left blank. All goes to show 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 leaf\(^1\) 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 \(\Pi\) (\(\delta =\) minn. 383, 614), and use \(Z\) as a general sign for \(D\) and its various allies, Greek, Latin, and Syriac. I use \(A\) 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 $D$, $\Delta^g = \text{Gigas}$, $\Delta^h = \text{Floriacensis}$, $\Delta^p = \text{Perp}$. So also in references to Evv. I use $\Delta^e$ and $\Delta^k$ 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 $vga$ and $vg^2o$ 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 \textit{codex Thomae}. I regard the text to which they are appended as Philoxenian, also on the evidence of the colophon, and call it $\text{S}^{\text{ph}}$. I denote the agreement of $\text{J}^5\text{p}$ and $\text{S}^{\text{ph}}$ (= Peschitta) by $\text{S}$.

A number of references will be found in this paper to the arrangement by $\alpha\tau\iota\chi\omega\iota$ 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, \textit{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 $\Gamma$ and $B$.

The chief affinities of $\text{p}$ are with $D$ and $c. \text{Thom}$. 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 $\text{p}$ to the other MSS, especially to $D$ and $c. \text{Thom}$, 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 \textit{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 calcuros videtur revocasse.

Sanders thus discovers 'perfect agreement' between *p* and *c. Thom.* against *D* four times (p. r2), 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.*

xi. *D* has:

\[
\text{Θελοντος δε του παυλου}
\]
\[
κατα την ιδιαν βουλην}
\]
\[
ποτενεισθαι εις ιεροσολυμα}
\]
\[
eιπεν αυτω το πια υποστρεpheiv εις την ασια}
\]
\[5\]
\[
διελθων δε τα ανωτερικα μερη}
\]
\[
eρχεται εις εφεσον.}
\]

*C. Thom.* agrees exactly with *D,* except that in st. 4 it gives *convertete* for *υποστρεφειν.* This may be a Syriacism, so I do not take it into account.

*p,* as supplemented by Sanders, has:

\[
\text{Θελοντ[ος δε]}
\]
\[
[του π]αυλου κατα την ιδιαν βουλην]}
\]
\[
[ποτενεισθαι εις ιεροσολυμα [ειπεν αυτω] το [πια]}
\]
\[
[υποστρ]εϕειν εις την ασιαν διελθων δε τα]}
\]
\[
[ανωτερικα μερη] ερχεται εις εφεσον] [και]}
\]

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

\[\Gamma, \text{ cett. give:—}
\]
\[
\text{εγενετο δε ειν τω των Απολλω ειναι ειν Κορινθω Παυλον διελθωντα}
\]
\[
\text{τα ανωτερικα μερη έλθειν εις Εφεσον.}
\]

Here a tame abbreviation has taken the place of st. 1–4, with a consequential change of *διελθων* to *διελθωντα.*

\[\nu. 2 \text{ *D* has:—}
\]
\[
\text{οι δε προς αυτων αλλ ουδε πια αγιον λαμβανουσιν τινες ηκουσαμεν.}
\]

Here *οδε* is a scribal error for *οδ̜̃ε* ει.

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

\[\text{*p* has:}
\]
\[
[\text{αλλ ου}]^3\text{ ει πια αγιον λαμβανουσιν τινες η}
\]
\[
[κουσα]μεν}
Sah. gives 'We heard not even that any one is wont to receive holy spirit' (Horner).

1. oetl. have: ἀλλ' οἶδ' εἶ πνεῦμα ἡμοῦ ἐστὶν ἱκουσμεν.

v. 14 D has:—

en ois kai νιοι σκευα τινος ιερεως
ηθελησαν το αυτο πουῃαι
εθος εχαν τους τουοντους εξορκιζεν
και εισελθοντε προς τον δαιμουνζομενο

5 ἡρξαντο επικαλεσθαι το ονομα λεγοντες
παραγγελλομεν σοι εν ιη
ον παυλος εξελθεν κηρυσσει
τοτε απεκρηθη το πνα το πονηρον ειπεν αυτοις.

In στ. 7 εξελθεν κηρυσσει is a scribal error for κηρ. εξ. 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 στιχοι like those of D.

inquibus 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 ρ as follows:—

en ois kai νιοι[ν]
ιον τινως αρχιερεως ηθελη
σκουμεν αυτο πουησαι εθος εχοντες εξορκιζε
ζευς τους τουοντους και εισελθοντες
5 προς δαιμουνζουμενον ηρξαντο επι
καλεσθαι το ονομα λεγοντες παραγγελ
λομεν σοι εν ιην εν Παυλος αποστο]
λος κηρυσσει εξελθεν αποκεθεν
δε το πνα το πονηρον 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 Σκεενα with all other MSS, while ἐπτα, possibly
in the form ζ', may have come after viol, as in c. Thom. In l. 5 the omission of τῶν after πρὸς 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.

Τ, cett. give:—

insula δὲ τινὸς Σκευᾶ Ιουδαίου ἀρχιερέως ἐπτὰ viol τούτο ποιοῦντες ἀποκριθέν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.

They omit all the extra matter furnished by D, c. Thom., Ὑ (θεός . . . κηρύσσει), which occupies five στίχοι in D. At the beginning of the verse there are two notorious cruces in the reading of Τ, viz. the sons of Sceva are said to be seven in number, while in v. r6 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 Τ in reading ἐπτὰ and with D in reading ἱερέως. That this is so is clear, since in the lemma, taken from $6^{	ext{th}}$, 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 ἱερέως of cod. Bezae, as it is due to the influence of the Latin parallel sacerdotis’. That this is not so, is clear from its occurrence in the Syriac as well as in D.

The theory that ἱερέως in D is due to sacerdotis in the Latin (Λα) 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 ἀρχιερέως is sometimes rendered by sacerdos in Latin. Thus sacerdos occurs four times in Λκ of Evv., viz. Matt. ii 4: Mark xiv 47: xv 11, 31. As against this, Λκ 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 Λκ. In the Palatinus (Λε), a MS which has traces of affinity with Λκ, 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 $\Lambda^d$ are as follows:—

- princeps sacerdotum: Evv. 38 exx.: A. none
- princeps sacerdos: Evv. 3 exx.: A. none
- summus sacerdos: Evv. 18 exx. (all in Mark): A. none
- pontifex: Evv. none: A. 7 exx. (also iv 6 pontificalis = $\delta\rho\chiιερατικός$).

$\textit{Sacerdos}$, without summus, is not found in $\Lambda^d$ except in the sense of $\iota\varepsilon\rho\varepsilon\iota\varsigma$. Zahn's theory therefore is perverse. $\textit{Sacerdotis}$ in $\Lambda^d$ does not stand for $\delta\rho\chiιερεύως$; for this purpose pontificis would have been used. It is the normal rendering of $\iota\varepsilon\rho\varepsilon\iota\varsigma$ 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 $c. \textit{Thom.}$ which otherwise agrees with it, viz. in giving $\epsilon\nu \delta\varsigma$ for $\eta\sigma\tau\nu \delta\varepsilon$ (Γ), in omitting $\iota\nu\omega\delta\alpha\iota\varsigma$ (Γ), in reading $\iota\varepsilon\rho\varepsilon\iota\varsigma$ for $\delta\rho\chiιερεύως$ (Γ), has incorporated in its text a single variant from Γ, viz. $\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{a}$. I have elsewhere suggested ¹ that $\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{a}$ owes its origin to a marginal note $\xi\eta$, or $\tau\varepsilon$ ($= \xi\eta\tau\acute{e}i$), indicating a corruption in the text—viz. the mention of a high priest at Ephesus—which was subsequently confused with $\zeta$ ($= \epsilon\nu\tau\acute{a}$).

I now come to the papyrus. In the first place it has $\epsilon\nu \delta\varsigma$ with $D$, $c. \textit{Thom.}$ In the next line, if Sanders' reconstruction is correct, which must be considered doubtful, it omits both $\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{a}$ with $D$ sol. and $\Sigma\kappa\varepsilon\nu\varphi$ which is found in all other MSS, and in place of them has $\iota\nu\omega\delta\alpha\iota\varsigma$ with Γ (om. $D$, $c. \textit{Thom.}$). His view is that $\iota\nu\omega\delta\alpha\iota\varsigma$ was the original reading, and that $\Sigma\kappa\varepsilon\nu\varphi$ 'came in as a gloss to $\iota\nu\omega\delta\alpha\iota\varsigma$, supplanting the latter in cod. Bezae and its relatives but uniting with it elsewhere'. To this I reply that $\Sigma\kappa\varepsilon\nu\varphi$ cannot be a gloss. It supplies necessary information. On the other hand $\iota\nu\omega\delta\alpha\iota\varsigma$ looks extremely like a gloss of the most ordinary kind, drawn from the context, viz. $\tau\wedge\nu\piεριɛρ\chiομένων \iota\nu\omega\delta\alpha\iota\varsigma \varepsilon\zetaορκιστή\varsigma\wedge\nu$ in the previous verse. If, therefore, the papyrus really has $\iota\nu\omega\delta\alpha\iota\varsigma$, it has incorporated a gloss from Γ, against $c. \textit{Thom.}$, as well as $D$: I say no more, since the reading of $P$ is so doubtful. On the other hand $\delta\rho\chiιερεύως$ with Γ, against $D$, $c. \textit{Thom.}$ is certainly the reading of $P$. I have already given my view of this variant.

In the sentence which follows, viz. $\epsilon\nu\varsigma . . . \epsilon\xiε\lambda\theta\epsilon\varsigma$, we are entirely dependent in $D$, $c. \textit{Thom.}$, $P$, as the whole passage is omitted by Γ, $cett$. The most important variant in $P$ is the addition of $\omega[\alpha\tauο-\sigma\tauο]\varsigma\alpha\iota\sigma\o\varsigma$ after Παύλος, 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 \( \varepsilon \). Thom. against \( \Delta \). Of these three occur in this sentence. One of them seems certain, viz. \( \varepsilon\theta\omega\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\tau\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\imath\nu\varepsilon\varsigm
The next variant, which is one of great importance, has been omitted by Sanders in his list (p. 11), viz.

D has πολυν συνεβάλλετο εν ταῖς εκκλησίαις

omitting the words τοῖς πεπιστεύκοντες διά τῆς χάριτος (om. διὰ τῆς χάριτος 614, Λ§, vg., Σph, Aug), which occur in Γ, cett. after συνεβ. πολύ.

The omission of D is shared by Ρ.

I do not on this account wish to reject the words omitted by D, Ρ, 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, Ρ, arranged in στίχοι similar to those found in D, i.e. after εκκλησίαις.

28 διαλιγμόμενος καί D, δ: δια[λεγόμεν]ος, without καί Ρ: om. Γ, cett., Aug. (The omission of καί by Ρ is an insignificant error.)

xix 3 ἐλεγον D, Ρ: ἔπον (αν) ΓΕΔ: responderunt Λ§, Hier.

5 εἰς ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτίων D, δ, Σph: [εἰς ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτίων Ρ: om. cett., Petil. Hier. Ambr. There can be no doubt that Sanders' supplement is correct.


(δ) Agreement of Ρ with δ, against cett. (D).

xix 13 ὁρκίω] ἐξορκίζομεν δ, Ρ (pluralēm tuentur vg$, $.).

(ε) Original contributions of Ρ.

xviii 28 τὸν Ἰησοῦν εἶναι Χριστόν D, §, Aug.: εἶναι τὸν (om. τὸν E) Χριστόν Ἰησοῦν ΓΕΔ: χρή [εναι] ὕν Ρ.

Any one of these collocations is equally possible.

2 καὶ εὑρὼν τινας μαθήτας εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς D: καὶ εὗρεν τινας μαθήτας εἶπεν τε (δ ἐπεν) πρὸς αὐτούς Γ. Sanders ascribes to Ρ καὶ [εἰπεν τοι] μαθήτας. If so, it is clear that Ρ 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 Ρ has left something out or has abbreviated the text.

After πιστεύσαντες Ρ has an addition which Sanders reads as τὸ ὦν [τον] κῦ εινα[i]. He explains τὸ ὀν 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 Ρ, it is a surprising variant. A better sense would be produced if Ρ had τὸν νῦν τοῦ θοῦ εἶναυ, but even this addition would be suspicious, since πιστεύσαντες (rack 'when ye believed') gives an excellent sense by itself.

3 ο δὲ παῦλος προς αὐ[το]υς Ρ. The nearest approach to this is
26 THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

ēπεν τε (δὲ) πρὸς αὐτούς Ἰδ3, Ἱων, Σαχ., Ηιερ. The other readings are:
eden δὲ (τε) D B Λ8, Petil.: ὁ δὲ eden ρΑΕ: eden οὐν 6τ4, Ἱον.

None of them give ὁ Παῦλος, which has the appearance of a gloss.

12 ἀπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ cett. (D): P omits αὐτοῦ.

13 ἐν Παῦλος κηρύσσει cett. (D): ὁν [κηρύ]σσει ὁ παῦλος 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 Π, P inserts ὁ [ἀπόστο]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 Π.

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

xix. 5 Κυρίων Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ D: τοῦ Κυρίων Ἰησοῦν Γ. Sanders ascribes to P τοῦ κ[ν ὑπὸ τοῦ χριστοῦ]. 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 (χρ). I suspect that P in addition to χρυ inserted ἡμῶν after κῦ. It may be added that Χριστοῦ is here supported by δ, Λ8, Λ, Σαχ., as well as by D. No MS adds ἡμῶν here, but the word frequently occurs after κῦρως, in some, or all, MSS.

6 καὶ ἐπιθέτος αὐτοῖς χείρα τοῦ Παῦλου D, Λ8, νεγ8, Ἱων, Petil.: καὶ ἐπιθέτος αὐτοῖς τοῦ Ἰ. χείρας Γ, cett. Sanders ascribes to P κ[αὶ επιθέτος αὐτοῖς το]ν τα[λυν χείρα], remarking that enough is preserved to show that the order of the words is not that of D, but that ‘the space is exactly right for the singular χείρα’ and that ‘the addition of another letter would crowd the space’. I should hesitate to claim an agreement with D on this evidence.

13 τινις ἐκ τῶν D, Λ8: τινις καὶ τῶν Γ, cett. Sanders gives τινις κ[αὶ εκ τῶν περιέρχομενων] 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:

[v]γ[εις δὲ τινις] ε[ρτε καὶ εφαλομενος]

He here adopts εφαλομενος (Γ) in preference to εφαλλόμενος (D) and

1 Prof. Hunt has made the same suggestion, and I gather from him that it is accepted by Sanders.
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 $e\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma$, $\Gamma \delta \epsilon\pi' \alpha\omicron\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma$, and $E \epsilon\nu' \alpha\omicron\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma$. If the $\pi$ is certain in $\omicron$, it supports $\Gamma$ against $D$, but it remains uncertain, whether it had $\alpha\omicron\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma$ or $\alpha\omicron\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma$.

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 ο $D$: om. $\Gamma E \delta$, $\omicron$: 5 τοῦ (before Κυρίου) cett. $\omicron$: om. $D$ (so also in v. 13): 12 τά (before πονηρά) cett. $\omicron$ (so also in v. 13): ib. ο $D$ (before Παύλου) $\omicron$: om. cett., 14 τόν (after πρός) $D$: om. $\omicron$. To these may be added two doubtful cases, viz. xix. 7, where Sanders in his supplement, on grounds of space, ascribes to $\omicron$ the omission of τό before πνεύμα, and 15, also in a supplement, where for the same reason he gives ἅν for τὸν ἅν as the reading of $\omicron$.

I conclude with a few remarks upon the lost portion of $\omicron$ between xix. 6 ἐρι' αὐτοῦ and 12 ἕπι τῶν ἀθένεωντας. 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. 1 (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 X 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 $\Gamma$, allowing for abbreviations of nomina sacra (.bounds, $\xi$), the total number of letters between αὐτοῦ in v. 6 and εἰς in v. 12 is 448. From this must be deducted 14 letters required to complete l. 21 after αὐτοῦ, so the total is reduced to 434. The differences between this and 544 is considerable.

$D$ does not differ greatly from $\Gamma$, the only extra matter being:—

v. 8 + δ Παύλου, with $\Lambda \delta$, $\Sigma \omicron$: + εἰν δυνάμει μεγάλη, with c. Thom.

9 + αὐτῶν, with $\Lambda \delta$, $\Sigma \omicron$: + τῶν ἐθνῶν τότε (om. τότε $E$), with $E, \Xi$: + δ Παύλου, with $\Sigma \omicron$: + τῶν, with most authorities (om. $\Gamma$, $\Sigma h.$): + ἀπὸ ὥρας ε ὃς δεκάτης, with $\delta$, $\Lambda \delta$, $\Sigma g\omega$, $\Sigma \Phi h$, Ambst.
Allowing for nomina sacra the number of letters is 514, from which we have to deduct 14 on account of 1. 21, i.e. we get a total of 500. 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 2ph, give ἐδάλλων δὲ γλώσσας καὶ ἐπροφήτευον. The reading of c. Thom. is given in White’s edition as:

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

ἐτέραις καὶ ἐπεγίνωσκον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ὥστε καὶ ἐρμηνευειν αὐτὰς ἑαυτοῖς τινὲς δὲ (= 66 letters).

𝒜 P has above the line and out of place, viz. after ἐπροφήτευον ita ut ipsi sibi interpretarentur. This represents ὥστε καὶ ἐρμ. αὐτῶς 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 Cat.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 επεγίνωσκον εν εαυτοῖς

ὡστε καὶ ερμηνευειν αυτὰς εαυτοῖς

one of the στίχοι might drop out.

If we credit 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 P had here something like the reading of c. Thom. If so, this is an important agreement between 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 P omitted the words καὶ επεγίνωσκον εν εαυτοῖς (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 γ in v. 8 (τρεῖς Γ) and ε (= πέμπτη) in v. 9 as single letters.