

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

century usage was the limit for capital charges sent on appeal from the provinces, but "two whole years" as spent by Paul in confinement awaiting trial, suggest that the Jews had at least given notice within the legal limit that they would press their case as soon as the winter of 61-2 was over and their witnesses could arrive?

(5) The nature of the references to his prospects made by Paul in Philemon and Philippians respectively, is against the theory that the Jews did not support their case at Rome. For if so, we should expect the tone of Philippians, as nearer the end of the time-limit for such action, to be *more confident* than that used in the earlier Philemon; whereas the opposite is the case. That is, Paul had growing cause to doubt the issue of the case as time went on and he knew more of his actual prospects as seen in Rome itself.

(6) Finally, this new view is excluded by the joint witness of 1 Peter and 1 Clement, which (as I have pointed out in the article "Paul" in the *Encycl. Britannica*) do not permit of Paul's having survived the Neronian persecution of 64, in which Peter also suffered. For Clement says (c. 6) that the Neronian victims of 64 were "gathered together," in the place of reward, unto these two Apostles just referred to. These last two arguments seem to me fairly decisive against Sir W. M. Ramsay's theory, and the latter of them against any theory of St. Paul's release from the imprisonment at Rome, where Acts lets him pass from our view.

VERNON BARTLET.

THE NEW CODEX "W."

THE publication of the new Greek uncial MS. "W" marks a further epoch for the textual history of the Gospels in Greek.

From the wonderful land of the Pharaohs this treasure has come to us. It is not to be known as the "Freer" MS., but

as the "Washington" MS., and the symbol W—selected, I believe, by Dr. Gregory—is therefore not inappropriate.

The MS. has been known to scholars to some extent for about four years. And attention has already been called to the fact that the MS., while having the regular ending to St. Mark after xvi. 8, yet incorporates in this section at verse 14 *the answer* of the eleven when upbraided for their unbelief which was hitherto unknown in Greek, and only partially known from a Latin quotation of St. Jerome. But the MS. has interest far beyond what we had thought possible from such preliminary information, and the noble and public-spirited publication in facsimile at Mr. Freer's expense puts the whole text before us.

The Editor, Professor H. A. Sanders, of the University of Michigan, has issued a companion volume, in which a digest of many readings is offered with the supporting authorities, and also a complete collation of the text with the Oxford edition of 1880. With the phototype edition in our hands for reference, it is easy to check the collation which proves to have been made with great care and faithfulness. We have to congratulate Mr. Sanders on the conclusion of his editorial work. The Editor leaves the all-important question of date until the very last (chapter v.) as he "wished the MS. to exhibit its great worth unaided by the prepossession which attaches to hoary age." In this (too brief) chapter he discusses both the paleography of the "first quire of John," which is written in a different hand, and the matter of the date of the MS. as a whole.

I am entirely at one with him in placing the date in the fourth century. Thus to \aleph and to B must be added a fresh contemporary witness. But this witness, [unlike \aleph and B in four and three short-lined columns respectively, has been copied from a third or early fourth century papyrus *book*. I do not think Mr. Sanders lays enough emphasis on this,

for there is an exceedingly close relation to W in its book-form in Oxyrynchus papyrus No. 2 (Grenfell and Hunt, vol. i.). In this document we have under our hands the exact type of papyrus in book-form of the third century,* which must have served as a model for W. Of this G. and H. write: "Part of a sheet from a papyrus book, which had been folded originally to make two leaves. . . . The papyrus was found near the "Logia" a day or two afterwards. Though the writing is somewhat later in style than that of the 'Logia' there is no likelihood of its being subsequent to the beginning of the fourth century, and it may with greater probability be assigned to the third. It may thus claim to be a fragment of the oldest known MS. of any part of the New Testament."

See G. and H. further remarks as to papyri in book-form in vol. ii.

Now the vellum MS. W corresponds as to size, form, and length of lines in a most remarkable and exact manner with *Oxyr*². The inner margin of the papyrus is double the width of that in W. After making allowance for this, the width of the page corresponds almost exactly with that of W. The length of the lines is practically identical. Owing to the papyrus contracting $\overline{\text{TT}}$ (*prim.*) in the first line, and the MS. writing $\text{T} \text{I} \text{O} \text{T}$ in full, $\text{T} \text{I} \text{O} \text{T} \text{ A} \text{B} \text{P} \text{A} \text{A} \text{M}$ begins the second line in the MS., while $\text{A} \text{B} \text{P} \text{A} \text{A} \text{M}$ is the first word of this line in the papyrus, but they run along together almost identically after making allowance for the "στίχοι" spaces in W, and certain slight differences in spelling, as $\Delta \text{A} \text{T} \text{E} \text{I} \Delta$ against $\Delta \text{A} \text{T} \text{I} \Delta$.

Passing to line 6 *seq.* on folio B of the papyrus (Matt. i. 16) note how they continue to run together.

* Burkitt (*Introduction to Barnard's Clement of Alexandria*) and Turner (J. T. S. *Historical Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, January 1910, p. 186) both accept the THIRD century for this fragment.

B 1 6 papyrus [E]ΓΕΝΝΗCEN ΙΩΧΦ ΤΟΝ ΑΝΔΡΑΜ[Α }
 2 1 16 W CEN ΤΟΝ ΙΩΧΦ ΤΟΝ ΑΝΔΡΑ ΜΑΡΙΑC }
 B 1 7 papyrus ΡΙΑC ΕΞ ΗC ΕΓΕΝΝΗ[Θ]Η ΙC Ο ΔΕΤΟΜΕΝΟC [XC }
 2 1 17 W ΕΞ ΗC ΕΓΕΝΝΗΘΗ ΙC ΟΔΕΓΟΜΕΝΟC XC }
 B 1 8 papyrus ΠΑCΑΙ ΟΥΝ ΓΕ[NE]ΑΙ ΑΠΟ ΑΒΡΑΑΜ ΕΩC }
 2 1 18 W ΠΑCΑΙ ΟΥΝ ΑΙ ΓΕΝΕΑΙ ΑΠΟ ΑΒΡΑΑΜ Ε }

B 1 9 papyrus ΔΑΥΙΔ ΓΕΝΕΑΙ ΙΔ ΚΑΙ ΑΠΟ [Δ]Α[Υ]ΙΔ' [E]ΩC ΤΗC }
 2 1 19 W ΩC ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΓΕΝΕΑΙ ΔΕΚΑΤΕCΑΡΕC }
 B 1 10 papyrus ΜΕΤΟΙΚΕCΙΑC ΒΑΒΥΛΩΝΟ[C] ΓΕ[NEAI] ΙΔ ΚΑ[Ι] }
 2 1 20 W ΚΑΙ ΑΠΟ ΔΑΥΕΙΔ' ΕΩC ΤΗC ΜΕΤΟΙΚΕ }
 B 1 11 papyrus ΑΠΟ ΤΗC ΜΕΤ[Ο]ΙΚΕCΙΑC ΒΑΒ[Υ]ΛΩΝ[Ο]C ΕΩC }
 2 1 21 W CΙΑC ΒΑΒΥΛΩΝΟC ΓΕΝΕΑΙ ΙΔ [] }
 B 1 12 papyrus ΤΟΥ ΧΥ ΓΕΝΕΑΙ ΙΔ ΤΟΥ ΔΕ ΙΥ ΧΥ Η ΓΕΝΕ }
 2 1 22 W ΚΑΙ ΑΠΟ ΤΗC ΜΕΤΟΙΚΕCΙΑC ΒΑΒΥΛΩ }
 B 1 13 papyrus CΙC ΟΥΤΩC ΗΝ ΜΝΗCΤΕΥΘΕΙCΗC ΤΗC ΜΗ }
 2 1 23 W ΝΟC ΕΩC ΤΟΥ ΧΥ ΓΕΝΕΑΙ ΙΔ [] }

B 1 14 papyrus ΠΡΟC ΑΥΤΟΥ Μ[ΑΡΙ]Α[C] ΤΩ[ΙΩ]ΧΦ ΠΡΙΝ Η CΥΝ }
 2 1 24 W ΤΟΥ ΔΕ ΙΥ Η ΓΕΝΕCΕΙC ΟΥΤΩC ΗΝ' }
 B 1 15 papyrus ΕΛΘΕΙΝ ΑΥΤΟ[C] ΕΥΡΕΘ[Η] ΕΝ ΓΑCΤΡΙ ΕΧΟΥ † }
 2 1 25 W ΜΝΗCΤΕΥΘΕΙCΗC ΓΑΡ ΤΗC ΜΗΤΡΟC ΑΥ }
 B 1 16 papyrus CΑ ΕΚ [ΠNC] ΑΓΓΙΟΥ ΙΩΧΦ ΔΕ Ο] ΑΝΗΡ ΑΥ }
 2 1 26 W ΤΟΥ ΜΑΡΙΑC ΤΩ ΙΩΧΦ ΠΡΙΝ Η CΥΝΕΑ }
 B 1 17 papyrus ΤΗC Δ[Ι]ΚΑΙ[Ο]C ΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΜΗ ΘΕΛΩΝ ΑΥΤΗΝ }
 2 1 27 W ΘΕΙΝ ΑΥΤΟΥC ΕΥΡΕΘΗ ΕΝ ΓΑCΤΡΙ ΕΧΟΥ † }

B 1 18 papyrus ΔΕΙΓΜΑ[Τ]Ε [ΙCΑΙ ΕΒΟΥΛΗ]ΘΗ [ΛΑΘΡΑ }
 2 1 28 W CΑ ΕΚ ΠNC ΑΓΙΟΥ [] }

[Room has to be made here
for rov].

Corresponds exactly allow-
ing for *ai* before *γενεαι*
in MS.

ΙΔ expanded in MS. W.

(Space in MS.)

Space in MS. Here ΙΔ not
ΔΕΚΑΤΕCΑΡΕC

(MS. ΙΥ not ΙΥ ΧΥ.)

(MS. supplies *γαρ*.)

† Notice above how the
lines come together
again.

(Space in MS.)

In vol. ii. of the *Oxyr.* papyri occurs No. ccviii., part of St. John i. and xx., of which, unfortunately, no facsimile is given, but in which the lines are somewhat shorter. This also is in book-form and attributed to the third century.

In vol. vi., No. 847, plate vi., John ii. G. and H. say : "This leaf from a *vellum MS.* of St. John's Gospel is sufficiently early in date to be of decided value. The rather large calligraphic script is more closely related to the sloping oval type of the third and fourth centuries than to the squarer and heavier style which *subsequently* became common for Biblical texts and of which 848 and 851 are examples. We have little hesitation in referring the MS. to the fourth century.

In this connection observe here on plate vi., lines 5 and 14, the swing to the left of the base of the perpendicular in the letter ϕ (as in W), and line 15 observe ξ in $\epsilon\xi\epsilon\beta a\lambda(\epsilon\nu)$, which corresponds to that most characteristic letter in W, which by itself alone, in my opinion, holds W in the fourth century and is of a form earlier than that visible in \aleph or in B.

One matter to be noticed in connection with the long lines of *Oxyr*². (third century) and W (fourth century) is that these documents must be rather far removed from short-lined bi-linguals or tri-linguals. Hence bi- or tri-lingual traditions (so completely vindicated in the MS. W, as will be seen) are far behind the Diocletian period.

Now let us glance at the text, for we can do no more in a short review. The subject is so vast, and its ramifications so many, that it cannot be dealt with or even sketched in a preliminary notice.

Let us take one of Mr. Sanders' tables only (p. 119). He is speaking of the possible keys to the real *base* of W as shadowed in this list of selected passages from St. John.

Take the well-known verse in x. 9, "I am the door.

Through me if any one enter in he shall be saved and shall come in and shall go out and find pasture." A reference to Tischendorf shows that *και εισελευσεται*, the first of the "pair" of expressions above, is wanting in Δ. Mr. Sanders now shows this Δ omission to be as old as W, for W omits, and to the evidence Mr. Sanders quite properly adds two very valuable old Latins *a* and *e* ("European" and "African" we were told these witnesses were) and *Lucifer* and δ, as well as *Δ^{gr}. Now we can see how important it is to bring Tischendorf up to date, and we wish Dr. Gregory very cordially every success in the task which he has undertaken in this respect, for the versions must never be neglected. *Lucifer* joined to *a* shows that this was a genuine omission in the copies of Italy and Sardinia in the fourth century, and *e* supported by W shows that this same base pervaded both Latin Africa and Greek Egypt simultaneously. So that Δδ, instead of standing alone, as readers of Tischendorf might suppose, have rather weighty support for the "shorter" text, which is here not found in NB. I am not saying yet that the text here is the true text, for this is a curious place which we have mentioned.

To proceed. Another case of the "shorter" text is to be found previously at viii. 53, where, instead of *μη συν μειζων ει του πατρος ημων Αβραάμ οστις απεθανεν; και οι προφηται απεθανον τινα σεαυτων ποιεις;* we find that D a b c d e f, l and *syr sin* [but not the other versions, Egyptian or otherwise] omit *πατρος ημων* and write merely *του Αβραάμ*. To this array W is now to be added. The Latins are thus practically agreed because the absentees can be accounted for (*f* and *g* having been largely revised). We are now face to face with a larger and more interesting problem as to the "shorter" text. Observe again that NB are absent

* δ so often opposes Δ that it should always be cited with Δ. The same applies to D *α*.

and also the Egyptian versions, so that here we are clearly on Latin ground. But, lo! *syr sin* adds its voice to our band [*cu* is not extant here to check it, ceasing at viii. 19], so that the international base is much strengthened.

Another curious place awaits investigation in this connection at vii. 1, where we had a reading known to the Latins (*a b ff l r*), but so far only to three Greek cursives and the second hand of another (240, 244, 249, 142 * *; of these 249 is important), and we had not seriously considered it. But W turns up with this reading: *ου γαρ ειχεν εξουσιαν ου γαρ ηθελεν*. For this reading *syr cu* stands (against *syr sin*) and one *boh*. MS. with Chrysostom, so that *syr* and *latin* draw together most decidedly through W and apart from NB. We have also found here the common base behind *syr cu sin*, as we have a reading of each, both supported by *a b r*.

Then in ix. 21 another curious revelation awaits us. W omits *αυτον ερωτησατε* with *N b syr sin* and *sah*. This passage about the speech of the blind man's parents is very involved and the original reading doubtful. Some say, "he is of age, ask him"; some vary the order: "ask him, he is of age"; some drop one or other half of the clause, and some, as *sah syr sin.*, modify what is left. But we have again here with *N b sah* and *syr sin* a shorter form than that given by B or D.

Then at x. 15 ND and W come together, using *διδωμι* for *πιθημι* as *pers* (and *aeth arab*, as translated, "trado" and "commuto").

Again, for a "shorter" text: xii. 16 — *τοτε* W (no other Greeks) *b c e ff l syr sin pesh diatess* and *pers georg*. This omission, observe, is not an accident, for *effl* join the Latins, and they are all fully connected with Egyptian traditions. They are supported, moreover, by *b*, so largely elsewhere with W, and by the Syriacs conjoined (*cu* is wanting,

hence the absence of this witness) and confirmed by *pers*, which was evidently founded on a most ancient Græco-Syriac.

A change of order in xii. 25 appears most significant. For *εις ζων αιωνιον φυλαξει αυτην* of all Greeks, W writes *φυλαξει αυτην εις ζων αιωνιον* with *syr sah boh aeth*. The Latins follow the regular Greek order strictly, so that the base of W either goes back to a very distant misty period here before all Greeks and Latins which we have, or it is a direct version influence upon W of *syr* or *copt*.

Another change of order, on the other hand, at xi. 17, *εν τω μνημιω εχοντα* (for *εχοντα εν τω μνημιω*), while shared with DLΨ, is the *Latin* order of *b c d l r aur* and *vg*.

On the other hand, again, at xi. 48 *την πολιν* is substituted for *τον τοπον* by W and *syr sin* only.

xx. 22 *αυτοις και λεγει*, W and *arm, pers, georg*.

Again, at xii. 2 *εποιησαν ουν αυτω δειπνον εκει και η Μαρθα διηκονει + αυτω* writes W with *c* and the Georgian version (*illic ministrabat gat*), and *+ αυτοις aeth*, thus, as it were, joining all these traditions together.

Again, a very curious but ancient form is found at xii. 47, *και εαν τις μου μη ακουση των ρηματων και μη φυλαξη εγω ου κρινω αυτον*. This *+ μη* before *ακουση* by W is found in no Greek document but Paris⁹⁷, but *e* has it and *syr hier* (with *pers*) and *Aug Chr*.

Paris⁹⁷ having all the common elements of **N** and **B**, thus here (and elsewhere) takes us *behind* **N** and **B***, as 28 sometimes takes us behind W itself.

Then a simple verb for a compound, always a sign of great age, or sympathy with Syriac, is found at xii. 35, *λαβη* for *καταλαβη*, with *Origen (syr pers)*.

* Thus xix. 20, *αεγνωσαν πολλοι* W Paris⁹⁷, *diatess arm pers*;

xx. 14, *ειδεν* (for *θεωρει*) W Paris⁹⁷, *c q δ aur sah boh (vg)*;

xvi. 23, — *εν πρωτ*, W Paris⁹⁷;

xvii. 20, *υπερ (προ περι σεσ)*, W Paris⁹⁷.

Next xii. 42. For *και εκ των αρχοντων πολλοι*, we find *πολλοι των αρχοντων* as *Chrys diatess* (*boh*, *aeth*, *arm*).

There is no room to proceed here, but with these suggestions a more complete study of Mr. Sanders' list will be found very profitable.

- xii. 44. For the order *εκραξεν δε ο Ιησους αεθ* and the later Arabic seem the only authorities.
- xii. 49. *εντολην μοι δεδωκεν* (for *μοι εντολην δεδωκεν*) *W jam*. 1 2^o and *boh* only (—*μοι arm*).
- xiii. 37. *υπερ σου την ψυχην μου θησω* (*προ την ψυχην μου υπερ σου θησω*), *NXW Paris*⁹⁷ and some bohairic MSS. (see Malan against Horner's codices). As *ξ* and *X* join *W* here this may represent a very ancient bohairic.

Finally consider this point. There is both an underlying and an overlying Coptic sympathy as between *W* and both Coptic versions. In John x. 32, 41 we come to both the underlying and overlying sympathy with the bohairic version. In John x. 41 *Ιωαννης secund.* is omitted by *W* 248, *syr sin* and *boh*, but in x. 32 + *ουν* by *W* has its only support in *boh*. The latter is what I should call the *overlying* bohairic influence on *W*, by which I mean an influence on *W* at the last copying of *W* in Egypt from a Græco-bohairic MS. This is really a very remarkable place. *All* the bohairic MSS. are agreed to add *ουν*. So far as I know, no Greek MSS. do it, although some of the family of *W* may be found to do so. No Latin MSS. do it; no Syriacs. Of the other versions neither Persian, Arabic, Slav, Georg., Arm., Goth., nor Aeth., nor Sahidic, and that in a place where the addition is most easy and natural, so that the only conclusion is that *W* and *boh* are hereby most intimately related. The passage is, "Jesus answered them, many good works have I showed you from the Father. On account of which work

(of them) *therefore* will ye stone me?" You will observe that bohairic for *therefore* is the same as in Greek. But it is not as if W might have influenced one bohairic MS., for *all boh* MSS. have it, and therefore I conclude that basic bohairic had it before W in the fourth or third century, and influenced W directly.

In this connection note that W omits *καλα* in the same verse (with only $\frac{1}{2}$ Evan 220, Evst 54 *b syr sin Thdrt*) and not so *boh*, so that *boh* was $\frac{1}{2}$ not copying W, and the omission of *καλα* represents the *underlying* text, while the addition of *ουν* exhibits the *overlying* bohairic influence. This alone places *boh* squarely in the early fourth century at least.

For the distinct *overlying* Coptic, consult further xviii. 29, *προς αυτους ο Πειλατος*, $\aleph W$ *Sah boh* only.*

A peculiar Semitic touch is visible in the first quire of John at iv. 11, *εστιν (προ εχεις) W* alone, in the phrase *ποθεν εχεις το υδωρ το ζων*; Cf. "whence to thee the living water."

As to St. John the first quire writing appears, on first inspection, *younger* than the rest.

This seems to be borne out by the strange text, which savours of Chrysostom's recension, although it is also derived from a Græco-Lat. But whereas in all the rest of the MS. there is evidence of *copt* or *sahidic* influence from a diglot in copying, here in the first quire of John there is hardly any to be picked up. Upon further test I find the Chrys. text used of John to be very ancient, and doubtless Mr. Sanders is right in considering this first quire to be at least coeval with the rest of the MS. We are much further removed from *e*, only having two agreements. And there is more independence here than anywhere else. The editor considers this

* Paris⁸⁷ is with $\aleph W$ at xviii. 23, *ειπον* for *ελαλησα*, and again below xviii. 31 — *αυτον sec.* with $\aleph W$, but not here in between. It is significant of the correctness of our contention.

first quire to be older than the rest and he has given much study to the subject. At first sight i. 4— $\eta\nu$ might appear basic, from whence sprang $+\eta\nu$ and $+\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$, but I hardly think so. No MSS. agree. No early Fathers quote, and the question arose somewhat late. Wetstein quotes *Cypr.* for $-\tau\nu$

I think W omits to avoid the difficulty. But if basic, it would account for the curious turn in *syr cu* and *copt.*

Syr cu. Now life is that which came to pass in Him.

Boh. Life was that (which) is in Him.

Sah. In him is the life. But *Diatess* (Hogg) says simply, "In Him was life."

On the other hand i. 16, $+\zeta\omega\eta\nu$ W, could hardly have been dropped by all. Hence we look with more suspicion on $-\eta\nu$ in i. 4 than we should otherwise do.

There is evidence of retranslation from Latin at iii. 21, iv. 51, iv. 45, iv. 47; an unknown recension, but we note that $k-r_2$ are missing [in fact, r_2 lacks almost exactly this first quire of W, opening where the second quire of W begins], and we only get one line on this recension at ii. 7, where Ξ (representing r_2) goes with e ff_2 l μ *fossat* and $\aleph X$ Greek, with one bohairic MS. (M) in supporting $+\kappa\alpha\iota$.

Here are the details of the stranger readings in quire 1.

- i. 4. $-\eta\nu$ *prim.* See Wetstein *ad loc.*
 6. $\alpha\pi\omicron$ (*pro para*). Retransl.
 16. $+\zeta\omega\eta\nu$ (*ante ελαβομεν*). *Sah* only (*Horner*) was missing in Balestri.
 17. $+\delta\epsilon$ (post $\chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma$). = *Latt vett.* and *Dimma* and *boh*, not *sah*.
 18. $+\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta$. No Greeks but most *vett. Latt.*
 21. $\tau\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota\ \text{Ηλίας}$. Cf. B and *copt.*
 $+\tau\iota\ \omicron\upsilon\nu$. Cf. *e.*
 29. $-\ \pi\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu$. Apparently no support.
- Ibid.* $\tau\alpha\varsigma\ \alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma$. No Greeks, but *e l r* and some Vulgates

and *Didymus Cypr.* In *boh* $\overline{M}\Phi\text{NOBI}$; in *sah* $\overline{M}\text{INOBE}$.

- Jo. i. 31. βαπτιζιν (pro βαπτιζων). *e q arm sah* $\frac{1}{2}$ only.
33. αυτω. *e* only. Others in *eum*; αυτω doubtless retransl.
46. τον τω (—ιον). No support. Cf. *ff*₂ (friendliest of Latins in this section) "ih̄m. fil. ios. qui est a naz."
51. — σε. No support apparently except *arm.*
- Ibid.* τουτων μειζω. Not Latin order.
- ii. 2. + εκει. Only 131 of Greeks (*testibus Scholz et Birch, non Lake, silet Lake*), also no less than 14 vulgates and *fossat*, but no other Old Latin.
7. + και. $\aleph X$. Of *Latt*: $\aleph e ff_2 l fossat \mu$ and one coptic MS. Perhaps an old Latin error misreading the "Ait" of some at the beginning of the verse; and as only \aleph and X are guilty among the Greeks this looks very likely.
12. — εις καπερναουμ. Error. No support, *ut vid.*
— εκει₁ (εγγυς pro εκει 508). Error. Hardly any support, *ut vid.*
14. κολλυβιστας (pro κερματιστας). Seems also an error. *Boh* clear with transliteration KEPMA , while *sah* = NETPAIIEZITHC .
16. πωλουσιν τ. περ. So *sah* and *ff*₂ exactly, "vendebant columbas"; also *a b r* with the order, but in the abl. abs.
20. ο ναος ουτος οικοδ. New order. *Clem*₁
21. αυτος (pro εκεινος). No Greeks and all Latins "ille," clear retransl.
22. ηνεστη (pro ηγερθη). So only *Matthæi's coc Chrys.* [see iv. 52]. Clear retranslation

for *a* proves how it occurred, having *surrexit* for the others' *ressurrexit*.

- Jo. ii. 22. — *οι μαθηται*. New.
αυτω. New.
- iii. 2. *τα σημεια ταυτα*. New order among Greeks, but supported by *lat*: *f*, alone, and *Orig.* (on Jo. iv. 45).
13. + *εστιν ος*. Only *f*, *l* write +*is* (his) before *qui*.
ανεβη (*pro αναβεβηκεν*). (Retransl.)
21. *εισιν* (*pro εστιν*). Ψ 2, 28, 67, 254, 511 and all Latins, even *δ* above *εστιν ex emend.*, but *not Iren* translator, nor *Lucifer* and *a = est* (cf. *N**). Hence this illegitimate *εισιν* is *ex lat* and *not old*, for *Iren est operatus* and *Lucifer est factum*, witness against it. (*sah*, "he did them.")
- iv. 11. + *και*. Cf. *aeth*.
12. + *το ζων*. New. Probably from reading *vivam* in line above, or *μειζων* above. The Latins, *e*, etc., *boh gr* 69, and very few + *Chrys.* add *hunc* after *puteum*.
17. — *δ*. No doubt *ex lat* or *copt*. No Greeks, but *sah* plain *IC*.
24. *ος* (*pro θεος*). No Greeks, no Latins, no *boh*, no *syr*, but some *sah* MSS. Perhaps from proximity of *eos* read by some Latins, or *contr. bar* omitted (69 omits the clause).
27. + *γε* (*post μεντοι*). Although read by *Origen* (see *Matthæi* who condemns it), it is not the usual style for the N.T. [*Copt* is the same as Greek *MENTOI*]. We must rule it out, and again say it may show comparatively late handling.

29. — *μοι*. Only *ff*₂ of all authorities and one *boh* MS. Clearly *ff*₂ is the nearest to us in the actual recension.
- Jo. iv. 36. *ζων* (*pro ζωνν*). No support. Must have misread *vivam* for *vitam* in the Lat (or transliterated *copt*).
40. *ηρωτων* (*pro ηρωτων*). *ηρωτον* Evst. 257. Rogabant *a ? b d r* (δ), and cf. *boh syr*. Other Greeks all with *text. rec.* except 248: *ηρωτησαν*.
45. + *τοις*. Retranslation. *Latt*: "in hierosolymis," and *sah* EN ΘΙΕΡΟΥΤΑΛΗΜ, not *boh* EN ΙΑΗΜ, and so *D d q*.
- Ibid.* — *αυτοι*. *Cyr*.
47. *ηκεν* (*pro ηκει*). No Greeks. *Latt* = venit or advenit (*sah*, *ει*), some adveniret or advenerat, etc.
48. — *o prim. ante ιησους* = *Lat.* and *sah* \overline{IC} .
51. *υπηνητησεν αυτω οι δουλοι*. *Latin* order of *d e r* and *Chrys*, not *copt*.
52. — *αυτω*. *Sah*, *Dimma*, and *a b* only and one *Chrys*. codex π; *ei* fell out before *heri*, no doubt.
- v. 2. *τη επιλεγομενη*. No support. (Cf. *N** and *sah*, however.) Retransl.
7. *εν οσω*. Cf. *e* and *sah*. And see Δ, where *ΕΓΩ* might be almost read *OCΩ*.

H. C. HOSKIER.

(To be continued.)