

the combination **NBk** is not necessarily right: **3, 17, 22** seem to shew that the 'African'¹ and Alexandrian texts may, on some rare occasions, agree in error against what one may call provisionally the texts of Rome and Antioch. It is difficult to construct a history of text-development which will account satisfactorily for this phenomenon: but there it is.

γ. Of the other Latins *a* and *i* are definitely the best.

δ. Always the most puzzling problem is the text of D. Not counting the two readings, **16, 18**, where the whole Western group, D *k* included, is perhaps wrong, it gives all the readings here recommended except **1, 2, 17, 21, 26**: of these **21** and **26** are singular readings of *k*, and **2** of *k* W, and in **17** *k* is wrong as well as D. No account has, however, been taken of any singular readings of D. And we do not therefore get further than that D, however erratic on occasion, contains a very valuable text.

These results are based on too small a number of instances to be more than provisional. But I think they are important in their implications.

C. H. TURNER.

DID CODEX VERCELLENSIS (*a*) CONTAIN THE LAST TWELVE VERSES OF ST MARK?

SOME doubt must naturally hang over the problem of the earliest Western text of the ending of St Mark's Gospel: for three of our authorities, *b e* and *i*, are defective at that point, and the rest are divided, *k* having the Shorter Ending only, while D and *f* contain enough of the Longer Ending to shew that when complete they contained the whole of it. And since Irenaeus also bears witness to the Longer Ending, it may be concluded that the Church of Gaul at any rate had it in its Gospel text from the first. Thus Gaul and Africa are set against one another: but we have so far no evidence as to Italy. The object of the present note is to examine the evidence of the oldest and best of our Italian, Old Latin MSS, codex *a*, the Vercelli Gospels.

Now the St Gall fragments known as *n* are admitted to stand in very close relation textually to *a*: and they contain verses 9 to 13 of Mark xvi on the last leaf extant (*Old Latin Biblical Texts* ii p. 72). There was therefore some presumption to start with that *a* also once contained the Longer Ending.

¹ I have myself always supposed that the 'African' text came from Rome. I only call it 'African' because St Cyprian's evidence shews that it was the text of Carthage in A. D. 250.

That presumption, however, does not seem to me to square with the deductions that can fairly be drawn from the phenomena presented by codex *a* itself. What are the facts?

The latest edition of *a* is in vol. iii of the Benedictine *Collectanea Biblica Latina* (Rome, 1914).¹ St Mark, in the usual Western order, comes last, beginning on q. xxxiii fol. 7*a* and ending (so far as the original text is concerned) with q. xxxxi fol. 8*b* at the words 'Pilatus autem', Mark xv 15. After this point four leaves have been cut out, and then follows a single leaf containing Mark xvi 7 (from the word 'galileam') to 20 in a later hand and according to the Vulgate text. Quite obviously the original scribe of *a* cannot have used the text of St Jerome, whose Vulgate is of later date than *a*. But the later scribe begins his Vulgate leaf not at xvi 8 but a little higher up at 'galileam' in v. 7. Why? I can see no other explanation than that he began there because a leaf of the original codex had begun there, and that he wanted to replace it, and so began where it began.

But, granted this, it may be answered that this last leaf of the original codex had been lost, as last leaves often are, and that, while the second scribe naturally replaced it with the Vulgate text when he wanted to make his Gospel text complete, there is so far nothing to shew that the original scribe may not have concluded the Gospel with an Old-Latin text of the Longer Ending, such as we have in *n*.

It is here that I want to submit an argument that, so far as I know, has not been brought into the discussion before. Four leaves have been cut out, representing the text from Mark xv 15 onwards. Calculation will shew that if 'galileam' commenced a leaf, it can only have been the fourth leaf: xv 15-xvi 7 represents roughly the material of three leaves of *a*.² Now if the fourth and last leaf of the original codex began with 'galileam', it is not likely that it can have contained the Longer Ending: for xvi 7-20 can hardly have been written within the limits of a single leaf. If, as with St Luke's Gospel in *a*, there was a subscription added at the end, the case is clearer still. Moreover the last page or at least the last column of a Gospel book would probably have been

¹ On p. xiii of the Introduction the editor writes that 'it is not quite clear how the smaller gatherings [in St Matthew] were counted in': but a reference to the extremely useful table on p. xxi suggests to me a very simple explanation, namely, that in both the gatherings vii and x the first two and last two leaves of the quaternion had in some way got inverted, and when the confusion was put right the wrongly placed conjugate leaves were not rearranged as part of the quaternion, but were just cut in two and each put separately in its proper place.

² It is in fact slightly over the average; three leaves of *a* should be about equivalent to 70 or 71 lines of Westcott and Hort's small edition, and there are here 74: but one line of W-H was no doubt omitted, with *D&N*, in Mark xvi 1. On the other hand xvi 8-20 takes up 26 lines of the same edition.

left blank. All goes to shew that the single leaf which once began with 'galileam' and has now disappeared cannot have sufficed for the Longer Ending, unless both very drastic methods of compression were employed in the text itself, and also there was a complete absence of colophon or subscription.

It may of course be asked why four leaves were cut out, when it was only the last which needed cancelling. Perhaps the original intention was to preserve the first three, and bind them up again with the new fourth leaf: perhaps the instructions for removing the last leaf were misunderstood as being instructions for removing the last gathering. But whatever answer we may give to this question, the reasons for supposing that there was a definite intention to replace a last leaf which did not contain the Twelve Verses with a leaf¹ which copied verses 7 b, 8 from the cancelled leaf and verses 9-20 from the Vulgate do not seem to be affected. *a* in fact must have had either the Shorter Ending or none at all.

C. H. TURNER.

THE MICHIGAN FRAGMENT OF THE ACTS.

THESE remarks occurred to me after I had read Prof. H. A. Sanders' paper upon 'A Papyrus fragment of Acts in the Michigan Collection', reprinted from the *Harvard Theological Review*, vol. xx no. 1, Jan. 1927.² I had no other object in writing them except to clarify my own impressions, but several friends have suggested to me that they might be worth printing, and after some hesitation I have complied with their request. My hesitation was due to the fact that I have for a long time been engaged upon a critical edition of the Acts based upon *codex Bezae (D)* and its allies, in which I have ventured to make certain modifications in the traditional *sigla*. The reasons for so doing will be set out in my edition, which I hope before long to offer to the Press. I did not like to desert my *sigla* on this occasion, but I fear that some readers may object to them as unfamiliar. I therefore add a brief explanation of them. I denote the Greek MSS in general as Γ ($\delta =$ minn. 383, 614), and use Z as a general sign for *D* and its various allies, Greek, Latin, and Syriac. I use Λ to denote old Latin MSS, e. g. $\Lambda^d =$ the Latin side

¹ The new leaf is written in much longer lines than the original scribe of *a* had used (17 letters to the line or so instead of about 10), and so the matter of the Longer Ending is easily got into one complete page, and one column of the second page, of a single leaf.

² I have to thank Prof. Sanders for his great kindness in sending me a copy of his article.