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A NOTEWORTHY SAHIDIC VARIANT IN A SHE-NOUTE HOMILY IN THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY.

BY THE REV. D. P. BUCKLE, M.A.

In a previous number of the Bulletin (vol. 4, pp. 312 f.), attention was called to the value of Biblical citations in manuscripts of homilies and their importance for textual criticism. A list of over sixty examples in the sixteen pages of Coptic MS. 70 was there given. A recent discussion in the Hellenistic Greek Seminar, founded by Dr. J. H. Moulton in 1913, has revealed the necessity of adding another, which is probably more significant than any of the texts noted in that article.

The hopelessly puzzling word πνημὴ in Mark vii. 3 (AV "oft" RV "diligently" or "up to the elbow") cannot be explained without ungrammatical forcing of language. As the ordinary text even with its great array of attestation by important uncials cannot be interpreted satisfactorily, the textual problem becomes important. There is an old saying, "When in doubt, consult the Vulgate." Reference to the "Novum Testamentum Latine" of Wordsworth and White gives the text:

Nisi crebro lavent manus
non manducant

and the apparatus

\[\text{misi, + prius, } g\]
\[\text{crebro, codd. omn et vg}\]
\[= \text{πνημὴ et sic gr } \& \text{ et } g_{2} \text{ l aug gig:} \]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{veteres plerumque reddunt} \\
\text{πνημὴ (vel στυγμὴ ?)} \\
\text{momento } a \\
\text{subinde } b \\
\text{pugillo } c \text{ ff}_{2} \text{ i q r} \\
\text{primo (πνημὴ D) do}
\end{align*}\]
The New Tischendorf (ed. C. S. E. Legg), after giving the ten uncials on which the ordinary text is based, adds:

\[ \pi\nu\kappa\nu\alpha \ \nu \ \nu, \]

\[ = \text{diligenter, Syriac (pesh)} \]

\[ \text{Coptic (bo) Aeth} \]

\[ \text{om A Coptic (sa)} \]

Mr. Legg’s labours in the accumulation of so much detailed information must be acknowledged with due respect, but his apparatus requires modification. The Bohairic, edited by Horner from the Bodleian MS., reads “many times,” but in the Curzon Catena in the British Museum it has the equivalent of the Old, “Primo.” Dr. Rendel Harris, in his “Study of the Codex Bezae” (Texts and Studies, vol. 2), writes that the Thebaic (i.e. Sahidic) rests in part on a Latin basis. The annexed facsimile is one proof of this and is welcomed as such by Canon Streeter, whose principle is that the pedigree of manuscripts is more important than their age. In the sixth line of the second column is the word ÑSORP well known to authorities like Dr. Crum and Sir Herbert Thompson as meaning “first.” Sir Herbert kindly tells me that the passage in the Curzon Catena is an extract from a commentary by Severus of Antioch, who quotes the passage from Mark (by name) giving the same expression as the Shenoute homily, though reversing the order of protasis and apodosis.

Obviously there were three recensions, one giving \[ \pi\nu\gamma\mu\nu \] and the others \[ \pi\nu\kappa\nu\alpha \] and \[ \pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\nu. \] Strictly accurate classical scholars who desire a definitely comparative form may refer to Ecclesiasticus xi. 7: \[ \pi\rho\iota\nu \ \eta \ \epsilon\zeta\epsilon\tau\alpha\omicron\sigma\varsigma\mu\nu \ \mu\nu \ \mu\epsilon\mu\nu\nu\iota, \ \nu\omicron\sigma\varsigma\nu \ \pi\rho\alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\nu \ \kappa\iota \ \tau\omicron\tau \ \epsilon\pi\nu\tau\iota\mu\alpha \] and note that the Sahidic version of the passage gives the same expression as the Shenoute homily.