

that it was presented to the Iberian Monastery at Athos by Plato Ioseliani on September 23, 1859. The former of the notes, in a woman's hand, runs as follows: *ese Sakarthvelos Tzkhovrebis tsigni Inglizis maioris Venthis Saabis aris da Ghmerthman moakhmaros mas da amisi neughle Mariams khanis sitzotzkhleshid, rome mathi dze btsqinvale Davith mshvidobith mobrdzanebul iqos da dedamama mshvidobith enakhos. Kristes aketh ch q c d.* (i.e. 1824). The MS is in strong leather binding. It does not seem to differ from other MSS of the same book.

It would be interesting to know more about the English major, his Georgian wife, and their son David.

O. WARDROP.

### 'HE SAID' IN THE LATIN GOSPELS.

As a sequel to Prof. Burkitt's paper on the rendering of 'Chief Priests' in the Latin Gospels<sup>1</sup> the following statistics, provisional and incomplete as they are, may be welcome as a clue to the ramification of the Latin Versions.

The Concordance of Stephanus (1555) gives for *ait* the numbers:—

	Mt.	Mc.	Lc.	Jhn	Acts
	63	72	73	8	9
<i>Dutripon</i> gives	78	77	87	9	18

The passages are not complete, compared with the edition of 1592; but sufficient for a rough estimate.

The corresponding numbers are (without guarantee) in our chief documents:—

Codex D (d)	10	74	0	0	0
„ k (as far as preserved)	2	3	—	—	—
„ a	59	38	12	64	—
„ b	84	64	68	10	—
„ g	75	75	—	—	—
„ ff	—	65	60	9	—
„ g <sub>1</sub>	81	—	—	—	—

What follows from these figures? First, that at least two Latin recensions must be distinguished, one which avoids *ait* and another which uses it freely.

Secondly that these versions are mixed in our documents. Luke in

<sup>1</sup> January 1908, ix 290.

*a* and John in *b* belong to the same class, and *vice versa* Luke in *b* and John in *a*.

Thirdly a comparison with the division according to the rendering of ἀρχιερέως shews that the translator who used *pontifex* (*k* in Mark, *a* Luke, *vg* in John) avoided *ait*.

The complete absence of the word in the later parts of *d* can be due to systematic revision. The *Thesaurus Latinae Linguae* says about *ait* (I, 1435):—

Notandum quod deest ap. CAES., in VIRG. *Ecl.*, in HOR. *Carm. Epod.*

De significatione cf. DON. TER. *Eun.* 139 semper 'ait' dicimus, cum vel invisā nobis et audientibus vel vana dicta narramus alicuius. *Andr.* 353 'ait' proprie quia contemnenda dicuntur. 321 'aiunt' de ea re dicimus quam volumus esse falsam. *Phorm.* 380 'ais' dicimus de eis qui vana loquuntur: 'dicere' autem dicimus de eis qui validiora.

If such a school tradition was in existence in a region where one of these Latin versions originated or came under revision, the reason for the absence of *ait* is clear.

Interesting is the occurrence of *ait* in *d* in the Gloss John xiv 1: 'et ait discipulis suis'.

I must leave it to others to take up these investigations; but I use the opportunity to ask, what is the best Concordance for the Latin Bible? That of *Peultier* gives *ait* only till Gen. i, ii with the remark: deinceps omittitur; similarly says that of *Phalesius* 'et aliquoties', 'et saepe hoc capite'; in that of *Stephanus* in Mt. alone eighteen passages are missing, perhaps because it is not based on the text of 1592. Even in that of *Dutripou* I miss in Matt. viii 19, xiv 2, xv 24, xx 17, 25.

EB. NESTLE.