THE CODEX VERONENSIS.

The two Old-Latin MSS of North Italy, \(a\) and \(b\), being both of great age, have long been of extreme interest to all students of the Western Text. Three times I visited Vercelli in the hope of being allowed to collate \(a\). The first time I did not even succeed in seeing the MS; the second time, in 1906, after waiting many hours for the librarian, I was quite late in the afternoon allowed a glimpse of the MS, but only through its glass case. My request that the librarian would himself turn one of the leaves was denied on the ground that the Archbishop's permission was necessary. I applied by letter twice to the Archbishop, but no answer was received, and I was obliged to quit Vercelli with my hopes frustrated.

Last May, encouraged by a letter from dom Pierre de Puniet, I again presented myself at Vercelli only to be informed 'The MS has been taken to Rome; if you desire to see it you must go thither'. I gathered that the MS would now be more accessible to students than it had ever been before. This is something gained for the cause of sacred study. I did not go to Rome, but contented myself with finishing my collation of \(b\) in the Cathedral Library at Verona. I was rewarded by discovering two whole leaves at the end of the MS which had never before been known to be in existence. In addition I found that more than half of Fol. 384 \(verso\) and nearly the whole of Fol. 385 \(verso\) had been left unpublished by Bianchini. Also part of Fol. 380 \(verso\) and small parts of other leaves had not been deciphered.

The Codex originally contained 418 leaves. St Matthew took up 120, St John 96, St Luke 127, and St Mark 75. Of these, 386 now survive, three being lost from St Matthew, two from St John, eleven from St Luke, and sixteen from St Mark. The MS to-day contains thirty-five quires, and was normally compacted in quires of twelve leaves or six sheets. The exceptions were Qs. IV and XXV containing eleven leaves, Qs. XX and XXXIII with ten leaves, and Qs. XXXII and XXXV with eight leaves. Q. XXXVI, which has entirely perished, was the last, and must, like its predecessor, have contained only eight leaves. Though I searched carefully, I could find no signatures anywhere on any of the last leaves of any gathering.

There are no Capitula in \(b\), and, allowing for this, two leaves in \(b\) contain almost exactly the same amount of text as one leaf in \(ff\). It is
remarkable that in the case of both these ancient MSS, such a large proportion of the whole has been preserved—in \textit{ff} 192 leaves out of 221 and in \textit{b} 386 out of 418. Except for the first ten verses of St Matthew, it always happens that where \textit{b} is wanting \textit{ff} is available, and vice versa.

The Eusebian Canons occur in \textit{b}, but they are not by the first hand. The original scribe followed a division of the text differing in many places from that of Eusebius. The learned scribe who subsequently inserted the Canons and Sections employed gold ink for punctuating and for quotation marks, and his pointing and that in silver of the original scribe are often found side by side. He punctuates likewise in the middle of the last letter, and his ink is similar in colour to such gold ink as there is of the first hand; also his ‘carets’ marking paragraphs and O.T. quotations are of the same shape and size as those of the copyist. For these reasons his work is probably not more than a century later. He doubtless gathered the Eusebian Canons from a copy of Jerome’s Vulgate; for the absence of the Canons in \textit{a b* ff} proves that they came into Old-Latin texts from the Vulgate, and not independently.

A curious feature in the paleography of \textit{b} is the sporadic occurrence of square capitals side by side with the ordinary round uncials. The scribe, there is reason to believe, had before him a copy written in square uncials.\textsuperscript{1} At the end of a line, when pressed for space, he not unfrequently employs \textit{E} for \textit{€}, \textit{V} for \textit{U}, \textit{M} for \textit{ο}. The Roman \textit{D} and \textit{Q}, as well as \textit{A} and \textit{H}, are also found occasionally, and have the same shape and angulation as the letters found inscribed on Roman stones of the third century. The archetype of \textit{b}, it seems probable, was possessed by a Roman church (or family) in Verona at the end of the third century when Diocletian was building his famous Roman amphitheatre, and when Verona was the home of many wealthy Roman families. From this now perished archetype our MS was copied in the fifth century. That \textit{b} was in Verona about the year 600 is certain from an uncial lectionary inscription in red ink by a hand of that period at the bottom of Fol. 99 verso:

\begin{center}
+ II. ID. APRILIS. ADSUMTIO. ŠČI. ZENONIS. EPI
\end{center}

Now \textit{a. d. ii Idus Aprilis} would be \textit{April 12th}, and this is the date on which the Festival of San Zeno is still celebrated in Verona. The Gospel anciently read on St Zeno’s day from Codex \textit{b} was St Matthew xxv 14–23, and this has been repunctuated in red ink.

Bianchini in 1769 edited the MS with care and accuracy, but considered it his province to correct not a few of its readings, thus \textit{locutus est} (St Lk. xiv 22) becomes \textit{locus est}; \textit{prode erit} (St Mk. viii 36) becomes

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{He miscopies eluditis as elyditis &c.}
\end{itemize}
proderit; malachus (St Jn. xvii 10) becomes malchus; secur (St Mt. iii 10) becomes securis; bus becomes bos. The reading tritticum which is invariable in the MS is always changed to triticum. Such forms as sante, defunta, arcta, talantum, praegnate, freictum, proferit, demensurabitur, conouerunt, have been silently corrected to sancet, defuncta, arcta, talantum, pregnante, fretum, profert, demensurabitur, cognouerunt.

In Bianchini’s work which I have carefully collated, I have noted in all 583 corrections; these are for the most part concerned with variant spellings, but a certain number are of deeper import, viz. pecunia (St Mk. xii 44) is edited for penuria, cum ira indi (St Mk. iii 5) for cum iracundia, crudelis (St Lk. xix 24) for infidelis, cadentes (St Mk. ix 14) for gaudentes.

Moreover, the points inserted by Bianchini, where the MS is slightly mutilated, often mislead the student and furnish no idea of how much of the text is missing. The contractions and paragraphs and punctuation of the MS are also highly important, and these Bianchini does not attempt to give. It is clear there is need for the MS to be represented as it is—line for line and page for page. In so ancient and valuable a witness to the text of the Gospels every iota is of consequence.

It will suffice for the present to give to the readers of this JOURNAL the most important of the portions of St Mark that Bianchini left unedited:—
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The Codex Muratorianus. In July 1907 I published in this Journal (vol. viii, pp. 537-545) some leaves from the Milan MS. Last May I collated the printed text with the MS, and found a few slips which I hasten to correct: Fol. Io 13: pro enarremus legē ennarremus; Fol. 11 l. 2; pro laudicensis l. laudecensis; l. 9: pro apocalypse l. apocalapse; l. 12: pro nuperimmet l. nuperrim et; Fol. 75 l. 14: pro pratre l. pratriēs; Fol. 75* l. 3: pro fíctus l. factus; l. 17: pro queres l. quares.

I believe on Fol. 10 singulis and singula are correct, and I would now edit Fol. 10* l. 12 gallatis, and l. 15 singolis; Fol. 11 l. 6 congruit, and l. 24 catafragum. A close examination of the clearest readings shews the tail of the letter G to have been restored in every case. Several hands have touched up the writing of the Muratori Canon, and this is that gives the ink on these pages a piebald appearance. Thus on Fol. 10* l. 18 Ioh has been obviously inked again. Moreover, I could find no vice versa confusion of G for C in any of the pages I examined.

Mr C. H. Turner has suggested salute on Fol. 75 l. 28 for salutē; but I am confident it is ē, not e. In this connexion I examined the terminal ē's in the MS, and discovered on Fol. 10 l. 7 that m* wrote In carne-ē, and in 11. 21-23 denatiuitate-ē de passione-ē de resurrectione-ē de conuesatione-ē and also de gemīnii-eius audentu-ē. An early corrector erased the lineola, but in every case it can still be detected. I also noticed that the word cuntis in l. 15 has been corrected in the same way as cuntas in the next line by a superscript c; and further that in Fol. 10* l. 18 m* wrote semptae and m* supplied the lineola.

On Fol. 10 l. 4, where the MS has utiuris, it is probably for ati[ut]uri-ē (= adiutorem), m and s being often confused in early MSS.

Old-Latin Biblical Texts: No. V. I am indebted to Professor Burkitt for a critical notice in the J.T.S. for January. I do not, however, agree that Berger has demonstrated the order of the primitive contents of k. I believe the Catholic Epistles preceded the Acts (as in Codex Bezae) and the Apocalypse was last. Berger says the Apocalypse would fill twenty-one leaves. Professor Burkitt adds 'then the Acts (Quires C-L)'. This is to allow at least eight quires for barely fifty leaves, which is all the text of the Acts could have occupied. A careful counting has convinced me that the Catholic Epistles must have occupied twenty-one leaves; why should not they, then, have come first on Berger’s shewing? The Apocalypse would then begin the tenth quire and follow the Acts.

Since the appearance of Professor Burkitt’s criticisms and others I have been to Paris and revised again the whole of k.

All that perseverance can do has thus not been wanting on my part to reach accuracy in the matter of this difficult MS. I have resolved at
least all my own hesitations, and the following corrections, some of which have appeared before, are the result:—

Fol. 129* ll. 10, 11 pro uenerit l. appa]ruerit; ll. 12, 13 pro aeternae coronam similiter l. co]ronam similiter (sic). Fol. 123 l. 12 pro commone de l. commemorare de; l. 18 pro abere l. habere; l. 19 pro esec[uti l. sec[uti. Fol. 128* l. 1 pro fili l. filii; l. 2 pro remituntur l. dimittuntur; ll. 19, 20 pro sto et [nostis o]mnia· (= hβ) l. sto [Nostis quo]niam; l. 23 pro ñ filium l. negat filium—(ut hae non habet filium hae).

Fol. 122 ll. 11, 12 pro quia [translati s]umus l. quo[niam transi]bimus. Fol. 118* l. 23 pro uocem ut tubam l. uocem uelut tubam. Fol. 115 ll. 5, 6 pro frontib· datum l. frontib· [et datum. Fol. 114 l. 22 pro audite per l. audituri per. Fol. 126* l. 10 pro unti l. tinki; l. 17 pro ut finctos l. uti uictos. Fol. 117 ll. 20, 21 pro ani—as l. ani[mas. Fol. 116 l. 2 pro unti sun]t l. tinti sun]t. Fol. 127 ll. 14, 15 pro agri]ppa l. qui]ta; l. 23 pro ad [caesarem l. ca[esari. Fol. 127* l. 20 pro possent l. possent (nt in ligatura).

In the following instances the letters have been wrongly divided, and I now give the right division: Fol. 128* ll. 5, 6 cognouist]is; ll. 13, 14 permane[bit. Fol. 121 ll. 7, 8 uoc]atur; ll. 21, 22 peper]erat. Fol. 114 ll. 19, 20 pro]etarum. Fol. 116 ll. 13, 14 fa]cinus. In the case of missing letters supplied I would make the following changes: Fol. 129* l. 5 pro sun[t obtestor l. sun[t obsecro. Fol. 118 ll. 6, 7 pro mam[illas l. mam[mas. Fol. 114* l. 4 pro adspice] dixit l. adspice] inquit. Fol. 119 ll. 19, 20 pro qui sedeb]ant l. qui er]ant. Fol. 124* ll. 10, 11 pro conuer[rit l. conuer[tit. Fol. 127* ll. 16, 17 pro trans]isset l. trans]isset. (I noted also on Fol. 119 l. 7 ba in small uncials high above the en of reuincenfur.)

Also in ff: Fol. 74 col. 2 l. 33 pro ista l. ipsa. Fol. 89 col. 2 ll. 42, 43 should be euntibus ad uillam | et *postolis etc. Fol. 172 col. 1 ll. 32, 33 pro misertus l. mis]ertus. Fol. 190 col. 2 ll. 13, 14 pro confirma[n]te l. confirma[te.

E. S. Buchanan.