

1637 but not in 1640 (the records for the two intervening years have been lost). Nothing more is known of its history. The pagination is inaccurate, the scribe in numbering the pages having in more places than one turned over two leaves. After the *Testimonia* is added the treatise (xxi) entitled—ἀθανασίου πριάρχου ἀλεξανδρείας πρὸς ἀντίοχον περὶ πλείστων καὶ ἀναγκαίων ζητημάτων ἐν ταῖς θείαις γραφαῖς ἀπορουμένων καὶ παρὰ πᾶσις χριστιανοῖς ἐπιγινώσκειν ὀφειλόμενον.

FREDERIC WALLIS.

ADDITIONAL NOTE BY THE REV. A. ROBERTSON, D.D.

By the courtesy of Bishop Wallis and of the Editor of the JOURNAL I have been allowed to see both parts of the Bishop's most interesting article in proof. Unfortunately severe pressure of work has prevented my giving the attention I should have wished to the questions discussed. But I should like to note one or two minor points that have occurred to me: all of them happen to have reference mainly to that part of the article which is printed in the present number.

(1) The lines on the *verso* of folio 434 of S (see above, p. 101) are merely a trivial scribbling. I read them as follows, μηνὶ σεπτεμβρίου εἰς τὰς κα ἡμέρας . . . ἡ ἡμέρα ἔχει ιβ ὥρας κ. ἡ νύξ ὥρας ιβ.

(2) I had, for the reason to be referred to below, quoted the readings of the 'Goblerianus' (see above, p. 102) in my edition of the *de Incarnatione*, under the symbol R. As Bishop Wallis 'commandeers' R for the certainly more important MS described at the head of his article, I have taken the opportunity of a new edition of my Greek Text to substitute 'H' for R as the symbol for the Harleian MS.

(3) The Bishop's conjecture that 'H' was acquired by Covel at Constantinople as late as 1664, or indeed at all, can hardly be maintained. The MS was used by Felckmann in preparing the Basel Edition of 1601, and the name 'Goblerianus' is due to him. The MS in fact bears the name of Gobler in two places, viz. folio 2, 'sum Justi Gobleri LL doctoris,' and on folio 219 b, 'justini Gobleri Goarini LL doctoris uitex sum,' the same words are apparently repeated below with the substitution of 'codex sum' for the last two words.

(4) I am not fully persuaded that 'H' is a direct copy of S (see above, p. 103). The discovery of the first part of R might throw light on the question. But meanwhile, my main reason is the presence in H of a certainly independent reading in *de Incarn.* ch. xiii 2 (p. 19, l. 18 in my edition). Here S inserts *μη* before *βιοῦν*, while H omits it. The reading of H is too good to be due to conjecture; the scribe betrays no capacity of the kind. Moreover Traversari, whose translation dates from about 1430 (in Italy; his Greek text is represented by no MS known

to me), read this passage without the $\mu\eta$. [Of the MSS of which the second part of Bishop Wallis' paper speaks, the Basel MS (B) has the inserted $\mu\eta$, while two of its supposed descendants, the Oxford MS (O) and the Cambridge MS (C), omit it. This appears to me to constitute an unexplained group of 'residual' phenomena, which may point to the use, by the scribe of O, of more than one original. In any case the point is worth consideration.]

(5) I should like to take this opportunity of cancelling the inaccurate reference to H in my *Prolegomena* to Athanasius (Nicene Library, vol. 4). When it was written I had not begun the study of the MSS of the *de Incarnatione*; it was shortly after the *Prolegomena* had gone to press that the facsimile in the Paleographical Society's publications led me to identify the *Codex Goblerianus* as the Harleian MS.

In conclusion I would express my entire belief, apart from the few details I have touched upon, in the correctness of Bishop Wallis' results. Even as to No. 4, I am quite open to conviction. It must be gratifying to all students of the Fathers that the Bishop has found it possible, amid his exacting labours, to pursue his fruitful investigations, of which I trust we now see only the beginning.

A. ROBERTSON.

ADVERSARIA CHRONOLOGICA.

I. TATIAN'S CHRONOLOGY OF THE MINISTRY.

DURING the last thirty years a tendency has been manifesting itself, and, especially in Germany and America, has been gathering strength as it proceeded, to attempt at first in detail and now on a more extended scale a rearrangement of the Fourth Gospel. The earliest, and not the least satisfactory, of these suggestions was made by the late Archdeacon J. P. Norris in the *Journal of Philology* for 1871 (pp. 107-112): he simply transposed chapters v and vi, and accounted for the error in our extant copies of the Gospel by the hypothesis that chapter vi was, like chapter xxi, a Galilean appendix added after the Gospel had been written, and inserted by mistake at somewhat too late a point. In this case 'the feast of the Jews' of v 1 (reading $\eta \epsilonορτή$) would without difficulty be identified with 'the passover the feast of the Jews' which had been mentioned (according to this rearrangement) not long before as 'near,' in vi 4: and the general scheme of the chronology of the Gospel, with its three passovers or two full years in the Ministry, will remain untouched. Of other transpositions on a similar or smaller scale two may be briefly mentioned. In chapter vii *vv.* 21-23 the sudden reference to the miracle of healing recorded in v 5-9—an event