

'adoption' and 'grace', which he afterwards planted into the latter part of the Edwardine collect. Nor does the early part of the collect seem so dissimilar that it might not have been suggested by the Latin collect. But in this I do not expect to find that all the world agrees with me. It will be enough if I have pointed out a possible source in the German collect for the reference which had escaped Dr Neale, and which possible source he desired should be known to Englishmen.

I will now give the two collects printed side by side :

WÜRZBURG BREVIARY 1518
(ad nonam in die nativitatis
Domini).

FIRST BOOK OF EDWARD VI
(Christmas Day at the second
communion).

Omnipotens sempiterne Deus: qui
hunc diem per incarnationem
Verbi tui et partum beatae
Mariae Virginis consecrasti :

Almighty God which hast given
us thy only-begotten Son to
take our nature upon him and
this day to be born of a pure
Virgin :

da populis tuis in hac celebritate
consortium: ut qui tua gratia
sunt redempti, tua sunt ado-
ptione securi. Per eundem.

Grant that we being regenerate
and made thy children by adop-
tion and grace, may daily be
renewed by thy Holy Spirit.
Through the same, &c.

J. WICKHAM LEGG.

AN EXAMINATION OF SOME OMISSIONS OF THE CODEX SINAITICUS IN ST JOHN'S GOSPEL.

WHILE examining some of the readings of the Codex Sinaiticus for another purpose, I noticed that the two omissions in John iii 20, 21, which are, I think, peculiar to \aleph^* and were practically beyond doubt not omitted in the exemplar from which \aleph was copied—they are restored by \aleph^{ca} —could be much more naturally explained if the lines in this exemplar contained on the average about eleven letters each.¹ This is

¹ Scrivener suggests (*Collation of the Codex Sinaiticus* p. xv) that the Codex Sinaiticus must have been derived from one more ancient, in which the lines were similarly divided—i. e., into lines of 12 to 14 letters (p. xiii; the average is, however, rather over 13, there are sometimes 17 letters in a line). He adds as his reason for this opinion that 'the writer occasionally omits just the number of letters which would suffice to fill a line, and that to the utter ruin of the sense; as if his eye had heedlessly wandered to the line immediately below. Instances of this want of care will be found in Luke xxi 8, xxii 25, perhaps John iv 45, xii 25, where complete lines

easily seen if a restoration of the exemplar is made on this assumption as follows :—

(1) Jn. iii 20, 21 :

	ΠΑΣΓΑΡΟΦΑΥ	
	ΛΑΠΡΑССΩΝ	
	ΜΙΣΕΙΤΟΦΩС	
	[ΚΑΙΟΥΚΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ]	} 22 letters (or 5 + 19)
5	<u>ΠΡΟΣΤΟΦΩС</u>]	
	ΙΝΑΜΗΛΕΓΧΘΗ	
	ΤΑΕΡΓΑΔΥΟΥ	
	[ΟΔΕΠΟΙΩΝΑΛΗ]	} 54 letters
	<u>ΘΕΙΑΝΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ</u>	
10	<u>ΠΡΟΣΤΟΦΩС</u>	
	ΙΝΑΦΑΝΕΡΩΘΗ	
	<u>ΤΑΕΡΓΑΔΥΟΥ</u>]	
	ΟΤΙΕΝΘΩΕΣΤΙ	
	ΕΙΡΓΑΣΜΕΝΑ	

τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ in line 12 is not the reading of B but it is of \aleph^{ca} and of L.

In the first omission \aleph^* stands practically alone, in the second apparently quite alone.¹

Before going any further, it is important to note that the measuring of lines by the number of letters they contain, however convenient, may be misleading, especially for those used to the long lines and divided words of a modern prose work. In an ancient prose work the division of the lines, and therefore the number of letters in each line, depended first and chiefly on the horizontal space which the scribe decided to give to his writing—often very little, considering the size of the letters—and then on the way in which the syllable-divisions fell. Thus, if the

are omitted; John xix 26; Heb. xiii 18 (partly corrected); Apoc. xviii 16, xix 12, xxii 2, where the copyist passed in the middle of a line to the corresponding portion of the line below'. None of these instances is, however, in the least convincing. In Luke xxii 25 the reading of the exemplar of \aleph is very uncertain; in John xii 25 we have an omission of 11 or 12 letters (*φυλάξει αὐτήν*); in the passages from the Apocalypse of 17, 17 (or 18), and 26 (or fewer) letters respectively; while Luke xxi 8, John xix 26, and Heb. xiii 18 (John iv 45 is discussed below) are very puzzling, and rather suggest that causes of more kinds than one have been at work, a possibility which has always to be borne in mind. It is almost needless to add that we must be prepared for variety in the length of line of the original even between gospel and gospel and may even expect it between the various groups of books. *Ου-κεστιν* (Scrivener *op. cit.* p. xiv) is, of course, the natural Greek division of the words—or should we say word—which we write *οὐκ ἐστιν* and similarly with many elisions.

¹ Here as later the portions omitted by \aleph are indicated by square brackets. Homocoteleuta at the ends of lines, which would help omissions, are underlined. I have used uncials, as I think they help the eye, and the common compendia.

space available was, as I think probable in the instance before us,¹ a trifle over two inches and would contain on the average eleven letters, and if a syllable came to an end, say, at the tenth letter, the scribe might have to choose between ending the line there, leaving perhaps a vacant space, and including in the line the whole of the next syllable, and his choice would depend (1) on the thinness or otherwise of (say) the first ten letters, (2) on the length of the next syllable and the thinness or otherwise of the letters of which it was composed, and (3) on the way in which the division would affect ease of reading, a consideration by no means neglected by good scribes (see *infra*, p. 570). *Caeteris paribus*, a good scribe would prefer to end a line with a word; and some letters (for instance I or Λ) occupy less space normally than others or lend themselves more readily to a contracted space (ο, for instance, or the combination αυ).

The other instances in the Gospel according to St John may be given in the order in which they occur.

(2) Jn. iii 3 :

ΑΠΕΚΡΙΘΗΟΙC
[ΚΕΙΠΕΝΑΥΤΩ]
ΑΜΗΝΑΜΗΝΛΕΓΩ

ℵ* apparently alone omits these 12 letters (or 5 + 9). ℵ^{ca} corrects. Note αυτω, λεγω.

(3) Jn. iv 5 :

ΔΙΑΤΗC
CΑΜΑΡΙΑC
[ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙΟΥΝ
ΕΙCΤΟΛΙΝΤΗC
CΑΜΑΡΙΑC]
ΛΕΓΟΜΕΝΗΝ

ℵ* apparently alone omits these 29 (or 28) letters; ℵ^{ca} restores; proper names prefer a line to themselves.

(4) Jn. iv 45 :

ΩCΟΥΝΗΛΘΕΝ
ΕΙCΤΗΝ[ΔΑΙΔΑΙ]
ΑΝ[ΕΔΕΞΑΝΤΟ
ΑΥΤΟΝΟΙ[ΔΑΙΔΑΙ]
ΟΙΕΩΡΑΚΟΤΕC

ℵ* apparently alone attests this omission of 22 (or rather 24) letters; ℵ^{ca} restores apparently with the addition of πάντα after έωρακότες. ℵ*

¹ This is on the assumption that the letters in the exemplar were about the size of those of ℵ. In suggesting a reading of the exemplar of ℵ I have been guided mainly by the reading of its later hands or by the reading of manuscripts which often go with it elsewhere.

stands alone in reading *οἱ ἐωρακότες*, which is Greek, but probably not the Greek of the exemplar. Γαλιλαῖος and its cases are words which lend themselves to squeezing, as **Ν** itself proves—even *ΑΥΤΟΝΟΙΓΑΙ* would be a short line. Γαλιλαῖαν, moreover, ends a line in **Ν**, which would explain the borrowing of the termination from line 3, if after τήν it required any explanation. After finishing the word and the line and the clause the scribe's eye went back to the ΓΑΛΙΛΑΙ of line 4. ὡς οὖν begins a new section.

(5) Jn. v 26 :

 ωσγαρ
 ΟΠΗΡΖΩΗΝΕΧΕΙ
 [ΕΝΕΑΥΤΩΟΥΤΩC
 ΚΑΙΤΩΓΩΕΔΩ
 ΚΕΝΖΩΗΝΕΧΕΙ]
 ΕΝΕΑΥΤΩ

Ν* alone apparently attests this omission of some 33 letters; there is some confusion, but I restore what seems to have been the reading of the first hand of **Ν**^{ca}, which reads, however, *εχν*.

(6) Jn. vi 11 :

 ΚΑΙ
 ΕΔΩΚΕΝΤΟΙC
 [ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙCΟΙΔΕ
 ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙΟΙC]
 ΑΝΑΚΕΙΜΕΝΟΙC

Ἐδωκεν* not *διέδωκεν* is the reading of **Ν with D and Γ and certain cursives. **Ν**^{cb} D and Γ with eleven other uncials read the words in brackets. 23 letters are omitted. I very much doubt whether the exemplar contained these words, in any case this example is of a very different character to the rest.

(7) Jn. vi 38, 39 :

 ΑΛΛΑ
 ΤΟΘΕΛΗΜΑΤΟΥ
 ΠΕΜΨΑΝΤΟCΜΕ
 [ΤΟΥΤΟΔΕΕCΤΙΝ
 ΤΟΘΕΛΗΜΑΤΟΥ
 ΠΕΜΨΑΝΤΟCΜΕ]
 ΙΝΑΠΑΝΟΔΕΔΩ

Ν* is apparently alone in omitting these 33 (or 34) letters; **Ν**^{ca} restores. A new section begins with *τοῦτο δέ*, which also begins a line.

(8) Jn. vi 55 :

 ΗΓΑΡCΑΡΞΙΜΟΥ
 ΑΛΗΘΩCΕCΤΙΝ
 [ΒΡΩCΙCΚΑΙ

ΤΟΑΙΜΑΜΟΥ
ΔΛΗΘΩΣΕΣΤΙΝ
 ΠΟΤΟΝ

Ν* omits these 29 letters apparently alone. Ν^{ca} restores with perhaps *ἀληθής* in each case for *ἀληθῶς*. A new section begins at *ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ*.

(9) Jn. x 40:

ΟΜ. ΕΙΣΤΟΝΤΟΠΟΝ

Ν* practically alone—10 or 11 letters. Ν^{ca} restores.

(10) Jn. xii 31:

ΤΟΥ
ΚΟΣΜΟΥΤΟΥΤΟΥ
[ΝΥΝΟΑΡΧΩΝΤΟΥ
ΚΟΣΜΟΥΤΟΥΤΟΥ]

Ν* apparently alone omits these 24 letters; A restores. A division at the ninth letter in lines 2, 3, and 4 would mean short lines and *του* occupies but little space.

(11) Jn. xiii 31, 32:

ΘΘC
ΕΔΟΞΑΘΗΝ
[ΑΥΤΩΕΙΘΘC
ΕΔΟΞΑΘΗΝ]
 ΑΥΤΩΚΘΘC

Ν* stands apparently alone in omitting these 19 letters. Ν^{ca} restores.

(12) Jn. xv 9, 10:

ΥΜΑC
ΜΕΙΝΑΤΕΕΝΤΗ
ΑΓΑΠΗΤΗΜΗ
[ΕΑΝΤΑCΕΝΤΟΛΑC
 5 ΜΟΥΤΗΡΗCΕΤΕ

ΜΕΝΕΙΤΕΕΝΤΗ
ΑΓΑΠΗΤΗΜΗ]
 ΚΑΘΩC

Ν* stands apparently alone in omitting these 45 letters; Ν^{ca} restores with the spelling *τηρησεται, μενιται*. Line 4 is a long line, but a break at the tenth letter would make the line too short and the word were better finished.

(13) Jn. xvi 14-16:

ΔΟΞΑCΕΙ
ΟΤΙΕΚΤΟΥΕΜΟΥ
ΛΗΨΕΤΑΙΚΑΙ
ΑΝΑΓΓΕΛΛΕΙΥΜΙ
 5 [ΠΑΝΤΑΟCΑΧΕΙ
 ΟΠΗΡΕΜΑΕCΤΙ
 ΔΙΑΤΟΥΤΟΕΙΠΩ

ΟΤΙΕΚΤΟΥΕΜΟΥ
ΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΙΚΑΙ
 ΙΟ ΑΝΑΓΓΕΛΛΕΙΜΙ
 ΜΙΚΡΟΝ

κ* stands apparently alone in omitting these 70 letters; κ^{ca} restores with the spelling *εχι, λαμβανι, αναγγελι*, which may have been the spelling of the archetype. Both *πάντα* (line 5) and *διὰ τοῦτο* (line 7) begin new sections.

(14) Jn. xvi 17 :

ΗΜΙΝ
ΜΙΚΡΟΝΚΑΙ
 [ΟΥΘΕΩΡΕΙΤΕ
ΜΕΚΑΙΤΑΛΙΝ]
ΜΙΚΡΟΝΚΑΙ
 ΟΥΕΣΘΕΜΕΚΑΙ

κ* apparently alone attests this omission of 29 letters; κ^{ca} restores with the spelling *ου θεωριται*.

(15) Jn. xvii 17, 18 :

ΑΥΤΟΥΣ
ΕΝΤΗΛΗΘΕΙΑ
 [ΣΟΥΛΟΓΟΣΟ
ΣΟΣΑΛΗΘΕΙΑ]
 ΕΣΤΙΝ

κ* apparently alone attests this omission of 20 letters (B, however, and others including C* and L omit *σου*); κ^{ca} restores with the spelling *αληθια*.

(16) Jn. xix 19 ff:

ΓΕΓΡΑΜΜΕΝΟΝ
 ΙΣΟΝΑΖΩΡΑΙ
ΟΣΟΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ
ΤΩΝΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ
 5 [ΤΟΥΤΟΝΟΥΝΤΟΝ
 ΤΙΤΛΟΝΠΟΛΛΟΙ
 ΑΝΕΓΝΩΣΑΝ
 ΤΩΝΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ
 ΟΤΙΕΓΓΥΣΗΝΟ
 10 ΤΟΠΟΣΤΗΣΠΟΛ
ΕΩΣΟΠΟΥΕΣΤΡΩ
ΘΗΟΙΣΚΑΙΗΝ
 ΓΕΓΡΑΜΜΕΝΟΝ
 ΕΒΡΑΙΣΤΙ
 15 ΡΩΜΑΙΣΤΙ
 ΕΛΛΗΝΙΣΤΙ
 ΕΛΕΓΟΝΟΥΝ
 ΤΩΠΙΛΑΤΩ

ΟΙΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΙC
 20 ΤΩΝΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ
 ΜΗΓΡΑΦΕ
ΟΒΑCΙΛΕΥC
ΤΩΝΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ]
 ΑΛΛΟΤΙΕΚΕΙ
 25 ΝΟCΕΙΠΕΝΒΑ
 CΙΛΕΥCΕΙΜΙ
 ΤΩΝΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ

N* apparently alone attests this omission of some 190 letters or 19 lines; perhaps, according to the mere number of letters, the eight lines 17-24 (68 letters) should be divided into seven. The division, however, I have given best represents to the eye the sense; there is a proper name in line 18, and lines 22 and 23 ought to stand out. The division of lines 14-16 is justified by the *εβραϊστι ρωμαϊστι ελληνιστι* of **N^{ca}**, which restores the omission with the further abbreviations of *ιονδαῶν* in lines 8 and 23 and of *ς* in line 12. The omission is too short for a column. *Τούτον οὖν τὸν τίτλον* begins a new section.

(17) Jn. xx 5-7:

ΠΑΡΑ
 ΚΥΨΑCΒΛΕΠΕΙ
ΤΑΘΘΟΝΙΑ
[ΚΕΙΜΕΝΑΟΥ
 5 ΜΕΝΤΟΙΕΙCΗΛ
 ΘΕΝΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ
 ΟΥΝΚΑΙCΙΜΩ
 ΠΕΤΡΟCΑΚΟ
 ΛΟΥΘΩΝΑΥΤΩ
 10 ΚΑΙΕΙCΗΛΘΕ
 ΕΙCΤΟΜΝΗΜΕΙΟ
 ΚΑΙΘΕΩΡΕΙ
ΤΑΘΘΟΝΙΑ]
ΚΕΙΜΕΝΑΚΑΙ

N* apparently alone supports this omission. **N^{ca}** restores with the spellings *μνημιον, θεωρι*. About 100 letters are omitted, an average of 10 to the line. Various slight alterations in lines 3-14 are possible, but the above appears to me most natural and any possible alteration would not affect the general result.¹

¹ It is, perhaps, worth while to notice (1) the omission in **N*** of *καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα* in John xix 23, although **N*** is here supported by *a, b, ff²* and *sy^{scb}*, and it is not certain that the prototype of **N** had this reading. It is an omission of 12 letters, or of *ς + 9* letters, which is the reading of **N^{ca}**. If the next two lines were

ΗΝΔΕΟΧΙΤΩΝΑ
 ΡΑΦΟC

the omission would be to some extent explained, but the division of *ἀραφος* does

In practically all the instances given above there is next to no doubt that the omissions are due to the carelessness of the scribe of \aleph , and there is hardly in any case more doubt as to the reading of the exemplar from which that manuscript was copied.¹ They all, moreover, readily lend themselves to explanation by the cause to which I assigned the omission in the first example, and that without any undue pressing of any considerations which might probably have influenced the scribe of either manuscript. The average number of letters in the line is unusually small, but if, as has been pointed out already (p. 565), the letters were the size of those of \aleph they would occupy about two inches, which would not make the width of the column without parallel (cf. Kenyon *Palaeography of Greek Papyri* p. 21). The length of line thus chosen would make the manuscript more costly both in material and labour, but it has this advantage that the line frequently ends with the end of a word, a reconstruction of the first fifty lines of \aleph on this principle giving only four divided words as against twenty-one.

However much this arrangement may have contributed to mistakes in copying, it made for clearness in reading and enabled important words or phrases to be isolated and so made prominent. It would also tend to ease of reference, especially if the first line of a section was indented, as I am inclined to think it was. The tentative colometry, if I may use the phrase, of the method suggests the sort of manuscript which a careful scholar, who knew the value of neat and clear arrangement, might make or have made for himself. Origen would be such a person and, especially with the experience of the Hexapla behind him, might very well have been directly or indirectly responsible for some arrangement of this sort.

An exhaustive examination of the rest of the New Testament from this point of view would carry me far beyond the limits and purpose of this note. Moreover, the Gospel of St John, with its frequent repetition of similar phrases, naturally lends itself to this kind of transcriptional error, and we could not in any case expect the phenomena observed in St John to be repeated with anything like the same frequency elsewhere. A certain amount of caution is, therefore, necessary in making any deductions. An examination, however, of a fair number of passages

not agree with my idea of the prototype of \aleph ; and (2) the omission in John xx 3 of *καὶ ἤρχοντο εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον* (say 23 letters), which may, perhaps, be explained thus (with \aleph^c):

[ΚΑΙΗΡΧΟΝΤΟ
ΕΙΣΤΟΜΝΗΜΙΟ]
ΚΑΙΕΤΡΕΧΘ.

Both omissions are, however, probably due to other causes.

¹ No. 6 is the possible exception.

in the other three groups of books (Acts—Catholic Epistles, Pauline Epistles, Apocalypse) yielded practically no example which even suggested a line in their original of eleven letters. In the Synoptic Gospels, which I examined with some care, Mark i 32, iv 37, xii 25, and xv 47 with Luke x 32, xiii 14, and xvi 16, and perhaps one or two other omissions can be explained with more or less plausibility in the same way as the omissions in St John. There are, however, numerous other omissions in the Synoptic Gospels obviously due to a blunder of the scribe of \aleph , and these either admit of no such explanation or suggest a different arrangement of the lines. The instances, indeed, in St John's Gospel are in comparison so convincing and so consistent that it looks as if St John stood by itself; in which case we have confirmation of the opinion which finds behind \aleph not a codex or codices but a series of papyrus rolls.

It is worth while just to point out that in John xvii 15 B omits the thirty letters enclosed below in brackets, and that the verse itself can be arranged as follows:—

$\overline{\text{I}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{C}}}$
 $\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{Y}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{Y}}\overline{\text{C}}\overline{\text{E}}\overline{\text{K}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{Y}}$
 [$\overline{\text{K}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{C}}\overline{\text{M}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{Y}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{L}}\overline{\text{L}}$
 $\overline{\text{I}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{R}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{C}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{C}}$
 $\overline{\text{A}}\overline{\text{Y}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{Y}}\overline{\text{C}}\overline{\text{E}}\overline{\text{K}}\overline{\text{T}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{Y}}$]
 $\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{N}}\overline{\text{H}}\overline{\text{R}}\overline{\text{O}}\overline{\text{Y}}$.

H. S. CRONIN.

DEUX SERMONS INÉDITS DE BALDWIN, ARCHEVÊQUE DE CANTERBURY 1184-1190.

Le second successeur de Thomas Becket a été plus étudié dans sa vie que dans ses écrits, et dans ses traités dogmatiques que dans ses œuvres parénétiques.¹ — En 1662, Bertrand Tissier² édita 16 sermons, qui furent réimprimés par Migne³ en 1855; le manuscrit utilisé, venant de l'abbaye de Clairvaux, est aujourd'hui à Troyes (n° 876, XIII^e s.); une copie, du XIV^e s., qui donne les mêmes sermons dans le même ordre, est conservée à Londres, à la Lambeth Library (n° 210); ce sont également des textes déjà connus que nous trouvons à Paris (Bibl. nat., lat. 14932, fol. 185, XII^e s.⁴; 1252, fol. 162 et 170 v°, XIII^e s.⁵), à Cambrai

¹ *Dictionary of National Biography*, nouv. éd., v° Baldwin.

² *Bibliotheca patrum cisterciensium* v 1-74.

³ *Patr. lat.* cciv 403-572.

⁴ Le sermon xvi des éditions.

⁵ Les sermons xvi et iv.