NOTES AND STUDIES

VON SODEN'S TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.*

I HAD looked for great things from Dr von Soden's final volume of the Text. The earlier volumes were very heavy reading, but I expected that his Text and critical notes would fill a gap in our studies.

Alas, he has but complicated our problems, and instead of writing a eulogy on his work I regret to have to condemn it strongly. The only redeeming feature of the whole work consists in the collations of codices at Sinai, Jerusalem, and Athos, not forgetting ^{050} at Tiflis.†

As to the presentment of the combined critical material, after making every allowance for the division of work among forty people, it can only be said that the apparatus is positively honeycombed with errors, and many documents which should have been recollated have not been touched, others only partially, and others again have been incorrectly handled.

Dr von Soden frequently opposes Schmidtke's edition of Paris^{97}, and doubtless it is von Soden who is wrong every time. He misquotes my 604/700 (his ^{133}) and has not correctly handled 28 (his ^{168}) or 157 (his ^{307}). He does not tell us if he had Ψ recollated. If he only used Lake's *edition of Mark and Collation of the other Gospels*, then he has done a great wrong by printing endless false readings. If he has had it recollated then Lake's work was rather careless. I leave them to settle this matter between them.

It has been my duty to go over von Soden's text and apparatus throughout the Gospels in all passages concerning a difference between א and B (in connexion with a work which is in the press), and very soon after beginning the investigation it became clear to me that von Soden's work was *a step backward.* I have striven myself to keep textual matters on as clear a basis as possible, and here we have an editor, who, not content with throwing overboard all our previous nomenclature in an excess of pride in his forthcoming enterprise, has brought this enterprise to fruition in such a way as to befog the issue at every step.

Without further preliminaries I proceed to indict him on the most serious count of all; upon a count on which none of his predecessors have been found guilty,‡ for they handled these matters with infinite care.

* See *supra* p. 306.
† Now published by Beermann and Gregory as the 'Koridethi' Gospels.
‡ I think Tischendorf is unwittingly guilty on one occasion only.

As regards Hort, his method had the merit of simplicity, whatever we may think of the result. When he was confronted with five or six varieties of order or three or four different readings, he chose upon occasion to follow B, even if alone, by preference. Not so von Soden. His method is that of eclecticism, carried to such a point that he *invents scripture* by conflation or combination, and instead of *reducing* our many various readings, he has actually *increased* them !

Here is the proof.

(I) *Invention of Scripture.*

He prints—

(1) Mark iii 3 καὶ λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ τὴν ἐξηραμμένην χεῖρα ἔχοντι.

There are varieties of reading here, but no MSS that I know of read as von Soden's text.

Tisch. has τῷ τὴν ξηρὰν χεῖρα ἔχοντι

W-H ,, τῷ τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντι ξηράν

Text. rec. ,, τῷ ἐξηραμμένην ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα

D ,, τῷ ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα ἐξηραμένην

28 ,, τῶ τὴν χήρα ἔχοντι ἐξηραμμένην

[Matt. xii 13 τότε λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ *tantum*

Luke vi 8 εἶπεν δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ ξηρὰν ἔχοντι τὴν χεῖρα with variations (and some τω την εξηραμμενην εχοντι την χειρα)]

(2) Luke xxiv 27. Von Soden prints διερμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς [τί ἦν] τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ.

In his margin he has 'om τι ην Ta *K* gg *H*[δ2 δ48] f bo *J*[a 050] η[a] b [288] pa'.

Now δ2 = א and δ48 = 33, plus L (= f after δ48), have τι ην but in quite a different position, viz. before ἐν. So does 1 [*non fam* 118–209–131] represented by von Soden as η[a]; so that unless Sod[050], or Sod[288] (= Evan. 22) has his order he has grossly erred and *invented* a new order with the addition, just as other MSS did when incorporating something from the margin.

As regards 22 Mr Sanders informs me that + τι ην occurs there before ἐν, so that the matter narrows down to Sod[050], but the edition just published shews τι ην before ἐν there also.

(3) Luke i 42. Another case of composite handling, without brackets. Von Soden prints: και ανεφωνησεν φωνη μεγαλη.

Now ανεφωνησεν is the reading of B *plur* against א C F Sod[050] 28 892 *minn*[40] or [50] for ανεβοησεν, but φωνη on the other hand is the reading of א *plur* against the κραυγη of B L Ξ and W 2[pe] Paris[97] *Orig*[ter] *boh*[duo], so that von Soden follows B for one thing and deserts him as to the very next word. He thus tacitly accuses א in one word and B in the other contiguous one of bearing false testimony. Does this justify him in *ever* following א B alone elsewhere, as at Matt. xviii 24, Mark viii 32 &c. ? Or does it justify him in following א B L alone

at Mark xvi 4 ? Or in following L alone at Luke xvii 12 ? Or B 892 alone at Mark ii 22 ? Or B T 892 alone at Luke xxii 30 ? If κραυγη of B L Ξ W 2ᵖᵉ Paris⁹⁷ *Orig*ᵗᵉʳ conjoined be wrong here in Luke i 42, how can he be convinced that the other singular or semi-singular readings of B referred to above are correct when he adopts them elsewhere ?

(4) John xiii 26. Von Soden prints βαψω το ψωμιον και επιδωσω αυτω, instead of βαψας το ψωμιον επιδωσω αυτω.

But those MSS which change βαψας to βαψω . . . και, all have δωσω afterwards and not επιδωσω.

Unless I am greatly mistaken, von Soden's βαψω το ψωμιον και επιδωσω αυτω is invented, whereas βαψω το ψωμιον και δωσω αυτω is read by B C L (δω) 213 Sod³⁵¹ ¹¹¹⁰ δ³⁷¹ *boh* (*sah*) *arm aeth*.

(5) Mark x 1. I considered until I came across this passage that von Soden had simply committed *errors* in his text, but here he shews us something, for he prints ' [και] [δια του] περαν ', which, in its entirety, *is only exhibited by one MS*, Laura^A 104. His apparatus is so constructed that you could not tell it from that, for Laura^A 104 (= his ¹²⁷⁹) is not cited thus.

He inserts the bracketed και because ℵ B C* L Ψ 892 read και περαν against the simple περαν of D G W Δ C² *min aliq lat syr goth arm*. He follows it with [δια του] because A N Φ *unc*¹¹ and *aeth* have this, but the general summary result is the product of conflation, in which process I arraign him as guilty with Laura^A 104.

(6) Luke v 2. Von Soden prints πλοιαρια δυο. This has, as far as I know, no *Greek* authority whatever, the witness for it being only *a* of the *Latins*. Von Soden's notes are so arranged that it is impossible to observe whether any of his new Greek witnesses so read. He has conflated the *order* of B W 892 Paris⁹⁷ *e copt syr* W-Hᵗˣᵗ : πλοια δυο, with the δυο πλοιαρια of A C L Q R Ψ &c. (W-Hᵐᵍ), while D *unc*¹³ *minn*ᵖˡ read δυο πλοια. It is in this same verse that he holds απεπλυναν against W-H, with επλυνον B D W 91 892, επλυναν ℵ C* L Q X 239 299 372 Paris⁹⁷ Sod¹⁴¹⁶, and the simple *lavabant* of the *Latins* !

(7) Luke xxiii 8. Out of a good many varieties † von Soden chooses εξ ικανου θελων (– χρονου or χρονων). No editor had done this before because there was no uncial authority for it. There happens to be *one* uncial MS for it now, viz. Ψ (Lake *teste*), but von Soden *does not recognize it*, because he quotes δ6 (= Ψ) in his notes (and on

---

† Txt. rec. θελων εξ ικανου as most, or θελων εξ ικανου χρονου W *al*. But εξ ικανων χρονων θελων ℵ B T X *aliq*. *c*. θελων εξ ικανων χρονων 157, εξ ικανου χρονου θελων *fam* 13, εξ ικανων χρονων L (– θελων), erat enim cupiens videre illum *a* (– εξ ικ. χρ.) *cf*. *vg*ᵂ. *Ord*. *ita* : θελων ειδειν αυτον εξ ικανων χρονων D *d cf*. *sah syr*, *cf*. *e*, εξ ικανου θελων Ψ *et* Soden *txt soli vid cum* 241 *et evangelistariis sex*.

page 946 of Band I, Abt. II) as reading χρονου *post* ικανου of his text, thus :—

'Add χρονου p ικανου (Ac 27₉) H^{014} δ⁶ Iη ' &c.

Thus (unless Lake is wrong, and I do not think he is) von Soden stands alone again, as far as the evidence recognized by him was concerned.

(8) Mark xv 34. Von Soden shews us how a polyglot mind among the scribes of old led to trouble, for, *without any Greek authority*, he prints in his text και τη ωρα ενατη. What he *means* to print (judging from his note) is και τη ενατη ωρα with אּ B Dᵍʳ F L Ψ &c. The majority of Greeks have και τη ωρα τη ενατη, but *none* και τη ωρα ενατη, nor does he give any MS in his notes which omits τη *ante* ενατη.

(9) Luke x 42 where D *d a b c e ff i l r (syr sin) Amb Clem* omit the clause altogether, and where Hort got into difficulties and followed C^2 L 1 [*non fam*] 33 (add now Paris⁹⁷) against B, while C* A *unc*¹⁴ and W Ψ 892 *minn*ᵖˡ give another version, von Soden elects to follow *one* Greek MS, viz. 38† (about which we hear but little generally) for ολιγων δε εστιν χρεια.‡ I am justified in placing this here, for I do not recollect him ever to have quoted Evan. 38 in his apparatus (N° δ 355). So he adopted this reading in all probability *without knowing of this solitary MS authority* because (see p. xxiv) of his rule : ' Für die Darstellung der Lesart war die Aufgabe denkbarste *Knappheit*, leichte Übersichtlichkeit, *unmissverständliche Klarheit.*' So, at the expense of documentary evidence, he prints *out of his head* : which incidentally is a wonderful commentary on the previous action of Evan. 38 *syr hier* and *boh*ᵈᵘᵒ.

The passage involved is the famous one conveying our Lord's remarks to Martha about Mary :—

' ἐνὸς δέ ἐστι χρεία· Μαρία δὲ τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα ἐξελέξατο ἥτις οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτῆς.'

The early sentence is found

in B as   ολιγων δε χρεια εστιν η ενος

in אּ* as   ολιγων δε εστιν η ενος

in C^2 L 1.33 Paris⁹⁷ as ολιγων δε εστι χρεια η ενος.

Clem with D *d a b c e ff i l r Ambr (syr sin)* omit it altogether, but von Soden with 38 and *syr hier boh*ᴺ⁰ᴶ¹* elects :—

' ολιγων δε εστιν χρεια '

for '*Knappheit*' and ' *unmissverständliche Klarheit* '.

(10) John vii 12. Who would suppose from von Soden's text ' και γογγυσμος ην περι αυτου πολυς ' (agreeing with Tischendorf's text) and from his apparently simple note

---

† The famous one (of four cursives only) which joins in omitting the first word from the cross. There at Luke xxiii 34 von Soden does not quote it, so he was evidently not familiar with it.

‡ *Syr hier* and *arm* are the only others to agree (partially).

'~ πολυς p γογγυσμος Ta *K* gg *H*δ 1 014 δ 48 f 5 δ 371 *I* φb 410 o129 1246
δ 469 Kι A³ C¹³ b q Xρ, om πολυς *I*ᵃ δ 5 f af a ff² 1 | ~ περι αυτου ην
K gg *H*δ 2 δ 6 δ 48 1016 *I*ᵃ δ 5 337 ιᵃ φa 1454 c 190 f o1279 π σ 351 pa C N
af syˢᶜ Xρ, om περι αυτου *I* φa δ 30 '

that he and Tischendorf (quite unwittingly I suppose) had very nearly
invented scripture here also, for 33 appears to be the only witness for
their case? It will be observed that δ 48 (= 33) is the only MS (with an
exception to be mentioned immediately) which occurs in both lists. It
so happened that the differing orders which caused them so to act also
misled another very ancient authority who preceded them by a thousand
and half a thousand years. A close inspection will shew ' Xρ ' also
appearing twice, and a reference to Matthaei's edition, p. 127, of St John
exhibits :—

πολὺs—ἦν] ἦν περὶ αὐτοῦ πολύs μ ε 7 4 λ θ

that is to say, practically all his codices of St Chrysostom !

So Chrys. and 33ᵛⁱᵈ Tisch. and von Soden invite us to read : και γογ-
γυσμος ην περι αυτου πολυς, because of trouble at that place very early.

The common text of most is και γογγυσμος πολυς περι αυτου ην,
but א reads και γογγυσμος πολυς ην περι αυτου, whereas B L T (X) W
and a few cursives have και γογγυσμος περι αυτου ην πολυς which Hort
prints.

πολυς is omitted outright by D Sod⁰⁵⁰ *a c d e ff l aur foss arm*, and is
probably basic. The order of B L T X W is opposed by *syr* and *pers*
which place πολυς in the text in an early position. Περι αυτου is
omitted by *goth*. Von Soden now adds δ 30 (= א) but does not mention
goth. (127 reads και γογγυσμος ην πολυς περι αυτου.)

This muddle has misled both Tisch. and von Soden, unless they have
purposely made a composition of the readings of א and B L T X W.

At any rate their authority is Chrys. and 33 only. On p. 957 Band I,
Abt. II, von Soden does not include this reading of 33 with Chrys.

Von Soden ends with εν τοις οχλοις against εν τω οχλω of 33. His
clause in its entirety is absolutely alone with Chrys.

(11) Luke xii 18. Von Soden prints παντα τα γενηματα και τα αγαθα μου,
omitting μου after γενηματα. *I know of no Greek MSS which do this*. He
has apparently mixed the testimony of B L T *minn aliq* and the versions
which substitute τον σιτον without μου for τα γενηματα μου, but this does
not justify his action in the least. It is impossible for a student, not
versed in these matters, to gather anything from his notes, for he states
the two matters differently. Thus :—

'add μου p γενημ. Ta *K* gg *H*δ 1 6 56 1016 ff *I*η φa 1444 σ 207 r δ 398 arm
| τον σιτον 1 τα γενηματα Ta *H*ᵉˣᶜ δ 2 * δ 6 δ 48 76 *I* η ι σ 207 A³ syᴾ.'

Possibly Sod¹⁴⁴⁴ has τα γενηματα without μου, but he surely did not

follow this one MS intentionally here. He has either made another mistake (from making up his text as a 'desk-student' from the apparatus gathered and put together by others and which he did not understand himself) or has gratuitously invented scripture once more, preferring τα γενηματα και τα αγαθα μου to the double use of μου. Another instance of how 'pairs' have caused various readings in the MSS themselves.

(12) Luke xxii 64. It is a question whether among the great and heavy variations in the Greek and Latin many, or any, can be found to support von Soden's text :—

'καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες'

for those which omit ετυπτον αυτου το προσωπον also omit the αυτον before λεγοντες.

(13) John xiii 18. ἐμοῦ τὸν ἄρτον (*pro* μετ εμου τον αρτον) is an invention. The codices which suppress μετ read μου, not εμου. See von Soden's own note below on the subject ' μετ εμου 1 μου . . .'.

(14) John i 50 (49 with von Soden). Here he surely does not mean to neglect all the Greeks and go alone with the Latins *ff l gat vg* as he does. by printing ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Ναθαναὴλ [καὶ λέγει].

This is how it looks set out in all its aspects :—

Ναθαναηλ *tantum* (− απεκριθη αυτω) + ϰε : *sah*unus *grandiloquus.*
Απεκριθη αυτω Ναθαναηλ   B L W 33 249 Paris97 *b aur W-H txt.*
Και ειπεν αυτω Ναθαναηλ   *aeth*
Ναθαναηλ απεκριθη αυτω   *sah (variant plurimum boh*codd)
Et Natanahel respondit   *e*
Απεκριθη Ναθαναηλ και ειπεν   ℵ Xb ?
Respondit Nathanael et ait   *c vg*E } *syr hier arm ?*
Απεκριθη Ναθαναηλ και λεγει αυτω   A Λ Π *unc*9 *al. r* (δ) *Chr Cyr*
Απεκριθη Ναθαναηλ και αυτω ειπεν   *pers* [*hiant* D *d syr cu sin*]
Απεκριθη Ναθαναηλ και ειπεν αυτω   Γ Δ Ψvid 28 245 435 Sod190 551 1443
  Evst 19 ? 26 ? 49 60 ? (δ dixit *vel* ait) *q syr pesh*
Και απεκριθη Ναθ. και ειπεν αυτω   254
Απεκριθη αυτω Ναθαναηλ και ειπεν   X 124 *a f arm* ? *Epiph*
Απεκριθη αυτω Ναθαναηλ και λεγει αυτω   Sod870 1091 *vid.*
Respondit ei Nathanael et ait   *ff₂ l gat vg*   }
Απεκριθη αυτω Ναθαναηλ [και λεγει]   Soden *txt sol inter Gr.*}

Von Soden's reading is therefore grotesque. And then immediately afterwards he proceeds to omit altogether from his notes the graphic + *fili* at the end of John ii 3 by his favourite ' af', and *b ff l* (which he follows at i 49) and *Ambrose*bis [*hiant* D *d syr cu sin*].

In view of the lacunae in D *d syr cu sin*, we should certainly have our attention called to this pretty addition, even if it is quite unauthorized beyond *e ff l*, for Buchanan has added *b* for it.

(15) John viii 41. Von Soden prints οὐ γεγενήθημεν without MS authority. The textus receptus, with the majority and *Orig Chr Cyr*, has οὐ γεγεννήμεθα as Tischendorf and Hort[mg]. Hort[txt] has οὐκ ἐγεννή-θημεν with B D* 409, while οὐκ ἐγεννήμεθα is read by א L T *Sod*[3017].

(16) Lastly, von Soden's reading in John xxi 18 in its entirety :—

καὶ ἄλλοι ζώσουσί σε καὶ ἀποίσουσιν ὅπου οὐ θέλεις

is a complete invention.

For the first part καὶ ἄλλοι ζώσουσί σε von Soden is following א alone; for the second part καὶ ἀποίσουσιν he follows Π alone, and ὅπου οὐ θέλεις agrees with B and the majority (against א), but for von Soden's sentence as a whole there is no MS authority. The matter will be found set out fully in vol. ii of my 'Codex B and its allies' (in the press).

(II) *Von Soden's quotations of 'af'*.

Having satisfied himself that his son has correctly 'restored' the African text, the elder von Soden makes a practice of quoting 'af' instead of *e* or *k* or *Cypr*, or *e k*, or *e k Cypr*, or *e Cypr*, or *k Cypr*. The viciousness of this system is obvious. I will give one illustration.

At Mark xii 4 where *e* and *k* are both extant, von Soden has in his notes 'om καὶ[1] I[a 168] af *c*'. He means 'om 28 *c e*' for *k* says *Et Iterum* against *Iterum* of *e*.

(He neglects the fact that *sah arm* and *pers* also omit the initial καὶ. It is important here, for they replace *syr sin* which omits the whole verse.)

(III) *System*.

As to *system* there is none. Sometimes א B are followed alone, as at Matt. xiii 36 διασαφησον (*pro* φρασον) (+ Sod[050] φ[a]; these witnesses are deserted by Soden on countless other occasions); whereas at John iv 15 διερχωμαι (*pro* ερχομαι) א B, adopted by W-H and John x 18 ηρεν (*pro* αιρει) א B, adopted by W-H, are put aside by von Soden.

In the former case von Soden does not even place φρασον in his upper notes or margin.

In the latter case he condemns ηρεν by placing it in his third or bottom series of notes, but takes pains to add after 'ηρεν *loco* αιρει H[δ 1—2*]': 'gg Ωρ Διδ Ευσ' that is to say א B but *against* Origen, Didymus, and Eusebius.

Why then at Luke vi 28 did he suppress the great Patristic testimony for υπερ (as against περι א B L W Ξ 604 Paris[97]) by *Justin Dial Clem*[bis] *Orig Eus*[bis] ?

Here is his note in Luke : υπερ 1 περι (Mt. 5 44) K gg H[δ 1—2 014 56 376f] I[a 133] A[1].

Not one word about the Fathers. Not one single new cursive added

for περι, because 376 = Paris⁹⁷ we knew already from Schmidtke's publication.   376 belongs in von Soden's limited group : *H* δ 1.2.014. δ 3 δ 6 26 δ 48 56 76 1016 376 δ371, that is to say א B W C Ψ Z 33 L Δ 892 Paris⁹⁷, 1241 (Sinai 260).   The f then (as 1016 = 892 does *not* read thus) can only refer to δ 371.   Does this Sinai MS read περι?   If so, it should have been mentioned by name.

It may be said as regards John x 18 that ἦρεν there is so palpably wrong that von Soden properly rejects it, and that it is merely a change of tense.   But at Matt. xviii 24, where a change of order from προσηνέχθη αὐτῷ εἰς ὀφειλέτης to προσην. εἰς αὐτῷ ὀφειλέτης does not appreciably affect the sense, yet von Soden follows the latter order in his text on the sole authority of א B.

The order is awkward.   εἰς was probably introduced into the text of א B from the margin and put in the wrong place, for *syr sin* and *e* with 245 and Sod¹³³³ omit εἰς altogether.   *Syr cu* holds the usual order, against א B ' before him one of them '.

Similarly at Mark viii 32, instead of καὶ προσλαβόμενος αὐτὸν ὁ Πέτρος ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ, von Soden, on the sole authority of א B (*sah boh syr*), adopts the order καὶ προσλαβ. ὁ Πέτρος αὐτὸν κτλ.   But αὐτόν is omitted by D Sod¹³⁴⁹ ¹⁴⁹³ and *pers*, and very likely here too αὐτόν was introduced into the א B text from the margin and put in the wrong place.

Luke xxii 30.   Order τας δωδεκα φυλας κρινοντες of Sod^{txt} is only supported by B T 892 *i*.

I urge that there is no system in von Soden's text.   Consider among many other passages his adoption in Luke xx 27 of αντιλεγοντες against the λεγοντες of א B C D L N 892 Paris⁹⁷ &c. *d e goth copt syr*.   Observe λεγοντες supported by *four* of his families *H* (represented by א B C 892 Paris⁹⁷), *I* (by D *d* &c.), π (by N), 'af' (by *e*), besides *goth copt syr*, making *seven* groups in all.   Von Soden goes against this.

But just above he follows similar, although less powerful, grouping at xx 22 א A B L, xx 23 א B L, xx 25 א B L, xx 26 א B L.

Similarly at Mark xv 1 he follows א C L 892 for ετοιμασαντες, although B reads ποιησαντες with the majority and εποιησαν D Sod^{c50} 2pe *al*.

And even at Mark xvi 4 he follows א B L absolutely alone (not adding a single new witness) for ανακεκυλισται instead of αποκεκυλισται (roundly condemned by Merx).

But, as a matter of fact, א does not read with B L.   While B L read οτι ανακεκυλισται ο λιθος, א has, without οτι, ' ανακεκυλισμενον τον λιθον '. Tischendorf's edition of א is correct but his N.T. note completely wrong, and von Soden has accepted this without checking it.   The error has been with us for over forty years, and he has perpetuated it.   It must be corrected.   א really reads with the Latins *revolutum lapidem*.   Only

n has *amotum*. Therefore, while abandoning the Greek construction of the others, א yet retains the ανα- of B L (these three still remaining alone for this) as against απο- of the other Greeks for D *Sod*⁰⁵⁰ and 2ᵖᵉ, while changing somewhat the verse, write ερχονται και ευρισκουσιν αποκεκυλισμενον τον λιθον, and not ανακεκυλισμενον τον λιθον as א. The form of D *Sod*⁰⁵⁰ 2ᵖᵉ is found in *c d ff n* of the Latins:

et veniunt et inveniunt revolutum (amotum *n*) lapidem *c d n*.

et venerunt et invenerunt revolutum lapidem *ff*. 'Revolutus' of the Latins being *anceps* as to ανα- or απο- we are still left to argue this out on other lines (see Merx, p. 510 sq., and plates on Luke xxiii 52–54, but we must get the textual matters properly aligned before we can discuss it properly.

At Matt. xi 19 he has εργων for τεκνων [although his countryman Merx (p. 194) had warned him against this] with only א* B 124 Sod¹²²² *boh sah*ᵘⁿᵒ *syr pesh* (*arm*). He seems to err by quoting *I*ᵗᵇ as a whole = *fam* 69, whereas only 124 reads thus. His sub-family *I*ᵗᵇ is composed of 69–124, 174 (his ¹⁰⁹), and his ¹⁰³³, an Athens codex. Do ¹⁰⁹ ¹⁰³³ read εργων?

At Mark ii 22 και ο οινος απολλυται και οι ασκοι of Sod^txt has its only support from B 892 and *boh*.

At Luke xvii 12 he omits αυτω after υπηντησαν with only B L. He misquotes D 157. 157 is wrong, and D has οπου ησαν so of course αυτω fell away. As a matter of fact

L only reads υπηντησαν (− αυτω)

for B reads απηντησαν (− αυτω),

so that von Soden is here following *one* MS L against all others. This is pretty extensive editing! Of what use then all this examination of documents?

At John iv 21 he reads πιστευσον against πιστευε of no less than א B C* D L W 1 *fam* 13 22 Laura^A104 Sod¹⁹⁰ ¹¹¹⁰ 2ᵖᵉ *Orig Ath* and *Cyr*.

At Mark v 25 he retains τις *against* א A B C L W Δ *latt*ᵖˡ which omit, thus following D *rell d a f syr* against his usual preferred combination.

At Mark v 40, again, he prints ο δε against αυτος δε of א B C D L Δ 33 Paris⁹⁷ *Evst* 48 *it vg*, and this where the two families א B and D are conjoined with the Latin. If there is *one* Gospel where this conjunction should be followed it is in Mark! (*Hiat syr sin*).

On the other hand, at Mark vi 12 he goes over to and follows א B C L Dᵍʳ Δᵍʳ for εκηρυξαν against εκηρυσσον *d* δ *it*ᵒᵐⁿ *vg* W Σ Φ *unc*¹¹ *minn*ᵒᵐⁿ *et* Paris⁹⁷. So that he follows for a tense change the very group whose reading he had outraged above by contradicting.

Then at vii 17 he opposes την παραβολην of א B D L Δ 33 Paris⁹⁷ + *it vg* by printing περι της παραβολης of A *rell*.

But at vii 31 he accepts ηλθεν δια σιδωνος of the same ℵ B D L Δ 33 2ᵖᵉ 604 *latt*, against και σιδωνος ηλθεν of A *rell*.

On p. xxviii he says, 'Stehen die Lesarten der Recensionen fest, so ist in der Regel die *von zwei Recensionen* vertretene Lesart in den Text aufgenommen'.

But how often does he break this rule ! Consult, for a change of mood, Luke vii 7. Instead of ἀλλ' εἰπὲ λόγῳ καὶ ἰαθήσεται ὁ παῖς μου he prints the sentence with ἰαθήτω. This is the reading favoured by B L only against their allies ℵ Δ Ψ and D, and against the rest of von Soden's *H* family including 892 and Paris⁹⁷, and against all the other families. He produces one new witness δ 371 (a MS at *Sinai*) of the *H* family. His only other witness is 'bo?'. Horner indicates but *two* boh MSS for this, but *all* the *sah* codices, which von Soden omits. And behold the reading favoured by Tisch., Hort, and von Soden proves once more to be purely 'Egyptian' and of an 'improving' order.

So von Soden's text appears to be an inadequate guide in these com‑plicated matters, and the art of navigation has not been mastered by the compilers of it ; in fact their compasses were not adjusted before leaving port.

This is severe criticism, but is supported by the charges in the following section.

(IV) *Grave Errors.*

There are many grave errors. Observe particularly an error, from lack of referring to original sources, at Matt. xxvii 53. Von Soden says 'om και ενεφανισθησαν πολλοις *H*^δ² *I*³⁷¹'. This is an important place, and the citation of *H*^δ² (= ℵ) is quite wrong. And it is only wrong because von Soden misread Tischendorf's note and did not trouble to look up the edition of ℵ itself. Tischendorf in ed. viii N. T. says :—

'εισηλθον (et Or⁴·²⁹⁸ et ⁱⁿᵗ ⁹²⁷ ; D it [exc f q] vg ηλθον: ℵ om una cum και sq'

by which he means that ℵ omits εισηλθον and the subsequent και (following πολιν and before ενεφανισθησαν). Von Soden neglects to record this – εισηλθον and – και, gives quite the wrong omission, and misunder‑stands that ℵ deliberately cut out εισηλθον, as the omission of και *seq.* shews. Here is the verse :—

Καὶ ἐξελθόντες ἐκ τῶν μνημείων μετὰ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῦ εἰσῆλθον [*om.* ℵ] εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν καὶ [*om.* ℵ] ἐνεφανίσθησαν πολλοῖς.

Thus ℵ wishes to read 'And going out from the graves after his rising into the Holy city, they appeared to many', which is quite different from the reading of *I*³⁷¹ which would have : 'And going out from the graves after his rising they came into the Holy city'; stopping there and eliminating 'and they appeared to many '.

Luke xxii 35. Tischendorf says as to ℵ 'τινοσ (ℵᶜ): ℵ* τι exeunte versu'. Von Soden (without referring to the original) has interpreted this to mean τινος omitted after μη and added *at the end of the verse* after ουθενος. So he gives in his notes [instead of τι 1 τινος] 'om τινος *H*δ²* /... add τι p ουθενος *H*δ²* '.

This is not only wrong, but by missing ℵ's reading of μη τι υστερησατε von Soden overlooks the Latin connexion of *aliquid* by a c f ff₂ l vgg, against *alicuius* by b d e, so that ℵ alone among Greeks is again exhibiting its polyglot mind and text.

John xvii 12. In von Soden's notes we read εφυλασσον (*pro* εφυλαξα) *H*δ²* *d r*. But *d r* do nothing of the kind. The verse is :—

οτε ημην μετ αυτων (εν τω κοσμω) εγω ετηρουν αυτους εν τω ονοματι σου ους (ω, ὃ *al.*) δεδωκας μοι (και) εφυλαξα . . .

d r both have *custodivi* for εφυλαξα as all the rest. They merely substitute *custodiebam* for *servabam* as an interpretation of ετηρουν. Did von Soden really suppose that Tischendorf had missed the reading of *d*? If he had taken the trouble to quote *d* against Dᵍʳ here instead of simply *d r* his attention would have been called to the matter, and he would have seen that his collator had made a mistake.

John xx 17. In the important short speech of our Lord after the resurrection '*Noli me tangere*', in Greek Μή μου ἅπτου, where B alone varies with Μὴ ἅπτου μου (*Tert* 'ne, inquit, contigeris me'), *Evst* 47 is found to omit μου, but only this MS (and possibly *Orig* 1/2).

Now von Soden tells us that ℵ and D, W and 348, 'af' and *Orig* all omit this μου. 'Om μου 1 *H*δ²* ⁰¹⁴ *I*ᵃδ⁵ βα¹²¹ af Ωρ¹·⁵' is what he says. He means – μου *secund. post* πατερα *prim*, but this is lacking in his text, so that the note should read quite differently: 'add μου p πατερα *K gg H*' &c. as we find in the middle notes. This is a serious error. He neglects the real omission by *Evst* 47, because he hardly ever quotes the testimony of the Lectionaries. Had he done so he would have avoided this mistake in a peculiarly important passage.

Luke xviii 16. Von Soden says – τα B instead of – αυτα *prim*. His remark makes B omit τα *ante* παιδια.

Luke xxii 67. Von Soden quotes a b q r for the omission of υμιν in the phrase εαν υμιν ειπω. Not one of them omits. All have '*Si vobis dixero*'.

Shortly afterwards, as if to accentuate this error, he misquotes *r₂*. Abbott had said 'xxiii 8 enim : *autem*', meaning that for 'erat enim cupiens' *r₂* reads 'erat *autem* cupiens'.

Von Soden turns this into 'γαρ 1 δε r²', meaning that we should read at the beginning of the verse ο γαρ Ηρωδης instead of ο δε Ηρωδης or *Herodes autem*.

Again, at John xiii 12 von Soden reproduces an error of Tischendorf. In his N.T. notes Tischendorf begins verse 12 thus : ' αυτων (אᶜ; א* αυτου): 13. 69. 124. 346. ante τους ποδας pon . . .' Accordingly in von Soden's lower notes to his N.T. p. 456 we read : *12. αυτου* l *αυτων* $H^{δ2}$*, that is to say, he would with Tischendorf make א read 'ὅτε οὖν ἔνιψεν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ', referring to the washing of Peter's feet and not to that of them all. But א *does not do this*. א in reality substitutes inversely and later in the verse αυτων for αυτου after ιματια, making the sentence read ἔλαβεν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν instead of ἔλαβεν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ. Von Soden at this place records εαυτου for W and the omission of αυτου by D *b e*, but does not insert the true variation of א* there as he should have done if he had really tried to bring our apparatus up to date.

Lastly at John xviii 16 von Soden quotes the variation εισηνεγκεν for εισηγαγεν as read by $H^{014\ 376}$ = W and Paris⁹⁷, but א also reads thus with W, and Paris⁹⁷ *does not* (according to Schmidtke's edition it has εισηγαγεν with the rest). Von Soden does not report א because Tischendorf omitted to do so, but the reading is to be found duly recorded in the late Dr Scrivener's very careful collation of א published at Cambridge in small and handy form by Deighton, Bell & Co. in 1864.

This leads up to another grave indictment. Von Soden depends entirely upon Tischendorf's notes in his eighth edition of the N. T. concerning א. He has evidently not had א collated for his use, and has ignored Dr Scrivener's exceedingly accurate collation.

In order to be brief I will prove the matter in one Gospel alone. I will take St John's Gospel. Tischendorf neglects to record some *fifty-five* readings of א. In every case but one von Soden follows suit, and neglects these readings also. And it is not as if the matters were of scant importance, for observe—

vi 47 + οτι recorded for $Sod^{050\ 95}$ sy, and read also by 124 (not mentioned), is read by א after the Coptic manner.

vi 53 > το αιμα αυτου recorded for $I^{a\ δ\ b}$ *a* Hil (and read also by *Cypr Jul Firm Gelas*) is the order also of א.

xiii 34 — ινα *sec.* recorded for ³²⁹ is also omitted by א.

xix 8 > τον λογον τουτον recorded for ³²⁹ ¹³⁸⁵ ᴺ (and read also by 249 and bt^{scr}) is the order of א.

But, far more important than the above omissions of Tischendorf and von Soden are the following readings of א, not only neglected by Tischendorf and von Soden, but also by Mrs Lewis, Horner, Merx, and the rest of the critics, readings of great import as to the matter of the versions, and an ' underlying Greek text ' :—

As to *syr sin* :

xvi 2 αποσυναγωγους + γαρ   א and *syrr*^{dis}, and these only.

xx 17 + ιδου *ante* αναβαινω ℵ and *syr sin syr hier*[ABC] only.

This conjunction of ℵ and *syr* stands apart from all other authorities and has hitherto been unrecognized. Mrs Lewis recognizes the first (p. 256 ed. 1910 of *syr sin*) but not the second. Merx neglects ℵ in both places, although referring to the reading of *l* and *q* among the Old Latins at xvi 2 of + οτι. 'Quia eicient vos de sinagogis' *l*, 'qūm in synagoga vos eicient' *q*, which is the only other variation there among authorities (neglected by von Soden) except that the *bohairic* joins verses 1 and 2 . . . 'if they should put you out of the synagogue'.

As to Coptic:

vi 58. The order > οι πατερες εφαγον by ℵ alone is the order of *sah* and of *boh*[dis].

vi 52. ℵ adds ουν after πως (alone with 56–58–61). In *bohairic* we read πωс οχ οη ψχολι.

x 27. For καγω ℵ substitutes και with only *e vgg*[CT] *Aug Chr*[μ. 7.] and the *sahidic* (against its usual emphatic method).

As to Latin:

xix 5. πορφυρουν (—το) ℵ alone.

As to Aethiopic:

xix 6. + και *ante* λεγει ℵ alone with *aeth*.

As to *Chrysostom*:

iii 22. > εις την Ιουδαιαν γην και οι μαθηται αυτου κακει διετριβεν ℵ *cum Chr*[solo] (instead of και οι μαθηται αυτου εις την Ιουδαιαν γην και εκει διετριβεν of all the rest of the Greeks and of the versions).

This is quite important as there are other traces of ℵ and *Chr*[codd π. λ. μ.] at i 15 ερχομενος + ος, iv 45 —εδεξαντο αυτον οι γαλιλαιοι, and St Chrysostom's copy of St John was a very ancient recension. We find *Chrysostom* and *syr sin* absolutely alone together at:

vii 32. γογγυζοντος *tantum* (— περι αυτου and —ταυτα).

viii 16. και εαν κρινω (—δε and —εγω),

besides being often in sympathy elsewhere.

I mention the above matters as to ℵ in justice to our late lamented countryman, Dr Scrivener, whose faithful work ill deserved to be put aside by those claiming to say the last word on these subjects. Mrs Lewis seems to be the only living critic who shews an acquaintance with Scrivener's collation of ℵ.

(V) *Errors of Omission.*

Errors of omission abound, as at Matt. x 16 ιδου εγω αποστελλω υμας εις μεσον λυκων for εν μεσω λυκων where B is quoted alone. To B[gr] should be added *ff₁ k vg*[B] and *Lucifer*. (Cf. the parallel at Luke x 3 where D[gr] substitutes μεσον for εν μεσω [against *d*] and the *vgg* and

Ambr have [lib] *inter lupos* which von Soden does not mention, merely stating D and not even D[gr] for μεσον.)

Matt. ix 35. – και ante κηρυσσων, by א *boh*[ES], is not mentioned by von Soden at all, not even as to א. It is interesting because it is rather in the Coptic manner, and actually two *boh* MSS omit with א *(teste* Horner *in vol. sah.).*

Besides omitting the επεσπαρκεν of א in Matt. xiii 25, he neglects to record B* [see photographic edition] for ελαλησεν *(pro παρεθηκεν)* in xiii 24. I suppose because in the latter case Tischendorf is silent. But when *k* alone is to be coupled with B[gr] for this *locutus est* for *proposuit* or *posuit* it becomes quite important.

k is quite clear with *locutus est illis dicens*, and apparently B before being inked over read in similar fashion ελαλησεν αυτοις λεγων, instead of παρεθηκεν αυτοις λεγων.

Matt. xxi 17. – εξω της πολεως א is given as being alone. But 28 also omits, as duly recorded by Scholz.

Matt. xxi 33. – εν αυτω א* Chr. So von Soden. But א only omits εν. Von Soden is misled by the form of Tischendorf's note and did not refer to the original.

Matt. xxii 16. Evan. 604 (700), i.e. von Soden's [133], is given for λεγοντας. This is wrong. Apparently von Soden took the evidence from Scrivener's *Adv. Crit.* instead of from my edition, and mistook d for b, for d[scr] there = Evan. 66 so reads, which von Soden does not report.

Luke xi 48. μαρτυρειτε א B L 892 and Sod[δ 371] *Orig*, he omits to add 604 also.

Matt. xxiv 34. Von Soden's note (foot of p. 94) says : 'add οτι ante ου *H*[1016]',= 892. But B D F L *al*[8] *it vg syr Ps-Ath Orig*[int], as well as *copt*, all add as well; see his upper notes.

Matt. xxv 24. Von Soden quotes 209 (his [δ 457]) for αυστηρος instead of σκληρος, but Lake definitely says not.

Matt. xxvi 50. – ιησους א z[scr]. Von Soden neglects this altogether.

Matt. xxvi 65. και λεγει *(pro λεγων).* Von Soden records א but fails to add *syrr.*

Matt. xxvii 3. μετεμεληθη και *(pro μεταμεληθεις).* Von Soden records א but fails to add *syr sin arm aeth pers.*

Mark vi 55. He cites א only for εν instead of επι, that is to say και ηρξαντο εν τοις κραβαττοις, but this is the way the Latins have it 'IN grabattis', and he should have added *latt.* It is important here as to א.

Mark vii 37. Von Soden's note reads 'add ως ante και[2] *H*[δι] bo ', but whereas *sah* adds ϩωϲⲧⲉ, only a few *boh* add ⲙ̄ⲫⲣⲏϯ, and von Soden neglects *sah.*

Mark viii 18. 'om $\kappa\alpha\iota^1$ $H^{\delta 2*}$ r_2'. He should add boh^{p1}, for this is the Coptic method here being illustrated by א, to which attention should be called.

Luke xxiii 50. Here, where he omits altogether to record – $\kappa\alpha\iota$ *tert ante* $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota o s$ for B, he should have quoted with *sah*, thus forming another link between B and *sah* in the Coptic manner, as above for א.

Mark x 21 'add $\epsilon\tau\iota$ post $\epsilon\nu$ (Lk 18_{22}) $H^{\delta 2}$'. But von Soden forgets that $minn^{10}$ and *sah boh* do so also.

Luke v 2. The order $\pi\lambda o\iota\alpha$ δvo credited to some few and *boh* should also indicate *sah*, for this is the usual Coptic order.

Luke x 35 '$\sim \epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$ ante δvo $H^{\delta 1}$'. To B add *sah*.

x 38 'om $\epsilon\iota s$ $\tau o\nu$ $o\iota\kappa o\nu$ $\alpha v\tau\eta s$ $H^{\delta 1}$'. To B add *sah*.

xi 36 'add $\epsilon\nu$ ante $\tau\eta$ Ta? $H^{\delta 1\,376}$'. To these, B and Paris⁹⁷, add both *sah* and *boh*.

xvi 17 '$\sim \kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota\alpha\nu$ $\mu\iota\alpha\nu$ $H^{\delta 1}$'. To B add *sah syr*.

xii 32 '$\sim v\mu\omega\nu$ o $\pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho$ $H^{\delta 2}$', but to א add *sah boh* as usual, the possessive before the noun.

Luke xxiv 38. $\epsilon\iota s$ $\tau\eta\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\nu$ von Soden quotes only Aδ ($= Dial.$), but cde read thus *in cor vestrum*, and so does *sah* practically and *syr sin* (Lewis, ed. 1910).

Luke v 17. $\epsilon\kappa$ $\pi\alpha\sigma\eta s$ $\kappa\omega\mu\eta s$. He says 'add $\tau\eta s$ ante $\kappa\omega\mu\eta s$ $H^{\delta 371}$ bo', but he forgets B and should include $^{\delta 1}$. It is clearly indicated in Tischendorf.

Luke ix 12. '$\eta\delta\eta$ loco $\delta\epsilon$ (Mk 6_{35}) $H^{\delta 1}$ af'. The testimony of Paris⁹⁷ should be added to B *af*.

Luke xiii 7. To B's unique $\tau o\nu$ $\tau o\pi o\nu$ *pro* $\tau\eta\nu$ $\gamma\eta\nu$ the testimony of 8o should be added. Von Soden neglects 8o throughout.

Luke xiii 34. $\tau\eta\nu$ $\epsilon\alpha v\tau o v$ $vo\sigma\sigma\iota\alpha\nu$. He cites א 16 Laura^{A104} only. But *sah boh* make the gender of the bird *masculine*, and he omits to add their testimony. This is a clear Coptic reflexion in א 16 and Laura^{A104} and may not be overlooked.

Luke xxii 27. $+$ o ante $\mu\epsilon\iota\zeta\omega\nu$ א. To א should be added *sah boh*.

John viii 55. $+$ $o\tau\iota$ $\pi\alpha\rho$ $\alpha v\tau o\nu$ $\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon\iota$ (*post* $\alpha\lambda\lambda$ $o\iota\delta\alpha$ $\alpha v\tau o\nu$). So T^i ($= Sod^{H78}$). Von Soden does not mention this, but he should have done so. Every new fragment which comes from Egypt [see again immediately below] confirms editorial changes. Here is another instance of the new fragment T^i improvising. Von Soden has recorded it at Luke xxiii 53 for $+$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\theta\epsilon\nu\tau o s$ $\alpha v\tau o v$ $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\theta\eta\kappa\alpha\nu$ $\tau\omega$ $\mu\nu\eta\mu\epsilon\iota\omega$ $\lambda\iota\theta o\nu$ $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\nu$ $o\nu$ $\mu o\gamma\iota s$ $\epsilon\iota\kappa o\sigma\iota$ $\alpha\nu\delta\rho\alpha s$ $\epsilon\kappa v\lambda\iota o\nu$ (cf. D dc *sah al.*), but does not do so here in John.

Luke vii 47. Here again (see Amélineau *Notices des mss coptes* p. 52) the fragment of a Greek Coptic Lectionary, whose mark I do not know in von Soden or in Gregory, reports $+$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ before $o\lambda\iota\gamma o\nu$ $\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\alpha$ *fin.*

with only B 892 and Paris⁹⁷, who read : ω δε ολιγον αφιεται και ολιγον αγαπα. Von Soden does not report this. Observe that this further support for B comes from the same source as the other T support. This fragment differs by reading : ο δε ολιγον· αγαπα αφιεται· και ολιγον αγαπα, as if aware of the variation of F Ξ? 28 *aeth*: ω δε ολιγον αγαπα ολιγον αφιεται, but erring in the process of conflation.

Mark xiv 3.   του ιησου (*pro* αυτου *pr.*) D *it sah boh*tres. Neglected by von Soden. (Beermann and Gregory report *Sod*⁰⁵⁰ for αυτου.)

Mark xvi 2.   ανατειλαντος του ηλιου.   Omitted by *k*.   Not noted by von Soden.

Hans von Soden has condemned me in a recent number of the *Literaturzeitung* for bringing as it were iron to Essen, and has said that I had nothing new to shew him ; and that everybody knew of the matters to which I had called attention.

I submit respectfully that much has yet to be learned by the school of von Soden in matters of textual criticism if it would make the path smoother and not harder for students of the coming generation.

(VI) *Unnecessary difficulties presented to Students.*

Mark i 26.   In von Soden's note we find ' το ¹ ⌒ το ² H δ¹ '. This means that B omits τὸ πνεῦμα reading καὶ σπαράξαν αὐτὸν τὸ ἀκάθαρτον (that unclean one) instead of καὶ σπ. αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον (the unclean spirit).

By this note he seems to wish to suggest that it is an error from το following το. But this is rather fanciful here. Why inject further trouble into these troublesome matters, and force the student to waste time in seeking out what το¹⌒το² means ?

Luke xxii 6.   Similarly, for the omission of και εξωμολογησεν by B C N *lat syr sin*, all we find in the apparatus is ' και¹⌒² H δ²* δ³ Iπ sys Ευσ '. This is not very illuminating, and involves a great waste of time to the student.

Again, Luke viii 25, the important omission of και υπακουουσιν αυτω by B Sod⁰⁵⁰ 604 *aeth Tert*marc ? is only noticed in the third set of notes as ' και⌒³και ₂₆ H δ¹ Iª ⁰⁵⁰*f ', f meaning 604.   The arrangement of the apparatus is most misleading.

Luke xvii 6.   For the omission of ταυτη after τη συκαμινω von Soden adds *syr cu* to 'H δ² ⁵⁶ ³⁷ᵈ bo Iª δ⁵ o ¹²⁹ A³ ', but *syr cu* (as against *syr sin* 'to this mulberry tree') says '*to a hill*'. Why divorce the important variation from its context to explain that *syr cu* does not read '*to* THIS *hill*'. This kind of thing is done again and again. As a matter of fact there is no need to add *syr cu* for —ταυτη above, for below von Soden has : 'add post αυ¹ : τω·ορει τουτω μεταβα εντευθεν εκει και μετεβαινεν και (cf. Mk 11₂ Mt 17₂₀ 21₂₁) Iª δ⁵ syᶜ (om τουτω und εκει).'

Again, Luke xxiv 31, ℵ omits και επεγνωσαν αυτον. Von Soden once more dignifies this by citing '$και^1 \frown^2 H^{δ2*}$'. It is placed in so insignificant a position that one hardly sees it, and then has to worry to find out what it means.

(VII) *Carelessness as to the application of f following a Codex.*

As regards 157, at the important place Luke xxii 43–44, he has gravely misrepresented my manuscript and probably some of his own.

[He has placed 157 in his family $I^{σ\ 207\ 351\ 1182\ 1226\ 377}$.]

At Luke xxii 43–44, in his upper notes (which constitute his 'margin') he records for omission of these verses 207^{cf} which means the corrector of 157 plus the family or one of them.

Now in 157 there is no sign of omission by any corrector. I examined the place carefully. As to f no doubt it indicates ^{351} (= 713), but why not say so here? If the other members of the family do not omit (and it is questionable whether they all belong together as a family) we should be quite sure of the fact. An f is quite insufficient here. His ^{377} (= 291) would be the more likely MS to omit.

The worst feature as to this is outside of St Mark's Gospel. Because if f follows $I^{aδ5}$ it does not refer to $I^{a\ 014}$ next in order on his list.

(VIII) *Neglect of the Aethiopic.*

Von Soden's neglect of the Aethiopic is really serious, especially as in a work up to date on the N. T. it is absolutely essential to take into consideration the readings of *aeth* and *pers*.

A case occurs at Matt. xxvii 50 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα, where he cites 'παρεδωκεν] αφηκεν (Io 19_{30}) Ta I^{1386}, ανεβη syr^{s}[c]' and stops there. He should have added *aeth* exivit.

Merx (p. 16), referring to this, says: 'Und damit wieder hängt die Erzählung Matt. xxvii 50 in Syrsin zusammen, wo es nicht heisst ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα = *er sandte den Geist fort, gab ihn auf, hauchte ihn aus*, sondern ܩܢܘܡܗ ܣܠܩ d. h. *sein Geist stieg hinauf.* Diese Lesart steht bis jetzt ganz allein; dass hier aber nicht nach äusserer Bezeugung, sondern nach dem dogmatischen Zusammenhange zu urteilen ist, das sollte einleuchten.'

Thus, von Soden could have supplemented Merx here by quoting *aeth* for *exivit*, ἐξῆλθε, as does Horner, but he does not. Nor does he use *aeth* in other places where its readings are both certain and most instructive.

So, again, at Luke ix 20, where von Soden quotes 604 for – με λεγετε ειναι, he neglects not only *aeth* but also *Dial* for this omission.

Again, at Luke xvi 3, we miss *aeth* which supports *sah boh syrr* as to B's very important and unique addition among the Greeks of και before επαιτειν.

At Luke vi 17, where he quotes δ 398 for κατεβη alone among Greeks with Marcion, he omits to record Marcion (*Epiph*bis *diserte*), and forgets to add to the Latins quoted the other versions *copt syr pers* and *aeth*.

(IX) *Style of note.*

Luke vi 26. Can one imagine a more inadequate note than this : 'om παντες Ta Mρ K gg H exc 014 56 ff bo Ja 050 f η ι φa b 287 f 1216 c 1091 f 1098 r 72 f o σ 351 f 377 κ r 1341 | 4 22 33 178 fff 1353 f 1386–1448 1493 A¹ A³ K¯¹ 179 K¹i 55 59⁾lat, ∼ οι ανθρωποι παντες H δ² bo Ir, ∼ οι ανθρωπου a ειπ. Jβa 1178.'

The phrase is : οὐαὶ ὅταν καλῶς εἴπωσιν ὑμᾶς πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι (or οἱ ἄνθρ. πάντες, or οἱ ἄνθρωποι *tantum*).

The inversion of order by א *sah boh* and *Iren*int is stated nearly correctly, *sah* only being omitted. This inversion, however, points probably to the omission of πάντες being basic. It is therefore essential that the evidence for omission should be carefully stated. What do we find ?

' Om παντες Ta Mρ K ', that is *Tatian Marcion* and Κοινή. But *syr sin* and *syr pesh* also omit as does *pers* confirming it. So does *aeth* ('populus') and also *arm* (*teste Rieu*) and *Macarius*, all to be found distinctly stated in Tischendorf, except as to *syr sin* since discovered. Whereas as to the Κοινή, the textus receptus and most cursives have it and do *not* omit. On the other hand, to the MSS cited against omission should be added 100 cursives examined by von Soden's predecessors. The uncials which omit : D Fʷ L S V Γ Δ Λ are not stated in von Soden's list, but include D.

Could any one tell from von Soden's grouping that D omitted ? D can hardly be included in K (Κοινή), and they have to be sought by a ridiculous process of elimination, or enquired after in Tischendorf.

The news which von Soden really gives us is that W (014) and the Tiflis MS (050) do not omit.

Tischendorf's note is quite clear. The important part is Irenaeus's interpreter's opposition to the Latin. Under the circumstances *d δ* should be quoted against the Latin, for *d δ* omit with Dᵍ Δᵍʳ, so that to von Soden's note add '(*praeter d δ μ vg*ᴰˣ *cod caraf., cor. vat vg*ᵉᵈ)' after 'lat'. Supply also *d δ μ vg*ᵉᵈ in Wordsworth and White's apparatus. Supply *syr sin* in Horner's apparatus.

(X) *Error or ambiguity in quoting fam* π, *and some of the most important cursives.*

π is a family of the purple uncials covering N Σ Φ and ℸ. Very loose use is made of this. We will read π exc 17 [= Φ], whereas Σ may be only one extant at this place, N and ℸ not being available.

At Luke xx 4 and elsewhere von Soden quotes π as a family, whereas N only is extant.

As to 2ᵖᵉ (Sod⁹³), at Mark ix 28 2ᵖᵉ reads ελθοντος αυτου and thus *alone*. Von Soden adds iˢᶜʳ (his ³⁵⁰) and fam ' π exc. 17 '. Both are wrong. N Σ and iˢᶜʳ read ελθοντα αυτον. As to ' exc 17 ', it is right to the extent that Φ reads εισελθοντα αυτον.

Many errors and omissions as to 157 occur. This is the more reprehensible as I notice that von Soden had at least two Gospels recollated (Matthew and Luke, see his card). At Luke vi 40 he quotes 157 (his ²⁰⁷) for − πας, the exceptional omission by א Sod⁴⁴⁸ *b* vg^D only. I did not note this, and I think I should have seen it. He does not quote 157 for εστω *in the same verse* which my eyes observed.

Note at Matt. xxiv 45 επι τη οικεσια 157 alone, for επι της θεραπειας (or οικετειας, or οικιας). Von Soden quotes 157 for επι τη οικια, so that his collator was not accurate there.

And at Luke xx 46 he quotes: 'add τους ante ασπασμους Iσ²⁰⁷'. This is 157. To it add *sah boh*.

But to this reading should also be added that of 157 *in the same verse* for + τας ante πρωτοκαθεδριας as well as *sah boh* again, which von Soden neglects. Why quote one and not the other?

Similarly, Luke xxii 7 ' ην loco ηλθεν (cf. Mk. 14₁) Iσ²⁰⁷'. To 157 for this exceptional reading should be added *pers*.

Evan. 604/700 (his ¹³³) is often misquoted by von Soden. At Luke xi 47 it is added by mistake to the very small group א C *Epiph*ᵐᵃʳᶜ for και οι πατερες, whereas it should be added on the next line and in the next verse to the small group for μαρτυρες εστε where von Soden omits it.

Sod¹²²⁶ (Matthaei's o and our 245) is frequently quoted wrongly, e.g. Luke ii 21, xix 43.

Sod¹⁰¹⁶ (Greg. and Scr. 892) collated by Harris. Although sometimes employed is often omitted by von Soden, as at Mark xiv 46. He says: ' om αυτω *d ff*²'; but add W 892 as well as *aeth* and *pers*, which omit επ αυτον of textus receptus, which in Soden's text is αυτω.

Sod³⁷⁶ (Greg. 579 Scr. 743, Paris⁹⁷). Often omitted, as at the important place Luke xvi 30 αναστη προς αυτους (*pro* πορευθη προς αυτους) where von Soden only quotes א. Again, Luke vii 47, where ειπαν for λεγω is read by א Paris⁹⁷ only, correctly reported by von Soden, *in the same verse* as to + και ante ολιγον αγαπα he only gives B and ¹⁰¹⁶f. This obscures the issue. By ¹⁰¹⁶ he indicates 892. By f he *may* mean Paris⁹⁷, but he should say so, for these three only have the reading (with an *Evst* from Egypt published by Amélineau).

Von Soden often opposes Schmidtke's edition of Paris⁹⁷, as at Luke xxii 17 *fin.*, quoting αυτοις while Schmidtke prints definitely εις αυτους (with L).

Indeed, I question the appearance of Evan. 33 (Sod⁸⁴⁸) several times in the apparatus; notably at Luke vi 38 where Soden quotes ⁸⁴⁸ for

μετρηθησεται.   Tischendorf does not.   Tregelles does not.   In von
Soden's apparatus appears [33] (=our P).   Did he not when copying
33 for P also add δ48 (Evan. 33) by mistake ?   If I am correct, this
change of numbers leads to absolutely nothing but confusion.

But to state these matters is only to make a partial impression on my
readers of the grievous state of things in this latest book on a most
intricate subject.   *Es ist zum Weinen.*   I have claimed the privilege of
presenting these few facts, gleaned in the course of a self-imposed task
for other purposes (and not for an unfriendly review), because I am pro-
bably one of the very few who could pass an oral examination as to the
numbers used by von Soden and their equivalents in the older notation.

H. C. HOSKIER.