

For private circulation

June 1932

BULLETIN OF THE BEZAN CLUB
Nº. X

LATE E. J. BRILL LTD.
LEYDEN

MEMBERS OF THE BEZAN CLUB:

- TH. ZAHN, *Hon. President*, Erlangen.
J. RENDEL HARRIS, *President*, 210 Bristol Road, Birmingham
D. PLOOIJ, *Secretary*, 155 Euterpestr., Amsterdam Z.
Rev. C. A. PHILLIPS, *Treasurer*, 36 Dean Park Road,
Bournemouth.
Prof. A. BAUMSTARK, Rheinweg 111, Bonn a. Rh.
Prof. R. P. CASEY, 114 Park Street, Dorchester (Mass.,
U. S. A.).
Prof. A. C. CLARK, Corpus Christi College, Oxford.
Rev. A. M. COLEMAN, 2 Hagley Grove, Birmingham.
Prof. J. A. FINDLAY, The College, Didsbury, Manchester.
Prof. JAC. VAN GINNEKEN, S. J., Stijn Buysstr. 11, Nijmegen.
Prof. F. W. GROSHEIDE, Amsteldijk 83, Amsterdam.
Mr. HERMAN C. HOSKIER, "Ivy Farm", *Trinity* Jersey C. I.
(N. J., U. S. A.).
Père M.-J. LAGRANGE, Convent of St. Stephen, Jerusalem.
Prof. BENEDIKT KRAFT, Eichstätt (Bayern).
Prof. K. LAKE, Harvard University, Cambridge (Mass.,
U. S. A.).
Prof. HANS LIETZMANN, Berlinerstrasse 65, Berlin-Wilmersdorf.
Dr. E. A. LOWE, 6 Oriel Str., Oxford.
Prof. A. MERK, S. J., Ignatiuskolleg, Valkenburg (L.),
(Holland).
Dr. A. MINGANA, Rylands Library, Manchester.
Prof. JAMES H. ROPES, Harvard University, Cambridge,
(Mass., U. S. A.).
Prof. H. A. SANDERS, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor,
U. S. A.
Prof. K. SNEYDERS DE VOGEL, Turfsingel 23, Groningen.
Prof. HANS VON SODEN, Wörthstrasse 37, Marburg a/d Lahn.
Canon B. H. STREETER, Queen's College, Oxford.
Prof. C. C. TORREY, Yale University, 191 Bishopstreet,
New Haven (Conn., U. S. A.).
Prof. H. J. VOGELS, Argelanderstr. 49, Bonn a. Rh.
Prof. J. DE ZWAAN, Leyden.

BULLETIN OF THE BEZAN CLUB.

Nº. 10.

The first thing that we have to record in the present issue of the Bulletin is the removal from amongst us of our colleague Canon J. M. WILSON, at the advanced age of 94. He was from a regimental point of view one of our most recent recruits, and he retained his interest in Bezan studies and his zeal in prosecuting them to the very last, though his eyesight was failing and his physical strength was beginning to decline. In other respects he was young to the last.

Members of the Club will remember how he circulated amongst us copies of his translation into English of the Bezan text of the *Acts of the Apostles*, in the hope of reviving amongst us, and so indirectly among scholars generally among whom we occupy almost a pioneer position, the theory of BLASS that the double text of the *Acts* was due to the fact that Luke issued two editions of his work, and that the canonical text can only be properly understood, when it is regarded and read as a revised work, upon which the author's own hand has been engaged. Canon WILSON thought, and there was much to be said for his view, that BLASS' brilliant hypothesis of an original double text had never been adequately considered, and that, in the thirty years that had elapsed since its first promulgation, it had wrongly lapsed into desuetude. He was, I think, rather disappointed that he did not succeed in reviving amongst us an adequate study of BLASS' position, but perhaps this was not so much the result of a lack of interest in a particular phase of the great New Testament Problem, as it was due to a disinclination on the part of

some of our members to put into writing what they were really thinking.

I will append a copy of one of the latest communications that I received from him, not long before his decease.

STEEP,

PETERSFIELD. Oct. 26, 1930.

My dear Dr. RENDEL HARRIS,

I am indeed **greatly obliged to** you for your statement how matters **stand**, and **for your** renewed taking up the affair, and **promise** of a **new Bulletin**.

I do not see that I can write anything fresh on the matter. I object to the readings of the Bezan text being called "glosses". My theory is this. St. Luke wrote his first copy of the Acts at the time when the narration ends. He then proceeded to make a copy of it to send to his friend Theophilus at Antioch. Of course he improved its expressions a little, omitting what could be omitted without loss of clearness, slightly modifying what seemed like exaggeration in documents sent him, and leaving out what might be misunderstood, and a part of the story of Apollos. This was sent to Theophilus, and for some reason did not at once, or for some time, see the light. Meantime his original text became the received text, was used for translation, and was in general circulation. Then the other text came to light, and a copy of it, with the addition of a marginal explanation after blood "of things strangled" (Acts 15) appeared, and in the end supplanted the first. But the earliest text that can be shown to exist was in the main the same as the Greek or Latin of Codex Bezae. I am not scholar enough to go into further detail. That Luke was the **writer of both texts**, or the original of both texts, is I think *demonstrated* beyond doubt by the perusal of the Codex itself. What happened after A. D. 80 to the **two texts** is a matter of no concern to me only inasmuch as it **proves the existence of one text**, and fails to prove the **existence**, in circulation, of the other.

Why because only one Greek text survives should its readings be called *glosses*?

However, I am not disturbed in my views by any later history of the text.

Once more my warmest thanks to you for so taking the matter up again.

Truly yours
JAMES M. WILSON.

[P. S.] You know I suspect that Theophilus is Manaen. But that cannot be proved.

R. H.

ANTIOCH OR ALEXANDRIA?

Those who are following carefully the studies in the text of Josephus, which have recently culminated in the discovery of a Russian version of the *Jewish War*, may perhaps have noticed that along with the greater questions involved, such as the authenticity or otherwise of the celebrated Testimony of Josephus to Jesus Christ, there has also come to the front an interesting question as to the character of the text of the Septuagint which was employed by the Jewish historian. To which of the principal recensions of the LXX had the text of Josephus most affinity? We know from Jerome that the three principal types in his day were classed as Hesychian, Lucianic and Eusebian. Hesychius will be the equivalent, roughly speaking, of our modern texts of the LXX, which follow the Codex Vaticanus, whilst Lucian is the scholar-martyr of Antioch in the fourth century (A. D. 311). Setting aside for the present the question of the Eusebian text, we ask whether the text employed by Josephus inclines to the recension or recensions of Alexandria, or to that of Antioch. The answer will surprise those who approach the subject for the first time, and it will provoke a supplementary question as to what this has to do with the Bezan Club, or why does it obtain a place in our Bulletins. The surprising answer is that the *Biblical text of Josephus is fundamentally Lucianic and not Hesychian, it is Antiochian and not Alexandrian.*

In order to make this clear, we may turn to the lectures on Josephus which were given in New York by Mr. J. St. JOHN THACKERAY, shortly before his decease. We must quote some of his statements: —

p. 85. "The Lucianic text has in large measure been identified through an ancient note stating that the readings were marked by the letter *Lamed*, and the discovery of the mark in certain passages in a Paris MS Here comes in the importance of the evidence of Josephus in showing that *the Lucianic (text) has survived, with some alterations, from a period not only earlier than Lucian, but a century and a half earlier than Origen*".

Nor does the surprise end there. The authorities from which this first century Antiochian text can be deduced are a handful of late cursive MSS. far inferior in date to what we call the Great Uncials. The last has suddenly become the first. Let us see how Thackeray states the case for us:

p. 83. "We can identify the type of Greek text which lay before (Josephus). This text was not one of those contained in our oldest uncial MSS., the Codex Vaticanus or Alexandrinus, on which our modern printed texts of the Septuagint are based. It was a text allied to one preserved only in a small group of MSS. written not in uncial but in cursive script at a much later date, between the tenth and the fourteenth centuries; and known by the figures assigned to them by the eighteenth century editors HOLMES and PARSONS, as 19, 82, 93 and 108 Now that we have in our hands fuller and more accurate editions both of the Septuagint and of Josephus, we discover that the 'Syrian' text in an older form was in existence more than two centuries earlier, and can be carried back from the age of the Christian Lucian to that of the Jewish historian".

That is, as we have said, an astonishing subversion of critical judgment: one feels like saying with the chorus in the Medea, *ἄνω ποταμῶν ἱερῶν χωροῦσι παγαί*.

We have a demonstration before our eyes that the best MS. is not necessarily the oldest, or as perhaps we have been learning to say for ourselves, 'the true text may turn up anywhere'.

The caution which we accumulate from the LXX must certainly be carried over to the text of the New Testament. Suppose we can make it clear that Lucian and Hesychius, to say nothing of other editors, revised the New Testament as well as the Old Testament, what is to prevent the occurrence of similar conclusions, both in the textual rivalry between Antioch and Alexandria, and in other textual variations. At all events it will not do any longer to say with modern editors that such and such a reading is Western and Syrian, or Syrian only, and may therefore be safely renounced; or that no readings of Codex B, however singular, can safely be rejected: and of course we are far from endorsing the textual slogan that the best text must be in the earliest copies. That at all events must be avoided. We have taken a little of the space in the Bulletin to draw the attention of the members of the Club to a situation which has certainly developed in the Greek text of the LXX and may find a parallel in the New Testament itself.

R. H.

THE CAESAREAN TEXT

with special reference to the new Papyrus and
another ally.

The forthcoming publication of the Chester Beatty Papyrus will shortly bring into prominence the Caesarean Text of the Gospels, especially of S. MARK, and so far as its limited range permits and the evidence is clear, modify or confirm previous study, theory and conclusion. Accordingly it may be both of interest and to the convenience of readers of the Bulletin to collect some of the outstanding features of the present situation as it has been left by the "Caesarean Text of S. MARK"¹⁾, and Prof. BURKITT's review in *J. T. S.*,

¹⁾ By KIRSOPP LAKE, R. P. BLAKE & S. NEW, *Harvard Theological Review*, Oct. 1928.

Vol. XXX, July 1929, to give the probable effect of the new discovery as foreshadowed in Sir F. KENYON's summary report in the Times of November 19, and the letter from Harvard University with which the authors of the Caesarean text lost no time in following it up, and — *magnis parva componere* — to take this opportunity of calling attention to another member of the Caesarean family in Mark, whose kinship, though recognised by Von Soden, is obscured by his grouping, and seems to have been overlooked in the recent Caesarean studies.

The Caesarean Text has been so called because it is the type of text known to have been used by Origen and Eusebius in Caesarea, and is found in a group of later MSS., Θ 565 fam¹ fam¹⁸ 28,700 and the Old Georgian versions. Allied to these in various ways are the Old Syriac, Codex W, the Palestinian Syriac Lectionary, and 'more occasionally', some of the Old Latin¹).

Canon Streeter in his 'Four Gospels' (1924) thought it could be proved that Origen used the Neutral text while in Alexandria, and changed to the Caesarean only after he came to Caesarea; but the evidence was fogged by his putting together²) Bks. I–X of the Commentary of S. JOHN, while Bks. I–V only were written in Alexandria. The evidence for these is very slight, comprising chiefly the opening three verses of Mark. Here there are four variations, of which one is Neutral, another Neutral with the **K II** group, the third D exactly with a slight variation in **NB** etc. and the fourth is supported only by **N** among the great MSS.; but *all* of them are supported by Θ and one or more of its allies. So the evidence slight as it is, at least permits the contrary view that Origen had a Caesarean text in Alexandria, that he found and used a Neutral text while writing Bks. V–X in Caesarea, and afterwards reverted to the Caesarean text for the rest of the work. So the conclusion reached in the "Caesarean

1) For a diagram of the group, illustrating also the authors' conclusion, see *Caesarean Text of S. Mark*, p. 325.

2) Op. cit., p. 93.

Text", p. 331 — to which the authors in their letter to the Times of Dec. 16 refer as one which most of their readers then regarded as a 'rather rash statement' — is as follows:

"So far as the evidence goes, and it obviously does not go far enough to give certainty, it would seem that for his text of Mark, Origen during his early days in Alexandria used a Codex akin to family Θ , then deserted it in favour of a copy of Mark with a Neutral text (at least in the first 12 chapters) which he found in Caesarea, and finally, some years later, reverted to the Θ text which he had formerly used in Alexandria".

There is one other passage which occurs in the Commentary on S. JOHN, both in the part written in Alexandria, and that written in Caesarea, and also in the Martyrdom, which "is considered (p. 263) to be of a different nature", the addition of *πατήρ* in Mc. x. 18.

"It clearly seems to have been known to Clement of Alexandria. It is all the more remarkable that it is not found in any extant manuscript. This is one of the cases where one is inclined to doubt the judgment of Westcott and Hort, that there are no variations in the Gospels due to doctrinal reasons".

I venture to suggest that this requires some further treatment. Though the addition does not occur in any Greek MS. of Mark, it does occur in Cod Pal (*e*) in Mc. and in *d* in Lk., and a footnote to that effect might have saved some misconception. Also the reading is, of course, used by Justin, Irenaeus, and later by Ephrem, so that it is not of a 'different nature' in the sense of being evidence for a local use in Alexandria only. It may, as is suggested, be a reading that has been removed in the true text owing to its doctrinal difficulties: — and members of the Bezan Club probably hold no brief for this particular judgment of Westcott and Hort — but it may also be a Marcionite reading that had been widely used in the Catholic Church, both in East and West, from the second to the fourth centuries.

We are carefully warned that the evidence used so far

is only for S. MARK, though Canon Streeter's study on the Four Gospels has been wider: and one of the first things to be done is to make a complete collection and collation of the Origen and Eusebian quotations from the other Gospels. For some examples of the Caesarean text outside Mark, see Streeter, pp. 86, 87, especially Mt. xxvii, 16, 17, where the name of Barabbas is Jesus Barabbas in Θ , fam 1, 241, 299, sy^(c) pal georg. For Origen's comment, and its implication that the reading was in the text most familiar in Caesarea at the time, see p. 101.

The Caesarean group represents a 'local' text rather than a family like the Ferrar group, which with all probability derives from a 'concrete non-extant Codex'. This is stressed both by authors and reviewer. "The Caesarean text was never a definite single entity like the Vulgate or the Peshitto, but is analogous to the European Latin, which is not only contemporary in time but remarkably similar to it in character (though not in detail)¹. An ancient local text is different in character from that of a concrete non-extant Codex. It is not only more diverse at any given date but also to a certain extent, it differed at different dates"²). And the 'specially characteristic' readings of Mc. xi. 13 are quoted as an example. There are of course a number of striking examples where the group are wholly or almost wholly agreed, and these will be fully illustrated under the 'new ally', but this one is typical of a good many readings of the Caesarean text.

The variants here are:

- (1) *ἐλ ἄρα τι εὐρήσει ἐν αὐτῇ* \aleph B A C W 1 etc. 13 etc. 28 sy^s and arm.
- (2) *ἰδεῖν ἐὰν τι ἔστιν* D *k b c ff i r gat*.
- (3) *ὥς εὐρήσων τι* Θ 565 700 *a f q* Orig.³)

"It would be difficult on general principles to decide between (1) and (2), but my impression is that (2) is nothing more than the O. L. rendering of (1), and that D only

1) Caesarean Text, p. 326 and J. T. S., p. 354.

2) p. 355.

3) Also P. 13416 from the Berlin Collection of papyri, published by A. H. SALONIUS in *ZNTW* xxvi, 1927, pp. 101 ff; see 'Caesarean text', pp. 212 f.

has it by retranslation from the Latin. On the other hand it is obvious that (3) is a Greek stylistic paraphrase of (1): *ὥς* with a future participle is good Greek but alien from Mark's style. The question is, how far are we justified in supposing that this particular corruption — for such it is — ever formed a part of the text of W 1 etc. 13 etc. 28 or the original Armenian? . . . Does it belong to an earlier, or a later, stage of the Caesarean text? Was *ὥς εὐρήσων* corrected out of *fam*¹ and W through the influence of the *ⲛ B* text? If so, what are we to make of the curious and important readings of W and *fam*¹ shared by *syr*^s but not by *ⲛ B'*?

He also criticizes the method of reconstructing the Caesarean text: it is to pick out the non-'Ecclesiastical' (non-Byzantine) readings of *Θ fam 1 fam 13 28 700*, the Armenian and the Georgian and to combine them into a synthetic text. Such a tentative reconstruction for Chaps. I, VI and XI is given in an excursus, and "is well worth the making as it gives the reader an opportunity of seeing what is the general style of that text as compared with the familiar entities like the Received Text or Westcott and Hort"; and we hear from the letter of Dec. 16 that the whole of the Gospel of S. Mark has now been so reconstructed¹), and is only awaiting the publication of the papyrus before being set up. "The result is a convenient repertory of 'various readings', but is it an historic entity as Jerome's Vulgate or Rabbula's Peshitto is?"

Another of the Excursus is of special interest to Bezans, where Mrs. S. New gives the results of her study of the Harclean and its marginal notes. She concludes (p. 394) that one of Thomas' Greek exemplars was predominantly Caesarean²); neither of the other two was of the type of

1) For the editors' intention, cp. *Caesarean Text*, p. § 326, it is to present "a text . . . which can reasonably claim an authority equal to that of a fourth- or even third-century Greek MS. used in Caesarea".

2) An interesting result of this conclusion is given below among the readings of the "new ally". In Mc. 15¹³ add *ἀνασείόμενοι . . . ἔλθον*, the evidence in Tischendorf, G 13 etc. *cscr syhm* arm is somewhat indefinite: add *ε1337f georg 2B* to these newly discovered affinities of *syhm* arm Ferr, and the Caesarean source at once emerges.

Codex Bezae. They may have been both Neutral or both Alexandrian, or one may have been of either type. The absence of Gk. 'Western' readings in the margin of the Harclean in the Gospels is as noticeable as is their presence in the Acts¹). *In antiquo Syriaco* refers to a copy akin to Syr^s, and *In illo Mar Xenaiae* to one belonging to Philoxenus, and was apparently a copy of the Peshitto. The evidence is highly interesting, and so far as it goes, offers another example of a Caesarean text in Alexandria, in the 7th Cent. in the library at Enaton.

It seems agreed that the Georgian Version derives from an Old Armenian (unrevised, as has been the Arm. Vulg.), which in turn derives from an old Syriac, which is more Caesarean than Syr^s. Burkitt analyses the readings of 1449^{ff}, and finds there a good example of the way in which Georg¹ (Adysh) and Syr^s are higher up to this original than the extant Armenian and Georg². The fact that Syr^c, where extant in Mark, has so many variations from Syr^s should make us prepared for "extensive variations between MSS. of the Old Syriac, just as there were among the MSS. of the Old Latin". And he would accordingly prefer the term "Eastern" to that of "Caesarean", and in cases like *ὡς εὐρήσων* in Mc xi. 13, adapt an expression used by Westcott and Hort, and describe them as "Eastern of limited range".

And now comes the new papyrus, to 'fulfil' rather than 'destroy', as far as we are told at present, most of these studies, theories and conclusions. We would restrict these notes entirely to what Dr. KENYON tells us about the Gospel portion. The first fact is bibliographical — the quite new and important phenomenon that in this 3rd century papyrus, when complete, all four Gospels and including the Acts were in Codex form. The text is very fragmentary: "it includes two leaves²) from S. Matt. ranging between chs. xx and xxvi; five of S. Mark, from iv. 36—

1) For probable exceptions in Mc. cp. 4⁹ add. *qui intelligit, intelligat* D a b ff₂ i r, but also 81222; 7¹³ add. *stultam p. traditionem vestram*. D Old Lat (*k*. hiat).

2) In most cases about a third of each page has disappeared at the bottom, and an uncertain amount from each side.

IX. 31; six of S. Luke (including the best preserved) from IX. 26—XIV. 33; two of S. John x. 7—xi. 56, — in every case with considerable breaches of continuity. With regard to the character of the text he speaks with much reserve from the evidence of just the first summary collation which time has so far permitted. While there are “no sensational variations, additions or omissions, it presents several remarkable characteristics”. So early a text is not of course Byzantine, but neither is it wholly Neutral. Nor again has it the remarkable variants which characterize the so-called Western Text. “In many places, especially in Mark, it agrees with what are known as the Ferrar Group and the family associated with Codex 1: and the suspicion is permissible (though it can at present be put forward only with the utmost reserve) that we have here the earliest representative of the family which Canon Streeter has shown to be associated with the great school of Caesarea, connected with the names of Origen (in his later years), Pamphilus, Eusebius and Jerome. Much further study is necessary before this conjecture can be regarded as established; but it is evident that the new MS. will deserve the careful attention of all students of the Bible Text”.

The authors of the Caesarean Text in their following letter of Dec. 16 recall first their correction of Streeter and the ‘rash conclusions’ of p. 321 mentioned above, adding “if Sir FREDERICK’S opinion prove justified, it no longer can be doubted that the ‘Caesarean’ Text existed in Egypt in the 3rd cent. A. D.” And they sum up the real epoch making effect of the new discovery as follows:

“Putting aside the Western Text, we have hitherto had two texts of Mark which certainly existed in the third century, — the Neutral Text and the Caesarean”.

“The evidence for the Neutral Text is the existence of the two uncials \aleph B and quotations in Origen in the books which he wrote during the first part of his life in Caesarea. There is no evidence that he used the Neutral Text of Mark before this time. The evidence for the Caesarean text is the quotations of Origen both in Alexandria and Caesarea, and now the new papyrus.

Up to the present almost everyone, including ourselves, has tried to explain the Caesarean text as a composite of Neutral and Western Texts. It is, however, obvious that it now becomes a serious question whether the Neutral Text is not rather to be explained as a revision of the Caesarean, a theory to which we believe Canon Streeter has inclined".

And now we must possess our souls in patience for a while. All New Testament students will have ready their own special questions and passages. Caesareans will be asking, will it support Θ or fam¹ as the better representative of the text? Bezans will want to know what it will say on those small variations where the Latin is equivocal and D remains(?) Caesarean, or to what extent, if any, it will back up the D Θ 565 *lat.* readings — "that somewhat degenerate form of the text used by Eusebius, largely due to mixture with a text of D type"¹). It will, unfortunately, be no good asking how Boanerges is spelt, or whether the publican apostle is JACOBUS or LEVI, or whether we shall find πατήρ in x. 18, or ὡς εὐρέσων or ἐπιβαλὼν later on: but we can look forward, lacunae permitting, to hunt up διὸ πεποιήκει λάθρα or (ναί) κύριε or στήσητε for τηρήσητε, or see how Capernaum looks (in Luke) or meet the Gergesenes, or make land-fall at Magdala, or watch and see whether the Vision on Mt. Tabor was given ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι, and may it be αὐτούς and not αὐτόν.

Meanwhile it may be of some value and interest to bring forward this further member of the family, especially as it begins almost exactly where the new papyrus in Mark ends, at ix. 31.

ε1337. — A 'CAESAREAN' ALLY.

In going through Prof. BLAKE's edition of the Old Georgian Versions of S. MARK and adding their readings to VON SODEN's apparatus, one notices in the latter third

1) Streeter, pp. 91 and 92.

of the Gospel the constant recurrence of a MS. unlisted by Gregory, and not quoted elsewhere, — $\epsilon 1337$. The description of the MS. in VON SODEN's list of Gospel codices (Tl. I, Bnd. I, p. 183) is immediately illuminating. It is a Mt. Athos (Watopädi 694) MS. of the xiv Cent., of no particular interest except with regard to fol. 100—122, of which it is stated that they are "mit Mk. 9²⁹ — Lk. 1⁴⁰ und Luk-Bild einem andern Cod. s. xiii. zur Ausfüllung einer zwischen Mk. 9⁴² und Lk. 1²⁹ entstandenen Lücke entnommen. Denselben Cod. entstammen ferner fol. 75 f. mit Mt. 28¹⁷⁻²⁰ (wiederholt), Kapitelliste, und Porträt des Mk." This portion of $\epsilon 1337$ is given full prominence in the list of Gospel sigla, and is included last but one, the fragment $\epsilon 2$, (I³), in his group I^{a 1}); and he has observed its affinity to fam 1²). But, as far as I know, no special attention has been called to it in recent years, or since the emergence of the 'Caesarean' text³).

I have lately made a survey of the readings where according to VON SODEN, $\epsilon 1337$ in this section varies from the T.R.: they are over 300 in number, and practically the whole of them support fam 1 (especially) or two or three of its 'new' allies Θ 700 565 28 fam 13, fam 1424 and W. There are, of course, a good number of passages where $\epsilon 1337$ is absent from the 'Caesarean' testimony, probably through correction to the Byzantine text; but this has happened freely to all the members of the group. I have not yet tested it for its place among the others for loyalty and resisting power, but my impression is that

1) VON SODEN links with $\epsilon 1337$, as a 'Brüdercodex', a Lawra MS. $\epsilon 1468$, which however has only been collated in Mk 9¹³⁻¹¹, 14⁷¹—15³¹ Lk 1¹⁻²⁹, 4¹⁻³⁶. In the two passages from Mk. it supports $\epsilon 1337$ in about 75% of its readings, and also has several 'Caesareans' where the latter is absent (? hurt), and in a complete study of $\epsilon 1337$ might be regarded as its 'sub'. In 9¹³⁻²⁹ it occurs only twice, where it supports Caesareans in readings, which are also Alexandrian: it does not appear in vss. 22, 23. 1³ in its Mark fragments (9¹⁴⁻¹⁸, 19-22 14⁵⁸⁻⁷⁰) has also several Caesarean affinities.

2) II p. 1290: "Zu bemerken ist die mehrfache Überstimmung beider oder eines von ihnen mit Hr an für I sonst nicht sicher bezeugten Stellen".

3) The authors of the Caesarean Text of the Gospel of Mark tell us that they did not use VON SODEN in making their tables of chs I VI XI; otherwise they could not have failed to observe and enlist this new ally, which in ch. XI alone supports Caesarea in some 48 places.

it will be a high one — quite high enough to give its presence real 'Caesarean' weight where it supports an otherwise weakly attested reading, e. g. 10^{11, 12} or 15¹³. The inversion of vss. 12, 11 is noted by TISCHENDORF just in a bracket with Cod. 1 as its sole witness: to this VON SODEN can add 1582 W 872¹⁾ ε 1337 ε 1468 syr^s (c), and there is now the further support of the Adysh Version, georg¹.

Of these 300 odd readings where 'Caesarean' testimony is present and mostly prominent, about 120 are also Neutral. Of the remaining 180, 73 are Caesarean pure and simple, — 51 without²⁾, 22 with Syriac support; 72 are also Latin, 41 of which are supported by Bezae: there are also 17 instances of D without other lat; but curiously enough, these are all cases where the Latin is equivocal³⁾ or where D is against *d*, the latter being with the Latin tradition. There are also 3 instances where *d* is Caesarean against D, once alone, twice with other Old-Lat.

The selection of examples appended may serve to illustrate, what the complete 300 might demonstrate, the following propositions:

1. the partial survival of another Caesarean text beyond those noted in the "Caesarean of S. Mark".
2. the misleading grouping of I^a: in almost all these readings fam 1 or its allies are prominent, while the comparative absence of D is remarkable.
3. they offer beyond the chapter (xi) selected for analysis⁴⁾, examples of the Caesarean affinities of the Old Georgian and the Palestinian Lectionary, though the extant portions of the latter are meagre in Mc. ix—xvi.

1) The witness of 872 is equivocal as (together with 22) it is a very poor relation of fam. 1 in this part of Mk: so the evidence of 1337—1468 is highly valuable, especially as we have in the same passage a remarkable example of that "degenerate" D Θ 565 lat. group referred to later. For the combined testimony of 1, 1582 and also for 22, see Burkitt, *J. T. S.*, l. c. pp. 355, 6.

2) The Georgian is not only almost always with sy, but supports also 25 of these: georg-lat without sy, 18, sy-georg-lat 30; so that if georg is regarded as a sy witness, there survives Syriac support in 97, Latin in 72 cases.

3) In nearly all the instances, about 20, where D without other Latin is with Caesarea and Neutral, the Latin is also equivocal.

4) The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of S. Mark, pp. 237 f., 286 f.; *J. T. S.*, l. c. p. 350.

The evidence of (2) and the comparatively slight surviving connection between D and Caesarea, call attention to a phenomenon throughout Mk., — the number of D-lat readings supported by two of the most prominent of its members Θ 565, and to a less degree 700, with or without and sy W, but without fam 1 and rarely with any other of its allies. Well known examples are 14⁷² 16⁴⁻⁶. They are numerous and clear-cut enough to represent some other source or revision: and it is in this connection also that our ε1337 is interesting, because, though usually absent in loyalty to fam. 1, it does occur rarely; cp. 15¹ 16¹.

The study here of Mk. 16 is perhaps of more than usual interest: verses 1 and 7 contain well defined Caesareans; in between, vs 4-6, there is that group of remarkable D Θ 565 lat readings: then in the appendix, though there are some 6 or 7 variations from T. R. with Caesarean evidence, ε1337 is silent, as if the exemplar of its *ἐπιβλημα* here had been purely Byzantine or more severely corrected.

It may be added that the Matthew and Lukan portions of this Section, and the Lukan portions of ε1468 that have been collated, shew little or no variation of importance; and so we seem to have here another smaller example — where the new papyrus may be a greater — of Dr. STREETER's Canon of Criticism, that the survival of "material for reconstructing old local texts is far more abundant and more trustworthy in the Gospel of S. Mark" ¹⁾.

C. A. P.

I. ε1337. *With united or strong Caesarean group.*

One or two cases will be noticed, where ε1337 has been more loyal to the group than fam 1.

* = Also ε1468 collated only in ix. 13—xi, xiv. 71—xv. 31.

Mc. ix. 39. om ταχυ 1 1582*²⁾ 209 565 28 sy^{s(c)} arm georg W H* Old-Lat.

*x. 14. add επιτιμησας a. ειπεν Θ fam 1 565 28 fam 13 W sy^{s(c)}

1) "The Four Gospels", p. 64.

2) For the combined testimony of 1, 1582 see BURKITT, *J. T. S.*, l. c., pp. 355 f.

- sy^{p 28*} sy^{h mg} arm georg (επετιμησεν l. ηγανακτησεν, add αυτοις georg²).
- *x. 20. **εποιησα** l. **εφυλαξα** fam 1 (exc. 872 22) 565 sy^{s(c)} georg arm Ephr. (Moes) 125, 171 Aphr. I. 972.
- *ix. 31. add **ημιν** p. **ερει** (Mt. 21³⁰) Θ fam 1 565 700 fam 13 D* (**υμιν**) W Old-Lat sy^{s(c)} georg.
- xii. 7. add. **θεασαμενοι αυτον ερχομενον** Θ 565 700 28 fam 13 fam 1424 1071 713 al. sy^{h*} arm georg Ephr. 192.
The Mt. Lk. parallel here is **ιδοντες αυτον**. In Mt. *e.* adds *de longe* (Gen. 37¹⁸); cp Aphr. I. 954 and Ephr. 265, *Cum haeres advenisset, dum adhuc longe abesset*.
- xii. 14. **ηρξαντο ερωταν αυτον εν δολω λεγοντες** l. **λεγουσιν αυτω** fam 1 fam 13 28 W sy^{s(c)} georg¹ (ε1337 **εν λογω** l. **εν δολω λεγοντες**).
επηρωτων αυτον εν δολω λεγοντες Θ 565 700 sah sy^p georg² (ω **εν δολω** p. **ελθοντες**).
επηρωτων αυτον οι φαρισαιοι D *d k* (add *dicentes*) *c* (add *dicentes*)
επηρωτων αυτον a
επηρωτων αυτον εν δολω *b ff₂ i q r*; add *pharisei ff₂*.
- xii. 41. **εστως** l. **καθισας** Θ fam 1 (exc. 22 118) 565 28 299 ¹).
W sy^{s(c)} arm georg sy^{h mg} Ta^{ned} Orig.
- xiv. 49. ²) add **των προφητων** p. **γραφαι** (= Mt.) Θ 565 fam 13 ε 551 W Φ N sy^{h*} pal (Land) georg.
50. ²) **τοτε** l. **και** = Mt. Θ 565 fam 13 ε 551 W N Σ sy^p arm georg² pal (Land) *c l r r²* Vg.
50. ²) add **οι μαθηται a αφεντες** (= Mt.) Θ 565 fam 13 ε 551 W N Σ sy^{s(c)} pal (Land) arm georg *c l r r²* Vg.
51. ³) add **οι δε νεανισκοι a κρατουσι** l. **και** Θ fam 1 fam 13 565 700 W sy^h arm georg aeth.
- xiv. 65. **ελαμβανον** l. **εβαλλον** Θ 1 1582 209 565 fam 13 (exc. 124) D (contra *d*) W G. georg²
(**ελαβον**: B X C L Δ I A N).
caedebant: *d* lat sy^{s(c)} 33 579 and Byzantines.
- *xv. 17. add **χλαμυδα κοκκινην και a. πορφυραν** (from Mt.) Θ 565 700 fam 13 1071 Δ pal arm sah (om **κοκκ**) i. e. not fam 1 or georg⁽¹⁾², but for fam 1 see below v. 20.
- *xv. 20. add **την χλαμυδα και a. την πορφ.** Θ 565 700 fam 13 1071 pal arm sah; **χλαμυδα** l. **πορφυραν** 1 1582 872.

1) 299 supports Θ fam 1 sy^{s(c)} pal arm georg in the Jesus Barabbas reading in Mt. 27^{16, 17}.

2) See Burkitt, *J. T. S.*, l. c., p. 351.

- *xv. 28. add. vers. all Caesareans with L 33 Δ 579 and Byzantines; om. B \aleph Ψ C D A al 8 k sy^(c) copt.
- xv. 47. *Μαριαμ*¹ Θ I 1582 209 sy^(c) arm georg aeth with 33.
- xv. 47. *Μαριαμ*² Θ I 1582 209 sy^(c) georg arm aeth.; cp. (not read by ϵ 1337) xv. 40. *Μαριαμ*¹ Θ fam I (exc. 872 22) W sy^(c) georg arm aeth with BC; *Μαριαμ*² Θ fam I (exc. 872 22) sy^(c) georg arm aeth.
- xvi. 1. *Μαριαμ*¹ I 33 sy^(c) georg arm.
- xvi. 1. *Μαριαμ*² I 1582 sy^(c) georg arm aeth.
- xvi. 7. add *ιδου προαγ.* (Mt.) Θ fam I 565 sy^(c) georg^{2A} pal with D W nff_2 .

II. Where ϵ 1337 supports a weak or divided Caesarean.

- *Mc. x. 11. ω vs 12 and vs 11, I 1582 872 W sy^(c) georg¹.¹⁾
- x. 21. ω *αρως τον σταυρον* a. *δευρο* fam I 28 (om^{*} *δευρο*) W G sy^(c) (om *δευρο*) arm georg¹ a ; om. D Θ 565 lat exc. a q with B \aleph C L Δ 33 etc.
- *xi. 13. *ει αρα τι ευρησει* fam I (exc. 872 22) 28 W 1424 1071 sy^p georg^{2A} with B \aleph C L 33 A N Σ Φ ; *ως ευρησων τι* P. 13416 Θ 565 700 sy^{p20} georg^{1,20} 28 a f q Orig; *ιδειν. εαν τι εστιν* D $kbciff_2r$.
- *xi. 15. ω *κατεστρεψεν* p. *κολλ.* \aleph . Orig (*ανεστρ*) sah²⁾; add *εξεχεεν* p. *κολλ.* = Jo. 2.¹⁵ Θ 565 700 28 W Σ N georg.
- xii. 14. om. *ειπεν ουν ημιν* fam I fam 13 (exc. 124) sy^{hms} (non invenimus in Graecis) with B \aleph C^e L 33 etc. sy^(c), contra Θ W 700 565 28 al georg arm D Old-Lat.
- xii. 29. *πρωτον* l. *πρωτη* fam I 700 28, (?) latinism³⁾
add *παντων* p. *πρωτη*^{ov} fam I sy^(c) georg¹⁽²⁾ 892 [add a. *πρωτη* D Θ W 565 700 28 a b ff_2 i q].
- xiv. 47. *ωτιον* = Mt. Θ W 700 565 28 C Δ 33 and Byzantine text *ωταριον* = John, fam I aeth B \aleph D.
- *xv. 13. add *ανασειομενοι υπο των αρχι. και ελεγον* p *εκραξαν* fam 13 al 3 G sy^{hms} arm georg⁽¹⁾².
- xv. 36. *δραμοντες ... εγεμισαν λεγοντες* fam 13 georg.
39. *αυτω* l. *εξ εναντιας αυτου* I 1582 22 W sy^(c) georg¹ (*qui stetit juxta eum* contra georg² *coram eo*).
- εκει* l. *εξ εναντιας αυτου* D Θ 565 nq .

1) Contrast D Θ 700 565 28 a b q ff_2 arm georg² which read 11, 12 in order, and *εξελθη απο ανδρος* l. *απολυση τον ανδρα*.

2) om. D (contra d') k sy^(c).

3) Lat. *mandatum* or *praeceptum*.

III. Where $\epsilon 1337$ is against Caesarea or has been corrected to T. R.

- ix. 36. add $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron$ ¹ with T. R. and Neutral georg^{1, 2A} 700; om. $\epsilon 1468$ Caesareans and arm georg^{2B}.
 ix. 44-46. add these verses with T.R. Θ 700 sy^{ph1}); om. fam 1 565 28 W sy^{s(c)} arm georg k with B \aleph C L Δ etc.
 xi. 9. om. $\tau\omega$ $\nu\psi\iota\sigma\tau\omega$ p $\omega\sigma\alpha\nu\nu\alpha$ with fam 1 Neutral and Byzant add Θ 700 565 28 fam 13 georg(¹ *gloria* l. *osanna*) $k a c i$.
 xi. 10. $\omega\sigma\alpha\nu\nu\alpha$ $\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\nu\psi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ Neutral and Byz. with D. $\epsilon\iota\rho\eta\nu\eta$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\delta\omicron\xi\alpha$ l. $\omega\sigma\alpha\nu\nu\alpha$ Θ fam 1 arm georg sy^h $\epsilon 192$. $\epsilon\iota\rho\eta\nu\eta$ l. $\omega\sigma\alpha\nu\nu\alpha$ 700 28 W sy^{s(c)} Orig $1/1$.
 xiv. 35. om. $\epsilon\pi\iota$ $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\nu$ with W georg T.R. and B \aleph C L Δ 33; add (= Mt.) fam 1 (exc. 872 22) Θ 565 700 28 713 Σ D G Old-Lat. sy^{s(c)} georg¹ (appendix).²)
 xiv. 61. om. $\epsilon\kappa$ $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ with fam 1 D lat T.R. and B \aleph C L Δ 33 etc. add Θ 565 700 W fam 13 Φ sy^{s(c)} georg^{1 2B}.

IV. Where $\epsilon 1337$ supports one of the degenerate variants caused by mixture with D lat.

- xiv. 36. $\omicron\upsilon\chi$ $\omega\varsigma$ l. $\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\iota$ Θ 565 fam 13 $c d ff_2$ georg¹ (app.) copt. $\alpha\lambda\lambda$ $\omega\varsigma$ l. $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha$ $\tau\iota$ Θ 565 fam 13 (exc. 124) $b c d ff_2$ copt. $\alpha\lambda\lambda$ \omicron D fam 1.
 xiv. 41. add $\tau\omicron$ $\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ p. $\alpha\pi\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$ D Θ W. 565 fam 13 1071 713 Φ .
a consummatus est finis
b fr, adest finis
c ff₂, adest enim consummatio
 Ta^{ar} sy^{s(c)} Georg² 'the end hath arrived'.
 *xv. 1. $\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ l. $\epsilon\tau\omicron\iota\mu\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ ($\sigma\upsilon\mu\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\nu$). D Θ 565 georg¹⁽²⁾ sy ($\alpha\lambda\omega$) Old-Lat. Orig. $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ B A and Byzantines.

Appendix.

I. Where in small variants the Lat. is equivocal and D (?) remains Caesarean.

e.g. omission or addition of the article spellings like $\sigma\tau\iota\beta\alpha\delta\alpha\varsigma$
 $\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\beta\alpha\delta\alpha\varsigma$

1) Note that in vs. 48 sy^h asterisks the $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ p. $\pi\upsilon\theta$, but not in vss. 44, 46. May this mean that Thomas' Gk. exemplars omitted the latter after all, but that he allowed them to stand in his text uncriticized for some ulterior reason, so that the passage may be only an apparent exception to Mrs. New's findings.

2) Lection, Mc. 1433-37 appended in the MS. to the Gospel of St. John.

παντες, απαντες
om η ρ. πριν
δοκει l. φαινεται
ομνυειν l. ομνυναι
ηδει l. εγινωσκεν
βασιλευ l. ο βασιλευς
παρεδωκαν, παραδεδ.

εις l. προς
παρα l. απο
φαγομαι l. φαγω
σημειον l. συσσημον
αγωσιν l. αγαγωσιν
ενδιδυσκουσιν l. ενδυουσιν
εως l. μεχρις.

II. (a) *Where D is Caesarean against d, with Lat.*
(b) *d is Caesarean against D.*

- xi. 7. καθειζει επ αυτον D fam 1 565 700 22 W; *d sedebat* with lat Neutral etc. *εκαθισεν* (exc. **Σ** -αν).
- a) xiv. 36b. ουχ ο D only georg^{1,2}.
αλλ ο D fam 1 1071 G al. georg^{1,2}.
ουχ ως Θ 565 ε1337 fam 13 *c d ff₂* copt georg¹ (app.).
αλλ ως Θ 565 ε1337 fam 13 (exc. 124) *b c d ff₂* copt.
- xiv. 65. ελαμβανον D Θ 1 1582 209 565 fam 13 (exc. 124) georg²
ελαβον B **Σ** C L Δ I³ A N.
caedebant d lat sy^(c) 33 579 with Byzantines *εβαλλον*.
- xv. 2. λεγει l. ειπεν fam 1 Θ 565 D B **Σ** C L; *d* lat *dixit* or *ait*.
- xi. 19. *egrediebantur εξεπορευοντο d c r* ε1337 f 700 565 872 124
al sy^p arm with B Δ Ψ.
εξεπορευετο D and the rest incl. fam 1 Θ.
- b) xii. 36. λεγει l. ειπεν D Byzantine.
dixit d k ff₂ q with ε1337 fam 1 Θ 565 28 W fam 13
(exc. 124) 1071 713 al with Neutral.
- xiv. 54. ηκολουθηει (= Mt. Lk.) *d k c ff₂ q r* Θ fam 1 (exc. 872 22)
565 700 fam 13 W G al. *ηκολουθησεν* D and rest.
- xiv. 64. add παντες ρ. ηκουσατε *d* fam 1 565 124 W G **Σ** Φ sah
sy^(c) georg.

C. A. P.