

conjecture *unti* (Acts xviii 8) by *tinti*. *Tingere* for *baptizare* is found in Tertullian and Cyprian, and once even in Ps.-Aug. *Quaest. Vet. et Nov. Test.* 127. It is an early Old-Latin word which in the fourth century ceased to be used, probably owing to the restriction of *tinctio* to heretical baptism. Its occurrence in *h* lends further support to what has been said about the antiquity of many of the words found in the Palimpsest and altered in the Vulgate.<sup>1</sup>

E. S. BUCHANAN.

### THE NICENE CREED IN THE CODEX MURATORIANUS.

MR BUCHANAN has done good service in recalling attention to the complete contents of the Milan MS that contains the Muratorian fragment on the Canon: and as I myself have had its version of the Nicene Creed in print for some years, awaiting publication in my *Ecl. occ. monumenta*, I naturally took the opportunity of comparing Mr Buchanan's transcript with my own, and found five divergences between us, of which two were serious. Mgr Mercati has been kind enough to examine the MS at these five points, and I think it better to publish the results in the JOURNAL rather than to stereotype them, so to say, in the apparatus of my book.

1. (fol. 75 a, l. 22) 'In unum deum iesum christum': 'in' is cancelled (as I thought) in the same way as 'caeli' earlier in the line. Dr Mercati holds that the alteration is certainly intentional, and that there can be no question of accidental injury to the letters.

2. (l. 28) I had read 'salute', not 'salutē': and Dr Mercati sees no trace of the sign of abbreviation.

3. (l. 32) I had read 'de substantia': but Dr Mercati agrees with Mr Buchanan that it should be 'de substantiā'.

4. (fol. 75 b, l. 3) Mr Buchanan prints what would be a quite unique reading 'fictus': but Dr Mercati tells me that 'factus', as I had read it, is certainly right.

5. (l. 4) I had read 'conuertibile ut uid', Mr Buchanan 'conuertibilē': Dr Mercati decides that the latter is correct.

May I just add in conclusion that there is no foundation for Mr Buchanan's suggestion (p. 539) that the inscription 'liber sancti columbani de bobio' implies that the archetype of the MS actually belonged

<sup>1</sup> It is difficult, for example, not to believe that *conprobator* is earlier than *consentians*, *effigies* than *figura*, *multa plebs corinthiorum* than *multi corinthiorum*, *arteficio lectari* than *scenofactoriae artis*.

to St Columban personally? The same inscription is, so far as I recollect, universal in all Bobbio MSS: and it means no more than that the book belonged to the monastery of St Columban at Bobbio.

C. H. TURNER.

### MARK i 1 AND THE REVISERS.

THROUGH a correspondence which I have had lately with the Editorial Superintendent of the British and Foreign Bible Society about the true reading in Mark i 1, my attention has been called to the fact that both *Palmer* and *Scrivener* give Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ as the reading underlying the Text of the Revisers. I likewise did so on the margin of the Greek Testament, which I prepared for the Bible Society:

‘SR<sup>t</sup> Xp. υἱον του Θεου.’

But surely this is one of the cases of injustice done to the Revisers, of which I spoke in this JOURNAL, April 1904, p. 461. Certainly, the Revisers did not intend to support the latest of three variants here in question, that which is called ‘Syrian’ by Westcott-Hort, but the other, which these editors style ‘pre-Syrian’, attested by the MSS N<sup>a</sup> BDL, the reading υἱοῦ Θεοῦ without article. Of course the difference is not one of sense, but of principle. It needs to be remembered that the editions of Palmer and Scrivener frequently do not mention readings, which are much better attested than those of Stephanus, and can just as well claim to correspond to the Revised Version.

I cannot enter here into the discussion of the question, which is the true reading in this passage, (1) Gospel, alone, with no genitive, or (2) Gospel of Jesus (28\*), or (3) Gospel of Jesus Christ (N<sup>a</sup> 28\* 255\*), or (4) Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God (without article); the last reading, with article, does not come into competition. But I may point out that the omission is now also attested by an Armenian MS: see Plate viii in the *Atlas zum Katalog der armenischen Handschriften* of the University of Tübingen, 1907. In this MS, written in the year 1113, after a copy of the year 893, ‘the Son of God’ is omitted by the first hand, and supplied by a later hand on the margin. Whether this is the case also in other MSS of the Armenian Version, I do not know. At all events Dean Burgon’s statement (*The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels* p. 286), ‘The clause is found in all the Versions’, needs now a little limitation; and it seems worth while to point out, that while the two readings υἱοῦ Θεοῦ and υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ make no difference of sense and have been treated almost generally as one, Westcott-Hort shewed their usual accuracy on this point also, clearly distinguishing between the two, styling the one pre-Syrian, the other Syrian.

EB. NESTLE.