

would travel further, though we need not suppose the reference, to him more minutely accurate than that to Cyrenius, Luke ii 2. Lastly a textual parallel may be permitted. As Spitta pointed out, we should read Jac. ii 1 *μη ἐν προσωπολημψίαις ἔχετε τὴν πίστιν τοῦ Κυρίου τῆς δόξης*. A devout and sagacious reader noticed that 'the Lord of glory' here was the same as in 1 Cor. ii 8, and wrote above the line *τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. The copyist who took the gloss over into the text thought one *τοῦ Κυρίου* was enough. A puzzled reader wrote, above *ἐθνάρχης*, *ἐπαρχος Ἀρέτα τοῦ βασιλείως*: when the time came for his gloss to pass into the text, *ἐπαρχος* went the same way as *τοῦ Κυρίου* in the gloss on St. James. He would be a very resolute optimist who maintained that the standard copies of the New Testament to which St. Irenaeus and his contemporaries appealed were as accurate as the proof which a press reader sends with his corrections to the author. By the time of St. Pamphilus, Christian scholars had learnt to copy accurately the best texts they could find, but then it was too late.

G. A. SIMCOX.

CODEX CHRYSOPURPUREUS SINOPENSIS.

IN the *Journal des Savants* for May 1900, M. Omont announced the discovery of a portion of a purple manuscript of the Gospels. The short but most interesting notice in which the announcement was made gave a brief description of the appearance of the manuscript, of its contents, of the character of its text, and reproductions of four of the five miniatures with which it was adorned. It also contained the welcome intelligence that a more complete edition of the manuscript was shortly to appear. This larger edition, also the work of M. Omont, is given in the thirty-sixth volume of *Notices et Extraits*. It contains, according to M. Omont's promise, a fuller description of the manuscript and of its miniatures, a line for line transcription of its text in uncials and a transcription in ordinary type showing at the foot of each page the variants of two other purple manuscripts, the Codex Rossanensis (Σ) and the Codex Petropolitanus (N)¹. By M. Omont's kindness I was allowed to see and examine the manuscript in July 1900. My interest in the group to which the manuscript undoubtedly belongs, as well as the desire to bring it to the notice of as many as possible, must be my excuse for trespassing on ground already so well occupied².

¹ Σ has been edited by O. von Gebhardt, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, i 4 ('Die Evangelien des Matthaeus und des Marcus aus dem Codex Purpureus Rossanensis,' Leipzig, 1883); N by H. S. Cronin, *Texts and Studies*, v 4 ('Codex Purpureus, Petropolitanus,' Cambridge, 1899).

² The main part of this paper was written in August 1900, but not published

The history of the manuscript has not been traced back further than Dec. 1899. It was then the property of an old woman, a member of the Greek community at Sinope. It was discovered in her possession and purchased by a French officer, Captain Jean de la Taille, who brought it with him to France. He appears to have come across it by accident during rambles in the Greek quarter at Sinope, where, on his return from a journey in the Caucasus, he had to await the arrival of a steamer. After his arrival in France he sold it to a bookseller at Orleans, from whom it was acquired for the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris by M. Omont. It is 'No. 1286 du fonds du Supplément grec' in that Library. To these facts we may add the very probable conjectures that the manuscript was written in the sixth century—perhaps in the latter years of Justinian—and that it was once the property of a member of that emperor's family or court. Its close resemblance both in text and appearance to N and Z would suggest Constantinople or the west of Asia Minor as its place of origin.

The portion of the manuscript recovered consists of forty-three leaves. They are all from the Gospel of St. Matthew, and they contain rather less than one-third of it. The following table will show the portions recovered and their distribution among the leaves. The leaves are numbered according to their present arrangement.

Matt. vii 7 [δοθη]σεται υμιν — 22 προεφητευ[σαμεν]	Fol. 1, 2
xi 5 πτωχοι — 12 βια[ε]ται]	3
xiii 7 αι ακαθαι — 47 εκ παντος	4-9
xiii 54 δυναμεις — xiv 4 εχειν αυτην	10
xiv 13 [αυ]τω — 20 των κλασ[ματων]	11
xv 11 [εισερχομε]νον — xvi 18 την εκκλησιαν	12-17
xvii 2 ηλιος — 24 υμων	18-20
xviii 4 [ος]τις — 9 βλη[θηται]	21
xviii 16 στοματος — 30 εως ου	22, 23
xix 3 [προσ]ηλθον — 10 οι μαθη[ται]	24
xix 17 θελεις — 25 εξεπλησ[σονται]	25
xx 9 [ελθον]τες — xxi 5 και επι παω[λον]	26-29
xxi 12 [κα]τεστρεψεν — xxii 7 εκει[ρους]	30-35
xxii 15 οπως — 24 λε[γοντες]	36
xxii 32 νεκρων — xxiii 35 Ζαχαριου	37-42
xxiv 3 ημιν — 12 την απο[μωαν]	43

then, as I did not wish to anticipate the appearance of M. Omont's edition. I have availed myself of the copy he has kindly sent me to supplement my own notes in various details. For much else in my paper I am indebted either to his first article or to information which with his invariable kindness he conveyed to me personally. I had an opportunity last April of consulting the manuscript again. The reading in xix 8 is λεγει and in xix 24 εισελθειν. The reading in Dan. iv 11 (vide *infra*, p. 600) is αγιος not ιδιος.

The leaves are of fine vellum stained purple, and the writing—in this point the manuscript is among uncials unique¹—is in gold throughout. The leaves are at present 30 cm. by 25; their size has, however, been reduced by cutting. There is one column only on the page; each column contains sixteen lines; each line on an average eighteen or nineteen letters. There are fifteen lines on 10 *b*, 11 *a*, 15 *a*, 29 *a*, and 30 *b*, the pages on which the miniatures stand. Lines, 32 in number and 7 mm. apart, have been drawn from left to right to guide the scribe; a line is also drawn vertically on the left of each column. The writing is continuous and is of the same style as that of N. It appears to me to be firmer and less worn than that of Σ. The beginning of a section is marked by a letter of larger size standing outside the column and by a mark ∩ in the margin above the figure of the Ammonian section. The *τίτλοι* stand in the upper or lower margin of the page. Both they and the section-numbers are in smaller writing than the text—one-half the size—but the writing of the text itself decreases under pressure of space towards the end of a line. These smaller letters are also less carefully formed. The marks of punctuation are generally a single, rarely a double or a treble point (xiii 58). The syllable-divider is found, as well as a single point over Υ and a double point over Ι. There is also the curious point which is found in N². There are the usual abbreviations for the sacred names and for *πατηρ*, *μητηρ*, *ανθρωπος*, *ουρανος*, *ισραηλ* and *δauιδ*. Besides a short line above a vowel to indicate *υ*, the following compendia are found:—*α* in *αυτω*, *μ* in *μη*, *β* in *πολεμους*, *κ* in *πονηρους*, *κ* in *γεννηματα*, *π* for *πατρος*, and *π* in *προς*, *προσηλυτον*, *προσωπον*, *πρωτη*. *ε* is found in *εμοι*, *σ* in *εποιησεν*, *ο* in *τοις*, *του*, *τους*; *λ* in *πλειονας* and *ν* in *θρονω*. *θ* and *δ* are also found in *αυτω* and *αυτων*³. Cases of itacism are frequent but call for no remark.

For the reconstruction of that portion of the manuscript which contained the first Gospel we have sufficient or nearly sufficient materials. This Gospel appears to have occupied 144 leaves, distributed among thirteen quires. If the manuscript when complete contained the four gospels, it must have extended to 490 or 500 leaves. The accompanying table will show the probable distribution of the leaves. A short horizontal stroke indicates a missing leaf; a figure indicates a leaf of the manuscript which has been preserved at Paris. The Greek numerals on the left indicate the number of the quire.

¹ N² (vide infra, p. 598) is only a fragment of two leaves.

² M. Omont (*N. et E.* xxxvi p. 11) gives an interesting account of the use of this point. It is employed to mark (1) initial *ε*, *η* or *υ*, or (2) the initial vowel of a word of which the first letter only stands at the end of a line and the rest is contained in the line which follows.

³ M. Omont adds *MM* for *μμ*.

α'	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
β'	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
γ'	—	—	—	—	—	1	2	—	—	—	—
δ'	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
ε'	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
ς'	—	—	4	5	6	7	8	9	—	10	—
ζ'	—	—	—	12	13	14	15	16	17	—	18
η'	19	20	—	21	—	22	23	—	24	—	25
θ'	—	26	27	28	29	—	30	31	32	33	34
ι'	—	36	—	37	38	39	40	41	42	—	43
κ'	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
λ'	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
μ'	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
ν'	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Though the reconstruction of the first five quires and the last three is uncertain, there is hardly room for doubt that they contained fifty-four and thirty leaves respectively. The first leaf of quire α' and the last of quire ν' contained in all probability nothing of the text. Folios 1 and 2 are the middle leaves of quire γ'; the position of folio 3 in its quire is doubtful. With regard to the remaining quires (ς'–ι') the reconstruction is placed, I think, beyond doubt by the following facts:—There are traces of the quire-signature (H) on the left-hand lower corner of folio 19. Folios 11, 18, and 35 are the second leaves of pairs of conjugates and cannot therefore belong to quires ζ', η', and ι' respectively, and folios 7 and 8, 14 and 15, 22 and 23, 39 and 40, are both conjugate and consecutive and mark therefore the middle of the quires. The gaps at the beginning and the end of the manuscript would, on the evidence of the Codex Rossanensis, extend to twenty-five or twenty-six and thirty-one or thirty-two leaves respectively. There are at these places 348 and 434 lines respectively in Σ, rather less than fourteen of them going to a leaf of Cod. Sinop. The gap between folios 2 and 3 is 238 lines or seventeen leaves; between folios 3 and 4, 137 lines or ten leaves. There is no difficulty in the lack of uniformity in the size of the quires¹. Nine of the thirteen were probably quires of twelve leaves. The numbers 5–8, 10–17, 35, 38, 52 and 53 stand in ordinary characters in the corners respectively of folios 6, 7, 8, 9, 1, 2, 38, 41, 27, 28, 29, 11, 14, 17, 42 and 20. Of the evidence the numbers offer I can make nothing because of its insufficiency. There is a cursive note on folio 6 b which I cannot decipher.

As the text shows the closest possible resemblance to that of the Codex Rossanensis (Σ) and to that of N where the latter exists, a transcript, or

¹ See H. S. Cronin, l. c. p. xxv, note 1. In line 12 of that note I ought to have made it clear that I was thinking of pages devoted entirely to miniatures. Of these in the middle of a Gospel there is, I believe, no evidence.

even a collation with the Textus Receptus, is for our present purpose unnecessary. It will suffice to record the differences with Σ, indicating the readings of N where that manuscript is still in existence. Σ is extant for all the folios of Cod. Sinop.; N for about nineteen, that is to say for the whole or part of folios 1 (and 2), 3, 4-7 (and 8), 9, 10, 12, 14, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26-29, and 30.

vii 10 αἰτησεῖ N Σ] αἰτηση Sinop.

xi 8 βασιλιων Σ] βασιλειων N Sinop. 10 κατασκευαση Σ] κατασκευασι Sinop. -σει N.

xiii 10 ἐμ παραβολαις Σ] ἐν παραβολαις N Sinop. 12 περισσευθησεται Σ] περισευθησεται N Sinop. 14 ακουσητε N Σ] -αι Sinop. | βλεψετε . . . ειδητε Σ] βλειψητε . . . ιδητε N Sinop. 18 σπειροντος Σ] σπιροντος N Sinop. 20 σπαρεις Σ] σπαρις N Sinop. | ευθεως Σ] ευθυσ N Sinop. 22 συμπνιγει Σ] συνπνιγι N -ει Sinop. 24 ωμοιωθη Σ] ομοιωθη N Sinop. 25 επεσπειρεν Σ] επεσπιρεν N Sinop. 26 εφανη Σ] εφανησαν N Sinop. 27 εσπειρας Σ] εσπιρας N Sinop. | εχει N Σ] εχι Sinop. | τα ζιζανια Σ (τα in marg. add.) ζιζανια N Sinop. 34 χωρις δε Σ] και χωρις Sinop. 35 δια Σ] υπο Sinop. | ερευξομαι Σ] ερευξομε Sinop. 39 συντελεια Σ] συντελια Sinop. 40 συντελεια Σ] συντελια Sinop. 47 βληθειση N Σ] βληθηση Sinop. 55 λεγεται N Σ] λεγετε Sinop.

xiv 1 τετραρχης N Σ] τετραρχης Sinop. 14 οχλον πολυν Σ] πολυν οχλον Sinop. 15 σφιας Σ] σφειας Sinop. 16 χριαν Σ] χρειαν Sinop. 18 φερεται Σ] φερετε Sinop.

xv 14 αφεται Σ] αφετε N Sinop. | εμπεσουνται Σ] ενπεσουνται Sinop. 16 ο δε υιους Σ] ο δε Sinop. | υμς Σ] υμεις Sinop. 19 φονοι μοιχαι πορνιαι Σ] π. μ. φ. Sinop. 30 κυλλους Σ] om. Sinop. 31 τους οχλους Σ] τον οχλον Sinop. | υγεις N Σ] υγειεις Sinop. 32 ηστις N Σ] ησταις Sinop. 35 αναπεισειν Σ] αναπεισιν N Sinop. 39 μαγδαλα Σ] μαγδαλαν Sinop.

xvi 2 πυραζει Σ] πυραζι Sinop. 3 σημμα Σ] σημεια Sinop. 4 μοιχαλεις Σ] μοιχαλις Sinop. | καταλειπων Σ] καταλειπων Sinop. 8 διαλογιζεσθαι Σ] διαλογιζεσθε Sinop. 10 τους επτα εις τους τετρακιςχειλιους Σ] τους επτα αρτους των τετρακιςχειλειων Sinop. 12 προσεchein Σ] προσεχιν Sinop. αλλα Σ] αλλ Sinop.

xvii 4 μωυσι Σ] μωυσει Sinop. 14 ελθοντων Σ] ελθον ελθοντων Sinop. ελθον bis ex errore scriptum. 17 φερεται Σ] φερετε Sinop. 20 μεταβηθι Σ] μεταβηθι Sinop. 21 ησταις Σ] ησται Sinop.

xviii 5 παιδιον τουτου Σ] το παιδιον τουτο Sinop. 8 σκανδαλιζει Σ] σκανδαλιζει Sinop. -ειζι N. 9 σκανδαλιζει N Σ] σκανδαλειζι Sinop. 19 παλιν Σ] παλιν δε N Sinop. | συμφωνησουσιν N Σ] συνφ. Sinop. 21 ειπε Σ] ειπεν N Sinop. | αμαρτηση Σ] αμαρτησει N Sinop.

xix 4 αυτους ο θεος Σ] αυτους Sinop. 8 μωυσης N Σ] μωυσης Sinop. p. m. μωυσης s. m. 9 και γαμηση αλλην μοιχεται Σ (omnia haec in rasura)] ποιει αυτην μοιχευθηναι N Sinop. 19 ως εαυτον Σ] ως σεαυτον

Sinop. 21 *εξεις* Σ] *εξις* Sinop. 23 *εις την βασιλειαν των ουρανων* εισελευσεται Σ] εισελευσεται εις την β. των ουρανων Sinop.

xx 13 *συνεφωνησα σοι* Σ] *συνεφωνησας μοι* N Sinop. 19 *εμπεξαι* N Σ] *εμπαιξαι* Sinop. 21 *θελεις* N Σ] *θελις* Sinop | *καθισωσιν* N Σ] *καθεισωσιν* Sinop. 22 *αιτισθε* Σ] *αιτισθε* N Sinop. 25 *οιδαται* Σ] *οιδατε* N Sinop., 30 *κ̅ε̅ ι̅ω̅ υ̅ε̅ δ̅α̅δ̅* N Σ] *κ̅ε̅ υ̅ε̅ δ̅α̅δ̅* Sinop. 31 *μειζον* Σ] *μίζον* Sinop. -ων N.

xxi 1 *βηθφαγη* Σ (inter θ et φ rasura unius litterae)] *βηθσφαγη* N Sinop. 2 *ευρησεται* Σ] *ευρησετε* N Sinop. | *δεδεμενιν* Σ] *δεδεμενην* N Sinop. 5 *και πωλον* Σ] *και επι πωλον* N Sinop. (*επι erasum* Σ). 13 *γεγραπται οτι* Σ] om. *οτι* N Sinop. | *αυτον εποησατε* Σ] *εποησατε* (-αι N) *αυτον* N Sinop. 21 *εχγητε* Σ] *εχετε* Sinop. | *ποιησετε* Σ] *ποιησητε* Sinop. | *ορει* Σ] *ορι* Sinop. 33 *οικοδεσποτης* Σ] *οιδεσποτης* Sinop. 35 *απεκτιων* Σ] *απεκτειων* Sinop. 38 *προς εαυτους* Σ] *εν εαυτοις* Sinop. | *αποκτεινωμεν* Σ] *αποκτινωμεν* Sinop. 42 *εγεννηθη* Σ] *εγεννηθη* Sinop.

xxii 2 *ομοιωθη* Σ] *ομοιωθη* Sinop. 4 *παλιν* Σ] *παλιν δε* Sinop. 7 *φωνεις* Σ] *φονις* Sinop. 16 *αληθια* Σ] *αληθεια* Sinop. | *μελι* Σ] *μελει* Sinop. 18 *πειραζετε* Σ] *πιραζετε* Sinop. 21 *καισαρι* Σ] *τω κ.* Sinop. 33 *εξεπλησσοιτο* Σ] *εξεπλησσυιτο* Sinop. 37 *ισχυει* Σ] *ισχυι* Sinop. 39 *αγαπησεις* Σ] *αγαπησις* Sinop. 46 *αποκριθηναι αυτω* Σ] *αυτω αποκριθηναι* Sinop. | *ουκετι αυτον* Σ] *αυτον ουκετι* Sinop.

xxiii 2 *εκαθισαν* Σ] *εκαθεισαν* Sinop. 3 *εργαγα* Σ] *εργα* Sinop. 7 *καλισταθαι* Σ] *καλεισθαι* Sinop. 9 *υμων ο πατηρ* Σ] *ο πατηρ υμων* Sinop. 13 *λημψεσθαι* Σ] *λημψεσθε* Sinop. 14 *κλειετε* Σ] *κλιετε* Sinop. 15 *περιαγε* Σ] *περιαγατε* Sinop. | *ινα ποιησετε* Σ] *ποιησαι* Sinop. | *γεννης* Σ] *γενης* Sinop. 19 *μειζων* Σ] *μίζων* Sinop. 23 *αριθον* Σ] *αηθον* Sinop. 28 *φαινεσθαι* Sinop. 31 *μαρτυρειτε* Σ] *μαρτυριτε* Sinop. 34 *σταυρωσητε* Σ] *σταυρωσετε* Sinop.

xxiv 3 *σημειον* Σ] *σημιν* Sinop. | *της συντελειας* Σ] om. *της* Sinop. 6 *μελλησεται* Σ] *μελλησετε* Sinop. 8 *ταυτα* Σ] *ταυτα δε* Sinop. | *αρχαι* Σ] *αρχη* Sinop.

In addition to the instances given above Cod. Sinop. agrees with Σ against N in the following places. Cases of itacism are not registered.

xiii 25 *εχθρος* Σ Sinop.] *εκθρος* N. 27 *τω οικοδεσποτη* Σ Sinop.] *του οικοδεσποτου* N. 28 *ειπον* Σ Sinop.] *ειπαν* N. 51 *ταυτα παντα* Σ Sinop.] *παντα ταυτα* N.

xviii 6 *περι τον τραχηλον* Σ Sinop.] *επι τον τρ.* N. 10 *οι αγγελοι αυτων* Σ Sinop. N*] + *εν ουρανοις* N² | *του̅ εν τοις ουρανοις* Σ Sinop.] om. *τοις* N.

xx 26 *ουτως* Σ Sinop.] *ουτως δε* N.

xxi 11 *ελεγον* Σ Sinop.] + *οτι* N. 15 *τους παιδας κραζοντας* Σ Sinop.] *τους π. τους κρ.* N et Σ p. m. (*τους* 2^o punctis superpositis improbatum).

The mere mention of the fact that the text of Cod. Sinop. bears

a close resemblance to the texts of N and Z implies that for critical purposes the importance of the newly discovered manuscript must be secondary. There are three points, however, in connexion with its readings which deserve comment. First, taking the three manuscripts together, we find that in nineteen leaves there are only eighteen instances of differences of reading which deserve to be considered. These differences, moreover, are slight and can easily be accounted for by the laws which regulate transcriptional error. They fall, moreover, in such a fashion that in no instance are the manuscripts completely at variance with each other. In eight cases Cod. Sinop. agrees with N against Z, in eight with Z against N, while in two cases N and Z are found in combination against it. Of the immediate common ancestry of N and Z there is already hardly room for doubt; the position which Cod. Sinop. occupies with regard to them affords additional confirmation of such a relation. For taken in conjunction with the likeness in text between Z and Cod. Sinop. throughout the forty-three leaves, it can only mean that the latter manuscript is the third of a trio, each member of which was made directly from the same original.

Reserving the differences in reading where Cod. Sinop. and Z alone exist for subsequent discussion, I give here the differences which concern all three manuscripts. I have noted the support which the readings receive from other uncials, and have employed the sign † to indicate that the reading to which it is attached is unique.

- xiii 26 *εφανησαν* N Sinop. †] *εφανη* Z omn. codd.
 27 *τω οικοδεσποτη* Z Sinop. al. fere omn.] *του οικοδεσποτου* N D
ζιζανια N Sinop. N^b B C D al. mult.] *τα ζιζανια* Z (τα in marg.
 additum) N L al.
 51 *ταυτα παντα* Z Sinop. al. fere omn.] *παντα ταυτα* N M
 xviii 6 *περι τον τραχηλον* Z Sinop. N B L Z] *επι τ. τρ.* N D U al. . . . *εις*
τ. τρ. codd. mult.
 10 *οι αγγελοι αυτων* Z Sinop. N* Γ 13] *+ εν ουρανοις* N^a al. fere omn.
εν τοις ουρανοις Z Sinop. D V 33] *εν ουρανοις* N al. fere omn.
 19 *παλιν δε* N Sinop. M Δ cur] *παλιν* Z N Δ L al. . . . *π. αμην* B al.
 mult. . . . *αμην* minusc. pauc.
 xix. 9 *ποιει αυτην μοιχευθηναι* N Sinop. B C* 1] *και γαμηση αλλην μοι-*
χεται Z (omnia haec in rasura) N C^s D I Z al. mult.
 xx 13 *συνεφωνησας μοι* N Sinop. N B C D al. fere omn.] *συνεφωνησα*
σαι Z L Z 33
 26 *ουτως* Z Sinop. N B D Z al. pl.] *ουτως δε* N C al.
 30 *ιησου νιε δαυιδ* N Z N L 69] *νιε δαυιδ* Sinop. B al. fere omn.
 xxi 5 *και επι πωλον* N Sinop. Z* N B L] *πωλον* Z^s C D al. fere omn.
 11 *ελεγον* Z Sinop. al. fere omn.] *+ οτι* N †
 13 *γεγραπται* N Sinop. omn.] *γεγραπται οτι* Z †

- ἐποιήσατε (-αι N) αὐτὸν N Sinop. al.] αὐτοῦ ἐποιήσατε Σ C D al.
 plur. . . αὐτὸν ποιεῖτε Ν B L 124
 15 τοὺς παιδας τοὺς κραζούσας Ν Σ (τοὺς 2^ο punctis superpositis improbatum) Ν B D L] τοὺς π. κρ. Sinop. C al. omn. vid.

If the agreement of any two of these manuscripts may be taken as showing the reading of the original, it would appear—so far as the evidence carries us—that Cod. Sinop. is most faithful to its ancestor. It would also appear that the original approached more nearly to the text of the so-called better uncials than any of the copies. In xiii 27 (*bis*), xiii 51, xviii 6, xix 9, xx 13, xx 26, xxi 5, xxi 11, xxi 13 *a* and xxi 15 the original had a reading supported by B, with a varying amount of other attestation. In xiii 27 (*b*) Ν L are against the original as in xx 30 they are with it. Thrice only is a copy in the position of being nearer than the original to the great uncials, in xiii 26 (where the original has a unique reading, and Σ agrees with all other codices), and in xviii 10 (where N in two places has the support of almost all manuscripts). In xviii 19 and xxi 13 *b* there is much confusion in the text. The reading of Σ in xxi 13 *a* is without other attestation. This elimination of readings by the departure of copies from the text of the better uncials is what we have been led to expect. We do not, however, often have the chance of seeing the scribe at work.

For the differences in reading between Σ and Cod. Sinop., and for their relations to the readings of other manuscripts, the following table will give nearly all that is required. It is only necessary to notice that in xiii 34, xvi 10, xix 4, xix 23, xxi 38, xxii 46 *b* and xxiv 8 (*bis*) Σ, and in xiii 35, xv 30, xviii 5 and xxii 4 Cod. Sinop., has unique readings. Only in xv 30, xviii 5, xxiv 8 *a*, in all which places there is much confusion in the text, is Cod. Sinop. or Σ, as the case may be, without the support of all (or practically all) other manuscripts. The unique readings are, moreover, unimportant and can be ascribed to incuria.

- xiii 34 χωρὶς δε Σ †] καὶ χωρὶς Sinop. codd. omn.
 35 δια Σ codd. omn.] ὑπο Sinop. ‡
 xiv 14 οχλον πολυν Σ D 33 435] π. ο. Sinop. al. pl.
 xv 16 ο δε ιησους Σ C L al. omn. fere] ο δε Sinop. Ν B D Z 33
 19 φοροι μοιχαι πορναι Σ al. omn. fere] π. μ. φ. Sinop. L
 30 κυλλους Σ (much confusion in text)] om. Sinop. ‡
 31 τοὺς οχλους Σ B L al. longe pl.] τον οχλον Sinop. Ν C D 1. 13 al.
 39 μαγδαλα Σ L al. pl.] μαγδαλα Sinop. C M 33 al. . . μαγαδαν Ν B D
 xvi 10 τοὺς επτα εἰς τοὺς τετρακισχειλιους Σ †] τοὺς επτα αργους των τετρα-
 κισχειλειων Sinop. al. omn. . . τοις τ. D
 xviii 5 παιδιον τοιουτο Σ al. pauc.] το π. τουτο Sinop. ‡ . . . εν π. τοιουτο
 B D L Z, π. τ. εν T. R al. pl. . . π. εν τ. Ν G

- xix 4 αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς Σ †] om. ὁ θεὸς Sinop. codd. omn.
 19 ὡς αὐτοὺς Σ 69 124 157 al⁶⁰ fere] ὡς σεαυτὸν Sinop. unc. omn.
 23 εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν εἰσέλυσεται Σ †] εἰσέλυσεται εἰς τὴν
 β. τῶν ου. Sinop. codd. omn.
 xxi 38 πρὸς αὐτοὺς Σ †] ἐν αὐτοῖς Sinop. codd. omn.
 xxii 4 παλιν Σ codd. omn.] παλιν δε Sinop. †
 21 καισαρι Σ Ν Β Λ Χ Ζ al. fere omn.] pr. τῷ Sinop. D al. pauc.
 46 ἀποκριθῆναι αὐτῷ Σ Ν Β Δ Λ Ζ al. mult.] αὐ. ἀπο. Sinop. unc.
 mult. al. pl.
 ουκετι αὐτὸν Σ †] αὐτὸν ουκετι Sinop. codd. omn.
 xxiii 9 υμῶν ὁ πατήρ Σ Ν Β U 33 al.] ὁ πατήρ υμῶν Sinop. D L unc. mult.
 al. pl.
 15 ἵνα ποιήσετε Σ D (-αι)] ποιῆσαι Sinop. al. fere omn.
 xxiv 3 τῆς συντελείας Σ D unc. mult. al. pl.] om. τῆς Sinop. Ν Β C L
 1 33 157 209
 8 πάντα πάντα Σ †] τ. δε π. Sinop. 1. 69 124 al. pauc. . . π. δε τ.
 codd. omn.
 ἀρχαί Σ †] ἀρχῇ Sinop. codd. omn.

Following on the hints already given of the relation of Cod. Sinop. to its exemplar, and of the exemplar to the better uncials, it is interesting to note that Cod. Sinop. has the better attested readings in xiii 34, xiv 14, xv 16, xvi 10, xix 4, xix 19, xix 23, xxi 38, xxii 46 b, xxiii 15, xxiv 3 and xxiv 8 b; Σ in xiii 35, xv 19, xv 31, xxii 4, xxii 21, xxii 46 a, xxiii 9. For a discussion of the general character of the text presented by this group, reference may be made to the editions of Σ and N¹.

The similarity in material of Cod. Sinop. to the fragment known as N^a—both are written in gold on purple vellum—suggests at once the conjecture that N^a is a portion of the former manuscript. I have not seen N^a, nor have I been able to gain access to the facsimile given by Porphyry Uspensky in the *Christiansky Vostok* (St. Petersburg, 1857). The contents and the style of the two leaves offer apparently no difficulty—they contain a portion of the ninth and tenth chapters of the second Gospel—nor does the date to which they are assigned. An insuperable objection, however, to the truth of this conjecture must be found in the amount of text which they contain. Judging from the indications given by Gregory, the amount contained in the leaves if they were untorn would be considerably in excess of the amount contained in two leaves of Cod. Sinop.

Of the miniatures M. Omont writes as follows:—‘Les cinq miniatures qui ornent ce manuscrit, admirablement conservées à l’exception

¹ O. von Gebhardt, l. c. pp. xxxvii–liii; H. S. Cronin, l. c. pp. xlii–lxiv.

d'une seule, sont peintes au bas des pages, dans les marges, et rappellent, par leur disposition, leur composition et le mouvement des personnages, d'une manière générale le style d'ornementation de la Genèse de Vienne et surtout des Évangiles de Rossano¹. The excellent condition in which all but the second has been preserved gives those who are fortunate enough to see the originals a chance of forming an idea of what they were like when they left the artist's hands, but, as M. Omont himself laments, it renders any attempt to reproduce them in facsimile inadequate. They represent five scenes from the Gospel history: the Daughter of Herodias receiving the head of the Baptist (fol. 10 b); the feeding of the 5000 (fol. 11); the feeding of the 4000 (fol. 15); the two blind men at Jericho (fol. 29); and the cursing of the Barren Fig-tree (fol. 30 b). The miniatures measure 170 mm. by 65. They have been reproduced in lithograph and somewhat reduced in size in the *Journal des Savants* as well as in *Notices et Extraits*; and in colour in their proper dimensions in volume vii of the *Mémoires et documents de la Fondation Piot*.

On either side of each miniature is a figure holding a scroll. On the scroll is inscribed a verse from the Old Testament which illustrates the scene depicted in the miniature.

Miniature I, left. Μωυση:—πας ο εκχεων αιμα αντι του αιματος αυτου εκχυθησεται διوتي εν ικορι θυ εποιησα τον ανων (Gen. ix 6).

Right. Δαδ:—τιμος εναντιον κυ ο θανατος των οσιων αυτου (Ps. cxv [cxvi] 6).

Miniature II, left. Μωυση:—και ειπεν μωυσης τοις υιοις ιηλ' οντος ο αρτος ον ειπεν κε δουναι υμιν φαγειν (Ex. xvi 15).

Right. Δαδ:—ο διδους τροφην παση σαρκι οτι εις τον [αιω]να [το ελ]εος Ps. cxxxv [cxxxvi] 25.

Miniature III, left. Δαδ:—οι οφθαλμοι παντων εις σε ελπιζουσιν και συ διδους την τροφην αυτων εν ευκερια (Ps. cxliv [cxlv] 15).

Right. Μωυση:—και φαγη και ευφρ[αν]θηση εναντι[ον] κυ του θυ σου ευλογησης το ονομα κυ του θυ σου (? Deut. xii 18).

Miniature IV, left. Δαδ:—συ επλασας με και εθηκας επι εμε την χειρα σου (Ps. cxxxviii [cxxxix] 5).

Right. Ησαιας:—τοτε αποχθησονται οφθαλμοι τυφλων (Is. xxxv 5).

Miniature V, left. Αμβακον:—διوتي συνη ου καρποφορηση (Hab. iii 17).

Right. Δαυηλ:—και ιδου ειρ και αγιος απ ουρανου και ειπεν εν ισχυει εκκοψεται το δενδρον και εκτιλατε τους κλαδους αυτου (Dan. iv 10, 11).

Verbal accuracy is not to be expected in such quotations. It may be

¹ *J. des S.* p. 6.

as well to note, however, that for the addition of *πας* in the first quotation, and for the omission of *ανθρωπου* after *αιμα* there is no authority. In the third quotation *ον ειπεν κυριος δουσαι* for *εδωκεν* has no attestation, nor has the omission of *αυτου* after *ελεος* in the fourth. The sixth quotation is very free. The last quotation (from Daniel) follows, though not exactly, the text of Theodotion. The correct reading is, I think, *αγιος* and not *ιδιος*, which has no support. The text as given in Professor Swete's manual edition is as follows:—*και ιδου εω και αγιος απ ουρανου κατεβη και εφωνησεν εν ισχυι και ουτως ειπεν εκκοψατε το δεινδρον και εκτιλατε τους κλαδους αυτου.*

H. S. CRONIN.

NOTES ON THE OLD LATIN VERSION OF THE BIBLE.

I. THE RENDERING OF THE NAME LAZARUS.

THE Greek name *Λάζαρος* is familiar to us in two contexts of the New Testament, in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, Luc. xvi 20-25, and in the story of Lazarus of Bethany, Jo. xi 1-xii 17. The name is of course a Graecised form of the Semitic Eleazar: and both the Sinai Syriac and the Peshitta represent it, in St. Luke and St. John alike, by the form *L'azar*. But the fact to which I do not think attention has sufficiently been called before¹—and indeed the printed texts have done their best to obscure it—is that there is good reason for supposing that the earliest Latin rendering in one Gospel was *Eleazar* (*Eleazarus*).

It is true that the MSS which used, before Dr. Hort's more exact classification, to rank as the leading witnesses to the Old Latin agree in the form *Lazarus*. Such is the case with the codex Vercellensis (*a*), the codex Veronensis (*b*) and the codex Bezae (*d*), except (and the exception is both curious and noteworthy) that in one instance, Jo. xi 14, the nominative *Λάζαρος* is represented in *b* and *d* by *Lazar*².

But it is now universally recognised that the north Italian MSS *a* and *b* contain not an original but a secondary (although early) text, known conventionally as the European text. It will soon, it may be hoped, be recognised with equal unanimity that it is hopeless to start the enquiry into the Old Latin version by the examination of a witness so corrupt and so peculiar as the codex Bezae. There remain the 'African' witnesses, Tertullian, St. Cyprian and the codex Palatinus (*e*)—the codex

¹ Since writing the above I learn that Dr. Sanday, in his papers on the Western text, which appeared in the *Guardian*, May 18 and 25, 1892, had called attention to the evidence of *e* and of Prudentius who also uses the form *Eleazar* for the beggar of the parable (Trench *Sacred Latin Poetry* p. 289): Dr. Sanday's words are quoted at length in Dr. Chase's *Syriac Element in Codex Bezae* p. 145.

² Dr. Rendel Harris, *Study of Codex Bezae* p. 183, erroneously says *a* and *d*.