

SCOTUS ERIGENA ON GREEK MANUSCRIPTS OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

DR SOUTER notes in the Critical Apparatus of his N. T. that οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρός is omitted by B* 17* Clem. Eus. Ath. *al.*; he does not mention that the first clause οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκός is omitted by other witnesses (E*, &c.). Both omissions are no doubt mistakes that arose mechanically; see Th. Zahn on the passage (note 70). But nowhere do I find mentioned the statement of Scotus Erigena:—

In antiquis Graecorum exemplaribus solummodo scribitur: Qui non ex sanguinibus, sed ex Deo nati sunt.

Scotus seems to have known MSS (or a MS) in which *both* clauses were omitted. The passage of Erigena is quoted by Franz Overbeck *Das Johannesevangelium* (Tübingen 1911, p. 126) with reference to Ravaisson *Rapports sur les bibliothèques des départements de l'Ouest*, Paris 1846, p. 325. Erigena is not mentioned by Tischendorf among the authors who are important for the text of the Greek Testament. This passage shews that even so late an author deserves the attention of an editor of the Greek Testament.

On i 15 Scotus writes:—

Et clamat, vel sicut in Graeco legitur *et clamavit dicens: Hic erat quem dixi*, vel sicut in Graeco habetur *quem dicebam*, quod multo significantius est. Nam si praeteritum perfectum, quod est *dixi*, poneret, peractum iam praedicationis eius de Christo opus significaret; praeteritum vero imperfectum, quod est *dicebam*, et inchoationem praedicationis Christi ab Ioanne significat, et adhuc in ipsa praedicatione perseverantiam.

For the imperfect ἔλεγον instead of εἶπον Tischendorf quotes only C³. Is there any connexion between Scotus and C³, or did he consider εἶπον as imperfect, or are there any other MSS reading ἔλεγον?

Curious is the remark on i 29:—

Alterā die, vel, ut in Graeco significantius scribitur, *alia die videt Ioannes Iesum venientem ad se*. *Alia*, inquit, *die*, hoc est, alia cognitione. Prima enim cognitio fuit, quando . . . Nunc autem veluti secunda notitia, *altera die* vel *alia die*.

In Greek there is no variant for τῇ ἐπαύριον.

On i 18 we read:—

Unigenitus filius, qui est in sinu Patris, vel ut in Graeco scribitur *qui est in sinu Patris* vel *in sinibus Patris*. In quibusdam codicibus Graecorum singulariter *sinus Patris* dicitur, in quibusdam pluraliter, quasi sinus multos Pater habeat.

How is this statement to be understood? Ought we to read for the Greek 'in sinum' to correspond with εἰς τὸν κόλπον? or, 'in sinus'? But what of the plural? Is it a confusion with Lk. xvi 22, 23?

On iii 3 Scotus calls attention to the difference of 'denuo et ἀνωθεν hoc est *desursum*'; on iii 13 he says that 'ascendit' might be present or perfect, 'sed in Graeco non est ambiguum.'

On iii 27:—

nisi fuerit ei datum de caelo. In quibusdam codicibus Graecorum legitur *nisi fuerit ei datum desursum de caelo.*

For this ἀνωθεν Tischendorf quotes only 13, 69, 129; Wettstein adds the Armenian version. Codex 69 is the famous codex of Leicester, of the origin of which Dr Rendel Harris treated in 1887. Have we here a trace of one of its ancestors?

EB. NESTLE.

RECENT DISCOVERIES IN THE CATACOMB OF S. CALLISTUS.

THAT the opening number of the new *Journal of Roman Studies* should contain an article on the topic about to be discussed is of good omen for the study of Christian archaeology in England. Our country sends forth few workers in this field, which might well occupy the attention of some of those attracted to Rome by the advantages for study offered by the British School of Archaeology.

The last decade has been fruitful of discovery in the catacombs. Readers of the *Journal of Theological Studies* will recollect that excavations in the Catacomb of Priscilla on the Via Salaria have made it possible to determine with some approach to certainty the spot hallowed by tradition as the scene of S. Peter's ministry. The works upon which Miss Barker's article in the *Journal of Roman Studies* are based deal with the group of cemeteries lying on or between the Via Appia and Via Ardeatina, and although they do not carry us back to Apostolic times, they throw much fresh light on the history of the third century and its martyrs. Unfortunately, the interpretation of the remains which have been discovered has led to much diversity of opinion and to a bitter and unedifying controversy between the principal writers on the subject, of which as little as possible will here be said.

The 'queen of roads' and the relatively unimportant highway which led from Rome to Ardea issued from the city by the Porta Capena and Porta Naevia respectively, and when the walls of Aurelian were built, the first passed through the new Porta Appia, whilst a small gateway, the Porta Ardeatina, which was blocked in the middle ages and finally destroyed by Sangallo to make room for his bastion, gave passage to the second. The Via Ardeatina, however, fell into disuse in the Dark