

*THE WESTERN TEXT OF THE GREEK
TESTAMENT.*

In the *Codex Beza* of the University of Cambridge we have preserved, according to the judgment of the great critic who has so lately been taken from us, a truer image of the form in which the Gospels and the Acts were most widely read in the third, and probably a great part of the second century, than in any other Greek MS. This is, of course, a very different thing from saying that it comes nearer than any other to the original text. It is evident that an interpolator's hand has been at work on every page. Paraphrases, grammatical expansions, and especially harmonizing corruptions, abound. As Dr. Hort says, "we seem to be in the presence of a vigorous and popular ecclesiastical life, little scrupulous as to the letter of venerated writings, or as to their permanent function in the future, in comparison with supposed fitness for immediate edification." But however little we may trust the distinctively Western readings to guide us in restoring a primitive text, it is obviously a matter of extreme interest that we should get what light we can upon their origin. Professor Rendel Harris, in his recent *Study of the Codex Beza*, has attacked this question with so much learning, ingenuity, and familiarity with textual phenomena, that his explanation deserves to be widely known, and claims to be carefully examined.

The *Codex Beza* has now 406 leaves remaining out of an original total of 534; on the left-hand page of each open leaf appears the Greek text, on the right a Latin version. The first point for critics to decide is, what is the relation between these two? Is the Latin a rendering of the Greek which it faces? Are they derived independently from earlier Greek and Latin archetypes? Or has the Greek

been revised and adapted to the Latin? The third of these possibilities seems at first sight far the least probable. Yet it has at times found considerable support. The charge of Latinizing has been again and again brought against Greek MSS. To pass over the incautious language of scholars like Erasmus and Wetstein, as late as 1857 an Edinburgh Reviewer put it forward in an extravagant form. In Luke xiv. 5, the reading which has overwhelming support in our earliest authorities is *τύπος ὑμῶν υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς εἰς φρέαρ πεσεῖται*. The reviewer holds that no one will doubt for an instant that this reading grew up through the intervention of a Latin version. Seeing that the *only* early support (with the exception of **N**) to be found for *ὄνος ἢ βοῦς* is derived from Latin or Latinized sources, it is rather bold to assume that the alternative reading, universal in texts free from this influence, is due to it. But if limited to the bilingual MSS., the charge of Latinizing is not *a priori* absurd; and it has been advanced by scholars of eminence. Dr. John Mill, for instance, quoted seven or eight instances in which he thought it was evident that the Greek text of Δ ¹ had been altered under the 'influence of the Latin; and Wetstein, as might be expected, supported him. Michaelis replied to them with some force, and not long afterwards the question was for a time laid to rest by the emphatic and weighty judgment of Griesbach. He did not altogether deny the possibility of occasional forms or glosses slipping in from the Latin; but he contended that these are of slight importance, and accidental; and denied the existence of any systematic adaptation. Bishop Marsh too contended that there was no "Latinizing" reading in Δ which might not as well be a genuine reading of the Greek. On the other hand, Bishop Middleton found, as he thought, clear evidence of Latinizing corruption, which he arranged under

¹ It will be convenient in this paper to use Δ for the Greek text of *Codex Bezae* (commonly denoted *D*), and *D* for the Latin text (commonly denoted *d*).

eight distinct grammatical heads. But his evidence, carefully as it was marshalled, did not produce general conviction. Tischendorf, it is true, spoke of Δ as entirely dependent on D; but probably Dr. Hort more truly represented the current opinion, when he spoke of "the whimsical theory of the last century, which maintained that the Western Greek text owed its peculiarities to translation from the Latin," and elsewhere of "the genuine Old Latin text, which has been altered throughout into verbal conformity with the Greek text by the side of which it was intended to stand."

Now against this prevalent doctrine Mr. Harris's *Study* is an emphatic and elaborate protest. "If New Testament criticism," he says, "is to progress with any confidence, we must retire in order to advance; we must go back again to positions clearly defined by Mill and Wetstein, deserting the theories which underlie the majority of the texts published in later days." It may be doubted whether his practice would be quite so revolutionary as these words seem to indicate. At any rate so far he has not directly assaulted the general critical principles of scholars like Lachmann and Tregelles; nor do his researches bear very dangerously even against the more dubious theory of the Syrian recension put forward by Bishop Westcott and Dr. Hort. What he claims to have shown is that the Western text, not in Δ only, but also as represented in some of the earlier versions, has largely Latinized; and that it is to this source, rather than to the accumulated effects of the free handling of which Dr. Hort writes, that its peculiarities are due. But to whatever cause the deviation is owing, Mr. Harris is at one with other critics as to the existence of a deviation from the primitive text; and this is the practically important point. His theory as to the origin and course of this deviation is not stated at the outset, but is allowed to reveal itself in the course of the investigation; and the enquiry is at times retarded by digressions as to the

phonetics, morphology, and syntax of the Latin version, which have but a remote bearing on the main question ; and which, therefore, interesting as they are, might perhaps have been better relegated to an appendix. But the outcome of the inquiry is somewhat as follows : that a primitive translation of the Gospels and Acts into Latin was made, probably at Carthage, early in the second century, from a text already marked by a few Western readings, now preserved to us in the *Codex Ephræmi* ; that this was in use at Rome about A.D. 160-170, and was there largely corrupted by Montanist glosses in Luke and Acts, and by Marcionite corruptions (possibly even earlier) in the other Gospels ; that before this date two or three distinctive readings had been introduced by a Homeric centonist, and the text with these additions used for a primitive Syriac version ; and that after the introduction of the Montanist element the text was employed for the Theban version. Then, Mr. Harris holds, in the bilingual MSS. the text of the Greek was freely corrected, so as to correspond with the Latin version, which had been so modified.

Some of these points the author himself considers problematical, and confessedly they rest on but slight evidence ; others he thinks that he has firmly established. If this is the case for only a part of his results, we must accept his *Study* as one of the most interesting, and possibly important, of recent contributions to New Testament criticism.

Before any attempt is made to consider the nature and the strength of the evidence which Mr. Harris adduces, it may be well to inquire what is the value of that on which the commonly accepted view is based. Dr. Scrivener tries to prove (1) that the Latin version is on the whole an independent translation, made either directly from the Greek on the opposite page, or from a text almost identical with

it; (2) that the translator often retained in his memory, and perhaps occasionally consulted, both the old Latin version and Jerome's revised Vulgate; (3) that he probably executed his work in Gaul about the close of the fifth century. Each of these three propositions Mr. Harris considers an error. "The translation was not made from the Greek text as now read in the MS., for this has been harmonized with the Latin. The translator not merely remembers the Old Latin version; he is himself the author of it, and the reference to Jerome is probably a delusion. Last of all, the translation is much older than the fifth century."

What then are Dr. Scrivener's arguments for deriving the Latin version from the Greek text which faces it? First, he says, how else shall we account for the frequent insertion in the Latin of purely Greek words, which no other version ever employed, and for which there are adequate equivalents in Latin? He quotes such words as *aporia*, and the still more barbarous *aporiari*, *allophylus*, *spermologus*, *eremum*, and the like. Secondly, no other version is quite so grossly ungrammatical in its defiance of the rules of syntax, having such imitations of the Greek as a genitive absolute, a neuter plural with a singular verb, a genitive after a comparative, a double negative increasing the negative force, constructions of verbs following the Greek and not the Latin usage, and dozens of other cases of the kind. Thirdly, and more conclusive still, are the many instances where the Latin has a false reading which is plainly derived from some error in a Greek MS., though one not now found in Δ ; e.g. *verbum* answers to *νόμος*, where the original evidently had *λόγος*, *sacrificare* to *θυμιάσαι* (as if *θύσαι*), *in ipso iudicio* to *ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι*, *sindon nuditatis* to *σύνδονα ἐπὶ γυμνοῦ*, *possidens in timore* to *ὑπάρχων ἐν φόβῳ*, and very many similar cases. Finally, the present Latin often differs from the Greek by an error;

which has evidently arisen in the Latin; e.g. ἠγάπησαν rendered by *dixerunt* (for *dilexerunt*), παραθεωροῦντο by *discupiuntur* for *dispiciuntur*, ἐχθές by *externa* (for *hesterna*), *die*, ῥαβδούχους by *lectores* (for *lictiores*), and the like.

But we must observe exactly how far this evidence takes us. The first group of facts proves that the version was made from a text containing many Greek words occurring in Δ, which no one would question for a moment, and also that *either* D was made independently of the other Old Latin versions, *or*, the latter were revised and more familiar Latin words substituted for the Greek words retained in D. Obviously either supposition would satisfy the conditions of the problem, which must be solved otherwise. The same may be said of the second group of facts. That D adheres more closely to the form of its original than many, perhaps than any, of the other versions is evident; that this original was Δ, or "a text almost identical with it," is not in any way shown. The third group is collected to show that Δ is not dependent on D; it shows almost as clearly that D, as we have it, is not dependent on Δ. At least there is nothing to show that the misreading of the Greek was a result of translating from Δ rather than at any earlier stage. And this seems proved to a certainty by the fact that there are several cases where D has the correct reading, while Δ is corrupt; e.g. Matthew xi. 3, σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐργαζόμενος ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν, where the Latin is *tu es qui venis aut alium expectamus*; or Luke ii. 14, πλῆθος στρατείας οὐρανοῦ αἰτούντων τὸν θεόν (for αἰνούντων D *laudantes*); with others quite as significant.

Taken along with the cases of the fourth group, these show us quite clearly that there has been no systematic attempt to assimilate either Δ or D to the other; there are in both corruptions which must have been subsequent to any such attempt, if it was ever made. We are of necessity thrown back upon an earlier stage. But if it is held that at some

earlier stage the Greek text was assimilated to the Latin, in such a way as to deprive its testimony of independent value, while not excluding a reciprocal influence on D as we have it now, I find nothing in Dr. Scrivener's arguments in any way fatal to such a view. It is admitted, of course, that the original of the Gospels and Acts was in Greek; hence no amount of Hellenisms in the Latin version will surprise us; they will be simply indications of what we know already. They will prove that D is derived from a Greek text, but not that it is derived from Δ . On the other hand any clearly marked Latinisms in Δ will be strong evidence that they came from the influence of the Latin version (though probably a stage or two back), for we know of no other source to which we can so plausibly assign them. In symbols we may say that a Greek text a may have been translated into a Latin a , that a bilingual $a + a$ came into the hands of a copyist, who produced $\beta + b$, where β is a modified by a , and b may also have suffered from assimilation, and that $\beta + b$ was the mediate or immediate parent of $\Delta + D$, *i.e.* our present *Codex Bezae*. All this is, of course, pure conjecture. The theory is consistent with the facts put together by Dr. Scrivener, but so might half-a-dozen other hypotheses be. We have to consider whether there is any more definite evidence as to the way in which the problem must be solved.

The first piece of evidence, which Mr. Harris adduces, comes out incidentally. In John xxi. 22, Δ has *εαν αυτον θελω μενειν ουτως*; D, *si eum volo sic manere: ουτως* and *sic* have no authority in any other MS. The obvious thing is to suppose that *ουτως* crept in from a remembrance of the *εκαθέζετο ουτως* = *sedebat sic* of John iv. 7. But Jerome's Vulgate reads *sic eum volo manere*, and there are traces of this in other Old Latin sources. Mr. Harris calls attention to two other places in which *sic* appears, where we expect *si*, and finds in this a retention of the archaic *sic* for *si*,

sometimes used by Plautus. From this he argues that a marginal gloss has found its way into our text, not however expelling, but only displacing the original *sic*. If we accept this theory, two immensely important consequences follow: first, that the Greek text Δ has, at least in this instance, Latinized; and second, that the Latin versions are derived from a common source, for it is not likely that independent translators should agree in retaining this archaism. But one or two points require to be noticed. Mr. Harris says "the Western text has Latinized"; but there is no trace of this reading in any Greek MS. except Δ, and it is not universal even in the Latin versions. Then again the question whether a Plautine archaism like *sic* for *si* could have been retained in the popular Latin of the time of the version deserves fuller consideration than it has as yet received. Mr. Harris has quoted some interesting instances from the Latin translation of Irenæus, in which *sic* is found in the best MSS. where the sense seems to require *si*, but the inquiry is not carried far enough to be convincing. And there is always the possibility of the other alternative, that of a gratuitous insertion of the word, being the true explanation.

The next instance is from Luke xxiii. 53. After the ordinary reading *και εθηκεν αυτον εν μνημειω λελατομημενω ου ουκ ην ουπω ουδεις κειμενος* Δ goes on *και θεντος αυτου επεθηκε τω μνημειω λειθον ου μογισ εικοσι εκυλιον*. D has *etposito eo imposuit in monumento lapidem quem vix viginti movebant*. The interpolation is puzzling enough; it looks at once like a reminiscence of the huge stone, which twenty-two waggons would not have stirred, that Polyphemus rolled to the door of his cave; but how did it come in here? Is the Latin or the Greek to blame? Omitting two redundant phrases, we have in Latin *imposuit lapidem quem vix viginti movebant*, which reveals itself at once as an attempt at a hexameter, though a rather lame one. In Greek there is

not a trace of metre. This seems to indicate pretty clearly that the words were inserted in the Latin and afterwards passed into the Greek. Mr. Harris weakens his case by accepting a suggestion that the line may have come from the ancient version of the Odyssey by Livius Andronicus. I think he is in error in supposing that there are any traces of hexameters in this version, all the extant fragments being plainly in Saturnians;¹ and it is inconceivable that any early writer should have so shortened the final syllable of *viginti*. (The marking of the quantity in Lewis and Short is carelessly retained from Forcellini, and is quite unwarranted). Probably the Latin scribe attempted a rendering of a Homeric line for himself. A striking fact is that this same addition is found in the Theban version, an indication that there was a close connexion between this version and the text from which Δ was derived. But it must not be overlooked that we have an intermediate stage, between the reading of Δ and that of most MSS. here, in those which introduce into Luke the clause from Matthew (xxvii. 60) *προσκυλίσας λίθον μέγαν τῇ θύρᾳ τοῦ μνημείου* (cf Mark xv. 46), and that it is perfectly possible that the interpolation passed through some such stage as this. In any case if the Theban version is rightly ascribed to the second century, we find here another of those textual phenomena which are quite fatal to any late date for our Gospels.

A third line of argument has been drawn from the fact that words seem to have been dropped from the Greek, though really needed for the sense, in order to keep up a verbal equality with the Latin. In Luke xv. 28, *ὁ δὲ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ ἐξελθὼν παρεκάλει αὐτόν*, D has *pater autem eius exiens rogabat eum*, but most of the Latin versions have like the Vulgate *cœpit rogare eum*: Δ has *ο δε πατηρ αυτου εξελθων ηρξατο αυτον*. It is evident that *παρακαλεῖν* has

¹ The three marked as hexameters in Bishop Wordsworth's *Specimens* are better treated by Dr. Merry, pp. 9, 10.

been dropped at the end of the line. Is this due merely to accident? Mr. Harris thinks that it was lost because there was nothing to balance it in the Latin. But this does not explain the origin of either of the readings: ἤρξατο παρακαλεῖν may very well have been suggested by *cœpit rogare*, which is natural enough as a rendering of *παρεκάλει*; but how is it that D has given up the reading of the other versions, supported as it was by the Greek facing him, and taken to *rogabat*? This is an interesting instance, showing at the same time that there are phenomena in Δ not to be explained from anything in D, and that the copyist of D did not himself translate from Δ, *i.e.* that Dr. Scrivener's theory obviously needs much qualification.

In Acts vi. 14, *ἀλλαξει τα εθη* is translated *mutabit iterum*: Bentley suggested that here the translator mistook *εθη* for *ετι*; Mr. Harris thinks it more probable that *mutabit iterum* translates *ἀλλαξει*, and that some word like *consuetudines* was dropped at the end for the sake of symmetry. Seeing, by the way, that the relative which follows is *quos*, it would have been better to conjecture *mores*. This is doubtful. But much stronger evidence is given by a group of instances in which a word quite needless in Greek has been added without any apparent reason, except to balance the Latin, *e.g.* Matt. xi. 28, *δευτε προς με παντες οι κοπιωντες και πεφορτισμενοι εσται*, where the last word (by itacism for *εστε*) can have no other origin than the Latin *qui laboratis et onerati estis*. A single instance of this kind goes far to show that Latinizing is *a vera causa*, but it needs careful consideration to decide whether it has been the *causa efficiens* in any particular case. In Mark viii. 2, Mr. Harris argues that the original reading was, as in B, *οτι ημεραι τρισιν προσμενουσι μοι*, that the Latin translator rendered *quoniam iam triduum est ex quo hic sunt*, that then the attempt was made to turn *triduum est* literally into Greek, giving us *ἡμέραι τρεῖς εἰσίν*: and that

finally *ex quo hic sunt* has been restored verbatim to the Greek, giving us Δ 's fearful and wonderful *οτι ηδη ημεραι τρεις εισιν απο ποτε ωδε εισιν*. But how does this theory suit the intermediate stages? All MSS. except B give us *ημεραι τρεις* or *ημερας τρεις*: but there is not a trace of the *ex quo hic sunt* except in D and some other Latin versions. How are we to suppose that all the Greek uncials but B were influenced by the first half of the Latin translation and not one by the latter? Even Westcott and Hort do not venture to place *ημέραις τρισίν* in their text; and the temptation to alter an ungrammatical nominative must have been very strong. It is not to be overlooked that in Matt. xv. 32, all the good MSS. (including B) have *ημεραι τρεις*, where there can be no question of Latinizing. In this instance there seems to be a corruption in Δ and D originating in Δ : the former has *ηδη ημεραι γ. εισιν και προσμενουσιν μοι*, the latter *jam tres dies sunt et sustinent me*. Now *jam tres dies sustinent me* would present no difficulty in Latin, but *ημεραι τρεις προσμενουσιν* would suggest correction. In Luke xv. 24 Mr. Harris supposes that *απολωλως* lost its *ην* in order to correspond better to *perierat*, but the very strong evidence for the omission of *ην* in v. 32 makes us doubt this explanation. Still, there are a good many readings of this kind in Δ , of which it is not only a possible but also a probable account that they are due to an endeavour to make the Greek text more parallel to the Latin. There are no data at present for determining the period at which this endeavour was made; but it was clearly at some stage between the original translation and the transcription as we now have it.

Mr. Harris next proceeds to gather evidence of Latinizing from a wider range. His first case is not a strong one. In Luke i. 78 MSS. vary between *επισκεψατο* and *επισκεψεται*. Here he assumes that the difference is due to a confusion between *visitabit* and *visitavit*: of course the

confusion was a constant one, but hardly more common than that in Greek MSS. between the future and the aorist ; and to assign this as the cause here is to assume not merely that all uncials but \aleph B L have gone wrong, which critics often have to say, but also that they have been all misled by a Latin version, which is a much more doubtful proposition. In Luke xiv. 5., Tregelles long ago made it clear that $\pi\rho\beta\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ of Δ could not have been the original reading from which through *ovis* came $\upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$. Mr. Harris's suggestion that in D *ovis* is due to the subsequent *bobis* either as a dittograph or as a correction, is more plausible but not necessary, seeing how common is the combination $\pi\rho\acute{\beta}\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ ἢ βοῦς (cf. Matt. xii. 11). In some of the cases where Mr. Harris supposes that the translation of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ by *et* has reacted by producing in Δ a $\kappa\alpha\iota$ — $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, there seems good authority for thinking the latter genuine ; e.g. in Mark vi. 21 it is surely $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (which is found only in Δ^* (a, b, c) that should be erased, not $\kappa\alpha\iota$, which appears in all our authorities. In Mark viii. 29, where the true reading is $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, Δ has $\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon$, D *ipse autem* : which looks like the earlier variation ?

It was pointed out long ago that the Latin translator had been puzzled how to deal with the Greek definite article, and had tried various renderings (cp. Scrivener's *Cod. Bez.*, p. 33). Mr. Harris well shows what confusion this has at times produced in the Greek text, culminating in the extraordinary \omicron $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ of John xvii. 25. But if, as he thinks, $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in Mark viii. 2 is due to *istam* of D, the corruption has spread far in the Western text : it is noteworthy, by the way, that Δ alone of Greek MSS. has the genitive $\epsilon\pi\iota$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\omicron\chi\lambda\omicron\upsilon$, all others having the accusative. If the case had been reversed, this would certainly have been quoted as an instance of Latinizing. In Matthew ix. 26 $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$ η $\phi\eta\mu\eta$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta$ appears in C 1, 33, Memph., as $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$ η $\phi\eta\mu\eta$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$: this Mr. Harris takes as the original

Western text, and assumes that *αυτης* became *eius* in the Latin version, and then *αυτου* in Δ. If so, how is it that all the Latin texts have *haec*? Are we to suppose that the Western reading was corrected away? In dealing with Matthew xiv. 6 Mr. Harris is on slippery ground. The true reading is *ἠρχήσατο ἡ θυγάτηρ τῆς Ἡρωδιάδος*; Δ gives *ἠρχήσατο ἡ θυγάτηρ αὐτου Ἡρωδίας*, which seems historically impossible. Mr. Harris suggests that *τῆς Ἡρωδιάδος* was rendered *eius Herodiadis*, that *eius* was taken as masculine, and so translated *αὐτοῦ*, and that this involved the further change to *Ἡρωδιάς*. But it must be observed (1) that there is no trace of *eius* in D, which has simply *filia Herodiadis* (thus markedly departing from Δ); (2) that there seems to be no case of the article before a proper name being rendered by *is*, though *hic* and *ille* are common enough; (3) that in the parallel passage Mark vi. 22 *τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἡρωδιάδος* is found in **NBLΔ**, and two other MSS. as well as in D, and is actually adopted by Westcott and Hort, in spite of Scrivener's protest (*Introd.*, p. 544). Whatever cause led to the adoption of this reading in Mark by MSS. of such high authority, which, if any, have escaped from Latinizing, may also have brought it into Δ in Matthew.

On the other hand, in Matthew xviii. 20, if we set down these readings: B *οὐ γὰρ εἰσιν δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἕμὸν ὄνομα ἐκεῖ εἰμὶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν*; D *non enim sunt duo aut tres collecti apud quos non ero in medio eorum*; Δ *οὐκ εἰσιν γὰρ δυο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμενοι εἰς το ἐμον ὄνομα παρ οἰς οὐκ εἰμει ἐν μεσω αυτων*, there does not seem to be much doubt that the corruption began by a Latin translator, who confused *οὐ* with *οὐδ*. Of course it is just possible to maintain that a careless Greek copyist made the error, to avoid the possibility of which Origen often quotes the verse with *ὅπου* substituted; but the probability lies in the other direction.

In some cases Mr. Harris ascribes to Latin influence

grammatical constructions which are due rather to the laxity of declining Greek; e.g. ἀκούειν is followed by the genitive in other cases besides Acts xi. 7, and in Acts iii. 25 ἦν need not be defended by Latin usage. There may have been some assimilation, but there is certainly far more in the Latin text than in the Greek. In Acts v. 3, where Δ has πρὸς Ἀνανίαν, this is very possibly due to the mistake of a Latin translator, who took Ἀνανία for a dative, and rendered *ad Ananian*; but this reading is so natural in itself that it may have been spontaneous. It is not possible to lay much stress on the confusion between aorists and imperfects, nothing being more common in any Greek MS. [the Vaticanus in Thuc. viii. is always going wrong thus], nor does one see what was the inducement to translate a Greek aorist by a Latin imperfect, as Mr. Harris thinks to have been often the case. In Luke viii. 27 ἐνεδύσατο may be the earlier reading, but why suppose that ἐνεδιδύσκετο of all Uncials but four and of Syriac versions is due to an assumed *induebatur*? Or why set down the very natural ἔκραζον of Mark xv. 14 (adopted, though doubtless wrongly, by Lachmann) to *clamabant*? In Matthew xxvii. 23, ἔκραζον is found in all MSS. but Δ: here D retains *clamabant*, and yet Δ has capriciously altered it; why may it not have been so in many other cases? In Matthew iv. 8, ἔδειξεν looks very much like a misunderstanding of *ostendit*; yet v. 5 may give us pause. Here ἔστησεν corresponds to *statuit*; but it is supported against ἵστησιν by NBCDZ, so that it must be genuine, and it may well have brought ἔδειξεν after it. We may more confidently ascribe μείσει of Δ in John xvii. 14 to *odit*; but it must be noticed that there are no aorists in the context, so that ἐμίσησεν may perhaps have been intentionally changed.

Of the numerous instances where Δ has the Latin idiom of two finite verbs and a copula instead of a participle and a finite verb, many may fairly be ascribed to Latinizing. But

the question may arise here, as in similar cases, whether the Latinizing was not due quite as much to the fact that the copyist was familiar with Latin idioms, as to the influence of the attached version. In Matthew xiii. 4 *καὶ ἦλθον τὰ πετεινὰ καὶ κατέφαγεν* is supported by all MSS. but B, which has *ἐλθόντα*: must we admit that D has corrupted every other authority, as Mr. Harris says? The case is much the same with Matthew xvii. 7 & B alone escaping; and in Luke xv. 23 where Δ has *ενεγκατε* the quasi-Latinized reading *φέρετε* has much better support than *ἐνέγκαντες*, so cancelling the argument that might be drawn from Δ's *φάγωμεν*. In John xii. 3 we have a perplexing case: *λαβοῦσα λίτρην . . . ἤλειψεν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ* appears in Δ as *λαμβανι λειτρην . . . και ηλειψεν*, which points to *accipit libram—et unxit*; but D gives *accipiens . . . et unxit*. Why should the reviser have gone back to the participial construction after the translator had abandoned it, when there was nothing any longer in the Greek to suggest it? There seems some confusion in the text of other Latin versions here. In five or six other cases we have the participle left in Δ but a *καὶ* introduced to answer to the Latin *et*; Mark vii. 25, xi. 2, xiv. 63, xvi. 14; Acts xiv. 6 are indisputable instances.

A. S. WILKINS.

(To be concluded.)