

left blank. All goes to shew that the single leaf which once began with 'galileam' and has now disappeared cannot have sufficed for the Longer Ending, unless both very drastic methods of compression were employed in the text itself, and also there was a complete absence of colophon or subscription.

It may of course be asked why four leaves were cut out, when it was only the last which needed cancelling. Perhaps the original intention was to preserve the first three, and bind them up again with the new fourth leaf: perhaps the instructions for removing the last leaf were misunderstood as being instructions for removing the last gathering. But whatever answer we may give to this question, the reasons for supposing that there was a definite intention to replace a last leaf which did not contain the Twelve Verses with a leaf¹ which copied verses 7 b, 8 from the cancelled leaf and verses 9-20 from the Vulgate do not seem to be affected. *a* in fact must have had either the Shorter Ending or none at all.

C. H. TURNER.

THE MICHIGAN FRAGMENT OF THE ACTS.

THESE remarks occurred to me after I had read Prof. H. A. Sanders' paper upon 'A Papyrus fragment of Acts in the Michigan Collection', reprinted from the *Harvard Theological Review*, vol. xx no. 1, Jan. 1927.² I had no other object in writing them except to clarify my own impressions, but several friends have suggested to me that they might be worth printing, and after some hesitation I have complied with their request. My hesitation was due to the fact that I have for a long time been engaged upon a critical edition of the Acts based upon *codex Bezae (D)* and its allies, in which I have ventured to make certain modifications in the traditional *sigla*. The reasons for so doing will be set out in my edition, which I hope before long to offer to the Press. I did not like to desert my *sigla* on this occasion, but I fear that some readers may object to them as unfamiliar. I therefore add a brief explanation of them. I denote the Greek MSS in general as Γ ($\delta =$ minn. 383, 614), and use Z as a general sign for *D* and its various allies, Greek, Latin, and Syriac. I use Λ to denote old Latin MSS, e. g. $\Lambda^d =$ the Latin side

¹ The new leaf is written in much longer lines than the original scribe of *a* had used (17 letters to the line or so instead of about 10), and so the matter of the Longer Ending is easily got into one complete page, and one column of the second page, of a single leaf.

² I have to thank Prof. Sanders for his great kindness in sending me a copy of his article.

of *D*, Λ^g = Gigas, Λ^h = Floriacensis, Λ^p = Perp. So also in references to *Ev.* I use Λ^o and Λ^k for the MSS generally called *e* and *k*. I refer occasionally to two Vulgate MSS, which in the Acts contain a number of *Z* readings, viz. the book of Armagh and the Wernigerodensis of Blass, as *vg^a* and *vg^w* respectively. Controversy rages around the Syriac text and marginalia printed by J. White in 1799. I can only say that I accept in its plain sense the colophon of Thomas of Harkel—who states that he took the marginalia from a Greek MS belonging to the Enaton near Alexandria—and I refer to his MS as *codex Thomae*. I regard the text to which they are appended as Philoxenian, also on the evidence of the colophon, and call it \mathfrak{S}^p . I denote the agreement of \mathfrak{S}^p and \mathfrak{S}^v (= Peschitta) by \mathfrak{S} .

A number of references will be found in this paper to the arrangement by *στίχοι* in *D*, since this throws great light upon the history of the text. This is a subject upon which I have touched in chh. xi and xii of a previous work, *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford, 1914).

The discovery of the new papyrus, which contains Acts xviii 27–xix 6 and xix 12–16 can only be described as sensational. Recent critics have been extremely unwilling to credit the statement of Thomas that his marginalia were drawn from a Greek MS, arguing on *a priori* grounds that such a MS was not likely to be found in Egypt. Their ingenious hypotheses are upset by the appearance of the papyrus which shews that a Greek text of the *Z* type was in use in Egypt, as elsewhere, at a very early date.

Sanders is of opinion that the papyrus was written between A. D. 200 and 250. It is only fair to mention that others have ascribed to it a somewhat later date, viz. cent. iv. This is a question which must be decided by papyrological experts. The papyrus may safely be regarded as prior to our oldest Greek MSS \mathfrak{N} and *B*.

The chief affinities of \mathfrak{P} are with *D* and *c. Thom.* Unfortunately Thomas gives only three quotations from the verses in question, so the evidence is incomplete so far as his MS is concerned. The silence of Thomas, of course, proves nothing, since his collation was very imperfect.

Sanders is at pains to ascertain the relation of \mathfrak{P} to the other MSS, especially to *D* and *c. Thom.*, and collates it with *D* throughout (pp. 11–12). He then employs a method which has been used by many critics, notably by H. Meusel in his treatise upon the chief authorities for Cicero's *Verrines* iv and v, viz. the Vatican palimpsest (*V*) and Paris. 7774 (*R*). This is to put together in one table all variants, not distinguishing between those of real importance and trivial errors which prove nothing: to add up the results, and to operate with the

figures thus obtained. Peterson in his preface to the *Verrines* (p. xiii) says of Meusel:

dum litterarum, syllabarum, verborum permutationes, additiones, omissiones quasi in trutina expendit, rem nimis ad calculos videtur revocasse.

Sanders thus discovers 'perfect agreement' between P and c . *Thom.* against D four times (p. 12), and later on says that these agreements prove Ropes's contention that c . *Thom.* is regularly right against D . I shall have something to say shortly about these supposed agreements, but before doing so I venture to rearrange the evidence according to another method.

(A) I take first the passages in which we have the evidence of c . *Thom.* as well as that of D and P .

xix 1 D has:

Θελοντος δε του παυλου
κατα την ιδιαν βουλην
πορευεσθαι εις ιεροσολυμα
ειπεν αυτω το π̄να υποστρεφειν εις την ασῑα
5 διελθων δε τα ανωτερικα μερη
ερχεται εις εφεσον.

C . *Thom.* agrees exactly with D , except that in $\sigma\tau$. 4 it gives *converte* for *υποστρέφειν*. This may be a Syriacism, so I do not take it into account.

P , as supplemented by Sanders, has:—

Θελοντ[ος δε]
[του π]αυλου κατα τη[ν ιδιαν βου]λη[ν πορευ]
[εσθα] εις ιεροσολυμα [ειπεν αυτω] το [π̄να]
[υποστρ]εφειν εις τ[ην ασιαν διελθων δε τα]
[ανωτ]ερικα μερ[η ε]ρχετα[ι εις εφεσον] [και]

It will be noticed that with D it gives *υποστρέφειν*. In l. 1 Θελονι is a trivial error for Θελοντ.

Γ , *cett.* give:—

ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ τὸν Ἀπόλλω εἶναι ἐν Κορίνθῳ Παῦλον διελθόντα τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη ἔλθειν εἰς Ἐφεσον.

Here a tame abbreviation has taken the place of $\sigma\tau$. 1-4, with a consequential change of *διελθών* to *διελθόντα*.

v. 2 D has:—

οι δε προς αυτον αλλ ουδε π̄να αγιον λαμβανουσιν τινες ηκουσαμεν.

Here οὐδέ is a scribal error for οὐδ' εἰ.

c . *Thom.* has (sed neque si) accipiant aliqui (spiritum sanctum).

P has:

[αλλ ου]δ ει πνα αγιον λαμβα[ουσιν τι]νες η
[κουσα]μεν

Sah. gives 'We heard not even that any one is wont to receive holy spirit' (Horner).

Γ. *cett.* have : ἀλλ' οὐδ' εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἔστιν ἠκούσαμεν.

v. 14 *D* has :—

εν οἰς και υἱοι σκευα τινος ιερεως
 ηβελησαν το αυτο ποιησαι
 εθος ειχαν τους τοιουτους εξορκιζειν
 και εισελθοντες προς τον δαιμονιζομενῶ
 5 ηρξαντο επικαλεισθαι το ονομα λεγοντες
 παραγγελομεν σοι εν ιηῦ
 ον παυλος εξελθειν κηρυσσει
 τοτε απεκριθη το πᾶ το πονηρον ειπεν αυτοις.

In στ. 7 ἐξελεῖν κηρύσσει is a scribal error for κηρ. ἐξ. Such inversions are common in all MSS, and *D* has other instances in the Acts.

The quotation from *c. Thom.* is as follows. I employ White's Latin, but for purposes of comparison arrange it in στίχοι like those of *D*.

in quibus filii septem Scevae cuiusdam sacerdotis
 qui voluerunt id ipsum facere
 qui soliti erant adiurare super eos qui tales.
 et cum ingressi erant ad demoniacum
 5 coeperunt invocare nomen dicentes
 praecipimus tibi per Iesum
 quem Paulus praedicat exeas.
 respondens autem spiritus ille malus dixit.

Sanders gives the reading of **ϐ** as follows :—

εν οἰς και υἱοι]
 ἰϐ[υ]δαιου τινος αρχιερεως ηβ[ελη]
 σαν[το α]υτο ποιησαι εθος εχοντες [εξορκι]
 ζειν τους τοιουτους και εισελθο[ντες]
 5 προς δαιμονιζομενον ηρξ[αντο επι]
 καλεισθαι το ονομα λεγοντες π[αραγγελ]
 λομεν σοι εν ιηῦ ον Παυλος ο [αποστο]
 λος κηρυσσει εξελθειν απο[κριθεν]
 δε το πᾶ το πονηρο[ν ειπεν αυτοις]

The reading of l. 2 is very uncertain. Sanders says that 'iota with the diaeresis is sure, and also omicron, of which one half is preserved'. He thinks that there was 'either a small place in the papyrus on which the scribe could not write, or else an error immediately crossed out, which took the space of two letters'. It is hard to believe that the papyrus did not contain Σκευᾶ with all other MSS, while ἐπτᾶ, possibly

in the form ζ', may have come after *υιοί*, as in *c. Thom.* In 1.5 the omission of *τόν* after *πρός* is a *proprius error* of no importance. There are some minor points which I reserve for the moment, so as not to confuse the argument.

Γ, *cett.* give:—

ἦσαν δέ τινος Σκευᾶ Ἰουδαίου ἀρχιερέως ἑπτὰ υἱοὶ τοῦτο ποιοῦντες ἀποκριθὲν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.

They omit all the extra matter furnished by *D, c. Thom.,* ϩ (ἔθος . . . κηρύσσει), which occupies five *στίχοι* in *D.* At the beginning of the verse there are two notorious cruces in the reading of Γ, viz. the sons of Sceva are said to be seven in number, while in *v. 16* ἀμφοτέρων is used of them, and Sceva is called a high priest, ἀρχιερεύς. It is impossible to explain the presence of a Jewish High-Priest at Ephesus. On the other hand the reading of *D* is free from all difficulties. The number of Sceva's sons is not stated, but it is to be inferred from ἀμφοτέρων.

The reading of *c. Thom.* has been given above. It will be seen that it agrees with Γ in reading *ἑπτὰ* and with *D* in reading *ιερέως*. That this is so is clear, since in the lemma, taken from *Σ^{ph}*, White gives *principis sacerdotum* and in the quotation of Thomas *sacerdotis*. *D* and *c. Thom.*, therefore, agree in this most important variant. It is somewhat singular that Sanders on p. 12 assigns ἀρχιερέως to 'all' MSS except *D*, and on p. 16 definitely ascribes ἀρχιερέως to *c. Thom.* On p. 17 he also says: 'We may disregard the variant *ιερέως* of cod. Bezae, as it is due to the influence of the Latin *parallelel sacerdotis*'. That this is not so, is clear from its occurrence in the Syriac as well as in *D.*

The theory that *ιερέως* in *D* is due to *sacerdotis* in the Latin (*Λ^d*) was started by Zahn and adopted by Ropes, while Sanders states it as a fact. It is, therefore, well to point out that it is groundless.

It is indeed true that ἀρχιερεύς is sometimes rendered by *sacerdos* in Latin. Thus *sacerdos* occurs four times in *Λ^k* of Evv., viz. Matt. ii 4: Mark xiv 47: xv 11, 31. As against this, *Λ^k* has seventeen examples of *pontifex*, all in Mark, and one of *princeps* (without *sacerdotum*) in Mark xv 10. *Sacerdos* as 'high-priest' or 'bishop' occurs not infrequently in Cyprian (so also *magnus sacerdos*), who used a text resembling that of *Λ^k*. In the Palatinus (*Λ^e*), a MS which has traces of affinity with *Λ^k*, there are six examples of *sacerdos*, as against sixteen of *princeps sacerdotum* (+two of *principes et sacerdotes*), and eleven of *pontifex*. Apart from these cases, the use of *sacerdos* (= ἀρχιερεύς) is rare both in MSS and authors. The consecrated renderings are *princeps sacerdotum*, *pontifex* and *summus sacerdos*.

The renderings in Λ^d are as follows:—

{ princeps sacerdotum	Ev. 38 exx. : A. none
{ princeps sacerdos	Ev. 3 exx. : A. none
summus sacerdos	Ev. 18 exx. (all in Mark): A. none
pontifex	Ev. none : A. 7 exx. (also iv 6 pontificalis = ἀρχιερατικός).

Sacerdos, without *summus*, is not found in Λ^d except in the sense of *ιερεύς*. Zahn's theory therefore is perverse. *Sacerdotis* in Λ^d does not stand for ἀρχιερέως; for this purpose *pontificalis* would have been used. It is the normal rendering of *ιερέως* in the Greek.

Before going further, I would state what I conceive to be the natural interpretation of these facts. This is that *D* preserves the *Z* reading in its pure form, while *c. Thom.* which otherwise agrees with it, viz. in giving ἐν οἷς for ἦσαν δε (Γ), in omitting Ἰουδαίου (Γ), in reading *ιερέως* for ἀρχιερέως (Γ), has incorporated in its text a single variant from Γ, viz. ἐπτά. I have elsewhere suggested¹ that ἐπτά owes its origin to a marginal note ζη, or ζτ (= ζήτει), indicating a corruption in the text—viz. the mention of a high priest at Ephesus—which was subsequently confused with ζ (= ἐπτά).

I now come to the papyrus. In the first place it has ἐν οἷς with *D*, *c. Thom.* In the next line, if Sanders' reconstruction is correct, which must be considered doubtful, it omits both ἐπτά with *D sol.* and Σκευᾶ which is found in all other MSS, and in place of them has Ἰουδαίου with Γ (*om. D, c. Thom.*). His view is that Ἰουδαίου was the original reading, and that Σκευᾶ 'came in as a gloss to Ἰουδαίου, supplanting the latter in cod. Bezae and its relatives but uniting with it elsewhere'. To this I reply that Σκευᾶ cannot be a gloss. It supplies necessary information. On the other hand Ἰουδαίου looks extremely like a gloss of the most ordinary kind, drawn from the context, viz. τῶν περιερχομένων Ἰουδαίων ἐξορκιστῶν in the previous verse. If, therefore, the papyrus really has Ἰουδαίου, it has incorporated a gloss from Γ, against *c. Thom.* as well as *D*: I say no more, since the reading of **P** is so doubtful. On the other hand ἀρχιερέως with Γ, against *D*, *c. Thom.* is certainly the reading of **P**. I have already given my view of this variant.

In the sentence which follows, viz. ἔθος . . . ἐξελεῖν, we are entirely dependent in *D*, *c. Thom.*, **P**, as the whole passage is omitted by Γ, *cell.* The most important variant in **P** is the addition of ο[αποστο]λος after Παῦλος, where Sanders' supplement seems certain. It has, however, all the appearance of a gloss, and does not enhance the authority of **P**.

¹ *Descent of MSS* p. 450 (Oxford, 1918).

Sanders finds in \mathfrak{P} four examples of what he calls 'perfect agreement' (p. 12) between \mathfrak{P} and *c. Thom.* against *D.* Of these three occur in this sentence. One of them seems certain, viz. $\xi\sigma\rho\kappa\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ \mathfrak{P} as against $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \xi\sigma\rho\kappa\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$ in *D.* White gives as the reading of *c. Thom.*, *adiurare super eos qui tales.* This, therefore, may be granted, though it is not an important variant. Another is not so certain, viz. for $\xi\theta\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\chi\alpha\nu$ (*D*) \mathfrak{P} has $\xi\theta\omicron\varsigma\ \xi\chi\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. White renders the reading of *c. Thom.* as *qui soliti erant*, and Sanders says that this equals $\xi\theta\omicron\varsigma\ \xi\chi\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. It might, however, represent $\omicron\acute{\iota}\ \xi\theta\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\chi\omicron\nu$, or, in view of the fact that in the same sentence White gives *qui voluerunt* for $\eta\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$, might stand for $\xi\theta\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\chi\omicron\nu$ with *D.* The third example is one which is quite valueless, viz. the inversion of $\kappa\eta\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota$ and $\xi\zeta\epsilon\lambda\theta\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$ in *D*, which is a *proprius error* and makes nonsense.

Sanders' fourth example is taken from *v.* 15, where we have the evidence of Γ as well as *c. Thom.* *D* here has:— $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon\ \alpha\pi\epsilon\kappa\rho\iota\theta\eta\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\acute{\nu}\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$. Γ gives $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\rho\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\acute{\epsilon}\delta\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$. Here *D* shows signs of conflation with Γ , i. e. $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ was struck out before $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$, as if $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\rho\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ had preceded. The reading of *c. Thom.*, as given by White, coincides with that of Γ . It will be seen from the transcript that the papyrus is somewhat defective. It certainly has not got $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$, and it is very probable that Sanders' supplements are correct, in which case $\mathfrak{P} = c. Thom.$, Γ . This, however, is a different case from those previously treated, owing to the entry of Γ into the problem. Generally speaking, when one member of *Z* has a reading agreeing with Γ , while another has one which disagrees with Γ , it is held that the agreement has been brought about by conflation with Γ . I am inclined to believe that there were two variants, viz. $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon\ \alpha\pi\epsilon\kappa\rho\iota\theta\eta\ \dots\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$ (*Z*) and $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\rho\iota\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \dots\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$ (Γ). This then is a case where *c. Thom.* and \mathfrak{P} have been corrected from Γ .

The only clear case, therefore, which I can find of 'perfect agreement' between \mathfrak{P} and *c. Thom.* is the variant in collocation ($\xi\sigma\rho\kappa\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$). I regard with some doubt that of $\xi\theta\omicron\varsigma\ \xi\chi\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$. The other two seem to me beside the point.

(B) I now come to the portions of the papyrus for which no readings of *c. Thom.* are quoted. Here also I shall mention first the points which appear to be important.

(a) Agreements of \mathfrak{P} with *D*, or *D*+other representatives of *Z*.

xviii 27 $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\eta}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ *D*, δ , $\Lambda\mathfrak{B}$, \mathfrak{S}^{ph} : [\dots] $\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \alpha\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\alpha$ \mathfrak{P} (?): *om.* Γ , *cett.* Aug.

$\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\tau\omicron$ *D*, $\Lambda\mathfrak{B}$, \mathfrak{P} , *Aug.*: $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\beta$. $\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}$ Γ , *cett.* $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota\varsigma$ *D*: *om.* Γ , *cett.* The papyrus is here very defective, but Sanders seems right in filling up the gap with $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\kappa\lambda$.

The next variant, which is one of great importance, has been omitted by Sanders in his list (p. 11), viz.

D has *πολυν συνεβαλλετο εν ταις εκκλησιαις*
ευτονωσ γαρ τοις ιουδαιοις διακατηλεχθεο
 omitting the words *τοις πεπιστευκοσιν δια τῆς χάριτος* (*om. δια τῆς χάριτος* B14, A^g, *vg.*, S^{ph}, *Aug.*), which occur in *Γ*, *cett.* after *συνεβ. πολυ*.

The omission of *D* is shared by *ϕ*.

I do not on this account wish to reject the words omitted by *D*, *ϕ*, since they have a genuine ring, and a dative seems to be required after *συνεβάλλετο*. As *D* frequently omits *στίχοι*, I prefer to think that a *στίχος* containing these words has dropped out of a common ancestor of *D*, *ϕ*, arranged in *στίχοι* similar to those found in *D*, i. e. after *εκκλησιαις*.

28 *διαλεγόμενος καί D*, *δ*: *δια[λεγομε]ος*, without *καί ϕ*: *om. Γ, cett., Aug.* (The omission of *καί* by *ϕ* is an insignificant error.)

xix 3 *ἔλεγον D, ϕ*: *ἔιπον (-αν) ΓΕδ*: *responderunt A^g, Hier.*

5 *εις ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν D, δ, S^{ph}*: [*εις α*] *φεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν ϕ*: *om. cett., Petil. Hier. Ambr.* There can be no doubt that Sanders' supplement is correct.

6 *εὐθὺς ἐπέπεσεν D, Hier.*: *επε[πεσεν] ϕ*: *ἦλθεν Γ, cett., Petil. Cass.*

(b) Agreement of *ϕ* with *δ*, against *cett.* (*D*).

xix 13 *ὀρκίζω] ἐξορκίζομεν δ, ϕ* (*pluralem tuentur vg^a, S*).

(c) Original contributions of *ϕ*.

xviii 28 *τὸν Ἰησοῦν εἶναι Χριστόν D, S, Aug.*: *εἶναι τὸν (om. τὸν E) Χριστόν Ἰησοῦν ΓΕδ*: *χρῆ [εἶναι] ἦν ϕ*.

Any one of these collocations is equally possible.

2 *καὶ εὐρών τινας μαθήτας εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς D*: *καὶ εὐρεῖν τινας μαθήτας εἶπέν τε (ὁ δὲ εἶπεν) πρὸς αὐτούς Γ*. Sanders ascribes to *ϕ* *καὶ [εἶπεν τοι]ς μαθηταις*. If so, it is clear that *ϕ* had a shorter reading than that found in other MSS. It is, however, very abrupt to say that St Paul spoke to the disciples in Ephesus, without first mentioning that he found disciples there. Either *ϕ* has left something out or has abbreviated the text.

After *πιστεύσαντες ϕ* has an addition which Sanders reads as *το ἰδιῶ* [*το] κῦ ενα[ε]*. He explains *τὸ ἴδιον* as meaning 'characteristic property or quality' and translates 'having believed that it is the characteristic quality of the Lord'. If this is really the reading of *ϕ*, it is a surprising variant. A better sense would be produced if *ϕ* had *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θῦ εἶναι*, but even this addition would be suspicious, since *πιστεύσαντες* (= 'when ye believed') gives an excellent sense by itself.

3 *ο δε παυλος προς αυ[του]ς ϕ*. The nearest approach to this is

εἶπέν τε (δέ) πρὸς αὐτούς 383, *S*^{ve}, *Sah.*, *Hier.* The other readings are : εἶπεν δὲ (τε) *D B Λξ, Petil.* : ὁ δὲ εἶπεν *SAE* : εἶπεν οὖν *β14, S^{ph}*. None of them give ὁ Παῦλος, which has the appearance of a gloss.

12 ἀπὸ τοῦ χωρὸς αὐτοῦ *cott.* (*D*) : *P* omits αὐτοῦ.

13 ὃν Παῦλος κηρύσσει *cott.* (*D*) : *ov* [κηρυ]σσει ο παυλος *P*.

To these may be added an instance mentioned in a previous section of this paper, viz. xix 14, where, in a passage omitted by *Γ*, *P* inserts ο [αποστο]λος after Παῦλος against *D* and *c.* *Thom.*

Sanders is not enthusiastic about the additions in *P* and thinks them 'rather additions by an intelligent reader than survivals of the original text'. He, however, considers them to be 'excellent illustrations' of the way in which what he calls the 'Western paraphrase' arose. I agree with his first remark, but disagree with the second, since I hold an entirely different view of the *Z* text and its relation to that of *Γ*.

I have not included in these lists certain cases in which the supplements adopted by Sanders seem to be insecure, viz.

xix. 5 Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ *D* : τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ *Γ*. Sanders ascribes to *P* του κ[υ] ιη[σ]υ του χριστου]. It is a grave objection that Χριστοῦ has to be written in full in order to fill up the vacant space, instead of the usual abbreviation (χρῶν). I suspect that *P* in addition to χρῶν inserted ἡμῶν after κῦ¹. It may be added that Χριστοῦ is here supported by *δ, Λξ, S, Sah.,* as well as by *D*. No MS adds ἡμῶν here, but the word frequently occurs after κύριος, in some, or all, MSS.

6 καὶ ἐπιθέντος αὐτοῖς χεῖρα τοῦ Παύλου *D, Λξ, vg^a, S^{vg}, Petil.* : καὶ ἐπιθέντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ Π. χείρας *Γ, cott.* Sanders ascribes to *P* κ[αι] ἐπι-θέντος αὐτοῖς το]υ πα[υ]λου χείρα], remarking that enough is preserved to shew that the order of the words is not that of *D*, but that 'the space is exactly right for the singular χεῖρα' and that 'the addition of another letter would crowd the space'. I should hesitate to claim an agreement with *D* on this evidence.

13 τινες ἐκ τῶν *D, Λξ* : τινες καὶ τῶν *Γ, cott.* Sanders gives τινες κ[αι] ἐκ των περιερχομενω]ν as the reading of *P* and says (p. 7) that 'this is clearly the original out of which both the "Western" and the common text arose by the omission of a single word'. If the supplement is correct, which I doubt, I should be disposed to say that in *P* the two strains were conflated.

16 Sanders gives as the reading of *P* :

[υ]μ[εις δε τινε]ς εσ[τε και εφαλ]ομενος
[ο ανθρωπος ε]π[α] α[υτους. . . .

He here adopts ἐφαλομενος (*Γ*) in preference to ἐναλλόμενος (*D*) and

¹ Prof. Hunt has made the same suggestion, and I gather from him that it is accepted by Sanders.

ἐφαλλόμενος (*E* δ). The difference between these variants consists of a single letter, which is not much to go upon when the text is so defective. In l. 2 *D* has εἰς αὐτούς, Γ δ ἐπ' αὐτούς, and *E* ἐπ' αὐτοῖς. If the π is certain in **P**, it supports Γ against *D*, but it remains uncertain, whether it had αὐτούς or αὐτοῖς.

There remain a few trivial variants connected with the use of the article, which are best taken together. I need hardly say that I attach no importance to them, as the MSS are capricious in such matters, and *D* is notoriously lax. The instances which I have noticed are xix 4 ὁ *D*: om. Γ *E* δ, **P**: 5 τοῦ (before Κυρίου) cett. **P**: om. *D* (so also in v. 13): 12 τὰ (before πονηρά) cett. **P** (so also in v. 13): ἰβ. ὁ (before Παῦλος) **P**: om. cett., 14 τόν (after πρὸς) *D*: om. **P**. To these may be added two doubtful cases, viz. xix. 7, where Sanders in his supplement, on grounds of space, ascribes to **P** the omission of τό before πνεῦμα, and 15, also in a supplement, where for the same reason he gives ἰην for τον ἰην as the reading of **P**.

I conclude with a few remarks upon the lost portion of **P** between xix. 6 ἐπ' αὐτούς and 12 ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας. Sanders points out that this would form part of the first page, and occupy sixteen lines of the papyrus. I do not doubt the accuracy of his conclusion, but his method of comparing the portions lost and preserved with lines in Ropes' edition is not very exact. In such a case I prefer to count the letters.

The figures which are yielded by his transcript of p. i (I exclude l. 21 as imperfect) are:

40, 38, 33, 33, 32, 32, 33, 34, 34, 38, 33, 34, 33, 31, 33, 34, 33, 32, 33, 34 = 677.

This gives an average of 34 letters to a line ($34 \times 20 = 680$). In l. 1 I have taken the six dots at the beginning to represent letters, but the line is curiously long. Line 21, which is imperfect, requires 14 more letters to bring it up to the average. If Sanders is correct in supposing that 16 lines have perished, their contents should be $34 \times 16 = 544$ letters.

In Γ, allowing for abbreviations of *nomina sacra* ($\overline{\theta\varsigma}$, $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$), the total number of letters between αὐτούς in v. 6 and ἐπὶ in v. 12 is 448. From this must be deducted 14 letters required to complete l. 21 after αὐτούς, so the total is reduced to 434. The differences between this and 544 is considerable.

D does not differ greatly from Γ, the only extra matter being:—

v. 8 + ὁ Παῦλος, with **A**^g, **S**^{vg}: + ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλης, with *c. Thom.*

9 + αὐτῶν, with **A**^g, **S**^{vg}: + τῶν ἐθνῶν τότε (om. τότε *E*), with *E*, **S**: + ὁ Παῦλος, with **S**^{vg}: + τινος, with most authorities (om. Γ, *Sah.*): + ἀπὸ ὧρας εἰς ἑως δεκάτης, with δ, **A**^g, *vg*^{aw}, **S**^{ph}, *Ambst.*

Allowing for *nomina sacra* the number of letters is 514, from which we have to deduct 14 on account of l. 21, i.e. we get a total of 500.¹ This still falls short of 544.

I now come to *c. Thom.*, which in *v. 6* has a famous variant. Γ *cett.*, including *D* and \mathfrak{S}^{ph} , give ἐλάλον δὲ γλώσσαις καὶ ἐπροφήτεον. The reading of *c. Thom.* is given in White's edition as :

Et loquebantur linguis aliis et sentiebant in se ipsis quod et interpretarentur illas illi ipsi; quidam autem prophetabant. The extra matter after γλώσσαις represents :—

ἐτέραις καὶ ἐπεγίνωσκον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὥστε καὶ ἐρμηνεύειν αὐτὰς ἑαυτοῖς· τινὲς δέ (= 66 letters).

Δ^{p} has above the line and out of place, viz. after ἐπροφήτεον *ita ut ipsi sibi interpretarentur*. This represents ὥστε καὶ ἐρμ. αὐτοῖς ἑαυτοῖς (= 30 letters), omitting the other additions given by *c. Thom.* The same variant is found in several Vulgate MSS, which have incorporated readings from *Z.* Ephrem's words in *Cal.^{arm.}* 'they spoke with tongues and interpreted of themselves' may be quoted in connexion with this shorter reading. It is easy to see how, if an ancestor written in *στίχοι* had :

καὶ ἐπεγίνωσκον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς
ὥστε καὶ ἐρμηνεύειν αὐτὰς ἑαυτοῖς

one of the *στίχοι* might drop out.

If we credit \mathfrak{P} with the whole of the extra matter given by *c. Thom.* in *v. 6* we get a total of 500 + 66 = 566, which is near enough to 544 to make it probable that \mathfrak{P} had here something like the reading of *c. Thom.* If so, this is an important agreement between \mathfrak{P} and *c. Thom.* against *D*, which has been brought into conformity with Γ .

There is a curious circumstance which I mention with all reserve, viz. that if \mathfrak{P} omitted the words καὶ ἐπεγίνωσκον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (23 letters) for which there is no Latin evidence (*cf. Ephrem*), otherwise reading with *c. Thom.*, the total becomes 500 + 43 = 543, which may be described as absolute agreement with the desired number 544. This, of course, is merely a suggestion, as so much is uncertain.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

¹ In this calculation I treat $\bar{\gamma}$ in *v. 8* (*τρεῖς Γ*) and $\bar{\epsilon}$ (= *πέμπτης*) in *v. 9* as single letters.