

I.

NOTES ON THE BIBLICAL TEXT OF THE BOOK OF MULLING.

By REV. H. J. LAWLOR, B.D., F.S.A. Scot.

The purpose of this paper is to direct attention to two portions of the text of the Synoptic Gospels preserved in the Book of Mulling, which appear to me to be in themselves of considerable interest, and to have some bearing on the history of the manuscript, and on that of the Irish recension of the Latin Bible.

§ 1. *Corrections.*

It is necessary, however, by way of preface, to notice one of the palæographical features of the manuscript. It will be at once perceived by any one who inspects it, that the hand of a corrector has been busy on its pages. Corrections, it is true, are in some places much more frequent than in others; but there is scarcely a page in the entire book which is altogether free from them.

The existence of a large number of these corrections is easily explained. The manuscript, as originally written, was not supplied with the numbers in the margin referring to the so-called Ammonian Sections and Eusebian Canons. The Gospels of St Matthew and St Luke, moreover, were divided into paragraphs, which, whatever may have been their origin, certainly had no relation to these sections. When, therefore, the numbers were subsequently added, an attempt was made to indicate the exact point at which each section began. This was effected in various ways. Usually the end of a section was denoted by a punctuation mark, resembling a colon followed by a comma (:,). The following word was sometimes marked with the sign \sloper , and a similar sign was placed over the corresponding number in the margin (*e.g.* Mark viii. 30, f. 43 *v b*). More commonly, however, the first letter or two of the section were altered in such a way as to make them more prominent. Sometimes they were simply re-traced, as we may see, for example, in line 15 of the second column of f. 48 *r*. At other times they were re-written in a larger character. Examples of this may be found in line 8, where the sign for

'et' (7) has been transformed into ϵ , and line 23 of col. a, where, in the space occupied by e , the letter ϵ has been written, the original letter being left otherwise unaltered. Occasionally, when the first word of a section happened to be also the first word of a line, the scribe has placed one or more dots under it, re-writing the same word in the margin (f. 46 r b, ll. 3, 23). But not infrequently he has actually erased the original word and written it afresh, either in the margin (as in f. 48 r, col. a, l. 36), or in the space occupied by the erasure, or partly in one, partly in the other (f. 46 r a, ll. 15, 16). This is frequently done when it is desired that a section should begin with the first word of a line, where the original writing does not admit of its doing so. In this case the last word or two of the previous section are also erased, and transferred to the right margin opposite the preceding line. In such cases as those last mentioned, we can, of course, usually have no absolute certainty as to the original reading of the manuscript; but obviously we have no right to assume, in the absence of indications pointing in that direction, that it differed from that which the corrector has put in its room.

But besides the corrections made with the object of adapting the manuscript to the division into sections, there are very many others the purpose of which is undoubtedly to change the reading. Much the same methods are used in this as in the former case. A word has a dot placed under each of its letters, and that which is to be substituted for it is written above it (f. 48 r a, l. 20) or in the margin; a word to be omitted is marked with a group of three dots above it, or with single dots above or below, or in both positions (f. 48 r a, l. 25); and in the case of a whole sentence so dealt with, a punctuation mark precedes and follows the omitted portion, and a wave line is drawn down the margin (f. 46 r a, ll. 29-31); a word to be supplied is written above the line or in the margin, with a mark indicating its place in the text (f. 46 r b, ll. 20, 35); or, finally, a word is erased, and the resulting space is either left blank, or something else written in it (e.g. f. 48 r a, l. 30, where \ddot{u} =uero is written over a partially erased \ddot{h} =hautem). Where we find a word written over an erasure not at the beginning or end of a section, we are plainly warranted in the inference that the displaced

word of the original text was different, and we can often conjecture with high probability what the original word actually was.

§ 2. *General Character of the Text.*

It is now our task to make an attempt to ascertain the general character of the text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Book of Mulling as originally written (which we shall henceforth designate by the letter μ). This we shall most easily do by collating a few passages with the Codex Amiatinus (A). In parallel columns with the collation of these selected portions of μ , we shall place, for comparison, collations of the same passages as they are found in three other Irish manuscripts. We take first the Book of Durrow (*Durmach*), which may be regarded as the ancient Celtic manuscript of the Gospels which approaches most nearly to the ordinary Vulgate text. The Book of Kells (Q) is a good example of the usual type of Irish text,—having a Vulgate base, but with a large contingent of old Latin readings. While, as an example of pre-hieronymian Irish texts, we give in the fourth column the readings of Codex Usserianus (r_1). This manuscript is in a fragmentary state, and by this circumstance I have been mainly guided in selecting the passages to be collated. It is essential that all four texts should be approximately complete in the passages presented, and I have therefore chosen those places in which the Codex Usserianus is practically intact for at least two or three consecutive verses.

No complete collation or edition of the Book of Mulling has been published. The text of the Codex Usserianus has been printed by Professor Abbott, with collations of the Books of Kells and Durrow and another manuscript (r_2), which will be referred to lower down. I have re-collated all these texts, so far as it appeared necessary for my purpose; and where the reading of any of the manuscripts differs, in my judgment, from that given by Dr Abbott, I have indicated this fact by inserting the letters 'ms.' in brackets after the reading in question. Mere differences of spelling I have neglected, but a few readings which might perhaps have been included under this description I have retained, marking them, however, with an obelus (†), and building no argument upon them. Readings in which μ and r_1 agree are indicated by asterisks (*).

A. 1.

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIANUS (r ₁).
Matt. xxi.			
22. 23.			<i>om. docentem.</i>
24. * dicite' mihi quem si dixeritis mihi <i>pro</i> quem si dixeritis mihi.	aut <i>pro</i> et <i>tert.</i> (<i>ms.</i>).	<i>eis pro</i> illis.	uerbum <i>pro</i> sermonem. * q[ue]m dicit[ur] mihi <i>pro</i> quem si d. m.
25. † <i>intra pro</i> inter.		† <i>intra pro</i> inter.	[fu]it <i>pro</i> erat. de caelo <i>pro</i> e caelo. illi autem <i>pro</i> at illi.

A 2.

Marc. vii.			
29.		illi + iesus. sermonem hunc <i>pro</i> hunc ser.	dix[it] <i>pro</i> ait. iesus <i>pro</i> illi (<i>vel</i> illi + iesus.) uade propter hunc ser- monem <i>pro</i> p. h. s. uade. a <i>pro</i> de. uen[is]set <i>pro</i> abisset. <i>om.</i> suam.
30. abisset + ad. † <i>super pro</i> supra.	abisset + ad.	abisset + ad.	
31.		Tyri + et. † <i>medicos pro</i> me- dios (<i>ms.</i>).	
32. deprecabantur <i>pro</i> deprecantur.		inponant <i>pro</i> in- ponat.	adferunt <i>pro</i> adducunt. depraecantes <i>pro</i> et deprecantur. inponeret <i>pro</i> inponat.
33.		deorsum <i>pro</i> seor- sum.	ei <i>pro</i> illi. suscip[is]et <i>pro</i> adpre- hendens.
Marc. viii.		auriculas + eius.	conspuens [m]isit digi- tos suos in auriculas eius et <i>pro</i> misit d. s. in a. et expuens.
2. hanc turbam <i>pro</i> turba.	† turbam <i>pro</i> turba. † <i>traditio pro</i> tri- duo.	turbam istam <i>pro</i> turba.	istam turbam <i>pro</i> turba. quoniam <i>pro</i> quia. <i>om.</i> ecce. triduum iam <i>pro</i> iam triduo. est ex quo hic sunt <i>pro</i> sustinent me.

A 2—continued.

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIANUS (r ₁).
<p>Marc. viii.</p> <p>3.</p>		<p>domus suas <i>pro</i> domum suam.</p>	<p>dimittere <i>pro</i> si dimi- sero. <i>om.</i> suam.</p>
<p>4. respondentes <i>pro</i> responderunt.</p>		<p>quia quidam <i>pro</i> quidam enim.</p>	<p>nollo ne fatigentur <i>pro</i> deficient. quoniam quidem et aliqui <i>pro</i> quidam enim. his <i>pro</i> eis.</p>
<p>5. † interrogabit <i>pro</i> interrogavit.</p>	<p>† quod <i>pro</i> quot.</p>	<p>dixerunt+ei (<i>ms.</i>).</p>	<p>sui+dicentes. quis p[ro]s[er]uit <i>pro</i> po- terit quis. <i>om.</i> hic.</p> <p>† quod <i>pro</i> quot.</p>

A 3.

<p>Luc. iii.</p> <p>19. 20.</p> <p>*† super <i>pro</i> supra. <i>om.</i> et <i>sec.</i></p> <p>† carcerem <i>pro</i> car- cere.</p>	<p><i>om.</i> et <i>sec.</i></p> <p>† carcerem <i>pro</i> car- cere (<i>ms.</i>).</p>	<p><i>om.</i> et <i>sec.</i></p> <p>† carcerem <i>pro</i> car- cere.</p>	<p>faciebat <i>pro</i> fecit. et adiecit <i>pro</i> adiecit et.</p> <p>*† super <i>pro</i> supra.</p>
<p>21.</p>			<p>baptizatus esset <i>pro</i> baptizaretur. populus+ab iohanne. cumque et iesus bap- tizatus esset <i>pro</i> et iesu baptizato. +ab eo <i>ante</i> et <i>sec.</i> orante+ipso. aperti sunt caeli <i>pro</i> apertum est. caelum. quasi <i>pro</i> sicut.</p>
<p>22.</p> <p>te+bene.</p>	<p>te+bene.</p>	<p>† columbam <i>pro</i> co- lumba.</p> <p>te+bene (<i>ms.</i>).</p>	<p>eum <i>pro</i> ipsum. filius meus es tu <i>pro</i> tu es f. m. <i>om.</i> dilectus. ego hodie genui te <i>pro</i> in te complacuit mihi. qui* putabatur <i>pro</i> ut putaretur.</p>
<p>23. * putabatur <i>pro</i> pu- taretur.</p>	<p>putabatur <i>pro</i> pu- taretur.</p>	<p>putabatur <i>pro</i> pu- taretur.</p>	

A 3—continued.

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIANUS (71).
<p>Luc. xv.</p> <p>5. * eam <i>pro</i> illam. *† inponet <i>pro</i> imponit.</p> <p>* super <i>pro</i> in. cum gaudio <i>pro</i> gaudens.</p> <p>6. om. et. domui <i>pro</i> domum.</p> <p>7. dico+autem.</p> <p>(hiat μ.) (hiat μ.) (hiat μ.)</p> <p>8. (hiat μ.)</p> <p>domum+suam.</p> <p>9.</p>	<p>gratulamini <i>pro</i> congrat.</p> <p>unum peccatorem <i>pro</i> uno peccatore.</p> <p>† habentem <i>pro</i> habente.</p> <p>istos <i>pro</i> iustis.</p> <p>† paenitentiam <i>pro</i> paenitentia.</p> <p>uertit <i>pro</i> euertit.</p>	<p>uicinos+suos.</p> <p>dico+autem. unum peccatorem <i>pro</i> uno peccatore.</p> <p>† habentem <i>pro</i> habente.</p> <p>iustos <i>pro</i> iustis.</p> <p>† penitentiam <i>pro</i> paenitentia.</p> <p>uertit <i>pro</i> euertit.</p> <p>domum+suam.</p> <p>amicos et uicinos (ms.) <i>pro</i> amicas et uicinas.</p>	<p>* eam <i>pro</i> illam. *† inponet <i>pro</i> imponit.</p> <p>inp. +eam. * super <i>pro</i> in.</p> <p>amicos+suos.</p> <p>quod <i>pro</i> quia. inuenerim <i>pro</i> inueni. in <i>pro</i> super.</p> <p>agente <i>pro</i> habente.</p> <p>iustos <i>pro</i> iustis. egent <i>pro</i> indigent.</p> <p>quae+est. decem+et. om. dragnam. scopis mundat <i>pro</i> euertit.</p> <p>inueniat+eam.</p> <p>quod <i>pro</i> quia. inuenerim <i>pro</i> inueni.</p>

A 4.

<p>Joh. i.</p> <p>16. † accipimus.</p> <p>17. (hiat μ.) * gratia+autem.</p> <p>18. * umquam+nisi.</p> <p>19. * hoc+est.</p> <p>miserunt+ei. om. ad eum.</p>	<p>acc.+et (ms.).</p> <p>hoc+est.</p>	<p>† accipimus (ms.). acc.+et (ms.).</p> <p>umquam + nisi (ms.). hoc+est.</p> <p>qui <i>pro</i> quis (ms.).</p>	<p>quoniam <i>pro</i> et.</p> <p>quoniam <i>pro</i> quia. * gratia+autem. * umquam+nisi.</p> <p>* hoc+[es]t. cum misissent <i>pro</i> quando miserunt.</p> <p>illum <i>pro</i> eum <i>pri.</i> eum <i>sec.</i>+dicentes.</p>
--	---------------------------------------	---	--

A 4—*continued.*

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIANUS (r_1).
Joh. xi. 33. <i>om. ergo.</i> uidisset <i>pro</i> uidit.		uero <i>pro</i> ergo.	autem <i>pro</i> ergo. fientem <i>pro</i> plorantem. fientes qui uenerant cum ea <i>pro</i> qui u. cum e. plorantes. infremuit <i>pro</i> fremuit.
fremuit <i>pro</i> fremuit.		infremuit <i>pro</i> fremuit.	+ in <i>ante</i> spiritu.
34. 35. 36. † et <i>ad init.</i> ; dixerunt + ergo.	dixerunt + ergo.	dixerunt + ergo.	dixerunt + autem. illum <i>pro</i> eum. eis <i>pro</i> ipsis.
37.	poterat + ut.	eis <i>pro</i> ipsis.	ne hic <i>pro</i> ut hic non: autem <i>pro</i> ergo. <i>om. rursum.</i> intra semet ipsum <i>pro</i> in semet ipso.
38. † rursus <i>pro</i> rursum. autem + quasi.	† lapis <i>pro</i> lapis.		

A mere glance over these four collations will enable us, so far as they go, to form a tolerably correct notion of the characters of the texts represented by them. *Durmach* approaches very closely to A, the best manuscript of the Vulgate: r_1 widely diverges therefrom. Midway between these two come μ and Q. And when we actually count the variants, this general impression is confirmed. The second column gives us 17 variants of *Durmach*; the fourth, 120 of r_1 ; while the first and third give respectively 43 (perhaps one or two more) of μ , and 37 of Q. The text of μ is therefore in these passages of the same general type as that of Q. It would, of course, be more than rash to make any inference as to the text of the entire manuscript from a few cases taken at random. But after working through a large part of the text I see no reason to alter the conclusion to which these passages appear to lead. In every chapter which I have tested—with certain exceptions to which I shall ask attention immediately—the result has been the same. The numbers of various readings in μ and Q are almost the same; the preponderance, when it exists, being for the most part on the side of μ . In St Mark the amount of variation

from the Amiatine text in μ is perhaps less than elsewhere, in St John greater.

§ 3. *The Old Latin Passages.*

I now come to deal with the exceptions just mentioned. They occur in the latter chapters of St Matthew and the earlier of St Luke. Following the same method as before, I append collations of a few passages.

B 1.

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIANUS (71).
Matt. xxiv.			
16. * in <i>pro</i> ad.			* [fugia]nt (ms.) in <i>pro</i> f. ad.
17. * tecto+sunt. * discendent <i>pro</i> descendat. † domu <i>pro</i> domo.		† domu <i>pro</i> domo.	* tecto+sunt. * [descendant <i>pro</i> descendat.
18. * agro+erit.			* agro+erit.
19. *† pregnantibus <i>pro</i> praegnatibus.	† praegnantibus <i>pro</i> praegnat.	† praegnantibus <i>pro</i> praegnat.	*† praegnan[tibus] <i>pro</i> praegnat.
20.	† flet <i>pro</i> fiat (ms.).		[n]e <i>pro</i> ut non.
21. * saeculi <i>pro</i> mundi.	(flet = A. [ms.].)		om. tunc. * saeculi <i>pro</i> mundi.
22. † brebiati <i>pro</i> brev. flerit <i>pro</i> fleret. † braebabunturtur <i>pro</i> breviabuntur.			om. illi.
23.			hic+est. aut+ecce.
24. * exurgent <i>pro</i> surgent.			* exurgent <i>pro</i> surgent.
inducant <i>pro</i> inducantur. electos <i>pro</i> electi.		om. ut.	om. magna. † errore <i>pro</i> errorem. ([fieri potest] = A [ms.].)
26. credere <i>pro</i> exire.	† penetrabilibus <i>pro</i> penetrabilibus (ms.).	† induantur <i>pro</i> inducantur.	
* ad <i>pro</i> in. om. et sec.	ergo <i>pro</i> enim.	† exiit <i>pro</i> exit. apparet <i>pro</i> paret.	(hiat r ₁ .)
23. † illic <i>pro</i> illuc. aquilae+et.		om. et sec.	* ad <i>pro</i> in.
29. +et ad <i>init.</i> eorum <i>pro</i> illorum.		† +ali ante aquilae (ms.)	(hiat r ₁ .)
eorum <i>pro</i> caelorum.	obscurabuntur (ms.) <i>pro</i> obscurabitur.		

B 1—continued.

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIÁNUS (r ₁).
<p>Matt. xxiv. 30. * apparebit <i>pro</i> par. † filii <i>pro</i> filii. plangent+se.</p> <p>31. † mittit <i>pro</i> mittit.</p> <p>* angulis uentorum <i>pro</i> uentis. summo <i>pro</i> sum- mis</p> <p>* <i>ad fin. vers.</i>+cum coepererent (<i>sic</i>) hæc fieri respi- cete et leuate ca- put quoniam ad- propeat redemp- tio uestra.</p> <p>Matt. xxvi. 24. <i>Ad init. vers.</i>+et.</p> <p>tradetur <i>pro</i> uadit. <i>om.</i> de illo. *† tradetur <i>pro</i> tradi- tur. * non nasci homini illi <i>pro</i> ei si na- tus non fuisset homo ille.</p> <p>25.</p> <p>* traditurus eum erat <i>pro</i> tradidit eum.</p> <p>* illi+iesus.</p> <p>26. * ipsis hautem man- ducantibus <i>pro</i> cenantibus au- tem eis. † accipit <i>pro</i> accepit.</p> <p><i>om.</i> et <i>pri.</i> et <i>pro</i> ac. et dedit <i>pro</i> dedit- que.</p> <p>* dicens <i>pro</i> et ait. * manducate <i>pro</i> comedite * est+enim.</p>	<p>apparebit <i>pro</i> par.</p> <p>hominis quidem <i>(ms.) pro</i> qui- dem hominis.</p> <p>† tradetur <i>pro</i> tra- ditur. <i>om.</i> ei.</p> <p>† traditurus erat eum <i>pro</i> tradi- dit eum. eum+et. illi+iesus.</p> <p>† accipit <i>pro</i> accepit.</p> <p>dicens <i>pro</i> et ait. edite ex hoc omnes <i>pro</i> et comedite. est+enim; <i>ad fin. vers.</i>+quod confringitur <i>pro</i> sæculi vita.</p>	<p>apparebit <i>pro</i> par.</p> <p>plangent (<i>ms.</i>) super se <i>pro</i> plangent. † nubus (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> nubibus.</p> <p>suos <i>pro</i> eius. uentis+et.</p> <p><i>Ad init. vers.</i>+et.</p> <p>eo <i>pro</i> illo. † tradetur <i>pro</i> tradi- ditur. non natus <i>pro</i> na- tus non.</p> <p>respondit <i>pro</i> re- spondens.</p> <p>traditurus erat eum <i>pro</i> tradi- dit eum. eum+et. illi+iesus.</p> <p>† accipit <i>pro</i> accepit.</p> <p>dicens <i>pro</i> et ait. edite ex hoc omnes <i>pro</i> et comedite. est+enim; <i>ad fin. vers.</i>+quod confringitur <i>pro</i> sæculi vita.</p>	<p>* apparebit <i>pro</i> par.</p> <p>lamentabun[t] <i>pro</i> plangent.</p> <p>congrega[n]tur (?) <i>pro</i> congregabunt.</p> <p>* angulis uent[or]um <i>pro</i> uentis.</p> <p>surum[a] illorum <i>pro</i> terminos eorum. * <i>ad fin. vers.</i>+cum coe- perint autem hæc fieri respicitæ et leuate capud quia ad[pr]opinquet] re- demptio uestra.</p> <p>(<i>hiat r₁.</i>)</p> <p>† uadet <i>pro</i> uadit. eo <i>pro</i> illo. *† tradetur <i>pro</i> traditur.</p> <p>* non nasci hom[ini] illi <i>pro</i> ei si natus non fuisset homo ille.</p> <p>indas+scarioth. * tr[ad]iturus eum erat <i>pro</i> tradidit eum.</p> <p>* illi+iesus. * ipsis autem mandu- cant[ibus] <i>pro</i> cen- anibus autem eis.</p> <p>iesus accipit <i>pro</i> acc. iesus.</p> <p>(<i>hiat r₁.</i>)</p> <p>* dicens <i>pro</i> et ait. * ma[n]ducate <i>pro</i> co- medite. * est+enim.</p>

B 1—*continued.*

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIANUS (71).
Matt. xxvi.			
27. † bibete <i>pro</i> bibite.	† effundetur (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> effunditur.	effundetur <i>pro</i> uobis et <i>pro</i> mul- tis <i>pro</i> <i>pro</i> mul- tis effunditur.	† effundetur <i>pro</i> effun- ditur.
28.			
*† remissione <i>pro</i> re- missionem	† remissione (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> remissionem.		*† remissione (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> remissionem.
29. * uobis + quia.		uobis + quia.	* uobis + quia.
diem illum cum illud <i>pro</i> diem cum illum.	diem illum cum illum <i>pro</i> diem cum illum.	† gemine (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> genimine. diem illum quo illud <i>pro</i> diem cum illum.	ac creatura <i>pro</i> hoc genimine. illud diem cum ^{msd} <i>pro</i> diem cum illum.
30.			
31.			om. illis. (ista = A[<i>ms.</i>].)
Matt. xxvii.			
20.	principes <i>pro</i> prin- ceps.	principes <i>pro</i> prin- ceps.	principes <i>pro</i> princeps.
* populo <i>pro</i> populis. autem <i>pro</i> uero.			* populo <i>pro</i> populis. autem <i>pro</i> uero.
21. * de duobus dimit- tam uobis <i>pro</i> uobis de duobus dimitti.	om. uobis (<i>ms.</i>).	dimittam <i>pro</i> di- mitti.	* [de] duobus uobis di- mittam <i>pro</i> uobis de duobus dimitti.
22. † qui <i>pro</i> quid. * ergo <i>pro</i> igitur.			* ergo <i>pro</i> igitur. fa[ci]amus <i>pro</i> faciam. om. de.
23. om. illis. pilatus <i>pro</i> praeses.	† praesit (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> praeses. om. magis (<i>ms.</i>).	clamauerunt <i>pro</i> clamabant.	om. dicentes. se nihil [pro]ficere <i>pro</i> quia n. proficeret. tumultum fieri <i>pro</i> tumultus fieret.
4. proficit <i>pro</i> pro- ficeret. † ferit <i>pro</i> feret. fier. + in populo.			[ac]cepit aquam <i>pro</i> accepta aqua.
† lauauit <i>pro</i> lauit. * manus + suas. dicens coram po- pulo <i>pro</i> coram p. d.		coram + omni.	* manus + suas.
* om. iusti.		ego innocens <i>pro</i> innoc. ego.	sum ego <i>pro</i> ego sum.
25.		respondit <i>pro</i> re- spondens.	* om. iusti (<i>epat.</i>).
* huius <i>pro</i> eius.			omnis turba <i>pro</i> uni- uersus populus.
26.		uestros <i>pro</i> nostros. uero <i>pro</i> autem.	* huius <i>pro</i> eius.
* eum crucifigeret <i>pro</i> crucifigeretur.			flagellis caesum <i>pro</i> flagellatum. * eum crucifigerent <i>pro</i> crucifigeretur.

B 1—*continued.*

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIANUS (7).
<p>Matt. xxvii. 27. * duxerunt <i>pro</i> suscipientes. * praetorium <i>pro</i> praetorio. * praet. + et.</p>			<p>* duxerunt <i>pro</i> suscipientes. * praet[orium] <i>pro</i> praetorio. * praet. + [et].</p>

B 2.

<p>Luc. v. 6. ut <i>pro</i> eum. multitudinem piscium <i>pro</i> pis. m. * ita ut rumpentur <i>pro</i> rumpebatur autem. * retia <i>pro</i> rete. 7. tunc <i>pro</i> et pri. * socis + suis. qui cum <i>pro</i> et tert. om. et quart. * repleberunt <i>pro</i> impleverunt. 8. hoc uiso <i>pro</i> quod cum uideret. * om. Petrus. † procedit <i>pro</i> procedit. * dicens + rogo te. 9. * timor <i>pro</i> stupor. * inuaserat <i>pro</i> circumdederat. * illum <i>pro</i> eum. 10. * dixit <i>pro</i> ait. * eris homines <i>pro</i> hom. eris. 11. * nauculis in terram <i>pro</i> ad t. naucibus. * eum <i>pro</i> illum. Luc. viii. 10. ait <i>pro</i> dixit. scire <i>pro</i> nosse. autem + non est datum sed. similitudinibus <i>pro</i> parabolis.</p>	<p>† procedit <i>pro</i> procedit.</p>	<p>ita ut rumpebatur haute[m] <i>pro</i> rump. autem. uidisset <i>pro</i> uideret. † procedit <i>pro</i> procedit. me + domine. om. domine.</p>	<p>* ita ut ru[m]pentur <i>pro</i> rump. autem. * retia <i>pro</i> rete. innuerunt <i>pro</i> annu. * socis + suis. * repleuerunt <i>pro</i> impl. ut sec. + paene. uidisset <i>pro</i> uideret. * om. Petrus. * dicens + rogo te. quoniam <i>pro</i> quia. * timor <i>pro</i> stupor. * inuaserat <i>pro</i> circumdederat. * illum <i>pro</i> eum. † capturam <i>pro</i> captura. autem + et. * dixit <i>pro</i> ait. iesus. ad simonem <i>pro</i> ad s. iesus. * eris homines <i>pro</i> hom. eris. uiuificans <i>pro</i> capiens. * nauculis in terram <i>pro</i> ad t. naucibus. * eum <i>pro</i> illum.</p>
--	--	---	---

B 2—continued.

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIANUS (r).
<p>Luc. viii. 11. haec est hautem <i>pro</i> est autem haec. * similitudo <i>pro</i> pa- rabola.</p> <p>12. quod <i>pro</i> qui. autem + cecidit.</p> <p>* hii sunt <i>pro</i> sunt hi. * audiunt + uerbum.</p> <p>uenit hautem <i>pro</i> deinde uen. tulit <i>pro</i> tollit. * de corde eorum uerbum <i>pro</i> u. de c. eorum.</p>	<p>autem + uerbum.</p>	<p>tulit <i>pro</i> tollit.</p>	<p>haec autem <i>pro</i> est autem haec. * similitudo <i>pro</i> para- bola. + qui seminat est filius hominis <i>ante</i> semen. semen + autem.</p> <p>uam + seminati sunt. * hi sunt <i>pro</i> sunt hi. audiunt + * uerbum' in cordibus suis.</p> <p>* de corde illorum uer- bum <i>pro</i> u. de c. eorum. uti ne credant et <i>pro</i> ne credentes. qui autem <i>pro</i> nam qui.</p>
<p>13.</p> <p>petrosam <i>pro</i> pet- ram.</p> <p>* + hi sunt <i>ante</i> qui. audiunt <i>pro</i> audi- erint.</p> <p>* + uerbum <i>ante</i> cum <i>sec.</i></p> <p>* accipiunt <i>pro</i> susc.</p> <p>* illud <i>pro</i> uerbum.</p> <p>non habent * radi- ces <i>pro</i> radicem non h.</p> <p>* † quia <i>pro</i> qui.</p>	<p>accipiunt (ms.) <i>pro</i> susc.</p> <p>radices (ms.) <i>pro</i> radicem.</p> <p>om. et <i>sec.</i> (ms.) tribulationis <i>pro</i> temptationis.</p>	<p>accipiunt <i>pro</i> susc.</p> <p>radices <i>pro</i> ra- dicem.</p> <p>† quia <i>pro</i> qui.</p> <p>tribulationis <i>pro</i> temptationis.</p>	<p>petram + seminati sunt. * + hi sunt <i>ante</i> qui.</p> <p>* + uerbum <i>ante</i> cum <i>sec.</i> * accipiunt <i>pro</i> susc.</p> <p>* illud <i>pro</i> uerbum. ipsi <i>pro</i> hi. * radices <i>pro</i> radicem.</p> <p>* † quia <i>pro</i> qui. (et in tempore tenta- tionis recedunt = A [ms.].) cum audierint <i>pro</i> audi- erunt. aud. + uerbum. om. et <i>pri.</i> in sollicitudinibus <i>pro</i> soll.</p>
<p>14. audiunt <i>pro</i> audi- erunt.</p> <p>per sollicitudinem <i>pro</i> sollicitudini- bus. diuitiarum <i>pro</i> et diuitiis. dulcidinis <i>pro</i> uol- uptatibus.</p> <p>* om. euntes. * adferunt <i>pro</i> refer- unt.</p>	<p>a sollicitudinibus (ms.) <i>pro</i> soll.</p> <p>uoluntatibus (ms.) <i>pro</i> uolupt.</p>	<p>a sollicitudinibus <i>pro</i> soll.</p>	<p>† uoluptatibus <i>pro</i> uol- uptatibus. uitae + huius saeculi.</p> <p>* om. euntes. * adferunt <i>pro</i> referunt.</p>

A cursory inspection of these collations reveals immediately a remarkable difference between them and those with which we were previously occupied. Two facts at once strike us. The column which stands in closest relation to the first is no longer the third, but the fourth; and the number of asterisks in the first and fourth columns in proportion to the total number of readings has increased. Once more our first impression is borne out by a count. The number of various readings recorded for μ is 95, for r_1 99, for *Durm* 16, for Q 38. And of the 95 variants in μ and 99 in r_1 , 50, or more than half, are marked with an asterisk. This suggests that the part of μ with which we are now concerned has a text substantially Old Latin with Vulgate mixture, rather than, as the remainder, a text substantially Vulgate with Old Latin readings. The relative number of variants in *Durm*, Q, and r_1 has not materially changed, while that in μ has been almost trebled. Again, the number of asterisks has advanced from 14 in 43, to 50 in 95. This is what we might expect to find if the text before us is really Old Latin. For the variations of any Irish Biblical codex from the Vulgate fall into two classes—errors of transcription and Old Latin readings. The number of the former would be about equal in two copies written under similar conditions; the latter will of course vary in proportion to the remoteness of the manuscript from the Old Latin type. Assuming, therefore, that there was one Old Latin recension in Ireland, the number of agreements in variation from the Vulgate between any two copies of that recension will be greater in proportion to the whole number of variations than between two manuscripts, one of which is mainly Vulgate and the other mainly Old Latin.

Now the passages of μ which have just been collated with A do not stand alone. The same test applied to the two passages, extending—to speak roughly—from the middle of St Matthew xxiv. to near the end of the Gospel, and in St Luke from the beginning of chap. iv. almost to the end of chap. ix., brings to light exactly similar phenomena. The text of these two passages is absolutely different in type from that which appears throughout the remainder of the Synoptic Gospels. It is essentially Old Latin.

It is naturally difficult to determine, within a verse or two, the exact points at which these Old Latin portions of our Book begin and end. It

can be done, however, with more precision than might have been anticipated, as my third series of collations will demonstrate.

C 1.

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIANUS (r ₁).
Matt. xxiv.			
1. accesserunt + ad eum. aedificationem pro aedificationes.		accesserunt + ad eum. aedificationem pro aedificationes.	structuram pro aedificationes.
2. illis pro eis.	illis (ms.) pro eis.	illis pro eis.	[e]lis dixit pro dixit eis.
3.			om. hic.
4.		discipuli + eius.	om. eo.
5.			in monte pro super montem.
			discipuli + eius.
			(hiat usque -educat r ₁ .)
			(hiat usque meo et a christus usque -ent r ₁ .)
6. * audietis, hautem pro audituri enim estis.	autem (ms.) pro enim.	audietis enim pro audituri enim estis.	* audietis enim pro audituri enim estis.
7.		contra (ms.) pro in sec.	pugu[as]pro proelia. proelorum + sed. exsurget pro consurget. contra pro in (bis).
8.	enim pro autem.		om. pestilentiae et. omnia] haec pro haec autem omnia.
9. † tribulationem pro tribulatione.	† tribulationem pro tribulatione.	† tribulationem pro tribulatione.	
10. * inuicem pri + se.		inuicem pri + se.	* inuicem pri + se. occid[ent] . .] pro odio habebunt.
11. insurgent pro surgent.		insurgent (ms.) pro surgent.	exsur[gent] pro surgent.
12. iniquitas + et.			multos seducent pro sed. mult.
* † refrigerescet (sic) pro refrigerescet.	† refriget (ms. p. m.) pro refrigerescet.		quia pro quoniam.
13. permanserit pro perseuerauerit.	permanserit pro perseuerauerit.	permanserit pro perseuerauerit.	* † refrigerescit pro refrigerescet.
14. * per totum orbem pro in uniuerso orbe.	† orbe regni in uniuerso (ms.) pro regni in uniuerso orbe.		* per totum (ms.) orbem pro in uniuerso orbe.
15. hautem pro ergo.			(hiat ab hoc usque [reg] niet ab in sec. usque -bus et ueniet consummatio r ₁ .)
per danielum profetam pro a danielo propheta.			(hiat usque -tum et ab -st usque intellegat r ₁ .) [quod dic]tum e[st] pro quae dicta sunt. aliqua uerba omissa sunt (e spat.).

Taking first the early part of St Matt. xxiv., it will probably be agreed that there is no sign of an Old Latin base up to the end of v. 11. The variants in r_1 number *at least* (see vv. 4, 5) 17, in μ only 7, in Q 8, and in *Durm* 2; of the seven readings in the first column, no more than two have an asterisk. Here, then, we have the ordinary mixed text. From verse 16 onwards, on the other hand, the text is Old Latin, as we have already shown. About the intervening verses it is impossible to speak with confidence. In vv. 12-14, μ has three variants as against two in r_1 ; *Durm* and Q have one each. This gives us little to go upon. It must be observed, moreover, that only a portion of v. 14 remains in r_1 ; and that in the portion that is wanting the Codex Usserianus Alter (r_2) has an important reading—"finis" for "consummatio"—while, on the other hand, the reading "permanserit" in v. 13 (μ *Durm* Q) has every appearance of being an Old Latin survival, though unsupported by either r_1 or r_2 . In v. 15 our difficulties increase: μ registers two variants, one of which is supported by r_2 ; *Durm* Q give none at all; r_1 , in the few letters that remain, two (one of which is an inference from the insufficiency of the space to contain the words of A). On the whole, I am inclined to think that the Old Latin text begins with v. 12; but if not, then certainly somewhere between the end of v. 11 and the beginning of v. 16.

What seems important to observe is, that the change in the type of text takes place suddenly. There is no gradual increase of Old Latin mixture, culminating in the almost total disappearance of the Vulgate element. We may fairly conclude from the facts that if r_1 were not so fragmentary just where we need its help most, in vv. 14, 15, we could fix, within a line or two of our manuscript, the place where the Vulgate and the Old Latin texts meet.

So much, then, for the starting-place of the Old Latin text in St Matthew. Where does it end? A collation of 25 verses of chapter xxvii. (vv. 40-64), which it would occupy too much space to print here, shows that the relation between the texts of r_1 and μ remains much the same as in the previous chapter. At the same time, however, we notice a considerable numerical increase in the variants of Q. The numbers are: readings in μ 43, in r_1 36 or more, in Q 33, in *Durm* 12, asterisks

23 or more. Our manuscript has therefore still an Old Latin text, while the Old Latin element in Q has become more marked. Let us now, therefore, collate the passage extending from xxvii. 65 to xxviii. 15, in order that we may determine, if possible, how far the Old Latin character of μ is maintained.

C 2.

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KĒNANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIANUS (r ₁).
Matt. xxvii.			
65. * milites <i>pro</i> custodiam.		milites <i>pro</i> custodiam.	* milites <i>pro</i> custodiam. ite+et.
+ipsi <i>ante</i> scitis. 66. <i>om.</i> abeuntes.		abeuntes + cum custodibus.	* et signauerunt <i>pro</i> signantes.
* et signauerunt <i>pro</i> signantes. lapidem + et discesserunt.		lapidem + et discesserunt. <i>om.</i> cum custodibus.	
Matt. xxviii.			
1.			
2.		de caelo descendit <i>pro</i> descend. de c.	
3. <i>haudem pro</i> enim. * uestimenta <i>pro</i> uestimentum. * eius <i>sec.</i> + candida.	<i>autem pro</i> enim.	<i>autem pro</i> enim. eius <i>sec.</i> + candidum.	et erat <i>pro</i> erat enim. * uestimenta <i>pro</i> uestimentum. * eius <i>sec.</i> + [ca]ndida.
4.		uel moltui (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> uelut mortui.	a <i>pro</i> prae. sicut <i>pro</i> uelut.
5.			q[uaeritis] qui crucifixus est <i>pro</i> qui c. est q.
6.		hic + sed.	dixerat <i>pro</i> dixit. * uenite+et. (<i>hiat ab -ocum usque ad fin. vers. r₁.</i>)
* uenite+et.	uenite+et (<i>ms.</i>).	uenite+et.	ite [et] <i>pro</i> euntes. (<i>hiat ab [et] usque ad timore v. 8 r₁.</i>)
7. surrexit + a mortuis. <i>om.</i> ecce <i>pro</i> sicut praedixit <i>pro</i> ecce praedixi.		surrexit + a mortuis. sicut dixit <i>pro</i> ecce praedixi.	* gaud[io] magno <i>pro</i> mag. gaud. * [et] current (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> currentes. (nuntiate [ms.] = A.)
8. * gaudio magno <i>pro</i> magno gaudio. * et current <i>pro</i> currentes.	<i>om.</i> ecce praedixi uobis (<i>ms.</i>). gaudio magno <i>pro</i> mag. gaud.	gaudio magno <i>pro</i> mag. gaud. suis <i>pro</i> eius.	

C 2—continued.

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIANUS (r_1).
Matt. xxviii.			
8.	† aduerunt (ms. p. m.) pro adoraerunt.		
9. † habete pro haueete. om. autem. accesserunt + ad eum.			† ille pro illae.
10. timere + sed.		timere + sed (ms.).	anplexerunt pro tenuerunt.
11.	† et + et (ms.).		quia praecedo uo[s] pro ut eant. galilaeam + et.
12.		adnuntiauerunt (ms.) pro nunt.	sunt pro fuerant. consilium acceperunt[t] pro consilio accepto. om. copiosam.
13. uenerunt nocte pro nocte uen.			
14.			pers[uade]bimus pro suad. (h ^{at} r_1).
15. instructi pro docti.	† deuulgatum (ms.) pro diu.	edocti pro erant docti. † deuulgatum (ms.) pro diu.	† deuulgatum pro diu. hoc pro istud.

It will be seen at once that there is a sudden change in the relation between μ and r_1 after xxviii. 3. For xxvii. 65–xxviii. 3 the collation yields the following figures: μ 8, r_1 6, Q 7, *Durm* 1, asterisks 4. The ratio of these numbers agrees pretty closely with that of those already given for xxvii. 40–64. But for xxviii. 4–15 the result is different. Here we get μ 11, r_1 16 or more, Q 10, *Durm* 3, asterisks 8 or more. The sudden decrease in the number of readings in μ and the almost more notable disappearance of asterisks are remarkable. Our conclusion is that the Old Latin text ends with xxviii. 3. This conclusion, however, could not, with the evidence now given, be held with absolute confidence, for the proportion of the variants of μ to those of r_1 is considerably larger than in the greater part of the manuscript. This might perhaps be accounted for by the specially imperfect state of r_1 just here, or by a greater amount than usual of Vulgate mixture in its text. But to place the matter beyond doubt, let us apply another test.

The Clermont manuscript in the Vatican Library (*h*) agrees more closely than any other Old Latin manuscript of St Matthew with the Irish text. We may use it, then, in place of r_1 in these verses. Now let us examine the following collations of μ , *Durm*, Q, and *h* for St Matt. xxviii. 4-20.

C 3.

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX CLAROMONTANUS (<i>h</i>).
Matt. xxviii.			
4.		uel moltui (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> uelut mortui.	a <i>pro</i> prae.
5.			quia <i>pro</i> quod.
6.		hic+sed. uenite+et.	dixerat <i>pro</i> dixit.
* uenite+et.	uenite+et (<i>ms.</i>).		* uenite+et. sed <i>pro</i> et <i>pri.</i> ite et <i>pro</i> euntes.
7.		surrexit + a mortuis.	
surrexit + a mortuis.			
* <i>om.</i> ecce <i>pri.</i>			* <i>om.</i> ecce <i>pri.</i>
sicut praedixit <i>pro</i> ecce praedixi.	<i>om.</i> ecce praedixi uobis (<i>ms.</i>).	sicut dixit <i>pro</i> ecce praedixi.	† praecedet <i>pro</i> praecedit. dixi <i>pro</i> praedixi.
8. * gaudio magno <i>pro</i> magno gaudio. et current <i>pro</i> currentes.	gaudio magno <i>pro</i> magno gaudio.	gaudio magno <i>pro</i> magno gaudio.	* gaudio magno <i>pro</i> magno gaudio. occurrentes <i>pro</i> currentes.
9. † habete <i>pro</i> haete <i>om.</i> autem. accesserunt + ad eum.		suis <i>pro</i> eius.	* † habete <i>pro</i> haete.
10. timere+sed.		timere+sed (<i>ms.</i>).	amplexauerunt <i>pro</i> tenuerunt.
			ite+et. quia praecedo nos <i>pro</i> ut eant. galileam+et. uidebitis <i>pro</i> uidebunt. † ciuitate <i>pro</i> ciuitatem.
11.	† et+et (<i>ms.</i>).	adnuntiauerunt (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> nuntiauerunt.	
12.			sunt <i>pro</i> fuerant. consilium acceperunt et <i>pro</i> consilio accepto.
13.			magnam <i>pro</i> copiosam. et dixerunt <i>pro</i> dicentes. +illis ante dicite.
uenerunt nocte <i>pro</i> nocte uenerunt.			

C 3—*continued.*

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX CLAROMONTANUS (h).
Matt. xxviii.			
14.			audierit praesis <i>pro</i> auditum fuerit a praeside. persuademus <i>pro</i> suadebimus.
15. * instructi <i>pro</i> docti.		edocti <i>pro</i> erant docti.	* instructi <i>pro</i> docti. hoc <i>pro</i> istud.
16.	† deulgatum (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> diulgatum.	† deulgatum (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> diulgatum. discipuli + eius (<i>ms.</i>)	
17.	† constituerat (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> constit.		cum uidissent <i>pro</i> uidentes.
18.		(iesus= <i>Am</i> [<i>ms.</i>].)	† est + est. <i>om.</i> ergo.
19. * +nunc <i>ante</i> docete.		+nunc <i>ante</i> docete.	* +nunc <i>ante</i> docete.
20. obseruare <i>pro</i> seruare.		obseruare <i>pro</i> seruare.	<i>om.</i> amen.
	<i>om.</i> amen (<i>ms.</i>).		

It is not too much to say that our inference is completely established by this table. The Codex Claromontanus yields 28 variants against 4 in *Durm*, 12 in μ and 13 in *Q*, while the asterisks have dwindled to five. The Old Latin fragment of St Matthew therefore begins at or a little after xxiv. 12 and ends at xxviii. 3.

Now let us turn to St Luke. That the portion upon which the genealogy immediately follows (iii. 19–23) is mixed Vulgate will be evident from the collation A 3. Omitting the genealogy, an examination of which would be valueless for our purpose, we next collate the early verses of chapter iv.

D 1.

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIANUS (r).
Luc. iv.			
1. * deserto <i>pro</i> desertum.			repletus <i>pro</i> plenus. reuersus <i>pro</i> regressus. * deserto <i>pro</i> desertum.

D 1—*continued.*

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIANUS (r ₁).
<p>Luc. iv. 2. +in <i>ad init. vers.</i></p> <p>* illis diebus <i>pro</i> diebus illis. † esurit <i>pro</i> esuriit.</p>		<p>+in <i>ad init vers.</i></p> <p>his <i>pro</i> illis <i>sec.</i></p>	<p>per dies <i>pro</i> diebus. (et <i>tem. ms.</i>]=A.) * illis diebus <i>pro</i> diebus illis. his <i>pro</i> illis <i>sec.</i></p> <p>+postea <i>ante</i> esuriit. ut lapides [1]sti panes fiant <i>pro</i> lapidi huic ut panis fiat. <i>om. et.</i> illi <i>pro</i> ad illum.</p> <p><i>om. quia.</i></p>
<p>3.</p> <p>4.</p> <p>iesus + dicens. † uiuit <i>pro</i> uiuet.</p> <p>5. * illum + iterum. * diabolus + in montem excelsum ualde. ei <i>pro</i> illi. mundi <i>pro</i> orbis terrae.</p>		<p>† uiuit <i>pro</i> uiuet.</p> <p>zabulus + in montem excelsum (<i>ms.</i>)</p>	<p><i>om. et.</i> illi <i>pro</i> ad illum.</p> <p><i>om. quia.</i></p> <p><i>vv. 5-8 post vv. 9-12.</i> * illum + iterum. * diabolus + [in montem altissimum.</p>
<p>6.</p> <p>ipsorum <i>pro</i> illorum. * uolero <i>pro</i> uolo.</p>	<p>uolero <i>pro</i> uolo.</p>	<p>uolero <i>pro</i> uolo.</p>	<p>dixit <i>pro</i> ait. illi <i>pro</i> ei : + diabolus.</p> <p>* uo[l]hero <i>pro</i> uolo. dabo <i>pro</i> do. † illam (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> illa.</p>
<p>7.</p> <p><i>om. pro</i> cadens.</p> <p>* <i>om. coram.</i> omnia tua <i>pro</i> tua omnia.</p>	<p>uero (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> ergo <i>om. pro</i> cadens.</p>	<p>uero <i>pro</i> ergo.</p> <p>si cadens <i>pro</i> pro-cidens si.</p>	<p>si procedens <i>pro</i> pro-cidens si. * <i>om. coram.</i></p>
<p>8.</p> <p>est + enim.</p> <p><i>om. soli.</i> eum <i>pro</i> illum.</p>			<p>dixit illi iesus <i>pro</i> iesus d. i. iesus + uade post me satanas.</p> <p>diliges dominum deum tuum <i>pro</i> d. d. t. adorabis.</p>
<p>9.</p> <p>ei <i>pro</i> illi. quoniam <i>pro</i> quod *† mandauit <i>pro</i> mandabit. custodiant <i>pro</i> conseruent.</p>	<p>† illis <i>pro</i> illi. † mandauit <i>pro</i> mandabit.</p>	<p>† mandauit <i>pro</i> mandabit.</p>	<p>illum + diabolus.</p> <p>*† mandauit <i>pro</i> mandabit. te conseruent <i>pro</i> conseruent. te.</p>
<p>11.</p> <p><i>om. et.</i> manibus + suis.</p>	<p><i>om. et.</i> manibus + tuis (<i>ms.</i>).</p>	<p><i>om. et.</i> manibus + suis.</p>	<p><i>om. et.</i> <i>om. quia.</i> † tollant <i>pro</i> tollent.</p>

An analysis of this collation makes it clear, as I believe, that a sudden change in the character of the text takes place at the end of verse 4. For vv. 1-4 the numbers are, μ 4, *Durm* 0, Q 2, r_1 11, asterisks 2; while for vv. 5-11 we have μ 17, *Durm* 5, Q 6, r_1 15, asterisks 4. The beginning of the Lucan Old Latin fragment is therefore to be placed at verse 5. Its close may with no less confidence be assigned to ix. 54. Scarcely any part of the manuscript agrees so closely with r_1 as Luké ix. 45-54. As our collations of passages in this Gospel have not been numerous, we give our comparison of the four texts for these verses and a few which follow them in full, in order that the complete change which occurs in μ at v. 54 may the more easily appear. The numbers of variants are, for vv. 45-54, μ 27, *Durm* 6, Q 9, r_1 29 or more, asterisks 17; for vv. 55-62, μ 11, *Durm* 8, Q 7, r_1 23, asterisks 2. Our second Old Latin fragment therefore includes Luke iv. 5-ix. 54.

D 2.

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIANUS (r_1).
<p>Luc. ix.</p> <p>45. * hoc uerbum <i>pro</i> uerbum istud. * erat hautem <i>pro</i> et erat. * coopertum <i>pro</i> uelatum. illis <i>pro</i> ante eos. * intellexerent (<i>sic</i>) <i>pro</i> sentirent.</p>	<p><i>om. et sec.</i> tenebant <i>pro</i> timebant.</p>	<p><i>om. et sec.</i></p>	<p>* hoc uerbum <i>pro</i> uerbum istud. * erat autem <i>pro</i> et erat. * coopertum <i>pro</i> uelatum. illos <i>pro</i> eos. * intellegerent <i>pro</i> sentirent. <i>om. illud.</i></p>
<p>46. * in eis cogitatio <i>pro</i> cog. in eos. <i>om. maior.</i></p> <p>47. * iesus hautem <i>pro</i> at iesus. * eorum <i>pro</i> illorum. adprehendit <i>pro</i> adprehendens. puerum + et. * <i>om. eum.</i></p> <p>48. * <i>om. illis.</i> * acciperit <i>pro</i> suscepit. † recipit <i>pro</i> recepit : * + non me recipit sed. * <i>om. omnes.</i></p>	<p>† recipit <i>pro</i> recepit.</p>	<p>eorum (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> illorum.</p> <p>† recipit <i>pro</i> recepit : + non me recipit sed.</p>	<p>* in eos cogitatio <i>pro</i> cog. in eos. * iesus autem <i>pro</i> at iesus. * eorum <i>pro</i> illorum. * <i>om. eum.</i> * <i>om. illis.</i> * acceperit <i>pro</i> suscepit. recepit <i>pro</i> recepit : * + non me recipit sed]. inter uos est <i>pro</i> est inter omnes uos. * (<i>om. omnes.</i>)</p>

D 2—*continued.*

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIANUS (r ₁).
<p>Luc. ix.</p> <p>49. respondit <i>pro</i> respondens. dicens <i>pro</i> dixit.</p> <p>* magister <i>pro</i> praeceptor.</p>			<p>(<i>hiat r₁</i>).</p> <p>dixit + ad iesum.</p> <p>* magister <i>pro</i> praeceptor.</p>
<p>† qui <i>pro</i> quia. eum <i>pro</i> illum.</p> <p>50. * iesus + sinite eum et.</p>	<p>† inmine (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> in nomine.</p>	<p>iesus + sinite eum et.</p>	<p><i>om.</i> ad illum.</p> <p>* iesus + sinite eum et.</p>
<p>51. coupleretur <i>pro</i> completerentur.</p>	<p><i>om.</i> qui enim.</p>	<p>† aduersum <i>pro</i> aduersus.</p>	<p><i>ad fin. vers.</i> + nemo est autem qui faciat uirtutem in nomine meo et poterit male loqui de me.</p>
<p>* iret + in.</p>	<p>cum <i>pro</i> dum.</p>	<p>cum <i>pro</i> dum.</p>	<p>* iret + in.</p>
<p>52. illi + cenam.</p>	<p>iret + in.</p>	<p>† et ipse + et ipse (<i>ms.</i>).</p>	<p>euntes + nuntii.</p>
<p>53. * euntis + in.</p>	<p>illi + cenam.</p>	<p>iret + in.</p>	<p>illum <i>pro</i> eum.</p>
<p>54. * uidissent + autem. iohannes + et.</p>	<p>† euntes <i>pro</i> euntis. eunt. + in.</p>	<p>† euntes <i>pro</i> euntis. eunt. + in.</p>	<p>* euntis + in.</p>
<p>† dicemus <i>pro</i> dicimus.</p>	<p>uidissent + autem.</p>	<p>uidissent + autem.</p>	<p>uidentes <i>pro</i> cum uidissent.</p>
<p>55. <i>om.</i> cuius spiritus estis (<i>vide p. 34</i>).</p>	<p>† igni (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> ignis.</p>	<p>uidissent + autem.</p>	<p>* uid. + autem.</p>
<p>56. <i>om.</i> filius . . . saluare (<i>vide p. 34</i>).</p>	<p><i>om.</i> et dixit usque estis.</p>	<p><i>om.</i> et dixit usque estis.</p>	<p>dixerunt + ad iesum. (<i>hiat r₁</i> a vis usque et co-.)</p>
<p>57. eum <i>pro</i> illum.</p>	<p><i>om.</i> filius usque saluare.</p>	<p><i>om.</i> filius usque saluare.</p>	<p>eos <i>pro</i> illos. <i>ad fin. vers.</i> + sicut helias fecit. c[onue]rsus autem <i>pro</i> et com. + iesus ante increpauit. quali spiritu <i>pro</i> cuius spiritus. animas + hominum.</p>
<p>58. * nidos + ubi requiescant.</p>	<p>† foueant (<i>ms.</i>) <i>pro</i> foueas.</p>	<p>† alium <i>pro</i> aliud. et factum est <i>pro</i> f. est autem. euntibus <i>pro</i> ambulanti- bus.</p>	<p>† uiam <i>pro</i> uia. <i>om.</i> illi.</p>
	<p>† capud + uii (<i>ms.</i>).</p>	<p>nidos + ubi requiescent.</p>	<p>* nidos + ubi requiescant. caput + suum.</p>

D 2—*continued.*

LIBER MULLING.	CODEX DURMACHENSIS.	CODEX KENANENSIS.	CODEX USSERIANUS (71).
Luc. ix.			
59.			et ait <i>pro</i> ait autem. † alterutrum <i>pro</i> alterum. me <i>pro</i> mihi. et dixit <i>pro</i> dixitque: +* ei. om. ut.
60.	iesus + ei. om. ut. † sepelient (ms.) <i>pro</i> sepeliant.	dixitque + ei. † sepelient <i>pro</i> se- peliant.	
* dixitque + ei. om. ut mortui se- peliant.			
uade + et.	adnuntiare (ms.) <i>pro</i> annuntia.	adnuntiare <i>pro</i> an- nuntia.	
61.	alter <i>pro</i> illi. om. sed.	alter <i>pro</i> illi.	ait autem <i>pro</i> et ait. alius <i>pro</i> illi.
	mihī + ire.		mihī + ire et.
* nuntiare <i>pro</i> re- nunt.	nuntiare <i>pro</i> re- nunt.	qui + in.	* nuntiare <i>pro</i> renunt. meis <i>pro</i> his. in domo <i>pro</i> domi.
62.			dixit autem <i>pro</i> ait. illi <i>pro</i> ad illum. super <i>pro</i> in.
om. suam.			

§ 4. *A Hypothesis.*

It may be well here to suggest a question which is not without interest. Granted that we have imbedded in Mulling's mixed text of the Gospels two fragments of genuine Old Latin,¹ how are we to account for this fact?

¹ The Book of Mulling is not unique in presenting the problem which we are attempting to solve. Readers of M. Berger's great work, *L'Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du moyen âge*, will have observed many parallels. Such are the text of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Vulgate, except chaps. x., xi.) in Brit. Mus. Harl. 1772 (Berger, p. 51); the Book of Job in St Gall 11, in which the text of Jerome's first revision of the Old Latin gives place to another in the middle of a word at xxxviii. 15, the handwriting changing at the same time (p. 122); the Chartres St John, Paris, B.N. 10,439 (Old Latin chaps. i.-vi., approaching to Vulgate chaps. vii.-xv., adhering still more closely to the Vulgate chaps. xvi.-xxi.: Berger, p. 89); the Sapiential Books in Metz 7 (Vulgate up to the middle of Wisdom, thenceforth "an exceedingly mixed text, abounding in passages taken from the ancient versions: " p. 101); the text of Acts in the Rosas Bible, Paris, B.N. Lat. 6 (Vulgate, except xi. 1-xii. 8, which is European: p. 25); and most striking of all, the text of Acts in Paris

It will conduce to clearness if, before giving what we believe to be the most probable answer to this question, we state a theory which is obviously suggested by the facts, and which for some time appeared to the writer sufficient to account for them.

Let us suppose that the scribe—the writer, that is, either of the manuscript actually before us, or of one from which it was copied—had before him a codex from which a few pages were missing. The text of this was mainly Vulgate. When he reached the lacunæ, the deficiencies of the primary exemplar were supplied from another, the text of which was pre-hieronymian.

The truth of this hypothesis is, of course, incapable of proof. But it accounts for the facts by which it is suggested, and it is confirmed by various considerations.

It supposes, be it observed, that the main exemplar of the scribe was an imperfect copy of the Vulgate. This is proved to have been the case in another instance—the Stowe St John. In the Stowe manuscript the lacunæ of the exemplar are not supplied in the copy.¹

It supposes, again, that our scribe used two exemplars, preferring the Vulgate, but having recourse to the other, an Old Latin manuscript, in case of need. That two different types of text should be current side by side in Ireland in early times, and that copies of both should be found in the library of a single monastery, will not surprise those who have studied Mr Haddan's account² of the gradual progress of the Vulgate

B.N. 321. This is so closely analogous to our manuscript that M. Berger's words (p. 77) may be quoted: "Le livre des Actes des Apôtres est composé de deux parties fort différentes. Le premier tiers, jusqu'au verset 7 du chapitre xiii., représente un texte mêlé dans lequel les éléments anciens tiennent une si grande place, que l'on peut à peu près le considérer comme un texte ancien. Le texte antérieur à saint Jérôme reprend à xxviii. 15 et occupe le fin du livre. Malheureusement les leçons anciennes ont été le plus souvent corrigées par grattage, de sorte qu'il est quelquefois difficile de les retrouver. Entre ces deux limites, le texte semble être un texte meridional," etc. The change of a few words would make this an accurate description of the text of St Matthew in our Book. Other parallels are mentioned in the text.

¹ J. H. Bernard in the *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*, xxx. p. 316.

² Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, vol. i. p. 180 sqq.

in these Islands, or M. Berger's abridgment of the story.¹ And more direct proof in the shape of parallel cases is not wanting. The scribe of the Book of Durrow had in his hands, in like manner, two manuscripts—one of the Vulgate, another of the Old Latin.² So, again, had the scribe of Ussher's Codex. Its text is pre-hieronymian, and so lacked the *Pericope Adulterae*. This supposed deficiency is supplied from a Vulgate manuscript.³ And, moreover, a similar hypothesis will be found to explain some of the phenomena of the Codex Usserianus Alter (r_2). This manuscript Professor Abbott regards as preserving an Old Latin text in St Matthew. In the latter chapters it certainly does so, but I venture to think the fact is not so clearly made out in the earlier portion of the Gospel. I must not encumber these pages with needless collations. It will suffice therefore to say that of the first half of St Matthew's Gospel only three fragments remain—i. 18—ii. 6, iv. 24—v. 29, and xiii. 7—xiv. 1. In the two latter of these passages the variants of Q are almost identical in number with those of r_2 ; in the first there is a decided preponderance on the side of the latter manuscript. Now the existing portions of chapters iv., v., and xiii. are quite long enough to enable us to come to a satisfactory judgment as to the character of the text of which they are fragments, and the fact just mentioned leaves no room for doubt that it was Vulgate with Old Latin mixture. When we reach chap. xvi., and more especially when v. 19 is passed, we at once perceive a change. The variants of r_2 in xvi. 20—28 are nearly four times as numerous as those of Q.⁴ May we not conclude

¹ Berger, *L'Histoire*, p. 30.

² See the writer's *Chapters on the Book of Mulling*, chs. ii., iii.

³ Abbott, *Evangeliorum Versio*, p. vii.

⁴ The numbers of the variants in the three MSS. *Durm*, Q, r_2 for the passages mentioned in the text may be exhibited in a table. Mere variations of spelling and unmistakable blunders are not reckoned. Several readings of r_2 , however, are counted, which are almost certainly errors of the scribe.

	i. 19—ii. 6.	iv. 24—v. 29.	xiii. 8—58.	xvi. 13—19.	xvi. 20—28.
<i>Durm</i>	5	7	21	2	3
Q	6	14	57	10	10
r_2	15	18	61	15	37

that in r_2 part of St Matthew's Gospel was copied from a mixed text, the remainder from a manuscript of an Old Latin version?

The hypothesis, therefore, which we have provisionally assumed to account for the phenomena of μ , receives confirmation from the fact that a similar hypothesis serves to explain the textual features of the only other Irish Old Latin manuscripts of the Gospels known to exist.¹ And if we go a little further afield we shall find other parallels. Mr White² tells us, for example, that the Codex Palatinus (*c*) of the Old Latin, though mainly African, must have been copied from an ordinary European MS. in the last few chapters of St Luke; and he subjoins the remark that other similar instances of vacillation in the text of Old Latin manuscripts might be added. Dr Sanday, in like manner, suggests³ that the last leaf of the archetype of *a* was lost or worn, and the text of this portion taken from some other copy. And a most interesting case of the same kind has recently been brought to light. The Earl of Crawford possesses a Syriac manuscript of the entire New Testament containing a version of the Apocalypse of which the only other known copy is a fragment in the British Museum. This version is akin to the Philoxenian rendering of the other New Testament books; but the exemplar from which the Crawford manuscript was copied had lost a leaf at the beginning, and the lacuna has been supplied from a manuscript of the later recension, akin to the Harkleian version, the *editio princeps* of which was published by De Dieu at Leyden in 1627, and which is now usually bound up with the Peshitto.⁴

Our hypothesis is therefore well supported by parallel cases. We have next to remark that it seems to account sufficiently for two curious readings, one at the beginning, the other at the end of the Lucan fragment. To begin with the latter. It is found in St Luke

¹ Excluding, of course, the St Gall fragment (*p*).

² Scrivener's *Introduction*, 4th ed., ii. p. 56.

³ *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, ii. p. clxxv.

⁴ Full proof of this fact is given by Professor Gwynn in his paper "On a Syriac MS. of the New Testament belonging to the Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, and on an in-edited version of the Apocalypse therein contained: *Trans. R.I.A.*, vol. xxx, part x., App. E, p. 414. See also *The Apocalypse of St John in a Syriac Version hitherto unknown*, edited by John Gwynn, Dublin, 1897, part ii. p. 37.

ix. 55, 56. Our Lord's answer to the question of the two disciples is there cut down by our scribe to the single word "Nescitis." In many Greek MSS. the entire answer and the two preceding words "et dixit" are omitted, and this reading is followed by the Books of Armagh, Kells, and Durrow, Ussher's second Codex, and other Irish Vulgate manuscripts. The scribe of the Book of Mulling is conscious that there is something wrong in his (apparently unique) reading. For immediately after writing "Nescitis" he adds *in his text* the letter "d" (= "desunt") and places in the upper margin the remaining words of the sentence, reading the last five words, if not the whole clause, as they are found in r_1 , which here differs from the Vulgate. It is not difficult to suggest an explanation. After copying v. 54 from his Old Latin exemplar, the scribe turns once more to the manuscript whose text he preferred, and which now again becomes available. But his memory of the other codex is still fresh, and so he writes "et dixit nescitis" before he observes that these words, with those that follow them, are absent from the text which he is transcribing. He allows the words which he has written to stand in his text, inserts after them the mark indicating omission, and relegates the remainder, which he takes from his Old Latin manuscript, to the margin.

We turn now to St. Luke iv. 5—the first verse, as we have already seen, of the fragment. It opens with the words "Et duxit illum *iterum* diabolus." What is the antecedent of "iterum"? Plainly neither "Agebatur in spiritu" (v. 1), nor "Dixit autem illi diabolus" (v. 3). "Iterum" is in fact meaningless as the text stands. But re-arrange the narrative according to the order of r_1 , in which the third temptation, according to the Vulgate, precedes the second, and all becomes clear. We now have "Et duxit eum in hierusalem" (v. 9) . . . "Et duxit illum *iterum*" (v. 5). What has happened is evident. The scribe was copying from an exemplar in which the temptations were given in the order in which they are found in all European Old Latin manuscripts.¹ He

¹ So *b, c, f, l, g, r_1*. The Vercelli manuscript (*a*) is no exception, for, in the first place, its text is not European in St. Luke (Scrivener's *Introduction*, ii. 56); and moreover, though it here follows the African and Vulgate order, the marks of transposition in it are even clearer than in μ . The opening words of v. 5 in it are, "Et adduxit eum

transposed the last two, but in other respects preserved the text unchanged. Now what prompted this clumsy dislocation of the text? The answer which the hypothesis under consideration suggests is this. The scribe has before him a Vulgate text. Suddenly at v. 5 it deserts him; but enough remains to indicate that what immediately followed v. 4 in it was v. 5, and not, as in his secondary exemplar, to which he now turns, v. 9. It breaks off, let us suppose, with the words "Et duxit illum diabolus et ostendit illi omnia" . . . This is sufficient as a cue. Following it as well as he can, he transcribes vv. 5-8 exactly as they stand in his second copy, before turning to v. 9, not perceiving that in so doing he deprives "iterum" of all meaning.

In spite of these many arguments by which our preliminary hypothesis may be supported, it lies open to one objection, not indeed absolutely fatal, but sufficiently serious. The Gospels of St Matthew and St Luke are in our Book divided into sections, according to a system found in many Old Latin texts.¹ These divisions embrace the Old Latin as well as the mixed portions of the text. This fact in itself makes it probable that these Gospels were ultimately derived not from two copies, but from a single exemplar of the Old Latin text, altered by the hands of successive copyists to its present state.

This is not, it is true, a necessary inference. The Old Latin exemplar would most probably have these sections. But experience shows us that quite possibly a mixed copy might have them also; and so, on the supposition that our scribe used two exemplars, we are not absolutely prohibited from believing that both of them had sections such as we have mentioned. Probability, however, is against the supposition; and so we come to suggest another hypothesis, or rather a hypothesis which is that already proposed, but in a slightly modified form. It is this: Our scribe copied from an Old Latin exemplar, which we may call *x*. This manuscript had, however, been previously corrected by means of an imperfect copy of the Vulgate, *y*. Where *y* failed, the pré-

hierusalem et statuit eum supra pinnam templi et ostendit illi," etc. I know of no MS. except μ which reads "iterum" in v. 5 while following the Vulgate order; ϵ , however, has "secundo."

¹ See *Chapters on the Book of Mulling*, chap. iii.

hieronymian text remained ; where it was available, the resulting text was mixed.

This hypothesis is supported by all the parallel instances which have been adduced above. It supposes, as before, in the hands of a scribe an imperfect Vulgate, *y*, evidently regarded as giving the better text, and an Old Latin, *x*. It explains, moreover, the reading "iterum" at iv. 5, just as readily as the other hypothesis. It accounts, too, though not so easily, for "et dixit nescitis" at ix. 56. The passage may have been expuncted in *x* by the corrector, though our scribe did not perceive the marks of deletion till he had written its first three words, or he may have mistaken the meaning of marks over the final words of the saying ascribed to Christ. It is, moreover, supported by the fact that in St Matthew and St Luke alone, the division into sections of the type referred to occurs. For these Gospels, therefore, and probably for these alone, we are obliged to suppose an ultimate Old Latin archetype. It will not, then, surprise us to find in them, and in them alone, a few pages passed over by the corrector, exhibiting an Old Latin text. And finally, it is supported by the fact that the Matthean Old Latin fragment is actually corrected into conformity with the Vulgate, exactly in the way we have supposed *x* to have been corrected by means of *y*. But this will be seen more clearly in our next section.

5. *The Corrector.*

We turn, then, to these corrections of the text with which our fragments are so thickly studded. These corrections are, so far as I can judge, all written by the same hand—the hand of him who added the marginal numbers. They were certainly in some cases made concurrently with or before the insertion of the numbers. This may be seen, for example, by an inspection of f. 47 *r a*, l. 25 (St Matt. xxvi. 1). Here the words "omnia verba haec" have been erased, and in their room "sermones hos omnes" has been written. The correction extends, however, so far into the margin, that the number referring to the Eusebian Canon, which had to be inscribed opposite the corresponding line of the second column (l. 24, Matt. xxvi. 26), is placed more to the

right than is customary; while, at the same time, the number of the section (cclxxiii.) is begun too high and written in a slanting direction, so that the last letter composing it is in its proper position.¹ Thus the correction of the first column was completed before the numbers of the second were written. And in the second column the first words of this section, as originally written, were "et manducantibus." The word "et" is erased, a punctuation mark set in its place, and "Et (in prominent character) edentibus" written above the line. The text is altered in the very act of marking the beginning of the section. Thus it is quite clear that the corrector was identical with the numerator,² and that he did both parts of his work concurrently. It is important to note this fact, because it appears to lead us to a further inference. The emendations and the numerals must have been taken from the same exemplar. The large number of these emendations shows us how thoroughly (too thoroughly) the corrector accomplished his task in St. Matthew's Gospel. His purpose seems to have been to assimilate the text of μ to that of the copy which he had in his hands. He was unsparing in the performance of this work, and we may be pretty confident that, except by oversight, he omitted to alter no word which differed from his codex. What, then, was the character of the manuscript from which the corrections were drawn? Any copy of the Latin Gospels which is furnished with the Eusebian Section and Canons may be expected to contain a substantially Vulgate text. That this was the character of the text of the corrector's manuscript is proved by collating our first fragment, as it left his hands, with the Codex Amiatinus. In a very few instances an Amiatine reading is replaced by another: now and then

¹ Similar phenomena are found at Matt. xxii. 46 (xxiii. 23), xxiv. 26 (40), 27 (42), Luke xix. 25 (39), etc. Specially interesting is Matt. xxvii. 3. Here the corrector wished to transpose "eum tradidit." He therefore wrote a double stroke under "eum," and a single stroke over "tradidit" in the usual way. The latter was found to interfere with the signature, belonging to "Tunc." Hence it was replaced by a single stroke *under* "tradidit." Obviously the signature was written after the first and before the second of these single strokes.

² It may be remarked, in confirmation of this conclusion, that there is no perceptible difference of hand between words introduced with the sole purpose of emending the reading, and those by which the beginnings of sections are marked.

one reading gives way to another, neither of which is Amiatine; but in the vast majority of cases, readings which differ from those found in A are obliged to make way for rivals which it supports. Let us take, for example, St Matt. xxiv. 21-31, which has been collated above (B 1). It occupies lines 1-31 of the first column of f. 46 r. In this passage μ varies from A 16 times. In two cases the corrector introduces non-Amiatine readings, and in nine he brings our text into agreement with the Amiatine. He leaves therefore 7 variants. Q, in the same passage, has also 7. Examining in the same way St Matthew xxvii. 20-26, we find the 13 variants of μ reduced by a similar process to 6, while again Q has 7. If we extended our inquiry further, the result would be to prove that the manuscript from which the Old Latin fragment was corrected was of much the same character as Q or the greater part of μ ,—in fact, that it contained a mixed Vulgate text.

In the Lucan fragment the work of correction does not seem to have been done in so thorough-going a spirit as in St Matthew. Thus, in the two passages collated above (B 2), μ has 45 variants, while there are only 6 corrections. Every one of these, however, is an assimilation to the Amiatine text. The manuscript, therefore, from which they were taken, if not the same, was at least probably of the same character as that which the diorthotes used in St Matthew.

Who, then, was the corrector? I have already stated my belief that the scribe who added the marginal numbers, and at the same time divided the Gospels into sections, revised the text as he went along. I must now express the further conviction that this reviser was identical with the original scribe of the manuscript. It is true some slight difference may be detected in the writing of the text and of the corrections. But the difference is not greater than that which is found to exist in many cases between two pages of the text itself. And, independently of this fact, a difference in the script was to be expected, owing to the difference of the conditions under which it was executed. A man naturally writes better when his letters are penned upon a blank sheet of well prepared vellum, than when he inserts them where he can find space between closely written lines or over erasures. And

so the writing of the text in our fragments is *better* than the writing of the emendations, but the difference extends, as I believe, no further. It is quite consistent with identity of hand.

But, again, if we suppose that the corrections are not due to the first hand, we are driven to one or other of two conclusions. The Book of Mulling consists of five gatherings, forming what the colophon calls separate "volumina." The last four of these contain the evangelical text with some additions. The first is occupied with Jerome's letter to Damasus and other similar matter, including the Eusebian Canons. If we do not admit that our corrections and numerals are by the hand of the writer of the bulk of the manuscript, we are bound, therefore, to believe, either that the first gathering was penned by a different scribe from the last four,—in other words, that it is not really part of the Book of Mulling properly so called,—or that a manuscript, provided with a table of the Canons, was nevertheless unsupplied with the sections and marginal numbers, which were absolutely necessary if the table was to have either use or meaning.

It must be admitted indeed that the latter alternative is neither impossible nor without example. The Book of Armagh, for example, has the table of canons without the marginal numbers. Not only so. Its Gospel text is divided into regular sections, the beginnings of which are usually indicated, as in our Book, by capitals set out in the margin: and these sections are clearly quite independent of the Eusebio-Ammonian division. The Book of Armagh is therefore an exact parallel to our manuscript, supposing the latter to have been left by its original scribe without indication in the text, by numbers or otherwise, of the Eusebian sections. But even though the phenomena of the Book of Mulling may be illustrated by those of one or two other codices, we are still entitled to assert that the supposition which we are now discussing is *a priori* improbable. Nothing could be more natural than that a scribe who had added to his Gospel text the usual prefatory matter, should afterwards, when revising his work, bring the latter into agreement with the former in the way we have supposed.

On the other hand, the hypothesis that the scribe of the first "volumen" was different from that of the other four, does not seem to

have occurred to such palæographers as Westwood and Gilbert. The writing of the first gathering does indeed present a different appearance from that of the Gospels to a superficial observer; it is larger, and it is written all across the page, instead of in columns. But the form and character of the letters are identical; the abbreviations used are, so far as I have observed, the same in both cases; and I see, therefore, no reason to suppose a difference of hand. It may, then, perhaps be granted that it is at least the more probable view that the entire manuscript (with the exception of the office for the Visitation of the Sick), including prefatory matter, numerals, and corrections, was the work of a single scribe. Assuming this to be true, and assuming also¹ that this scribe was not the Mulling of the colophon, but one who copied from him, we are now in a position to construct a tentative and hypothetical history of the writing of the Evangelium. St Molling of Ferns, in the latter half of the seventh century, wrote a copy of the four Gospels, in four gatherings of leaves, with a colophon in which this fact was stated. His exemplars were three in number,² including a mixed Vulgate text of St Mark, an Old Latin text of St Matthew and St Luke, and a copy of St John, written *per cola et commata*. The first and third Gospels were subsequently corrected from an imperfect Vulgate, or mixed copy. In the ninth century a transcript of Molling's Evangelium, thus corrected, and including the colophon, was made by a scribe of his monastery. This scribe possessed another mixed Vulgate Gospel manuscript, from which he took the numbers of sections and canons now found in the margin of the copy which he made. At the same time he adapted the text to them, made many corrections of the text, wrote an additional page which I have already described,³ and added a fifth "volumen" or gathering containing Jerome's prefaces and the Table of Canons, probably copied from the second manuscript just mentioned. The result was the Book of Mulling as we now have it.

Whether I have made it probable that this is a true history I must leave to others to decide. At least one thing is certain. We have

¹ As has been already shown, *Proceedings*, 1894-5, p. 12.

² See the present writer's *Chapters on the Book of Mulling*, chapter iii.

³ *Proceedings*, 1894-5, p. 13 *seq.*

succeeded in laying our hand on the adulteration of the text in its actual process. A copy made from the corrected text of our first fragment would have differed essentially from its archetype. The latter was Old Latin, the former would have been mainly Vulgate with Old Latin mixture. It is worth at least a sentence to remark, that such a text is formed, in this case at least, not by adulteration of the Vulgate with reminiscences of the older text, as we might have assumed to be the usual order of things,¹ but by the reverse process—by deliberately doctoring a pre-hieronymian text in order to bring it up to date. The text has in fact been constructed by exactly the same method as that which we have assumed to have given birth to that of the remainder of the Gospels of St Matthew and St Luke.

It may be well to add here a list of the readings of the corrector which differ from those of the Codex Amiatinus.

Matt. xxiv. 25. *om. vers.*
 27. *apparet pro paret.*
 xxv. 2. *his pro eis.*
 14. *om. peregre.*
 29. *om. et sec.*
 34. *om. eius.*
 36. *carcere eram.*
 37. *om. ei (?)*
 39. [. . .] *pro et pri.*
 xxvi. 14. *dicitur pro dicebatur.*
 26. *om. et comedite.*
 28. *effundetur pro effunditur.*
 36. *gezamani.*
 39. *procedit pro procidit.*
 42. *iterum hautem abiit pro iterum secundo abiit.*
 48. *illum pro eum.*
 eis pro illis.
 56. *adimplerentur pro implerentur.*
 58. *finem rei pro finem.*
 59. *princeps pro principes.*

Matt. xxvi. 64. *cum pro in.*
 67. *om. in pri.*
 om. ei.
 71. *om. autem.*
 75. *fleuit amarissime pro ploravit amare.*
 xxvii. 1. *aduersum pro aduersus.*
 3. *tradidit eum pro eum trad.*
 quia pro quod.
 5. *secessit pro recessit.*
 13. *aduersus pro aduersum.*
 19. *tibi sit pro tibi.*
 illum pro eum.
 20. *princeps pro princeps.*
 22. *faciemus pro faciam (?)*
 23. *om. dicentes.*
 24. *huius iusti pro iusti huius.*
 35. *om. ut impleretur &c.*
 40. *distruit . . reedificat pro destruebat . . reedificabat.*

¹ Compare Westcott and Hort's *New Testament*, ii. 81.

Matt. xxvii. 41. includebant eum *pro* in-
 ludentes.
 43. confidit *pro* confidet.
 domino *pro* deo.
 46. hel. i. hel. i.
 49. liberare *pro* liberans.
 Luke iv. 32. eius *pro* ipsius.
 33. sinagoga + eorum.
 34. sis + tu es.

Luke v. 15. *om.* autem.
 16. deserto *pro* desertum.
 31. *om.* et.
 37. ueteres ueteres *pro* ueteres
 uet.
 vi. 35. disperantes *pro* inde
 sperantes.
 viii. 2. e[x] *pro* de.
 ix. 20. ait *pro* dixit.

§ 6. Value of the Text.

We must now attempt to estimate the value of our fragments as witnesses to the text of the Gospels in Ireland before the influence of the Vulgate translation began to be felt. A rough and ready test at once suggests itself. For the greater part of the Matthew fragment we are able to compare our text with two others, r_1 and r_2 . There are in fact about 540 places in which one or more of the three Old Latin manuscripts vary from the Codex Amiatinus, where the evidence of all three is available.¹ In about 140 of these μ r_1 r_2 agree in supporting a reading different from the Amiatine. In 17 all three vary from it, but without supporting each other. In 11, two vary independently, the third supporting the Amiatine reading. In about 50 cases μ alone differs from A, in 70 cases r_1 , in 130 r_2 . Again in 65 readings μ supports the Codex Amiatinus against the combined testimony of the other two, r_1 does the same 25 times, r_2 35 times. In all these latter cases we seem to have undoubted instances of Vulgate mixture in the several copies. Thus it will be seen that the Vulgate element in r_2 is more marked than in r_1 , while in μ it is much greater than in either of these. On the other hand, r_2 , as Mr Abbott remarks,² is full of blunders. The value of its singular readings is to a great extent discounted by this fact, and by it also their large number, as compared with those of r_1 and μ , is at

¹ The numbers given in this and the following paragraph are to be regarded as merely approximate, though I have taken pains to make them as accurate as possible. The general inference drawn from them is not likely, I believe, to be affected by any errors I may have made in the enumeration.

² *Evangeliorum Versio*, p. xvi.

least partially accounted for. On the whole, therefore, r_1 must be held to contain the purest Old Latin text, μ the most corrupted, while r_2 —allowance being made for errors of the scribe—occupies a position midway between them.

In the Lucan fragment, the relation between μ and r_1 seems not to be quite the same as in St Matthew. In the former there are 1078 places in which one or other of the manuscripts varies from A. In 379 of these μ and r_1 agree, or, though not yielding exactly the same text, support one another in opposition to A; in 87 they vary from it independently. In 345 cases μ alone varies from A, in 267 cases r_1 alone. These figures point to the inference that μ has here an older type of text than r_1 . That the variation in character has taken place rather in μ than in r_1 appears from the fact that while the number of variants in both manuscripts is greater than might have been expected, judging from the number found in St Matthew, the increase in variation is even more marked in μ than in r_1 . The Lucan fragment is about half as long again as the Matthean, and the Codex Usserianus is here in a less fragmentary state. Now in St Matthew r_1 yields 336 variants; we might therefore expect rather more than 500 in St Luke. We have in fact 733, or about 50 per cent more. In μ , on the other hand, in St Matthew, there are nearly 275 variants, which warrants us in anticipating say 410 in St Luke. We actually find more than double the number—831. There is no evidence, so far as I have observed, to show that either r_1 or μ has suffered more from transcriptional errors in the third than in the first Gospel: we may thus pretty safely infer that the text of μ is in St Luke more ancient than in St Matthew,—more ancient indeed than that of r_1 in either Gospel, and less adulterated with Vulgate mixture.

§ 7. *The Affinities of the Irish Text (St Matthew).*

It may be well now to carry our inquiry somewhat further, at least with regard to the passage in St Matthew, in which we enjoy the advantage of having three witnesses to the text. Our object is to ascertain the affinities of the Irish Old Latin text. It is generally agreed that it

belongs in the main to the European family, of which *b* is the typical representative. We shall make the attempt to discover whether there are any variations from that type, and to what extent these are derived from the Italian or African recensions. This will be most easily done by giving a list of the readings in which at least two of our mss. ($\mu r_1 r_2$) are in agreement against the Vulgate, omitting those which are found in *b*.¹ With these we have noted the principal mss. of the pre-hieronymian text in which they are found. We confine ourselves to *f* for the Italian family, *e* and Cyprian's quotations for the African (*k* not being available), and *a d* as representing other ancient types of text. The references for the Cyprianic readings are to the pages of Hartel's edition in the *Vienna Corpus*.

I. Readings in which at least two of the three MSS. $\mu r_1 r_2$ agree.

- Matt. xxiv. 12. $r_1 r_2$ (*ms.*) quia pro quoniam = *d*.
 μr_2 iniquitas et ref.
 14². $\mu r_1 r_2$ per totum orbem = *e* (+ terrarum) Cyp. i. 335 (+ terrae).
 15. μr_2 (*hiat* r_1) per danielum profetam (-tum r_2) = *d e* Cyp. i. 335.
 17. $\mu r_1 r_2$ in tecto sunt.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ discendant (-dent μ).
 18. μr_1 in agro erit; r_2 in agro sunt. *e f* Cyp. i. 335 in agro est.
 23. r_1 aut ecce illic; r_2 ecce illic: $r_1 = a$ Cyp. i. 336, $r_2 = b e$.
 24. μr_1 (*hiat* r_2) exsurgent = *a d f*.
 27. μr_1 usque ad = *e f* Cyp. i. 336.
 μr_2 (*hiat* r_1) erit aduentus = *a d*.

¹ The number of variants recorded in the following list is over 200: it would have been about 350 had those been included which are supported by *b*.

² The text of this verse is of peculiar interest. - St Patrick, in his Confession (Whitley Stokes, *Tripartite Life*, ii. p. 369), quotes St Matt. xxiv. 14 as follows: "Predicabitur hoc euangelium regni in uniuerso mundo in testimonium omnibus gentibus; et tunc ueniet *finis*." And elsewhere (p. 367) he says that our Lord had foretold that His Gospel would be preached "in testimonium omnibus gentibus ante *finem* mundi." These two passages suffice to show that St Patrick read the last word of the verse as it is found in $r_2 d f q \delta$ Cyp. i. 335, though μr_1 agree in this case with the Vulgate. In the earlier part of the verse, on the other hand, his reading agrees with the Vulgate against the unanimous testimony of our three manuscripts, which have there adopted the African "per totum orbem" of *e* Cyp. i. 335. This is the only passage within the limits of our fragments quoted by St Patrick.

- Matt. xxiv. 30. $\mu r_1 r_2$ apparebit = $e f$ Cyp. i. 336.
 r_1 lamentabunt[*t . . .*]; r_2 lamentabunt se . e lamentabuntur;
e vel r_2 = Cyp. i. 336.
31. $\mu r_1 r_2$ (*ms.*) quattuor angulis uentorum . b quat. angulos caeli.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ *ad fin* + cum coeperint autem (*om.* autem μ) haec fieri
 respicite et leuate caput quoniam (quia r_1) adpropiat redemptio uestra = b (capita uestra) d (incipientibus . . . his
 . . . capita uestra quia).
32. μr_2 (*hiat* r_1) cognoscitis (-cetis μ) *pro* scitis = $d e$ (-cite).
 μr_2 (*hiat* r_1) prope esse aestatem (aestas μ).
33. μr_2 (*hiat* r_1) sic *pro* ita.
 μr_2 (*hiat* r_1) quoniam *pro* quia = $d e$.
 $*\mu r_1$ (? *ms.*) r_2 prope est ianuis.
35. $\mu r_1 r_2$ (*ms.*) uerba autem = $a d e f$.
37. $\mu r_1 r_2$ (*ms.*) enim *pro* autem = $d e$.
38. μr_2 manducabant; r_1 manducantes : $\mu r_2 = a$; $r_1 = b d e f$.
 μr_2 bibebant = a .
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ et (*om.* r_1) nubebant.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ uxores ducebant = a .
 μr_1 (? *ms.*) r_2 usque in = $a d f$.
 μr_2 *om.* eum = f .
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ noe in arcam = $d f$.
39. $\mu r_1 r_2$ non senserunt.
40. $\mu r_1 r_2$ erunt duo.
 μr_1 alter relinquetur; r_2 alius rel.
42. $*\mu r_1 r_2$ qua die uel (+ qua μ) hora . e qua hora aut qua die.
45. $r_1 r_2$ *om.* suus = $a d e$.
 μr_2 super = $a d e$.
49. $*\mu r_2$ conseruos suos percutere.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ ebriosis = $d f$.
51. μr_1 cum infidelibus.
- xxv. 1. $r_1 r_2$ simlabitur = d .
 $*r_1 r_2$ prodierunt.
 2. r_1 (? *ms.*) r_2 sapientes = d .
 3. μr_2 (*hiat* r_1) fatuae autem . d stultae ergo.
 4. $r_1 r_2$ sapientes = d .
 $r_1 r_2$ (*ms.*) autem *pro* uero = d .
 $r_1 r_2$ *om.* suis.
 9. μr_2 et (*om.* r_2) dixerunt.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ ad eos qui uendunt. . . .
 $*r_1 r_2$ emite nobis oleum.
 11. μr_1 (*e spat.*) r_2 postea *pro* nouissime = f .
 μr_2 (*hiat* r_1 [*ms.*]) uenerunt (-iarunt r_2) = $d f$.
 12. μr_2 (*ms.*) (*hiat* r_1) uobis + quia = f .
 14. $r_1 r_2$ substantiam suam = $d f$.

- Matt. xxv. 15. $\mu r_1 r_2$ + quidem ante dedit = *d*.
 16. $\mu r_1 r_2$ autem abiit (abhiis r_2) = *f*.
 17. μr_1 similiter autem.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ et qui = *a d f*.
 19. * μr_2 om. uero.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ tempus = *d f*.
 * μr_1 illorum seruorum.
 20. * μr_2 om. et pri.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ accessit . . et.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ (ms.) om. talenta sec.
 $r_1 r_2$ lucratus.
 21. $\mu r_1 r_2$ serue bone = *d f*.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ fidelis fuisti.
 23. μr_1 (hiat r_2) dominus suus = *d*. [r_2 om. vv. 22, 23.]
 μr_1 fidelis fuisti.
 24. μr_1 colligis.
 25. * $\mu r_1 r_2$ timui ergo (enim μ) et.
 26. $r_1 r_2$ serue nequam = *a* (nequa) . *d* nequa serue.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ colligo = *f*.
 27. $\mu r_1 r_2$ te dare pecuniam ; r_2 uenundari pecuniam.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ ego ueniens.
 29. * $r_1 r_2$ om. autem.
 μr_1 etiam quod ; r_2 quod . . . etiam.
 34. μr_2 regnum quod uobis paratum est = Cyp. i. 391, 430¹. Cyp. i. 100, 112, quod uobis paratum est regnum.
 35. $r_1 r_2$ suscepistis pro collexistis.
 36. $\mu r_1 r_2$ carcere (-rem r_2) fui = *d f* Cyp. i. 100, 112, 181, 391, 700.
a b carcerem eram.
 37. $\mu r_1 r_2$ aut sitientem = *d f*.
 * μr_1 potauimus te ; r_2 pauimus te . *d f* Cyp. i. 100, 112, 391, potauimus.
 38. * $r_1 r_2$ + aut ad init.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ suscepimus (suscip. μr_2) = *a*.
 39. $\mu r_1 r_2$ uel pro aut.
 40. $\mu r_1 r_2$ ex pro de = Cyp. i. 100, 112, 392.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ om. his.
 41. $\mu r_1 r_2$ quem (quae r_2) praeparauit (par. r_1) pater meus = *d* (quod) Cyp. i. 100 (L) : r_1 = *a* (quod) *b* Cyp. i. 100 (Hartel), 112, 392.
 42. $r_1 r_2$ bibere ([. . .]e r_1).²
 43. $r_1 r_2$ suscepistis = *f*.
 $r_1 r_2$ cooperuistis = *f*.

¹ So also Lebar Brecc, p. 450. See Bernard in *Trans. of R.I.A.*, xxx. p. 323.

² So Lebar Brecc, p. 418, *Trans. R.I.A.*, xxx. 323.

- Matt. xxv. 44. μr_1 (*ms.*) r_2 respond. + ei = *f*.
 45. * $r_1 r_2$ respondet (respōn̄ μ).
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ eis = *d*.
 $r_1 r_2$ minimis = *a* Cyp. i. 101, 112, 392. *d* minimorum.
 46. $\mu r_1 r_2$ et tunc ibunt (*om.* et μ).
 μ isti *pro* hi; r_1 [. .] s[t]i (? *ms.*); r_2 iniusti : μ = Cyp. i. 101,
 112, 392.
 xxvi. 1. $\mu r_1 r_2$ omnia uerba haec.
 3. * $\mu r_1 r_2$ (*ms.*) uocabatur.
 8. μr_2 quod (qui μ) cum uidissent.
 9. r_1 hoc *pro* istud; r_2 haec (*ms.*): r_1 = *d*.
 μ pretioso multo; r_1 praetio; r_2 praetio magna : r_1 = *a b* . *f* multo
 praetio.
 10. * $\mu r_1 r_2$ bonum opus.
 12. * $\mu r_1 r_2$ ecce enim mittens.
 * $\mu r_1 r_2$ *om.* haec.
 19. μr_1 eis = *a d*. [hiat r_2 usque v. 45.]
 21. μr_1 manducantibus = *a d*.
 23. μr_1 dixit = *a d*.
 24. * μr_1 non nasci homini illi . *b* homini illi non nasci.
 25. μr_1 traditurus cum erat . *a b f* traditurus erat eum.
 26. μr_1 ipsis autem manducantibus = *d*. *a b* ipsis autem cenanti-
 bus.
 μr_1 dicens *pro* et ait = *f*.
 29. μr_1 uobis + quia = *f*.
 34. * μr_1 quoniam.
 35. μr_1 dicit = *d*.
 36. μr_1 cum illis iesus . *f* cum eis iesus.
 μr_1 agrum qui = *d*.
 38. μr_1 dicit = *d*.
 45. $r_1 r_2$ (*ms.*) ait = *f*.
 47. μ plurima multitudo; r_1 plurima turba.
 50. $\mu r_1 r_2$ cui dixit.
 * μr_2 uenisti fac.
 51. $r_1 r_2$ abscidit.
 53. $r_1 r_2$ putatis = *f*.
 r_1 non posse me; r_2 non . . possum me . *a b* non . . . posse me.
 * $r_1 r_2$ exiberet; μ exhibet.
 55. $\mu r_1 r_2$ ad turbas . *a* ad turbam.
 * $r_1 r_2$ eram *pro* sedebam.
 $r_1 r_2$ tenuistis me = *a d*.
 56. * μr_2 inpleretur.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ discipuli eius = *a*.
 57. $\mu r_1 r_2$ illi autem = *d*.
 * $\mu r_1 r_2$ perduxerunt.

- Matt. xxvi. 58. $\mu r_1 r_2$ intus= d .
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ (ms.) exitum rei pro finem= a . $b d f$ finem rei.
59. $\mu r_1 r_2$ aduersus= $a d f$.
60. $\mu r_1 r_2$ inuenerunt in eum (eo μ) quicquam (quicquam r_2). d inuenerunt sequentia.
 $*r_1 r_2$ om. cum . . . accessissent.
61. $*r_1$ (?) r_2 dei hoc ; μ hoc dei : $\mu = b d$.
63. μr_1 dixit pro ait= $a d$.
64. $\mu r_1 r_2$ + et ad init.
 $r_1 r_2$ dixit.
65. $*\mu$ (hiat r_1) opus est pro egemus ; r_2 opus uobis . d opus habemus.
69. $\mu r_1 r_2$ petrus autem.
 μr_1 ex (de r_1) ancillis= f .
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ dixit ([. . .]t r_1).
71. μ illis pro his ; $r_1 r_2$ eis : $\mu = a$ (illi).
72. μ dixit quia ; r_1 dicens quia ; r_2 dicens : $r_1 = f$; $r_2 = b$.
74. μr_1 statim.
75. μr_2 (hiat r_1) amarissime fleuit . f fleuit amare ; b amarissime plorauit.
- xxvii. 1. μr_2 (hiat r_1) fecerunt pro inierunt= $a f$.
2. μr_1 eum adduxerunt . $a d$ eum duxerunt.
3. μr_1 quoniam pro quod ; r_2 quia : $\mu r_1 = d$; $r_2 = a b f$.
5. μr_1 (e spat. ms.) om. abiens.
6. μr_1 eos mittere= f .
 $*\mu r_2$ corb. hoc est in oblationem (locum r_2) . b loculum.
7. μr_1 autem facto.
8. μr_1 cognominatus est.
9. μr_1 adimpletum= f .
 μr_2 (hiat r_1) om. $a = f$.
13. μr_1 ei.
 μr_1 testificantur= f . d testantur.
14. $*\mu r_1$ multum pro uehementer.
15. $*\mu r_2$ om. autem.
 $*\mu r_1$ consuetudo erat.
17. μr_1 uobis dimittam= d .
 $r_1 r_2$ (ms.) aut pro an= d .
18. $\mu r_1 r_2$ (ms.) tradiderunt= f . $a b d$ tradiderant.
19. μr_2 eum pro illum= $a d$.
20. $\mu r_1 r_2$ (ms.) autem pro uero= d .
21. $\mu r_1 r_2$ de duobis dimittam uobis (u. dim. r_1)= d . f ex d. dim. uobis ; b de duobus uobis dimittam ; a uobis de du. mittam.
24. $\mu r_1 r_2$ (ms.) manus suas= d .
25. μr_1 huius pro eius= $d f$.
26. μr_1 eum crucifigerent . $a b$ cruci eum figerent ; d crucifigerent eum.

- Matt. xxvii. 27. * $\mu r_1 r_2$ duxerunt . . . et *pro* suscipientes.
 μr_2 (*hiat* r_1) praetorium = *d*.
28. * μr_1 (*e spat.*) r_2 uestiarunt eum (*om.* eum r_2) tunicam purpuream et. *a b f* induerunt eum (*om.* eum *b*) tunicam purpuream et; *d* vestientes eum tunicam purpuream.
30. * $\mu r_1 r_2$ expuerunt . . . et (*om.* et r_2). *a* expuebant . . . et.
31. * μr_2 *om.* et *sec.*
32. μr_1 cirinensem ([*c*]yr. r_1).
 * $\mu r_1 r_2$ uenientem obuam illi (*sibi* r_2). $r_2 = a$; *b d* obuam sibi uenientem.
35. * μr_2 *om.* autem.
38. $\mu r_1 r_2$ crucifixerunt. *f* crucifixissent.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ duos = *f*.
 μr_2 (*hiat* r_1) unum *pro* unus *pri.* = *f*.
 $r_1 r_2$ unum *pro* unus *sec.* = *f*.
40. μr_1 saluum fac.
41. r_1 [eu]m cum; r_2 eum : $r_1 = f$.
43. μr_2 filius dei.
44. * $r_1 r_2$ crucifixerant (-runt r_2).
45. μr_1 ab ora autem sexta = *d*. *a* ab hora sexta.
 r_1 usque in; r_2 in : $r_1 = a$ Cyp. i. 91.
46. μr_1 (? *ms.*) *om.* meus *pri.*
49. μr_1 si uenit = *a d f* : r_2 si ueniat; *b* si ueniet.
 μ et saluet; r_1 et saluabit.
 * μr_2 + *ad fin. vers.* alius hautem accipit lanciam et (accepta lanciam r_2) pupungit latus eius et exiit (exit μ) aqua et sanguis.
50. * μr_1 exclamauit . . . et; r_2 exclamans.
54. * $\mu r_1 r_2$ cum uidissent terrae motum. *d* uidentes t. m.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ ea *pro* his = *a* (*sic*).
55. $\mu r_1 r_2$ fuerant *pro* erant *sec* = *a*.
 $\mu r_1 r_2$ illi *pro* ei.
57. $r_1 r_2$ autem sero = *f*.
58. $\mu r_1 r_2$ dari *pro* reddi = *f*.
59. μr_1 cum accepisset ioseph corpus = *a*. [*hiat* r_2 usque *fin. ev.*]
60. μr_1 discessit (-et μ) *pro* abiit.
65. μr_1 milites *pro* custodiam.
66. μr_1 et signauerunt.

Most of these readings may fairly claim to have found place in the Irish recension of the Old Latin, and about one-fifth of them have no other pre-hieronymian attestation so far as I have been able to discover. These I have marked with asterisks. Some few of them may seem to suggest that the Irish Old Latin recension was based to some extent on a study

of the original Greek. Such are the omission (supported by the Greek cursives 24*, 39, 180, 198, etc.) of a part of xxvi. 60, and the narrative of the piercing of the Saviour's side, found in the uncials **Ⲛ B C L I U** and some cursives and versions at xxvii. 49. But M. Berger's caution (*L'Histoire*, p. 34) on this subject must not be forgotten.

Among the remainder, Dr Sanday's remarks on the St Gall fragment (*p*)¹ lead us to expect to find some of Italian origin. In the search for these we are indeed confined to a somewhat restricted area. The Italian origin of a reading cannot be proved, though it may be sometimes very probable, in the absence of opposing African testimony. Now, for the entire extent of our Matthew fragment the Codex Bobiensus (*k*) is wanting, the Codex Palatinus (*e*) is available only for xxiv. 12-49, xxviii. 2 *sqq.*, Cyprian's citations for xxiv. 12-31, xxv. 31-46, xxvi. 28, 29, 39, xxvii. 3, 4, 45. Or, in other words, African evidence is forthcoming only for about one-quarter of the fragment. Keeping within the limits of these passages, a few readings, supported by *f* alone among the group *a b e f* Cyp., may be classed under this head. Upon several of them, indeed, no stress can be laid: but the more significant are xxiv. 38 *usque in diem . . . noe in arcam*, xxv. 43 *suscepistis . . . cooperuistis*.

Far more important is the African element, of which no instances were brought to light by Dr Sanday's comparison of *p* with *r*₁. African readings are found in our passages from St Matthew at the following places: xxiv. 14, *per totum orbem*; xxiv. 15, *per danielum profetam*; xxiv. 30, *lamentabuntur*, or *lamentabunt se*; xxiv. 32, *cognoscitis*; xxiv. 42, *qua die uel (qua) hora*; xxv. 34, *regnum quod uobis paratum est*; xxv. 46, *isti*; and perhaps also at xxv. 40, *ex*. We may be allowed also to add xxiv. 31, *a quattuor angulis uentorum*, and xxiv. 51, *cum infidelibus*, supported by *m* alone among old Latin authorities, and xxiv. 39, *senserunt*, found elsewhere in *h m* only. We shall perhaps not be wrong in concluding that African influences played a larger part in shaping the Irish text of St Matthew's Gospel than Italian.

When, still keeping within the same limits, we come to look for coincidences with *d*, which appear so strikingly in *p*, disappointment

¹ *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, ii. p. ccvi *sqq.*

awaits us. Three only, and those of little importance, are found: xxiv. 12, *quia*; xxv. 45, *eis*; xxvii. 45, *ab ora autem sexta*.

What, now, is the significance of these coincidences of reading? Are we to infer direct literary contact with the African and Italian texts and the text represented by *d*? By no means. M. Berger has remarked the resemblance of the text of the Codex Claromontanus (*h*) to that of *r*₁. Of the 350 variants in our passage of St Matthew in which two of the three MSS. μ *r*₁ *r*₂ are together, it supports them in about 230, or in two-thirds of the entire number. Among the readings attested by it are both those which we have classed as Italian (one however only partially), the three in which it coincides with *d*, and seven of the eleven which we regard as African. The thought is thus suggested that the Irish recension may not be in the strictest sense indigenous. The version upon which it was founded, and from which its African, Italian, and *d* elements were derived, may have been imported from the region which gave birth to the text represented by *h*. If the provenance of *h* can be fixed, we shall perhaps have advanced one step towards ascertaining the local origin of the Irish Old Latin text.

§ 8. Individual readings of μ , *r*₁, *r*₂ in St Matthew.

I now proceed to give a list of the individualisms of μ —variants, that is, in which it stands apart from both *r*₁ and *r*₂. For the sake of completeness, I include those which appear to be mere scribe's errors, marking them, however, with an obelus. Opposite each reading is given a list of its supporters among the Old Latin MSS. *a b c d e f ff₁ g₁ h n q δ* . Where *r*₁ or *r*₂ gives a rival variant, I have recorded it with its Old Latin supporters. In all cases where this is not done, *r*₁ and *r*₂ agree with, or at least support, the Amiatine text.

II. Readings in which μ stands alone.

- Matt xxiv. 13. permanserit = *b c q . a* remanserit.
 15. hautem *pro* ergo (*hiat r*₁).
 24. inducant = *c f h*.
 electos = *c d f ff₁ h*.
 26. credere *pro* exire (*hiat r*₁) = *c ff₁ (sed et exire pro credere) . r*₂ *om.*
 exire *usque nolite . b om. nolite exire.*

- Matt. xxiv. 29. [et] statim hautem.
 eorum *pro* illorum.
 eorum *pro* caelorum.
30. plangent se = $a c m q . r_1$ lamentabun[t . .]; r_2 lamentabunt se
 —*vide sup.*
31. a summo.
35. transibunt *pro* praeteribunt = d (transient) e (transient).
41. *om.* molentes. r_1 *om.* in mola = a .
 †unus (*bis*) = q .
43. fur uenisset (*hiat* r_1). r_2 fur ueniet. $a b c f h$ fur uenit. $d e h q \delta$
 fur ueniret.
45. *om.* quis putas est. $r_1 r_2$ quisnam est = $a b c f f_1 h m . d q$ quis
 enim est.
- xxv. 1. *om.* et sponsae (*hiat* r_1) = δ .
9. †nobis *pro* uobis *sec.*
15. talio (*bis*).
18. †habens *pro* abiens. $r_1 r_2$ *om.* abiens = $a b c d f_1$.
20. tradidisti mihi. r_1 mihi dedisti = $b f_1 q$.
21. †at *pro* ait.
 dominus suus (*hiat* r_1) = $d f_1 h$.
om. in. (*hiat* r_1).
22. *om.* autem (*hiat* r_1).
 acceperat + similiter.
 dixit = $d f$.
 mihi tradidisti = $d g_1 h \delta . r_1$ mihi dedisti = $f_1 q$.
 †alio. } *om.* vv. 22, 23 $r_2 = a$.
- superlucratus (*hiat* r_1) = $d f$.
23. serue bone = $b c d f f_1 g_1 q \delta$.
om. in.
om. tui.
26. †mala. $r_1 r_2$ nequam (*vide sup.*).
om. et *pri.*
 †metuo.
29. *om.* ab eo (*hiat* r_1).
30. inutilem seruum nequam. $r_1 r_2$ nequam seruum (*vide sup.*).
32. *om.* eos.
 quemadmodum *pro* sicut = Cyp. i. 100, 112, 391.
 separat pastor. δ pastor separat vel segregat.
33. quidem oues = δ . r_1 *om.* quidem = $b c d f f_1 h$ Cyp. i. 100, 112,
 391.
34. percipite *pro* possidete = Cyp. i. 100, 112, 391, 430.
 ab initio *pro* a constitutione. r_2 ab origine = $c d f_1 \delta$ Cyp. i. 100,
 112, 391, 430.¹

¹ So also Lebar Brecc, p. 450: Bernard in *Trans. R.I.A.*, xxx. p. 323.

- Matt. xxv. 38. *om. autem* = δ Cyp. i. 100, 112, 391. r_1 aut *pro* quando autem te uidimus.
40. †respondit (*hiat* r_1).
43. nudus eram (*hiat* r_1) = h . r_2 nudus fui = Cyp. i. 112. carcere fui.¹
- xxvi. 6. iesus esset = ff_1 .
7. accedens.
9. *om. istud*. r_1 [h]oc = d ; r_2 haec (*ms.*) = h .
13. ut ubicumque.
21. me traditur *pro* traditurus est me (*hiat* r_2). r_1 tradet me = $a d h \delta$.
22. contristati sunt (*hiat* r_2).
24. + et ad init. (*hiant* $r_1 r_2$) = $c q$.
tradetur *pro* uadit (*hiat* r_2). r_1 uadet.
om. de illo (*hiat* r_2). r_1 [de] eo = $a d f q$.
26. *om. et pri* (*hiat* r_2).
et *pro* ac (*hiat* r_2) = $c h$.
et dedit (*hiant* $r_1 r_2$) = $a c f q \delta$.
29. diem illum cum illud (*hiat* r_2) = $b c f ff_1 h q$. r_1 illud diem cum illud.
32. †*om. postquam autem* (*hiant* $r_1 r_2$).
33. dixit (*hiat* r_2) = $a c d h$. δ ait uel dixit.
om. illi (*hiant* $r_1 r_2$) = $b c$.
si *pro* etsi (*hiant* $r_1 r_2$) = $a b c d q \delta$.
ego enim nunquam (*hiat* r_2). h ego autem numquam.
35. si *pro* etiamsi (*hiat* r_2).
38. + iesus ante tristis (*hiant* $r_1 r_2$) = $a f h \delta$.
39. cecidit (*hiat* r_2) = d .
quod *pro* sicut (*bis*) (*hiat* r_2) = Cyp. i. 133.
40. discipulos suos (*hiat* r_2) = $a b c d f ff_1 g_1 h q$.
dixit (*hiat* r_2) = $a g_1$. r_1 ait = $b c f q$.
42. abiit hautem iterum (*hiant* $r_1 r_2$).
om. si (*hiat* r_2) = $a h$.
om. hic (*hiat* r_2).
transire a me (*hiat* r_2 ; r_1 [? *ms.*] = Δ) = $f q \delta$.
om. tua (*hiat* r_2).
43. *om. et pri* (*hiat* r_2).
44. relinquens eos (*hiat* r_2) = d .
om. dicens (*hiat* r_2) = a .
45. eis = $d q$.
47. ex *pro* de = $a f$.
multitudo *pro* turba.
48. quem *pro* quemcumque = $d f g_1 h$.
51. extendit . . . et (*hiat* r_1).

¹ So Lebar Brecc, p. 431: *Trans. R.I.A.*, xxx. 323.

- Matt. xxvi. 52. in gladio (*hiat* r_1) = $h \delta$.
 53. exhibet. $r_1 r_2$ exhiberet.
 57. conuenerunt (*hiat* r_1) = $g_1 \delta$.
 58. in atrio sedebat.
 59. *om. autem.*
 61. templum hoc dei = $b c d h$. r_1 (?) r_2 t. dei hoc.
 62. testificantur aduersus te.
 64. ad dexteram = $a b c f h q$.
 65. blasfemat.
 quid nunc adhuc.
 67. cæderunt (*hiat* r_1). r_2 cedentes.
 eius *pro* ei = $c h$. r_1 *om.* ei (?) . r_2 *om.* alii *usque* dederunt = $a b \delta$.
 69. illi et tu. r_2 ei et tu = n (*corrector*).
 72. *om. et.*
 iuramento + dixit. $r_1 r_2$ dicens = $b c f h$.
 75. *om. et sec.* (*hiat* r_1).
 xxvii. 1. cum factum esset (*hiat* r_1) = h .
 3. damnatus est (*hiat* r_1) = $b c d g_1 q \delta$. f ad iudicium ductus est; h
 iudicatus est.
 5. processit. $r_1 r_2$ secessit = $a b c h q$.
 suspendit se = d .
 7. \dagger ex illis hautem.
 17. *om.* ergo. $r_1 r_2$ autem *pro* ergo = $a b c d f g_1 h q$.
 19. *om.* enim (*hiat* r_1).
 22. \dagger qui *pro* quid.
 23. *om.* illis = δ .
 pilatus *pro* praesis = $g_1 h$.
 24. fier. in populo = b .
 dicens coram populo.
 28. *om.* exuentes eum (*hiat* r_1) = $a b c d q$. r_2 cum spoliassent eum.
 29. *om. et pri.*
 adorabant *pro* inludabant. r_2 deludentes. $a b c h q$ deludebant.
 31. calamidem cocciniam. h chlamydem et uestem purpuream.
om. et tert. = d . r_2 *om.* et duxerunt usque *fin. vers.*
 + eum ad *fin.* (*hiat* r_1). $a b$ cruci eum figerent; f eum cruci-
 figerent.
 32. tollere *pro* ut tolleret.
 36. obseruabant (*hiat* r_1) = δ . r_2 seruauerunt.
 37. illius *pro* ipsius.
 inscribam. r_2 scriptum est.
 38. alterum *pro* unus *sec.*. $r_1 r_2$ unum = $f. a g_1 h q$ alter.
 39. tunc euntes *pro* praetereuntes autem. $r_1 r_2$ transeuntes autem
 = $a b c d h q$.
 40. distruebas = $b f_1 h \delta$. r_2 distruas = f (-es.)
 42. es discende.

- Matt. xxvii. 43. *confidat.*
dominum . r₁ deo suo . r₂ deum = c d f g₁ δ . ff₁ domino.
iam liberet eum.
46. *circa hautem horam (hiat r₁) = c h ; r₂ circa uero horam . d circa*
. . . . autem horam ; q δ circa autem horam.
om. nonam.
48. *arundinem . r₁ in harundin [. .] = a h.*
49. *sinete (hiat r₁) = δ.*
51. *usque ad.*
terrae motus factus est magnus = h . a terrae motum factum est
magnum.
52. *om. multa.*
57. *esset factum.*
58. *+ iesu ad fn. (hiat r₂).*
65. *sicut ipsi scitis (hiat r₂).*
66. *om. abeuntes (hiat r₂).*
lapidem + et discesserunt (hiat r₂).
- xxviii. 3. *hautem pro enim (hiat r₂) = a b c d e f ff₁ g₁ n q δ . r₁ et erat = h.*

An inspection of this list brings to light both Italian (xxiv. 24) and African (xxiv. 35; xxv. 32, 34, 38; xxvi. 39) readings, the latter bearing about the same proportion to the former as in the preceding table. The only reading supported by *d* alone of our selected MSS. is *cecidit*, xxvi. 39. Moreover, we observe that nearly half the individual readings of μ (60 out of 129) are supported by other Old Latin MSS., and may accordingly be probably assumed to be genuine readings, and not mere later corruptions of the text. This is in itself sufficient to show that even readings in which μ stands alone against, or at least without the support of, $r_1 r_2$ may be of high value. It is interesting, moreover, to mark that in a few instances (xxiv. 30 (43); xxv. 22, 23, 33, 43; xxvi. 40, 67; xxvii. 40, 43; xxviii. 3) readings of μ attested by other Old Latin texts are set over against rivals of r_1 or r_2 with similar support. This appears to suggest that there may have existed side by side in Ireland two or more recensions of the Evangelical text, closely similar, and yet appreciably differing from one another. Three of the individual readings of μ (xxiv. 15, *autem* = \aleph^c L, etc.; xxvi. 42, *om. hic* = V, etc.; xxvii. 17, *om. ergo* = 243) have Greek support. They may possibly be due to a revision of the text by the aid of MSS. of the original.

It seems unnecessary to burden these pages with tables showing the

individual variants of r_1 and r_2 . It will suffice to state results. In r_1 there are about 110 such readings. Of these about 55 have other Old Latin attestation: two bear marks of African origin, xxiv. 20, *ne* (= *e* Cyp. i. 336), xxiv. 32, *fuertit tener* (= *e*); one, in itself of but little account, is supported by *f* alone among the primary manuscripts, xxvi. 29, *quia*; while *d* alone countenances xxiv. 31, *summum* for *terminos*, and xxv. 34, *praeparatum*. In r_2 we find about 175 individualisms, of which some 75 have Old Latin attestation; about 6 being African—xxiv. 21, *sed neque* (= *e* Cyp. i. 336), xxiv. 27, *apparet* (= *e* Cyp. i. 336), xxiv. 28, *ubi* (= *e* Cyp. i. 336), xxiv. 30, *om. tunc* (= *e*), xxv. 43, *nudus fui* (= Cyp. i. 112), *uenistis ad* (= Cyp. i. 100, 112, 392); and perhaps xxv. 45, *istis* (= Cyp. i. 101 [A]); one or two Italian—xxv. 36, *cooperuistis* (= *f*), and perhaps xxiv. 41, *altera* (*f alia*); while two are supported by *d* only, viz., xxiv. 34, *generatio haec*, and xxv. 34, *ab origine*.

§ 9. Affinities of the Irish Text (*St Luke*).

The Lucan fragment gives less material than the Matthean for such an inquiry as we have just now made, r_2 having here deserted us. Some results, however, may be obtained. The length of the passage and the largely increased deviation of μ from the Vulgate make it undesirable to give full lists of the readings. Of the 360 or 370 variants in which μr are together, 45 coincide with *e*, which is fortunately available for nearly the entire passage, against *b f*, and may therefore be esteemed as African. They are the following:—

- Luc. iv. 13. *ab eo* = *a d e* : *ab illo b f*.
 36. *quis est iste sermo* = *e* : *d quis est hic sermo* ; *a b f quid (quod f) est hoc uerbum*.
 43. *ad hoc enim* ; *d e in hoc enim* : *a quia ob hoc* ; *f quia ad hoc* ; *b quia ideo*.
 v. 14. *om. ipse* = *e* : *a b d f ipse*.
 22. *ad eos* = *e* : *d eis* ; *a b f ad illos*.
mala = *e* : *d iniqua* ; *om. a b f*.
 24. *grabatum* = *d* : *a b f lectum* ; *om. e, sed in vers. sequ. add. grabatum post tulit*.
 33. *orationes* = *a e* : *b f obsecrationes* ; *d praecationes*.
 36. *conueniet* = *a d e* : *b f conuenit*.

- Luc. vi. 8. surrexit et= $e : a b d f$ surgens.
20. ad= $e : a b d f$ in.
29. ei= $e : b f$ eum ; $a d$ ab eo.
33. ipsud= $e : a b d f$ om.
34. eis= $a e : b f$ his ; om. d .
37. dimittetur uobis ; e dimittitur uobis : $a b d f$ dimittimini.
- vii. 4. om. ad iesum= $a d e : b f$ ad iesum.
6. ibat autem cum illis iesus= $a d$ (eis) e (abiit itaque) : $b f$ iesus autem abiit (ibat f) cum eis (illis f).
12. mortuus= $a d$ (mortuum) $e : b f$ defunctus.
30. doctores= $a d e : b f$ periti.
42. amabit (-auit μ) ; $d e$ amat : b dilexit ; a diliget ; $d f$ diligit.
43. respondit= $e : a b d f$ respondens.
47. illi= $d e : a f$ ei ; b tibi.
- viii. 4. qui= $a d e : om. b f$.
8. bonam et optimam= $a e : d$ bon. et uberam ; $b f$ bonam.
9. similitudo= $e : a b d f$ parabola.
11. similitudo= $e : a b d f$ parabola.
14. suffocantur (om. euntes)= $e : b$ euntes simul suf. ; f euntes suf. ; d abientes suf., a ingredienti es suf.
15. audiunt . . . et ([aud.] . . . et r_1)= $e : a b d f$ audientes.
tenent= $e : a b f$ retinent ; d continent.
17. est enim= $d e : a b f$ enim est.
absconsum= $d e : a b f$ occultum.
19. eius et fratres= $d e : b f$ et fratres eius ; a et fratres illius.
22. nauem= $d e : a b f$ nauiculam.
24. discipuli= $a ; e$ discentes (ante dicentes) : om. $b d f$.
26. in= $a d e : b f$ ad.
28. exclamauit . . . dicens= $e : a b f$ exclamans . . . dixit ; d exclamauit . . . dixit.
49. eo= $a d e : b f$ illo.
- ix. 3. non (quater)= $e : d$ non . . . neque . . . neque . . . neque ; $a b f$ neque (quater).
habueritis= $e ; a f$ habeatis ; d habere ; $hiat b$.
11. eum= $a d e : b f$ illum.
eis= $e : a b d f$ illis.
24. hic= $d e$ Cyp. i. 345 : b ille ; om. $a f$.
32. cum eo erant= $a d e : b$ cum illo ; f cum illo erant.
47. iesus autem= $a d e : b$ ad iesus ; f et iesus.
49. magister= $a d e : b f$ praeceptor.

In nineteen of these readings e alone of the group $a b d e f$ supports μr_1 . Thus the anticipation which our experience led us to entertain, that the African element would be fairly conspicuous, is verified.

In the enumeration which follows we have of Italian readings 30 in all, or 16 if we include only those which have the support of *f* alone.

- Luc. iv. 5. iterum=*f*: *e* secundo; *om.* (*a*) *b d*.
 7. me=*f*: *a b* ante me; *d e* in conspectu meo.
- v. 6. ita ut rumperentur=*f*: *d* ut etiam . . . rumperentur; *e* ut . . . dirumperetur; *a b* rumpebantur (-atur *b*) autem.
 8. rogo te=*f*: *d* rogo; *e* oro te; *om.* *a b*.
 19. et per tegulas=*a f*: *e* et per teculatum; *b* et discoperuerunt tectum et; *d* et detegentes inbrices ubi erat.
 36. parabolam=*a d f*: *b e* similitudinem.
- vi. 10. sicut et altera; *f* sicut altera: *b d* sicut (+ et *d*) alia; *om.* *a e*.
 16. fuit traditor=*f*: *b* fuit proditor; *a* erat proditor; *d* etiam et tradidit eum; *e* tradidit illum.
 20. spiritu=*a f*: *om.* *b d e*.
 29. praebe + illi=*d f*: *a b e* ei.
 40. erit si sit=*a f*: *b* erit ut sit; *d* erit; *e* erits.
- vii. 3. qui cum audisset=*f*: *b e* et cum audisset; *d* et audiens; *a* audiens autem.
 14. iesus=*f*: *om.* *a b d e*.
 17. in omnem regionem=*f*: *d* in omni regione; *a* in omni finitima regione; *b* omni confinio regionis illius; *om.* *e*.
 22. iesus=*f*: *om.* *a b d e*.
 24. iesus dicere; *f* dicere iesus: *a b d e* dicere.
 42. illum=*a f*: *b d e* eum.
 43. autem (? *sec. man.* r_1)=*a f*: *om.* *b d e*.
- viii. 21. at ille=*d f*: *a b* qui; *e* ille autem.
 52. enim=*a d f*: *om.* *b e*.
- ix. 5. de pedibus uestris=*f*: *a b* uestrum de pedibus; *e* uestrum a pedibus uestris; *d* pedum uestrum.
 16. dedit=*f*: *a d e* dabat; *b* distribuit.
 24. eam (*bis*)=*d f*: *a b e* illam.
 39. ab eo=*d f*: *a* ab illo; *om.* *b*; *claus.* *om.* *e*.
 41. incredula=*d f*: *a e* incredibilis; *b* infidelis.
 42. eum *sec*=*f*: *om.* *a b d e*.
 45. hoc uerbum=*f*: *a d* uerbum hoc; *b* uerbum istut; *e* uerbum illud. intellegerent (intellex. μ)=*a f*: *b d e* sentirent.
 50. sinite eum et=*f*: *a* sinite illum et; *om.* *b d e*.
 51. in hierusalem=*a d f*: *b* hierusalem; *e* ad hierusalem.

In 11 readings we find coincidences with *d* alone:—

- Luc. v. 9. timor: *a f* pauor; *b* miratio; *e* stupor.
 20. uidens autem iesus fidem eorum (illorum r_1): *a* et uisa fide illorum; *b* quorum ut uidit fidem; *e* ille autem cum uidisset fidem illorum; *f* et uidens fidem eorum.

- Luc. v. 24. grabatum : *a b f* lectum ; *om. claus. e.*¹
- viii. 4. talem ad eos (illos r_1) : *b* ad illos talem ; *e* talem ; *om. a f.*
14. adferent (μ -unt) fructum : *a f* dant fructum ; *b* referunt fructum ;
e fecundantur.
15. fructificant : *a* fructum dant ; *b e f* fructum adferent (*f*-unt.)
17. occultum : *a b f* absconsum (-ditum *f*) ; *e* celatum.
- ix. 10. ei : *a b e f* illi.
19. ex *pro de* : *a b f* de ; *om. e.*
45. coopertum : *a f* occultum ; *e* absconsum ; *hiat b.*
47. eorum : *a b e f* illorum.

The only unsupported readings of μr_1 , so far as I have observed, which can be claimed as bespeaking, and that more than doubtfully, a reviser who consulted the Greek text, are v. 36 *scindetur* = R ; vii. 38 *tersit* = **N*** A D, etc. ($\epsilon\xi\xi\epsilon\mu\alpha\xi\epsilon\nu$).

§ 10. Individualisms of μr_1 in St Luke.

We come now to tabulate the African, Italian, and *d* readings found among the individual variants of our two manuscripts. It is curious to notice that while, as we might expect, the number of African variants in the two manuscripts is nearly equal, the Italian readings of μ exceed those of r_1 in the ratio of 4 : 1.

African readings in μ .

- Luc. iv. 11. quia = *e* : *b d* et ; *f* et quia ; *om. a.*
- v. 7. eum uen. (*om. et quart.*) = *e* : *a f* et uen. et ; *d* uenientes ergo ;
om. b.
14. uade et = *a d e* : *b f* uade.
15. de eo = *a d e* (deo) : *b f* de illo.
31. respondit . . . et ; *e* respondit et : *a b d f* respondens.
36. *om. et pri.* = *e* : *a b d f* et.
eos = *a d e* : *b f* illos.
- vi. 9. aut *pri. et tert.* = *d e* : *b f* an ; *hiat a.*
20. dixit (*hiat r_1*) = *e* : *a b d f* dicebat.
31. uobis faciant = *e* : *a b d f* faciant (-ciam *d*) uobis.
37. iudicetur de uobis = *e* : *b* de uobis . . . iudicabitur ; *a d f* iudice-
mini.
ne condempnemi = *e* Cyp. i. 139 : *a d* ut non cond. ; *b* et non
condemnami ; *f* et non condemnabimini.

¹ But see above, p. 56.

- Luc. vi. 45. bona = e : a b d f bonum.
 47. sit similis = a e : d est similis ; b f similis (-e b) est.
 vii. 12. sequebatur cum ; e consequbatur : d cum . . erat ; a b f cum.
 22. et tert. = e : om. a b d f.
 25. uestitum = e : a b f uestimentis indutum ; d uestimentis uestitum.
 28. quia = e : d quoniam ; om. a b f.
 illo est = a d e : b f est illo.
 36. recubuit = d e : a b f discubuit.
 40. dicere aliquid ; e dicere aliquid : a b f aliquid dicere ; d quod dicere.
 viii. 10. non est datum sed = e (nisi) : om. a b d f.
 similitudinibus ; e similitudinem (sic) : a b d f parabolis.
 14. per sollicitudinem ; e per sollicitudinis (sic) : a b d a sollicitudini-
 bus ; f a sollicitudine.
 16. om. ponit sec. = e : a b d f ponit.
 omnibus luceat = e : a b f intrantes uideant lumen ; d qui in-
 trant uideant lumen.
 21. respondit = e : a b d f respondens.
 27. exit . . et ; e cum exisset ; d exierunt . . et : b f cum egressus
 esset ; a gresso . . . illo.
 28. om. is = a d e : b is ; f qui.
 29. alligabatur = a e : d f ligabatur ; b uinctus.
 49. om. ei = e : a b f ei ; d illi.
 51. puellae et matrem = d e : a b f et matrem puellae.
 ix. 14. eos = d e : a b f illos.
 25. ipsum hautem = d e : a f autem ipsum ; b autem.
 41. om. et peruersa post incredula = a e : b d f et peruersa.
 47. adpraehendit . . et = e : b d f adpraehendens ; a adpraehensum.

African readings in r₁.

- Luc. iv. 6. dixit = a d e : b f ait.
 10. te conseruent = e : b f conseruent te : a d custodiant te.
 17. erat scribtum = a d e : b f scriptum erat.
 23. ad illos = a e : b f illis ; d ad eos.
 35. et nihil = e : b nihilque ; a d f nihil.
 v. 7. paene = d e : om. a b f.
 8. quod cum uidisset = e (om. quod) : b f quod cum uideret ; a hoc
 uiso ; om. d.
 quoniam = d e : a b f quia.
 12. om. rogauit eum (e spat.) = d e : b rogabat eum ; f rogauit eum ;
 a orabat illum.
 15. audire . . . curari = a d e : b f ut audirent . . curarentur.
 18. [in]ferre eum = e : b f eum inferre ; a inferre illum ; d inducere
 eum.

- Luc. v. 28. surrexit et = *e* : *a b d f* surgens.
 38. seruantur = *a d e* : *b f* conseruantur.
 vi. 2. quid = *a e* : *b* ad eos quid ; *f* illis quid ; *d* ei ecce quid.
 3. ad illos = *e* : *a b f* illis ; *d* ad eos.
 21. et sitiunt iustitiam = *e* : *b* et sitiunt ; *a* et sititis ; *om. d f*.
 35. quo[niam] = *a d e* : *b f* quia.
 46. me uocatis = *a e* : *b f* uocatis me ; *d* mihi dicitis.
 48. [est] enim = *e* : *a b d f* enim erat.
 49. domum = *a d e* : *b f* domum suam.
 vii. 6. dicens illi = *e* : *a d f* dicens ei ; *b* dicens.
 22. renuntiate = *a e* : *b f* nuntiate ; *d* dicite.
 34. uinarius = *e* : *a b f* bibens uinum ; *d* uinipotor.
 37. uas = *e* : *b d f* alabastrum ; *a* ampullam.
 42. ambobus = *e* : *a b d f* utrisque.
 43. et dixit = *e* : *a b d f* dixit.
 dixit = *e* : *a b f* dixit ei ; *d* dixit illi.
 45. osculando = *a e* : *b f* osculari ; *d* osculans.
 viii. 17. nihil = *a e* : *b d f* non.
 19. ad eum *pri.* = *d e* : *a b f* ad illum.
 24. accesserunt . . . et = *e* : *a b d f* accedentes.
 magister = *a e* : *b f* praeceptor ; *d* domine domine.
 25. iesus = *e* : *om. a b d f*.
 ix. 3. non calciamenta = *e* : *a b* neque cal. ; *d f om.*
 4. et . . . exite = *a d e* : *b* et . . . proficiscimini ; *f* donec exeatis.
 11. excipiens = *a e* : *b f* exceptit . . . et ; *d* suscipiens.
 12. deserto loco = *a d e* : *b f* loco deserto.
 22. quo[niam] = *a d e* : *b* quod ; *f* quia.
 32. cum eo *sec.* = *d e* : *b f* cum illo ; *a* ei.
 39. subito = *a e* : *d* desubito ; *b f* et subito clamat.
 50. *om.* ad illum = *d e* : *a f* ad illum ; *b* ad illos.
 54. eos = *a d e* : *b f* illos.

Italian readings in μ.

- Luc. iv. 5. in¹ montem excelsum ualde¹ ; *f* in montem excelsum : *d* in montem
 altum ualde ; *e* supra montem ; *om. b.* ; *a* hierusalem.
 mundi = *d f* : *a* orbis terrarum ; *b e* orbis terrae.
 41. eos = *f* : *e ea* ; *om. a b d*.
 v. 19. eum cum lecto = *f* : *a* eum cum lectulo ; *b* illum cum lecto ; *e*
 illum . . . cum grabattum ; *d* grabattum cum paralytico.
 24. dimittendi = *f* : *a* remittendi ; *b d* dimittere ; *e* dismittere.
 31. eis = *f* : *a b e* ad illos ; *d* ad eos.

¹ Here, as in other cases to be mentioned presently, we have a conflate reading, one member of which is found in *d*.

- Luc. vi. 7. in sabbato=*d f*: *a* (*e spat.*) *b e* sabbato.¹
 28. calumniantibus uobis=*f*: *b d* cal. uos; *a* his qui calumniantur uos; *e* eis qui uobis iniuria faciunt.
 42. perspicies (*hiat r₁*)=*a f*: *b* respicies; *d e* uidebis.
 vii. 10. qui languebat=*f*: *d* aegrum; *om.* *a b e*.
 15. protinus (*hiat r₁*)=*f*: *om.* *a b d e*.
 21. *om.* in *ad init.*=*a f*: *b d e* in.
 26. dico uobis etiam; *f* ita d. u. etiam: *a d* etiam d. u.; *b* utique d. u. et; *e* ita d. u. et.
 36. in domum=*a d f*: *b e* domum.
 48. peccata + tua=*f*: *om.* *b d e*.
 viii. 2. ab *sec.* (*hiat r₁*)=*f*: *om.* *b d e*; *claus.* *om.* *a*.
 11. haec est autem=*f*: *a b d* est autem haec; *e* est autem . . . haec.
 12. cecidit=*f*: *b* seminati sunt; *e* seminatum est; *om.* *a d*.
 15. cecidit (*hiat r₁*)=*f*: *om.* *a b d e*.
 18. et *sec.*=*a d f*: *b* etiam; *om.* *e*.
 29. eum=*d f*: *a b e* illum.
 49. ad principem=*f*: *a b* a principe; *d* ab archisynagogo; *e* puer principis.
 ix. 5. excutite puluerem=*d f*: *a b e* puluerem . . . excutite. illis=*a f*: *b d* supra (-per *d*) illos; *e* super eos.
 39. eum *pri.* =*f*: *a b d e* illum.

Italian readings in r₁.

- Luc. v. 14. mundatione=*f*: *b e* emundatione; *d* purificatione; *a* purgatione.
 vi. 38. cumulatam=*a f*: *b* confersam; *d* inpletam; *om.* *e*.
 viii. 14. cum audierint=*f*: *a b* audiunt et; *d e* audierunt et.
 ix. 13. iesus=*f*: *om.* *a b d e*.
 18. discipuli eius=*f*: *b d e* discipuli; *d* discipuli sui.
 19. respondentes=*a d f*: *b e* responderunt.
 54. uidentes=*a d f*: *b e* cum uidissent.

We must now give a list of individual readings of μ and r_1 in which the *d* element appears. It will be found specially remarkable in μ . In this manuscript we observe in the first place a constant tendency to substitute the oblique cases of 'is' for those of 'ille.' In many instances the resulting reading is found in *d* alone of the group *a b d e f*. Examples will be found at iv. 9, 39; vi. 7, 17; vii. 12, 36; viii. 18, 22,

¹In r_1 we have 'sabbatis,' but the two last letters are apparently written over 'o' erased.

30, 40; ix. 2, 3, 13, 33, 42. Omitting these, we discover sixteen *d* readings. The list follows:—

d readings in μ .

- Luc. iv. 7. *om.* procedens : *a b f* procidens ; *e* prostratus.
 21. *om.* quia : *b e f* quia ; *a* quoniam.
 36. in omnes : *b f* in omnibus ; *a e* super omnes.
 v. 18. inducere : *a b e f* inferre.
 37. utres ueteres *sec.* : *om.* ueteres *a b e f*.
 vi. 26. homines : *a b e f* omnes homines.
 vii. 10. in domum : *a b e f* domum.
 viii. 10. scire : *b f* nosse ; *e* cognoscere ; *om.* *a*.
 16. cooperit : *a e f* (-riet *a*) operit ; *om.* *claus. b*.
 37. rogauerunt autem : *b f* et rogauerunt ; *a* et rogauit ; *hiat e*.
 46. scio (sciui *d*) : *a b f* cognoui ; *hiat e*.
 49. magistrum : *a e* illum ; *f* eum ; *om.* *b* (?).
 56. expauerunt¹ (*hiat r*₁) ; *om.* *a b e f*.
 ix. 19. ex profetis prioribus² ; *d* ex profetis : *a b f* propheta . . de prioribus ; *e* profetarum.
 27. filium hominis (+ uenientem *d*) in gloria sua : *a b e f* regnum dei.
 51. compleretur : *a b f* complerentur ; *e* supplerentur.

The list for *r* is not so long. It comprises, in addition to substitutions of the parts of 'is' for those of 'ille' at iv. 21, 38, viii. 45 (*ms.*), the following:—

d readings in r_1 .

- Luc. iv. 24. amen amen : *a b e f* amen.
 vi. 14. primum simonem : *om.* primum *a b e f*.
 35. [iniqu]uos (?*ms.*) : *a e* nequas ; *b f* malos.
 vii. 12. adpropiasset (-aret *d*) : *a b e* adpropinquaret ; *f* adpropinquauit.
 viii. 3. illis : *a* illi ; *b* ei ; *e f* eis.
 39. in *sec.* : *a b f* per ; *hiat e*.
 ix. 10. r_1 seorsum + in uicum³ ; *d* seorsum + in castellum (*om.* in locum desertum) : *om.* in uicum *a b e f*.
 33. faciamus (facio *d*) hic : *om.* hic *a b e f*.

¹ Apparently a conflation in μ .

² Again, it would seem, a conflation.

³ A conflation.

Finally, a comparison of the lists now given for St Luke with those previously made for St Matthew brings to light the following facts. Allowing for the difference in length of the passages, and for the very small portion of the Matthean fragment for which African evidence is available, we find that the number of African variants in St Luke, attested by both μ and r_1 , is as nearly as possible what our experience of St Matthew might have led us to expect. The same remark may be made of the comparatively small group of d readings; though the examples of this class of variants are more satisfactory in the third than in the first Gospel. As regards these two constituents, the Irish Old Latin text appears to be homogeneous in the two passages. On the other hand, we observe in St Luke a very remarkable increase in the number of Italian variants. When we consider those readings in which μ is unsupported by r_1 , or r_1 by μ , our results are not quite identical. We find a large increase in the African element of μ , while in r_1 the African readings have increased even more notably, being about four times as numerous as might have been anticipated from St Matthew. The Italian element in μ has become very considerable, though still less important than the African; in St Matthew it was very small indeed. The Italian element in r_1 and the d element in both μ and r_1 are insignificant in both Gospels.