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The first two of these studies present a critical review of the Greek text assumed by W. Streitberg as the original of the Gothic New Testament fragments. They also give some account of the relation of the Gothic text to the contemporary Byzantine Greek text of the fourth century, and of its subsequent contact with the Old Latin version.

The third study provides an analysis of the renderings, in both the Gospels and the Epistles, of the particles καί, δέ, οὖν, and γάρ, the erratic representation of which in the Gospels, and especially in John, contrasts with the great degree of uniformity in the renderings of the other parts of speech. Differences in usage between the Gospels and the Epistles, and in the Gospels between John and Luke, may be due at least in part to the different translators engaged.

The original Gothic Gospels presumably preserved the usual order Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. The sixth-century Codex Argenteus follows the western order Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, which has here been conveniently retained.
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THE GREEK TEXT UNDERLYING THE GOTHIC VERSION OF THE GOSPELS

1. INTRODUCTORY

Any future editor of the Gothic Bible fragments will have to undertake a review and revision of the Greek text with which W. Streitberg equipped his edition, *Die Gotische Bibel* (Heidelberg, 1908). So far as the fourth-century Greek text of Antioch and Constantinople is concerned, Streitberg took full account of the work of Tischendorf, of Westcott and Hort, and of Hermann von Soden, as well as that of their contemporaries and predecessors in that field. But the possibilities and probabilities of the Greek original need to be closely correlated with the history of the Gothic N.T. text and the changes brought about by contextual adaptations and by the influence upon one another of the parallel passages and, from without, by its contact with the Old Latin version, a physical contact in the bilingual texts of the fifth and sixth centuries in which the Gothic and the Latin stood side by side. Besides this, there are to be considered the exigencies of grammar and idiom, so far as these can be certainly known.

Streitberg was fully aware that the extant text of C.A. does not everywhere reproduce the original version, and he ascribed most of its deviations to the influence of the parallel passages and the Old Latin version. But he does not seem to have applied these considerations to the determination of the Greek text from which the original version resulted. He speaks of 'die streng systematische Herstellung des griechischen Textes' and then goes on to say, 'Doch die Herstellung der Vorlage umfaßt nur die eine Hälfte der notwendigen Arbeit. Denn der gotische Text ist nicht unverändert auf uns gekommen' (&c., see n. 1). His twofold task, as appears from this section of the *Vorwort*, was first to determine the Greek original text, and then to recover such original Gothic renderings as he could from their extant form in the C.A. His

---

1 W. Streitberg, *G.B.*, *Vorwort*, pp. viii–ix: Denn der gotische Text ist nicht unverändert auf uns gekommen: an zahlreichen Stellen entfernt er sich vom Wortlaut des Originals... Bis auf wenige, für die Textgeschichte meist belanglose Ausnahmen führen sie (teilweise die Anmerkungen) alle Abweichungen auf zwei Ursachen zurück: auf den Einfluß fremder Bibeltexte, in der Regel der altlateinischen Übersetzung und auf die Einwirkung der Parallelstellen.
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xxxviii–xxxix of his Einleitung. He divides the Syrian uncials into two groups: (in erster Linie) EFGHSV and (die stark nach *K korrigierten Hs) KUAI. It will be seen that, for him, the most typical Syrian texts were EFGHSV, and that in the sub-groups of readings in which he suppresses all the non-Syrian uncials (D 1, D 1(a)) he suppresses K and Π as well. Whilst in his apparatus he consistently employs von Soden's symbol *K, the citations of manuscripts are taken from Tischendorf's Octava.

The 532 readings which will presently be examined include all but a few of those which compose Streitberg's apparatus. They fall into the following groups:

I. Older, non-Syrian readings alternating with the Syrian

Group A

The Gothic rendering agrees with a non- or pre-Syrian reading sponsored mainly by non-Syrian texts. All the Greek uncials are cited. The alternative Syrian reading is described as *K. Example: J. x. 26 φτερ οὐκ SinBDLX Chr min b ff g l vg; οὐ γαρ *K a c e ιντ τη ni.

Group B

The first, described as *K, is a Syrian reading to which the Gothic text ought, conventionally, to correspond. But the Gothic text often agrees with the alternative, against the *K-reading which stands in the text and is placed first in the Apparat. In this group in the Gospel of St Luke there are five such cases (ii. 43, v. 6, ix. 47, xviii. 7, xix. 48), but in John there are no less than twenty-six out of forty-nine. Furthermore, in only nine of these is there any explanation offered for the deviation of the Gothic text. There are five similar cases in Group C, and one (xiii. 26) in Group D 2(a). Examples of each kind from Group B:

J. xvi. 3 γινοσκοω *K; γινοσκοω ADGLYA Δ] krapneina
J. vi. 21 (with explanation) λαβεν αυτον *K; αυτον λαβεν D min] ina non
J. x. 32 (no explanation) αυτον εργον *K; αυτον εργον K min] pize waursue

The alternative non-Syrian reading is followed by all the uncials supporting it.
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Group C

The Gothic is referred by Streitberg to the reading of one or two isolated uncial manuscripts, the complete list of which is given on page 35. Cf. Group B.

Example: J. xviii. 38 η αληθεία V min; αληθεία *K] so sinja

II. Syrian texts divided in their testimony

Group D

Sub-group D 1

Supporting uncial witnesses are given for both readings, but only the Syrian manuscripts are listed (i.e. EFGHSV-KUΔΠ), and sometimes not all of these, for Streitberg regularly omits K and Γ. All the other uncial witnesses by Tischendorf are suppressed.

Example: J. vi. 58 ζησει EGSVA Chr; ζησει HUII] libaiρ

Sub-group D 1(a)

These are given with the same restriction, but one or other is described as *K, the one not so designated being accompanied by the attesting Syrian uncial witnesses, mostly less K and Γ.

Example: J. vi. 2 τα σημεια ΣΛΠ Chr it vg; αυτου τα σημεια *K rell] taiknins

Sub-group D 2

These are comparable to those of D 1, but there is no suppression of evidence. All the uncial witnesses by Tischendorf are given for both readings.

Example: J. xvii. 2 δωση SinACGKMSX; δωσει BEHUY ΓΔΛΠ] gibai

Sub-group D 2(a)

These are comparable to those of D 2, there being no suppression of evidence. All the uncial witnesses by Tischendorf are given for the first reading, the second being described as *K.

Example: J. xvi. 7 ομοι λεγω KLYΠ Chr a; λεγω ομοι *K] izwiv qiva

The nature of the Greek texts which Wulfila used for the Gothic version can only be inferred from the text of C.A. and from the circumstances in which he found himself at that time. It is generally supposed that he may have commenced his task about the year 350, and his close connexion with Eusebius of Nicomedia lends support to the further general assumption that he would use the text which was official and current at that time, namely the Syrian, or Antiochian, or Byzantine text of the New Testament.

Westcott and Hort discussed this text in considerable detail in their Introduction where, in § 194, they say, 'We cannot but be struck by the considerable though unequal and on the whole decreasing proportion in which pre-Syrian readings of all types are mingled with Syrian. On the other hand before the close of the fourth century, as we have said, a Greek text not materially differing from the almost universal text of the ninth century and the Middle Ages was dominant, probably by authority, at Antioch, and exercised much influence elsewhere.' The 'considerable proportion' of pre-Syrian readings formed a substantial admixture in the Byzantine text which Wulfila, as is now generally believed, had before him.

Of the actual Syrian readings, the same scholars say (§ 165), 'The Authors of the Syrian text had before them documents representing at least three earlier forms of text, Western, Alexandrian, and a third. Where they found variation, they followed different procedures in different places.' It is due to the fact that the Byzantine text in Wulfila’s time still presented numbers of Western and pre-Syrian readings, which subsequently disappeared from currency, that the many readings in Group A are referred to the non-Syrian uncial manuscripts SinBDLX.

In the following lists of readings from Matthew, John, and Luke, the first Greek reading is always that adopted by Streitberg, the second is the competing reading. Then follows the Gothic, then my comment. I have regularly supplemented Streitberg’s list of uncial manuscripts, and his symbol *K, from the apparatus of Tischendorf, so that the reader should have before him all the uncial witnesses. I have also added a few minuscule witnesses, often from the Ferrar group, and any relevant Old Latin texts from Wordsworth-White.

1 Ibid., § 191: ‘Mixture prevails everywhere in the fourth century: almost all its texts, so far as this can be seen through the quotations from the Fathers, are more or less chaotic.’

2 Of the Gothic version they say (ibid., § 218): ‘The Gothic has very much the same combination as the Italian revision of the Old Latin, being largely Syrian and largely Western, with a small admixture of ancient non-Western readings.’
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I have thought it better to deal with the readings under the groups described above, although by considering them serially in order, some contextual trends and possible reactions might have been more readily controlled. The results of my survey and comments are for convenience summed up by groups at the end of this work.

2. THE GOSPEL OF ST MATTHEW

The summary result of this appraisal of the Greek readings adopted and commented on by Streitberg in his Apparat is that twenty-three of the thirty-seven readings here examined are 'accepted'. In twelve passages the restoration of the *K-reading is recommended, whilst two (xi. l 6 2 and xxvi. 7 l) are doubtful.

The number of readings here examined is small by comparison with those in the Gothic St John ( l 80) and St Luke ( l 5 7), yet they exhibit the same characteristics.

The ten readings in Group A are non-Syrian readings with which the Gothic text agrees. They are represented chiefly by the uncialss SinBDZΔ, comparable to SinBDLX in the corresponding groups in Luke and John. The absence of X is coincidental with that uncial's fragmentary survival in Matthew.

Of the eight readings in Group B the Gothic renderings agree in four passages with the adopted *K-reading, but diverge in the remaining four (vi. 30, viii. 3, xi. 23, xxvii. 49), and Streitberg offers some explanation for this in all but xi. 23.

In Group C seven of the adopted eight readings are rejected in favour of the restoration of the *K or the majority reading. This is in keeping with the findings in the same group in John and Luke.

The eight readings of Group D are comparable to those in John and Luke; in five all the non-Syrian uncialss are suppressed, in the remaining three all are exhibited.

The three readings collected under E (viii. 17, ix. 18, 35), which would have come under Groups C, D, A respectively, appear to have escaped inclusion in the Apparat through some oversight.

Group A: ten readings

vi. 5 (οταν) προσευχηθε (ουκ) εσεσθε Sin*ΒΖ 1.22.118. it pler vg; προσευχη . . . εση *K c. DEKLMSUXΔΠ al pler q| (bam)
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ix. 4 ειδως ΒΜΕ-Π l. 209. al plus 50; ειδων *K c. SinCDE*FK LSUVXΔΠ al pl it vg| witands (uidens a d f). Restore the *K-reading, witands being from M. xii. 25 ειδως (thus also Str.). An original gaseroids may be reflected in uidens (f), but a, d have the same reading. Cf. b c e vg even uidisset.

ix. 13 αμαρτωλος SinnBDV*ΠΔ Δ 1.22.33. al plus 15 a b ff f1 h k l q vg; + εις μετανοιαν *K c. CEGKLMSUVmgXmg al pler c g*i [i] frawaurhtans. Streitberg adds: 'Die Abweichung vom *K-Text durch Mc 2, 17 veranlaBt, wie die Wortwahl zeigt', apparently with reference to the use of frawaurhtans against garaihtans in Luke. This passage must be considered along with the parallels in Mk and L.:

Mk ii. 17 αμαρτωλος SinABDKLΔΠ al plus 40 b c ff f2 g il q vg; + εις μετανοιαν c. Cf unc a c f1 g*i.

L. v. 32 αμαρτωλος εις μετανοιαν, the universal reading. In the parallels M. and Mk Streitberg reads καλεσα δικαιας αλα αμαρτωλος λαπον uswaurhtans ak frawaurhtans.

L. v. 32 adds εις μετανοιαν in idreiga.

The Gothic passages have been levelled out thus:

(a) lapon (only here = καλειν in this sense, elsewhere haitan 8/11) has been levelled out in the three passages.

(b) uswaurhtans only in M. and Mk (only here and in L. xiv. 14 = δικαιος, elsewhere garaihts 14/17).

(c) in idreiga not at all.

In the neighbouring parallel M. ix. 6 = L. v. 20 = Mk ii. 5 the original text of Luke (ειπεν αυτω) has been altered to conform to the texts of M. and Mk du pamma uδιπην (νο χαραλοτικην), and f-paraolyto is after the Gothic. In the other neighbouring parallel M. ix. 16–L. v. 36–Mk ii. 21 snaga (for ματαιον = wasti 24/27) has been levelled out. This suggests that the levelling-out of in idreiga was inhibited by the majority reading, in M. and Mk, of the OLat. texts (including f) in the bilingual period,
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when the addition of in idrega (εις μετανοιαν of *K), if ever it formed part of the Gothic text of M. (and Mk), would be deleted under the influence of the opposite Latin text. Restore the *K-reading.

x. 33 καγω αυτον SinBDΔ 1.33. al plus 15 it vg; αυτον καγω *K c. CEGFKLMSUVXΓΠΙ al pler] jah ik iu (cf. et ego eum f vg). Accept.

xi. 2 δια SinBC*DPZΔ 33.124. q(per); διο *K c. C3EGFKLMS UVXΓΠΙ al pler ff'g'h vg] hi. Accept.

xi. 5 και νεκροι SinBDLPZΔ 1.13. al a b g' k l q; om και *K c. CEGFKLMSUVX al pler c ff'g'h vg] jah daupai. Accept. The Greek Plural could be after the contextual.

xi. 8 βασιλευς SinBCDLPZΓΠΔ# al pl; βασιλεως *K c. EFGKSVXΠΙ al fere 90; cf. L. vii. 25 en τοις βασιλεως in piudangardjom] piudane. Accept. in domibus regum f latt vg.


xi. 16 τοις ετερωσ SinBDZ it vg; +αυτω CEFKLMXΓΠΙ*; alis d g k; αληθειας Chrem εως; (in, ad) inuicem a b c ff' g' h q, ad alterutrum f; τοις ετερωσ GSUVΠΙ (vg coaequalibus)] anpar anparana (cf. Phil. ii. 3 αληθειας anpar anparana) represents none of the Greek uncial readings, but is from L. vii. 32 (cf. next) αληθειας (seina misso; cf to the 1 Thess. v. 11 αληθειας εις miso) or the Latin. The Gothic text does not help us to determine the Greek original. f may reflect the Gothic.

xi. 17 εβρησιματου SinBDZ 1.248. c ff'g'h k l q vg; +υμων *K c. CEGFKLMSUVXΓΠΙ al pler a b h q] hufum. Accept. L. vii. 32 reads εθρ. υμων gaunodedum (ng gloss hufum) izwis.

Group B: eight readings

v. 20 υμων η δικαιωσυνα *K c. SinBKEKLMVΓΠΙ al plus 50; η δικ. υμων SU al pl] iuzωματος garaitheins. Accept. The Gothic rendering agrees with the Greek in order and emphasis.

vi. 30 ou ποιλω *K (Ti. silet); ποσο Δ, quanto it vg] hawia. Accept. hawia is after latt, or the parallels M. vii. 11 (thus Str.), L. xii. 28.

viii. 3 ηφατο αυτον ο Ιησους *K c. C3EGKLSUVXΓΠΙ al pler b h q; om ο Ιησους SinBC*Z 1.13.33. 118. al pauc ff'k; praem
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a c f g'h2 vg] attaitok imma. Accept. The Gothic om. is after the parallels Mk i. 41, L. v. 53 (thus Str.).

ix. 6 σου την κληνη *K (Ti. silet); του κραβατον αυτου Chr (nach MC 2, 11)] pana ligre peinana. There could be no other reading: κληνη = ligrs 7/7, and κραβατος = badi 7/7. Streitberg's note was unnecessary. Mk ii. 11 κραβατον badi.

xi. 23 Καφαρναουμ *K c. CEGFKLMSUVXΠΙ; Καφαρναουμ SinBD 33. it vg] Kafarna(un). Accept. The Gothic form Kafarnaum (7/7 times elsewhere in the Gospels) is from the Latin, and is often the case with proper names.

xxvii. 1 ωστε θαυμασωσι *K; να θαυμασωσοντων D] ei aidaupideina. Accept. The universal reading. This is the only instance in C.A. where ωστε = ei, but since ωστε here denotes intention, as in M. xxiv. 24 ωστε πλανησαι, it is here represented by ei and the subj. just as if it were wn.

xxvii. 42 επ' αυτω *K c. EFGHKMSUVXΠΙ al plus 150; αυτω AD 1.69. it vg; επ' αυτων SinBL 33. etc.] tma. Accept. Galathian (πτοσεως) takes the dative, εις, ειν, ειμι being commonly omitted, e.g. εις J. vi. 29; ειν Eph. i. 13; ειμι i Tim. i. 16.

xxvii. 49 σωσων *K c. SinABC1.Θε unc 12, liberans f'g'h vg; σωσαι Sin* 69. al 5; liberare f'g' nasjan. Accept. Although the Greek fut. pple. presents a difficulty. For the Gothic infinit. of purpose after verbs of movement see E.B., § 315, and G.-L., Gram., § 254/1 (infin. without du) and 2 (the more usual constr. with du). All the examples in G.-L. have the infin. in Greek except Mk x. 46, L. xviii. 35 προοριων du aihtron, and L. xix. 48 άκοον των du hausjan. Cf. Streitberg, Anmerkung. The last citation from Ti. is incorrect: f actually reads saluare (after the Gothic nasjan), against latt vg liberans, -are.

Group C: eight readings

vii. 16 σταυρος SinB 1.22.118.209. al 5 it vg; σταυρον *K c. C3EGFKLMSUVXΠΙ al pler] weinobasja. Restore the *K-reading. The Greek plural could be after the contextual smakkans (συνα) or the OLat uasus . . . (ficus). Cf. also L. vi. 44 συνα . . . σταυρον smakkans . . . weinobasja (L 13.69.346. c e go σταφυλας), and see G.V.G., p. 177.

vii. 24, 26 μου των λογους; +τουτους *K (latt pler vg uerba mea haec); om. τουτους verse 24: B* al 4 a g k m; verse 26: pauc f k] waurus meina. Restore the *K-reading, which should give }
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unigenito deo subsistente.

[The rest of the page continues with a detailed analysis of the Greek text, comparing and contrasting various readings in the Greek原文, Gothic, and Latin versions of the Gospels.]

---
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Group D: eight readings

vi. 4 apodwse SinBKLUX 1.22.33, etc. al plus 35 it pler vg; autovs apod. DEMSXDII al ph qj usgibip. Accept.


xxvi. 71 tois ekex EGSPI* it pler vg (Ti. : SinBDEGKSII*); autovs ekex EFGUVII* (Ti. : ACEFHLMVXZII 1.33, al 150); fvg his qui erant ibi, q eis ibi) du pam jainar. The Gothic could represent either reading, and it is impossible to decide between them.

xxvii. 6 korbonan E Chr vg (Ti. : EKM al mu vg ed); korbonan *K (Ti. : SinABCLMDI unc 6 al pl); B* korbon, corban f g1 q, corban a d h] kaurbanan. Restore the *K-reading and correct the erroneous C.A. kaurbanam to kaurbanan.

xxviii. 45 egvento ektos UITA (Ti. : SIM); ektos eq, *K; latt vg tenetrae factae sunt] warp rigis. Accept. Examples in G.-L., Gloss., show that the relative position of waripan and its subject conforms to the Greek original; cf. esp. Mk xv. 33 genomenos oras ektos ektos egvento hipe warp heila saihsta, rigis warip.

xxviii. 64 kefivsin autov EHVII (Ti. : SinABCDEHVII1 al 50 Vere it vg); nuktos kK aut. FGU (Ti. : CFGLMUG); autovv nuktos S] binimaina imma. Accept.

xxviii. 65 efq EFH it vg (Ti. : BEFGHKLM+7 al 70 Vere it vg); efq de SUIV (Ti. : SinACDMSUVDI] gap. Accept.

Group E: three readings which seem to have been inadvertently omitted from the Apparat.

viii. 17 avelaben (Str. silet); elaban is the majority reading] usnam. Restore elaban. The rare reading avelaben (Ti. KII al 10 Vere Chr) is not needed to justify usnam, which is idiomatic: cf. M. xxvii. 9 elabon usnam; L. vi. 4 elaben kai efavelen usnam jah matida.

ix. 18 arqev eis elthov (Str. silet)] reiks ains qimands. Accept. The
3. THE GOSPEL OF ST JOHN

Group A: fifty-six readings

v. 47 πιστεύσητε DGSΔ 1.28,69,124.; πιστεύετε *K reel c. SinΔΛΩΠΙΙ unc reel al pl a b c e g q vg] (hωνα) . . . gαλαύρ
- jαίρη. Restore the *K-reading. In the apodosis of this type of conditional sentence the indic. is normal, but the subj. occurs, esp. in questions: cf. E.B., § 367/1, Anm. 1, citing 2 Cor. iii. 7, 8 ει δε η διακονία του θεου τουτον εγκύρην εν δοξή . . . των ουκεί μαλλον η διακονία του πνευματος εστιν εν δοξή, ωαρψ ωιρψ . . . ωαρψαι ειν επιρας. A further example of the Greek subj. for the Gothic future, as in the present passage, is given in G.-L., § 280/1, Rom. xi. 21 pandei . . . ni freidida (εφεσωτα), ibai aufto ni fuk freidia (εφεσετα, the majority reading being εφεσετα). 1
vi 5 (επορας ουν) τους οφθαλμους ο Ιησους SinABDKLΜΠII al plus 10 it vg; ο Ιησους. Accept. The same order (ισχυρας αυγώνα) in Gk and Goth. in J. xvii. 1, L. vi. 20, xvi. 23.
vi. 11 εδοκεν (error for δεδοκεν which Str. has in this text) τους ανακειμενους Sin*ABΛΠΙ 1.33. 118*. a c ff2 l q vg; εδοκεν τους μαθητας, οι δε μαθηται τους ανακειμενους *K c. Sin*ΔΙΔΑ unc 9 al pler b e] gadaulida paim anakoombjanan. Accept. Cf. L. xviii. 22 διαδος πιτογες gadailei unledaim.
vi. 15 παλιν SinABDKΛΠΑ 1.33. 118. al mu it vg; fehlt *K c. EFGHMSUVΔΑ al plus 100] aftra. Accept.
vi. 17 ουκει SinBDL 33. 69. etc. a b e f l q; ουκει *K c. AΠΛΑ unc 9 al pler c ff2 vg] ni (ατιδυτα) nauhtan. Accept.

1 For the Gk indic. for the subj. after particles and after relatives with αυ see W.-H., App. p. 171: 'The tense of the indic. which thus replaces the conj. is almost always the future. . . . The last of a series of verbs following αυ is often found in the future than verbs with which αυ stands in a more immediate relation.'
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ix. 8 προσωπῆς SinABC*DKLXII: al 10 f ff2 g q vg; τύφλος

ix. 11 οὐ παγε νυφᾶ (εἰς κ.τ.λ.) KXXI 13.22.33. etc. al 10 f (‘nach
got’); οὐ παγε εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν τοῦ Σίλουμ (εἰς τὸν Σίλουμ
SinBDLX) καὶ νυφᾶ *K c. ΑΓΔΠΙ unc 8 al pler ε f g q vg]
gagg asfghanen in pata swumfsil Siloamis. Accept. The Gk νυφᾶ is
represented by an imperative in it vg. In Gothic two constructions
are possible, cf. οὐ παγε οὐκος δεξίων in M. viii. 4 gagg pak
silban ataugei, but in Mk. i. 44 ataugejan. See E.B., § 315, G.-L.,

ix. 25 απεκρίθη οὖν εἴκενος SinABDL al 10 it vg; add καὶ εἴτεν
*K c. ΧΓΔΠ unc 8 al pler] panuh andhohf jains. Accept. Note that
it vg read dixit, except d, δ respondit, presumably after their
Gk texts, and f ille autem respondit after the Gothic, but the
deviant order is not explained, nor autem (thus r); but Gothic
pan can represent either δε or οὖν. See comment on x. 39,
below.

ix. 31 o θεὸς αἰματολῶν BDA a d (-rum e) deus peccatores; αμαρτ. o
θεὸς *K c. SinALXTΣ unc 7 al omn vid b c ff2 g l q vg] gup
frawurthaim. Accept.

x. 14 γνωσκόμας με τα εμα SinBDL it vg; γνωσκόμας υπὸ τὸν
εἰμων ΑΧΓΔΠΙ unc 7 alm om vid] kunnā mik pō meina. Accept.

x. 16 γεννησσοντα Sin=BDLX 1.33. f; γεννησσον *K c. ΑΓΔΠΙ unc
7 al pler it pler vg] warirand. Accept. It vg have fiet, exc.
fient d f (d from the Gk D, f from the Gothic).

x. 26 οτι οὐκ SinBDLX 1.13.28. etc. al 10 fere b c ff2 g l vg; οὐ γαρ
*K c. ΑΓΔΠΙ unc 8 al pler a c c 8] οὐ nte ni. Either reading
would be properly represented by οὐ nte ni. As a causal conjunction
unte = oti occupies 23 lines in G.-L., Vocab. and = γαρ
17 lines.

x. 29 o δεδεκεν Sin*Bλ a b c ff2 g l vg (vgl. J. 6, 39); ος
δεδεκεν (MU al pc εδωκεν) *K c. AB-XΓΔΠ(Δ)Π unc 8 al
pler] patei fragaf. Accept. This and the next form one reading.
Cf. xvii. 24 below.

x. 29 μείζων ABX it omn vg; μείζων *K c. SinDLΓΔΠΙ unc 8
al omn vid] maiço (allaim ist). Accept. This and the preceding
reading belong together. It is of curious interest to note that B
is the only surviving uncial representing the combination o and
μείζων, yet, by combining the representatives of o and those of
μείζων, we get SinABLX it vg.
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x. 33 απεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι SinABKLM*ΧΠ al 20 it pler
vg; add. λεγοτες *K c. DEGH=ΣΤΙΔΑ al pler e] andhüfan
imma pāt Iūdaīēs. Accept.

x. 39 αὐτὸν παλῶν Sin*AΚΛΧΠ 1.33.131. al 5 f; παλῶν αὐτῶν
*K c. BΕΓΗΜΣΙΔΑ al plu] (sokidėnum ina aftert (gafahan).
Accept. This must be taken with x. 39 (ἐξῆτων) in Group B.
The *K-reading is ἐξῆτων παλῶν αὐτῶν πίασα (ΒΕΓΗΜΣΙΔΑ);
the alternative is ἐξῆτων οὖν αὐτῶν παλῶν πίασα c. Sin
(Sin om παλῶ) ΑΚΛΧΠ. The it vg have quarebent ergo
eum apprehenderē (="Sin*D"); only f, δ have eum+iterum,
δ from its Gk text Δ, and ff from the Gothic; only f has autem.
The probability suggests itself that the Gothic original was
from the non-*K reading ἐξῆτων οὖν αὐτῶν παλῶν πίασα (cf.
the parallel) J. vii. 30 ἐξῆτων οὖν αὐτῶν πίασα sokidėnum pan ina
gafahan), of which f quarebent autem eum iterum apprehenderē
is the precise equivalent. Since the time of the Brixian bilingual,
pan = οὖν dropped out from the Gothic text, but its former
existence is reflected by f autem, which in John occurs five
times in thirty-three passages for the normal ergo (vii. 16, 40,
45; ix. 12; xi. 31).

xi. 21 οὐκ αν ἀπεθανεν o ὀδηφός μοῦ SinBC*LX 1.33. etc. al pauc
a g l; o ad, μου ωκ on ἀπεθανεν *K c. CΓΔΠ unc 8 al pler
verse 32 nai pau gaswulati meins brepar (μου o ὀδηφός) c. AC:ΧΠ.

xi. 29 εκεῖνη ἡ Sin=BC*LX 33. 69. etc. f; εκεῖνη *K c. AC:DX
ΓΔΠΙ unc 8 al pler a c e g vg] ip jaina. Accept. Cf. autem EG,
ευρο f.

xi. 30 ην ετι SinBCX 1.33. etc. b c ff2 g vg (erat adhuc); eti ην
F a e; ην *K c. ADLΓΔΠΙ unc 7 al pler] was nau derpawun. Accept.

xi. 45 ερισανεν ABC*Ι. 1. b c e l; add. Ιησοῦς *K c. (Sin)C5
DXΓΔΠ unc 7 al pler a f ff2 g vg cle; a SinALXΓΔΠ unc
7 al pler a b c f ff2 g l vg; o A:BC*D 1.224.249. e (Str.
wrongly reads a ερισανεν ABC*L. The documentation for a ερισανε
is AL, for o et. BC*) patei gaatawaia. Accept a, and om. o Ιησοῦς.
The incongruence a = patei occurs elsewhere, as in viii. 38
above; cf. also J. vi. 13, Gal. i. 20, ii. 18, iv. 24, v. 17, 21.
Cf. E.B., § 350.

xii. 26 (εαν μοι) τὶς διακονὴ SinABKLMUXΠ al 15; διακονὴ τις
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Cf. f vg si quis mihi ministrat. For the order cf. 2 Tim. ii. 5 εαυ δε και αθλη τις jah pan jabai haifsteip has. See comment on vi. 46 in Group B.

xii. 35 εν υνων SinBDKLMXII it vg; μεθ' υνων *K c. AEGHSU ΓΔι al plu] in iizwis. Accept.

xiii. 18 ενευον SinBLCM 33.157.; ους *K c. AD ΓΔιI unc 7 al pler latt] karjans. Accept. For ους we might have expected panzei, as in J. xviii. 9 ους δεδωκας μου panzei atsga mis. Cf. latt vg quos (elegern).

xiii. 33 μικρον χρονον SinLXI τα 15 c 1; μικρον *K c. ABCDΓΔιI unc 8 al pler a b e ff² g q vg] leitit mel. Accept. Cf. modicum tempus c d (Γ-ōris) 1.


xiv. 36 οπου ενω (υπαγω) SinDS*nUX 13.33. etc. al 70 vg; οπου *K c. ABCEGBKLMs=ΓΔιI al plu vid] padei ik(gagga).

The *K-reading is not excluded because it omits ενω. The Gothic normally follows the Greek original as to υνα: e.g. J. viii. 21 ενω υπαγω και ζητητε με ik galeipa jah sokeip mik. Where Gk has ενω, the Gothic regularly retains the pronoun, but in some cases, as perhaps in this passage, it adds ik against the Gk, as in the following passages, also from John: ix. 25, xiii. 20, 34, xiv. 28, xv. 12, 15. See G.-L., Gram., § 199/2. Cf. J. vii. 3 in Group C.

xiv. 12 πατερα SinABDLQXXI 1.22.33. etc. it (exc e) vg; add. μον *K c. ΓΔιI unc 7 al pler c] attin. Accept.

xiv. 22 τι ABDELX 33. al vix mu it pler vg; και τι *K c. SinGH KMQSUΓΔιI 1.28. etc. al plus 110 q 8] hia. Accept.

xiv. 28 οτι πορευομαι SinABDK*LXII 12 al it vg; οτι ενων πορευομαι *K c. EGHK*MSUΓΔιI al pler] ei ik gagga. Accept.

The additament ικ is possibly from the preceding ενω ευνων ικ gagga, or from other passages where ενω υπαγω = ικ gagga, but cf. above, xiii. 36.

xv. 6 αυναγωγουν αυτο SinDLXΓΔιI 1.13.33. etc. al plus 12 e g q vg cle; ουν. αυτα *K c. ABIΓΔ unc 7 al pler b c ff²] galisada. Accept. The Gothic sing. confirms αυτο. A literal rendering would be galisand ina (weinatins being masc.). The pronoun, however, disappears in the passive construction which replaces the Gk active constr. (prob. idiomatically), as in the

parallelism M. vii. 16, L. vi. 44, where lisanda replaces ουλ-λεγον (φιλαφος M., σωκa L.).

xvii. 4 η ωρα αυτον ΑΒΠ* 33.124. etc. al 5 b c e ff² g lq vg; η ωρα SinDYTΓΔ unc 7 al pler α] so heila ize. Accept.

xiv. 16 και ουκετι SinBDIPΓΔιI 2.133. etc. c b ff² g vg; και ου *K c. ΑΥΤΙΠ* 3 un 7 al pler a d e f q (Ti.: praeterea 122 f g go μικρον etv (modicum adhuc f, pusillum adhuc q)] nauh jah ni. The C.A. reading is corrupt. Nauh = etn, ni nauh = onow; nowhere is ουκετι represented by nauh+ni. Ουκετι is correctly rendered by ni panaseip, ni panamais. If the original had been the *K-reading και ου = nauh ni, one might explain the oddly placed nauh as a later attempt to represent it vg iam (in iam non = oukerti). On the other hand nauh nauh ni corresponds exactly to f q adhuc et non, of which it may be a caique.

xiv. 20 μεις (sec) Sin*BDΔ 1. a b c e ff² q; μεις δε *K c. ALΓΔιI unc 7 al fere omn g vg] ius. Accept.

xiv. 22 νυν μεν λατην Sin*BC*DLMY 1.33. etc. a (om. μερ) b c e ff² q vg; λυν. μεν νυν *K c. ACΓΔιI unc 6 al pler] (jah pan jis) aukt na sauurg. Accept. Auk (= μερ) could not in either event be placed further on in the sentence. See G.V.E., p. 183.

xiv. 29 λεγουν Sin*BC*D*ΓΔιI 1.262. e q; +αυτω *K c. ACΓΔ*LXΓΔ unc 7 al pler it pler] (paruh) qepun. Accept. paruh is a gratuitous additament. The preterite is stylistic, bringing the narrative into line with verse 31 andhof.

xiv. i ννν ανοις SinABC*D 1.96.97. a b c ff² g vg; ναι και ανοι *K c. C*UXΓΔιI unc 7 pler q] ei sunus. Accept.

xiv. 8 ελαβων αληθος Sin*AD a e q; ελαβων και ενων αληθος *K c. Sin*BC*LXYΓΔιI unc 7 al omn vid it pler vg] nemun bi sunai. Accept.

xiv. 19 ωνων και αντω SinABC*DKLXY al 14 it vg; και αντω ωνων *K c. ΓΓΔι unc 6 al pler] sijina jah eis. Accept.


xviii. 24 αστετελευν ανα Sin*BC*LXΓΔιI 1.33. al vix mu a b ff²; αστετελευν. η Sin. 16.39, etc. al 10 c vg et misit; αστετελευν *K c. AC*DS*ΓΔΓ*ΓΓΓΔιI unc 7 al 70 ere q] panuh insanda. Doubtful,
for *panuh* also represents *δε*, besides καί and τοις: cf. verse 28

for *panuh* was marginal. See p. 2.
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vi. 28 ἀλλὰ *SinABC*Δ*supp* 1. al pauc b g; *αλλ' ων* *K c.

C. LX CIA II unc 7 al pler a e f ff² vg Clem ak. Accept.

viii. 39 απολουσο (sec) *μην SinABCD*Δ*supp* KLUXYII 1.33.69. al mu it vg; *μην απολουσο* *K c. EGHMSΔΔα* al plu] *fraietau* ἰτίς. Accept.

xix. 331 eγηλθέν (πατον εξω) *SinD*Δ*supp* 1.106.157. a c e f g q; add. *ον* *K c. EGHMSΥΔΔα* al longe plu b ff² vg Clem] *atiddja* (αφτα) ut. Accept. Cf. verse 5 *εγηλθέν ον εξω *panuh ἱστιδια* ut. Cf. xviii. 29 in Group B.

Group B: forty-nine readings


vi. 30 ειτων ουν *K (Ti. silet); om ουν 248.254. q] *gebun* (om ουν). Accept. The same omission in e f q.

vi. 33 ζων πιδους *K et a b e q; διδ. ζων ΑΚ 33.254. c f ff² vg] *gaf libain*. Accept. In similar cases Str. would have placed the AK reading first, and this item would have been dealt with under Group C.

vi. 45 (ο) *ακουουν* *K c. DΓΔα* unc 7 al 90 a b d e q δ (qui audit); *ακουους SinABCD*Δ*supp* AL permu c f ff² vg (qui audiuit)] (sa) gahausjands. It would be impossible in Gothic to write *sa hausjands at attin iah ganam.* Gahausjands would have to stand, whether for *ακουουν* (as in L. xix. 11, xx. 45) or for *ακουους.* It is impossible to decide between them on linguistic grounds.

Cf. Str., Anmerkung. The constr. is analoculithic; the regular sequence would be either *sa gahausjands ... iah ganimands, or saei gahauseip ... iah ganam.* Cf. G.-L., Gram., § 265, Anm 2.

vi. 46 της εωρακεν *K c. ΑΓΔα* unc 7 al pler; *εωρακεν της Sin* BCDLT 33.it v g] *seki has.* Substitute the non-Syrian reading. In the passages involving *has,* the Gk pronoun generally precedes the verb, the Gothic order agreeing; where the pronoun follows, the Gothic conforms, as in J. ix. 32 οτι *γηνειει της *patei u s t i k e p

vi. 46 *para tou *θεου: σατροσ nur *Sin* frαm attin. Accept. C.A.

*attin* is assimilated to the context, as Str. says in his Anmerkung. There was no need for this entry in the Apparat.

vi. 50 *vai της *K] *ei saei.* Accept. This is one with the next, q.v.

vi. 50 και μη: και fehlt it pler vg] *ni* (tantum). Accept. There is only one Greek reading: *vai της ... και μη,* which therefore must be assumed for the Gothic original. The latt a b c d ff² vg and vg form is *ut si quis ... non (*moriatour,* of which the text of C.A. (*ei saei ... ni*) is clearly a translation. Gothic *ei = vai, ut,* and *saei = eaw της,* as may be deduced from the negative *eaw μη της = niba saei* (J. iii. 3, 5 vg, nisi quis, xv. 6 vg nisi quis non), and from a number of passages in which *ος eaw = saei* (M. x. 42, Mk ix. 37, and elsewhere). See G.-L., Gloss.

vii. 44 (*τυες δε) θεθενοι εξ αυτων (*πιασα αυτων) *K (Ti. silet); εξ αυτων ηθελουν 251.252. ; ex ipsis volebari it vg] (sumaih pan) εζε wildedun (fahan ina). Accept. The *K*-reading is certain; the Gothic rendering is a matter of style. A literal version *sumaih pan* wildedun εζε fahan ina would be intolerable, as its equivalent would be in Latin, and the verb wildedun would need to be placed after εζε. The passages J. xi. 37, 46, Mk viii. 3, cited by Str., present no similar problems.

vii. 51 (*eaw μη) *akouui παρ' αυτων προτερουν* *K c. EGHKMSUV ΓΔα 1. 69. etc.; πρωτουν akouui παρ' αυτων X f g²ed vg Clem] (nibai) faurpis hauseip frαm imma. Accept. Streitberg's comment 'Stellung wie Mc 3, 27 (M r2, 29)' does not apply, the Greek there being eaw μη πρωτουν. The position of *faurpis* everywhere agrees with that of the Greek original. The position in this passage of *proterouν* varies: last in *K,* first in X f (g) vg Clem, second in a c d ff² q. The actual place of *faurpis* in C.A. is most probably due to the Old Latin.

viii. 38 και μηεις ουν: ουν fehlt Chr; Ti.: 248 al 8 fere f ff² g 1 m vg

has; Mk ix. 30 *vai της γηνει ei has wissed.* If the position of the Gothic word was, according to the usual Gothic practice, conditioned by the Greek, it would be reasonable to adopt the reading εωρακεν της in the present passage, which would then be treated under Group A. Streitberg does not comment, but he would have been following his usual practice had he adopted εωρακεν της. There is a similar instance in 1 Cor. vii. 18, where της εκληθη *K ought to be replaced by εκληθη της D*EFG. Cf. xii. 26 in Group A.
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(handum is an independent adjustment, or after OLat. See, however, prec. and x. 39 in Group A.)

x. 41 μεν *Κ; om 69, 124. al pauc go om.] Accept. The omission may be scribal.

xi. 19 (ελονθεσαν) προσ τας περι *Κ c. ΑΣΓΔΠ unc 7 al pler; προσ την SinBc*lx 33-38. etc. it vg] (gageum) bi Marpan jah Marjan. Accept. 'bi = περι' beweist, das dem got. Text ursprünglich die Fassung von *Κ zugrunde gelegen hat.' The C.A. text is corrupt; it is not comparable with, e.g., Mk iii. 32 setum bi ina (εκαθηντο περι αυτου). G.-L. proposed an orig. gageum at pain bi Marpan jah Marjan. The present text could result from the omission of at pain, as a part-assimilation to OLat ad Maranth et Mariam, which bi M. jah M. does not correctly represent.

x. 42 εγω *Κ f vg; καγω 13.39.124. a b e ff2 l aur; om. de D c] jah pan ik. Both και and de are not infrequently represented by jah, or pan, or jah pan. Thus και = pan in L. ii. 37 και αυτη soh pan; και = jah pan in J. vii. 33 και νυαγω jah pan gagga, cf. also J. xiv. 3, 7; L. vii. 8, xiv. 3. de = jah in L. v. 1, vi. 1 εγενετο de jah warp; J. vi. 35 ετεν δε jah gap; de = jah jah in J. xiv. 21 o de jah jah sae. It is thus impossible to pin down the alternative renderings to one or other Greek reading. In this instance, therefore, we can but accept the *Κ-reading with that caveat. See also xviii. 18 below, and xvi. 19 in Group C.

xii. 10 εσουνας *Κ (ΕΚ; Ti.: B add και); om 97. 254. it pler] munaidedumaπan auκ. Accept. Αυκ= δε elsewhere, as in 1 Cor. xv. 50 τουτο δε φημι πατα auκ qph. Sometimes γαρ = -υπβαν (J. vi. 64 γαρ wissu̇h pan; xii. 47 υπαν nih pan), and the present -υπβαν auκ may be a double translation, as Mk vi. 17 αυτος γαρ sa auκ raithis.

xii. 18 δια τουτο υπτητιγσε B* (sed add και p. αυτω) ΕΗΔΑ al 20 a b c e ff2 l r δ; δια τουτο και υπητιγσ. *Κ f vg (Ti.: SinBc*dlq XΠΠ unc 5 al pler f vg)] duppe idjdun gamatjan. Accept. The symbol *Κ is misplaced, it belongs to the first reading. Cf. xvii. 17 in this group.

xii. 20 τυες Ελληνες *Κ c. ΑΕΓΗΚΣΤΔΠ al pler vg cle go; Str.: τυες των Ελληνων Chr; Ti.: Ελληνες τυες c. Sinbdlm QX 1.33. etc. it pler] sumai piudo. Accept. The position of sums is conditioned by the Greek original, and the partitive gen. is normal.
xvi. 4 (να) ... μημονευτη *Κ; -ητε ELIDA αl μu] (ei) ...
gamoneiph. Accept. In a final clause, ei takes the subj., as here
(G.-L., Gram., § 276). For the Greek indic. for the subj. see
p. 12 n. 1.

xvi. 4 (μημονευτη) αυτω *Κ (Τi.: ita etiam ABΠ] 33. al 3 go);
Str.: τουτων Chr] πιε. Accept. The fact that sa represents
ovtou as well as autou is no reason for mentioning the isolated
reading of Chr.

xvi. 21 (οταν) τινη *Κ; τικτει λ γυ] (pan) bairip. Accept. In
temporal clauses after pan or bipe the verb is mostly in the indic.
(G.-L., Gram., § 282/1). For the indic. for otan (av) see p. 12
n. 1.

xvi. 21 (οταν) δε γενηση; γενησει H al μu] (ip bipe) gaburan ist.
Accept. Cf. prec. For the Greek future see p. 12 n. 1. Str.,
Anmerkung.: passiv nach gaburans warp mappa.

xvii. 3 α γεωσκων Κ c SinBCXII unc 6 al pler; γεωσκωνei
ADGLYΔΑ] 33. 244.] ei kuneina. Accept. Cf. xvi. 4, above. For
the Greek indic. see p. 12 n. 1.

xvii. 17 ε ν αλθεια (for Sin* see note in Ti.) ABC*DΚΠι: 1.
it pler vg (Str. vgl. V. 19 αλθεια); add oou *Κ c Sin*C-XY
ΓΔΛΠ* unc 7 al pler q 8] in suniai (om oou). Accept. The first
reading, which properly belongs to Group A. Str. has taken
the reading of *K into his text, so that his invention is not clear.
Cf. xii. 18, above.

xviii. 24 κεκουνοι *Κ c SinBCDLXΥΓΔΛΠΙ: unc rell al pler (Τi.:
και κεκουνοι AKUΠ*]; και αυτοι Chr] jah pai. Accept. But since
pai can stand for both ekeinou and avtoi, there was no need to
mention the isolated reading of Chr. Cf. xvi. 4, above.

xviii. 13 να γαρ *Κ; νη δε ουνο Chr Hss] sa was awk (swaihra).
Accept. This is a Gothic additament ‘ohne gr. Entsprachung’

xviii. 17 λεγει εκεινου *Κ; ο δε φησαι Chr] ip is gap. Accept. The
pronoun is competently renders ekeinou, e.g. in J. ix. 9 ekeinou
δε λεγειν ip is gap. For ip there is no need to appeal to an
isolated reading in Chr, for it occurs as an additament against
the Greek (J. vii. 8, viii. 15, 23, ix. 25, xv. 15).

xviii. 18 να δε μετ' αυτων ο Πετρος *Κ c ADsuppΥΓΔΛΠ unc 7 al
pler f g; και o ΠI. 13.346. b c q vg; (Τι.: να δε και o Π μεt'
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vi. 24 *K; επιθετος ευς αριτταντι εις την τελευτατον της 247

vi. 24 εις την τελευτατον της 247

vi. 24 εις την τελευτατον της 247

vi. 36 απο KA al 5 e f; στι και *K] patei. Restore the *K-reading;

C.A. om. jah could just as well be a domestic matter.

xvii. 3 a sv G l. al alic; falt *K. This is badly expressed. Str. reads

τα εργα σου α σου ποιεις. This, less ov, is the reading of Sin*BLX

ΓΑΔΠΙ unc 7 al plier f 1 l.vg; similarly, but om. ov, Sin*DGU

1. al plus 20 a b c e f f*1 q*; of these, only G 1. al alic add ov

post a l] (waurstwa peina) poie pu (taijis). Restore the *K-reading.

The Gothic represents the common reading τα εργα σου α

ποιεις, with the additament pu. For this cf. E.B., § 275, G.-L.,

Gram., § 199/2,a, and see the comment on J. xiii. 36 in

Group A.

ix. 15 και αυτου A 13. q; αυτου *K jah paim. Restore the *K-

reading. In the passage ib jah paim, jah is probably induced by the preceding frehun ina jah pai Faireisaitis.

x. 25 απεκρηθη Sin*D; add αυτου *K c. Sin*ABL unc rell al fere

omn. it vg] andhof (im). If im is restored, then so ought the

*K-reading to be adopted. If απεκρηθη be accepted as the

original, then C.A. andhof (tandum) should stand. I suggest

the former course.

xi. 3 ai a defendi autou DS 1.249.346. al plus 20 a c e f l.vg; ai

defensei *K] pos sietrjus is. Restore the *K-reading. Is

parallels ἴσος (αιτη) in verses 1 and 5.

xi. 25 ειπεν die Sin* (om.) 1. al pauc b; ειπεν oov X min; (Ti.;

item X al plus 25 add oov); ειπεν *K] gap pan. Restore the

*K-reading, for pan could represent either δε or oov (see xi. 42

in Group B), or it may be a gratuitous addition as elsewhere.

C.A. omits (izai) after pan.

xii. 35 και ειδηκουσεν SinD 61**.69. it vg go; ειδηκουσεν *K c.

ABCLX unc rell al plier] jah tagrida. Accept, but doubtfully.

xii. 14 ὁ τοις χειρας και τους ποδας ΑΔ 28.29.157.262. al 15 go; τους

ποδας και τας χειρας *K it vg] handuns jah foduns. Accept; yet the

Gothic order may be idiomatic. Cf. M. xxii. 13 ποδας και χειρας,

but χειρας και ποδας M min 60.

xii. 32 ασο (της γης) DL al pauc, item a terra b c e f f*2 g l.vg

(contra a d de terra); ek *K c. SinAB unc rell al plier] af

(aipai). Restore the *K-reading: af renders both ασο and ek,
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tive with parei, and the postposition of jah jus is intended to neatly balance im ik. For the rare indic. siyuh (the subj. is normal) see G.-L., Gram., § 276 e, note 5.

xiv. 30 eiposei (ofodev) ΚΠ 42.116.252w, f (Str. nach got); ουκ εξε υον *Κ b c e ff g l vg) (ni) bigitiip (waiht). Accept. The isolated non inueniet of f is after Gothic.

xvi. 19 eipov de o Ιησους ΥΠ 38. f q g vg; eipov ouv *Κ c. ΑΥΤΔΑ unc 9 al pler; eipov (tamtum) SinBDL 1.33.157. al pauc a b c ip Jesus wissuh. Accept doubtfully. The sequence ip . . . -uh represents plain de in J. ix. 38 o de ef hip is qaph and elsewhere, but since ip and -uh may each represent both de and ouv, we cannot link the present Gothic with eipov de to the exclusion of eipov ouv. Cf. J. x. 20 eipov de qaphuh; J. xvi. 18 eipov ouv qaphuh; J. xviii. 3 o ouv loundas ip Iudas (thus 4, 10, 19, 28). See G.-L., Gloss., and Wb., passim. Cf. comment on xi. 42 in Group B.

xvii. 7 eipov Sin; eipowka 7.118. etc., cogwii a b c e ff q; eipowkan *Κ c. ABCDL unc pler al pler g vg; eipowκαν UX 33. 39. al muj ufkunpa. The decision lies between the sing. and the plur. The former being attested only by Sin 7.118, I would restore the *K-reading (which would give ufkunpedum), and attribute the C.A. ufkunpa to the OLat. For the tenses c. xii. 40 in Group B.

xvii. 7 Παρα σοι Χ 69.209. etc.; Παρα σου *Κ, abs te latt vg) at pus. Restore the *K-reading. At+dat. represents παρα+dat. (place), παρα+gen. (origin), and προς+acc. (place), as in J. xiv. 25 παρ ημεν μενων at izis wisands. J. viii. 26 a ηκονα παρ αυτον at imma, Mk xiv. 49 προς υμα at izis (alter J. vi. 46 παρα του θεου from attin. J. viii. 38 παρα τω πατρι at attin . . . παρα του πατρος from attin). The sequence in xvii. 5 and 7, παρα σαιων at pus silbin . . . παρα σοι at pus, . . . παρα σου at pus is therefore quite in order.

xviii. 32 κυριου Chr 245.435. (domini F vg); Ιησους *Κ it vg; Ti.: θεου ΙΔ 59.235) frajnus. Restore the *K-reading. Frajins is more likely to be reminiscent, as no doubt is κυριου in the few Greek texts cited.

xviii. 36 η εμη βασιλεια ηεμη *Κ meina piudangadi. Accept, with some reluctance. The *K-reading appears three times in this verse; for these three, Sin has η εμη βασιλεια in each case, with Dsupp 73.106.124. in
The Greek Text underlying the

the second. C.A. reads piudangardi meina in the first and third places. The present C.A. text may be a Gothic development. xviii. 38 η αληθεία V min (Ti. has only 1. al aliq); αληθεία *K] so sunja. 'What is this truth you speak of?' The Gothic use (independently of the Greek text) of sa, so, pata to distinguish something as previously mentioned, or as known, or as to be inferred from the context, is amply illustrated throughout the Gothic N.T. See E.B., § 281/2, and esp. G.-L., Gram., § 195, where many examples are given. This passage requires the *K-reading, and ought not to have appeared in the Apparat.

Group D: forty-eight readings

Sub-Group D 1: seven readings

vi. 58 (σοι) EGSVA (Ti.: SinBCEGLSTVΔΑ al plus 50); (σοι) HUII (Ti.: DHMKMΠΙ al perm) libaiπ. Accept, for we must choose one or the other. But both readings mean the same thing and call for the same rendering, whilst the witnesses (cf. L. ix. 52) seem to be evenly divided.

vii. 12 (ον μη) περιπατηση FGSUA (Ti.: SinBFGLSTUXΛ al plus 60); -σει EH (Ti.: DEHMΓΔ al perm)] (ni)goggiπ. Accept. For a similar distribution of witnesses cf. L. xix. 4.

viii. 12 (ον μη) περιπατηση FGSUA (Ti.: SinBFGLSTUXΛ al plus 60); -σει EH (Ti.: DEHMΓΔ al perm)] (ni)goggiπ. Accept. The Gothic is appropriate in either case. For the Greek variants see p. 12 n. 1. See also x. 5 below. vg.: non ambulant.

viii. 14 (ad fin) γ νου ΑΛ f l q vg (Ti.: BDKTUXΑ l. al 50 f ff 1 q vg); και που ΕΦΓΗ a b c d e ff2 (Ti.: SinEFGLHL al sat mu a b c d e)] aipha hap. Accept.

viii. 53 (πως) σαουρον σω (σαουες) EFHSUA (Ti.: EFHMUSA al plu); σαουρον GII it vg (Ti.: SinABCDELKXΓΔΠΙ al 50 it vg)] (handa) puk silban (taijis) pu. Accept, but the deviant position of pu suggests that it might be a later addition. Everywhere else, it seems, pu occupies the same place as its Greek original σων, and, where added independently, it precedes the verb (e.g. in J. xiii. 38 pu mik afaικις, xvi. 30 pu kant alla. Cf. G.-L., Gram., § 199/2a. Here it may express emphasis and contempt: 'Who do you think you are?'

x. 5 (ον μη) ακολουθησουσιν EFG (Ti.: ABDEFGΔ al 20);
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-σωςν SUΠΙ (Ti.: SinKLSUXΓΔΠΙ al plu)] (ni) laistjand (vg non sequitur). Accept. The Gothic is appropriate in either case. In this passage and in viii. 12 above Str. has relegated the T.R. reading to the second place, the reason for which is not apparent. See p. 12 n. 1.

xiii. 13 ο διδασκαλος και ο κυριος SUIΠ it vg (Ti.: SinABC*DKL SUIΠΠι al plu it vg); ο κυριος και ο διδασκαλος EFGHΜΠΠ (Ti.: C*EFGHΜΠΠ 13.28.33. etc. al 30)] laisareis jah frauija. Accept. Sub-Group D 1 (a): twenty-two readings

vi. 2 τα σημεια SAIΠ it vg (Ti.: SinABDKLSAlΠ al 20 it vg); αυτον τα σημεια *K rell (Ti.: EFGHMUVΓΔ al plu)] taimiun. Accept.

vi. 23 (αλλα δε) ἀληθεία πλοιαρια*Κ (Ti.: ABΔΓ γε 7 al plu; γηδον KΛΜΓΘε 1.33. al. al 20 fere); πλοιαρια γηδον Κ (nach Mκ 4.36) (Ti.: Κ al pauc)] (anpha pan) skipa gemen. Accept. The Gothic order is probably idiomatic; το αλια uara naus wenerant is from Gothic.

vi. 35 (ον μη) πεναση ... (ον μη) δωρηση *Κ (Ti.: πεναση SinAB ΛΓΔ Γε 8 al plu; δωρης ΒΙΓΔ γε 8 al plu); -σει ... -σει Chr (Ti.: πεναση DHT al 20; δωρης SinAB*ΔΗΛΤΔ al 25)] (ni) huggreip ... (ni) parasiηp. Accept. The Gothic is appropriate in either case. For the Greek variants see p. 12 n. 1.

vi. 40 (ωι ... και *K (Ti.: no comm.); ειγε EHΛΑ (Ti.: EHΚ ΜΠΛ al mu)] (ει) ... ειγι. Accept. The Gothic is appropriate in either case. For the Greek variants see p. 12 n. 1.

vi. 40 ει τη (εσατη γεμηρις) SUIΠ a b c f ff2 g q vg (Ti.: SinAD KLSULΠ al 40 a b c etc.); τη *Κ (Ti.: BCITΔΓΣΛΓΓ 5 al plu ε m)] in spedinst daga. Accept, but no conclusion is to be drawn from the absence or presence of pamma in the Gothic: see E.B., § 281/2.

vi. 63 λεαιληκα UΠΙ it vg (Ti.: SinBCEDLΤUΠΙ al plus 15 it vg); λαλω *Κ (Ti.: ΓΔΓ γε 7 al pler)] rodida. Accept.

vi. 70 τον Ιησους UΠΙ it vg (Ti.: (Sin)BCDLΤUΠΙ al perm it vg); fehlt *Κ (Ti.: om ΓΔΓ γε 7 al plus 70) (andhof im) Iesus. Accept.

vii. 8 ε τον καιρον U c f ff1 l q vg (Ti.: SinBDLTUX al l (meum tempus c f ff2 l q vg); α τον καιρον ε τον *Κ (Ti.: ΓΔΠΠΓ Γε 8 al pler, temp. meum a b c)] meinita mel. Accept. The complete documentation, which includes SinBDLX, would place this passage
in Group A. Without it, the reader might wonder why, with the apparently isolated witness U, this reading was not treated here under Group C. The case of viii. 26, x. 42, and xiii. 33 below is exactly similar.

vii. 27 (σταύρος) ἔρχεται *K (Ti.: BDLTΔΠ unc 6 al pler) ; ἔρχεται FH (Ti.: SinFvId HXΔ* 28.69.)] (bipe) qimip. Accept. The Gothic indic. is normal (E.B., § 360/2, G.-L., Gram., § 282/1).

For the Greek variant see p. 12 n. i.

viii. 32 (ἥκοσαν) οὖν KUI a ff2 (Ti.: KMUI 1.28.131. al 20 a ff2) ; δε SinD al pauc c e go) ; fehlt *K b g l q vg (Ti.: BLTXΓΔΠ unc 6 al pler b l q vg)] (hausedun) pan. Accept. But the presence or absence in go of οὖν, esp. in John, is not to be taken seriously. In the immediate context οὖν appears as pan (32), παρὰ (33), παρῆ (35). Cf. G.-L., Gram., § 286/5c.

vii. 35 (οτι) ... εὐρήσωμεν ΗΑ (Ti.: HΜΓΑ al mu) ; -ομεν *K rell (Ti.: no comm.)] (pe) ... bigitaima. The *K-reading is equally likely, the Gothic subj. being appropriate in either case. For the relative particle pei (= ei) cf. G.-L., Gloss., s.v. pei, and Wb., s.v.). See p. 12 n. i.

vii. 26 διὸ λέγω U loquor it vg (Ti.: SinBDKLTXΔ al 45 fere, item loquor it vg go) ; λέγει *K vgl. V. 28 (Ti.: EFGHMΣΓΑ al plu)] roda. Accept. See comment on vii. 8 above. Cf. also x. 42.

vii. 54 (θεός) ημῶν *K f g (Ti.: AB2-CLIΔΠ unc 7 al 100 f g go) ; ημῶν F a b c e ff2 l q vg (Ti.: SinBDFX al mu a b c e ff2 l q vg ed)] (τυγκ) unsa. Accept.

ix. 1 παραγων*K (Ti.: no comm.) ; add o Ιησοῦς FGH c ff2 g lg vg (Ti.: CfGHMFΔ al 15 c ff2 g lv vg)] pairhaggands. Accept. For pairh- = para- cf. L. xviii. 37 παραγων παρηγγι, Mk ii. 23 παράπτωμα παρηγγι. 

ix. 9 καθευδος δε UIP a b c e f (wero) ff2 g lg q (Ti.: Sin*εbAC-KUX ΓΠ 33.69. al plus 10 a b etc.) ; δε fehlt *K (Ti.: Sin*εbBC-DEFGHLMΣΔΠ al plu)] jdp is. Accept.

x. 42 εις αυτὸν εκει UIP (Ti.: SinABDKLMUXΠ al plus 10 go) ; εκει εις αυτὸν *K (Ti.: EFGHΣΔΠ al plu)] du immas jnaris. Accept. Cf. comment on vii. 8 above.

xi. 41 (τον λάβον) ὁ θαν ΑΚΠ min (f) (Ti.: AKΠ 1.22.249. al 3 f g go) ; ον τὸν θαν θεός κείμενος *K (Ti.: CGEGHMSΣΔΠ al longe plu)] (pala stain) parei was. Accept. Vg latt read latipem; f+ ubi fuerat is after Gothic.

xii. 1 o Ιησοῦς EGAΠ ff2 g vg (Ti.: Sin*εbABDEGILA-Π al 20 f ff2 g vg go) ; fehlt *K. rell a b c e (Ti.: HKMSUXΓΔΠ al plu a b e c) Jesus. Accept.

xii. 18 ηκοσαν ἉΠ (Ti.: SinABDKLMQΣXΠ al plus 40 it vg go) ; ηκοσαν *K rell (Ti.: EGHUTΔ al plu)] hausidun. Accept, but *K has an equal claim. Collectives may take a singular or (as often) a plural verb. Cf. J. vii. 20 andhof so managei jah qepun. Here the Greek reads ωρησαν αυτῳ ας ως, στι ηκοσαν (-σεω) ; C.A.: iddjdun ... managei, unte hausidun. Once go is committed to the plural iddjdun, hausidun must follow, whatever the Greek reading. See G.-L., Gram., § 209/3 (E.B., § 239/2).

xiii. 33 εγὼ υπαγω UI c e ff2 g lg vg (Ti.: SinABCDKLMUXΠ al 50 c e f etc.) ; υπαγω εγώ *K b g q (Ti.: EFGHSΤΓΔΠ al plu (sum ego) b q)] ik gaggas. Accept. See comment on vii. 8 above. The pers. prons., 1st and 2nd persons, normally follow the Greek order. Cf. comment on viii. 53 (D l).

xiii. 38 αποκρωναι SinABC-LX (Ti.: SinABC-LX al 10) ; απεκρηθη ΚΜΠ a e (Ti.: C-ΓΔΠ-Π) ; απεκρηθη αυτω *K b f q (Ti.: + αυτω C-EGHSUΓΔΠ a b g)] andhof. Streitberg adopts απεκρηθη in his text, so one must assume that he intended to place that reading first. However, I should be prepared to support αποκρωναι, assuming that the Goth had replaced the Greek present by the more conventional andhof (cf. verse 36 λεγει gaf). See G.-L., Gram., § 180, Anm. 2, also E.B., § 299/2.

xvii. 24 (νου) εδωκας (μου) *K (Ti.: BEGSKΥΑΠ* al permu)] ; δεδωκας HUIΠ (Ti.: SinACDHLUXΠ al plus 60)] panei gaf (mis). I should prefer δεδωκας, the documentation of which closely resembles that of δεδωκας at the beginning of the verse. The Gothic rendering would represent either tense.

Sub-Group D 2: six readings

xii. 47 κρίνω (pri) EΚΑΠ indicito it vg (Ti. sim.) ; κρίνω G (Ti.: G al κρίνω, item Aug indicabo)] (ik ni) stoja (ina). Accept. Stoja would represent either reading: cf. next.

xii. 48 κρινει EΚΠ indicabit it vg; κρινει ΤΑ indicat d (Ti. sim.)] stoij. Accept. But stoij is equivocal. Cf. prec.

xiv. 14 (αυτηθης) με SinBEHUTΔ min c (f) vg (Ti. sim.) ; fehlt ADGKLQΣΠΔΠ a eg q (vgl. V. 53) (Ti. sim.) ;] (bidij) mik. Accept.
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xvii. 2 (vna) ... διωμην SinεACGKMSX (Ti. sim.) ; δωσει BEHUY ΓΔΠΠ (Ti. : al plus 80)] (ei) ... gibai. Accept, but either reading would result in the subj. gibai in a clause of purpose (G.-L., Gram., § 276). For the Greek see p. 12 n. 1.

xviii. 28 πρωτια EGHKSYΠΠΠ (Ti. : al permut) ; πρωι SinABC D suppLMUXΔΠΠ (Ti. : al 100)] maugins. The Gothic would represent both readings, between which it is impossible to decide. Πρωι is attested by SinBDLX, the main supporters of the readings in Group Α.

Sub-Group 2(a): thirteen readings

vii. 16 ουν ο Ιηναως ΚΠΠ 13. al pauc b e f ; ουν αυτως ο Ιηναως *Κ (Ti. reads αυτως without comment)] βαν (Jesus). Accept. respondit autem f, ergo q δ.

vii. 50 προς αυτον νυκτος ΚΥΔΠΠ 131. etc. f l q vg ; νυκτος προς αυτον. *Κ (Ti. : EGHMSIA al pler)] du imma in nath. Accept.

x. 41 εποιησαν στημων ουδεν ΚΛΜΠΠ 169. etc. al 5; στημων εποιησαν ουδεν *Κ (Ti. : SinABGΔΠΠ unc 5 al pler it pler vg)] ganasidedeina, fropes, gawandidedeina. The uncials SinABL are well in evidence in Group Α.

x. 40 (vna) ... ιναουμαι ΛΠΠ al plu ; ιναουμαι *Κ (Ti. : SinABD*KΔΠΠ unc 7 al plu)] (ei) ... ganasidedeina, fropes, gawandidedeina, or as from latt vg sanem. See p. 12 n. 1.

xii. 26 (εγων) βαφας *Κ (Ti. : SinADXΔΠΠ unc 8 al omn vid it vg) ; εμβαφας ADΠΠ 1.42. al pauc] (ik) usidawaipjads. Accept.

xvi. 7 ποιον λεγω KΠΠ 33.69.87. a; λεγω ποιον *Κ (Ti. no comm.) ; vg latt dio woikri iezw livi qipa. Accept.

xvi. 13 (σοι αυ) κοινισει BDFHY 1.435. audiet g vg ; ακοους *Κ a c d f ff2 m q (Ti. : AE-GKMΣΤΔΠΠ al pler, audierit a c d etc.) ; ακοους SinL 33. audit b e l] (stta filui swe) hauseip). Any of these readings would result in the same rendering. For the Greek see p. 12 n. 1.

xviii. 25 ηρησαντο ουν CEGMYΤΠΠ ΔΠΠ 100, item a (at ille negauit) f (ille autem negatit) ; ηρησαντο *Κ b e f2 g q vg (Ti. : SinABC* D suppHLUXΠΠ al sat mu b e etc.)] ip is gafaitk. Accept.

Summary

Streitberg's Greek readings fall readily into the four groups which have been described in detail in pp. 3 f. In the first and largest group (Α) he justifies his selections of non-Syrian readings supported by the uncials SinBDLX against an alternative reading which he designates by von Soden's symbol *Κ. As in Luke, there are a few brief and untypical combinations such as DKΠ (vi. 52), ΚΠΠ (ix. 11), BDA (ix. 31). Group Β consists of his selections of *Κ-readings against an alternative reading. In twenty-six of the forty-nine readings, however, the C.A. text deviates from the *Κ-reading adopted: see p. 3. In Group Κ I have collected readings whose uncial support is limited to one or two manuscripts. Group Δ contains pairs of competing readings each of which has the support of a number of Streitberg's eleven Syrian uncials EFGHSV-KUΔΠΠ.
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The fifty-six readings of this group comprise those non-Syrian readings which Streitberg has adopted in agreement with the Gothic text of C.A. These readings are supported mainly by the unicals SinBDLX and, but to a much less extent, by ACKMII.

I have accepted Streitberg's reading in fifty cases, many of which are accompanied by some form of comment. In five readings (viii. 46, x. 26, xiii. 36, xvi. 16, xviii. 24) doubt is cast upon Streitberg's choice, and in one (v. 47) I have expressly suggested that the *K-reading be restored.

My use of the word 'accept' is without prejudice to a possible alternative, and sometimes means little more than acquiescence after I have failed to discover any cause that might explain the deviation of the actual reading of C.A. from the hypothetical normal *K-reading. The fact that in this group the OLat texts agree as to 33 per cent. with the Syrian text in a large measure discounts the too ready assumption that most of the deviation of the Gothic text from the Syrian should be attributed to that source whenever the OLat happens to agree with the pre-Syrian or non-Syrian reading. On the other hand, the OLat may in many cases be responsible and not the original non-Syrian, and both H. J. Vogels and Hermann von Soden have expressed themselves in this sense.

The proportion of readings accepted without qualification varies with each group. Of the 180 readings 130 are 'accepted'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Accepted</th>
<th>Doubtful</th>
<th>Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2 Die Schriften des N. T., p. 1470: Ganz sicher ist, daß die altlat. Übersetzungen irgendwie gelegentlich berücksichtigt wurden, merkwürdigerweise meist an Stellen, an denen auch ihr Einfluß erfahren hat.

In 25 the alternative reading is proposed for adoption, and in the remaining 25 there is more or less doubt.

Of the most prominent uncial supporters of Streitberg's Greek readings in Group A, SinBDLX, only two are nearly contemporary with the Wulfilian version, the others being of the sixth (D), eighth (L), and tenth (X) centuries. A and C belong to the fifth, KMII to the eighth and ninth centuries.

Group B

Of these forty-nine readings forty-one are 'accepted'. The proportionately large number of cases in which the text of C.A. deviates from the *K-reading of the Greek text was commented on in p. 3. Twelve readings involve the presence or absence of some Greek particle, and a further four (ix. 28, xi. 42, xii. 10, xviii. 18) the manner of their rendering. I have decided against Streitberg's *K-reading in two instances (vi. 46, x. 39); six readings (vi. 45, ix. 28, xi. 42, xii. 40, xv. 14, 24) are doubtful.

Group C

This group, consisting of twenty-seven readings for which Streitberg depends on one or two isolated unicals, calls for greater vigilance and provides more occasion for doubt than the more widely supported readings of group A, and I have gone against Streitberg's choice in no less than nineteen readings, suggesting that the *K-reading be restored. Of the remaining eight three are doubtful. In the corresponding group in Luke twenty-four of the thirty-two readings are rejected.

It is not that the paucity of uncial support is in itself sufficient reason for rejecting out of hand any equation based on one or two manuscripts, for these, even of the ninth century, may be the last surviving witnesses to a Greek reading which in the fourth century had a much wider distribution. Nor is it to be overlooked that such a reading, represented so sparsely in the surviving unicals, is sometimes supported by a number of minuscules, among which those of the Ferrar group are prominent, and also by the Old Latin version.

1 The supporting unicals are: Sin (3), Sin or X, A (2), G (2), K, S, U, V (2), X (2), F, 25, A, Chr (2), 251, SinD, SinS, AK, A, D Chr, DL, D8, KA, KII, MU, UA, UIT. These readings are not to be confused with others, grouped under D 1, which appear to be supported by only one or two unicals because Streitberg has suppressed the remaining witnesses. See p. 36.
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On the other hand, it is not enough to cite a solitary uncial as representing the Wulfilian Greek original because it happens to be the only one that corresponds literally with the Gothic text of C.A. This device is fairly common in Bernhardt's edition, and has been adopted by Streitberg, as I think, too often and too confidently.

Consider, for example, vi. 1, supported by V, vii. 3 and xii. 37 by G, xiv. 3 by Chr, ix. 45, xiii. 36 by A, xii. 26 by A, xii. 47 by S, in which the Gothic rendering can be explained as being due to grammatical or stylistic expediency, or to contextual or reminiscent accommodation, or to mere scribal inattention. In ten passages the authority of a single uncial, or of two uncials, is invoked to justify the addition or omission of a particle, or to decide between the variation of *ovv etc., the representation of which, especially in John, is unpredictable. See p. 2, and comment on xvi. 19. See also Study III passim.

Group D

This group falls, formally, into four sub-groups which are, however, essentially alike in that they consist of two competing readings, each of which is supported by some of the eleven uncials (EFGHSV-KUTAII) which constitute Streitberg's 'Syrian' witnesses. Streitberg has given no explanation, so far as I know, why, in the twenty-nine readings of D I and D I(a), he has suppressed the additional attestation furnished by Tischendorf, citing only nine of the eleven uncials, for he regularly omits K and Γ.

In this way he produces a mutilated and distorted picture of the documentary attestation. For example, in D I(a) vi. 70, Streitberg's UII appears as SinBCLUXII and in vii. 8, U again as SinBDLUXII. Without the complete tale of witnesses before him, the reader would wonder why these readings were not in this article placed in Group C, whilst with all the evidence before him, he might ask why they were not dealt with in Group A as being supported by SinBDL(X).

In the same sub-group no less than seven readings are supported by the same attestation that characterizes the pre-Syrian or non-Syrian readings in Group A: vi. 63, 70, vii. 8, viii. 26, x. 42, xiii. 33, 38. Three from each group are set down for comparison:

4. THE GOSPEL OF ST LUKE

Group A: sixty-eight readings

The D I(a) readings appear in the Apparat as supported by U, UII, UII respectively. The selection made does not depend on a majority attestation, but Streitberg tends to give his vote to whichever of the two readings agrees formally with the Gothic.

Taking the four sub-groups together, thirty-four of the forty-eight readings are accepted, three rejected, whilst eleven are for various reasons doubtful. In this group, where the Syrian witnesses are often evenly divided and the Gothic rendering could represent either of the alternatives, decision is difficult or impossible.

This section was published in *Mélanges Mossé* (Marcel Didier, Paris, 1959).
ligando. The present galagid is from OLat et positum in verse 12, which makes it probable that jah was taken over at the same time, replacing an original κειμενον ligando.

ii. 14 ευδοκίας Sin*AB*D it vg; ευδοκία *K c. Sin*BLPΓΔΛΞ
unc 8] godis wiljins. Although ευδοκία occurs five times in the Epistles and twice in the Gospels, the present rendering is found only once more, in Phil. i. 15 δὲ ευδοκίας in godis wiljins. Were it not for Phil. i. 15 one would suggest that godis wiljins in the present passage was from OLat bonae voluntatis. In the circumstances accept.

ii. 36 μετά ανδρὸς ετη επτα SinBGLXΔΞ 13.33. etc. a e f g2 m q vg; ετη μετά ανδρος επτα *K c. EHMSUVΓΤΑ 1. al pl b c l; ετη επτα μετά ανδρος ADKΔII al 8 ff2] mib abin jera sibun. Accept. Cf. i. 59.

ii. 38 Ἰεροσολυμοῖ SinBΞ 1.72. etc. b c e f ff2 g2 l q; ἐν Ἰερ. *K c. ADLΧΔΔΠΙΙ unc 8 al pler] Ιαουρσιουμοσ. Accept. The present form is after verse 42 εἰς Ἰεροσολυμοῖ in Ιαουρσιουμοσ. Accept.

ii. 39 κατὰ Sin*DLΠΙΙ* 1.33.69. al 7 it vg omnia secundum legem; τα κατὰ *K c. Sin*ABΧΓΛΞΠΙΙ unc 8 al pler] hi (witoda fraujins). Accept.

ii. 48 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μητὴρ αὐτοῦ SinBCDLX 1.118. etc. a e f (nach V. 49); πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μητὴρ αὐτοῦ εἶπεν *K c. ΑΓΔΔΠΙΙ unc. 8 al pler] jah gup du inma so aipei is. Accept.

iii. 2 αρχηγεῖς Typus J (v. Soden) Theodoret it pler vg (Ti.: c. Streitberg) in OLat or for grammatical congruence. Accept.

iv. 1 εν τῇ ερμοὶ SinBDL a b g1 q; εἰς τῷ ερμοὶ *K c. (c.: ut Mt et Mc) AEGHKMSUVΓΤΔΞΠΙΙ al omn vid c e f ff2 g2 l vg] in aufiduid.

iv. 8 γνωρίσται SinBΣΔΕΛΞ 1.82.23. etc. a e f ff2 g2 l vg; praem. ὑποτε εἰς αὐτοῦ μανᾶς *K c. AWΓΔΔΠΙΙ unc 9 al pler b [e scriptum est uade retro S.] 1 q r] gamelid ist. Accept.

iv. 8 κυρίων τοῦ θεοῦ παπα προσκυνήσεις SinBDFLΒΓΔΛΞ 1.33. etc. b c e f ff2 g2 l q vg (Μ 4, 10 Deut 6, 13); προσκ. κ. τ. θ. σου *K c. AEGHKMSUVΓΔΠΙΙ al longe pl a] fraujan gup peinana inueltais. Accept.

iv. 11 καὶ οτι SinABKLMWΞ 1. al permu f g1 l q vg; καὶ *K c. DEFGHΔΣUVΓΔ al pl] jah patei. Accept.
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v. 5 τὰ δικτυα SinBDL 1.209. al pauc c e q (nach V. 4); τὸ δικτυα
*K c. ACXΓΔΔΠΙΙ unc 8 al pler a b ff2 g2 l vg] nati. This passage (verses 2, 4, 5, 6) must be considered as a whole. The *K-readings δικτυα—δικτυα—δίκτυον—δικτυα, SinBD read τα δικτυα, and C.A. nati, throughout. Streitberg reads δικτυα in verses 2, 4, 5, but δικτυα in verse 6, here ascribing the Gothic plural to the influence of the 'afri.' text, f being corrected to the Gothic. But other OLat texts have the plural in verse 6: a d f retiae, b c e ff1 l q aur retia. I should read τα δικτυα throughout (in verses 2, 4, 5, 6) with SinBD. See v. 6 in Group B.

v. 9 oν BDX, quos ceperant d; γ *K c. SinACLΓΔΔΤΙΙ unc 8 al omn it vg (quam)] panzei (ganutum). Accept.

v. 15 o λογος μαλλων DMU al pauc; μαλλον o λογος *K (Ti. silet) it vg] pata waurd mais. Accept.

v. 35 καὶ τοτε SinFΜΔ 1.13. etc. b c e f ff2 g2 l q; τοτε *K c. ABCDLRXΓΔΞΠΙΙ unc rell al longe pl a vg] jah pan. Streitberg's reading καὶ οταν . . . καὶ τοτε jah pan . . . jah pan makes poor sense, nor does it commend itself to one's judgement that in the closest context καὶ οταν (*K) should be paired with καὶ τοτε (SinFΜΔ 1.13, etc.). One would rather expect to see both the *K-readings (καὶ οταν . . . τοτε) or else οταν (SinCFLM 1.13, etc. it pler vg) and καὶ τοτε (SinFΜΔ 1.13 . . . it pler). If we adopt the former pair (with Ti.), the C.A. second jah pan could be due to later accommodation to the par. pass. M. ix. 15, Mk ii. 20 pan . . . jah pan.

vi. 10 (ο de) εἰς τοῦν SinDX 1.13. etc. al mu it vg (nach M. 12, 13 Mc. 3, 5); (ο de) εἰς τοῦν *K c. AEF*LMSUVΓΔΠΙΙ 33 al plus 80] (paruh is) ufrakida Accept. The probability is in favour of o de εἰς τοῦν, for if an original paruh is tawida had been brought into line with M. xii. 13 (def. C.A.) or Mk iii. 5 καὶ εἰς τοῦν jah ufrakida, or with the OLat et extendit, we should rather expect jah ufrakida in the present passage. For o de = paruh cf. L. viii. 30, 96, x. 26.

vi. 26 κατα τα ωρα Sin*BDKRXΞΠΙΙ 33 a c e; κατα ταυτα *K c. Sin*AEHΛΜΨUVΓΔΠΙΙ al pler b ff2 g2 l q vg] samaleiko. Accept. This and verse 23 must be considered together. The Greek and OLat readings of v. 23 are κατα τα ωρα BDQΞΞ 33 a (similiter) c (eadem) e (per eadem) κατα ταυτα SinAEHΚΛ...
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MPRSUVΓΔΛΠ b ff² g 1 q r. The three uncial KRΠ read kata tauna in v. 23 (bi pamma) and kata ta auta in v. 26 (samealeto). The Vulfrilian original may have done the same.

vi. 36 γνωσθε SinBDΛΞ 1.33. etc. a b c e ff² l q; γνωσθε ow *K c. ARξΓΔΛΠ unc 7 al pler fg² ων vḡ] wairpaic. Accept.

vii. 37 ων μι ΔΔΑ al pauc a c e f (nach M. 7, 1) και ων μι *K c. SinBCΕΗΚΛΜΠΣΤΥΓΔΛΠΙ al pler b ff² g² l q vḡ] ei ni (stojaindau). Accept.

vii. 44 μοι επι τους ποδας μου Verschmelzung zweier Lesarten:

(a) μοι επι (τους) ποδας BX mihi ad pedes e, und (b) επι τους ποδας μου *K c. AΙΡΓΔΛΠ unc 9 al pler b c f g² vḡ] mis ana fotuns meinans. This conflation does not occur in Greek, and if it were a Gothic conflation, that would presuppose a double rendering from (a) and (b). More probably the original was ana fotuns meinans from *K, the addition of mis being from the OLat. μοι is found in BX and D; mihi in a e (aquam mihi ad pedes non dedisti) ff² g¹ q, with d (aquam in pedes mihi non dedisti from D). ποδας μου owk edwka.

vii. 44 θρεψιν SinABDΙΚΛΠΞΠΙ al 25 fere it vḡ; θρεψιν γις κεφαλης *K c. EFГHMSUVΓΔΛΠ al pler) shatia. Goth. shatia (ON skopt) means the hair of the head and would equally well represent either reading. Shatia would probably not tolerate the addition of haubidis.

viii. 20 αυτω SinBDΛΞ 1.22.33. etc. it vḡ; αυτω λεγοντων *K c. ΑΧΓΔΛΠ unc 9 al pler) imma. Accept. This and the next form one reading.

viii. 20 στι SinDLX 1.131. etc. a b c e ff² g¹ l q; fehlt *K c. ΑΒΓΔΛΠ unc 9 al pler vḡ] patei. Accept. See prec.

viii. 21 ποιοντες SinBDΛΞΠΙ al plus 30 it vḡ; ποιοντες αυτων *K c. EFГH*ΚΜΣUVΓΔΛΠ al pler) tajuandans. Accept.


viii. 48 τω δι SinΦΥΞΠΙ al 15 fere; τω *K c. SinABDEH KΛΣΤΥΓΔΛΠ al pler it vḡ] ἰψ Ἰησυς. The C.A. parallels are M. ix. 22 ἰψ Ἰησυς . . . gap (following the majority reading SinbBC unc rell), Mk v. 34 ἰψ is gap du izai. The present C.A. reading could also be from the Gothic of M. ix. 22.
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viii. 51 Ἰακωβον καὶ Ιωαννην SinALSXΠ 33 al mu vg; Ιωαννην καὶ Ἰακ. *K c. BCDEFKMRΓΔΛΠ al 125 fere a b c e ff² l q r δ aur vḡ] Iakobu jah Iohannen. The C.A. text could also have been levelled out from Mk v. 37, or from the Transfiguration passages which have the same order: cf. ix. 28.

viii. 52 αυτοι SinBCDFΛΔΠ al 25 fere a c d f ff² g² l q (M. 9, 24); ouκ *K c. AEHKMRΓΣΥΓΔΛΠ al pler b e vḡ] unte ni. An original *K-reading could have been made to conform, in C.A., to M.

ix. 1 τους δωδεκα αποστολους SinC*LΛΞ 16.33. etc., a c e f vg; τους δωδεκα μαθητας αυτου (M. 10, 1) CΕΦΗΠΗ al mu b f² g² l q; τους δωδεκα *K c. ABDKMRSΤΥΓΔΠ al 100 fere) pans twalif apauastaulus. Accept. The parallels are: M. x. 1 τους δωδεκα μαθητας αυτου pans twalif siponjans (seinans); Mk. vi. 7 τους δωδεκα pans twalif.

ix. 23 καθ' ημεραν Sin*et c b ABKLΜΡΞΠΙ 1.13-33. etc. f g² ων vg; fehlt *K c. Sin*we 1*a CDEF*GHSUVΓΔΛΠ al 120 fere a b c e ff² l q] dag hannah. Accept.

ix. 28 παραλαβων Sin*ΒΗ a b ff² g¹ l; και παραλαβων *K c. Sin*ACDEFGKLΜΨΤΥΓΔΛΠ al omn fere c e fg² q vḡ] ganimands. Accept. Influence of the parallels is excluded.

ix. 28 Ιακωβον και Ιωαννην C*DLΜΞΠΙ 33. etc. f² g² vḡ (nach M. 17, 1 Mc. 9, 2); Iw. κ. Ἰακ *K c. SinABC*ΕΘΗΚΡΨUVΓΔΛΠ al longe plu a b c e fg² l q] Iakobu jah Iohannen. The present C.A. text could also have been levelled out from the parallels. Cf. viii. 51.

ix. 38 μοι εστιν SinABCDLX 1.28.33. al 20 fere a e; εστιν μου *K c. RWΓΔΛΠΙ une 8 al longe plu a b c e ff² g² l q vḡ] mis ist. Accept.

ix. 50 καθ' ημοιν υπερ ημοιν Sin*eBCDKΛΜΞΠΙ al plus 25 it vḡ; καθ' ημοιν υπερ ημοιν *K c. Sin*eEFGHΓΣΥΓΔΛΠ al permu) wipra izweis faur izweis. Accept.

ix. 62 προς αυτων ο Ιησους SinΛΞΠ al mu vid a b c e fg² l m vg (vgl. V. 60); ο Ιησους προς αυτων *K c. ACΓΠΙΙ une 8 al longe plu q] (gap pan) du imma Jesus. Accept. It may be noted that in v. 60 επειν δε αυτω ο Ιησους gap pan du imma Jesus) Streiberg, without comment, rejects the reading of SinBDΛΞ 33 a (which omits Ιησους), but in v. 62 accepts that of SinΛΞ it pler vg to match the Gothic order.
the idiomatic το be expressed in Gothic, except by ignoring it, as in Latin quid facerent? I should here assume the *K-reading.

**xx. 44** 209. al plus 10it pler vg; δευτε apok. (ex ii. pp.) *K c SinCDLRTGΔΔΑΑ al unc 6 al pler c] afslaham. Accept. This differs from the prec. in that the parallels M. xxii. 38 and Mk xii. 7, both reading δευτε, have not influenced the present passage. Mk. xii. 7 reads hirijp, usqimam imma. The rendering afslaham is unusual (G. V. G., p. 115). For the imperative see G.-L., Gram., § 186/4.

**xx. 19** oι γραμματευκαοι και οι αρχευεσ AB(C)KLMUPI 1.33. etc. e (vgl. Mc. 11, 18 *K); οι αρχευκαι οι γραμ. *K c SinDEGH SΓΤΔΔΑΑ al plu it pler vg] pai bokarjos jah aukumisjans gudians. Accept.

**xx. 27** oι λεγευεσ SinBCD 1.33. etc. e qui dicit resurrectionem non esse (nach Mc. 12, 18 vgl. M. 22, 23); οι αρχευευεσ *K c ΑΡΤΔΔΙΙ Unc 8 al pler a c ff2 a1 l q vg] paiie qiqand ustass ni wisan. Accept. Cf. Mk xii. 18 octres λεγευεσ λεγευεσ λεγευεσ, whence perhaps the present reading, but οι λεγευεσ could appear either as pai qipandans or paiie qiqand. Cf. L. iii. 1 l o εγου o o εγου sa habands sae habait.

**xx. 44** αυτον κυριον ABKLMPHUII al plus 10 f; κυριον αυτον *K c SinDEGHSPΓΤΔΔΑΑ al pler a c ff2 a1 l q vg] (Daweil) ινα frajun (haip). Accept. C.Α. omits oon with D (gr) a d i; the parallel Mk xii. 37 reads λεγε αυτον κυριον τιφιφ ina frajun.  

**Group B: sixteen readings**

1. 37 παρα τω θεω *K c SinACΔΔΑII Unc 8 al pler apud dean a d f vg; παρα τω θεω SinBDLΣ; τω θεω min., deo b c c ff1 l q] (nist unmahteg) guda. The third reading has as good a claim as the first or second. Cf. L. xviii. 27 mahteg is at guda (παρα τω θεω); Mk x. 27 fram mannam (παρα ανδραυοις) ... fram guda (παρα τω θεω); 2 Cor. x. 4 mahtegs guda (δυνατα τω θεω). On these analogies one ought either to
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ascribe guda to the OLat b c e ff2 l q, or to suppose that the preposition at or fram has fallen out, in which case we could accept the *K-reading.

1. 62 αυτον *K c ACLΔΔΔΠΙΙ Unc 7 al pler; αυτο SinBDLΣ 33. etc.] (haitan) ινα. Accept. Cf. ii. 28 in Group D 2(a).

2. 37 και ανθυ *K c ΕΗΚΜΠΤΩΙΑ (e et ipsa); και ανθυ GΠΙΙ al (et haec it pler vg]) soh pan. Accept. Soh may properly represent ανθυ, ανθυ, or η (in the present passage). Cf. G.-L., Gram., § 202. Pan for και occurs elsewhere. Cf. vui. 12 in Group D.

3. 43 εγνω (εγνωσαν Δ al pauc f g!) Ιωαθη και η μυθη αυτον *K c ACXΓΔΔΠΙΙ Unc 8 al pler b c ff2 a1 l q rd; εγνωσαν οι γονεις αυτων SinBDL 1.13.33. etc. a e vg] (jah ni) wissedan josef jah aheie is. Accept. The plural verb with Ιωαθη και η μυθη seems to be a Greek correction which is reflected in f nescierunt. b c ff2 have non cognovit, q agnovit.

4. 10 πονησαμεν *K c SinABCDFHLMSPΣΓΔΔΠΙΙ pl al; -σομεν GΚΜ 1. al permu it vg] (faciemus] ταυβαιμα. Accept. This and the two following form one reading. For the Gothic subj. for Gk. subj. or future see E.B., §§ 308, 301 (d); G.-L., Gram., § 182/1 (d), and cf. esp. M. vi. 31;

5. 12 πονησαμεν *K (cf. v. 10); -σομεν GU 1. al permu it vg] ταυβαιμα. Accept. See prec.

6. 14 πονησαμεν *K c SinBC* et***DFHLMSPΣΓΔΔΠΙII al pl; -σομεν AGΚ 1. al permu it vg] ταυβαιμα. Accept. See prec. v. 6 το δικτουν *K c ACXΓΔΔΠΙΙ Unc 8 al pler (b e) g1.2 r vg; τα δικτου SinBDL 1. al pauc a b c d e ff2 a1 l q r aur (thus W.-Wh., who read b tumpetan narr, e dirumpere narr) natja. The plural τα δικτου should be substituted in this verse: see v. 5 in Group A.  

7. 16 εγινησαται *K c EFGKMRΣΠΣΓΔΔΠΙII al pler; ηγερη SinABCLΣ 1.13.33. etc.] urrais. This rendering represents either Greek reading equally well. For the aorist see E.B., § 298/i/a, G.-L., Gram., § 181/4; for the perfect see E.B., § 303/1 ('nur selten erscheint ein got. Präteritum als Übertragung eines griech. Perfects'), and G.-L., Gram., § 181/2. The Greek verb occurs also in L. ix. 7 and Mk vi. 14 with the rendering urrais. In the present passage Streitberg selects εγγερται against SinABCLΣ; in L. ix. 7 again εγγερται against SinBCLE; in Mk vi. 14 he selects ηγερθη against SinBDLΔ. In view of his statement in E.B., § 303/1, one might have expected all three, with the older reading, to have been placed in Group A.
The Greek Text underlying the

ix. 47 αυτο *K (Ti. silet); αυτων Λ 262.; om. D α ε ff² q] gasatida 'ohne αυτο (vgl. ita Mc. 9, 36) nach α d e ff² l q (D'). Accept. f, with vg, reads statut eum. Attribution to OLat, as here, is unusual. More likely orig. ita has dropped out.

ix. 54 απο *K c. SinABXΓΔΛΠ UOL vacc. 8 al pler; εκ CD 1.118.131. (it vg de caelo)] us himina. Accept. But us renders both απο and εκ: cf. Mk vii. 1 απο Iep. us lairensaetemin, Mk i. 10 εκ του νοοτας us pamma watin.

ix. 59 απελθουντι πρωτων θαφαι *K c. CEGHMSUVΞΓΔΛΞ al pler; πρωτων απελθουντι θαφαι SinBD; πρωτων απελθουν και θαφαι ΑΚΠ al 25 fere a b e f g q vg (nach M. 8. 21)] Galeipan faurpis jah usfilhan. The Gothic reading agrees with none other. The order Galeipan faurpis is that of απελθουντι πρωτων (say, Galeipandin faurpiri), but the construction follows the third reading, and may have been assimilated to a b e f q primum (etc.) ire et sepelire. The Mk viii. 21 parallel is rendered, formally, frumist Galeipan jah gafilhan. Streitberg in his note ad loc. gives a somewhat different explanation.

xvii. 4 αφες *K (Ti. silet); αφες DHA al pauc it vg (dimitte, remitte) fraletais (innia). Accept. Fraletais would properly represent either reading (see E.B., § 307 citing xvii. 3). Cf. verse 3, where the universal reading αφες is rendered fraletais.

d. 36 fehlt *K: om also in Gothic. Accept. Ti. hunc uersum ... cum Du al permu a b c e ff² 1 q ... vg ... non dedimus cum SinABQXΓΔΛΠ unc 7 al longe plu qa.

xvii. 7 μακροθυμεις *K c. RGΔΛ unc 8 al pler (item om. και 80.88. a b c ff² 1 q); μακροθυμεις SinABDLQXΓΠ unc 7 al longe plu qa.

xviii. 7 μακροθυμεις *K c. RGΔΛ unc 8 al pler (item om. και 80.88. a b c ff² 1 q); μακροθυμεις SinABDLQXΓΠ unc 7 al longe plu qa.

xviii. 48 αυτου ακουν ας *K (Ti. silet) it vg akou. αυτ. ας ακουν DM al 8 (D ak. αυτ.) (hahaida) du hausian imma. Accept. The Gothic rendering is completely accounted for in Streitberg's apparatus.

Group C: thirty-two readings

i. 14 σου χαρα D Orig; χαρα σου *K (Ti. silet) it pler vg] (jah wairpan) pus faheds (jah sugwapi). Restore the *K-reading. The transposition in Gothic is stylistic. Only d e have tibi gaudium. i. 65 αυτων D, αυτων II al 5; αυτων *K (Ti. silet)] (paim bisitantam) ina. Restore the *K-reading. This is more probably a plausible alteration of orig. ins.

iii. 14 οι στηριευομενοι 28.118.209. al 10; om. οι *K (Ti. silet)] pai milliandans. 'als Entsprechung des pai ist für die griech. Vorlage höchstwahrscheinlich der Artikel anzunehmen; der got. Artikel ist nicht als absolut notwendig zu erachten, vgl. L. 20, 20 und E.B., § 281, 2. There are very few instances where sa functions as a definite article in the absence of the corres. Greek, yet this must be counted as one. Cf. G.-L., Gram., § 195. Streitberg cites L. xx. 20 pans ... taikniandans; cf. also f Tim. iii. 16 aggenous paim aggilum. Restore the *K-reading.

iii. 14 μηδενα σωκοφαντουσε Sin*H; μηδε σωκ. *K c. SinABECD LΞ unc rall al om vi it vg] (ni mannanhun holop) ni mannanhun (anaamhtjaip). Restore μηδε (= nik, nippun). The C.A. reading is most likely corrupt. Bernhardt, who reads μηδε, is of opinion that the two items holop ... anaamhtjaip have been reversed; if that were the case, it would account for the (repetitious) ni mannanhun for orig. nik.

iv. 8 αποκριθες αυτῳ ο Ιησους εισετε DA al aliq; ατ. αυτῳ εισεν ο Ιησους *K c. BEGHSUVΓΔΛΓΑ al pl] andhaffjands imma Jesus qap. Accept. There are two other combinations (Ti.) αποκ. o Ιησ. εισεν αυτῳ SinFLMες Ξ 1.13.33. etc. ε (om αυτῳ) f ff² g² q vg; αποκ. εισεν αυτῳ o Ιησους ΑΚΜεπΠ al 15 fere a b c q. The two contextual readings of iv. 8 in Group A are supported by SinBDΛΞ latt, here the uncials are spread over three variants: DA–B–SinLΞ. I cannot see how Streitberg's choice can be improved upon.

v. 3 χαλασωμεν II 1. al pauc; -σουμε K al pauc (nach ελασωμεν); χαλασω *K it vg (Ti. silet)] wairpan. Restore the *K-reading χαλασο, the pl. wairpan meaning contextual. Cf. the contextual readings v. 5 in Group A, v. 6 in Group B.

v. 17 συνελησθε Α*Δ 1.13.33. etc. a (nach V. 15 συνήρχετο)] υπελθε Κ c. SinABCLXΓΔΛΞΠ unc 7 al pler it pler vg] gaqmanani. Restore the *K-reading. The prefix needs explaining (cf. Mk ix. 1 υπελθεναν qumana), but it could be contextual (ek paws komis k. a.) or from v. 15 garumun.

vi. 4 τοις (μερι αυτου) BL 1.112. it vg ('it vg lassen και —도 auch Mc. 2, 26 weg)'; και τοις *K c. SinADEHKMRSUVΞΓΔΛΠ al pler] pain (mp sis wisandam). As Streitberg points out, wisandam is from Mk. ii. 26 και εδωκεν
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vii. 19 ετεροφεν αυτων Σ; ετεροφεν *K (universal reading) insandida ins. Here ins is a plausible, necessary addition, the transitive sandian being regularly accompanied by its object. Restore the *K-reading. Cf. Bernhardt: ‘ins zugesetzt’.
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viii. 8 και εφευ και επουηεν Sin* (ähnlich DL et fructificavit (f germinavit) et fecit e l; και φευ επουηεν *K (Ti. silet)] jah uskeinoda jah tawida. Accept. (D και φευ και επουηεν L και εφευ επουηεν.) Noteworthy is the agreement of e and f.

viii. 43 [τον βιων αυτως (Sin* εαυτως) CX 157. al pauc it vg (nach Mc. 5, 96); om. αυτος *K c. Sin*ALPRΓΔΑΠΙ 8 unc 8 al pler] (allennma agina) seinanna. Accept.

viii. 53 διοντες Χ; ειδορες *K (the universal reading)] gasai­handans. Restore ειδορες (latt vg scientes), C.A. gasaihandans being reminiscent of similar passages, where διων and ειδος (κ.τ.λ.) are in competition, and Streitberg's treatment has not been consistent or satisfactory. Thus in M. ix. 4 ειδος is chosen to match wairpan (against *K ειδον), which is easily explained by M. xii. 25 ειδος (C.A. def.); in Mk xii. 15 the *K-reading ειδος is chosen when C.A. gasaihandans could have been referred to ειδον Sin*D latt (as in other cases); in Mk xii. 28 again ειδος *K is selected for gasaihandans, against ειδον Sin* CDL.

ix. 7 τα γενομενα AX 1.69. etc. al 15 fere erant facta b ff² l q r τα γενομενα *K (universal reading) (quae fæabant f vg, faciebant e c)] po wαιρανονα. The similar phrases in the Gospels, M. xxvii. 54 τα γενομενα po wairpanon, L. viii. 34 το γεγονημον οτ γεγονος, and Mk v. 14 το γεγονος ηται wairpan, do not help us, nor do two other passages in which το γεγονος (L. ii. 15) and γενομενα (Mk xiii. 29) are used predicatively. Mk xiii. 29 is of independent interest because of the Gothic rendering pan gasaiht pata wairpan for οται ιδητε ταυτα γενομενα. In the Gothic po would have been normal, yet pata, as a summary word, is in good style, even though not literal, whilst wairpan is a very proper rendering. Yet the vg cum uideritis haec fieri, a haec fieri, e ista fieri, e ff² q haec omnia fieri (b d def.) make it probable that Gothic wairpan is from the OLat. In the present instance, whichever Greek reading was before the translator, the past ppl. po wairpanon would be correct,1 unless a change of construction had been preferred. The *K-reading τα γενομενα should be restored.

1 Cf. G.-L., Gram., § 190/2: Das Participium passivi, welches eigentl präteritische Bedeutung hat, steht auch für das Präsens: 2 Cor. vii. 5 θηδομενον αναπραγ­ganai; 1 Cor. xi. 24 το υπερ ειμι κλημον ηται gabruckano; M. vi. 30 δαλλομεν galagip, u.b.
The Gothic present indic. could represent either reading: for

Γασκαρίπια. Accept. The Gothic is appropriate in
either case. Cf. xviii. 7 below, and see p. 12 n. 1.

div. 15 αρστόν ГΗΛ it vg (Ti.: SinΑΒΓΔΗΚΛΜΠΧΩΓΔΑ 1. al mu it vg); αρστόν (= *Κ v. Soden) ЕΗΣUVII (Ti. ЕΗ2ΚΜ ΣUVIΠ Λ11.13. etc. al plus 130) hlaif. Accept.

div. 21 τυφλοὺς καὶ χωλοὺς FUII it pler vg (Ti.: SinΒΔΗΚΦΛΜ ΠΨΙΩΩΓΔΑ 25 fere it pler vg); χ. κατ. ЕΗΝΣΑΥΒΣΑΥ (Ti. ЕΘΗΡΧΣΧΥ ΓΔΑ al e) blindans jah haltans. Accept. This could have gone
der under Group A with the attestation SinBL against *Κ: cf.,
for example, div. 21 in Group A which has similar uncial support.

div. 27 ευνει μου μαθητης EFGHСVA (Ti.: SinΒΕΦΓΗΛΨΥΩΓΔΑ 30 fere b e f q); μου ευνει μαθ. УП (Ti.: ΑΚΜ=УП al pl c ff2 vg) ὦισαν μείνει σιπονεῖ. This is not a matter of word-order,
but of emphasis. Either Greek reading would result in the
present text of C.A. See div. 33 in Group A.

div. 1 aυτόν ενεγκαίωτες KUII (Ti.: SinΑΒΚΜΨΙΩΩΓΔΑ 12 fere); γρηγ. aυτόν ЕΗΗΣΑΥΒΣΑΥ (Ti. DEGΗΗΧΣΧΥΓΔΑ al pl e f ff2 i) (wesunuppan) imma nekhjandans sik. Accept, without prejudice
to the second reading. Sik must follow its verb, but imma could
either precede or follow.

div. 18 ενεγκαίωτες ΣUVII (Ti.: Sin*СΒΑΒΚΛΜΨΥΩΓΔΑ 60 fere); fehlt EHGά (Ti.: om SinξΕDΗΓΑ al pl) om Goth.
(item e f vg). The personal construction in δυ μανεί σιντείνοι
σκυλαν binžjan virtually precludes the use of ins following binžjan
(G.-L., Gram., § 199/2/b3). The C.A. text could therefore represent
either reading: cf. div. 25 in Group D 2(a). In any case
the appropriate place for comment would have been the
Gothic Anmerkungen, not the Greek Apparat.

div. 18 ενεγκαίωτες ΣUVII (Ti.: Sin*СΒΑΒΚΛΜΨΥΩΓΔΑ 60 fere); fehlt EHGά (Ti.: om SinξΕDΗΓΑ al pl) om Goth.
(item e f vg). The personal construction in δυ μανεί σιντείνοι
σκυλαν binžjan virtually precludes the use of ins following binžjan
(G.-L., Gram., § 199/2/b3). The C.A. text could therefore represent
either reading: cf. div. 25 in Group D 2(a). In any case
the appropriate place for comment would have been the
Gothic Anmerkungen, not the Greek Apparat.

The Gothic present indic. could represent either reading: for

Γασκαρίπια. Accept. The Gothic is appropriate in
either case. Cf. xviii. 7 below, and see p. 12 n. 1.

xvi. 4 προοδραμων EFGHСVA (Ti.: ЕФГΗΛΨΙΩΩΓΔΑ 25); προοδρα-

---

1 See reference on page 12.
The Greek Text underlying the
μον ΣΑ (Ti.: SinABKMQRSΔΔ al plu it pl vg)] biopagjands (fuer). Accept. προστρεχοντες, προσδρομον are rendered by durinnan, duatrinan in Mk ix. 15, x. 17.

xix. 22 λεγει δε Ο*FHS*VII (Ti.: ΑΕ*FHKS*VΓΔΠΙ al plu q); λεγει Ε*GS*UA (Ti.: SinBE*GMRS*UA 1 etc. al plus 40 a s vg)] jah gap (du imma). Jah could represent δε, but could also be after OLat et (b ce e fi i). The uncial evidence is equally balanced. Cf. Streitberg’s Axkmerkung, ad loc., to the same effect, referring jah gap to v. 17.

xx. 19 τον δαον ΕΗΥΙΙ it vg (Ti.: SinABCDEHKLMRUDΠΙ al plu it vg); fehlt GSVΔ (Ti.: om GSVTA al 80 fere)] (ohledun) po managein. Accept, and see p. 12 n. 1.

Group D 1(a). Nine readings. As D 1, except that one or the other reading (first or second) is designated by the symbol *K: see p. 4.

ii. 51 τα ρηματα απαντα ταυτα ΑΚΠ (D παντα o הונε ταυτа); παντα τα ρηματα ταυτα *Κ b c e f ff 2 g 1 1 vg) (Ti.: παντα τα ρηματα SinBCEGHMULVΧΙΑΔ al pler b c e ff 2 g 1 vg); τα ρηματα απαντα (D παντα) ΑΔΚΠΙΙ go haec ubera omnia; absque tanta Sin*BDM a ε; add. tanta Sin*ACLXΓΔΠΙΙ unc 7 al omn uid b c ff 2 g 1 vg)] po waurda alla. Accept.

v. 26 εδομεν *Κ (Ti.: SinB*DEΣUΠΛΔ ΠΙ II al pl vid); εδομεν ΙΙΙ* (Ti.: ACKLMVRΧΠΙ al mu)] (patei) gasaihvanAccept. Streitberg’s entry was unnecessary (Tischendorf adds ‘utrum recipias dubium’), εδομεν being but a graphic variant of εδομεν, for the rendering of which by gasaihvan see G.-L., Gram., § 180/5. For εδον / δον see W.-H., Appendix, p. 162.

v. 28 καταλεων *Κ (Ti.: SinBCDKMRUSUVΧΠΙΙ al pl); καταλεων ΕΛΠΙΙ* (Ti.: AEΛΓΔΠΙΙ 33 al mu)] bileipjands Accept, but the Gothic represents either reading. These are genuine variants (aor. ppl., pres. ppl.), but have in some manuscripts been treated as graphic variants.

vii. 22 εγενετο δε ΟΙΙΙ it vg (Ti.: SinABDKLΜΠΙΙ 1.33. etc. al plus 20 it vg); και εγενετο *Κ (Ti.: EFGHSVΧΓΔΔ al plu)] warp pan. pan represents και in a number of passages (e.g. L. ii. 37 και αυτη soh pan), and could do so here. There is no cogent reason for selecting εγενετο δε especially on the strength of ΟΙΙΙ, which Streitberg rejects in the following.

viii. 34 το γεγενημενον *Κ (Ti.: EGHMSVXΔΔ al plu); το γεγονος ΟΙΠΙ (Ti.: SinABCDKLFRUΞΠΙ al 35 fere)] pata waurpamo. Accept. The Gothic could represent either reading. See ix. 7 in Group C.

ix. 38 επιβλεψαι *Κ (Ti.: ABCGHKLMSUVΧΠΙΙ al plu); επιβλεψαι ΕΛ it vg (Ti.: SinDEW*XΔ al permui] (bidja pak) insaihban (du sanu mehnma). Accept.

x. 19 ovkerei *Κ it pler (Ti.: SinABDE*suppHLQRΣUVΧΠΙ al 40 fere it pler vg ed); και ovkerei G g i (Ti.: GMPX al plu g)’ ju panaxips. Accept. Cf. xv. 21 in Group A.

xix. 41 επ αυτην ΗΠΙ it vg (Ti.: SinABDHLRGΠΙΙ al plus 30); επ’ αυτη *Κ (Ti.: EGΚMSUVΑ al plu)] (gaigrot) bi po. This rendering would suit either reading; cf. iv. 22 εδομανεν επ’ τουs λογοιs bi po waurda; 32 επ αυτη διακριτi bi po laisein. For the Greek dative cf. γελαν επ’ του to laugh at anyone.

xx. 32 ιστερον ΕΗΣΑ g i vg (Ti.: Sin*BDEHΣΔΙΑ al 35 fere ff 2 g 1 vg); ιστερον δε *Κ f l q (Ti.: Sin*ACKLMΡUVΠΠΙΙ al plu f l q) spedista (allaize). Accept.
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Group D 2. Five readings comparable to those of D 1, without suppression of witnesses. All uncials are cited for both first and alternative readings. See p. 4.

i. 50 εις γενεας γενεας ΑΣ*DEGHΚΥΓΓΠΙΙ al permul b c; εις γενεας και γενεας SinFMOS 1.13. etc. ff 2 g 1 q] in aldins alde. Accept. Cf. Eph. iii. 21 εις πασαις τας γενεας του αιωνος των αιωνων in allos aldins aiwe.

vi. 26 πανται SinABEHΚΜΡΟΧΞΠΙΙ 1.33. etc. al permul a b c e ff 2 g 1 1 q; om. DF*LΣUVΔΔ al 100 fere vg ed] allai (mans). Accept.

ix. 55 και επεν επεν ... εετε om. SinABCEFGLHΣVΧΠΙΕ 28.33. etc. al 60 fere g 1; και επεν oik oikate oon (pouou Chr. D. 6 mn.) πενεματος εετε DF*UΓΔ al permul a b c e fi q vg] ηνι υπετη αιμανεν σιαμ. Accept. The immediately following addition ο γερε νος ... ονομα αντεν μεν ... ηνιαν is supported by Γ*ΚΜΟΠΓΠΙΙ a b c e fi q vg.

x. 11 εις τους ποδας ποδας ΑΣ*ΕΚΓΜΛΧΞΠΙΕ al 50 fere f; fehlt ESVΔΔ al permu vg] ana futus unsarans. Accept. Cf. also εις τους ποδας SinBDR min, in pedibus a (pedes) b c d e i q r;
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The Greek Text underlying the

f qui adhaesit nobis in pedibus nostris de ciuitate uestra shows in pedibus nostris from Gothic intruded into the wrong place.

xii. 22 κρίνω hoc accentu ΕΗΚΜΣΠΠ al plu (indicabo ad); κρίνω BΛ al mu it pler vg (indicó) stața (puk). Accept, but the Gothic could represent either reading.

Group D 2(a). Six readings comparable to those of D 2. All uncials given by Tischendorf are cited for the first reading, but the alternative is summed up as *K: see p. 4.

ii. 28 αυτοι MUΓΛ (Ti.: + 13.69. etc. al 40 fere it vg eum); αυτο *K (Ti. no further details) iâa. Accept. Cf. i. 62 in Group B.

iv. 20 ευ συναγωγη ησαν οι φθαλμωι AKΠ 72. etc. b; οι φθ. ησαν *K (Ti.: DΕGHMSUVΔΛα pler it pler vg)] (jah allaim) in hțzai summongein wesen augona. Accept.

iii. 28 αVTov MUr A (Ti.:+ 3.69. etc. al 40 fere it vg eum); αVT *K (Ti.: DEGHMSUVΔΛα pler it pler vg)] (jah allaim) in hțzai summongein wesen augona. Accept.

iv. 24 ευ συναγωγη ησαν οι φθαλμωι AKΠ 72. etc. b; οι φθ. ησαν *K (Ti.: DΕGHMSUVΔΛα pler it pler vg)] (jah allaim) in hțzai summongein wesen augona. Accept.

v. 30 εκθασων EGSVΔΛ 1.131. etc. al plus 30 b egf i 1 q vg; εκθασωντες rell (Ti. gives no further detail) biraubodedun. Accept.

xvii. 25 δει πολλα παθεων αυτον AKΠ; αυτον πολλα παθεων *K (the universal reading)] (skal) manag gapulan. The pronoun is not represented in C.A., therefore the word-order of the Greek readings cannot decide which of them should be selected. For a similar instance see xviii. 1 in Group D. For Streitberg’s attestation AKΠ cf. xvii. 29 in Group A.

Summary

Streitberg’s Greek readings in Luke fall into the same groups as those in Matthew and John which have been described in detail in pp. 3-4.

Group A

These sixty-eight readings are supported mainly by the uncials SinBDLX and, but to a much less extent, by ACKMEΠ. The Old Latin texts agree with these Greek uncials in the proportion of about 30 to 20, the OLat siding, therefore, with the alternative *K-reading in about 40 per cent. of the instances. I have accepted Streitberg’s reading in fifty cases, fifteen of which are accompanied by some, usually brief, comment. In sixteen readings my sometimes more lengthy comment throws doubt on or expresses disagreement with Streitberg’s choice, and in two cases (iii. 2, xix. 48) I have expressly suggested that the *K-reading be substituted. As in John there are a few untypical combinations, as DMU (v. 15), CRX (viii. 38), DGPX (xi. 22).

Group B

I have endorsed most of his *K-readings with the word ‘accept’, but in four cases (v. 6, vii. 16, ix. 59, xviii. 7) I disagree. In five passages the Gothic rendering could equally well represent either Greek reading. The last item, xix. 48, is a classic example of complete justification of the editor’s reading against the Gothic text; the first item, i. 37, of complete indecision. In five passages (see p. 3) the Gothic text agrees with the alternative reading.

Group C

The difficulty of reconstituting the Greek text underlying the Gothic text presented by the C.A. is well illustrated by the problems encountered in Group A, even though the readings of that Group are supported by the fairly broad and uniform bases of the uncials SinBDLX, with ACKMEΠ as an occasional reinforcement.

The present Group C, consisting of readings for which Streitberg depends on only one or two isolated uncials, calls for still greater vigilance and provides more occasion for doubt.

Consider, for example, i. 14, 65; vii. 6 supported by D, vii. 19 by Ε, viii. 53 by X, and ix. 28 by P, in all of which the Gothic reading can be better explained as the result of grammatical or stylistic expediency, or as contextual or reminiscent alteration. The treatment of ix. 28 exhibits an error of judgement in that an unusual but natural grammatical congruence in Gothic is linked

1 The single or dual supporting uncials are: Α, Β, Ε, Π, Τ, Φ, Σ, H, L, A, AD, AX, ΒP, ΒR, Ψ, CI, DM, DA, MU (bis), SV.
with a similarly isolated change in the Greek of MS. P. In viii. 53, where the universal reading εἰδώρες appears in C.A. as gasaidans, Streitberg follows Bernhardt by adopting 'ἰδώρες Χ' as the Wulfilian Greek, without, however, sharing his predecessor's cheerful and irresponsible temerariousness: 'ἰδώρες nur Χ; Schreibfehler der griech. Vorlage für εἰδώρες.'

However, even a claimant with few witnesses must be given a fair hearing, and I hope that the cluster ix. 11 (MU 13.33.69.), ix. 18 (B* 245.), ix. 18 (MU 1.33.69.) deserves the verdict 'accept'.

My recommendations that the *K-reading be restored, as against Streitberg, are proportionally much more numerous than they are in Group A, numbering as they do twenty-four readings out of the total of thirty-two. My objections are based on considerations of style, grammar, influence of the context, of the Old Latin, and of parallel or reminiscent passages.

**Group D: D 1**

This group falls into the four sub-groups described in p. 4. In nine cases,¹ as is pointed out in the comments, either of the two readings would have produced the same Gothic rendering. The distribution of the supporting uncials gives no indication why one reading was selected and the other rejected. The item xvii. 1 does not belong here at all, but ought to have been dealt with in the Gothic Anmerkungen.

A clearer case for Streitberg's selection is made out where, as in vii. 11, 12, 37; xiv. 15, 21; xix. 19, the alternative Greek reading could not have originated the Gothic rendering, so that in vii. 11 one must accept ευ τη ξη to account for in pamma aferdaga against ευ τη ξη.

**D 1 a**

Four of these nine readings are accepted without comment. In four (v. 28; viii. 22, 34; xiv. 4) the Gothic text may represent either reading. In these and similar cases one can only choose. Consistency is hardly possible, perhaps not even desirable. The two readings offered in v. 26 are only one, δομεν being just a graphic variant of ειδομεν.

This sub-group affords evidence of the apparent incon-

---

¹ iv. 41, 42; vi. 34; vii. 24; viii. 5; ix. 52; x. 19; xiv. 27; xviii. 1.
The Greek Text underlying the
question of the pronoun does not arise. D 2(a) resembles D 2
in that no supporting uncialis are suppressed (as they are in D 1
and D 1 (a)), but differs in that the attestation for the
second reading is summed up as *K (rell). I can see no reason
why these two sub-groups could not have been treated alike
under one scheme or the other. The difference in treatment was
probably not designed.

5. THE GOSPEL OF ST MARK

The following notes are restricted to a classified list of Streit­
berg's readings followed by the briefest summary notes on the
groups.

One hundred and sixty-one readings in Streitberg's
Apparat
have been collated with the documentation in Tischendorf's
Octaua
and assigned to the same groups as before, the distribution
being 36 readings to Group A, 35 to B, 14 to C, 44 to D 1, and
32 to D 2.

The chapter and verse reference is given for each; where two
or three readings occur in the same verse, they are distinguished
by a superscript index figure 1, 2, 3 for ready identification. These
lists may be used as the basis for detailed examination and com­
ment on the individual readings such as I have already furnished

Group A (36)

i. 2, ii. 10, i. 13, i. 16, ii. 9, ii. 18, ii. 20, ii. 21, ii. 23, ii. 24,
ii. 29, iv. 9, iv. 21, iv. 37, v. 23, vi. 55, vi. 56, viii. 1, viii. 1,
vi. 15, vii. 3, viii. 35, x. 30, xiii. 25, xiv. 5, xiv. 50, xv. 34, xv. 36,
xv. 41, xv. 47.

Group B (35)

ii. 20, ii. 21, iii. 31, v. 37, vii. 15, vii. 36, viii. 1, ix. 38, ix. 41,
ix. 42, ix. 50, x. 7, x. 14, x. 49, x. 46, x. 50, xi. 8, xi. 23, xii. 15,
xii. 28, xii. 28, xiv. 7, xiv. 15, xiv. 43, xiv. 64, xiv. 72, xiv. 72,
xv. 1, xv. 1, xv. 8, xv. 12, xv. 36, xv. 44, xv. 46, xvi. 3.

Group C (14)

iii. 10, iv. 3, v. 10, vi. 2, vi. 55, vii. 3, viii. 23, viii. 10, viii. 17,
ix. 30, xi. 2, xi. 8, xii. 15, xiv. 46.

Sub-group D 1 (44)

i. 5, ii. 9, ii. 21, iii. 7, iii. 11, iii. 11, iii. 20, iii. 31, iii. 33, v. 14,
v. 16, v. 18, v. 38, vi. 15, vii. 19, viii. 7, viii. 10, viii. 31, vii. 31,
vi. 31, x. 8, x. 29, x. 35, xi. 18, xi. 28, xi. 33, xii. 19, xiii. 21,
xxiii. 23, xiii. 29, xiv. 15, xiv. 41, xiv. 43, xiv. 48, xiv. 64,
xiv. 65, xiv. 68, xiv. 71, xv. 14, xv. 18, xv. 32, xv. 33.

Sub-group D 2 (32)

i. 16, ii. 17, iii. 4, iii. 5, iii. 32, v. 4, v. 5, v. 9, v. 9, v. 11,
v. 11, v. 19, vi. 23, vi. 24, vii. 2, vii. 7, vii. 7, viii. 21, viii. 23,
vi. 35, ix. 28, ix. 45, ix. 50, x. 1, x. 28, x. 35, xi. 14, xi. 29,
xi. 33, xii. 8, xii. 26, xiv. 40.

Brief comments on the Groups

Group A

The thirty-six readings adopted by Streitberg are non-Syrian
readings with which the Gothic text of C.A. should agree. They
are supported mainly by the uncialis SinBDLΔ, with C as a close
runner-up, comparable to the chief supporters SinBDLX in the
Corresponding group in John and Luke, and SinBDZA in
Matthew. The alternative reading, relegated to second place, is
regularly described by the symbol *K.

Group B

This comprises thirty-five readings adopted in the Apparat
there described as *K; the alternative reading is fully docu­
mented from Tischendorf. It is noted that in iii. 31 the combina­
tion και ερώτησε does not occur in G, but in BCLΔ, and that εις
tους δοθήν (pri.) in vi. 8 is incorrectly described as *K, being
attested by SinBCDLXΓΔ, which would here put this reading
into Group A.

Group C (14)

There are fourteen readings for which Streitberg relies on one
or two isolated uncials. There are fifteen others which at first
sight come under this group, viz. ii. 91, ii. 211, iii. 311, v. 14, v. 18,
v. 38, vii. 10, viii. 311, x. 351, xi. 28, xiii. 29, xiv. 641, xiv. 65,
xv. 18, xv. 33, but that is only because Streitberg has suppressed
all the other witnesses. Attention was drawn to this feature in
John (p. 36). They are correctly placed in Group D 1.

Sub-group D 1

In these forty-four readings the choice is made between two
readings each of which is supported by some of the Syrian uncials
EFGHSV-KUT’AI, less K and Γ, which are regularly suppressed
as in the corresponding group in John and Luke. These are in
most cases cited for both alternatives, but since all the remaining
(non-Syrian) witnesses are suppressed, the result is a distorted
and mutilated presentation of the facts (see Group C). The three
readings viii. 31 furnish a typical example. So in xii. 19 and xii. 25
eight uncials are cited for each reading out of totals of sixteen and
nineteen respectively.

Sub-group D 2

These thirty-two readings also show the Syrian attestation
divided between the two alternatives, but here the whole of the
documentation in Tischendorf is cited for the adopted reading,
whilst the alternative is summarily cited as *K. In four, however,
the entire documentation is cited for both sides.

6. SUMMARY

The three detailed studies of Streitberg’s Greek text of the
Gothic Gospels of Matthew, John, and Luke, and the statistical
summary of his readings in Mark, are based on 532 readings
from the Apparatus of Die gotische Bibel. The following table
displays the distribution of these, by Gospels, under the four groups
A, B, C, and D. Although Group D is essentially one, it is conven-
ient to show the sub-groups D 1 and D 2 separately, since in
D 1 all the uncials other than the Syrian, usually less
K and Γ, are suppressed, whereas in D 2 the entire uncial docu-
mentation is placed before the reader for one alternative or
for both.

An interesting comparison with the figures 34:180:157:161 is
furnished by those proportional to the bulk of the extant Gospel
fragments, namely, 1:2:3(-):2(+). See G.V.G., p. 93.

The main result of this review of the Greek readings which
Streitberg adopted in his reconstituted Greek original has been
to amend a number of readings which are demonstrably to be
rejected, and to segregate a further number where the Gothic
text of C.A. could have resulted equally well from either one of
the alternatives given in the Apparat. A third group emerges,
where Streitberg has selected whichever Greek reading happens
to match the Gothic in the omission, retention, or variation of
certain conjunctions and particles such as καί, δέ, οὕτως, γάρ, the
representation of which, particularly in John, is irregular and
extremely variable.

The remainder, amounting to roughly two-thirds in each of
the Gospels Matthew, John, and Luke, have been ‘accepted’,
sometimes under protest and, which may surprise the reader,
without considering the possible influence of the Old Latin
version.

So far as the Greek text is concerned it is impossible, in the
absence of indicative evidence, to choose between a non-Syrian
and a Syrian reading in Group A or Group B. The Byzantine
text of the fourth century was a mixed text in which non-Syrian
and pre-Syrian elements survived along with the later Syrian
readings, and it is not possible, with the restricted evidence at
our disposal, to select correctly a non-Syrian or Syrian reading
as the original of any Gothic rendering.

Where, therefore, the C.A. text agrees with either one or the
other, unless any post-Wulfelian alteration either after the Old
Latin or after a parallel passage, or from any other cause, can be
demonstrated or shown to be very probable, we must ‘accept’ whichever Greek reading coincides with the Gothic text. Streitberg used the same method but with insufficient discrimination, as has been shown in the comments on many of his readings, particularly those in Group C.

The Old Latin version undoubtedly exercised great influence on the post-Wulfilian text, but its influence was casual, and it is not possible to know, in the absence of indicative evidence, whether a Gothic non-Syrian reading was so from its origin, or whether an original Gothic Syrian reading was subsequently altered to agree with an Old Latin non-Syrian text. Thus, to take as a simple example J. vi. 7 (Group A), we cannot tell whether ήαήζηα is an original rendering of εκαστος (SinABLII), or whether the Wulfilian Gothic was ήαήζηα ζε (rendering *Κ εκαστος αυτων) from which ζε was subsequently deleted in agreement with the Old Latin unusquisque. The same argument, mutatis mutandis, applies to a Gothic text agreeing with the Textus Receptus. In Group A, in John, the Old Latin agrees with the non-Syrian Greek text in about two-thirds of the readings.

The Gothic renderings are much more revealing than the readings in this respect, and the influence upon them of the Old Latin has been amply demonstrated in The Gothic Version of the Epistles.

It is hoped that this exploratory study will enable a future editor to provide a better Greek text, but it is not possible to reconstruct the original in its entirety with the available documentation.

II. THE GREEK TEXT UNDERLYING THE GOTHIC EPISTLES, WITH AN ACCOUNT OF THE LATINIZATION OF THE EPISTLE TEXT

The present study, like the preceding study of the Gospels, is based on the Greek readings in Streitberg’s Apparat. The documentary conditions are simpler here than in the Gospels, nevertheless the Epistle text provides a number of problems of its own. The material will be illustrated by the readings of 1 Corinthians, which Epistle is the second largest, in bulk, of the extant fragments, being exceeded only by the complete 2 Corinthians, in the proportion of four to three.

The original version

2. The translation of the Bible into Gothic may be assumed to have been begun about the year 350 and, if all was accomplished during the life of Wulfil, some thirty years were available for its completion.

Although there is no confirmatory evidence for the testimony of Philostorgius (born c. 348), whose lifetime overlaps that of Wulfil, that the four Books of Kings were left untranslated, we have the statement by Salvian of Marseilles (c. 400–80) that the Gothic Scriptures used by the barbarians were incomplete.1 Salvian wrote about 440–50, and was well acquainted with the Burgundians of Lyons and Vienne, and probably with the Goths in general.

These two statements taken together may indicate that some portions of the O.T. were left untranslated. This, however, could not apply to the Psalms, which would receive priority of treatment by the translators of the O.T. In the case of the N.T. both the Gospels and the Epistles were indispensable, both being read at the celebration of Mass.

1 Saluianus, De gub. Dei, v. ii. 5–11: Incolumitatem enim non habent quae plenitudinem perdiderunt .. . Nos ergo tantum scripturas sacras plenas inuiolatas integras habemus . . . Ceterae quippe nationes aut non habent legem Dei aut debillem et conuulneratam habent ac per hoc, ut diximus, non habent quae sic habent. See also G.V.E., pp. 268 ff.
It will be assumed, therefore, that these three portions of the Scriptures were a first charge on the translators, and that they were done into Gothic during the period 350–80, during the time when the Goths were still domiciled in the eastern Balkans, before Stilicho became Consul in 400, before the Visigoths established themselves in Gaul in 412, or Ricimer came to power in Italy (456), or Odouacer was proclaimed King of Italy by the foederati (476), or Theodoric and his Ostrogoths took over Italy in 493.1

The bilingual period

3. The Epistles in their origin, therefore, belong to the time when the Goths were still under the influence of Greece and of Greek culture, whereas the latinization of the Gothic text was effected later, in the West, during what may be called the ‘bilingual period’ in the history of the Gothic bible. This latinization may have begun as early as the fifth century, or even before.2 It was during the fourth century that the use and knowledge of the Greek language died out in western Europe, and it is therefore not surprising that the first Latin commentaries on the Epistles of St Paul belong to this period.3 Of these, the so-called Ambrosiaster, written between 370 and 385, was consulted by the Goths, and affected many of the renderings of the Gothic Epistles.4 The Gothic Church, its ministers, and its congregations became rapidly latinized during their sojourn in the West, and as they lost contact with their earlier Greek background, so began their use of Gothic-Latin bilingual copies of the Scriptures.

4. The close association between the Ambrosian palimpsests A and B and some Latin text is exemplified by the use of the word laiktjo in the margin of B, and by the omission of Hebrews, which was not generally accepted as canonical in the West before the fourth to fifth centuries. Codex D (6th century) includes Hebrews, but puts it after Philemon. The Greek text of Hebrews is omitted, but the Latin text included, in Cod. F (9th century), whilst the contemporary Codex G omits both.

5. The Praefatio which forms part of the sixth-century Codex Brixianus of the Gospels was written by way of preface to a bilingual which we have referred to as the Brixian bilingual,2 and deals with the relation between the Gothic and the Latin texts and their Greek original. The extant Codex (f) is a descendant of the Latin partner of that bilingual, now lost, and bears proof of its relationship in a number of readings which are demonstrably due to the conformation of its ancestor to the Gothic text, as was first pointed out by F. C. Burkitt.3 Two examples of Gothic bilingual copies of their Bible survive in the Codex Gissensis, of the sixth or fifth century, a small fragment of the last two chapters of Luke, and the fifth-century Codex Carolinus containing portions of Romans xi-xv.4

6. The anxious and detailed inquiries of two Gothic clerics, Sunnja and Frithila, addressed to Jerome, who replied in Ep. 106, were concerned with verbal differences between the Septuagint and Jerome’s new Gallican Psalter, completed in 392. It suggests itself that the interest displayed by the Goths was neither idle curiosity nor just by way of challenge, but rather that it was prompted by their need to come to terms with the new version in connexion with a Gothic-Latin bilingual edition of the Psalter which may have been the first, or among the first, of the Gothic bilinguals instituted about the turn of the fourth and fifth centuries.5

7. The Gothic Luke exhibits a number of renderings which agree with the Old Latin texts generally, and a further number which it shares with similar renderings in the fifth-century Codex Palatinus of the Gospels. From these I ventured to assume a Palatinian bilingual,6 but my contention was not allowed by the late F. C. Burkitt, nor by H. J. Vogels.

The latinization of the Gospels and the Epistles

8. The Gothic Gospels that have come down to us in C.A. bear

---

1 G.V.E., pp. 261 ff.  
2 Ibid., p. 260.  
3 Ibid., p. 264.  
5 G.V.E., pp. 214 ff., and passim.  
6 G.V.G., chap. xiii.
The Greek Text underlying their former contact with the Old Latin version by the number of readings and renderings which are manifestly conformations to the Latin text. In this respect Luke contains the heaviest aggregate of latinisms, whilst Matthew is least affected by them.

The Epistles were latinized to a much greater extent. They are so heavily charged with Latin readings and renderings as to lead us to conclude that their latinization must have been the result of physical contact in bilingual copies. We have therefore to reckon with the probability that both the Argentean Gospels and the Ambrosian Epistles are descendants of the Gothic components of Gothic-Latin bilinguals dating back to the commencement of the fifth century or even earlier.

The relation of the Gothic Epistle text to the Textus Receptus and to that of the Codex Claromontanus, both Greek and Latin, was fully worked out for the first four chapters of 2 Corinthians and the surviving portions of Galatians and Colossians, in G.V.E., chapter I, and, of the 263 readings examined, 118, or about 45 per cent., were found to have been altered to agree with the Old Latin text.

The Greek uncial witnesses of the Pauline Epistles

9. The main uncial attestation of the Epistles consists of three groups of manuscripts: the older uncialsinABC, the chief representatives of the Koiné text, KLP, and the specifically Italian Graeco-Latin bilingualsD, E, F, G, with their Latin partners d, e, f, g. The last group claims our especial interest because it is through the medium of an Old Latin text very closely related to the Claromontanus (d) that the latinization of the Gothic Epistles was effected.

For the Greek partners, E is a transcript of D and has thus no independent voice, whilst F and G are so closely related that they count only as a single authority. D, the oldest of these, is assigned to the sixth century, so that the Gothic-Latin bilingual, the Carolinus-Guelpherbytanus, is a near contemporary. The text of D and G, the two independent uncials which preserve the ‘Western’ text of the Pauline Epistles, is much older than the ninth-century date assigned to their extant copies. The second of these represents a type of text later than that of D, but even so,

probably not later than the fourth century, whilst D is said to preserve the oldest text of St Paul.2

The Old Latin text

10. Of their Latin counterparts, d, e, and g are largely Old Latin, but f is mainly Vulgate. Other Old Latin texts which receive occasional mention are r (r², r³) and m and, for the extant fragment of Rom. xi–xv, gue (Guelpherbytanus), which is the Latin partner of the Gothic-Latin Codex Carolinus. Ambrosiaster, the Epistle text of which closely resembles that of d, occurs frequently.

The Latin text of these Graeco-Latin bilinguals has been thus commented on: ‘The origin of the Latin text...is precisely similar in all four manuscripts. A genuine (independent) OL text has been adopted as the basis, but altered throughout into verbal conformity with the Greek text side by side of which it was intended to stand...A large portion of the Latin texts of these manuscripts is indeed, beyond all reasonable doubt, unaltered Old Latin, but where they exactly correspond to the Greek, as they do habitually, it is impossible to tell how much of the accordance is original and how much artificial.’3

Assimilation of Gothic to Latin

11. The case of the Gothic-Latin bilinguals which may be postulated as the forerunners of the extant Epistle palimpsests is surprisingly different. Here we find that it is the Gothic text that has been made to conform closely to its Old Latin partner, but not so closely as not to leave unaltered a number of original readings which were left unaffected by their divergent Latin opposites.

Where the original (Wulfilian) Gothic has been altered conformably to the Old Latin, the resulting new readings are usually sponsored by D(E)FG, de(f)g. The Wulfilian Gothic may have for its original SinABC–DEFG–P d, which represents the

1 W.-H., § 203. According to N.T. Manuscript Studies, p. 77 (citing Rolanda and Caraglione (Biblica, pp. xxvi–xxvii), Ambrose (1399) is said to have known a number of such bilinguals.
3 W.-H., § 115. A detailed and somewhat different account of these bilinguals is given by H. von Soden, Schriften des N.T., pp. 1937–43.
older, non-Syrian readings, or Sin*D*bc*EKL, which is one of the
groups representing the Syrian or Koine text.

Codices Ambrosiani A and B: variant readings

12. The Ambrosian palimpsests A and B occasionally exhibit
each a different reading, one of which being the original, the
other a secondary reading. Since the original reading is repro­
duced sometimes by A, sometimes by B, it would appear that
these manuscripts are descended from two different bilinguals.
As will be seen, A represents the original in eight, and Bin nine
other a secondary reading. Since the original reading is repro­
duced in the passages. Since the documentation of these
doublets might be expected to provide some kind of guide to that
of the primary and secondary readings, the significant passages
are here exhibited, the original reading being placed first.1

13. (1) 1 Cor. xv. 49 φορεσομεν (SinACDEFGKLP it vg)
hibitai A; swa bairaima B (+ita Orig Ambrst (in Col. iii.
11) Ambr Aug Priscill; +sic Hier Priscill sine auct.
graeca).
(2) 1 Cor. xv. 54 σων δε το θνητον τωτο ευνυγησα ταθεαναν
(Sin*C*IM vg) A; om. B (TG e f g).
(3) 2 Cor. i. 8 εστε εξαπορθησαι (gr. omn.) swawee aftsag-
gwvaidai weseima A; swawee skamaideima uns B (app. = ita
ut taederet nos it vg).
(4) 2 Cor. i. 14 τον κυριον Ιησου (ACDEKL d e) fraujins
Iesuis A; +Xristaus B ((Sin)DEFGMP d ef g vg Ambrst).
(5) 2 Cor. ii. 12 εις το ευαγγελιον (gr. pler.) in aiwaggeljon B;
in aiwaggeljons A (dia το ευαγγ. FG, propter d e f g vg
Ambrst).
(6) 2 Cor. iii. 9 διακονια (BD*EKLP f vg Clem) andbahti
B; andbahtja A (τη διακονια SinACD*FG d e Ambrst).
(7) 2 Cor. iv. 1 εγ', εκκακουμεν (gr. omn.) wairpam usgrudjans
A; wairpaima usgr. B (non deficiamus DHΘU (vg), f g
Ambrst, infirmemur Aug).
(8) 2 Cor. iv. 4 τον θεου (gr. pler.) gudis A; +ungasaithanis
B (Sin*L*P, DL*O* (vg), m; cf. Col. i. 15).
(9) 2 Cor. v. 3 εγε (vel ειπερ) και (gr. omn.) jabai swepauh
jah B; om. jah A (e f g m vg si tamen, Ambrst si quidem).

1 See G.V.E., pp. 73-76.

14. This collation shows that the second reading of each of these
doublets is the result of assimilation to the Old Latin. It will be
seen that A proffers the accepted original reading in eight, and
B in nine of the passages. From this we conclude that the palimp­
ses are descended from two different bilinguals.
In twelve of the passages the original is based on gr. pler. or
gramm., opposed by Western groups comparable to those in the
list of Group 3. To these may be added Nos. 2, 15, and probably
16. No. 4 may be compared with No. 14 in the list of Group 1,
and No. 6 with No. 24 in the same group. The two readings in
No. 4 could just as well have been placed in reverse order, as may
be seen from the list in § 25, but since most of the alternatives
here are latinized readings, preference was given to ACDEKL d e.
The Greek Text underlying the apparatus criticus of Tischendorf and Streitberg’s Apparat

15. Tischendorf’s notes on readings are of three types, here succinctly illustrated by actual examples.

(a) 1 Tim. iv. 16 αυτος: D* d f g vg Ambrst eν αυτος, item go. The uncials other than D* support the first reading and are therefore not specified.

(b) 1 Tim. ii. 5 Χριστος Ιησους et. Hipp ... Or ... Eus ... Epiph etc. ... K min ... Ιησ. Χρ. The first reading is followed by a number of references from Patristic works; the supporting uncials are omitted for the same reason as in (a).

(c) (i) 1 Cor. vii. 13 τον ανδρα SinABCDEFGQ it vg Ambrst go; τον ανδρα KL.

(ii) 1 Tim. i. 2 πατρος cum Sin*AD*FG min d f g vg go; τον ανδρα SinAD*FGKR.

(iii) 1 Cor. ix. 7 τον καρπον SinABCDEFGP f g go; τον καρπον SinAD*FGKL d e vg Clem.

These entries appear in Streitberg’s Apparat as follows:

(a) αυτος] *K usw.; εν αυτος D* d f g vg Ambrst.

(b) Χριστος Ιησους] *K usw.; Ιησ. Χρ. K.

(c) (i) Sometimes the essentials are reproduced as given by Tischendorf; αυτον KLP Chr τον ανδρα SinABCDEFGQ it vg.

(ii) One of the lists of uncials is suppressed, the siglum *K being substituted. This is regularly done when KLP are together: πατρος ημων] *K Chr; πατρος Sin*AD*FG d f g vg.

(iii) All uncials other than KLP are suppressed, regularly when KLP are divided: τον καρπον P; εκ τον καρπον KL.

16. There is no objection to the form of Streitberg’s entries (a) or (b), nor (c) (i). His reproduction of (c) (ii), especially when his *K represents Tischendorf’s τ, is tolerable, but it would have been methodologically sounder had he listed the actual uncials, etc., instead of including them under *K.

In the case of (c) (iii), however, which exhibits only the distribution of K, L, and P, the information is not only of no effect, but completely falsifies the evidence brought together in the

17. The Textus Receptus of the Epistles is represented by Sin*DBc KLP, and the older or pre-Syrian readings by Sin*ABC–DEFG, sometimes accompanied by P (cf. § 26). The specifically ‘Western’ readings may be retained by the bilinguals DEGF and their Latin partners d e fg, the text of Augustine (r), m, and Ambrosiaster. In the Gospels the Syrian text is represented by the uncials EFGSUV and KULAI, whilst the pre-Syrian readings are sponsored by SinBDLX.

In both the Gospels and the Epistles the Greek original from which the Gothic text was first translated was a mixed text which retained many older readings, so that the extant text of C.A., where it has come down to us without being altered in conformity with the Old Latin, or without other change, will reflect now one, now the other type of fourth-century Greek readings (cf. § 26).

18. The serial numbers in the following list will be used in later references. The two Greek readings, with the Gothic, are taken from Streitberg’s Apparat, but the completed documentation is from Tischendorf’s Octaua, sometimes amplified by the notes in Wordsworth and White’s Vulgate. The siglum *K is from Streitberg, the sign τ (Sigma = Stephanus) from Tischendorf. Where Streitberg’s Apparat gives more than one reading in the same verse, they are indicated by superscript figures, e.g. iii. 141, iii. 142, iii. 143.

The 158 readings here examined, as those of the other Epistles, fall into four groups:
The Greek Text underlying

Streitberg's selected reading, with which the Gothic text mostly, but not always, agrees. These readings are for the most part accepted.

1. Streitberg's selected reading is given first, then his alternative, then the Gothic.

It was found convenient to exhibit these four groups in the order (1) Streitberg's selected reading, with which the Gothic text agrees, (2) Streitberg's alternative reading, (3) which agrees with the alternative, having been altered from its original form to agree with the Old Latin text, (4) which agrees with the alternative, having been altered from its original form to agree with the Old Latin text.

Mostly, but not always, agrees. These readings are for the most part accepted. (77 readings)

The Greek Text underlying

Group 3: seventy-one readings

19. (1) i. 162 ei tina allo *K r vg Clem; ei tina FG d e f g; ei ainnohot.
(2) i. 18 tais de sou'omeneous hym *K; om. hym FG d e f g r Ambrst (vgl. 2 Cor. 2, 15); ip haim ganisandam.
(3) i. 221 evdei kai *K; epei FG f g Ambrst; unte.
(4) iv. 2 puntos tis evrethi *K d e vg; tis evrethi puntos D*E f g; tis ptiat. eur. D*FG f g; hais trigges bigidaiad.
(5) iv. 5 kairyov ti *K f g; om. ti d e vg Ambrst; om. go.
(6) iv. 6 to mu *K; mu fg it vg; ni.
(7) iv. 7 ei de kai gr. omn.; om. kai d e vg; aiprau jabai.
(8) v. 7 f sw Sin CLP; om. SinABDEFG d e f g m vg Ambrst; om. go.
(9) v. 9 swanaamunnaia *K d e; -a the D*om, commisceamini fg vg Ambrst (nach 2 Thess. iii. 14); blandaihp.
(10) v. 101 f kai ev puntos Sin D*LP; om. kai SinABDEFG d e f g vg Ambrst; om. kai, puntos go.
(11) vi. 1 pragma eixon proa ton etepou *K vg; pr. te. et. pragma eixon DEFG d e f g Ambrst; wipra anparana staua habands.
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(12) vii. 71 7 beta r Sin ABDEFG KLP; beta de SinACDFG d e f g vg Ambrst; ip wiljau.
(13) vii. 72 omega kai *K; om. kai f Ambrst; om. go.
(14) vii. 8 f autous estin D*EKL; om. estin SinABDEFGP; est illis d e f g vg; ist im.
(15) vii. 111 menetw...kataallaghto *K; menen...gamma FG d e f g m vg; wisan...gagawaihian.
(16) vii. 131 f autou KLP; ton andre SinABCDEFQG it vg Ambrst; pana aban.
(17) vii. 172 kurios KL; theos SinABCDEF d e f g vg Ambrst; gup.
(18) vii. 173 ev tais ekklhsaias paws *K; ev paws te ekklhsaias Sin vg; in allaim aikthesis (vgl. 1 Cor. 4, 17 etc.).
(19) vii. 28 f gamma KL, gamma SinBP; labys gamma DEFG, accepteris worem it vg Ambrst; nimis gen.
(20) viii. 12 kai tuptwtes *K; om. kai FG d e f g; slakandans.
(21) viii. 131 f ton adelphon mou (pri) *K Ambrst; om. mou FG d f g; brolar.
(22) ix. 7 f SinACKLP; om. BC DEFG it vg Ambrst; om. go.
(23) ix. 8 alalw Sin ABCKLP; lew DEFG d e f g vg; qiba (cf. legew qibet following).
(24) ix. 8 f ton bow *K; perii ton bow DEFG, de bobus it vg; bi auhsum.
(25) x. 16 Xristou (sec) *K; kurion DFG d e f g vg Ambrst; fraujins.
(26) x. 17 apostou *K; + kai ton einos potyrio DEFG d e f g Ambrst; jah ains stiklis.
(27) x. 201 alg sti a *K; alia a FG, sed quae d e f g m vg; a de DE; ak patei.
(28) x. 202 koineous ton daimoniou SinABCD*KLP; tau daim. kov. D*EFG d e f g; skohglm gadailans.
(29) x. 28 ovm *K; om. FG d e f g vg; om. go.
(30) x. 29 aitia *K; apostou FG, infideli d e g; ungalaubjandins.
(31) x. 33 pavta pavta *K vg; pavta pavta DE (omnia per omnia d e f g Ambrst, pavta kata pavta FG); allaim all.
(32) xi. 22 f ovm esti KL; esti ovm SinABCDEFG it vg; qiba izwis.
(33) xi. 23 ev tη νυκτι *K; en η νυκτι DEFG, in qua nocte d e f g vg Ambrst; in pizakei naht.
The Greek Text underlying the Gothic Epistles

(34) xi. 31 ἐς γὰρ Sin<CKLP; εἰ δὲ SinABDEFG (si autem g, quod si d e f vg Ambrst); ἵνα jabai.
(35) xii. 11 παυτὰ δὲ παυτὰ SinABCKLP; παυτὰ δὲ παυτὰ DEFG d e f vg Ambrst; πατὴρ-πατὸς ἀλλὰ.
(36) xii. 12 καὶ μελῆ Κ; μελῆ δὲ DFG, μεμβρανεῖ autem d e g; ἵνα lipuns.
(37) xii. 12 τοῦ σου ματός SinABCFGKLP f g vg; ἄρα τοῦ εὐφρονικοῦ Sin<DE Ambrst; ἐκ τοῦ σουμ. D*, ἐν ὑμῶν ὑπὸ ἑνὸς καταργήθησεται *Κ; κατ. το εκ μερους D* EFG it vg Ambrst; γαταιρὶς πατεὶς υἱὸν δαίλαι ἰστ (ἕν ὑπὸ εὐφρονίας ἐστι).
(38) xii. 13 εἰς πνεῦμα Sin(A)BCDFGP d e g Ambrst; ἤ εἰς εἰς πνεῦμα D<EKL, ἐν ψυχῇ vg codds, ἐν ψυχῇ ψυχῆς ψυχῆς c f; αἰναμαίνειν.
(39) xii. 16 καὶ εὰν Κ f g vg; εὰν DE d e Ambrst; jabai.
(40) xii. 16 το εκ μερους καταργήθησεται *Κ; κατ. το εκ μερους D* EFG it vg Ambrst; γαταιρὶς πατεὶς υἱὸν δαίλαι ἰστ (ἕν ὑπὸ εὐφρονίας ἐστι).
(41) xii. 11 ἦ σε ὑπὸ Sin<DE EFGKLP f g Ambrst; ὑπὸ SinABD vg d e; ὑπὸ.
(42) xii. 11 ἔκκλησια ὑπὸ SinABKLP; ὑπὸ ἔκκλησια SinABDEFG d e g (non f vg) Ambrst; ἀρνικείονς αὐλαγιδάμ (ἂν εὐφρονίας ἐστι); see G. F. E., p. 186).
(43) xii. 12 βλέπομεν γὰρ SinAB<KL; ὑπὸ γὰρ DFG d e f g vg; σαίναμ.
(44) xiv. 20 ταῖς d e Κ; ὑπὸ ταῖς FG d e f g; ei (frathiam).
(45) xiv. 23 εἰς ὑπὸ SinABDEKLP (si ergo vg); εἰς FG d e g Ambrst; jabai.
(46) xiv. 23 ἦ ἔκκλησια ὑπὸ SinABKLP; ὑπὸ ἔκκλησια SinABDEFG it vg Ambrst; ἀλλὰ αἰκλείσομεν.
(47) xiv. 23 δὲ πνεύματα γλωσσάζειν καλωθείν D**KL f g vg, π. λαλ. γλ. SinABFGP g; λαλ. γλ. πνεύματα D* E d e; ροζάντας ραζόν dαίλαι.
(48) xiv. 25 ἦ καὶ οὖτωs (pri) D<KL; ὑπὸ SinABDFG d e f g vg; ὑπὸ om.
(49) xiv. 25 ἦ το θεὸς οὖτως KL; οὖτως ὑπὸ θεὸς SinABDEFG it vg; ἵνα sunjai gup.
(50) xiv. 25 δὲ γλωσσάζειν εἰς, ἀποκαλυψιν εἰς Λ ἐν αὐξήσει πλοῦτι; ἀποκαλυψιν εἰς Λ SinABDEFG d e f g vg Ambrst; andhulein habaip, ῥαζὰ ῥαζὰ habaip.
(51) xv. 2 εἰ κατεχεῖ Κ; δι' εἰς κατεχεῖ DFG d e g Ambrst; skulup gamunum.
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(52) xv. 5 ὅτι ὑπὸ BD<KL; καὶ μετὰ ταύτα DFG, καὶ post hoc f Ambrst, ἐν τούτῳ d e (g), καὶ ὡς ὁ ἑαυτῷ vg; jah afar pata;
(53) xv. 5 ὅτι ὡς SinAB<DKLP: ὡς κατὰ DFG it vg Ambrst; ainvim.
(54) xv. 6 ὅτι καὶ Sin<AD<KL; ὑπὸ SinABDEFG it vg Ambrst; om. go.
(55) xv. 10 ὅτι εἰς Κ; εἰς εἰς DFG it vg; in mis.
(56) xv. 14 οὖ πέρην ἔγνωκα Κ f vg; πέρην οὐκ ἔγνωκα D, οὐ γενέσθαι FNG, pauper (a) non fuit d e g Ambrst; ἕλκα ne warp.
(57) xv. 10 ὅτι οὖν εἰς Sin<AD<EKLP; οὖν εἰς SinBDFG it vg Ambrst; mih mis.
(58) xv. 11 οὖν Κ; δὲ DFG d e f g vg; ip.
(59) xv. 17 δὲ πίστις ὑπὸ Sin<AD<EFKLP; δὲ πίστις BD d e f g vg wana est fides uestrā; sware jah (add., perh. after verse 14) so galaubeins izwara ist.
(60) xv. 19 δὲ πίστις εἰς ἐν Sin<AD<FL; εἰς XV. ἡλικίας εἰς ἐν SinABDEFG d e f g r vg Ambrst; in Xristau wen-jandans sijum.
(61) xv. 19 δὲ πίστις εἰς ἐν SinAB<KL; εἰς εἰς Κ; εἰς εἰς Κ; ὑπὸ ἐν ὑπὸ DE d e f r vg Ambrst; sium allaize manne.
(62) xv. 24 δὲ πίστις εἰς ἐν SinABDEFG d e f g vg Ambrst; ζωὴν (νοθετ). fvg (potestatem); waldufnjis.
(63) xv. 25 εἰς ἐν SinBDEKLP d e f g vg Ambrst; + auwv AFG f g r; fijands is.
(64) xv. 26/27 this order in Sin<AD<FGKLP f g r vg; as in Gothic: Sin<DE d e and vg codds Ambrst.
(65) xv. 27 οἷς Κ f g r; om. B d e vg Ambrst; om. go.
(66) xvi. 57 διδότω Κ; διδότω DE, qui dedit it vg; iguiente.
(67) xvi. 11 οὖν Κ; om. DFG d e g; om. go.
(68) xvi. 12 οἶδαν Κ; + δὴν ὑπὸ στὶ SinDEFG d e f g vg codd Ambrst; broap barniskeins izwara patei.
(69) xvi. 15 ἐν Sin<AB<KLMP r; εἰς CDEFG d e f g vg; sind.
(70) xvi. 19 ἐκκλησία Κ; + παρ ὑπὸ και ἐνεκάκμι DEFG, ἀπὸ διός (etiam, et) hospitor vg codd d e f g; at paimei jah salja.
(71) xvi. 23 ἦ ἦν ὑπὸ Xristov Sin<ADEFGLKMP d e g r vg codd Ambrst; ἦν ὑπὸ SinB vg codd; Isuēs.
20. This group of seventy-one readings needs little comment. The original Gothic readings or renderings have been altered to conform to the Old Latin text represented by d e f g, with which m and r are sometimes, and Ambrosiaster frequently, associated.

The manuscripts sponsoring the Gothic on the 'alternative' side are regularly DEFG d e f g, the Western uncials being occasionally reinforced by the older SinABC. The Syrian uncials KLP do not even once appear here, but they do so regularly on the opposite side. The Latin group d e (f) g appears entire only three times on the 'accepted' side (38, 62, 71), and in part in eleven readings, the alternative being supported by the remaining members of the group.

This division of the Greek uncials into two distinct groups representing the original text and the Western text which later influenced the Gothic through the Latin version, will prove a useful aid when we come to consider the readings under Group 1 (cf. §§ 24–27).

**Group 4: five readings**

21. If Streitberg's selected readings of these five passages were replaced by his alternative, the Gothic of C.A. could be readily explained by the Old Latin text, and this small group could join the other latinized readings of Group 3, in spite of the anomalous position of Pin three of the passages. This is how the five passages explained by the Old Latin text, and this small group could join the other latinized readings of Group 3, in spite of the anomalous replacement by his alternative, the Gothic of C.A. could be readily influenced the Gothic through the Latin version, will prove a useful aid when we come to consider the readings under Group 1 (cf. §§ 24–27).

**The Greek Text underlying**

22. (1) vii. 11² τῷ αὐθήgr. rell. d e f g m; τῷ ὀδῷ αὐθή P; αβίν seinamma. The Gothic, strictly, represents neither reading, for ὀδῷ would normally require seinamma to precede its noun (yet cfr. Eph. v. 22, 24 in which both positions occur). But αβίν seinamma properly represents vg uīro suo. The isolated reading of P and min 120 must remain unexplained.

(2) ix. 2 μείας εστε εν κυρίῳ *K Ambrst; μείας εστε D de; jus sijup.

(3) ix. 25 εκενων μεν οὐν *K; om. οὐν K d e g; αβδαν εἰς. Here αβδαν = μεν in correlation with the following δὲ = ip.

(4) xiii. 10² τοῦ τοῦ Κ d e f g FGP; τοῦ Κ SinABDFGP it vg; gataurnip patei us dailai ist. These two groupings fit exactly into the list given in § 26, under Group 1, but the Gothic rendering agrees so exactly with vg evacuabitur quod ex parte est as to leave no doubt about its Old Latin origin. For evacuabitur d e read destruetur, which could equally well have inspired gataurnan.

(5) xvi. 10 αδνοβοι gr rell; αδνοβος P min 47.119.; ei unagands sijai, which is after latt ut sine timore sit. As in no. (1) the isolated reading of P remains unexplained and ignored.

**Group 1: seventy-seven readings**

These give Streitberg's selected reading, his alternative rendering, and the Gothic, which normally agrees with the selected reading.

22. (1) i. 16¹ λοιπον *K; το λοιπον FG; pata anpar (vgl. 2 Cor. 13, 11).

(2) i. 22² σημεῖα SinABCDEFGP d e f g r vg; ἕ σημεῖον L al pler (nach M. 12, 39, 16, 4 u.s.w.); taikne. Cfr. J. vi. 30 ἀν ταίνην ἑι taikne (σημεῖον), and J. x. 41.

(3) v. 4 ἤ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (sec) D EFG GL e f g; Ἰησοῦ SinAB DP d vg Ambrst; Ἰησοῦς Χριστάς.

(4) v. 5 τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ SinL; τ. κ. ημῶν Ἰησ. Χρ. ΔFGP; om. ημῶν DE d e Ambrst; οἵρωιν Ἰησοῦ (cfr. vg domini Ἰεσοῦ).

(5) v. 10² καὶ ἀρμαξω SinABCDEFGP d e f g; ἅ ἄρμα. SinD F vg Ambrst; fiauijins Iesuis (cfr. vg domini Iesu).

(6) v. 12 σὲ καὶ τοὺς εἴω DEL; τοὺς εἴω SinABCDEFGP d e f g vg; jah pans uta.

(7) v. 13¹ κρείνει B P, iudicabit f g vg Ambrst; κρίνει L, iudicat d e; stojip, which could represent either reading.

(8) v. 13² πωδρατε SinABCDEFGP d e f g vg Ambrst; καὶ εἰς. D EL; usnimip.

(9) vii. 5¹ σομολαζήτει KL; σομολαζήτη SinABCDEFGP; uhteigai sijaip, which could represent either reading.

(10) vii. 5² ἐκ τῆς ηγεσεσὲ καὶ KL; om. SinABCDEFGP d e f g vg Ambrst; fastan jah (bidan).

(11) vii. 7¹ ἔξω του Ἴησου εἷς KL vg Clem Ambrst; εἷς ν. SinABDEFGP d e f g; gibia habaij.

(12) vii. 9 (κρείνεσθαι) γιρ έστιν *K; om εστιν DFG g; (batizo) iat auk; the Gothic order is normal; cf. vg melius est enim.

(13) vii. 12 εἴω εἴω SinABCP; ik qipa.
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(14) vii. 13’ ζ ἡς ABCD-KL; εἰ τις SinDFGP d e f g vg Ambrost; soei.
(15) vii. 13’ ζ αὐτος D-EKL; οὗτος SinABCDGFPGQ d e f g vg; sa, which could represent either reading.
(16) vii. 15’ ήμας SinEDEFGL it vg Ambrost; ήμας SinACK; uns.
(17) vii. 17’ ζ ο θεις KL; ο κυριος SinABCDEFGL it vg Ambrost; gup.
(18) vii. 18’ ζ εκληθη *K it vg; εκληθη ζ τις D*EFG; γαλαφος ωαρς has; the order is after the following γαλαφος ωαρς has κεκληται ζ τις: see next.
(19) vii. 18’ κεκληται ζ τις SinABP; ζ τις εκληθη D-EKL d e f g vg; τις κεκληται DFG g; γαλαφος ωαρς has.
(20) vii. 22 ομοιος SinABP vg Ambrost; ζ +και KL; +δε και DEFG d e f g; samaleiko.
(21) vii. 26 ο τιτος εναι *K; om το FG; σω̣ wisan.
(22) vii. 27 λυσι (vg solutionem) is the universal reading, by a graphic variant of which, λυσει, the Goth may have been misled, but it is more likely that lausjan was suggested by the preceding γαλαφος and the following γαλαφος is; Str. refers to J. xii. 13, L. v. 4.
(23) viii. 11’ ζ κατι L al pler; εν SinABDEFGP d e f g vg Ambrost; ana.
(24) viii. 13’ τον αδελφον μου (sec) SinABD*EKLP; om μου DFG d e f g vg Ambrost; bropar meina.
(25) ix. 1’ αποστολος . . . ελευθερος DEFGKL d e f g Ambrost; ελευθ. . . . απ. SinABP vg; apaustalus . . . freis.
(26) ix. 3’ ζ αυτη εστιν DEFGKL it vg; εστιν αυτη SinABP; pat-isat.
(27) ix. 6’ ζ του μη εργαζεσθαι D-EKL; om του ΣinABDFGP (non operandi d e g); du ni waurkjan; du would be needed in either case.
(28) ix. 7’ του καρπου SinABCDFGP f g; ζ εκ του καρπου C*DbcEKL d e f g Clem; aktran.
(29) ix. 20 μη ον αυτος υπο νομων SinABCDEFGL it vg Ambrost; ζ om. D-K al pler; ni wisands silba uf witoda.
(30) ix. 21’ θεου . . . Χριστου SinABCDFGP it vg; ζ θεο . . . Χριστο D-KL; gudis . . . Xristaus.
(31) ix. 21’ ζ κερδησων SinEDEKL; κερδησω SinABCFCGP; gageig (aided j) au, which could represent either reading.
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(32) ix. 22 παντως gr. pler.; παντως DEFG it vg (ut omnes); ει καιεω (see G.V.E., p. 220).
(33) ix. 23 ζ τουτο δε KL; παντα SinABCDEFGP it vg Ambrost; patub-pan.
(34) x. 1’ ζ (ου θελω) δε Sin*KL; γαρ SinABCDEFGP it vg; om. go. Both readings have an equal claim, the Gothic being probably erroneous.
(35) x. 19 ζ εδωλον . . . εδωλοθυτον KL; reverse order SinBC**DEP d e f (g) vg Ambrost; galiugaguda . . . patei galugam saljada.
(36) x. 20’ ζ θευ (pri) KL; θουουν SinABCDEFGP; saljand, which must be plural with piudos, as vg immolant with gentes.
(37) x. 20’ ζ τα ηνυ SinACK(L) f g vg; om. BDEFG d e m Ambrost; piudos.
(38) x. 20’ ζ θευ (sec) και ου θεω KL; και ου θεω θουουν SinABCDEFGP; saljand jan-ni guda (plural, as in no. 36).
(39) x. 23 παντα (pri) εξεστιν SinABCDEFGP d e f g; ζ παντα μου SinC*HKL vg Clem Ambrost; all binah.
(40) x. 27 ει δε τις CD*EHKL; ει τις SinABDFGP it vg Ambrost; ι p jabi has.
(41) xi. 2’ ζ αδελφοι DEFGKL it vg Ambrost; om. SinABCP; brofrjus.
(42) xi. 5 αυτης SinACDFGGLP; ζ αυτης BC*EK; sein, which could represent either reading.
(43) xi. 21 ει τω φαινει *K; ει SinDEFG and ad manducandum e f vg; in mand. g; du matjan (Str. nach V. 22 εις το ειθεν).
(44) xi. 27 του κυριου ενοχος SinD*L; ενοχος ABCDEFGKP it vg; fraujins skula wairpfj.
(45) xi. 28 εαυτον ανθρωπος CDEFGP it vg; ανθρ. εαυτω SinABKL; sik silban manna.
(46) xii. 11’ το ει *K; ει DFG; ains, which seems to be idiomatic: cf. L. vii. 41 ο εις . . . ο ετερος ains . . . anpar. Greek has both forms: (ο) εις και ο αυτος. So L. unus et idem.
(47) xii. 21 (ου ευναται) δε SinBDEKL d e f g Ambrost; om. δε ACGFP d e f g; nip-pan mag (δε = ub-pan).
(48) xiii. 3 (ον) καινησομαι CK d e f g m vg; (ον) -σουαι DEFG; καινησομαι SinAB; ei gabrannjaidau; the subj. would be required after ei in any case.
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(49) xiii. 9 εκ μερους δε KL; γαρ SinABDEFGP it vg Ambrost; suman (go om. copula, perhaps after the following suman).
(50) xiv. 23 σειδλωνων δε ειδωτα *K; δε καϊ Matthewis f; atup-pan-gaggand inn jah unweisai, where jah seems to be a contextual or arbitrary addition.
(51) xv. 7 ειται (τοις) Sin-BDELP; ειται (τοις) SinAFGK; paprop-pan. The Gothic could represent either. In this verse Streitberg reads ειται . . . ειται for paprok-pan . . . paprok-pan.
(52) xv. 12 στη εγγερηται εκ νεκρων SinABDKLP fvg Ambrost; εκ νεκρων οτι ενηγ. D*:EFG d e g patei urrais us daupaim.
(53) xv. 12 ζ των εν νημιν DEFGKL Ambrost (vg quidam dicunt in uobis; dicunt quidam e g Ambrost, inter uos Ambrost); εν νημιν των SinABP; sumai in isewis.
(54) xv. 14 αρα και SinADEGFKP g; αρα Sin-βL d e f vg Ambrost; pau jas(-so).
(55) xv. 14 ζ των και SinABDFGP f g r vg Clem Ambrost; ζ κενη δε και D*:EKL; jah (so gaulaebins unsara) lausa. Str. 'zur Stellung vgl. 1 Kor. 15, 58'.
(56) xv. 14 νημων SinAD*:FGKLP d f g vg Ambrost; ημων BD; unsara, from the context: 'nach κρηνημα ημων V. 14'.
(57) xv. 15 δε και *K f g r vg; δε DE (om. και); et d e (om. δε); atup-pan-gitanda (up-pan = δε), formally agreeing with DE. The om. of και here is probably of no textual significance.
(58) xv. 20 ε σενετο D*:KL; om. SinABDEFGP d e f g r vg Ambrost; ουαραπανς, an unaccountable rendering; Str. cites one instance of γενομενος from Griesbach's MS. 80 (see Soden (a 172)).
(59) xv. 24 παραδων KL, tradiderit it vg; παραδων Sin ADEP; anafihiph, which could represent either.
(60) xvi. 28 τοτε και SinAD*:KLP f g Clem Ambrost; τοτε BDEFG d e g; panuh pan, an arbitrary deviation.
(61) xvi. 29 ιτερ αυτων SinABDEFGKLP d e f g r vg Ambrost; ιτερ νεκρων D*:L; faur ins.
(62) xvi. 31 οδελφοι SinABKP r vg; οι om. DEGKL d e f g Ambrost; hroprjus.
(63) xvi. 34 λαλω SinBDEP, loquor d e r vg Ambrost; λεγω AFGKL, dico f g m; rodja.
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(64) xv. 50 κληρονομει SinABC*:D*:EKL-P; -μετει CDFG d e f g vg; arbo wairst, which could represent either reading.
(65) xv. 52 ανασηπτονται ADEFGP; εγερθησονται SinBCKLM; vg resurgent, resurgunt d e; sustand.
(66) xv. 54 οταν δε το θυτην τουτο ενδυνηται αθανασιαν Sin*C* IM vg; θαρανον . . . αθαρανον και το θυτην κ.τ.λ. Sin-ΑΒ:DEKL d e; panepr-pan pata dia no gauetajada undeitanein.
(67) xiv. 2 ε σαββατων Sin-KLM; σαββατων Sin*:ABCDEF GIP it vg; sabbate.
(68) xvi. 2 τι αν ενωσαται SinBDFGLP; ενωσαται Sin*:AC IKM (it vg placeurit); patei wili (cf. quodcumque voluerit Ambrost).
(69) xvi. 4 η αξιων SinDEFGKL g; αξιων η Sin*:ABCIMP d f vg; ist mis wairst (mis representing καμε).
(70) xvi. 7 γαρ (sec) SinABDEFGIMP it vg Ambrost; ε δε KL; unite.
(71) xvi. 7 ορθων των *K; των χρ. Chr, aliquod temporis d e Aug; ho heilo, probably after the Old Latin. has usually occupies a position corresponding to that of its Greek equivalent, yet cf. 1 Cor. xx. 30 heilo heanh against πασαν οραν.
(72) xvi. 15 παρακαλω δε Sin*:ABCDE*:EFGKLM it vg; om δε SinD; om. go, probably scribal.
(73) xvi. 17 το μετερον BCDEFMP; το τοιμον SinAKL; izvanana, which could represent either reading.
(74) xvi. 17 οντοι SinBCKLP, illi d e r, illi uel ipsi g; οντοι ADEFGM f vg Ambrost; pai, which could represent either reading.
(75) xvi. 19 ασταξεται SinDEKP; -ονται BFGLM d e f g r vg; goleip.
(76) xvi. 19 Πρασκα SinBMP r vg; ι τη Πρασκα ACDEFGKL d e f g vg Clem Ambrost; Πρισκα.
(77) xvi. 23 τοις κυριων *K d e f g; +ημων ALP r vg codd Ambrost; froujins.

Group 2: five readings

23. The following five passages are here set out with Streitberg's alternative reading in the first place. It will be seen that the
The Greek Text underlying documentation, thus reversed, is similar to that of Group I, with which these could now be merged.

1. viii. 9 τοις αθένεσιν SinABDEFGP; 5 τ. αθένεσιν L; παίμ αμαθείγαμ, which could represent either reading.

2. viii. 11 καὶ απολογεῖται DcEFGL fg vg καὶ απολογεῖται Sin D*Db d c; ap. γαρ Sin*B; ap. οὐν AP; fragiisti nauk, an arbitrary substitution; Str. 'auk nach R 14, 15 *K'.

3. xv. 17 καὶ κατά SinBDEFGKLP gr; Kai En Sin* A; jah nauh. Perhaps jah was added to balance the similarly intrusive jah preceding. Cf. G.V.E., p. 245.

4. xv. 31 καὶ παρθένακι gr. omn.; gaswiltandans, which is influenced by the contextual plurals. The same may be said of the unique αποθεησαντες cited by Str. in support.

5. xv. 48 καὶ ωος gr. omn.; bileiks (sec), clearly to balance bileiks preceding. Str. cites ωος from Chr. and Matthaeis.

Comments on Groups 1 and 3

24. The essential difference between Groups 1 and 3 is that in the former the Gothic regularly agrees with Streitberg's selected reading, with a number of exceptions detailed below, whereas in Group 3 the C. A. text has been altered from its original form in agreement with the Old Latin text of the alternative reading.

The two main groups, as here presented, are conditioned by Streitberg's procedure: where there are two competing Greek readings, neither of them Western, he cites them both, selecting for his Greek text that with which the Gothic agrees. These readings form Group 1. Where the Gothic agrees with the Western, Old Latin text, he adopts the non-Western reading (*K, etc.) for his text and cites in addition the Western (Old Latin) reading to account for the Gothic deviation from its original non-Western text. These readings come under Group 3, and have been commented on in § 20.

Streitberg's selection in the case of the Group 1 readings is conveniently illustrated by the select list under § 26. Here the Gothic text agrees with the groupings KL, D*KL, D*FKL, etc., in nineteen passages, for which the selected Greek reading may be accepted as certainly original. In the remaining nine passages the Gothic agrees with SinABC–DEFG–P d e fg, and, without evidence to the contrary, these older readings may be accepted as original, the two sets of witnesses, D*KL and SinABC–DEFG–P d e fg, the Syrian and the pre-Syrian, well illustrating the mixed character of the fourth-century Greek text of Byzantium.

There is, however, a possibility that ought to be kept in mind, that the older reading may not be the original, even with the Gothic agreeing. It could be, for instance, that in no. 30 the original had been the reading of D*KL, and that the Gothic had later been made to conform to the Latin text of SinABC–DEFG–P d e fg on the other side. Such a contingency would usually not be susceptible of proof. Streitberg at any rate seems not to have taken cognizance of this possibility, for in Group 3 the uncial P appears only once on the 'alternative' side.

P stands apart from KL in that it is often found, in company with SinABC or SinABCDEFG, supporting an older reading. In Group 1 P appears thirty-one times on the 'alternative' side, by itself except in 44 (KP), 66 (KLP), and 77 (LP). K occurs on the same side nineteen, L twenty-three times, of which thirteen are together with K.

25. The seventy-seven readings of Group 1 may be classified as follows:

(a) The Gothic agrees with Streitberg's selected Greek reading together with d (f) g or e (f) g, that is, with the Old Latin text conveniently represented by de fg: 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 13, 16, 18, 25, 26, 29, 30, 39, 41, 45, 48, 56, 61, 64, 70, 72.

(b) The Gothic agrees with Streitberg's selected Greek reading against d (f) g or e (f) g: 6, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35, 40, 44, 49, 52, 54, 58, 60, 62, 67, 69, 75, 76.

(c) The Gothic differs from Streitberg's selected Greek reading for reasons briefly indicated: 1 (idiom), 18 (context), 21 (idiom), 22 (context), 36, 38 (grammar), 45 (idiom), 49, 50, 55, 56, 58 (context), 57 (casual), 60 (arbitrary), 68 (cf. L. placuerit), 71 (cf. aliquod temporis), 72 (scribal).

(d) The Gothic rendering could equally well represent either reading: 1, 7, 9, 15, 27, 31, 42, 46, 48, 51, 59, 64, 73, 74.

SinABC–DEFG–P in Group 1

26. This grouping appears twenty-eight times in the seventy-seven readings of Group 1, now on one side, now on the other, as follows:

* See p. 87 n. 1, and G.V.E., pp. 42-43.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streitberg's alternative reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) SinABCDEFGP d e f g vg Ambrst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) SinABCDFGP d e f g Ambrst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) SinABCDFGP d e f g Ambrst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(29) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(39) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(40) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(56) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(58) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(59) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(61) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(65) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(67) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(70) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(72) DEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(74) DEL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two characteristic groupings in Group 1

27. The grouping SinABCDDEFGP is of particular interest in connexion with Group 1 because, as the above list shows, it appears on both sides, nine times with, and thirteen times against the Gothic. The component DEFG is accompanied, as is to be expected, by the Latin partners d e f g. The other common grouping, summed up by Sin^BD^EKL representing the Syrian readings, appears in opposition to the grouping SinABCDDEFGP, and never in conjunction with d e f g, which accompany only the other group.

Two characteristic groupings in Group 3

The two groupings just described are the constant supporters of Streitberg's selected readings in Group 3, with a difference. The Syrian grouping Sin^BD^EKL is cited under the comprehensive symbol *K, sometimes simply as KL, and the grouping SinABCDDEFGP either in full or in a syncopated form. The Latin d e f g are occasionally represented.

The 'alternative' side is monopolized by the uncials DEFG, sometimes accompanied by the older uncials SinABC, with their Latin partners d e f g and the frequent support of Ambrst. The uncial P is not once found in this Latin company, nor K, nor L. P is, as a member of the grouping SinABC-DEFG-P, characteristically a representative of the older, pre-Syrian, not of the Western readings.

28. These two distributions are complementary. The group (SinABC)DEFG d e f g Ambrst represents the Western readings of the Epistles preserved especially in the Western bilinguals DEFG and their Latin partners, to which the Gothic readings under Group 3 were made to conform in the Gothic-Latin bilinguals. The combination SinABCD-DEFG-P (d e f g), on the other hand, represents the older or pre-Syrian readings of the Epistles, as distinct from the Syrian text sponsored by Sin^BD^EKL.

The select list in § 26 has shown how witnesses of the older and the later readings each appear now on one side, now on the other, confirming the statement that 'mixture prevails everywhere in the fourth century'. In Group 3 both groupings are in evidence, but only on the 'selected' side.

Conclusions

29. (1) The select list in § 26 not only illustrates the mixed character of the Wulfilian Greek text, but also the fact that there was no latinization of the Gothic text during the translational period, there being sixteen readings on the 'alternative' side supported by the Old Latin, which did not affect the Gothic text. Similar evidence has already been provided in § 25 where, under (a) and (b), it is shown that the Gothic and the selected Greek readings are accompanied by the Old Latin contingent in twenty-one, and opposed in twenty-seven readings, the Old Latin text of which might have influenced the Gothic if this had been intended at that time.

1 Hermann v. Soden, Schriften des N.T., p. 1928, includes P (= a3) among the witnesses of his H-text: 'g ist starker als die bisher besprochenen Codd. von K durchsetzt. Von H und K abweichende Lesarten sind selten und bedeutungslos.'

2 W.-H., § 191.
The Greek Text underlying

(2) Later, when bilingual copies came into use, and the readings of Group 1 were partnered by the Old Latin (Claromontane) text, the twenty-one readings under (a) would be already in agreement with the opposite Latin, whilst the twenty-seven readings (b) might be altered to conform with the Latin. The list of Group 1 provides us with instances in which no accommodation took place; the list of Group 3, those in which it was effected.1

(3) The latinization of 1 Corinthians affects 76 of the 158 readings examined. The figures for all the Epistles are summarized in the following table, which accounts for the 830 readings here examined under the same four groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Latinized readings: percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rom.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29/79 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>76/158 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>79/170 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38/82 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34/62 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20/50 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>26/59 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Thess.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23/37 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Thess.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/17 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tim.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24/66 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tim.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titus</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14/50 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>410</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>373/830 45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This percentage of latinization applies only to the 830 readings of Streitberg's Apparat. His Anmerkungen which, if not exhaustive, are yet very full and extremely useful, provide further instances of both readings and renderings affected by the Old Latin, whilst the latinization of the Gothic Epistle text, especially as reflected in the renderings, has been worked out in detail in G.V.E.

(4) The extant Epistle text is charged with a heavy aggregate of latinisms which would stand out prominently against the original Wulfilian version of the fourth-century Byzantine Greek, could we bring the two texts together.

1 Cf. G.V.E., pp. 40-41; from which it will be seen that, of the 263 readings examined, 118/263, or 45 per cent., underwent assimilation to the Old Latin, whilst 86/263, or 33 per cent., preserved their original text against the Old Latin.
III. THE RENDERINGS OF KAI, ΔΕ, ΟΥΝ, AND ΓΑΡ IN GOTHIC

THE GOSPELS

Among the more notable characteristics of the Gothic version of the Gospels is the high degree of uniformity observed in the rendering of individual Greek words into the vernacular, whereas the Epistles exhibit greater freedom in this respect. This conclusion applies especially to the renderings of the nouns, verbs, and adjectives. The Gothic equivalents of Greek particles and conjunctions, on the contrary, exhibit a great and often unaccountable diversity. The variety of these renderings has not remained unnoticed, as may be seen in the relevant sections of Streitberg's Gothisches Elementarbuch (E.B.). The most exhaustive account is to be found in the work of Gabelentz and Loebe, whose monumental Glossarium and Grammatik are still indispensable and unsurpassed.1

2. Both these works, however, suffer from a common tendency to accept or justify, rather than discuss, the extant texts of Upsala and Milan. To give one instance from G.-L., Gloss., s.v. jah, sections are numbered 1) und, καί; 2) auch, καί; 3) im Nachsatz; 4) aber, δε; 5) denn, γαρ; etc. In 4) and 5) the meaning of jah is given as aber, denn, in order to justify its representation by δε and γαρ. But jah cannot at any time 'mean' δε, nor can it ever 'equal' γαρ. An inspection of the passages cited under 4): M. vi. 30, Mkxv. 33 (G.-L, read δε with *K). L. v. 1, vi. 1, 12, vii. 6, xix. 22, J. vi. 35 will show that jah is in every case used catachrestically for δε; note especially L. v. 1, vi. 1, 12 ευνέτο δε jah warp.

3. The present study is written from a very different standpoint, but cannot become the vehicle for an exhaustive review of the relevant sections of Gabelentz–Loebe. It was prompted by the irregular and variable representation, in Gothic, of δε, ουν, γαρ, and sometimes even καί, which made it difficult or impossible to decide which of two particles to adopt as the Greek original in cases where the Greek uncials were divided in their support.

4–5. The Tables 4 and 5 exhibit the renderings of the particles δε and ουν in the 18th chapter of St John, together with the

1 H. C. von der Gabelentz und J. Loebe, Ulfils (1836). This work is available in Migne, P.L., vol. xviii. 455–1560. The citations in this article are from the reprint of 1843–6 (Brockhaus, Leipzig).
6. The diversity of the renderings in each of these columns, and the difference between the versions, are very remarkable. In the first table, a reader who believed in uniformity of rendering where the sense permitted, might well wonder how δε could be represented correctly by aber, and, and now in the same passage (verse 2), whilst an English reader, if he knew that the Greek and the Latin texts read δε and autem, would marvel how the A.V. could so frequently read and.

7. In the Latin rendering of οὐν, the normal ergo is sometimes replaced by autem, igitur, at illeque; Luther uses nun, denn, aber, da with no apparent system, whilst in the English versions the A.V. then is usually opposed by the R.V. therefore. Contextual influence will not account for so much apparently purposeless variation. The 5th and 6th chapters of Luke begin with εἰς ἐν τῷ δε. No argument can justify the Gothic jah (warp) in both passages, or Luther's es begab sich aber in L. v. 1 against und es begab sich in L. vi. 1, nor the A.V. and it came to pass, in both verses, against R. V. now.

8. It looks as though the Goth had more than one approximate equivalent for δε, namely ἰθ, ἰπ, ἰπαν; for οὐν he used ἰπ, ἰπαν, and ἰπαν, which occur in John 36, 32, and 28 times, respectively. For γὰρ the most common renderings are auk and unite. For καὶ the only renderings that can properly be allowed are jah and -uh. There is nothing surprising in the fact that the use of Greek particles was too subtle for exact reproduction in a barbarous language without exactly corresponding words or phrases. The Latin versions also show great freedom in rendering the Greek particles and conjunctions.

9. Nevertheless G.-L., and Streitberg after them, have attempted to explain the deviations from the numerically preponderant renderings by the influence of the context. To take a simple instance from the Glossarium s.v. ἰθ, which in section 2 gives the references of passages where ἰθ is used for καὶ: 'so meist in Gegensätzen (s. zu M. 6, 24 und zu Mk 15, 31) außer in den Lukastellen: M. 6, 24 Mk 2, 18 10, 42 15, 15 Luc. 1, 63 2, 9 18, 38 Joh. 9, 25 17, 11'.¹ G.-L. do not attempt to justify the use

¹ Two of these references are erroneous: Mk ii. 18, where ἰθ stands for δε, and J. ix. 25, where ἰθ is an addition, in Gothic, against the Greek text; cf. eram et a c d e f ff(1) q aur.
of *ip* for *kai* in the three passages from Luke. If the reader will look up these references he will find that in only two, M. vi. 24 and J. xvii. 11, could the context have been responsible for the substitution of *ip* for the literal rendering *jah*. In these passages A.V. and R.V. read *and*, with the single exception of J. xvii. 11 where A.V. has *but* (these).

10. More futile still is the attempt to establish a distinction between *appan* and *ip* as representatives of *de*. In Streitberg's *Gotisches Elementarbuch* (§ 335) we read 'Doch hebt *appan* den Gegensatz schärfer hervor als *ip*, giving as an instance M. v. 21–22 *ip* saei (os 8'auv) maurprei̇p, skula wairpi̇p stauai̇. *Appan* (*euyow* *de*) *ik* *qipa* *izwis* .... Both the statement and the example are taken from G.-L., *EYW* (*LEV* *E*3a77Tw) *fLEV* (3a77tw). But the same paragraph taken from Skeir. iii. 23, which reproduces the texts of M. iii. *ip* saei, *appan* *ik* , which is also after G.-L., who go out of their way to account for *de* respectively. Then, at the end of the section, we are told that 'appan . . . *ip* gibt einigemale µEv ... *SE* wieder'. The example is *EAEvaovrai* (Et) *yap* Гегенсаt scharfer hervor als . . . *ip*, giving as an instance M. *ip* saei *appan* *ik* .

11. A good example of the equivalence of multiple renderings is furnished by the main renderings of *yap* (*auk*, *unte*) and the two subsidiary renderings (*allis*, *raithis*). Consider the following groups:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{λεγω} & \text{για(κ.τ.λ.) γιαρ} & \text{eαν (ει) γιαρ} & \text{eαν (ει) γιαρ} & \text{eαν (ει) γιαρ} & \\
\text{M. v. 20} & \text{qipa auk} & \text{M. v. 46} & \text{jabai auk} & \text{M. v. 46} & \text{jabai auk} \\
\text{Mk v. 8} & \text{unte qap} & \text{M. vi. 14} & \text{unte jabai} & \text{M. vi. 14} & \text{unte jabai} \\
\text{L. vii. 28} & \text{qipa allis} & \text{J. v. 46} & \text{jabai allis} & \text{J. v. 46} & \text{jabai allis} \\
\text{M. xi. 18} & \text{gam raithis} & \text{os γαρ} & \text{eγω γαρ} & \text{eγω γαρ} & \\
\text{Mk ix. 41} & \text{saei auk} & \text{Mk ix. 40} & \text{unte saei} & \text{Mk iii. 35} & \text{saei allis} \\
\end{array}
\]

15. The only renderings that may properly be allowed for *kai* are the almost universal *jah* and the occasional -*uh*. The others are wanton substitutions the reasons for which it is useless to seek. The Old Latin renderings are in no case responsible.

*Pan* is added in L. ii. 37 *kai* *auum* *soh* *pan*, whereas L. ii. 38, xvii. 16, xix. 2 have the normal *soh*, *sah*. Cf. also J. vii. 33, xiv. 3, 7, L. vii. 8, xvii. 3, Mk iii. 6 *jah* *pan*. See also under *de*. Cf. G.-L., *Gram.*, § 259, Anm. 3.
\(\text{panuh}\) as an adverb = \(\text{τόστε}\). In M. ix. 2 the Greek text \(\text{kai òдов}\) is arbitrarily perverted to \text{panuh}, as in the next verse to \text{paruh}; in verse 20 it is given correctly as \(\text{jah sai}\). Similarly in Mk x. 13 \(\text{kai}\) is replaced by \text{panuh}. Cf. i Cor. xiv. 25 \(\text{kai ὄντως \text{panuh}}\) (cf. \(\text{d e et tunc})\).

\(\text{paruh}\) as an adverb = \(\text{εκεί}\). As in the case of \text{panuh}, we find \text{paruh} replacing \text{kai} in J. iii. 23 (= \text{Skeir. iii}), vii. 45, ix. 2, L. vii. 12, 37, and \(\text{kai òдов}\) in M. ix. 3, L. ii. 25. So M. ix. 18 \(\text{òдов \text{paruh}}\).

\text{paroh} in L. iv. 9 \text{και ἡγαγεν \text{paprh gatauh}} is after M. iv. 5 \(\text{τόστε}\), the isolated \(\text{deinid f (vg latt et)}\) being after the Gothic.

\text{ip} is an adversative conjunction and cannot properly represent \(\text{kai}\); the question of contextual influence was dealt with in § 9. Cf. the substitution of \text{jah for \(\text{δε}\) in § 16.}

\(\text{ju}\) in Mk ix. 13 \(\text{kai Ἡλías ἰη \text{Helias is after M. xvii. 12 Ἡλίας ἡ ἡλίας \(\gammaλθεν\). The reading \text{Helias iam uniet of f (sim. i, gat) is probably after the Gothic.}}\)

\text{swa(\text{h})}:\text{ in J. xiii. 15, xv. 9, xvii. 18 \text{kαθως . . . και the use of \text{swa(h)}} in the second sentence is a necessary correlative to the preceding \text{swasue}, which is paralleled by \text{vg f ita et vos}} in J. xiii. 15. The isolated \text{ita ego \text{of f in J. xv. 9 is probably after the Gothic.}}

\text{an replaces \text{kai} in J. ix. 36 \(\text{kai τις εστιν an has ist}, \text{L. x. 29 και τις εστιν ωυν πλησιον an has ist mis nekswa}, \text{L. xviii. 26 και τις an has, whether as an idiomatic necessity or for stylistic reasons it is difficult to say; at least in J. xviii. 38 τι εστιν η \text{ολθεια και is so sunja the Goth managed without it. Cf. L. iii. 10 s.v. \text{oun in § 17.}}\)

\text{ΕΙ: J. xvi. 17 μικρον και \text{ου \text{θεωρετε με leitil \text{ei ni saihp mik}}. This alteration was unnecessary, as is shown by the preceding J. xvi. 16 leitil nauh \text{jah ni saihp mik}}}, \text{and the following jah \text{gasaitwp mik. Cf. E.B., § 344, Anm. But if we emend the text to \text{ei leitil jah}}}, \text{then \text{ei would stand for \text{ορί}}} \text{as it does elsewhere after verbs of saying, etc., e.g. J. xiii. 33 \text{gap du \text{Iudaim et (= \text{ορί}}} \text{padei ik garga}}\).

\text{Appan} for \text{kai occurs in L. vi. 32 and J. viii. 16. L. vi. 32 has \text{kai ei agapate apfän jahabai friod against verses 33 and 54 και \text{eav jah jabai}}. The vg and OLat read \text{et si}, except \text{f si enim which is after the Gothic. In J. viii. 16 και \text{eav κρυυν de eyw, apfän jahabai staja ik}} \text{is the reading of C.A., which should be allowed to stand instead of Fr. Kauffmann's emendation jah-pan. In both passages}}

\(\text{appan jahabai}\) is a substitution for \text{jah jahabai} in J. viii. 16, possibly suggested by the oddly placed \(\text{δε}\). \text{Appan jahabai} appears, correctly, for \text{eav \text{δε} in J. xi. 10, xv. 7, and xvi. 7.}

\text{panuh, paruh, and ip are arbitrary substitutions for \text{kai as general resumptive particles, comparable to the use of (and) then, \text{(and there, (and so),}} \text{in plebeian speech or childish narrative. This comment applies a fortiori to the renderings of \text{δε and \text{ουν}}.}}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\text{The renderings of } \text{δε}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\text{M. J. L. Mk}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{ιp}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{(-uh) \text{f(\text{an}}}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the majority renderings; \text{appan qualifies as such by reason of its preponderance in the Epistles. It is assumed that they are approximately synonymous (cf. §§ 8, 11). For detailed analysis and attempts to define them more closely see G.-L., \text{Gram.}, §§ 259-60. The case of \text{ip and appan was discussed in § 10.}}

An interesting passage is J. xviii. 31 \text{επον \text{δε αυτω \text{οι Ioudaioi \text{i} \text{eis gepunuh du \text{imma \text{ludaietz)}}. First, \text{i} \text{gepunuh is a conflation of \text{i} \text{gepun with a competing analogical substitute gepunuh; secondly, \text{eis is an intrusion not compatible with the following \text{ludaietz, by false analogy with the use of \text{eis as in \text{οι \text{δε i} \text{eis}} \text{where the verb alone immediately follows (cf. E.B., §§ 275, 278), as in verse 28 \text{εγουσων oov \text{i} \text{eis tahuon, verse 40 \text{κραυγασων oow \text{i} \text{eis hropidu}}. The Greek text has the variant oov, but in John \text{i} \text{can represent both \text{δε and \text{ουν. The same sequence \text{i} . . . \text{-uh occurs in ix. 36 \text{i} \text{is qapuh, xvi. 19 \text{i} \text{Jesus wissuh, against x. 20 ελευον \text{δε gepunuh, xvi. 18 ελευον oov gepunuh.}}}}}}}}}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\text{και, \text{δε, \text{ουν, and \text{γαρ in Gothic}})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\text{M. J. L. Mk}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{ip}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{paruh}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{paruh \text{pan}}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{ip \text{pan}}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{appan}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\text{panuh (see also under \text{kai}): M. ix. 32 \text{αυτων \text{δε εξεργομενον panuh bive ut \text{usiddejedun eis} (not M. ix. 25 \text{οτε \text{δε panuh pan, where panuh = \text{οτε}}), as in J. xvi. 25, J. vi. 12, 16, xvii. 28, L. viii. 54, ix. 12, 13, x. 28, xv. 28, Mk iv. 29 provide instances of the}}
use of panuh for δε. Note also J. vi. 12, 13, 14 δε . . . ovv . . . ovv panuh . . . panuh . . . paruh.  

(paruh): the instances are: J. vi. 20, xviii. 15, 18, L. iii. 13, iv. 43, v. 34, vi. 8, 10, vii. 43, viii. 30, 46, 52, ix. 42, x. 26, xiv. 16, xv. 27, 29, 31, xvi. 6, Mk x. 20, 24, xiv. 64, xvi. 6. Note especially L. v. 33, 34, 35 δε . . . δε . . . δε . . . ip . . . ip . . . paruh . . . apfan.  

This reads very well, but see § 10, paruh pan in L. viii. 23 πλεοντων δε αυτων paruh pan swe fari dedun may be a double rendering, the original being swe pan. The Old Latin is not ever responsible.  

[ip pan], in M. xxvii. 46, J. viii. 59, L. vii. 50, ix. 21, xvii. 15 is most likely the result of competing renderings; cf., however, G.-L. (Gram., § 260, Anm. 2): ‘Zuweilen wird, nach gothischer Sitte, pleonastisch ip und pan verbunden’.  

G.-L. beg the question by explaining apfan as aber, which is unacceptable. In the one other instance, in 1 Cor. iv. 7 εί δε και άλαμεs apfan jabai andnant, by giving the conjunction its proper value γι, the text makes sense, if not the correct sense required by the Greek, which is well represented by vg si autem, R.V. but, L. aber. In Gothic, apfan would stand in both passages.  

-JAH as an equivalent of δε is inadmissible; the instances M. vi. 30, J. vi. 35, L. v. 1, vi. 1, 12, vii. 6, xix. 22 are substitutions which may be compared with those of ip for και (§ 15). The same perversion is presented in J. vi. 35 f ff2 et dixit, L. vi. 1 a d c et factum est, L. vii. 6 vg b c e f ff2 et cum.  

Jan pan: in J. xi. 42 ευω δε jah pan ik, J. xiv. 21 o δε jah pan saei, J. xviii. 18 γυ δε jah pan was, and L. xviii. 3 δε γυ wassip-pan jah, jah is an intrusion. See also under και.  

-UH is substituted in M. xxvii. 44 το δε αυτω patuh samo (vg latt autem); J. ix. 9 αλλοω . . . αλλοω δε sumaih . . . sumaih; J. x. 20 ελεγον δε qepunuh (vg autem, but et a b c e f ff2). Cf. G.-L., Gram., § 259, Anm. 5. See above, J. xviii. 31, etc. (ip . . . uh).  

Nu, one of the commoner renderings of ovv, occurs once, in J. v. 47 ει δε pande nu, with four further instances in the Epistles.  

(-uh-) pan auk in J. xii. 10 εδουλιεναυθο δε munaideduny-pan auk presents the normal -uh pan with an intrusive auk as a double rendering, but δε is not represented by auk in the Gospels, although it is found six times in the Epistles (Rom. viii. 10, i Cor. x. 20, xv. 50, 2 Cor. xiii. 9, Col. iii. 25, Tit. i. 12) as an expressive substitute for δε. See also L. vii. 8 in § 18.  

---

The Renderings of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>και, δε, ουv, and γαρ in Gothic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The renderings of ovv</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panuh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paruh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aippah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nunu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-uh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eipan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conjunction ovv occurs most frequently in John (15. 134. 19. 7.), where the preponderant renderings are pan (36), panuh (32), and paruh (28). The only other common rendering, a bad fourth in John, is nu (12. 10. 12. 2), but it is frequent in the Epistles.  

-pan: note the double rendering in Mk iii. 31 ερχονται ovv jah gemun pan, where jah represents the reading και SinBCDGLΔ it vg, and pan ovv ΔPLP.  

-paproph pan: (paproph appears for και in L. iv. 9, after the parallel) occurs for ovv in J. iii. 25 (Skeir. iii) εγεντεω ovv paproph pan warp and in J. xviii. 7 παλω ovv paproph pan astra where paproph is perhaps a double, but inferior, rendering of παλω (properly = astra).  

-afpan, the third commonest rendering of δε, occurs for ovv in J. vi. 30, L. xx. 5, 17, Mk xi. 31, xii. 27. In the first four examples afpan introduces a question απαν duhe? afpan ha?  

An ovv occurs introducing a question in L. iii. 10 τι ovv σωστων; an ha tajaima? Cf. an under και. Perhaps J. xviii. 37 ουκουν βασιλεις ει συ; an nud piudans is pu? belongs here. But nu can be used in the same way, as in L. xx. 15 τι ovv σωσει; ha nu tajai? Mk xv. 12 τι ovv thelete; ha nu wileip? See also an in § 15.  

-ip, the common rendering of δε, occurs in John (10;) and, once more, in a double rendering in M. v. 19 os εαν ovv ip saei nu. Cf. Skeir. i ip in pizire nu.  

Nu occurs as a consequential conjunction in the general sense ‘therefore’. Cf. the double rendering in M. v. 19 (see prec.).
The Renderings of 

The Renderings of yap in the Epistles, pan in Mk xii. 9 τι οὖν ποιήσας; ἢν υἱον ταύτας? is synonymous with nu in L. xx. 15, Mk xv. 12. J. xviii. 37 (see under an) shows a rare combination of an with nuh.

nu in M. x. 26, 31 is used after ni in prohibitions, as μη οὖν φοβηθήτε ni nunu ogeip.

-uh, which properly represents kai, is arbitrarily substituted for οὖν in J. vi. 66 ek τουν οὖν, with the equally arbitrary addition of mela in uezh pamma mel, whence f ex hoc ergo tempore. Thus J. xvi. 18 ελέγων οὖν gεπωμ. See under δε, § 16.

eipan 'zur Bezeichnung der logischen Folgerung' is found once in J. ix. 41 η οὖν αμαρτία ἡν οὖν μετά eipan frawaurhtis izwara pairhvisip. It occurs in 1 Cor. xi. 27 for ωστε, and three times, in the sense of οὖν, in the text of the Skeireins. In the present passage eipan is an expressive substitute for οὖν.

18. The renderings of yap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M.</th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>L.</th>
<th>Mk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>auk</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the main renderings in both the Gospels and the Epistles. For the synonymous use of auk, unt, allis, and raihtis, see § 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M.</th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>L.</th>
<th>Mk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>allis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raihtis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ip</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALLIS occurs as frequently as unto in Luke.

RAIHTIS needs no further comment.

ip, as the chief representative of δε, autem, cannot properly be used to render yap, enim. In these four passages, and in five more in the Epistles, ip is an arbitrary substitution.

-uh pan, especially in John and in the Epistles, is used to render δε, and the comment on the use of ip applies here as well. pan by itself is found in L. i. 66 και yap jah pan.

Pan auk in L. vii. 8 και yap εγω jah pan auk ik appears to be a conflation resulting from auk being proposed as a substitute for pan (cf. prec.), or vice versa, both finding their way into the next copy. See also J. xii. 10 in § 16.

AUK RAIHTIS in Mk vi. 17 avtos yap sa auk raihtis and Mk vii. 10 Mousig yap Moses auk raihtis is a conflation like the preceding.

The occurrence of dual and multiple renderings of nouns, verbs, and adjectives has been observed in both the Gospels and the Epistles. The Epistles are distinguished by a number of exegetical, or contextually interpretative renderings in which contextual implications have been allowed to affect the rendering of a word. Such deliberate deviations from the Greek text in the Epistles go beyond the comparatively modest degree of subjectivity of interpretation that has been observed also in the Gospels.

There is no occasion for surprise, therefore, that multiple renderings are found in the lists of the Gothic representatives of Greek particles and conjunctions. For one thing, the subtle shades of meaning in the various uses of δε, οὖν, and yap were not covered by any one Gothic word, and secondly, it may reasonably be assumed that none of the Gothic equivalents precisely coincided with even the basic sense of δε or οὖν, although we are not in a position to appreciate the exact shade of meaning by which the Gothic word differed from its approximate equivalent in Greek. We might, therefore, expect the twofold or threefold representation by numerically preponderant renderings.

20. So far, then, we can come to terms with the lists of equivalents of και, δε, οὖν, and yap, the main renderings of which may be shown as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M.</th>
<th>J.</th>
<th>L.</th>
<th>Mk</th>
<th>Epistles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>και: jah</td>
<td>the main rendering</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δε: ip</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pan</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aipan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὖν: pan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paruh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paruh</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yap: auk</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The closest analysis of the functions and of the differentiation of the meanings of these Gothic particles will be found in G.-L., Gram., §§ 258-62, and was taken into account by both Streitberg

1 In G.V.G. see the lists of dual renderings (pp. 86-91) and the select list of multiple renderings (pp. 159-60), and passim. In G.V.E. see the list of dual and multiple renderings (pp. 133-6). See also pp. 232, 266, and passim.
The Renderings of

(E.B.) and Mosé (Manuel). Mosé, for instance (§ 255), distinguishes between *nu* 'donc', *pan-nu* 'ainsi donc', *unte, auk* 'car, en effet', *raihtis* 'certes', *allis* 'du tout'.

These main renderings are taken for granted, and are assumed to be near-synonyms in the language of the Gothic translator or translators. As for the deviations from these standard or staple renderings, they are for the most part arbitrary and very often unjustifiable departures from the Greek text. A fourth-century translator who proceeded with such disregard for his original would have frowned on these deviations from the original by the Goths whose text was, as he says, 'ab auctoribus quondam malis et male ... interpolata et male tradita'.

22. The use of *ip* for *kai* was discussed in § 9. There are certainly cases where *kai*, and other particles, cannot well be rendered literally, but the substitution of *panuh*, *paruh*, and *paproh* for *kai* is indefensible.

23. The renderings which occur in substantial numbers for each of these are tabulated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>δε</th>
<th></th>
<th>ovv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.</td>
<td>J.</td>
<td>L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ip</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>51.</td>
<td>89.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pan</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ahpan</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.</td>
<td>11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>panuh</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>paruh</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>nu</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>jah</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two particles are in the Latin versions usually distinguished as *autem* and *ergo*. The fact that *ip* is the chief representative of δε contra-indicates its use as a rendering of *ovv*. It is unfortunate that *ovv* occurs so preponderantly in John, for we have thus no adequate criterion of comparison with its representation in the other Gospels. We must be content, therefore, to note the multiple renderings *ip* (10), *pan* (36) which is second only to *ip* as a representative of δε, *panuh* (32), *paruh* (28), and *nu* (10), which is the only one of these five to be the most common representative of *ovv* both in Matthew and in Luke, as in the Epistles (51). The translator of John seems to have been at a loss to find for *ovv* a near equivalent in Gothic: *panuh* and *paruh*, which cannot be divorced from their basic meanings "then" and "there", and *nu* 'now', described as 'Konjunction zur Bezeichnung der logischen Folgerung' (Wb.), are unacceptable as proper equivalents of δε or *ovv*. The use of *paruh* may be compared with the use of *then* in the A.V. against *therefore* in the R.V. Both *panuh* and *paruh* frequently represent *δε* and *ovv* before *qap*, *gepun*.

24. **The different translators of the Gothic version**

The possibility that more than one hand was engaged in the production of the Gothic version has been suggested before. It is referred to in the writer's *Gothic Version of the Epistles*, p. 259, whilst in his earlier work on the Gospels, p. 160, attention was drawn to the more varied diction in the Gospel of St John, and to the greater amount of total variation that distinguishes Luke and Mark, and especially to the notable preponderance in Luke (pp. 160, 242). Gabelentz and Loebe had suggested in their *Prolegomena*, p. xi, that Wulfila not having lived to complete the entire version, this may have been finished by other scholars, and named a certain Selinas as a possible successor. In their *Grammatik* they go even further and assume different translators for John and Luke.

The figures tabulated for *kai, δε, ovv, and yap* in § 20 show that here also John exhibits that more varied diction already mentioned; John comes a good first, and Luke is a fair second. The other Gospels are in this respect much more conservative. Luke employs *panuh* and *paruh* for δε, and *allis* for yap, more freely than the other Gospels; John employs *ip* ten times as an equivalent of

1 Cf. § 259, Anm. 2: 'da der Uebersetzer des Lukas am wenigsten regelmässig, *wh* vor *pan* braucht'; 258, Anm. 4: 'Für die griechische Copulativpartikel *kai* werden von solchen Uebersetzern, die sich etwas freier bewegen, einzeln auch andere Partikeln gebraucht', and, ibid., Anm. 5: 'und zwar braucht der Uebersetzer des Lukas *jah*, der des Johannes *jah* und *uh*'; § 285: 'die gothischen Uebersetzer'.

1 *De gub. Dei*, v. ii. 5-11, in *G.V.E.*, pp. 268-70.
The Renderings of ovv (cf. ip nu (§ 17), in M. v. 19), for which nu prevails in the other Gospels and in the Epistles (Matthew 12/15).

The tradition that Wulfila translated all the Scriptures except the four Books of Kings rests on nothing more than the statement of Philostorgius whose inaccurate and tendentious history survives sparsely in the Epitome of Photius. The evidence that has already emerged from the study of the Gothic text leads to the belief that the Gothic version represents the work of several, probably of a team of scholars presided over by Bishop Wulfila as editor-in-chief.

THE EPISTLES

25. The following tables will conveniently display the renderings of και, δε, ovv, and yap in the Epistles side by side with those in the Gospels. For the Epistles numbers are given of the main renderings, and the references where only a few instances are to be recorded. Both are taken from Gabelentz and Loebe's Glossarium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gospels</th>
<th>Epistles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. J. L. Mk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jah</td>
<td>main rendering</td>
<td>main rendering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-uh</td>
<td>0. 3. 4. 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-uh pan</td>
<td>0. 0. 1. 0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jah pan</td>
<td>0. 3. 2. 1. cf. pan jah 1 Tim. v. 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panan</td>
<td>1. 0. 0. 1. 1 Cor. xiv. 25, xv. 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panuh</td>
<td>0. 3. 2. 0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paruh</td>
<td>0. 0. 1. 0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paruh (και υδω)</td>
<td>1. 0. 0. 0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>趴proh</td>
<td>0. 0. 1. 0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ip</td>
<td>1. 1. 3. 2. Rom. xiv. 3, 1 Cor. i. 22, xii. 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ju</td>
<td>0. 0. 0. 1. Gal. v. 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an</td>
<td>0. 1. 2. 0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ei</td>
<td>0. 1. 0. 0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appan</td>
<td>0. 1. 1. 0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aippau</td>
<td>0. 0. 0. 0. Eph. v. 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pan</td>
<td>0. 0. 0. 0. 1 Cor. vii. 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Cf. M. H. Jellinek, Geschichte der gotischen Sprache, p. 11: 'Trotzdem wird man kein Bedenken tragen, die erhaltenen Bruchstücke ... mit Wulfila zusammenzuführen, ohne dass jedoch das Zeugnis des Philostorgius von der Pflicht enthebt, philologisch zu prüfen, ob alles, was wir besitzen, von einem Manne herrührt.'
The Renderings of "yap"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gospels</th>
<th>Epistles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>J. L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auk</td>
<td>18. 18. 35. 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unte</td>
<td>6. 5. 12. 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allis</td>
<td>0. 1. 12. 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raihtis</td>
<td>2. 0. 6. 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ip</td>
<td>0. 3. 0. 1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-uh pan</td>
<td>1. 3. 1. 0.</td>
<td>2 Cor. iv. 15, Gal. vi. 13, 1 Thess. iv. 15, 1 Tim. ii. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pan auk</td>
<td>0. 0. 1. 0.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auk raihtis</td>
<td>0. 0. 0. 2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jah</td>
<td>0. 0. 0. 2</td>
<td>2 Tim. iii. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jah pan</td>
<td>0. 0. 0. 2</td>
<td>2 Cor. xii. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appan</td>
<td>0. 0. 0. 0.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu</td>
<td>0. 0. 0. 0.</td>
<td>1 Cor. xiii. 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. It will be useful also to set out the main renderings in the Gospels and the Epistles with their total occurrences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gospels</th>
<th>Epistles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>J. L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καί: jah</td>
<td>main rendering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δὲ: ip</td>
<td>51. 89. 95. (331)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pan</td>
<td>31. 41. 164. 39. (275)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appan</td>
<td>10. 11. 17. 11. (49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὖν: pan</td>
<td>1. 36. 4. 1. (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>panuh</td>
<td>0. 32. 0. 1. (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paruh</td>
<td>0. 28. 0. 0. (28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nu</td>
<td>12. 10. 12. 2. (36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γὰρ: auk</td>
<td>18. 18. 35. 30. (101)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unter</td>
<td>6. 5. 12. 12. (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[allis</td>
<td>0. 1. 12. 7. (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raihtis</td>
<td>2. 0. 6. 4. (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Agreement in Gospel and Epistle usage

(a) δὲ is represented by the same main renderings ip, pan, appan.
(b) οὖν is represented by nu in the four Gospels and in the Epistles.
(c) γὰρ is represented by the same renderings auk (Gosp. 101, Ep. 128) and unter (Gosp. 35, Ep. 96).

Differences of usage

1. Minor deviations are very much fewer in the Epistles.
2. δὲ: appan, a bad third in the Gospels (49/655) is the chief rendering (152/328) in the Epistles. Conversely, pan (275), second to ip (331) in the Gospels, is a bad third (30) in the Epistles.
3. δὲ: Luke is conspicuous with a decided preference for pan (364/277) over the other two main renderings (see § 16).
4. οὖν: John is conspicuous for the use of pan, panuh, paruh (96/103), with nu, which is the chief rendering in the other Gospels and in the Epistles, only ten times.
5. οὖν: the Epistles have only one main rendering, nu.
6. γὰρ: the subsidiary renderings allis (20) and raihtis (12) in the Gospels appear only once each in the Epistles.

The comparatively few aberrant renderings will now be dealt with under their respective originals as adopted in Streitberg’s Greek text. They have all been collated with Tischendorf’s Octaua and with Wordsworth and White’s Vulgate.
The Renderings of

The Renderings of *jub* Gal. v. 21 καθος και προσώπων; we ju fawrapkh. This, if intentional, is a gross perversion of the Greek. Perhaps it is merely an error for *jah*.

*apist* in Eph. v. 4 for *ka* has been altered from the original *jah* after latt (vg) aut = η AD*FG.

The Renderings of *nun* in 1 Cor. vii. 5 is an instance not of the use of *pan* for *ka*, but of the substitution of the phrase *paprh pan* for *jah* after, in which case the instance does not belong here.

The Renderings of *nun* in 1 Cor. xvi. 4 seems to be an expressive substitute for *kah* in Rom. xvi. 7 τοι παντως ; 2 Cor. viii. 13 εν εν σάκεν *βρασματος* ni nunu matis; 2 Tim. i. 8 μην ευς κοιμηθης ni nunu skamai *puk*. Nunu is used after *ni* in prohibitions, and the first two passages, where *nun* is not represented in either Greek or Latin, show that *nun* is in idiomatic use there, and that *ow* in 2 Tim. i. 8, and elsewhere (M. x. 26, 31), is included in, not usurped by, *nun*.

The Renderings of *auk* in 1 Cor. viii. 1 l *auk* is apparently after Rom. xiv. 15 ει γαιρ.*

gai

The Renderings of *all* 1 Tim. iv. 10 εις τοιο γαιρ δυπφε *allis*.

The Renderings of *rahu* 1 Cor. xii. 12 καθαρε γαιρ το σωμα εν εστω *swe leik raihtis ain iston*: both *allos* and *rauhtis* are subsidiary renderings of *gai* in the Gospels, but occur for *gai* only here in the Epistles.

The Renderings of *nun* in 1 Cor. xvi. 4 seems to be *auk* after, in which case the instance does not belong here.

The Renderings of *auk* in 1 Cor. vii. 5 is an instance not of the use of *pan* for *ka*, but of the substitution of the phrase *paprh pan* for *jah* after, in which case the instance does not belong here.

The Renderings of *ow* in 1 Cor. viii. 1 l *ow* is after Latt (vg) enim, or else represents γαιρ ε. SinABCDF.

The Renderings of *nun* in 1 Cor. xvi. 4 seems to be an expressive substitute for *kah* in Rom. xvi. 7 τοι παντως ; 2 Cor. viii. 13 εν εν σάκεν *βρασματος* ni nunu matis; 2 Tim. i. 8 μην ευς κοιμηθης ni nunu skamai *puk*. Nunu is used after *ni* in prohibitions, and the first two passages, where *nun* is not represented in either Greek or Latin, show that *nun* is in idiomatic use there, and that *ow* in 2 Tim. i. 8, and elsewhere (M. x. 26, 31), is included in, not usurped by, *nun*.

The Renderings of *auk* in 1 Cor. viii. 1 l *auk* is apparently after Rom. xiv. 15 ει γαιρ.*

gai

The Renderings of *all* 1 Tim. iv. 10 εις τοιο γαιρ δυπφε *allis*.

The Renderings of *rahu* 1 Cor. xii. 12 καθαρε γαιρ το σωμα εν εστω *swe leik raihtis ain iston*: both *allos* and *rauhtis* are subsidiary renderings of *gai* in the Gospels, but occur for *gai* only here in the Epistles.

The Renderings of *nun* in 1 Cor. xvi. 4 seems to be *auk* after, in which case the instance does not belong here.

The Renderings of *auk* in 1 Cor. vii. 5 is an instance not of the use of *pan* for *ka*, but of the substitution of the phrase *paprh pan* for *jah* after, in which case the instance does not belong here.

The Renderings of *ow* in 1 Cor. viii. 1 l *ow* is after Latt (vg) enim, or else represents γαιρ ε. SinABCDF.
The Renderings of

2 Cor., Gal., Eph., Phil., 1 Tim., and 2 Tim. Not in the Gospels.

\( \text{jah \, \text{pan in 2 Cor. xii. i \, } } \) derives from the variant reading \( \delta \varepsilon \) (SinBFGP f g vg) with the intrusion of \( \text{jah} \) as in 1 Cor. xvi. 4 (see under \( \Delta E \)).

\( \text{nu, in 1 Cor. xiii. 12 for } \gamma \varphi, \) is contextual.

Conclusions

32. (1) In § 27 the subsections (2) and (6) evidence a radical difference in the choice of renderings in the Gospels as against the Epistles; subsection (3) shows Luke conspicuous among the other Gospels, whilst in subsection (4) the usage in John is seen to differ from that in the other Gospels and in the Epistles.

(2) When one considers the very uniform representation of \( \delta \varepsilon, \text{onv,} \) and \( \gamma \varphi \) by single or approximately synonymous renderings in the Epistles, it is difficult to impute the comparatively few deviations from those standard renderings to any original translator. With the exception of \( \text{nu} \) (\( \text{nu} \) for \( \text{nu} \)) they suggest the work of post-Wulfilian tamperers.\(^1\) This applies also to the representation of \( \gamma \varphi \) by \( \text{ap\beta \varepsilon} \) with its substantial number of fourteen instances (see § 31). If that be so, we can go further and say that, in comparison with some of the workmanship displayed in the Gospels, the treatment of these particles proceeded in the Epistles according to a uniform plan.

(3) The Gospels carry a much heavier charge of deviant renderings, and of arbitrary changes or substitutions, than the Epistles, and it is more difficult to apportion the responsibility for these aberrations. One would like to believe that any rendering of \( \text{to\varepsilon, } \) other than \( \text{jah or -uh}, \) could not emanate from the translator. In the case of \( \delta \varepsilon \) it passes belief that a translator, with the Greek original before him, could write in J. vi. 12, 13, 14 \( \text{panuh bipe sadai wearpun ... panuh galesun ... paruh pai mans with complete disregard for the original, which read simply } \text{onv } \delta \varepsilon \ldots \text{syn\varphi\gamma\alpha\gamma\nu ov ... ov onv an\varphi\theta\nu\tau\omega} \) for which the vg and Old Latin have \( \text{autem} \ldots \text{ergo} \ldots \text{ergo} \). Yet it is equally difficult to believe that any conscientious priest, scribe, or reader would have the temerity to alter an original \( \text{ip, pan,} \) or \( \text{ap\beta \varepsilon} \) representing \( \delta \varepsilon \) to \( \text{panuh or paruh,} \) which appear in thirty-three passages in the

extant fragments (16 times in Luke). On the other hand, the preponderant use of \( \text{pan, panuh,} \) and \( \text{paruh for } \gamma \varphi \) in the Gospel of St John (96 times, but occurring in the other Gospels only 7 times) can only be the work of the original translator.

(4) More difficult is the problem presented by the renderings of \( \delta \varepsilon \) and \( \gamma \varphi \) in the 18th chapter of St John, which are set out in §§ 4 and 5. Here \( \delta \varepsilon \) occurs eighteen times and \( \gamma \varphi \), twenty-two times, \( \delta \varepsilon \) being represented by \( \text{-uh} \) \( \text{pan, } \text{ip, panuh, ap\beta \varepsilon,} \) and \( \text{panuh, } \) and \( \gamma \varphi \) by \( \text{ip, panuh, paruh, parproh pan, and } \text{nu.} \) Which, the translator or some meddler after him, is more likely to be responsible for this medley of equivalents, as variegated as a patch-work quilt? Anywhere but in John one would blame the post-Wulfilian corrupters of the Gothic text. But if we allow for the observed greater variety of diction in John, we may accept, as normal for the renderings of \( \delta \varepsilon \) in that Gospel, \( \text{ip and } \text{pan,} \) which account for the observed eighteen renderings, and for \( \gamma \varphi, \text{nu,} \) and John's speciality \( \text{pan, panuh, paruh,} \) which account for fourteen of the twenty-two renderings, seven of the remainder being \( \text{ip,} \) which occurs, only in John, ten times, and which we may include among the idiosyncrasies of the translator of that Gospel.\(^1\) We can therefore accept these 35/40 variegated renderings in the 18th chapter as the work of the original translator of John. What Bishop Wulfila thought of this hotch-potch, or why it was never subjected to a purging revision, we shall never know.\(^2\)

(5) A glance at the other Gospels, especially the very conservative Matthew, points the same way. \( \text{Sai} \) occurs many times for \( \text{onv in both the Gospels and the Epistles, and thus we have M. ix. 20 } \text{and } \text{onv jah sai.} \) But when we find M. ix. 2 \( \text{and } \text{onv panuh,} \) M. ix. 3 \( \text{and } \text{onv paruh,} \) M. ix. 18 \( \text{and } \text{paruh,} \) which recall the extant text of John, we will not impute these perversions to the original translator of Matthew, but to later corrupters of the Gothic bible text. The same corruption is seen in L. ii. 25 \( \text{and } \text{onv } \text{paruh was, vii. 12, 37 } \text{and } \text{onv paruh sai.} \)

\(^1\) These may be responsible for the muddle in 1 Cor. xv. 28, 54 \( \text{onv } \delta \varepsilon \ldots \text{tote (kai) panuh bipe ... panuh pan, and } \text{panuh } \text{pan ... panuh, which could properly, and much more clearly, have been written ap\beta \varepsilon ... pan (jah).} \) See § 12.

\(^2\) In nine passages \( \text{panuh and paruh} \) are interpolated: \( \text{panuh} \) in ix. 28; xiii. 36; xviii. 38; and \( \text{paruh} \) in xii. 37; xiv. 5, 9, 22; xvi. 29; xviii. 5.