρτυρεί). No Greeks at all, but q exactly, "testificantur" (copt); a = "test. dicunt," e, "test. sunt," b ff, r, etc., Tert = "test. perhibent," all in the plural.

37. — autou sec. No Greeks, syr, or copt, but br* and r, of the Latins, Ath., and they alone.

vi. 2. θεωρούντες. Chrys. Nonn. (Retransl. from the "qu. videbant" of all Latt.) See 131 and Scholz' note.

16. — οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ. No support. (See change or order, syr.)

28. αὐτῷ (pro προσ αὐτοῦ). No Greek support. Either ex copt or a clear case of retransl. from Latins, who all agree in ad eum.

44. + προς με (ante καὶ εγώ). So only e boh [not sah], but with Hil, Ambr, Hier, Vigil. Clearly illegitimate.

46. αὐτός (pro αὐτός), 71. All Latins "hic." Clearly retransl. from Latt (or syr or copt).

53. — μη, but this is * and is corrected. Cf. sah (299 τις pro μη).

58. τον αρτον τοντον. 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. ζησῃ (pro ζησεταί). Al. ζησεῖ; vivet a c e ff, q r vg.

60. — εστιν. No support apparently, yet I seem to recollect some one who does this.

vii. 3. +καὶ (—οὐν). Syr. Non copt (=ΟΤΝ), non sah = σε = οὐν (one sah MS. 73 = δε). But 48 = δε with Latt and vg autem.

6. οὐδέπω (pro οὐττω). No support. Clear retransl. All Latins nondum, but Z* and vg necondum.

17. — θελη.

254 only (and boh ut vid.)

28. — καὶ (ante λεγον). Of Greeks 28 only, but aff, 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.]

39. ελαμβανον (pro εμελλον λαμβανειν). So δε / vg Cypr Vigil. A few Greeks omit εμελλον with some Latins, but only the above go wholly with Freer.

45. + αν (post ειτου). Cf. copt.

46. + αντοις (post απεκρ). Evan 892, Eust 234 (c) foss and syr only. (+ προς τους αρχ. και φαρ. post ουπηρεται, 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 ex-
pect 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 homoioitel
in W in another place, viz.:
vi. 20. — oude elepoutovin, for k also omits. So
that the parent of 'W and not the
scribe is responsible. Again:
xii. 48. — eosov Evan, 440; Evst, 259. c k
Tert bis and boh (2 MSS.) not sah. Truly “Afri-
can,” but very early African, before Cypr. Now
to show that vocabatur comes straight from an
early Latin observe—
ix. 15. afereta (pro apearthi). W only (28 want-
ing). All the Latins have auferetur, which was
basic. d, however, reads tollatur over against D
1, 25, 71, 273, Evst, 222, apthi; 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 + eithevi xiv. 30, or faievi xv. 32
(e q).

r2 is missing also xiv. 1–xvi. 13, but testing beyond,
I find—

xxii. 18. r2 = nequitas = tnv ponrivas of W against
all Greeks tnv ponrivas, and all the
Latins have the abl. abs. except vg.

* 28 is wanting here, but has kaloumenos for legoumenos in x. 2 alone.
T. And $r_2$ is nearest with *cognoscens* ($\gammaνο\varsigma$) and *nequitias*.

Again:

xxvi. 49. W reads alone προσηλθεν και for ελθων.
Only $r_2$, $a$ and syr read thus, *accessit* . . 
et. No other Latins. Sah and copi have "came," but no και.

Note also Matthew xii. 48. — τω εἰποντι αὐτω $X^\sigma$.

*Dimma $E^{lat}$* a notable conjunction with $W^\sigma$. (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. $x$, 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 via 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. $+ \eta v$ (ante aioutri $\nu$), 514 ($\varrho\epsilon\vartheta$) and $b$ $h$.

(Mr. Sanders does not notice this.)

Then note—

i. 20. $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha \tau\omicron \nu \mu\omicron \sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\omicron \nu \epsilon \nu \tau\omega \pi\lambda\omicron\omega$. New order with $syr$ $sin$, $\epsilon \nu \tau\omega \pi\lambda\omicron\omega$ being added. Note that $b$ omits $\epsilon \nu \tau\omega \pi\lambda\omicron\omega$ 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. $+ \kappa\alpha i \epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu b$ $c$ $e$ $syr$ $[nom boh = \lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu$, $mut. sah]$.

* 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.
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26. — το ακαθαρτον ετ. καὶ απηλθεν (προ εξηλθεν). No Greeks, but so exactly e and f.

27. εθαναμαξον (προ εθαμβισαν). 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 διδαχὴ η κενη αυτη η εξου-σιαστικη αυτων. Cf. e quænam esset doctrina haec inpotentabilis. W e alone together thus.

31. αυτω (προ αυτου), e and f [contra Dś].

Ibid. και επιλαβομενος (προ κρατησας). Retransl. for adprehensa, but here e has tenens.

37. — και ευροντες αυτον b c.

— oti c e.

38. κηρυσσων (προ κηρυξω) — iva κακει = b c e prædicare (— ut et ibi).


* 42. — και εκαθερισθη. b c e.

* 43. Om. vers. cum b c (e om. και εμβρ. αυτω ευθυς).

ii. 1. — δι' ήμερων. No Latins but Ev, 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 τουρο omitted by D, and it (præter f) is also omitted by W and three Greek lectionaries, not by boh [hieat 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 ἵδου ἄνδρες with Evan 28 2ψ 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. + εἶδοτε στι ἀπεθανεν (post και κατεγελῶν

autov), fam. 13, and sah only. (Ex Luc

viii. 53.)

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

καὶ ερχονται φεροντες προς αυτον (οἵ προς

αυτον φεροντες) παραλυτικον αἱρομενον ὑπο

tεσσαρων, we have καὶ ἵδου ἄνδρες ερχονται

προς αυτον βασταζοντες eu κρεβαττῳ

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 paralyti-
cum.

f = et venerunt ad eum portantes in grabato paralyticum inter quatuor

(while d is like the rest: et venerunt ad eum. adherentes

paralyticum qui a quattuor portabatur).

Nearest in order to W are e and c (but c uses lecto);

βασταζοντες = clearly portantes of c e f (against b ferentes),

but this word is made to serve for both φεροντες and αἱρομενον

ὑπο τεσσαρων. f using portantes but once retains alone of

the four Latins named inter quatuor (ὑπο τεσσαρων). We go

then with c e (b) against all else. But we supply ἵδου ἄνδρες
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, 2rd did not influence the Latin of b c e, for where is the δου ανδρες? It shows that b c e did influence W and chiefly e here.

Mark ii. 3. προσελθειν (προ προσεγγισαι). Cf. accedere it, but offerre vg.

*ibid. απο του σχλουν (προ δια τον σχλουν with D (prae turba latt).

8. — εν εαντοις c e.

† 11. — σοι λέγω. Eust 259 (υττ) e.

12. θαυμάζειν αυτους (προ εξιστασθαι παντας).

No Greeks support. Cf. ut admiraren-
tur (— παντας) e; ut adm. turbae c;
ut mirantes (— παντας) b.

17. εληλυθει (προ ηλθον). Not e. An old error

of ηλθεν come back vid. ?

But we must hurry on. The strongest agreement con-
tinues in chapters iii.—iv. between W and e and W and b c e.

In v. 3 we pick up τα poterant with W alone εδυνατο for εδυνατο. But I wish to exhibit one more place in full at iv. 1.‡

Common text

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{W.} & \quad \text{ωςε αυτων εις (το) πλοιον εμβαντα} \\
& \quad \text{kαθησθαι ευ τη βαλασση.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

† 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.

‡ Mr. Sanders does not chronicle this.

† On p. 66 Mr. Sanders exhibits this but partially and the true picture does not appear.
Common text \{ \text{kai} \text{pas} \text{o} \text{ochlos} \text{pros} \text{tun} \text{thalamassan} \text{epi} \text{tun} \text{gyn} \text{esan.} \}
\text{W.} \quad \{ \text{kai} \text{pas} \text{o} \text{ochlos} \text{en} \text{tou} \text{agiala} \text{yn.} \}

This is sheer, clear retranslation from \textit{ad litus} of \textit{b e} (proxime litus \textit{c ff,} circa litus \textit{maris a, super mare q, circa mare d, and D\text{\textsigma} peran \text{tun} \text{thalamasss})); and secondly, \textit{in litore} of \textit{b c e ff r} (circa \textit{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 \textit{e} and \textit{e} ceases at vi. 9.

Between chapters vi. and viii. observe—

Mark vi. 13. \textit{eksepempton pro ekeballov} alone. Translation of some kind probably influenced by the Coptic, which has a variety of words to express \textit{emittere} and \textit{ejicere}.

vi. 20. \textit{koudeusai pro kai epivn. W and 28 only.}

vii. 3. \textit{tuka pro tynmi. 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. \textit{agapa (pro tima). W with D\text{\textsigma} a b c (contra d honorat). In St. Matthew it is tima, but Clem. Alex., quoting five times, exhibits tima but twice, giving agapen \textit{\frac{\text{i}}{\text{f}} and philousi \textit{\frac{\text{i}}{\text{f}}.}}

9. \textit{otpetai (pro tephetae). W with D\text{\textsigma} 1, 28, 2\text{\textomega} (Cronin) and itala.}

10. \textit{adpeton (pro kakologiston) \)}} \text{W alone.}

13. \textit{tou logon tun entolyn. W alone, for tou logon, but jam 1 substitutes tun entolyn. A curious old conflation of W.}
Passing to the eighth chapter, where $k$ is available and $e$ is wanting, notice—

Mark viii. 2. $+\text{ αυτων post } \epsilon\chiοντων$. D and $2^\text{nd}$ only (not mentioned by the editor in his selected list of readings).

10. $\piρs τo όροs (\piρo εις τα μερη) = 28 \text{ syr } \text{ sin}$ (complicated by $N^\text{α} D^\text{α}$), $N$ εις τα ορη, D εις τα ορια.

11. $\alphaπ' (\piρo \piαρ') = \text{ copt or lat.}$

12. ταυτη τη γενεα (\piρo τη γεν. ταυτη). \text{ Copt order, not lat.}$

20. $- κλασματων$. (346) $k$ and 1 boh MS. and Horner’s translation, but not his text nor $\text{ sah }$ (which omits “full” 1 of 4 MSS. only).

23. $\epsilonνπτυσας (\piρo \piτυσας)$. Cf. lat.

25. παντα τηλαυγος. \text{ syr } \text{ sin } \text{ pesh } f. [non Goth]. Cf. $\text{ sah }$.

34. $- \text{ αυτως. } DAX \text{ itp }$.

38. $- \text{ λογους. } k \text{ sah } \text{ and } \text{ vg }$.

ix. 6. $\lambdaαλει. (\text{ syr } \text{ sin })$.

11. $\tauι \text{ ουν (προ } \sigmaτι)$. c.

18. $\etaδυνθροσαν (\piρo \text{ ιοχυσαν})$. 604 (latt).

24. $\tauo \text{ πνα (προ } \text{ o } \piατηρ)$. Possible error from copt, or $\text{ sah }$ rather: $\piωτ$ for Father.

25. $\sigmaυτρεχει. 511. \text{ Ex lat? Dropping eπi perforce.}$

27. $- \text{ και } \text{ ανεστη. } k \text{ and syr } \text{ pesh (syr } \text{ sin} \text{ omits, but substitutes “and he deliv­}\
\text{ ered him to his father ”).}$

31. $\lambdaεγει (\piρo \text{ ελεγεν})$. Cf. $k \text{ dicens } = \text{ sah }$.

36. $- \text{ ev. } \text{ Cf. } k: \text{ immedio sic.}$

x. 8. $\text{ ouκ (προ } \text{ ουκετι). } \text{ Evan } 71, \text{ Evst } 222, k \text{ and } d (\text{ contra } D^\text{α} \text{ and ff, with DL vulgates.}$
14. των ουρανων (pro των θεου). Again from proximity of boh "kingdom" μετουρω- or confusion of sah words for God and Heaven.

26. δυνησεται. Cf. k poterit with a b and d (contra Dεr).

32. + αυτω (fam 13). k c f and vulgates G X* with sah.

33. — αυτων sec c r₂.

Mark x. 45. λουτρον (pro λυτρον). Cf. k = prolium (that is: "profluvium"?) for redemptionem. Absolutely alone of Greeks and Latins.

46. — Βαρτιμαιος. Cf. k, who gives this verse in very condensed form.

49. — αυτω. c k.

xi. 2. — υμων. Ν k.

12. εις Βηθανιαν. r₂ and boh (6 MSS.) syr pesh (1).

14. ηκουσαν (pro ηκουν). Cf. k; audierunt. Other Latins, audiebant.

29. επερωτω (pro επερωτησω). Cf. k with a b c f f₂ i : interrogo and M of vulgates.

Ibid. τινι (pro ποια). Clear retransl. [in qua latt; cf. copt].

xii. 3. + και απεκτιναν (post edepnav). 346 [non 13–69–124]. (Cf. k occiderunt pro ceciderunt.)

6. — ετι ουν 2ος c k.

26. ανεγνωκατε (pro ανεγνωτε). Retransl.

30. — εντολη. 28, 2ος k EuśMœll.

31. + ομωσ. Cf. k "secunda similis"; al. "secundum simile vel similem."

33. — των prim. Ex lat.
34. + oti (ante ou μακραν). 157, 20e = copt.
38. + ταις (ante στολαις). 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, Eust 259, sah, Aug and other Fathers (245 is deeply Latin).

Ibid. — αρχαι ωδινων ταντα. c.

12. αναστησονται (pro επαναστ.). Retransl.
16. τα ματια. 61, 435. Retransl. (syr. 61 indeterminate).
20. — κυριος. 435 again, 513, Eust 259, with syr. 61 in- determinate. 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. πλαναν (pro αποπλαναν). 124 [non 13–69–346], 234,* 299 (which sympathizes elsewhere), while 28 = πλανησαι, and 512 = αποπλανησαι. Thus we trace three Greek lines of transmission. k Cyp = “erorem faciendum” against the others’ “seducendos”; and “evertandos,” Tert; “seducendum” a cf2.

25. —ai sec. Latt.

27. επισυνυστρεφονσιν (pro επισυνυαξει) 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).
iv. 5. — τούτο. Νκ syr.
6. κοπιων. Confused, but cf. k “illlic aedium facitis.”
14. — καί. prim, sah lect. m1 and ff2. (Cf. ff2 and W in John.)
16. + ετοιμασάι (post εξηλθον). 28, 124, [non 13–69–346], 299 (d) and sah (3 MSS. out of 4).
18. με παράδωσει. Cf. boh [non sah].
22. — αὐτῶν. Ex Latt. Only k, however, suppresses illis, saying “et dum manducant.” Cf. syr retaining illi.
Ibid. — εστών. Syr. (Cf. copt.)
27. σκόρπις πισθήσεται (προ διασκορπίτ). Retransl.
41. ἵδου —— καί. Matter of order. + τέλος Latt: Sah syr. order with lat and pesh (syr sin gives τέλος after ὁμα with q).
47. παρεστῶσαν. Retransl.
56. — καὶ ... ἀναν. 435, 440, 511 (see above with 435 in thirteenth chapter.
57. — καὶ τινες ... αὐτῶν. 435, 440, 511.
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60. — οὐκ ἀποκρινὴ οὐδὲν. (Cf. f3 q — οὐδὲν), οὐδὲν ἀποκρινὴ 28.

Ibid. οτί (πρὸ τί). Bα α[non L] (τοι 346), de his k or ad ea some Latt.

61. — ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς. c f3.

Ibid. εὐλογημένου (πρὸ εὐλογητοῦ). 28, 511 and 58, both retranslations, one early and one late. All Latins benedicti.

62. τῆς δυναμεως (πρὸ τῶν νεφελῶν). Possible copt or sahid confusion or from Greek line above or from Syr.

64. φανεταὶ νυν. Copt; and sah syr order but Δοκι’copi for φανεταὶ, as D 28, Eevt 150 δοκεῖ (videtur d).

xv. 1. + αὐτοῦ. 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[ex] d. (+ αὐτῷ 511).


16, 17. Βαραβᾶς 511 al.

7. Βαραβᾶς.


11. Βαραβᾶν.

Leaf lost between xv. 11–39.

xv. 39. — ο’ sec. (— ο’ prim. 69*).

παρεστὸς ( — Retransl.

41. διηκονουσαν (πρὸ διηκονοῦν). (28: διακονησαὶ αὐτῶ ministrabant latt, ministrant q. — καὶ διηκονοῦν αὐτῶ 508, Evst 150 sem 222 sem.

46. + εὐθεως ηνεκεν (post σωδονα). Cf. copt syr — εὐθεως.
xvi. 1. έισελθουσαί. (om. ινα ελθουσαι c d ff₂).
5. θεωρούσιν (pro έιδον). Late. Half of a
bohairic conflation; see Horner’s notes.
[mut sah.]
6. τον Ναζ. ξητείτε. c ff₂ k syrr.
Ibid. + αυτον εστιν. k syr + illius, c ff₂ q + ejus,
+ αυτον D (hiat d).
7. προαγω (pro προαγει). D k (hiat d).
8. + ακονσασαι εξηλθον
και syr sah [non latt]
(pro εξελθουσαι).
10. — και κλαιοσιν. Alone (mut sah syr).
15. + αλλα (following the long addition)
+ ΔΕ 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. Αβιλ (pro Αβια), perhaps from immediate
proximity of εβολ in copt in line above,
or from εβολ in sah in line below.
5. αντη (pro αντης). 300.
45. και η καρδια (pro και μακαρια) init. vers.
Clearly from sah. Sah ends verse 44
with ΝΖΗΤ or ΖΝ ΖΗΤ, for εν τη
κοιλια, as Μς εν τη καρδια. [Μς shows
relationship to Ev. 28 in Mark.]
68. τον λαον, ex lat. genet., but not e.
70. αυτον προφητων. Cf. latt and copt.
77. — τον (ante δονωα). All latt have ad danno-
dam including e, but d = dare against
“τον δονωα.” Cf. copt.

ii. 7. — τον πρωτοτοκον. This is rather vicious.
Only support Auct de prom.
26. — ῥος. 570 = Lat.; and cf. boh “Christ
the Lord,” but sah “the Christ of the
Lord.”

37. + ἡν. Moling gat r with sah and boh. No
others. See how with gat μ this proves
the Coptic base for this Irish school.

Ibid. νηστιαίς τε καὶ δεησειν. Cf. copt NEM
“with.” As at Matt. xxii. 10, πονηροὺς
τε καὶ αγαθοὺς the τε καὶ becomes NEM
in copt.

49. — μου. syr cu only; not syr sin nor latt
nor Greek.

ii. 51. ετηρεῖ (προ διετηρεῖ). 435 (our old friend in
Mark). Possibly due to proximity of
the word for “all,” THPOT in copt.

iii. 11. ευπεν (προ λεγεῖ). Latt e goth; ελεγεν BLX
fam. 1, fam. 13, 33, 892 latt. c, etc.
dicebat. Om. boh.

iv. 4. — μονω. Tertull ½; syr pesh (13) aeth.

5. γῆς (προ οἰκουμενῆς) = terrae W¹st and Vigil.
του κοσμου D 5 245, f Orig.⁹⁷. [Copt.
sah ΟΙΚΟΤΜΕΝΗ.]

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 care­
fully, not being content with the say-so of any one as to its
date or its character.

H. C. Hoskier.