

subsections comprised in the passage Luke xii. 49-xiii. 9, and their united reference to the national peril consequent upon the Jewish rejection of Jesus and His teaching, has been observed before. If the view here advocated in regard to this passage be accepted, it confirms our faith in the general superiority of Luke's arrangement, and strengthens very considerably the theory (suggested by numerous less striking touches) that the Great Interpolation conceals within itself the story of at least one, and in all probability two, visits of Jesus to Jerusalem prior to the last visit at which He suffered.

C. J. CADOUX.

*SOME INTERESTING READINGS IN THE
WASHINGTON CODEX OF THE GOSPELS.*

IN 1912 Professor Alexander Souter wrote in his excellent handbook, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (p. 31), concerning the newly discovered "Freer Gospels," bought in Egypt by Mr. C. L. Freer of Detroit and now in Washington (hence called W by Gregory): "to this MS. one can merely call attention, as at the moment of writing very little is known about it." But in that same year Professor H. A. Sanders, of the University of Michigan, published a *Fascimile of the Washington MS. of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection* (pp. x. 372), and issued at the same time *The Washington MS. of the Four Gospels* (pp. vii. 247), an elaborate discussion and collation of W. He has presented the essential facts, so far as known, concerning the history of the document. It belongs either to the fourth or to the fifth century, as is plain from the style, uncial writing, infrequent punctuation, absence of accents and of the Eusebian sections, etc. The Gospels appear in the Western order like that in D and the Old Latin

(a, b, e, f, ff²), i.e., Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. But Sanders devotes most of the space in the latter volume to a discussion of the problem of the text, arguing against the textual theory of Westcott and Hort and in favour of Von Soden's text. "A comparison of the readings of W with Von Soden's results, as shown in his prolegomena, convinced me that Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort had built on a false foundation" (p. 41). Now there is no connexion at all between the theory of Tischendorf and that of Westcott and Hort. But Sanders definitely takes Hoskier's side in his attack (*Codex B and its Allies*, 1914) on Westcott and Hort. He has accepted the classification of documents given by Von Soden, so that his exposition of the critical data found in W is vitiated for most modern students.

Professor E. J. Goodspeed, of the University of Chicago, is a disciple of Westcott and Hort. He published in 1914 *The Freer Gospels*, in which he carefully collates all the important readings. "It will be understood that our basis of collation is the full, continuous text of Westcott-Hort" (p. 7). He has a few pertinent remarks in closing. "In type of text W is curiously heterogeneous, showing three somewhat distinct strata, Neutral, Western, Syrian. Matthew and Luke viii.-xxiv. are decidedly Syrian in type. John and Mark i.-vii. are Neutral, with some interesting Western readings interspersed, e.g., the omission of the Lucan genealogy. The primitive subscription *κατα Ιωαννην* is a further hint of the Neutral ancestry of his part of the MS. Mark is decidedly Western throughout, and while its readings are often not those of D they are usually of the same general kind as they, and so illustrate Hort's feeling that the Western is as much a textual tendency as a definite textual type" (p. 64). The temper of this comment suits me far better than the interpretation of Pro-

fessor Sanders. I do not maintain that Hort said the last word in textual criticism, but nothing has yet been brought to light that shows he was on the wrong tack. There is need of a full, fresh study of W by an adherent of Hort.

One has in W a text of the Gospels copied by a fourth or fifth century scribe, and corrected by himself and three later hands. But in spite of these efforts to remove errors, many remain, like the repetition of John vi. 54*b*, 56*a* after *πίναν μου τὸ αἷμα* in verse 56, a clear case of homoioteleuton. It seems clear that the scribe of W did not copy one single manuscript, however. This codex is a splendid illustration of mixture, as Hort expounded it. The scribe either had access to a number of documents with different ancestries, or the manuscript (if only one) used by him had a diverse ancestry.

For myself I am prepared to argue that W shows Alexandrian readings as well as Neutral, Western, and Syrian. Thus in Matthew i. 25 the Neutral class (N B 2, 33) with some Western support (a^{vid} b c g' k sah cop syr^{sin} syr^{our} Am b) reads *υἰόν*, while the Alexandrian (CLW) and Syrian (EKMS al pler syr^{atr} Egypt) with some Western support (D f ff¹ g² arm Eth Aug) read *τὸν υἰόν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον*. In this instance, to be sure, W may be Western or Syrian instead of Alexandrian, but the Alexandrian class is here.

In Matthew v. 22, *εἰκῆ* is properly rejected again by the Neutral class (N B vg Or) and added by the Western, Alexandrian (LW cop), and Syrian, including Syr^{sin} (Western) and W. In Matthew vi. 1 the Neutral (N B 1, 209, al Or) and Western (D it vg Hil. Aug. Hier.) classes read rightly *δικαιοσύνην*, while the Alexandrian (WLΔ) and Syrian (EKMSUZ al pler syr² go arm al Chrys) read *ἐλεημοσύνην* with f, k of the Old Latin, and N^a syr^{our} have the colourless *δόσιν*. In Matthew vi. 4 and 6 *ἐν*

$\tau\tilde{\omega}$ $\varphi\alpha\nu\epsilon\rho\tilde{\omega}$ is rightly rejected by the Western and Neutral classes, while it is added by the Alexandrian (WLΔ) and Syrian. The doxology in Matthew vi. 13 is rejected by the Neutral (NB 1, 17, 118, 130, 209, cop Or) and Western (D a b c ff¹ g² l vg Cyp Tert), but appears in the Alexandrian (WLΔ) and Syrian (late documents), with some Western support, though K syr^{cur} and sah all have different shorter forms of it. In Matthew ix. 13, again, W joins the Neutral (NBWΔ 1, 22, 33, 118, 209, syr^{utr}) and Western (D most Old Latin, vg arm Eth Aug) against the addition of $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha\nu$, which is inserted from Luke v. 32 by the Alexandrian (CL sah cop) and Syrian classes. In Matthew xiv. 15 W goes with the Neutral, Western and Syrian classes against the addition of $\omicron\tilde{\nu}$ by the Alexandrian (NCZ cop Or). Classification is difficult at Matthew xix. 16, for $\sigma\chi\tilde{\omega}$ is read by Neutral documents like BDC, $\xi\chi\omega$ by Alexandrian (WΔ) and Syrian, while NL 28, 33, 77, 157, 238, syr^{cur} cop have $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$, which seems Western in spite of the absence of D (with B). In Matthew xxi. 44. W accompanies the Western class in omitting the addition. In Matthew xxiv. 36 the Neutral and Western classes have $\omicron\delta\delta\epsilon\ \acute{\omicron}\ \nu\acute{\omicron}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, as in Mark xiii. 32, while the Alexandrian (WLΔ cop) and Syrian reject it with syr^{sin}. In Matthew xxvii. 49 W goes with the Western and Syrian classes in rejecting properly the addition from John xix. 34, though this obvious insertion is supported by the Neutral class. One pauses here for a moment to wonder if the Alexandrian class is represented by CL with the Neutral or by WΔ cop Or with the Western and Syrian. It is one of Hort's Western non-interpolations (in other words Neutral interpolations).

In John i. 18, W reads $\nu\acute{\omicron}\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, not $\theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, agreeing with the Western and Syrian classes against the Neutral and Alexandrian. In John v. 1 W follows the Neutral and Western

in reading *ἐορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων* against the Alexandrian *ἡ ἐορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, while in iv. 44 it gives *τῶν Ἰουδαίων* instead of the Western and Syrian *τῆς Γαλιλαίας* or the Neutral and Alexandrian *τῆς Ἰουδαίας*, an evident effort to evade the question whether "Judæa" included Galilee. In John v. 3 W agrees with the Western and Syrian classes in reading *ἐκδεχομένων τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν*. In v. 4 it is with the Neutral and Western in rejecting the whole verse about the periodic visit of the angel to the pool, which is inserted by the Alexandrian and Syrian classes, with some early Western documents (e of the African Latin). In vii. 8 W reads *οἶπῳ* with the Neutral, Alexandrian (BLWTA f g q sah), and Syrian (Γ Δ al pler syr^{soh et p}), against the Western *οὐκ*. But it is more probable that the Western here is right. W joins the Neutral and Alexandrian classes in rejecting the Pericope Adulteræ (John vii. 53–viii. 11), and in xiii. 2 it sides with the Neutral in reading *γινόμενον* instead of *γενομένου*. In John xvi. 24, instead of *ἵνα ἡ πεπληρωμένη*, W has the curious reading *ἵνα πεπληρωμένη ἦν*. This use of *ἦν* may be a mere lapse of the scribe or it may represent the irrational *ν* which is so common in the papyri, in which case it would be meant for a subjunctive after all.

In Luke ii. 14 W lines up with the Neutral and Western classes for *εὐδοκίας*, against the Alexandrian and Syrian correction *εὐδοκία*. As we have said, the genealogy of iii. 23–39 is absent from W. In v. 26 W goes with the Western class in omitting the first half of the verse, while in vi. 1 it sides with the Neutral and Alexandrian in rejecting the unintelligible *δευτεροπρώτῳ* which is supported by the Western and Syrian. In Luke viii. 43 W agrees with B in inserting *ἰατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ὄλον τὸν βίον* (cf. Mark v. 26), and in x. 42 it reads *ἐνὸς δὲ ἐστὶν χρεῖα* with the Western, Alexandrian, and Syrian classes against

the Neutral (conflate) *ὀλίγων δέ ἐστιν χρεία ἢ ἐνός* (38 arm syr^{hkl} read *ὀλίγων δέ ἐστιν χρεία*). As often, the Western documents are divided here. In xv. 21 W omits *ποιήσόν με ὡς ἓνα τῶν μισθίων σου*, with the Western, Alexandrian, and Syrian, against the neutral interpolation; in xv. 24 W seems to stand alone, however, in omitting *ἦν ἀπολωλός καὶ εὐρέθη*. In Luke xxiii. 34 W joins B Δ 38, 435, a b d cop syrsm in omitting the beautiful saying. Is this the combination of the Neutral text and the Western? If so, the verse will have to go. But there is strong Western testimony (African Latin e and syr^{cur} besides c f ff² L vg) besides the Alexandrian and Syrian. And what if B itself is Western here? In Luke xxiii. 45 W goes with the Western and the Syrian classes in reading *καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος* instead of *τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος* (Neutral and Alexandrian), and in xxiv. 53 it follows the Syrian in reading *αἰνοῦντες καὶ εὐλογοῦντες*, the conflate reading which combines the Neutral and Alexandrian *εὐλογοῦντες* and the Western *αἰνοῦντες*.

In Mark i. 1 W has *υἱοῦ θεοῦ* with the Neutral, Western, and Syrian classes; in i. 2 it reads *ἐν τοῖς προφήταις* with the Syrian against the pre-Syrian *ἐν τῷ Ἑσαία τῷ προφήτῃ*. In i. 3 W along with the Old Latin inserts what is in Luke iii. 5, 6 and Isaiah xl. 4, 5. In Mark there are also frequent minor omissions and frequent transpositions (as in all the Gospels). In vii. 4 W reads *βαπτίζονται* with the Western and Syrian texts against the Alexandrian (LΔ) *βαπτίζονται* and the Neutral *ἐβαπτίσονται*. In xiii. 2 W goes with the Western class in adding *καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλος ἀναστήσεται ἄνευ χειρῶν*. But the distinctive addition in Mark is at the end of xvi. 14, where W, giving the long ending (so Western, Alexandrian, and Syrian), presents this strange apocryphal addition which had been only indirectly known before:

κακῆνοι ἀπελογοῦντε λέγοντες ὅτι ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος τῆς ἀνομίας καὶ τῆς ἀπιστίας ὑπὸ τὸν σατανᾶν ἐστὶν ὁ μὴ ἔων τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν πνευμάτων ἀκάθαρτα τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ καταλαβέσθαι δύναμιν. διὰ τοῦτο ἀποκάλυφόν σου τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἣδη ἐκείνοι ἔλεγον τῷ Χριστῷ. καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκείνοις προσέλεγεν ὅτι πεπλήρωται ὁ ὄρος τῶν ἐτῶν τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σατανᾶ ἀλλὰ ἐγγίζει διὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐγὼ ἁμαρτησάντων παρεδόθην εἰς θάνατον ἵνα ὑποστρέψωσιν εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ μηκέτι ἁμαρτήσωσιν· ἵνα τὴν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ πνευματικὴν καὶ ἄφθαρτον τῆς δικαιοσύνης δόξαν κληρονομήσωσιν.

It is certain that this addition was no part of the long ending of Mark as probably written by Ariston (the Aristion of Papias) to complete the Gospel.

From this rapid survey of some important readings in W it is plain that mixture is its chief characteristic. Early as it undoubtedly is, it does not rank with \aleph or B. It is more like A in its mixed character. But it will repay careful study precisely because of the complex character of the text which it contains. We can no longer condemn a reading because it is Western. The Western class has various strata in it, and is anything but homogeneous. If the Neutral class is a revision, the Western has a conglomeration of readings in the various documents that preserve it.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

LITERARY ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE FIRST
EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

II

v. 1. *It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you.*

In his Memoirs for 1708, speaking of the parish of Etrick, the Rev. Thomas Boston writes: "Meanwhile Satan raged in stirring up to the sin of uncleanness; so that, by the spring 1709, besides several fornications, there were two adulteries in the parish