

The explanation of the *b* text seems to me clear; the scribe's eye wandered from the 'Dixit autem maria' of column 1 to the same line in column 3, and he wrote as far as 'uerbum tuum' without discovering his mistake; he then started his next line ('Et respondens') from the first column (the 'angelus' may have recalled him) and copied his exemplar correctly to the end of *v.* 37; on arriving at 38 he found that he had written its opening sentence a few minutes before, and so he simply omitted the words, and added 'et discessit ab illa angelus' after 'omne uerbum' instead of after 'uerbum tuum'.

After I had settled this to my own satisfaction, I turned again to Professor Clark's examination of Luke xxii 17-22 and saw—what I had completely forgotten after first reading it—that he too finds the solution of his problem in an ancestor of *D¹L²S* written *in two columns of 15 lines*. This may of course be mere coincidence, and no doubt even stranger cases of coincidence have occurred; but I may be pardoned if I think that it is something more, and that there is now a great deal to be said for the genuineness of the longer text in each of these passages, and for the hypothesis that the ancestor of *b* was a MS written in double columns of 15 lines.

H. J. WHITE.

ERRATUM.

Vol. xv p. 319 l. 14, for οχον read οxon