

THE TEXT OF THE GOSPELS AND THE KORIDETHI CODEX

KIRSOPP LAKE AND ROBERT P. BLAKE *
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

SINCE the time of Griesbach it has been generally recognized that the main problem of textual criticism in the New Testament is due to the existence of three distinct types of text, the Neutral, Western, and Syrian (or Antiochian). The great contributions of Westcott and Hort were the clear delineation of this problem and the establishment in considerable detail of the Neutral text. The Western text they only indicated in outline, and the Antiochian text was left with little further definition than that already provided by the *Textus Receptus*.

The period after Westcott and Hort was chiefly devoted to the further study of the Western text ¹ and to the identification of a number of intermediate groups which, though they may have been based on the Neutral and Western texts, represent types intermediate between them and the later texts.²

At this stage von Soden took up the question and attacked in the main the problem of these intermediate texts. He did this partly by the discrimination of groups in his Introduction (and this part of his work is extremely valuable, and on the whole as intelligible as highly technical dissertations of this kind can be); partly in a critical edition, which unfortunately was almost a complete failure because it did not provide clear and accurate information.³ It is very hard, indeed impossible,

* The paragraphs below, pages 277-283, in which the origin of the Koridethi MS. is discussed, are written by Dr. Blake.

¹ Especially by Rendel Harris, F. C. Burkitt, Corssen, Blass, and Zahn.

² This began with the publication of the palaeographically Calabrian group of minuscules, 13, 64, 124, 346, by Ferrar (hence called the Ferrar group) and Abbott, 1877, and the investigation of the group by Martin in France, 1885, and Rendel Harris in England, 1893. It was carried further by W. Bousset, "Textkritische Studien," 1894, and by K. Lake, "Codex 1 of the Gospels and its Allies," 1902.

³ See P. W. Schmiedel, 'Der Ertrag der Arbeit Hermann v. Soden's am Text des Neuen Testaments' in *Theologische Blätter*, 1922, No. 10.

to use it satisfactorily, but it is a great error to think that its author left the problem of the text unchanged.

Von Soden's most certain contribution to our knowledge of the text was concerned with the *K*-text,⁴ but more important than this, especially for the purpose of the present article, was his treatment of the intermediate types connected with the Western text. He thought that what Westcott and Hort called the Western text was a recension made in Jerusalem, and he therefore called it I. The authorities for this text were D latt syr^{sin} syr^{cur} and some groups of minuscules. D latt syr^{sin} syr^{cur} he held to have been contaminated from Tatian, and the groups of minuscules from the *K*-text.

The general consensus of scholars has been against the first half of this part of the theory. Von Soden was certainly wrong in the extent to which he explained the variants of D latt syr^{sin} syr^{cur} by the influence of Tatian, and one unfortunate result of the recognition that he was wrong has been to ob-

⁴ Formerly, though we talked about this text, we knew very little about it. In practice the Antiochian text meant the editions of Stephanus and Elzevir. It was known that in many cases these editions did not really represent the Greek mediaeval text, but there was no clearness on the subject; nor could any clearness ever have been attained without a methodical investigation of almost all existing MSS. This investigation von Soden made. The result is that we now know that the *K*-text is found in at least three forms, K¹, K², K³, and it would not be difficult to take a few MSS., typical of these three forms, and from them produce a usable edition of the *K*-text. Complete accuracy would be unattainable without immense labor, but an edition that would be of enormous help to collators and investigators of the text could be made with relative ease. This addition to our knowledge serves to define the problem as to the *K*-text, with which von Soden left us. What is the date of the *K*-text? I believe that there is no proof of a pure *K*-text before the sixth century. But there are fifth century MSS., such as A (which in the gospels is mainly of the *K*-type), which contain *K*-readings. Are *K*-readings the proof that a *K*-text existed from which they were taken or are they the material from which the *K*-text was made? That is the real problem, although unfortunately von Soden did not see it and assumed that *K*-readings imply a *K*-text, equal, as he thought, in age to the H-text and the I-text. How is it possible to solve this riddle? Not from general probabilities; but by investigating the text of the early Greek fathers, which may hold the key. At present we have no good edition of the texts of Athanasius, the Cappadocians, Chrysostom, or Cyril. Von Soden assumed that we know much more about these texts than we do. Possibly it may not be worth while to do so much in order to learn so little, but patristic evidence is the key to the problem of the *K*-text, and a key which can be gained by simple methods involving long, but not difficult, work. A small percentage of the energy wasted on doctors' dissertations which begin nowhere and return to their starting-point would soon accomplish real results in this field.

secure the important contribution to knowledge made by his treatment of the groups of minuscules. Moreover it is very unfortunate that he misapprehended the position of the so-called Koridethi MS. (von Soden ε 050; Gregory Θ, formerly 1360), which, though palaeographically an uncial, belongs textually to this class.⁵

In his first volume he announced the discovery of this MS., calling it a twin sister of cod. 700, and declaring that it completely solved the riddle of Codex Bezae. Neither statement is quite correct; it is a first cousin (hardly a twin sister) of cod. 700, and it helps to define, rather than to solve, the problem of D. This was tacitly recognized in von Soden's later volumes, where the Koridethi MS. is more correctly classed as a codex of the I^a-group. This group consists mainly of D 28 565 700 and Θ.

This classification is, I think, wrong in two points. (1) D should not be included in the group. D has a text which in the main agrees with the Old Latin, but it has been influenced by, and sometimes conflated with, the Neutral text.⁶ Leaving out of consideration the intrusive Antiochian element in the individual members of the group, the 'family-text' of Θ 28 565 700 is not much closer to D than it is to B. (2) Fam¹ (von Soden's Iⁿ) and the Ferrar manuscripts (von Soden's I') ought to be included in the group.⁷

Certainly these MSS. are all closely related, and — omitting D — von Soden's I^a-text seems identical with the "local text" which I postulated in the introduction to "Codex 1 and its Allies." I there argued that Fam¹, the Ferrar group, 28, 565, and 700 constitute a number of hybrids between an early local text and K.⁸ The Koridethi MS. proves to be another

⁵ This codex is described by Gregory, with bibliographical references, in *Textkritik*, I, 1900, p. 257, his information having been derived from Oskar von Gebhardt.

⁶ Or is it with an early K-text? I think not, but the character of the non-western element in D has never been fully studied. That D is conflate cannot be doubted by any one who has analyzed it.

⁷ I omit some MSS. which on von Soden's showing ought to be included, because their text is not published and I cannot reconstruct it from his apparatus.

⁸ I also included cod. 22, but its affinity is much less clear, at least in Mark i, and I have therefore neglected it in this article. Von Soden reckons it among the 1ⁿ MSS.; this may be right in Matthew, but the question requires further investigation.

READINGS OF THE FAMILY			FAM ¹					FAM ¹³		28		565		700		S		THIRD READING	
			Θ	FAM ¹	FAM ¹³	28	565	700	S										
N	1	Χριστου	f	ς	ς	f	ς	ς	+υου του θεου									BD	
NB	2	καθως	f	f	ς	ς	f	f	ως									D	
D	ησαια		f	f	ς	ς	ς	f	τω ησαια									NB	
BD	αποστειλ(λ)ω		f	ς	ς	f	f	ς	εγω αποστειλω									ς	
NBD	σου		f	ς	ς	ς	ς	f	+εμπροσθεν σου										
D	4 εν τη ερημω βαπτιζων		f	ς	ς	f	ς	f	βαπτιζων εν τη ερημω										ο βαπτιζων εν τη ερημω NB
	5 ιουδαια		f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	η ιουδαια									NBD	
	οιμ παντες		f	ς	?	(3rd)	ς	ς	εβαπτιζοντο παντες									NBD	παντες και εβαπτιζοντο NBD
D	ιορδανη		f	ς	ς	ς	f	f	ιορδανη ποταμω									NB	
(NB)	6 ο ιωαννης		f	f	ς	ς	f	f	ιωαννης									D	
	7 οτι ερχεται		ς	ς	ς	ς	f	ς	οτι οτι									NBD	
D	λυσαι		f	ς	ς	f	f	ς	κω/ας λυσαι									NB	
NB	8 εγω		f	ς	(ς)	ς	f	ς	εγω μεν									D	
(D)	υμας βαπτιζω		ς	ς	ς	ς	f	ς	εβαπτισα υμας									NB	
(D)	υμας βαπτισει		f	ς	ς	ς	f	ς	βαπτισει υμας									NB	
	9 και		f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	και εγενετο									NBD	
	ο ιησους		f	ς	f	f	f	ς	ιησους									NB	
D	ναζαρεθ		f	f	f	ς	ς	ς	ναζαρεθ									NB	
NBD	εις τον ιορδανην υπο ιωαννου		f	ς	f	ς	f	f	υπο ιωαννου εις τον ιορδανην										
NBD	10 εκ		f	ς	f	f	f	ς	απο										
NBD	ως		f	ς	ς	ς	ς	f	ωσει									ς	
BD	εις αυτον		ς	ς	f	ς	ς	ς	επ αυτον									NBD	
	11 ιδου		ς	ς	ς	f	f	ς	οτι ιδου									NBD	
	εκ των ουρανων ηκουσθη		f	ς	ς	f	f	ς	εγενετο εκ των ουρανων									NBD	
NBD	εν σου		f	f	f	f	f	f	εν ω									NB	
D	12 ευθως		f	f	ς	ς	ς	f	ευθως										
KΠ sy ^{ain}	13 εκει		(3rd)	f	(3rd?)	f	f	f	εκει εν τη ερημω									NBD	εν τη ερημω ¹⁰ NBD
	επι ante ημερας		ς	f	f	f	f	f	οτι επι									NBD	
LM 33 boh	και τεσσαρακοντα νυκτας		ς	ς	f	ς	ς	ς	οτι τεσσαρακοντα νυκτας									NBD	
	διαβολου		f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	στανα									NBD	

ΑΠ	14 ιησους	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ο ιησους ¹¹	NBD
NBL	του θεου	f	f	ς	f	f	της βασιλειας του θεου	D
NBDL	15 λεγων ¹²	ς	f	ς	ς	ς	λεγων οτι	NBD
(NB)	16 παραγων	ς	ς	f	ς	f	περπατων	ΑΠΠ
D	του σιμωνος	ς	ς	f	ς	f	αυτου	D
K	αμφιβαλλοντας τα δικτυα	f	(ς)	f	f	(ς)	βαλλοντας αμφιβληστρον	αμφιβαλλοντας NB
NL	εις την θαλασσαν	ς	ς	f	f	ς	εν τη θαλασση	NBD
NL	17 αλιεις	ς	f	f	f	ς	γενεσθαι αλιεις	NBD
BDL	18 ευθους	f	ς	ς	f	ς	ευθους	BD
	λινα	ς	ς	ς	ς	f	δικτυα	NBD
	19 προβας	f	f	ς	f	ς	προβας εκειθεν	ΠΠ
	20 και αφεντες ¹³	(3rd)	ς	(3rd)	ς	ς	και ευθους εκαλεσεν αυτους	NBD
	μισθων	ς	f	ς	ς	ς	και αφεντες	και ευθους εκαλεσεν αυτους και ευθους αφεντες
	ηλθον	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	μισθων	NBD
21	εισπορευεται	ς	f	ς	ς	ς	απηλθον	NB
NBD	καφarnaουμ	f	ς	f	ς	f	εισπορευονται	NB
NL	ευθους	ς	f	ς	f	f	καπερναουμ	AC
NL	σαββασιν	ς	ς	f	f	ς	ευθους	BD
D	εδιδασκεν αυτους	f	ς	f	f	ς	σαββασιν εισελθων	BD
NBL	23 ευθους ην	ς	f	ς	ς	f	εδιδασκε	NB
NBD	24 τι	f	ς	ς	f	ς	ην	D
D	25 απο του ανθρωπου	f	ς	ς	f	ς	εα, τι	A
							εξ αυτου	NB

⁹ 565 reads *και παντες εβαπτιζοντο*.

¹⁰ *εν τη ερημω* NBDL 93 boh latt. The evidence of fam¹³ is divided. 69 124 read *εκει*, 13 346 543 788 826 828 read *εν τη ερημω*. *εκει sine addit.* is found elsewhere only in syr^{sin} arm and a few late Greek MSS. of which KΠ are the prominent ones.

¹¹ The omission of *ο* is the K¹ reading, against all other groups.

¹² A unique reading, probably an accident.

¹³ The text is confused: Θ reads *και εκαλεσεν αυτους και ευθους αφεντες*, 565 *και αφεντες*, fam¹³ reads *και ευθους εκαλεσεν αυτους και ευθους αφεντες*. The reading of 565 may be either that of the family or due to homoeoteleuton; in the latter case it seems based on the text of fam¹³. The reading of Θ is an accident, or an attempt to correct to the text of ς by taking out the wrong *ευθους*.

READINGS OF THE FAMILY							Θ	FAM ¹	FAM ¹³	28	565	700	5	THIRD READING	
D	το πνευμα το ακαθαρτον							f	ς	ς	ς	f ¹⁴	om το πνευμα το ακαθαρτον	NB	
D	26 απ							f	ς	ς	ς	ς	εξ	NB	
D	27 προς εαυτους							f	f	f	f	f	προς αυτους	NB	
AC 33	λεγοντες							f	ς	f	ς	ς	λεγοντας	NBD	
(NB)	διδαχη καινη αυτη							f	f	ς	ς	(f)	τις η διδαχη η καινη αυτη	(D has variant)	
NB (D)	κατ εξουσιαν							ς	f	ς	ς	οτι κατ εξουσιαν			
NBD	τους πνευμασι							f	ς	ς	ς	ς	και τοις πνευμασι		NBD
	28 και εξηλθε							f	ς	ς	ς	ς	εξηλθε δε	NBD	
	ακοη αυτη							f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ακοη αυτου		NBD
N 33 boh	εις ολην							f	f	(ς) ¹⁵	f	f	ευθυσ εις ολην		D
NBL	29 ευθυσ							ς	f	f	f	ς	ς	ευθews	D om
(D)	{εξελθων εκ της συναγωγης							f ¹⁶	ς	ς	ς	ς	εκ της συναγωγης εξελθοντες	N	
BD	{εξελθων							f	f	f	ς	f	εξελθοντες	N	
BD	{ηλθεν							f	f	f	ς	f	ηλθον	N	
LA	30 του σιμωνος							ς	f	f	ς	f	σιμωνος	NB	(D has variant)
NBD	ευθυσ							ς	ς	f	f	ς	ευθews	NBD	
NB	αυτω							f	ς	ς	ς	ς	αυτω περι αυτης	NBD	
BD	31 πυρετος							f	f	ς	f	f	πυρετος ευθews	(D)	
	32 εδυσεν							ς	ς	ς	f	ς	εδυ	N	
	εφερον παντες							ς	ς	f	f	ς	εφερον	NBD	
	προς αυτον							ς	ς	ς	f	ς	προς αυτον παντας	NBD	
NBD	33 και ην							f	ς	(ς)	ς	ς	ην post συνηγμενη	A	
	ολη η πολις							f ¹⁷	ς	ς	ς	ς	η πολις ολη	NBD	
	συνηγμενη							ς	ς	f	ς	f	επισυνηγμενη	NBD	
	τας θυρας							ς	ς	(f)	ς	f	την θυραν	NB	
(D)	34 αυτα λαλειν							f ¹⁸	ς	ς	ς	ς	λαλειν τα δαιμονια	NB	
N ^o BL boh	αυτων χριστων ειναι							f	f	f	f	f	αυτων	ND	
NBD	35 ενυχα							f	f	ς	f	ς	ενυχον	ND	
B boh	εξηλθε ¹⁹							ς	ς	ς	ς	εξηλθε και απηλθεν	απηλθε lat		

NB	36 κατεδωξεν	f	ς	ς	f	f	f	f	κατεδωξεν	D	
DKΠ	ο τε σιμων	f	f	f	f	f	f	f	οι τε		σιμων NBL 33
ΑΠ	37 σε ζητουσι	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ζητουσι σε	NBD	
Δ	38 λεγει	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	και λεγει	NBD	
NBL boh	εληλυθα	(3rd)	ς	ς	f	f	f	f	εξεληλυθα	D	εξηλθον NBCL 33
NBD	39 ηλθεν	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ην		
	εις τας συναγωγας	f	f	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	εν ταις συναγωγαις	NBD	
	δαιμονια	f ²⁰	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	τα δαιμονια		
NL	40 και γονυπετων	f	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	και γονυπετων αυτων		οι και γονυπετων BD
D	εαν	(3rd)	ς	ς	f	ς	ς	ς	οτι εαν	NA	κυριε εαν CL boh (B) ²¹
	θελησθης	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	θελης	NBD	
N	41 λεγων	ς	ς	ς	f	ς	ς	ς	και λεγει	NBD	
NBD	οι αυτη	ς	f	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	αυτη	ABD	
NBL	42 και	ς	ς	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	και ειποντος αυτου	D	
	43 ευθις	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ειθως	NBD	
	44 επων	ς	ς	ς	(f) ²²	f	f	f	και λεγει	NBD	
N	ο	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	α	NBD	
NCL	45 δυνασθαι αυτον	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	f	αυτον δυνασθαι	B	(D om αυτον)
	εις πολλιν φανερωσ	ς	ς	ς	f	f	f	ς	φανερως εις πολλιν	B	φανερως εισελθεν εις πολλιν D
NB	επ ερημοις	ς	ς	ς	f	f	f	ς	εν ερημοις	D	
NBD	παντοθεν	f	f	ς	ς	ς	ς	ς	πανταχοθεν		

¹⁴ So von Soden, but not Belsheim or Hoskier.

¹⁵ Fam¹³ has *ευθις πανταχου εις ολην*. This seems to be a conflation of *ευθις* (found by itself in AD etc ς) and *πανταχου* (found by itself in no Greek MS, but in b e q boh). But the apparent conflation is found also in BCL.

¹⁶ The reading of Θ may be accidental; but cf. the reading of D *εξελθων εκ της συναγωγης*, omitting *ευθις*.

¹⁷ May be accidental, but it is the reading of NBD.

¹⁸ Only in D (which has a widely variant text) and in the Latin; perhaps a reminiscence of Lk. 4, 41.

¹⁹ So B, but according to von Soden no other MS.

²⁰ Probably accidental; no other support.

²¹ Note that B has the conflation *κυριε οτι εαν*. Also von Soden's statements seem inconsistent with Hoskier and the text of Θ, nor is the text of 565 quite certain.

²² *και ειπε* 28.

and better hybrid of the same type. It would be well worth while for some young scholar to edit a collation of the text of all this group, indicating its affinities with **NB**, **D**, the Old Latin, and the Old Syriac. It would take some months of rather tedious work, but at the end he and we would really know more about the text of the gospels than at present. Meanwhile a tabular collation of the first chapter of Mark will serve to illustrate the facts.²³

In this table the readings on the left are those in which one or more members of the family, viz. Θ fam¹ fam¹³ 28 565 700, depart from the Textus Receptus; the readings on the right are those of the Textus Receptus; the readings of individual MSS. are shown by the symbols 'f' (for 'family') and ς (for the Textus Receptus); on the extreme left and right is shown the evidence of **NBD**, according as they agree with the family or with the Textus Receptus, and in a few cases the pertinent evidence of other MSS. has been added. In the few cases in which a third reading exists, it is given in the right-hand margin, and reference to it in the other columns is indicated by '(3rd).'

The table shows that in Mark i there are 102 variants (a little more than two to each verse) found in one or more of Θ fam¹ fam¹³ 28 565 and 700. A certain deduction may be made from these figures because Θ has 13 singular readings, accredited here to the family, of which the majority are probably only accidents; 565 has only 3 singular readings; fam¹, 4; fam¹³, 1; 28, 2; and 700, 3. The deduction of these yields the figures in the second column below. Even so the result is of course only approximate. The distribution is as follows:

<i>actual figures</i>				<i>corrected figures</i>			
Θ	60 variants from T. R.			47 variants from T. R.			
fam ¹	32	"	"	28	"	"	"
fam ¹³	29	"	"	28	"	"	"
28	35	"	"	33	"	"	"
565	57	"	"	54	"	"	"
700	38	"	"	35	"	"	"

²³ I have been as careful as time would allow, but I make no claim to complete accuracy in this specimen.

The analysis of subsingular readings, that is readings found only in two members of the group, gives some curious results. Θ 700 agree against the others 5 times; Θ 565, 4 times; Θ fam¹³, once fully and twice partially; Θ 28 agree once; and Θ fam¹ not at all. Similarly the combination 565 fam¹ is not found; but 565 fam¹³ is found 5 times, and 565 28, 3 times.

More interesting is naturally the information given by the evidence of **NBD**. **D** supports the family 30 times, **B** 35 times. In cases where **B** and **D** differ, **D** supports the family 16 times against **B**, and **B** supports it 15 times against **D**. Moreover in 9 variants the family is supported against both **B** and **D** by some or all of the combination **NLA** 33 579, a group which will be recognized as preserving **WH**'s "Alexandrian" text.

These figures show at once that the family is not more closely allied to **D** than it is to **B**; von Soden's grouping must be revised in that respect.

With regard to the Koridethi MS. itself the table is sufficient to show that Θ clearly belongs to the same group as fam¹ fam¹³ 28 565 700, and that it contains a noticeably smaller admixture of *K*-readings than any of the other MSS. The problem therefore of its origin is bound up with the problem of the nature of the original text, uninfluenced by *K*, which is distributed among all the members of the group. Once more, before that problem can be properly dealt with, it is necessary to have a complete statement of the facts, similar to the specimen given above, in the form of a collation with *K* and the pertinent evidence of **NBD** latt syr^{sin} syr^{cur} covering all the gospels.

Meanwhile some inkling of what the complete investigation would reveal can be had by using the tables of variants provided in "Codex 1 and its Allies." These tables are there numbered alphabetically A to G, and a comparison with them of the text of Θ gives interesting results.

List A gives the readings in which fam¹ agrees with all other authorities against *K*. In Mark i-iv there are 28 such readings. In 26 of them Θ agrees with fam¹, in one other it has a peculiar reading, in the remaining one it agrees with *K*. This is the same percentage of agreement as in 565, and higher than is found in any other MSS. of the group, for which the figures are:

Non-antiochian readings in fam ¹³	14
" " " " 28	13
" " " " 565	26
" " " " 700	16

In each case a fuller collation would show many more non-antiochian readings in all these MSS.; but the comparison is illusory only in so far as it exaggerates the value of fam¹, and there is little doubt that Θ and 565 have a higher percentage of non-antiochian readings than any other member of the group; in other words they are relatively freer from the influence of *K*.

List E gives the readings in fam¹ found in B but not in *K*, nor in the oldest Western authorities. There are in Mark i-x 20 such readings and for these the figures are as follows:

Readings common to <i>SB</i> fam ¹ in Θ	11
" " " " " fam ¹³	6
" " " " " 28	8
" " " " " 565	9
" " " " " 700	6

Again Θ shows both its membership in the group and its high rank.

List D gives Western readings found both in the Old Latin and Old Syriac. Mark i-x shows 31 such readings in fam¹ and the figures are:

Western readings in fam ¹ in Θ	19
" " " " " fam ¹³	8
" " " " " 28	19
" " " " " 565	22
" " " " " 700	15

Either Θ is not quite so good as 565 (although the difference is small) or else there is a special Western strain in the ancestry of 565.

Lists B and C give readings found only in the Old Latin and Old Syriac respectively. The figures here throw rather a different light on Θ. In fam¹ there are 16 Syriac-Western readings in Mark i-x. They are found in the other MSS. as follows:

²⁴ And of these one (γεργεσηνων) in Mark vi is not an uncommon reading, and, being found in L Δ boh, may be late Neutral (or "Alexandrian," in the sense of WH).

Syriac-Western readings in fam ¹ in Θ						5
"	"	"	"	"	" fam ¹³	5
"	"	"	"	"	" 28	8
"	"	"	"	"	" 565	6
"	"	"	"	"	" 700	5

In fam¹ there are 29 Latin-Western readings in Mark i-x, and the figures are:

Latin-Western readings in fam ¹ in Θ						15
"	"	"	"	"	" fam ¹³	4
"	"	"	"	"	" 28	12
"	"	"	"	"	" 565	17
"	"	"	"	"	" 700	11

It is certainly curious that Θ should be at the bottom of the list of Old Syriac readings, but back again at the top (except, as usual, for 565) of the list of Old Latin readings. But the figures are so small that it is possible that this is merely an accident. In general it cannot be doubted, in view of the figures, that these manuscripts all represent copies of a common original which has been corrected in different ways in different places to accord with the later *K* text.

To what locality may we suppose that this recension belonged? The only evidence which can be found is derived from considering the localities to which the smaller sub-groups or the individual manuscripts belong, and from the light shed by occasional notes as to the place where their archetype was kept.

1. *The Koridethi MS.* — The palaeographical investigation of the Koridethi Gospels can only be carried out with approximate accuracy on the basis of the Russian edition of the Imperial Moscow Archaeological Society.²⁵ In this publication a facsimile of the page containing the *incipit* of the Gospel of Mark²⁶ is given in natural size, while the folia containing the remainder of the work are shown in reduced magnitude.²⁷

²⁵ Материалы по Археологии Кавказа, издаваемые Графиней Уваровой, Выпускъ X, Москва, 1907; see G. Beermann and C. R. Gregory, *Die Koridethi Evangelien*, Leipzig, 1913, pp. 523-524.

²⁶ Plate I.

²⁷ Plates II-L.

One cannot obtain a proper conception of the general appearance of the codex from the facsimiles in natural size of small sections of various leaves contained in Gregory and Beermann's edition.²⁸ The photostatic prints of the whole MS. brought back from Tiflis by Mrs. R. P. Blake, now in the J. Pierpont Morgan Collection of the Harvard College Library, are likewise reduced in the ratio of 1:1.6. In a palaeographical analysis the individual peculiarities of the letters may be studied by regarding them in enlarged or in reduced size, but a general impression (which is after all the main point) can only be obtained from photographs which reproduce the pages of the manuscript as they meet the eye of the observer.

The general impression received from an inspection of the original of Codex Θ is that of heaviness and coarseness, both in script and in material.²⁹ Unmistakable likewise is the uncertainty displayed by the scribe in the delineation and formation of the individual letters. Another unquestionable point is the strong external similarity of the script to that of Coptic codices.

In Gregory's painstaking study of the script³⁰ we have a most elaborate palaeographical investigation, which, though thorough in the highest degree, is unilluminating. All his remarks and observations, whether slight or important, are thrown together with so little system that it is impossible, as they stand, to see their relative significance. We will therefore extract those points which seem significant. In the first place, the scribe did not *write*, but *drew*, his letters.³¹ This observation explains the difficulty he experienced in keeping to the proper size for the different characters,³² the tendency he evinces to run beyond or above the incised line,³³ and the clumsy execution of some of the letters.³⁴ A number of the errors met with

²⁸ Plates II-XI.

²⁹ Dr. Blake examined the MS. repeatedly during his stay in Tiflis (July 1918-May 1920).

³⁰ Beermann and Gregory, pp. 599 f.

³¹ Gregory, though noting this point (cf. Beermann and Gregory, pp. 600, 607), does not seem to grasp its importance.

³² Facsimile, plate I, col. 2, l. 13.

³³ *Ibid.*, *passim*.

³⁴ Especially M.

in the MS. are of a type which seems to point to the fact that the scribe was not accustomed from childhood to catch Greek words with his eye and to hold them.³⁵ We see, for instance, such errors as Matt. 5, 11 *ηυμων*; Matt. 9, 22 *σεσωκαιεν*; Matt. 16, 26 *καιερδηση*. [But these mistakes may also be due to inability to understand corrections. They seem to be conflateions of corrected itacisms. Compare the somewhat similar phenomena in Cod. 118, though here the scribe understood the question, and left blank spaces instead of conflating alternatives (see "Codex 1 and its Allies," pp. xxxvii-xxxix).]

The individual weight of the facts mentioned above, if taken separately, is not very great. Their combined moment is considerable. It is difficult to explain them all without the hypothesis of an intelligent foreigner, who knew some but not much Greek — just enough to read the archetype of our codex and to copy it more or less slavishly.³⁶

Further evidence in support of this hypothesis can be deduced from an examination of the types of the letters in the MS. With this in view an alphabetic table is subjoined of the various types of letters in the MS., with which in parallel columns are compared similar collections taken from Cod. Borg. copt. 109 (s. vi)³⁷ and from Cod. Vat. gr. 1666 (a. 800).³⁸ A glance at these alphabets will show that the alphabet employed by the scribe of Θ is an *eclectic* one. Those letters which Gregory most wonders at, Α Κ Χ,³⁹ appear in Vat. 1666, while most of the other letters approximate the forms of those of the "Coptic" text. The general ductus of the script is that of the Coptic, with broad strokes and rounded curves and the broader letters inscribable in squares, as opposed to the sharp angles and dashed-in lines of varying length in the Italian MS.

³⁵ A convenient list of classified errata is contained in von Soden's remarks, pp. VIII-X of Russian edition.

³⁶ Beermann and Gregory had inklings of this, but do not carry out their train of reasoning to the end (p. 607).

³⁷ P. Franchi de' Cavalieri and H. Lietzmann, *Specimina Codicum Vaticanorum Graecorum*, Bonn, 1910, plate 3.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, plate 6.

³⁹ Beermann and Gregory, pp. 614-615, 625.

We thus see before us an eclectic hand, uncertain in its chirographic manner, and presumably to a certain extent dependent on its archetype.⁴⁰ This again would tend to confirm the hypothesis that the scribe's Greek is not his mother tongue.

The question of the date of the MS., an answer to which must come from the various adscriptions rather than from palaeographical considerations, has been carefully studied by Beermann.⁴¹ It is highly unlikely that his earlier alternative date (the reign of the emperor Heraclius) for the Greek adscription on f. 249b can be accepted.⁴² Not only is it hard to believe that the MS. dates from a period as early as the end of the sixth century,⁴³ but furthermore it by no means follows that the MS. was written at Maiferrukat. We merely learn that it happened to be in that district in the ninth century.⁴⁴ Moreover Marr's study of the Georgian adscriptions shows that the majority of them belong to the thirteenth and not to the tenth century.⁴⁵

The extreme importance of the picaresque inscription on the inner side of the back cover has not been sufficiently appreciated.⁴⁶ We have here a *mélange* of Georgian and Coptic letters, and one Coptic word, viz. *hēppe* (ἰδοῦ).⁴⁷ Oscar von Lemm is right in holding that Armenian letters are not present. Now the very appearance of Coptic letters is an important and significant fact. It points to a connection with Egypt or with those districts immediately contiguous with it — Sinai and Palestine.⁴⁸ The inscription, to be sure, is on the inner side of the cover (on the parchment or on the wood?), but it seems to go back to a high antiquity, and very possibly may have been copied from the original codex.

⁴⁰ I doubt if this be true to the extent that Gregory thinks (Beermann and Gregory, p. 607).

⁴¹ Beermann and Gregory, pp. 569–581.

⁴² Ibid., p. 577.

⁴³ Among other things, the coarseness of the material speaks against this.

⁴⁴ Beerman practically admits this (p. 580).

⁴⁵ Н. Я. Марр, Грузинскія Приписки Коридетскаго Евангелія. ИАН, 1911, стр. 211–240.

⁴⁶ Beermann and Gregory, pp. 583–584.

⁴⁷ See O. von Lemm, ИАН 1911, стр. 458–459.

⁴⁸ On the stay-at-homeness of Coptic, cf. P. Peeters, Traductions et traducteurs dans l'hagiographie orientale, Acta Bollandiana 40, 1922, p. 246.

Θ	Borg. copt. 109	Vat. gr. 1666	Θ	Borg. copt. 109	Vat. gr. 1666
Α	Α	Α	Ν	Ν	Ν
Β	Β	Β	Ξ	Ξ	Ξ
Γ	Γ	Γ	Ο	Ο	Ο
Δ	Δ	Δ	Π	Π	Π
Ε	Ε	Ε	Ρ	Ρ	Ρ
Ζ	Ζ	Ζ	Σ	Σ	Σ
Η	Η	Η	Τ	Τ	Τ
Θ	Θ	Θ	Υ	Υ	Υ
Ι	Ι	Ι	Φ	Φ	Φ
Κ	Κ	Κ	Χ	Χ	Χ
Λ	Λ	Λ	Ψ	Ψ	Ψ
Μ	Μ	Μ	Ω	Ω	Ω

Connections between Georgians and Egyptians had been established at an early date; and the late Oscar von Lemm, the Coptic scholar, shed much light on this matter in two very brilliant articles some years since.⁴⁹ In addition we find Georgian settlements in Palestine from a very early period, and also on Mt. Sinai. These have been investigated in the book of Professor A. A. Tsagareli, "Monuments of Georgian Antiquities in the Holy Land and on Sinai."⁵⁰ Jerusalem, the laura of St. Sabba, and the Black Mountain near Antioch formed the chief centres of Georgian monastic settlement in Palestine during the middle ages.⁵¹ The earliest definite evidence for the existence of a Georgian colony in the Holy Land goes back to the time of Justinian, when we find a monastery of the Lazoi in Jerusalem.⁵² The existence of Georgian (as well as Armenian) inmates in the monastery of St. Sabba is attested by the typikon of St. Sabba (ed. Dimitrievski, pp. 222-223).⁵³ On the other hand, the importance of Palestinian influence in Georgia is sufficiently attested by numerous sources. The prevailing liturgy in that country until the eleventh century was that of St. James of Jerusalem.⁵⁴ To this day the churches of Swanetia exhibit peculiarities which undoubtedly took their rise from Palestinian models.⁵⁵ St. Gregory of Khandzt'a, the Georgian Apostle of Tao-Klardjet'ia,⁵⁶ sent a special envoy to St. Sabba to get the true text of the typikon of St. Sabba. Hilarion the Georgian went thither on his first pilgrimage.⁵⁷

⁴⁹ O. von Lemm, *Zur Bekehrung der Iberer zum Christentum*, *Kleine koptische Studien* LX (ИАН 10 [1899], 403 ff.): *Iberica* (Записки Имп. Акад. Наукъ, фил. ист. кл. Сер. viii, Томъ 7, No. 6, 1906).

⁵⁰ А. А. Цагарели, *Памятники грузинской старины въ Святой Землѣ и на Синаѣ*. Сборникъ Имп. Палест. Общества, Выпускъ 10. Спб. 1888 г.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 27 f.

⁵² Procopius, *de aed.* 5, 9. 6-7 (III, 2. 164, 16-17 Haugrey).

⁵³ Кіевъ 1895. This reference is taken from К. Кекелидзе, *Іерусалимскій Канонарь* vii вѣка, Тифлисъ, 1912, стр. 34-35.

⁵⁴ Кекелидзе, *l.c.*, p. 33, cf. his *Древнегрузинскій Архіератиконъ*, Тифлихъ, 1912, стр. ix-xiv.

⁵⁵ Кекелидзе, *Іер. Канонарь*, p. 1, note 2.

⁵⁶ Н. Марръ, *Житіе св. Григорія Хандзт'ійскаго*, Спб. 1911 (TP VII), text 12, 50-53, translation 97, 47-50.

⁵⁷ See (P. Peeters), *Acta Bollandiana*, 32, 1913, pp. 236 f. (St. Hilarion d'Ibérie).

The importance of Palestine as a centre of influence for Georgia was enhanced by the iconoclast movement in Constantinople, which directed into the domains of the Caliphate the stream of pilgrims that under other circumstances would naturally have gravitated to the *σεβάσιμοι τόποι* of Byzantium, and the connection with Palestine remained vital and active long after the establishment of normal relations with the Greek empire. We are less well-informed regarding the Georgian colony on Mt. Sinai, but its existence is attested in the ninth century.⁵⁸

Now the occurrence of an adscription in Coptic, a language but little known outside of Egypt, naturally causes us to look to Sinai rather than Palestine as the place whence our codex takes its origin. It is true that the evidence is far from conclusive, but there is a certain amount of it. As we have shown above, the scribe was not a Greek by birth, and presumably only partially so by education. Accordingly it would seem that the almost unique combination in a single codex of Greek, Georgian, and Coptic elements, taken together with the palaeographical testimony, makes it possible to localize the Koridethi MS. on Mt. Sinai. Where else would there have been a scribe, writing Greek in a quasi-Coptic hand, whose work was subsequently annotated by Georgians?

2. *Fam*¹. None of the manuscripts of *fam*¹ so far edited belong palaeographically to South Italy and all of them may well be Constantinopolitan. Codex 1 seems to have used the same arrangement of symbols for the evangelists as did Anastasius of Sinai, but this is, of course, not a point of great importance.

Since the text of Codex 1 was published I have had the opportunity of studying another manuscript of this group which is now in the library of Vatopedi on Mt. Athos. It is much the oldest manuscript of the family, though it does not seem to represent a noticeably better text than Codex 1; indeed I doubt if it is as good as Codex 1. A complete set of photographs of this manuscript is now in the Harvard College Library and a definite report on the subject may be expected soon. But it is an interesting fact that, unless I am much mistaken, the scribe

⁵⁸ See P. Peeters, *Acta Bollandiana*, 40, 1922, pp. 282-283.

of this manuscript, named Ephraim, is identical with the scribe of the now famous MS. Athos, Laura B 64 (Gregory 1739; a 78) generally known as von der Goltz's codex, and containing extracts from lost commentaries of Origen. I am disposed to guess that the text of fam¹ and that of von der Goltz's manuscript (or possibly of its archetype ?) represent a recension of the whole New Testament made by some unknown scholar; but I fear that von der Goltz's argument that this text originally belonged to a manuscript of much earlier date breaks down. He may be right in fact, but his palaeographical argument is fallacious, for the readings upon which it rests prove on closer examination to be misreadings of the manuscript.

One other point may perhaps be made, though it certainly ought not to be pressed, in connection with this family. The script of Ephraim is not unlike that of the Arethas manuscripts, which come from Caesarea; it is not inconceivable that there is some connection between the two.

3. *The Ferrar group.* Of this family all the codices (except 69, which is late) come from Calabria, but none is earlier than the twelfth century (*pace* von Soden) and nothing is known certainly as to the provenance of their archetype.

4. *Codices 28, 565, and 700.* No evidence enables us to fix the origin of 28 or of 700, but 565 (also known as 2^{pe}), which came from Houmish Khan in Pontus,⁵⁹ has an important colophon at the end of Mark, to the effect that it was written and copied from Jerusalem codices.⁶⁰ Some other manuscripts containing this colophon (with, however, a different gospel text) add that these Jerusalem codices were "on the holy mountain." It has been too lightly assumed by most investigators of the New Testament that this holy mountain means Mt. Zion, in other words, that the Jerusalem manuscripts were still in Jerusalem when these words of the colophon were first written. I protested against this interpretation in my "Texts from Mt. Athos" (1902), and am more than ever convinced that the

⁵⁹ It was given to Czar Nicholas in 1829 by the Metropolitan Sylvester, who states that tradition connects it with the Empress Theodora.

⁶⁰ It runs, according to Belsheim (p. 5): *εγγραφη και αντεβληθη ομοιως εκ των ιεροσολυμων παλαιων αντιγραφον*. Doubtless it is accentuated, but Belsheim always omits accents.

colophon must mean that the manuscripts which had come from Jerusalem were on the holy mountain of Sinai. I do not think that at the time of writing there was any other place to which "the holy mountain" could refer.

Thus the conclusions to which all the facts are, at least, not opposed can be summarized as follows:

(1) All these manuscripts, or groups of manuscripts, represent mixtures of the same 'family-text' with the Antiochian text.

(2) The two manuscripts which have preserved the greatest amount of the 'family-text' and the least admixture of the Antiochian text are Θ and 565.

(3) The ingredients in Θ and 565 — the 'family-text' and the Antiochian text — are the same, but they are differently mixed; therefore historical factors which have affected both Θ and 565, and are not derived from the Antiochian text, belong to the history of the 'family-text.'

(4) Both Θ and 565 are connected with Jerusalem and Sinai, Θ by its palaeographical history, and 565 by the colophon to Mark, and in view of (3) this connection must be inferred to belong to the 'family-text.'

(5) The 'family-text' is itself a combination of Western and Neutral readings. Most, though not all, of the great Western interpolations are absent, but there are about as many Western readings of the less striking type as there are Neutral readings. In its original form this text was probably not influenced at all by the *K*-text, but it may be parallel to that recension, in that it is a combination of the two earlier types. To go further is certainly hazardous, but three topics for further investigation may be indicated. First, if we ask how an early text came to be in Jerusalem, the natural suggestion would be the library of Alexander, which was for Jerusalem what the library of Pamphilus was for Caesarea. Secondly, if we assume that Sinai was the place where the Jerusalem manuscripts were used, and combined with another type, the natural view would be that the Neutral manuscripts came from Egypt and the other type from Jerusalem. Thirdly, Professor F. C. Burkitt has pointed out in "The Old Latin and the Itala" that, though there is a

close connection between the Old Latin and the Old Syriac, there is in the Gospels one set of interpolations characteristic of the Old Latin and another set characteristic of the Old Syriac. It may be added that the same thing is true of "non-interpolations." There is therefore special interest attaching to any evidence for the existence of a Western text, such as is incorporated in the 'family-text' of Θ and its allies, which seems to have missed so many interpolations. Is this partial freedom from interpolation a primitive characteristic, or is it due to correction?