

in *two* cases (Mk. xiv 62, Mt. xxvii 60) where the Caesarean text has no other support, besides one case (Mt. xii 4) where it has the support of a single Old Latin MS. But surely in the parenthetic words 'unsupported by' &c. there lurks fallacy. If in any particular passage the Caesarean text preserves a correct reading, then it *does* preserve it; it is no discredit to the Caesarean text that D or the Old Latin or Old Syriac should happen to support it in this meritorious action. Moreover even if the *fam* © text were 'essentially bad' it would not follow that it was not in use at Caesarea about 230. If the B^N text is as pre-eminently good as Prof. Burkitt holds, then 'essentially bad' texts were current everywhere outside Egypt at that date.

Prof. Burkitt concludes his main argument with these words: 'Any reading, for instance, found in τ has an off-chance to be a genuine survival, just as any reading in k or in Syr. S . . . has an off-chance to be a survival. But it is an off-chance, and no geographical word such as Caesarean adds to the authority with which it speaks'. This seems to me tantamount to saying that *external* evidence as to the date or range of circulation of any non-Byzantine reading is entirely without value. I should agree with Prof. Burkitt that in the last resort, and in clear cases, internal evidence must be given the greater weight. But most cases are not clear; and, where that is so, the number of different localities in the third century in which the reading is found to have been current is a fact which the critic is bound carefully to weigh. The identification, therefore, of local texts is the first condition of any scientific attempt to test the comparative value of different types of external evidence as such. This does not mean that external evidence can ever rule out internal, but at least it may provide us with a means of controlling it.

B. H. STREETER.

NOTE ON THE PRECEDING NOTE.

By way of explanation let me state what was in my mind when I wrote my strictures on Canon Streeter's Caesarean text.

1. There are a number of variants in our MSS and versions that are neither geographically 'Western' nor 'Alexandrian', i. e. attested neither by D-latt nor ^NB. Let us call these 'Eastern'. The chief MSS of this group, or groups, are

© 565 700 13-69-124&c 1&c 28 and syr.SC.

2. It happens only rarely that all the members of this group, or groups, agree together against the rest. When they are divided the

MSS that do not support the 'Eastern' reading do not always agree with the Byzantine text, but often agree with **NB** or **D** latt.

3. If we must divide the 'Eastern' group into families, the only way is to examine the coincidences of single members within the group. Each of the MSS listed above, but particularly 1 and 28, so often and so markedly agrees with syr.S against the rest that it seems unreasonable to divide them by marking off syr.S (with *C*) as representing the early text current at Antioch, and to group together all the others as 'Caesarean'.

A few instances will shew what I mean. In the first set I have picked out some triple variants to shew the cross-grouping, then come some notable agreements of 1&c with syr.S against the majority of Streeter's 'Caesarean' authorities.

Mk. i 13 *εκει* 1&c 28 69-124 565 700 syr.S (*also* arm georg)
εν τη ερημω **NBL** **D** latt *W*, *also* Ⓞ 13-346&c
εκει εν τη ερημω Ⓢ

Mk. viii 10 *τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά*

(i) *τα μερη*] *τα ορια* **D**^{ex} *c f(k)*, *τα ορη* **N**, *but το οροσ* **W** 28
 syr.S

(ii) *Δαλμανουθα* (incl. 700)] *-υθα* **B**, *Δαλμουναι* **W**, *Dalma-*
nounea arm

Mogeda(n) (**D**) lat. afr-eur *also* 565 28 syr.S

Magdala Ⓞ 69&c 1&c

Mk. xiv 45 *Rabbi* **NB** **D** latt al pauc, *also* Ⓞ syr.S

Hail, Rabbi **W** 565 69&c 1&c

Rabbi, Rabbi Ⓢ al longe pl, *also* 700

Mk. xiv 51^a *επι γυμνω*] MSS, *also* 124 700

γυμνοσ Ⓞ 565 69&c sah (*sic*)

om. **W** 1&c syr.S (= *c k*)

Mk. xiv 51^b *και κρατουσιν αυτον* **NB** **D** latt al pauc sah (*sic*), *pr.* 'and many persons went' syr.S

οι δε νεανισκοι κρατουσιν αυτον (**W**) Ⓞ 565 700 1&c (69-124&c)

(**W** 69-124&c *read* *εκρατησαν*)

και κρατουσιν αυτον οι νεανισκοι Ⓢ

In this last example the Eastern group is united: I give the evidence here, because in the first half of the verse the group is split into two.

Here follow instances where 1&c, with or without subsidiary support, deserts the main 'Caesarean' body to agree with syr.S.

Mk. ii 27 *εγένετο*] *εκτισθη* **W** 700 1&c syr.S

Mk. iii 17 *Βοανηργέσ*] *Βοανανηργε* **W**, *Βανηρεγεσ* 565, *Βανηρεγέσ* 700,
bnai rgesh syr.S

Mk. vi 22, 23 'Ask of me whatsoever thou wilt and I will give it thee'. And he sware unto her 'whatsoever thou shalt ask of me I will give thee unto the half of my kingdom.'] 'Ask of me whatsoever thou wilt and I will give it thee unto the half of my kingdom.' And he sware unto her. So 1&c with W and syr.S; W omits And he sware unto her, and syr.S whatsoever thou wilt.

Mk. x 11, 12. In W 1 and syr.S these verses are transposed, so that the prohibition of the wife leaving her husband comes before that of the husband leaving the wife.

Mk. x 20 ἐφύλαξάμην (or ἐφύλαξα)] ἐποιήσα 565 1&c syr.S.

Most of these examples are taken out of my *Evangelion da-Mepharreshe* ii, pp. 248 ff, where I collected such readings, especially agreements between 1&c and syr.S, because I thought, and still think, that there is a special element in 1&c derived directly from the text represented by syr.S, i. e. (as Dr Streeter and I like to believe) from the early text current at Antioch. Several other readings connect syr.S and 565 (e. g. Mk. x 50), and syr.S and the Ferrar-group (e. g. Mk. vii 33). The objections which I feel to Dr Streeter's classification will therefore not be satisfied by transferring 1&c from 'Caesarean' texts to 'early Antiochian' ones. I cannot see any fundamental separation between any of these interesting Eastern texts.

What difference does it make, after all? I can imagine this question may be asked by the non-specialist, who is more interested in getting at the true original text of the Gospels than in the classification of MSS. I would answer that Dr Streeter's new classification, if accepted, has a real bearing upon our final judgements about readings. His classes—Alexandrian, Western, Caesarean, early-Antiochian—belong to very early times, times when the counting of votes begins to have a real scientific significance. A single vote, e. g. 'Caesarea' against the other three, is no more lightly to be disregarded than 'Alexandria' against the rest. And 'Caesarea' supported by the Sinai Palimpsest would be Palestine *plus* Antioch, a most formidable-seeming conjunction. But in my view 'Caesarea' (i. e. all or some of © 565 700 69&c 1&c 28) is only one group with syr.S, and of this group syr.S is the earliest and best witness, wherever its text is free from the suspicion of harmonization or mere paraphrase. To put the whole matter into the most concrete form, I regard the Sinai Palimpsest (syr.S) as an integral element in the Eastern group, and when the attestation of any reading of this group does not include syr.S there is, I think, a strong presumption that the reading in question is a later corruption inside the group, not an original feature of it.