THE CRIMINAL. BY HAVELOCK ELLIS. (Walter Scott. Crown 8vo, pp. 441. 6s.)

This is the third edition of the standard work on Criminology. It has been revised and enlarged. It contains forty pathetic or revolting illustrations. It is a book one must either have nothing to do with or devour. To read it for mere pastime is impossible. It is a book of science; its purpose is noble and ennobling. It reveals the working of God's great laws of moral and physical health, and their unerring retribution as disease. It tells us what has been done for criminals. It suggests the means by which their numbers may be reduced. It asks us earnestly what we have done for our fellow-criminal for whom Christ died.

LESSONS FROM THE PARABLES. BY MRS. W. J. TAIT. (Elliot Stock. Crown 8vo, pp. 216. 5s.)

The lessons are meant 'for home and school use.' It is only in the home and in the school that you can touch the parables. To the present generation, at least, they seem to be impossible in the pulpit. For their meaning is so plain that even the children never miss it, and you have only to set their minds to think. But their meaning is also so difficult that our deeper study drives us to despair. We can only hope that unborn generations will make more of them than we can do.

STONES FOR SERMON BUILDERS. BY THE REV. JOHN MITCHELL. (Stockwell. Crown 8vo, pp. 122. 2s.)

Here is not only the straw for the bricks, but the bricks themselves. He does not know his craft, and should betake himself to another, who cannot build with this.

AN EDITOR'S SERMONS. BY SIR EDWARD RUSSELL. (Fisher Unwin. Crown 8vo, pp. 267. 6s. net.)

Clergymen have little patience with sermons by a layman. It is not professional jealousy only. They have tried and found them wanting. But these sermons stand apart. They have the professional man's knowledge together with the layman's detachment. For Sir Edward Russell is not only a man of surpassing ability, but throughout his public life he has given himself to the interpretation of the great problems of morals and religion. The Bishop of Hereford writes an introduction to the volume, commending it especially to clergymen, not merely, however, because it lets us see ourselves as others see us, but because it also makes distinct contribution to the subjects of which it treats, such as the gift of prayer, high-mindedness, and the decay of experimental religion. If we were allowed a phrase in which to express our obligation to these sermons, we should say that they had urged us to be more spiritual in our thinking, more intellectual in our spirituality.

A New Uncial of the Gospels.

BY W. C. BRAITHWAITE, B.A., LL.B., BANBURY.

A YEAR ago Mr. J. Bevan Braithwaite of London procured from Macedonia an uncial MS. of the Gospels in Greek, which I have since had the opportunity of examining and collating. He proposes to call it the Codex Macedoniensis. I gave some particulars of the document when lecturing at the recent Friends' Settlement for Bible Study at Scarborough, but its interest justifies a wider publication.

When complete the MS. seems to have consisted of 42 quires of 8 folios each, and of one odd folio containing part of the κεφάλαια of Luke, making 674 pages in all, of which 66 pages, or 9.8 per cent., are missing, namely—

Mt 11; Δαμιανος μετα 9; 16θ [θυγατερα] 7ερα ... δελεστε 11; a folio with part of the κεφ. of Mark; Lk 176 εις πελιον ... εν γραφας 18; 15θ πρεσβυερος ... προσκαλεσθαι μενος 16θ; 231 εθρον ... εμετα αυτοι 232; Ιη 2017 τιψάς μου ... δ Πέτρος 2117.

The MS. is on parchment leaves measuring 18.1 by 13.2 cm. in single-column writing, 17 by 7.5 cm., ruled 16 to 21 lines to a page. In the side margins stand the numbers of the Ammonian sections with the Eusebian canons, and in upper and lower margins, as the case may require, the τίτλοι of the κεφάλαια major with their numbers, which are repeated on the side margins. All these, and also the initials in the margin at the opening of sections and the apparatus of lection notes in text and margin, are in bright carmine ink, except the initials occurring from Lk 1 to 1160 (7 quires), which are in black.
Very tasteful frames of spot and pattern work in
carmine and gold enclose the titles of the
Gospels, and the first letter of each is also richly
illuminated. The titles run Ἐναγγέλων κατὰ
Μάρκον, etc.

The writing is in small dark brown continuous
uncials (without use of a syllable divider) in
letters as nearly as possible 2 mm. high,
punctuated by a single point, chiefly at the top
or bottom. A comma or colon is used in a few
cases, a semicolon never. Accents and breath-
ing are general, and are usually correctly
given. The breathings have the rectangular form
\(\text{}\) . Double letters and a few simple contrac-
tions occur occasionally, and the words regularly
contracted in uncial MSS are almost invariably
so written in the new codex.

The writing may be confidently identified as
ninth century, and resembles the facsimiles of
F, T, K, and Ev 150 given in Scrivener's
Introduction, though smaller and nearer than any
of these. The letters \(\Theta\), \(\omicron\), \(\omicron\) have the narrow
oval shape, the base of the \(\Delta\) is prolonged
beyond the triangle and strengthened at both
ends with points, the middle stroke of the \(\Theta\) is
also prolonged and strengthened with points, the
\(\Sigma\) is broad out of proportion to the other letters
and its middle loop is carried below the line, the
angular part of the \(\Theta\) is entirely separated from
the upright stroke.

The round uncial used for the chapter-
headings, and the occasional use in the text of the
older form of \(\Xi\), made like a \(Z\) with a horizontal
line above it, strengthened at both ends with
points (as the modern copyist of an eighteenth
century document might preserve an occasional
long \(s\)), suggest that the codex from which the
MS. was copied was a seventh century one. The
MS. is carefully written, and I have found no
clear case of omission of lines by homoioteleuton.
In six cases, however, entire phrases are omitted,
namely, Mt 9:19 καὶ οἱ μαθηταί αὐτὸν; Mt 24:6 δὲς
γὰρ τοῖ πάντα (so in margin) γενέθηκα; Lk 2:25 καὶ
Πνεῦμα ὑπὸ Αγίου (so in margin) ἐν αὐτῷ; Lk 16:38
καὶ αὐτὸς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς κώμην τινά; Lk 11:1 οὐ
δύναμαι ἀναστα σοι; Jn 6:48 Ἔξ ὑπογιζεῖσθε
μετ' ἄλληλων. In the first case no words are
supplied in the margin, in the next four cases the
words are supplied in black, in the last case in
red. As neither Tischendorf nor Tregelles
notices these omissions, they seem due to the

copyist, and the probable inference is that his
copy was written in sense-lines.

A monological rubric to the page Jn 12:25

gives a lection for TARASIS, Patriarch [of Con-
stantinople], about 780 A.D., and, so far as it
goes, confirms the palæographical evidence as to
date.

An examination of the text of the MS. soon
shows that it is to be classed with the mass of
later uncial of mixed 'Syrian' text, namely,
EFGHKMSUVGΔΧΠ. For instance, it contains
all the eight 'confute' readings cited by
Westcott-Hort (Introduction to the N.T. in Greek,
pp. 95-104). Like the others, it also has a ninth
conflation, not noticed by Westcott-Hort, as it
was not taken into the Received Text.

Mt 27:11 μετὰ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων. (N)ABL
Memph. Vulg.

καὶ τῶν γρ. καὶ φαρασσ.] D, most old Lat.,
Syr.-Sin.

καὶ τῶν γρ. καὶ πρεσβ., καὶ φα. Later uncial,
Syr.—Pesh., and Hark.

But though the mixture characteristic of
'Syrian' texts pervades the new uncial, it may
nevertheless rank high in its own class by virtue
of its resistance to this tendency, and to the
extent of this resistance may give important
support to pre-Syrian readings. The mixture and
smoothness of text exhibited by the later uncial
are explained when we remember that a MS. is
commonly the offspring of a marriage (often a
mixed marriage) of two older MSS—one parent
being the copy used by the scribe, the other the
text followed by the διαφωτήτωσ or corrector who
went over his work. This double parentage,
repeated in each generation of ancestors, naturally
resulted on the one hand in the mixing into
the text of readings capable of mixture, and on
the other in the disappearance of refractory
readings and of non-interpolations. The MS. now
under discussion, for example, contains omissions
of Mt 22:14, Mk 15:28, and part of Jn 8:14, which, so
far as can be judged, are genuine variants, but
the corrector has supplied the omitted words in
the margin, and the variant would thus probably
disappear from any copy made from this MS.
The survival of early readings in a characteris-
tically late text is therefore excellent evidence of
their vitality and originally wide currency.

How then does the new codex compare with
the other late uncial named above in retaining
early readings? Dr. Sanday's convenient Delectus
Lectioinum appended to the Clarendon Press
Greek Testament may serve for a rough test.
In the parts of the Gospels contained in our MS.
be examines 153 variants, but in 116 of these
the late uncialis in question all go one way, and
in four other cases (Mk 7:10 14:26, Lk 9:56, and
Jn 5:1) their evidence is too evenly divided to
afford assistance on this point. This leaves
33 cases where one or more late uncialis of
'Syrian' type are found standing out from their
fellows either for the approved primitive reading
or for some early variant. X (Codex Monacensis),
though far from complete, does so 17 times, and
has evidently a high value. II (Codex
Petropolitanus Tischendorfii) has 12 cases, our
codex has 10, of which eight follow the approved
primitive reading and two an early variant; K
(Codex Cyprius Parisinus) has 7 cases; none of
the others has more than 5.

The new MS. therefore ranks high in its own
class. It supports the Westcott-Hort text against
the T.R. about 400 times, say once for every ten
various readings in that text.

I add a selection of various readings, citing
other uncialis mainly from Tischendorf's apparatus,
and taking first good readings supported mainly
by non-Syrian attestation, which often includes
most of the early versions.

Mt 16:2.1 omit 'Oμίας γενομένης ... οι δύναται, with
NBVXI.
1615 ἄρτων γλυκαρίων, with NBCLKMSII.
19a omit οἷς εἰσήχθη, with BCLMII.
24a τὸ ἱμάτιον, with NBDKLZII.
24b omit μου ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, with NBDLII.
25a omit ἐν ὧν ἦν τὸν ἀνθρώπου ἐχθρόν, with
NABC*DLOΔΘII. Added probably to round off and point the moral of the
lection, Mt 25-13, read on Saturday of seventeenth
week after Pentecost. Our MS. adds the
words in red ink in margin, which confirms
this origin.
2745 omit μυκτός, with NABC*DEHKVΔII.

Mk 4:1 ὑπὸ τὴν λυκώπην εὐεισθ. So NB* 13-69-346,
33, but with verb ἐλθεῖν. According to
Westcott-Hort, ἐλθεῖν is a primitive corruption
rightly corrected to ἐλθεῖν by a very early con-
jecture.
8b τῶν διαθητῶν, with AC*DII.
11b διαν γιας ὑπὲρ, with NBCKLΔII.
14b omit τὸ κάνυμον, with NBBDLWΝΔΞ.
14b διαλεγμένον ἡμῖν, with NABCNLNSVΔII.
15b ἐκατον, with ADGKMΠII.

Lk 15:25 omit, with NABCD*DX. Corrector adds
in margin.
13b ὁ διακόνος, with NBKLRSVΔII.
14a ὁ διακόνος, with BDCLII.
14b Read ὑδαίνοντα (not υδαίνον), with NKLXII 1, 33, acbci,
Ath. With the help of the Syr.-Sin. and the
new codex critics may now be asked to draw
up the 'son' out of the well and leave the 'ass'
there instead.
21b ἦτοι για τὸν θεὸν, with NBCLMNRX.
23b ἀνέκαθεν για τὸν θεὸν, with NBKLMΠII.

Jn 3:5 Read θυγατέρα (not θυγατέρα), with N*GAΠII.
5 omit ἦ in Θεοῦ, with ABDDKNSVΠΓ.
6a ὁδόν, with NBDCLNTΠΔII.
7a omit κοινοπληθυντικός, with DaceΠII Arm.
7b ὑπερεποτειστά, with NBDDK(N)ΤΔII.
7b-8a ἐπερεποτείστα, and μέγατα μεγάραν. Omit
with NBACLNTXA. In the margin are two
faded asterisks, not by the first hand, but the
text leaves no special blank, the words ὑπερεποτείστα. Πάλιν οὖν αὐτοὶ forming one line.
The table of κφ. contains no reference to the
Pericope.
8a-44 Read καὶ ὅμως οὖν ἐκ θαυμάσεως παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν πειτέ. Omit ἦν at end of v. 30 and oin
after εἶναι in v. 42, and read εἶκεν τοῦ πατρὸς ν. 44.
15b ἀναπτειστό, with BC*KLXII.
18b τὸν, with S. AD 123 have τοῦ κηρύκων, and εἰς τόν Vulg., Goth., Arm. sup-
port the same reading.

In several of the above readings the principal
late uncial support comes from the group KМΠ,
and while this is not the only line of relationship
in the new codex, which often diverges from the
KМΠ readings, there is an important strain of
text in common, as the following cases of special
agreement with the group will show:

Mt 19:25 οἰκίαν, with K 33.
22a omit ἦν βῆνες, with KΔΙ.
22b add ἐκείνους after ἐκείνους, with DCΓΜΠ.
25a omit τοῦτον after τοῦτον, with EΚΜΠ.
2b add τοῦ τοῦ after τοῦ τοῦ, with AKΠ.
5a ἐνέγραψεν, with AKΠ.
8b omit τοῦ τοῦ, with FKΜΥΠΠΙ.
11a add τοῦ δικαίου after ἄνελλεν, with KМΠ.
18b ἑαυτοῦ ἀνεῖλεν ἡ σκότως, with KМΠ. Apart
from this reading and the reading of N* in Jn 3,
the phrase 'kingdom of heaven' seems confined
to Matthew.
THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Lk 20:14 Add τινες after λέγουσα, with AKMII.
Jn 5:1 Add Κυρίου after φασὶν, with AKLII.

... 6:10 Add ἄδρομοι before ἄδρομες, with AKII.
14:20 εἰρήνη for εἰς εἴρην, with KII.
16:10 τοι πρὸς οὐκέτι, with II* 131* w scr.*, οὐκέτι being at variance with our Lord’s post-resurrection appearances.

18:34 διόλος εοίτε, with MSII*’N.

Other readings of interest are the following:—

Mt 10:10 Omit καρποῖς καταρακτικά, with all late uncials.
10:20 ἰσώματα (to call by a name of abuse), with U.
20:30 κατακρατίζοντοι, with B 124. Also in Mk 10:22 with D (Gk.), and κατακρατίζοντοι in Lk 22:20, without other authority.

22:14 Omit verse, with 33, but corrector inserts in margin. In Mt 20:14 the words are retained, and in Lk 14:24 they are added, with GH(X)ΓΔ.

26:20 οἴνου, E(C)HΙΒΑ. Also in Mk 14:22 with EFGH(X)N.

Lk 10:10 προσευχόμενοι for προσευχόμενον, without other authority.

6:20 Omit πάντα, with DFLSVΓΔΑ.
9:20 Omit καθ’ ἡμέρας, with CDEFGHUVΓΞΔΑ.
20:20 Omit τῶν λαὸς, with GSVΤΔ.
22:22 αὐνακίτες for αὐνακίτας, without other authority.
22:22 Omit ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου, with EFGHSVΓΔΑ.
Jn 8:14 Omit ἤμεινοι, with MSII 28, 33, 69, but the words as above are added by corrector in margin.

10:8 Omit πρὸς ἐμοί, with Ν EFGMSUΓΔ.
19:97 ἡμέρας for ἡμέρα, with AE* 33, 69.

Except for the lists of κεφ. the only additional matter in the new MS. consists of short sentences in the same uncial hand as the text, which occur at the end of each Gospel, but relate to the character and composition of the next. Those for Mark, Luke, and John remain, and belong to the series contained in the cursive Scr. 512 = Greg. 473, from which Scrivener (Introduction to the Criticism of the N.T., 4th ed. vol. I. p. 66) cites the sentences for Matthew, Mark, and Luke. They are also found among other introductory matter in Scr. 236 and in other cursives (see Gregory’s Proleg. to Tisch. p. 456). The new uncial seems to be the oldest authority for them.

The interest of these sentences lies in the confirmation they give to the argument recently revived by Mr. F. C. Burkitt (Two Lectures on the Gospels, London: Macmillan & Co., 1901) in favour of the view that the Fourth Gospel was written at John’s dictation or prompting rather than actually by John himself. Mr. Burkitt bases his argument partly on the ancient tradition found in the Muratorian canon, and partly on a prologue in the tenth century MS. of the Vulgate, now at Madrid, known as the Codex Toletanus, which states that Papias wrote the Gospel at John’s dictation: ‘Qui hoc euangelium Johanne subdictante conscripsit.’ He also cites a statement to the same effect in a late Greek catena patrum (cited among the fragments of Papias in Lightfoot’s Apostolic Fathers), the word there used being ὑπαγορεύειν, ‘to suggest,’ ‘to dictate.’

The sentences run as follows—supplying the one to Matthew from Scr. 512:—

‘Ἰστοὺς τοι τὸ κατὰ Μαθαῖον εἰσαγγελίων ἰβραϊκά διαλέκτων γραφῶν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐν Ιερουσαλήμ ἐξεδόθη ἐρμηνεύθη δι’ ἦν Ἰωάννου ἐδιδάσκετο ἐν τῇ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον τοῦ Χριστοῦ γένεσιν, καὶ ἐστὶν ἀνθρωπομορφον τοῦτο τὸ εἰσαγγέλιον.’

‘Ἰστοῖς τοι τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον εἰσαγγελίων ὑπηγορεύθη ὑπὸ Πέτρου ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐκαθαρίσατο δι’ ἦν ἂρχη ἐπὶ τοῦ προφητικοῦ λόγου, τοῦ ὅδου ἐπόμενον, τοῦ Ἡσαῦ, τῆς προφητικής εἰκόνα τοῦ εἰσαγγελίου δεικνύει.’

‘Ἰστοῖς τοι τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εἰσαγγελίων ὑπηγορεύθη ὑπὸ Παύλου ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐτῆς ἦν ἂρχη τοῦ προφητικοῦ λόγου, καὶ ἐπάνω ἐπί τοῦ Χριστοῦ γενέσεως.’

Scrivener, after giving the three of these which he found in his copy, says, ‘The reader will desire no more of this.’ The matter cannot, however, be dismissed so lightly. For the second clause of each sentence is taken verbally from the well-known passage in Irenæus (Contra Her. iii. 11 § 8); and if the compiler used equally good authority for his first clauses, they certainly claim careful attention. Now Scr. 512 heads the sentence to Luke Κοσμά, Ἰνδικολ. εἰς Λουκ. παραγράφη. Cosmas Indicopleustes flourished about 520 A.D., and would base his statements on some earlier source of information. He uses the word ὑπαγορεύειν in the case of Mark, Luke, and John. Peter ‘suggested’ the contents of Mark, and Paul those of Luke, by which is evidently meant that these two apostles were the authority for the substance of the Second and Third Gospels. When, therefore, Cosmas also uses this word of the Fourth Gospel, he must mean that John stood behind the actual writer in the same way. The modified Johannine authorship advocated by Mr. Burkitt has so much of internal evidence to recommend it that we shall do well to inquire carefully into the possible existence of satisfactory external evidence in the same direction.