I had looked for great things from Dr von Soden's final volume of the Text. The earlier volumes were very heavy reading, but I expected that his Text and critical notes would fill a gap in our studies.

Alas, he has but complicated our problems, and instead of writing a eulogy on his work I regret to have to condemn it strongly. The only redeeming feature of the whole work consists in the collations of codices at Sinai, Jerusalem, and Athos, not forgetting 050 at Tiflis.

As to the presentment of the combined critical material, after making every allowance for the division of work among forty people, it can only be said that the apparatus is positively honeycombed with errors, and many documents which should have been recollated have not been touched, others only partially, and others again have been incorrectly handled.

Dr von Soden frequently opposes Schmidtke's edition of Paris97, and doubtless it is von Soden who is wrong every time. He misquotes my 604/700 (his 132) and has not correctly handled 28 (his 198) or 157 (his 297). He does not tell us if he had \( \psi \) recollated. If he only used Lake's edition of Mark and Collation of the other Gospels, then he has done a great wrong by printing endless false readings. If he has had it recollated then Lake's work was rather careless. I leave them to settle this matter between them.

It has been my duty to go over von Soden's text and apparatus throughout the Gospels in all passages concerning a difference between \( \text{\textit{et}} \) and \( \text{\textit{B}} \) (in connexion with a work which is in the press), and very soon after beginning the investigation it became clear to me that von Soden's work was a step backward. I have striven myself to keep textual matters on as clear a basis as possible, and here we have an editor, who, not content with throwing overboard all our previous nomenclature in an excess of pride in his forthcoming enterprise, has brought this enterprise to fruition in such a way as to befog the issue at every step.

Without further preliminaries I proceed to indict him on the most serious count of all; upon a count on which none of his predecessors have been found guilty;† for they handled these matters with infinite care.

* See supra p. 306.
† Now published by Beermann and Gregory as the 'Koridethi' Gospels.
‡ I think Tischendorf is unwittingly guilty on one occasion only.
As regards Hort, his method had the merit of simplicity, whatever we may think of the result. When he was confronted with five or six varieties of order or three or four different readings, he chose upon occasion to follow B, even if alone, by preference. Not so von Soden. His method is that of eclecticism, carried to such a point that he invents scripture by conflation or combination, and instead of reducing our many various readings, he has actually increased them!

Here is the proof.

(I) Invention of Scripture.

He prints—

(1) Mark iii 3 καὶ λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ τὴν ἐξηραμμένην χεῖρα ἔχοντι.

There are varieties of reading here, but no MSS that I know of read as von Soden’s text.

Tisch. has τῷ τὴν ἐξηραμμένην χεῖρα ἔχοντι

W-H , , τῷ τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντι ἐξηράν

Text. rec. , , τῷ ἐξηραμμένην ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα

D , , τῷ ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα ἐξηραμμένην

28 , , τῷ τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντι ἐξηραμμένην

Matt. xii 13 τότε λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ tautum

Luke vi 8 εἴπεν δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ ἐξηραμμένην ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα with variations (and some τῷ τὴν ἐξηραμμένην ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα)


In his margin he has ‘om τῇ ἡν Ta K gg H δός δός f bo Ia 160 ην b 288 pa’.

Now δός = ην and δός = 33, plus Λ (= f after δός), have τῇ ην but in quite a different position, viz. before ἐν. So does I [non fam 118–209–131] represented by von Soden as ην; so that unless Sod160, or Sod288 (= Evan. 22) has his order he has grossly erred and invented a new order with the addition, just as other MSS did when incorporating something from the margin.

As regards 22 Mr Sanders informs me that + τῇ ην occurs there before ἐν, so that the matter narrows down to Sod160, but the edition just published shews τῇ ην before ἐν there also.


Now ἀνεφώνησεν is the reading of B plural against η C F Soden160 28 892 minn10 or so for ἀνεβώθην, but φωνῇ on the other hand is the reading of η plural against the κραυγῇ of B L Ξ and W 250 Paris97 Origener b4835, so that von Soden follows B for one thing and deserts him as to the very next word. He thus tacitly accuses η in one word and B in the other contiguous one of bearing false testimony. Does this justify him in ever following η B alone elsewhere, as at Matt. xviii 24, Mark viii 32 &c.? Or does it justify him in following η B L alone
at Mark xvi 4? Or in following L alone at Luke xvii 12? Or B 892 alone at Mark ii 22? Or B T 892 alone at Luke xxi 30? If κρατηγη of B L = W 2pe Paris\(^9\) Or\(\text{ger}\) conjoined be wrong here in Luke i 42, how can he be convinced that the other singular or semi-singular readings of B referred to above are correct when he adopts them elsewhere?


But those MSS which change βαψας to βαψω . . . κα, all have δωσω afterwards and not επιδιωσω.

Unless I am greatly mistaken, von Soden’s βαψω το ψωμον και επιδιωσω αυτω is invented, whereas βαψας το ψωμον και δωσω αυτω is read by B C L (δω) 213 Sod\(^{311}\) 1110 9371 boh (sah) arm aeth.

(5) Mark x 1. I considered until I came across this passage that von Soden had simply committed errors in his text, but here he shews us something, for he prints ‘[κα] [δια του] περαν’, which, in its entirety, is only exhibited by one MS, Laura\(^{A104}\). His apparatus is so constructed that you could not tell it from that, for Laura\(^{A104}\) (= his \(^{127}\)) is not cited thus.

He inserts the bracketed κα, because Ν B C* L Ψ 892 read κα, περαν against the simple περαν of D G W Δ C\(^2\) min alig lat syr goth arm. He follows it with [δια του] because A N Φ uncl\(^{21}\) and aeth have this, but the general summary result is the product of conflation, in which process I arraign him as guilty with Laura\(^{A104}\).

(6) Luke v 2. Von Soden prints πλοουρια δω. This has, as far as I know, no Greek authority whatever, the witness for it being only a of the Latins. Von Soden’s notes are so arranged that it is impossible to observe whether any of his new Greek witnesses so read. He has conflated the order of B W 892 Paris\(^9\) e copt syr W-H\(\text{txt}\) : πλοου δω, with the δω πλοουρια of A C L Q R Ψ & c. (W-\(\text{Hmg}\)), while D uncl\(^3\) minn\(^{91}\) read δω πλοου. It is in this same verse that he holds ἀπελυναν against W-H, with ἐπλυνον B D W 91 892, ἐπλυναν Ν C* L Q X 239 299 372 Paris\(^9\) Sod\(^{416}\), and the simple λαβαβαν of the Latins!

(7) Luke xxi 8. Out of a good many varieties von Soden chooses εξ ικανου θελων (− χρωνου or χρωνων). No editor had done this before because there was no uncial authority for it. There happens to be one uncial MS for it now, viz. Ψ (Lake \(\text{test}\) ), but von Soden does not recognize it, because he quotes δ6 (= Ψ) in his notes (and on \(+\) T xt. rec. θελων εξ ικανου as most, or θελων εξ ικανου χρωνου \(W\) al. But εξ ικανων χρωνων θελων \(N\) B T X alig. c. θελων εξ ικανων χρωνων 157, εξ ικανων χρωνου θελων \(fam\) \(t\), εξ ικανων χρωνων \(L\) (−θελων), erat enim cupiens videre illum a (− εξ ικ. χρό) cf. πετ. Ord. \(\text{it}\) : θελων ειδων αυτου εξ ικανων χρωνων \(D\) d cf. sah syr, cf. ε, εξ ικανου θελων Ψ et Soden t xt soli vid cum 241 et evangelistariis sex.
page 946 of Band I, Abt. II) as reading \( \chi r\rho \nu \nu \) post \( \iota \kappa \alpha \nu \nu \) of his text, thus:—

"Add \( \chi r\rho \nu \nu \) \( \iota \kappa \alpha \nu \nu \) (Ac 27, 9) \( H^{\theta \alpha} \delta^\circ \iota \nu \) &c.

Thus (unless Lake is wrong, and I do not think he is) von Soden stands alone again, as far as the evidence recognized by him was concerned.

(8) Mark xv 34. Von Soden shews us how a polyglot mind among the scribes of old led to trouble, for, without any Greek authority, he prints in his text καὶ τῇ ὡρᾳ ἐνατῇ. What he means to print (judging from his note) is καὶ τῇ ἐνατῇ ὡρᾳ with \( \aleph \beta D F L \psi \) &c. The majority of Greeks have καὶ τῇ ὡρᾳ τῇ ἐνατῇ, but πονε καὶ τῇ ὡρᾳ ἐνατῇ, nor does he give any MS in his notes which omits τῇ ἀντὶ ἐνατῇ.

(9) Luke x 42 where \( D a b c e f f i l r (syr sin) \) Amb Clem omit the clause altogether, and where Hort got into difficulties and followed \( C^2 L 1 \) [non fam] 33 (add now Paris\textsuperscript{97}) against B, while \( C^* A \) unc\textsuperscript{4} and \( W \psi 892 \) minn\textsuperscript{1} &c. give another version, von Soden elects to follow one Greek MS, viz. 38\textsuperscript{8}† (about which we hear but little generally) for οἶγνω \( \delta \epsilon \varepsilon \tau \iota \theta \iota \rho ει \chi ξεια. †ο \) I am justified in placing this here, for I do not recollect him ever to have quoted Evan. 38 in his apparatus (N\textsuperscript{°} δ 355). So he adopted this reading in all probability without knowing of this solitary MS authority because (see p. xxiv) of his rule: 'Für die Darstellung der Lesart war die Aufgabe denkbarste Knappheit, leichte Übersichtlichkeit, unmissverständliche Klarheit.' So, at the expense of documentary evidence, he prints out of his head: which incidentally is a wonderful commentary on the previous action of Evan. 38 syr hier and boh\textsuperscript{3}ao.

The passage involved is the famous one conveying our Lord's remarks to Martha about Mary:—

'\( \epsilon νος \delta \epsilon ο\iota \chi ξεια. \) Μαρία \( \delta \) τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα ἐξελέξατο ἦτις οὐκ ἀφαιρεθηκαί αὐτὴ αὐτής.'

The early sentence is found

in B as οἶγνω \( \delta \epsilon \varepsilon \tau \iota \theta \iota \rho ει \chi ξεια εστιν \eta \epsilon νος \)
in \( \aleph ^* \) as οἶγνω \( \delta \epsilon \varepsilon \tau \iota \theta \iota \rho ει \chi ξεια εστιν \eta \epsilon νος \)
in \( C^2 L 1.33 \) Paris\textsuperscript{97} as οἶγνω \( \delta \epsilon \varepsilon \tau \iota \theta \iota \rho ει \chi ξεια \eta \epsilon νος \).

Clem with \( D d a b c e f f i l r \) Ambr (syr sin) omit it altogether, but von Soden with 38 and syr hier boh\textsuperscript{3} ao elects:—

'οἶγνω \( \delta \epsilon \varepsilon \tau \iota \theta \iota \rho ει \chi ξεια †ο .'

for 'Knappheit' and 'unmissverständliche Klarheit'.

(10) John vii 12. Who would suppose from von Soden's text 'καὶ γογγυσμὸς \( \eta \nu \) περὶ αὐτοῦ πολὺς' (agreeing with Tischendorf's text) and from his apparently simple note

† The famous one (of four cursives only) which joins in omitting the first word from the cross. There at Luke xxiii 34 von Soden does not quote it, so he was evidently not familiar with it.

‡ Syr hier and arm are the only others to agree (partially).
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that he and Tischendorf (quite unwittingly I suppose) had very nearly invented scripture here also, for 33 appears to be the only witness for their case? It will be observed that \( \delta^{45} \) (\( =33 \)) is the only MS (with an exception to be mentioned immediately) which occurs in both lists. It so happened that the differing orders which caused them so to act also misled another very ancient authority who preceded them by a thousand and half a thousand years. A close inspection will shew 'Xp,' also appearing twice, and a reference to Matthaei's edition, p. 127, of St John exhibits:—

\[ \tau \alpha \lambda \delta \lambda \nu \delta \mu \nu \rho \epsilon \iota \alpha \iota \omega \tau \omicron \upsilon \delta \theta \mu \epsilon \ \mu \epsilon \ \lambda \ \theta \] that is to say, practically all his codices of St Chrysostom!

So Chrys. and 33\( ^{\text{vid}} \) Tisch. and von Soden invite us to read: \( \kappa \alpha \iota \gamma \gamma \nu \nu \mu \mu \o\omicron \nu \rho \alpha \tau \alpha \iota \omega \nu \tau \alpha \lambda \delta \lambda \nu \delta \mu \nu \rho \epsilon \iota \alpha \iota \omega \tau \omicron \upsilon \delta \theta \mu \epsilon \ \mu \epsilon \ \lambda \ \theta \) of St Chrysostom! Because of trouble at that place very early.

The common text of most is \( \kappa \alpha \iota \gamma \gamma \nu \nu \mu \mu \o\omicron \nu \rho \alpha \tau \alpha \iota \omega \nu \tau \alpha \lambda \delta \lambda \nu \delta \mu \nu \rho \epsilon \iota \alpha \iota \omega \tau \omicron \upsilon \delta \theta \mu \epsilon \ \mu \epsilon \ \lambda \ \theta \) of St Chrysostom! because of trouble at that place very early.

The order of B L T X W is opposed by syr and pers which place \( \tau \alpha \lambda \delta \lambda \nu \delta \mu \nu \rho \) in the text in an early position. \( \tau \alpha \lambda \delta \lambda \nu \delta \mu \nu \rho \) is omitted by goth. Von Soden now adds \( \delta^{30} \) (\( =5 \)) but does not mention goth. (127 reads \( \kappa \alpha \iota \gamma \gamma \nu \nu \mu \mu \o\omicron \nu \rho \alpha \tau \alpha \iota \omega \nu \tau \alpha \lambda \delta \lambda \nu \delta \mu \nu \rho \) of St Chrysostom!) of St Chrysostom!

This muddle has misled both Tisch. and von Soden, unless they have purposely made a composition of the readings of 33 and B L T X W. At any rate their authority is Chrys. and 33 only. On p. 957 Band I, Abt. II, von Soden does not include this reading of 33 with Chrys.

Von Soden ends with \( \epsilon \nu \tau \omicron \iota \omicron \sigma \chi \omicron \lambda \omicron \omega \) against \( \epsilon \nu \tau \omicron \iota \omicron \sigma \chi \omicron \lambda \omicron \omega \) of 33. His clause in its entirety is absolutely alone with Chrys.

(11) Luke xii 18. Von Soden prints \( \pi \alpha \tau \alpha \tau \alpha \gamma \eta \nu \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \) \( \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \gamma \alpha \delta \alpha \mu \alpha \nu \), omitting \( \mu \omicron \nu \nu \) after \( \gamma \eta \nu \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \) of St Chrysostom! I know of no Greek MSS which do this. He has apparently mixed the testimony of B L T \( \min\alpha\iota\omicron\iota\omicron\nu \) and the versions which substitute \( \tau \omicron \iota \omicron \) without \( \mu \omicron \nu \nu \) for \( \tau \alpha \gamma \eta \nu \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \) \( \mu \omicron \nu \nu \), but this does not justify his action in the least. It is impossible for a student, not versed in these matters, to gather anything from his notes, for he states the two matters differently. Thus:—

\[ \text{add } \mu \omicron \nu \nu \rho \gamma \eta \nu \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \] of St Chrysostom! Possibly Sod\( ^{144} \) has \( \tau \alpha \gamma \eta \nu \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \) without \( \mu \omicron \nu \nu \), but he surely did not
follow this one MS intentionally here. He has either made another mistake (from making up his text as a 'desk-student' from the apparatus gathered and put together by others and which he did not understand himself) or has gratuitously invented scripture once more, preferring τὰ γενήματα καὶ τὰ αγαθὰ μοῦ to the double use of μοῦ. Another instance of how 'pairs' have caused various readings in the MSS themselves.

(12) Luke xxii 64. It is a question whether among the great and heavy variations in the Greek and Latin many, or any, can be found to support von Soden's text:—

'καὶ περικαλώπατες αὐτῶν ἐπηρώτων αὐτῶν λέγοντες'

for those which omit εὐπτον αὐτῶν τὸ προσωπον also omit the αὐτῶν before λέγοντες.

(13) John xiii 18. ἐμοῦ τὸν ἁρτον (ἐπὶ μετ ἐμοὸ τὸν ἁρτον) is an invention. The codices which suppress μετ read μοῦ, not ἐμοῦ. See von Soden's own note below on the subject 'μετ ἐμοῦ λ μοῦ . . .'.

(14) John i 50 (49 with von Soden). Here he surely does not mean to neglect all the Greeks and go alone with the Latins ff l gat vg as he does.

by printing ἀπεκριθη αὐτῶν Ναθαναήλ [καὶ λέγει].

This is how it looks set out in all its aspects:—

Namaηλ tuntum (— apeiριθη αυτω) + se : sah'umus grandiloquus.

Ἀπεκριθη αὑτω Ναθαναηλ B L W 33 249 Paris97 b aur W-H txt.

Και εἰπεν αὐτω Ναθαναηλ aeth

Ναθαναηλ απεκριθη αὑτω sah (variant plurimum bohood)

Et Natanahel respondit e

Ἀπεκριθη Ναθαναηλ και εἰπεν αν Χb? syr hier arm?

Respondit Nathanael et ait c vgE }

Ἀπεκριθη Ναθαναηλ και λεγει αὑτω Λ Α II unc. al. r (δ) Chr Cyr

Ἀπεκριθη Ναθαναηλ και αὑτω εἰπεν pers [liaint D d syr cu sin]

Ἀπεκριθη Ναθαναηλ και εἰπεν αὑτω Γ Δ ψvid 28 245 435 Sod192 551 1441

Εὐστ 19? 26? 49 60? (δ dixit vel ait) g syr pesh

Και απεκριθη Ναθ. και ειπεν αὑτω 254

Ἀπεκριθη αὑτω Ναθαναηλ και εἰπεν Χ 124 α f arm? Epiph

Ἀπεκριθη αὑτω Ναθαναηλ και λεγει αὑτω Sod197 1001 vid.

Respondit ei Nathanael et ait ff l gat vg

{ ἀπεκριθη αὑτω Ναθαναηλ [καὶ λεγει] Soden txt sol inter Gr. }

Von Soden's reading is therefore grotesque. And then immediately afterwards he proceeds to omit altogether from his notes the graphic + fili at the end of John ii 3 by his favourite 'af', and b ff l (which he follows at i 49) and Ambrosebis [liaint D d syr cu sin].

In view of the lacunae in D d syr cu sin, we should certainly have our attention called to this pretty addition, even if it is quite unauthorized beyond e ff l, for Buchanan has added b for it.
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(15) John viii 41. Von Soden prints ὦ γεγένηθημεν without MS authority. The textus receptus, with the majority and Orig Chr Cyr, has ὦ γεγένηθημεθα as Tischendorf and Horttwo. Horttxt has ὦν γεγένηθημεν with B D* 409, while ὦν γεγένηθημεθα is read by N L T Sod8037.

(16) Lastly, von Soden’s reading in John xxi 18 in its entirety:—καὶ ἄλλωι ζώσοντί σε καὶ ἀποίσουσιν δότων ὦ δέλεις is a complete invention.

For the first part καὶ ἄλλωι ζώσοντί σε von Soden is following alone; for the second part καὶ ἀποίσουσιν he follows II alone, and δότων ὦ δέλεις agrees with B and the majority (against Ν), but for von Soden’s sentence as a whole there is no MS authority. The matter will be found set out fully in vol. ii of my ‘Codex B and its allies’ (in the press).

(II) Von Soden’s quotations of ‘af’.

Having satisfied himself that his son has correctly ‘restored’ the African text, the elder von Soden makes a practice of quoting ‘af’ instead of e or k or Cypr, or e k, or e k Cypr, or e Cypr, or k Cypr. The viciousness of this system is obvious. I will give one illustration.

At Mark xii 4 where e and k are both extant, von Soden has in his notes ‘om Kat 1 Ia 168 af’. He means ‘om 28 ce’ for k says Et Iterum against Iterum of e.

(He neglects the fact that sah arm and pers also omit the initial καὶ. It is important here, for they replace syr sin which omits the whole verse.)

(III) System.

As to system there is none. Sometimes N B are followed alone, as at Matt. xiii 36 διασκάσησον (προ φρασον) (+ Sod800 φα; these witnesses are deserted by Soden on countless other occasions); whereas at John iv 15 διερχόμαι (πρό ερχόμαι) N B, adopted by W-H and John x 18 ηνευ (προ αυρει) N B, adopted by W-H, are put aside by von Soden.

In the former case von Soden does not even place προφαινον in his upper notes or margin.

In the latter case he condemns ηνευ by placing it in his third or bottom series of notes, but takes pains to add after ‘ηνευ loco αυρει. H[1-2]: ‘γε Θρ Πρ Διά Εντ’ that is to say N B but against Origen, Didymus, and Eusebius.

Why then at Luke vi 28 did he suppress the great Patristic testimony for νπερ (as against περι N B I W Ξ 604 Paris77) by Justin Dial Clembris Orig Eusbris?

Here is his note in Luke: νπερ 1 περι (Mt. 5 44) K gg H[1-2] 604 56 376f Iα 128 Α‘.

Not one word about the Fathers. Not one single new cursive added
for περι, because 376 Paris we knew already from Schmidtke's publication. 376 belongs in von Soden's limited group: \( H^8 \) 12.014, \( H^5 \) 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 14 16 75 83, that is to say \( \Psi W C Z \) 33 L Δ 892 Paris, 1241 (Sinai 260). The then (as 1016 = 892 does not read thus) can only refer to 8 371. Does this Sinai MS read περι? If so, it should have been mentioned by name.

It may be said as regards John x 18 that ἡρεφ there is so palpably wrong that von Soden properly rejects it, and that it is merely a change of tense. But at Matt. xviii 24, where a change of order from προσηνεχθη αὐτῷ ἐστὶ διδαξατις to προσην. ἐστὶ αὐτῷ διδαξατις does not appreciably affect the sense, yet von Soden follows the latter order in his text on the sole authority of Ν B.

The order is awkward. ἐστὶ was probably introduced into the text of Ν B from the margin and put in the wrong place, for syr sin and e with 245 and Sod1188 omit ἐστὶ altogether. Syr ευ holds the usual order, against Ν B 'before him one of them'.

Similarly at Mark viii 32, instead of καὶ προσλαβόμενος αὐτὸν δ Πέτρος ἡρέατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ, von Soden, on the sole authority of Ν B (sah boh syr), adopts the order καὶ προσλαβ. δ Πέτρος αὐτὸν κτλ. But αὐτῶν is omitted by D Sod1149 1193 and pers, and very likely here too αὐτῶν was introduced into the Ν B text from the margin and put in the wrong place.

Luke xxii 30. Order τας δωδεκα φυλας κρινοντες of Sodtext is only supported by Β T 892 ἐ.

I urge that there is no system in von Soden's text. Consider among many other passages his adoption in Luke xx 27 of αὐτελεγοντες against the λεγοντες of Ν B C D L N 892 Paris &c. d e goth copt syr. Observe λεγοντες supported by four of his families \( H \) (represented by Ν B C 892 Paris), \( I \) (by D d &c.), \( π \) (by N), 'af' (by e), besides goth copt syr, making seven groups in all. Von Soden goes against this.

But just above he follows similar, although less powerful, grouping at xx 22 Ν A B L, xx 23 Ν B L, xx 25 Ν B L, xx 26 Ν B L.

Similarly at Mark xv i he follows Ν C L 892 for στομασαντες, although B reads ποιησαντες with the majority and ποιησαν D Sod1170 2130 al.

And even at Mark xvi 4 he follows Ν B L absolutely alone (not adding a single new witness) for 

\[ \text{ανακεκυλισται} \] instead of \[ \text{ἀποκεκυλισται} \] (roundly condemned by Merx).

But, as a matter of fact, Ν does not read with B L. While B L read \[ \text{οτι ανακεκυλισται τον λειδο} \], Ν has, without \( \text{οτι} \), 'ανακεκυλισμενον τον λειδο'.

Tischendorf's edition of \( \text{Ν} \) is correct but his N.T. note completely wrong, and von Soden has accepted this without checking it. The error has been with us for over forty years, and he has perpetuated it. It must be corrected. \( \text{Ν} \) really reads with the Latins revolutum lapidem. Only
n has *amotum*. Therefore, while abandoning the Greek construction of the others, N yet retains the *ava* of B L (these three still remaining alone for this) as against *apco* of the other Greeks for D Sod⁵⁰⁰ and 21⁶, while changing somewhat the verse, write ἐρχονται καὶ εὐφράσκουσιν αποκεκλυσμένον τον λαθόν, and not απακεκλυσμένον τον λαθόν as N. The form of D Sod⁵⁰⁰ 21⁶ is found in cdff n of the Latins:

et veniunt et inviennent revolutum (amotum n) lapidem cdn.

The form of D Sod050 2Pe is found in cd if of the Latins:

e t veniunt et inveniunt revolutum lapidem ff. ‘Revolutus’ of the Latins being *anceps* as to *ava* or *apco* we are still left to argue this out on other lines (see Merx, p. 510 sq., and plates on Luke xxiii 52–54, but we must get the textual matters properly aligned before we can discuss it properly.

At Matt. xi 19 he has ἐργαν for τεκνων [although his countryman Merx (p. 194) had warned him against this] with only N* B 124 Sod¹⁸² boh sah²¹² syr pesh (arm). He seems to err by quoting I₁ᵇ as a whole = *fam* 69, whereas only 124 reads thus. His sub-family I₁ᵇ is composed of 69–124, 174 (his 1⁰⁸), and his 1⁰⁸³, an Athens codex. Do 1⁰⁹ 1⁰⁸³ read ἐργαν?

At Mark ii 22 καὶ ὁ ἀνωσ ἀπολλυταί καὶ ὁ αὐθεν of Sod₄₄₆ has its only support from B 892 and boh.

At Luke xvii 12 he omits αὐτω after οὐντὴρον with only B L. He misquotes D 1⁵⁷. 1⁵⁷ is wrong, and D has ὁποι ἡσαν so of course αὐτω fell away. As a matter of fact

L only reads οὐντὴρον (− αὐτω)

for B reads οὐντὴρον (− αὐτω),

so that von Soden is here following one MS L against all others. This is pretty extensive editing! Of what use then all this examination of documents?

At John iv 21 he reads πιστευον against πιστευε of no less than N B C* D LW i fam 13 22 Laura¹⁰⁴ Sod¹⁰⁹ ¹¹¹⁰ ²¹⁰ Orig Ath and Cyr.

At Mark v 25 he retains τις against N A B C L W ∆ latvi which omit, thus following D rell d a f syr against his usual preferred combination.

At Mark v 40, again, he prints δέ against αὐτος δε of N B C D L ∆ 33 Paris⁷ Eust 48 it vg, and this where the two families N B and D are joined with the Latin. If there is one Gospel where this conjunction should be followed it is in Mark! (Hiat syr sin).

On the other hand, at Mark vi 12 he goes over to and follows N B C L Dεr ∆ετ for εκηρυξαν against εκηρυξον d δ it⁴⁰⁰ syr W Σ Φ unc¹ min¹⁰⁰⁷ et Paris⁷⁰⁷. So that he follows for a tense change the very group whose reading he had outraged above by contradicting.

Then at vii 17 he opposes τὴν παραβολήν of N B D L ∆ 33 Paris⁷⁺ it vg by printing περι τῆς παραβολῆς of A rell.
But at vii 31 he accepts ηλθεν δια σιδωνος of the same Ν Β Δ Λ Δ 33 21ος 604 latt, against και σιδωνος ηλθεν of Α rell.

On p. xxviii he says, 'Stehen die Lesarten der Recensionen fest, so ist in der Regel die von zwei Recensionen vertretene Lesart in den Text aufgenommen'.

But how often does he break this rule! Consult, for a change of mood, Luke vii 7. Instead of ἀλλ' εἰπε λόγῳ καὶ ἱαθήσεται ὀ παῖς μου he prints the sentence with ἱαθήσω. This is the reading favoured by Β Λ only against their allies Ν Δ Ψ and Δ, and against the rest of von Soden's Η family including 892 and Paris, and against all the other families. He produces one new witness δ 371 (a MS at Sinai) of the Η family. His only other witness is 'bo?'. Horner indicates but two both MSS for this, but all the sah codices, which von Soden omits. And behold the reading favoured by Tisch., Hort, and von Soden proves once more to be purely 'Egyptian' and of an 'improving' order.

So von Soden's text appears to be an inadequate guide in these complicated matters, and the art of navigation has not been mastered by the compilers of it; in fact their compasses were not adjusted before leaving port.

This is severe criticism, but is supported by the charges in the following section.

(IV) Grave Errors.

There are many grave errors. Observe particularly an error, from lack of referring to original sources, at Matt. xxvii 53. Von Soden says 'om καὶ εὐφανισθησαν πολλοις Η 51 Ι 571'. This is an important place, and the citation of Η 51 (= Ν) is quite wrong. And it is only wrong because von Soden misread Tischendorf's note and did not trouble to look up the edition of Ν itself. Tischendorf in ed. viii N. T. says:—

'εἰσηλθὼν (et Οτ 1.296 et Ιnt 927; D it [exc f q] vg ηλθὼν: Ν om una cum και sq') by which he means that Ν omits εἰσηλθὼν and the subsequent και (following πολιν and before εὐφανισθησαν). Von Soden neglects to record this — εἰσηλθὼν and — και, gives quite the wrong omission, and misunderstands that Ν deliberately cut out εἰσηλθὼν, as the omission of και seg. shews. Here is the verse:—


Thus Ν wishes to read 'And going out from the graves after his rising into the Holy city, they appeared to many', which is quite different from the reading of Ι 571 which would have: 'And going out from the graves after his rising they came into the Holy city'; stopping there and eliminating 'and they appeared to many'.
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Luke xxii 35. Tischendorf says as to \( \text{τωσ} \) (\( \text{Nc} \)): \( \text{N* τι} \) exeunte versu'. Von Soden (without referring to the original) has interpreted this to mean \( \text{τωσ} \) omitted after \( \text{μη} \) and added at the end of the verse after \( \text{ονθενος} \). So he gives in his notes [instead of \( \text{τι \; τωσ} \)] 'ομ \( \text{τωσ} \) \( \text{H52* /... add τι \; ρ ονθενος \; H52*} \).

This is not only wrong, but by missing \( \text{N}'s \) reading of \( \text{μη \; τι \; υπερήψατε} \) von Soden overlooks the Latin connexion of \( \text{aiquid} \) by a \( \text{cf.} \) \( \text{f} \) \( \text{f} \) \( \text{f2} \) \( \text{1 \; vgg.} \) against \( \text{alicuius} \) by \( \text{b \; d \; e} \), so that \( \text{N} \) alone among Greeks is again exhibiting its polyglot mind and text.

John xvii 12. In von Soden's notes we read \( \text{εφυλασσον} \) (\( \text{προ \; εφυλαξα} \) \( \text{H52* \; d \; r.} \) But \( \text{d \; r} \) do nothing of the kind. The verse is:

\[
\text{oτο \; ημην \; μετ \; αυτων} \; (\text{εν \; τω \; κοσμω}) \; \text{εγω \; ετηρου} \; \text{αυτους} \; \text{εν \; τω \; ονοματι \; σου}
\]

\[
\text{oυσ} \; (\text{ω, \; δ \; αλ.}) \; \text{δεδωκας \; μοι} \; (\text{και}) \; \text{εφυλαξα} . . .
\]

d\( \text{r} \) both have \( \text{custodivi} \) for \( \text{εφυλαξα} \) as all the rest. They merely substitute \( \text{custodiebam} \) for \( \text{servabam} \) as an interpretation of \( \text{ετηρου} \). Did von Soden really suppose that Tischendorf had missed the reading of \( \text{d} \)? If he had taken the trouble to quote \( \text{d} \) against \( \text{D} \) \( \text{g} \) \( \text{r} \) here instead of simply \( \text{d \; r} \) his attention would have been called to the matter, and he would have seen that his collator had made a mistake.

John xx 17. In the important short speech of our Lord after the resurrection 'Noli me tangere', in Greek \( \text{Μη \; μου \; απτου} \), where \( \text{B} \) alone varies with \( \text{Μη \; απτου \; μου} \) (\( \text{Tert \; 'ne, \; inquit, \; contigeris \; me'} \), \( \text{Evst} \) \( \text{47} \) is found to omit \( \text{μου} \), but only this MS (and possibly \( \text{Orig} \) \( \text{1/2} \)).

Now von Soden tells us that \( \text{N} \) and \( \text{D}, \text{W} \) and \( \text{348} \), \( \text{'af'} \) and \( \text{Orig} \) all omit this \( \text{μου} \). 'Οm \( \text{μου} \) \( \text{H52* \; 014 \; I166 \; βa121 \; af \; Ω15}\) is what he says. He means - \( \text{μου} \) secund. post ρατερα \; \text{prim}, but this is lacking in his text, so that the note should read quite differently: 'add \( \text{μου} \) \( \text{ρ \; ρατερα \; K \; gg} \) \( \text{H'} \) \&c. as we find in the middle notes. This is a serious error. He neglects the real omission by \( \text{Evst} \) \( \text{47} \), because he hardly ever quotes the testimony of the Lectionaries. Had he done so he would have avoided this mistake in a peculiarly important passage.

Luke xviii 16. Von Soden says - \( \text{τα \; B} \) instead of - \( \text{αυτα \; prim} \). His remark makes \( \text{B} \) omit \( \text{τα \; ante \; παιδια} \).

Luke xxii 67. Von Soden quotes \( \text{a \; b \; g \; r} \) for the omission of \( \text{υμων} \) in the phrase \( \text{αιν \; υμων \; επω} \). Not one of them omits. All have '\( \text{Si \; vobis \; dixero}'\).

Shortly afterwards, as if to accentuate this error, he misquotes \( \text{r*} \). Abbott had said 'xxiii 8 enim : autem', meaning that for 'erat enim cupiens' \( \text{r*} \) reads 'erat autem cupiens'.

Von Soden turns this into 'γαρ \; 1 \; δε \; r2', meaning that we should read at the beginning of the verse o γαρ \( \text{Ηρωδης} \) instead of o δε \( \text{Ηρωδης} \) or \( \text{Herodes \; autem} \).
Again, at John xiii 12 von Soden reproduces an error of Tischendorf. In his N.T. notes Tischendorf begins verse 12 thus: ‘αὐτὸν (N; Ν* αὐτὸν): 13. 69. 124. 346. ante τοὺς πόδας πόν . . . ’ Accordingly in von Soden’s lower notes to his N.T. p. 456 we read: I2. αὐτὸν τί Ν αὐτὸν Ἡβς*, that is to say, he would with Tischendorf make Ν read ‘ὁτε οἶν ἐνωμέν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ’, referring to the washing of Peter’s feet and not to that of them all. But Ν does not do this. Ν in reality substitutes inversely and later in the verse αὐτὸν for αὐτοῦ after ἰματία, making the sentence read ἐλαβεν τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτῶν instead of ἐλαβεν τα ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ. Von Soden at this place records αὐτὸν for W and the omission of αὐτὸν by ḏ ἡ, but does not insert the true variation of Ν* there as he should have done if he had really tried to bring our apparatus up to date.

Lastly at John xviii 16 von Soden quotes the variation εἰσνεγκεν for εἰσγαγεν as read by Ἡβς* Ἡβς+ = W and Paris97, but Ν also reads thus with W, and Paris97 does not (according to Schmidtke’s edition it has εἰσγαγεν with the rest). Von Soden does not report Ν because Tischendorf omitted to do so, but the reading is to be found duly recorded in the late Dr Scrivener’s very careful collation of Ν published at Cambridge in small and handy form by Deighton, Bell & Co. in 1864.

This leads up to another grave indictment. Von Soden depends entirely upon Tischendorf’s notes in his eighth edition of the N. T. concerning Ν. He has evidently not had Ν collated for his use, and has ignored Dr Scrivener’s exceedingly accurate collation.

In order to be brief I will prove the matter in one Gospel alone. I will take St John’s Gospel. Tischendorf neglects to record some fifty-five readings of Ν. In every case but one von Soden follows suit, and neglects these readings also. And it is not as if the matters were of scant importance, for observe—

vi 47 + οτι recorded for Sod1659 95 sy, and read also by 124 (not mentioned), is read by Ν after the Coptic manner.

vi 53 > το αὐμα αὐτοῦ recorded for Ἰα* 85 a Hil (and read also by Cypr Jul Firm Gelas) is the order also of Ν.

xiii 34 — να σεκ. recorded for 299 is also omitted by Ν.

xix 8 > τον λογον τοιτον recorded for 929 1385 N (and read also by 249 and ὑτσερ) is the order of Ν.

But, far more important than the above omissions of Tischendorf and von Soden are the following readings of Ν, not only neglected by Tischendorf and von Soden, but also by Mrs Lewis, Horner, Merx, and the rest of the critics, readings of great import as to the matter of the versions, and an ‘underlying Greek text’:—

As to syr sin:

xvi 2 αποσταναγγειον + γαρ Ν and syr-dis, and these only.
xx 17 + ἵδον ἀντε αὐτῆς αὐτῶν Ν and syr sin syr hierABC only.

This conjunction of Ν and syr stands apart from all other authorities and has hitherto been unrecognized. Mrs Lewis recognizes the first (p. 256 ed. 1910 of syr sin) but not the second. Merx neglects Ν in both places, although referring to the reading of 1 and q among the Old Latins at xvi 2 of + ori. 'Quia eicient vos de sinagogis' 1, 'quia in sinagogá vos eicient' q, which is the only other variation there among authorities (neglected by von Soden) except that the bohairic joins verses 1 and 2... 'if they should put you out of the synagogue'.

As to Coptic:
vi 58. The order > οἱ πατερεῖς ἐφαγον by Ν alone is the order of sah and of bohdis.

vi 52. Ν adds οὖν after πῶς (alone with 56–58–61). In bohairic we read πῶς ὡσεὶς ὡσοιαμα.

x 27. For καγὼ Ν substitutes καὶ with only e vgg CT Aug Chrμ. and the sahidic (against its usual emphatic method).

As to Latin:
xix 5. πορφυροῦν (—το) Ν alone.

As to Aethiopic:
xix 6. + καὶ ἀντε λέγει Ν alone with aeth.

As to Chrysostom:

iii 22. > εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν γῆν καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κακεὶ διετρίβεν Ν cum Chrsolo (instead of καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν γῆν καὶ εκεί διετρίβεν of all the rest of the Greeks and of the versions).

This is quite important as there are other traces of Ν and Chrodd π. λ. μ. at i 15 ερχόμενος + ες, iv 45 — εἰδεχατο αὐτον οἱ γαλάλωοι and St Chrysostom's copy of St John was a very ancient recension. We find Chrysostom and syr sin absolutely alone together at:

vii 32. γογγυζόντος ταντομ — περὶ αὐτοῦ and — ταντα).

viii 16. καὶ εἰς κρανὸ (—δε and —εγω), besides being often in sympathy elsewhere.

I mention the above matters as to Ν in justice to our late lamented countryman, Dr Scrivener, whose faithful work ill deserved to be put aside by those claiming to say the last word on these subjects. Mrs Lewis seems to be the only living critic who shews an acquaintance with Scrivener's collation of Ν.

(V) Errors of Omission.

Errors of omission abound, as at Matt. x 16 ἰδον εγὼ αποστέλλω μιας εἰς μεσον λυκῶν for εν μεσοι λυκῶν where B is quoted alone. To Bgr should be added ἰ, κτι vgb and Lucifer. (Cf. the parallel at Luke x 3 where Dgr substitutes μεσον for εν μεσω [against d] and the vgg and
Ambr have 11h inter lupos which von Soden does not mention, merely stating D and not even Dgr for μεσον.

Matt. ix 35. - καὶ αντὶ κηρυσσὼν, by 8 bohES, is not mentioned by von Soden at all, not even as to 8. It is interesting because it is rather in the Coptic manner, and actually two boh MSS omit with 8 (testo Horner in vol. sah.).

Besides omitting the επεσπαρκέν of 8 in Matt. xiii 25, he neglects to record B* [see photographic edition] for ελάλησεν (pro παρεβηκέν) in xiii 24. I suppose because in the latter case Tischendorf is silent. But when k alone is to be coupled with Bgr for this locutus est for proposuit or posuit it becomes quite important.

k is quite clear with locutus est illis dicens, and apparently B before being inked over read in similar fashion ελάλησεν αυτοῖς λέγων, instead of παρεβηκέν αυτοῖς λέγων.

Matt. xxi 17. - εἴω τὴς πολεοῦς 8 is given as being alone. But 28 also omits, as duly recorded by Scholz.

Matt. xxi 33. - εν αυτῷ 8 Chr. So von Soden. But 8 only omits εν. Von Soden is misled by the form of Tischendorf's note and did not refer to the original.

Matt. xxii 16. Evan. 604 (700), i.e. von Soden's 133, is given for λεγόντας. This is wrong. Apparently von Soden took the evidence from Scrivener's Adv. Crit. instead of from my edition, and mistook δ for β, for dscr there = Evan. 66 so reads, which von Soden does not report.

Luke xi 48. μαρτυρεῖτε 8 B L 892 and Sod5 371 Orig, he omits to add 604 also.

Matt. xxiv 34. Von Soden's note (foot of p. 94) says: 'add oni ante ov H1016'; = 892. But B D F L al8 it vg syr Ps-Ath Origint, as well as copi, all add as well; see his upper notes.

Matt. xxv 24. Von Soden quotes 209 (his 8 457) for αυστηρος instead of σκληρος, but Lake definitely says not.

Matt. xxvi 50. - ὡσπον Φ 2scr. Von Soden neglects this altogether.

Matt. xxvi 65. καὶ λεγεῖ (pro λεγων). Von Soden records 8 but fails to add syrr.

Matt. xxvii 3. μετεμεληθη καὶ (pro μεταμεληθείς). Von Soden records 8 but fails to add syr sin arm aeth pers.

Mark vi 55. He cites 8 only for εν instead of επί, that is to say καὶ Ἰησοῦν εν τοῖς κραββάττοις, but this is the way the Latins have it 'IN gratiattis', and he should have added latt. It is important here as to 8.

Mark vii 37. Von Soden's note reads 'add ὡς ante καὶ² H61 bo', but whereas sab adds ἠοιτε, only a few boh add ἀφρης, and von Soden neglects sah.
Mark viii 18. ‘om καὶ τὴν $H^β_3$ τῆς $r_2$’. He should add $boh^1$, for this is the Coptic method here being illustrated by $N$, to which attention should be called.

Luke xxiii 50. Here, where he omits altogether to record — καὶ tert ante δικαίως for $B$, he should have quoted with $sah$, thus forming another link between $B$ and $sah$ in the Coptic manner, as above for $N$.

Mark x 21 ‘add στ. post εὐ (Lk 18,2) $H^δ_3$’. But von Soden forgets that $minn^{10}$ and $sah boh$ do so also.

Luke v 2. The order πλωμα δυο credited to some few and $boh$ should also indicate $sah$, for this is the usual Coptic order.

Luke x 35 ‘ἐδοκεν τον τοιούτου $H^δ_1$’. To $B$ add $sah$.

Luke x 38 ‘om εἰς τὴν οἰκου μνημής $H^δ_1$’. To $B$ add $sah$.

Luke xi 36 ‘add εν τοις γεραίοις; $H^δ_1$'. To these, $B$ and Paris $97^9$, add both $sah$ and $boh$.

xvi 17 ‘καὶ περαιαν μων $H^δ_1$’. To $B$ add $sah$ syr.

xii 32 ‘om τετυχα τα$H^δ_2$’, but to $N$ add $sah boh$ as usual, the possessive before the noun.

Luke xxiv 38. εἰς τὴν καρδίαν von Soden quotes only $Δδ$ (= Dial.), but $cde$ read thus in cor vestrum, and so does $sah$ practically and $syr sin$ (Lewis, ed. 1910).

Luke v 17. ἐκ παρεις κωμης. He says ‘add τῆς αντε κωμης $H^δ_1 bo$', but he forgets $B$ and should include $δ_1$. It is clearly indicated in Tischendorf.

Luke ix 12. ‘τῇ λοικο ὅ περ τῇ $H^δ_1 af'$. The testimony of Paris $97$ should be added to $B$ af.

Luke xiii 7. To $B$’s unique τον τοπον προ τῷ γερᾳ the testimony of $8o$ should be added. Von Soden neglects $8o$ throughout.

Luke xiii 34. τῶν εαυτον νουσιαν. He cites $N 16 Laura^{104}$ only. But $sah boh$ make the gender of the bird masculine, and he omits to add their testimony. This is a clear Coptic reflexion in $N 16$ and Laura $^{104}$ and may not be overlooked.

Luke xxii 27. + ο αντε μειξων $N$. To $N$ should be added $sah boh$.

John viii 55. + στι παρ αυτον εἰμε (post αλλ οὐδα αυτον). So $T_1$ (= Sod$^{78}$). Von Soden does not mention this, but he should have done so. Every new fragment which comes from Egypt [see again immediately below] confirms editorial changes. Here is another instance of the new fragment $T_1$ improvising. Von Soden has recorded it at Luke xxiii 53 for + καὶ θεντος αυτου επεθηκαν τῷ μνημεω λιθων μεγαν ον μογις εικοσι ανδρας εκλιων (cf. $Dde sah al.$), but does not do so here in John.

Luke vii 47. Here again (see Amélineau Notices des mss coptes p. 52) the fragment of a Greek Coptic Lectionary, whose mark I do not know in von Soden or in Gregory, reports + καὶ before ολγον αγαπα $fin$.
with only B 892 and Paris, who read: \(\omega \delta \epsilon \omicron \lambda \gamma \iota \omicron \nu \alpha \varepsilon \tau \iota \varsigma \) καὶ \omicron \lambda \gamma \iota \omicron \nu \alpha \varepsilon \tau \iota \varsigma \alpha \gamma \alpha \tau \tau \alpha \pi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \iota \varsigma \). Von Soden does not report this. Observe that this further support for B comes from the same source as the other T support. This fragment differs by reading: \(\omega \delta \epsilon \omicron \lambda \gamma \iota \omicron \nu \alpha \varepsilon \tau \iota \varsigma \) καὶ \omicron \lambda \gamma \iota \omicron \nu \alpha \varepsilon \tau \iota \varsigma \, \) as if aware of the variation of \(F \Xi \). 28 aeth: \(\omega \delta \epsilon \omicron \lambda \gamma \iota \omicron \nu \alpha \varepsilon \tau \iota \varsigma \alpha \gamma \alpha \tau \tau \alpha \pi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \nu \alpha \tau \iota \varsigma \), but erring in the process of conflation.

Mark xiv 3. τον υπον (\(\pi \rho \omicron \alpha \nu \tau \omicron \nu \) ὑπον) D it sah bōhtres. Neglected by von Soden. (Beermann and Gregory report \(\text{Sod}^{100} \) for \(\alpha \nu \tau \omicron \nu \).)

Mark xvi 2. ανατελάντος τον ηλιον. Omitted by \(\kappa \). Not noted by von Soden.

Hans von Soden has condemned me in a recent number of the \(\text{Literaturzeitung} \) for bringing as it were iron to Essen, and has said that I had nothing new to shew him; and that everybody knew of the matters to which I had called attention.

I submit respectfully that much has yet to be learned by the school of von Soden in matters of textual criticism if it would make the path smoother and not harder for students of the coming generation.

(VI) Unnecessary difficulties presented to Students.

Mark i 26. In von Soden’s note we find ‘\(\tau o^{1} \& \tau o^{2} H^{51} \)’. This means that B omits τὸ πνεῦμα reading καὶ σταφάλεαν αὐτῶν τὸ ἀκάθαρτον (that unclean one) instead of καὶ σπ. αὐτῶν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον (the unclean spirit).

By this note he seems to wish to suggest that it is an error from \(\tau o \) following \(\tau o \). But this is rather fanciful here. Why inject further trouble into these troublesome matters, and force the student to waste time in seeking out what το \(1 \& \tau o^{2} \) means?

Luke xxii 6. Similarly, for the omission of καὶ εὐθυμολογήσαν by BCN lat syr sin, all we find in the apparatus is ‘καὶ \(1 \& \tau o^{2} H^{52} \& 53 \) I ᾱ syς Εὐσ’. This is not very illuminating, and involves a great waste of time to the student.

Again, Luke viii 25, the important omission of καὶ νταλκονουσιν αὐτῶ by BSod \(100 \) 604 aeth Tert\(\text{mano} ? \) is only noticed in the third set of notes as ‘καὶ \(1 \& \tau o^{2} H^{51} \) ᾱ ᾱ ο\( \text{so}^{*} \) Εὐσ’, meaning 604. The arrangement of the apparatus is most misleading.

Luke xvii 6. For the omission of ταυτὴ after τὴν συκαμύνω von Soden adds syr cu to ‘\(H^{52} \& 57 \& 70 \) ᾱ ᾱ ο\( \text{so}^{*} \) Α\( \text{so}^{3} \)’, but syr cu (as against syr sin ‘to this mulberry tree’) says ‘to a hill’. Why divorce the important variation from its context to explain that syr cu does not read ‘to this hill’. This kind of thing is done again and again. As a matter of fact there is no need to add syr cu for -ταυτη above, for below von Soden has: ‘add post an\(1: \) των ὑπερ τουτου μεταβα εντεθεν εκει και μετεβαινεν και (cf. Mk 11, Mt 17, 21.) ᾱ ᾱ syς (om τουτου und εκει).’
Again, Luke xxiv 31, omits καὶ εἰπον τῶν αὐτῶν. Von Soden once more dignifies this by citing 'καὶ ὁ Οὐρανός'. It is placed in so insignificant a position that one hardly sees it, and then has to worry to find out what it means.

(VII) Carelessness as to the application of f following a Codex.

As regards 157, at the important place Luke xxii 43-44, he has gravely misrepresented my manuscript and probably some of his own.

[He has placed 157 in his family I$_{o}I^{207}561$ $1182$ $1236$ $277$.]

At Luke xxii 43-44, in his upper notes (which constitute his 'margin') he records for omission of these verses 207 of which means the corrector of 157 plus the family or one of them.

Now in 157 there is no sign of omission by any corrector. I examined the place carefully. As to f no doubt it indicates 351 (= 713), but why not say so here? If the other members of the family do not omit (and it is questionable whether they all belong together as a family) we should be quite sure of the fact. An f is quite insufficient here. His 377 (= 291) would be the more likely MS to omit.

The worst feature as to this is outside of St Mark's Gospel. Because if f follows I$^{a}$ it does not refer to I$^{a}$ next in order on his list.

(VIII) Neglect of the Aethiopic.

Von Soden's neglect of the Aethiopic is really serious, especially as in a work up to date on the N. T. it is absolutely essential to take into consideration the readings of aeth and pers.

A case occurs at Matt. xxvii 50 δὲ Ἰσραήλ πάλαι κράτας φονῇ μεγάλῃ ἀφῆκε τὸ πνεῦμα, where he cites 'παρέδωκεν 1 αφῆκεν (Io 19 19) Τα I$^{1386}$, αρβῆ συρτ[ε][c]' and stops there. He should have added aeth exivit.

Merx (p. 16), referring to this, says: 'Und damit wieder hängt die Erzählung Matt. xxvii 50 in Syrsin zusammen, wo es nicht heisst ἀφήκεν τὸ πνεῦμα = er sandte den Geist fort, gab ihn auf, hauchte ihn aus, sondern αἰωνὶ δαλίῳ d. h. sein Geist stieg hinauf. Diese Lesart steht bis jetzt ganz allein; dass hier aber nicht nach äusserer Bezeugung, sondern nach dem dogmatischen Zusammenhange zu urteilen ist, das sollte einleuchten.'

Thus, von Soden could have supplemented Merx here by quoting aeth for exivit, εἶδιλθε, as does Hornor, but he does not. Nor does he use aeth in other places where its readings are both certain and most instructive.

So, again, at Luke ix 20, where von Soden quotes 604 for με λέγετε εἰμι, he neglects not only aeth but also Dial for this omission.

Again, at Luke xvi 3, we miss aeth which supports sah boh syrr as to B's very important and unique addition among the Greeks of καὶ before εἰμι.
At Luke vi 17, where he quotes δ 398 for καρεβη alone among Greeks with Marcion, he omits to record Marcion (Epiphbis diserte), and forgets to add to the Latins quoted the other versions copt syr pers and aeth.

(IX) Style of note.

Luke vi 26. Can one imagine a more inadequate note than this: 'om παντες Ta Mp K gg H exc 014 56 ff bo Ia 060 f η φa b 267 f 1216 0 1091 f 1098 72 o σ 351 f 377 κε 1241 | 4 22 33 178 ρρ 1352 f 1398 1448 1493 A^1 Α^3 K K^1 179 K^1 05 85 latch, ~ οι ανθρωποι παντες H^3 2 bo Ir, ~ οι ανθρωποι α ειπτ. Iba 1178.'

The phrase is: αυτοι των καλων ειπωσιν υμας παντες οι ανθρωποι (or οι ανθρ. παντες, or οι ανθρωποι tautum).

The inversion of order by Ν sah boh and Irenint is stated nearly correctly, sah only being omitted. This inversion, however, points probably to the omission of παντες being basic. It is therefore essential that the evidence for omission should be carefully stated. What do we find?

'Om παντες Ta Mp K', that is Tatian Marcion and Kowt. But syr sin and syr pesh also omit as does pers confirming it. So does aeth ('populus') and also arm (testet Rieu) and Macarius, all to be found distinctly stated in Tischendorf, except as to syr sin since discovered. Whereas as to the Kowt, the textus receptus and most cursives have it and do not omit. On the other hand, to the MSS cited against omission should be added 100 cursives examined by von Soden's predecessors. The uncials which omit: D FW L S V Γ Δ Λ are not stated in von Soden's list, but include D.

Could any one tell from von Soden's grouping that D omitted? D can hardly be included in K (Kowt), and they have to be sought by a ridiculous process of elimination, or enquired after in Tischendorf.

The news which von Soden really gives us is that W (014) and the Tiflis MS (050) do not omit.

Tischendorf's note is quite clear. The important part is Irenaeus's interpreter's opposition to the Latin. Under the circumstances d δ should be quoted against the Latin, for d δ omit with D δ ΔS, so that to von Soden's note add ' (praeter d δ μ υγ δX cod caraf., cor. vat υγ ed) ' after 'lat'. Supply also d δ μ υγ ed in Wordsworth and White's apparatus. Supply syr sin in Horner's apparatus.

(X) Error or ambiguity in quoting fam π, and some of the most important cursives.

π is a family of the purple uncials covering Ν Σ Φ and π. Very loose use is made of this. We will read π exc 17 [= Φ], whereas Σ may be only one extant at this place, Ν and π not being available.

At Luke xx 4 and elsewhere von Soden quotes π as a family, whereas Ν only is extant.
As to 2Pe (Sod 93), at Mark ix 28 2Pe reads ελθοντα αυτον and thus alone. Von Soden adds ier (his 326) and fam ‘π exc. 17’. Both are wrong. N Σ and ier read ελθοντα αυτον. As to ‘exc 17’, it is right to the extent that Φ reads εσελθοντα αυτον.

Many errors and omissions as to 157 occur. This is the more reprehensible as I notice that von Soden had at least two Gospels recollated (Matthew and Luke, see his card). At Luke vi 40 he quotes 157 (his 207) for –τας, the exceptional omission by N Sod 48 b vg only. I did not note this, and I think I should have seen it. He does not quote 157 for ετω in the same verse which my eyes observed.

Note at Matt. xxiv 45 επι ης οικεσια 157 alone, for επι ης θεραπειας (or οικεσιας, or οικες). Von Soden quotes 157 for επι ης οικες, so that his collator was not accurate there.

And at Luke xx 46 he quotes: ‘add τους ante ασπασμον I 301’. This is 157. To it add sah bοh.

But to this reading should also be added that of 157 in the same verse for +τας ante πρωτοκαθεδριας as well as sah bοh again, which von Soden neglects. Why quote one and not the other?

Similarly, Luke xxii 7 ‘ης loco ηλθεν (cf. Mk. 14 1) I 301’. To 157 for this exceptional reading should be added pers.

Evan. 604/700 (his 135) is often misquoted by von Soden. At Luke xii 47 it is added by mistake to the very small group N C Epiphm & for και αι πατερες, whereas it should be added on the next line and in the next verse to the small group for μαρτυρες εστε where von Soden omits it.

Sod 1126 (Matthaei’s o and our 245) is frequently quoted wrongly, e.g. Luke ii 21, xix 43.

Sod 1016 (Greg. and Scr. 892) collated by Harris. Although sometimes employed is often omitted by von Soden, as at Mark xiv 46. He says: ‘om aυτω dff’; but add W 892 as well as aeth and pers, which omit επ aυτω of textus receptus, which in Soden’s text is aυτω.

Sod 1016 (Greg. 579 Scr. 743, Paris 97). Often omitted, as at the important place Luke xvi 30 αναπτη προς αυτους (προ πορευθη προς αυτους) where von Soden only quotes Ν. Again, Luke vii 47, where επαν for λεγω is read by N Paris 97 only, correctly reported by von Soden, in the same verse as to +και antε ολιγων αγαπα he only gives B and 1016f. This obscures the issue. By 1016 he indicates 892. By f he may mean Paris 97, but he should say so, for these three only have the reading (with an Est ι from Egypt published by Amélineau).

Von Soden often opposes Schmidtke’s edition of Paris 97, as at Luke xxii 17 fin., quoting aυτους while Schmidtke prints definitely εις aυτους (with L).

Indeed, I question the appearance of Evan. 33 (Sod 48) several times in the apparatus; notably at Luke vi 38 where Soden quotes 544 for
μετρηθήσεται. Tischendorf does not. Tregelles does not. In von Soden's apparatus appears 33 (=our P). Did he not when copying 33 for P also add 848 (Evan. 33) by mistake? If I am correct, this change of numbers leads to absolutely nothing but confusion.

But to state these matters is only to make a partial impression on my readers of the grievous state of things in this latest book on a most intricate subject. Es ist zum Weinen. I have claimed the privilege of presenting these few facts, gleaned in the course of a self-imposed task for other purposes (and not for an unfriendly review), because I am probably one of the very few who could pass an oral examination as to the numbers used by von Soden and their equivalents in the older notation.

H. C. Hoskier.