

ιστίον : ὅλοις τοῖς ιστίοις, <i>under full sail, with all one's might</i>	1117 B
καθεδεῖν	1269 C
κωμαστικός (with ψῆφος)	1221 C
ὄκλαδία	1093 B
πάντα ἐκ πάντων	1053 B
πρεσβυτικός (technical?)	1073 D
προσερμηνεύω	1161 C
προσκατάγνωμι	1192 A
ῥαδιολόγος	1280 C
σάλπιγξ: ὑπὸ σάλπιγγι	1260 C
συμπελάζομαι	1073 A
συνεπάνειμι	1277 C
τριχομαχία	1196 A
φιλοκριητέον (cf. φιλοκριητέον)	1104 C

To this list I had thought of appending a number of notes I have made on the text, but these it would be better to defer till the appearance of a critical edition, when they may become unnecessary.

A. SOUTER.

ORIGEN, \aleph AND THE CAESAREAN TEXT

WESTCOTT and Hort would have been not a little shocked by one item in the article by Mr Tasker in the last number of the JOURNAL (xxxvi 60). I allude to the column (p. 63) headed 'Neutral authorities in support', which deals with quotations from Matthew and Luke in Origen's *Exhortation to Martyrdom*. The term 'Neutral' was expressly invented by them to emphasize the superiority of the text for which B is the type MS, not only to the 'Western' but also to what they named the 'Alexandrian' text. The name 'Alexandrian' they give to readings found in any one of the MSS \aleph , C, L, 33, Δ , Ξ which (without being Western) differ from B, provided B has any support at all. They also note with lament the fact that even \aleph is contaminated by mixture with Western readings, as well as Alexandrian. Mr Tasker's table (if we ignore the section on quotations from Mark) sets out twenty-eight variants from the T.R. in Matthew and Luke which occur in Origen's *Exhortation to Martyrdom* flanked by a column headed 'Neutral authorities in support'; but only eighteen out of the twenty-eight variants quoted have the support of B. True, another six are supported by \aleph , but Mr Tasker fails to note that in five of them (Mt. x 28, xix 28

xxvi 29, Lk. viii 13, ix. 23) D backs up \aleph , while B is in the opposing camp. That is to say, Hort would have regarded these five variants as clear cases of \aleph ceasing to be an authority for the Neutral text and becoming for the time being Western. Again, two of Origen's variants (Mt. xix 29, Lk. xii 4) are supported (against B) respectively by \aleph^a (not \aleph) C L and \aleph L, and are examples of what Hort called 'Alexandrian' readings. Note also that Origen's readings in Lk. viii 13 and xii 11 are supported by D against most other MSS, and are thus distinctively Western. Mr Tasker's suggestion, therefore, that Origen is here using what Hort called a Neutral text breaks down.

Personally, if not shocked, I was at least surprised by another column in the table—that headed 'Members of Fam. \odot in opposition'. Every student of the subject knows that each member of the group of MSS which (for want of a better name) may be spoken of as Fam. \odot has been heavily revised by a Byzantine (or, as Hort would have said, 'Syrian') reviser—fortunately, however, in different places in different MSS. It follows that only those variants of Fam. \odot which differ from the Byzantine text (which practically = the Textus Receptus) are worth quoting at all. In this column Mr Tasker eleven times quotes either \odot or 1 as 'in opposition'; but in only one case does the reading quoted differ from that of the Textus Receptus. This column, therefore, is not merely irrelevant, it is positively misleading.

Turning again to Mr Tasker's tables, I would supplement the column 'Members of Fam. \odot in support' by noting that in Mt. x 19 and xix 29 (*πολλαπλασίονα*) the reading of Origen has support from Fam. 1424 (Soden's I ϕ group) which in my book *The Four Gospels* (pp. 577-578) I argue belongs to Fam. \odot .

The facts, then, appear to be as follows. We have quoted from Origen twenty-eight variants; of these twenty-six occur in members of Fam. \odot , two are purely Western. Of the twenty-eight, twenty-three are found in \aleph , but in five of these \aleph is opposed by B and other important supporters of the Neutral text. Two of the variants are what Hort called 'Alexandrian'. Clearly the text used by Origen is what Hort would have called a mixture of Neutral, Western, and Alexandrian.

But when we find that in as many as twenty-six out of twenty-eight readings quoted from Origen, Origen is supported by members of Fam. \odot , we are considering a fact which is not merely numerical. The quotations from Origen represent a text which Hort would have described as a mixture of the three 'pre-Syrian' texts; but this mixture follows a particular pattern. Now the text which results from the purely objective process of deducting Byzantine readings from members



of Fam. ⑥ is a text which in twenty-six out of twenty-eight cases exhibits a mixture of Neutral, Western, and Alexandrian readings *in accordance with the same pattern* as that in the MS used by Origen. It is not merely that the proportion of readings from each of these texts, in Origen and in Fam. ⑥, is much the same; it is that Origen and Fam. ⑥ are found constantly to have selected from out of three alternative pre-Syrian texts the same reading in the same verse.

Mr Tasker, then, has earned the gratitude of scholars by printing evidence which, properly interpreted, proves beyond reasonable doubt a conclusion which he himself fails to draw, namely that Origen in Matthew and Luke, as well as in Mark, used the Caesarean text.

But another question is raised by the facts shewn in his tables. In twenty-three variants out of twenty-eight \aleph supports Origen—doing so in six cases against B. I have shewn that this is because \aleph in these six passages exhibits five Western readings and one Alexandrian. But it is surely remarkable that the contamination of \aleph by non-Neutral readings should coincide so often with readings in the text of Origen and Fam. ⑥. The hypothesis suggests itself that the 'Western' and 'Alexandrian' mixture which Hort detected in \aleph is, at least in part, due to an ancestor of \aleph having been 'crossed' with a MS of the Caesarean text.

B. H. STREETER.

Xrōštay and Padvāxtay, Call and Answer

THE two names in the title of this Note mean 'what is called' and 'what is answered' (Syr.  and , of rather uncertain vocalization). They were hypostasized by the Manichees, and are found both in texts from Turfan and in the Coptic (e.g. *Mani-Fund* 65). The form in which they appear in Manichaean myth is as follows. The Primal Man, created or 'evoked' to repel the invasion of the Dark, goes forth with his panoply, the Five bright Elements, but is overcome. His bright Elements are swallowed up by the Demons of the Dark; he is left in a swoon, or himself swallowed or surrounded. Somehow he makes his condition known, and a fresh creation is evoked for his aid, consisting of the Friend of the Luminaries and his five helpers (the *Splendetens*, etc.). They come to the aid of the Primal Man, absorbed by the Dark (see Pognon, p. 188), finding him by a *Call*, to which the Primal Man replies by an *Answer*. This Call and this Answer are what we find hypostasized in certain Manichee documents. One of their Dodecads (or Dozens), symbolized by the Months or the Zodiacal