CODEX BEZAE

A STUDY OF THE SO-CALLED WESTERN TEXT
OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

BY

J. RENDEL HARRIS

FORMERLY FELLOW OF CLARE COLLEGE CAMBRIDGE
AND NOW PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE IN
HAVERFORD COLLEGE PENNSYLVANIA

"Quis enim sanae mentis homo Cod. D sequatur?"

MATTHAEI.

"The Codex Bezae sets criticism at defiance."

MIDDLETON.

"The singular Codex."

ELLICOTT.

PREFACE.

THE present treatise is the result of an attempt to solve the textual enigmas which recur so constantly in the pages of the Codex Bezae. We are advised by Dr Hort that "knowledge of documents must precede final judgment about readings"; and certainly there never was a text where our knowledge was so imperfect, and where a right understanding was so imperative. The Codex Bezae in some passages shews an accuracy of transcription which is quite exceptional; in others it displays a laxity of reading which is simply appalling. Everyone knows and admits this, but no one has found a scientific method for separating the precious from the vile, "the good fish from the other fry."

I have therefore undertaken to re-examine the manuscript and write the life-history of its text: and in doing this I have found that what I had long suspected but scarcely dared to say was indeed true; namely, that the textual critics of modern times have in certain directions overbuilt their foundations, and run ahead of their proofs. And it will be seen from the following pages that if New Testament criticism is to progress with any confidence, we must retire in order to advance; we must go back again to positions clearly defined by Mill and Wetstein, deserting the theories which underlie the majority of the texts published in later days.

I can well believe that the mere suggestion of the necessity of a backward step in criticism will be received by many with an incredulous smile: they will say what Dione said of Diomed,

νήπιος, οὐδὲ τὸ οἶδε κατὰ φρένα Τυδέος υἱός,
ὅττι μάλ' οὐ δηναιὸς ὃς ἀθανάτοισι μάχηται.

To such I can make but this reply: that every other textual hypothesis has been worn threadbare before it has been discarded: that I have adopted the present theory only after a long and careful investigation: and that I am confident that it will be found that the present re-statement of an ancient interpretation will lead to a permanent simplification of the perplexities of the New Testament text.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY NOTES ON THE CODEX BEZAE.

IT may be assumed that the search after the primitive form of the books of the New Testament, and in particular of the four Gospels, will demand the service of many minds, that have undergone very diverse forms of training. There must be a wide acquaintance with languages, if we are to understand the bearing of the Versions upon the restoration of the text, and give their evidence the right weight; there must be a keen Semitic feeling which is able to distinguish the Syriasm imported by a translator from that which belongs to the primitive apostolic idiom, or to restore the latter against editorial refinement; there must be a close study of the palaeography of the scripts which are involved in the problem; and this study must further be balanced by an acquaintance with the laws of phonetic change, so that we may not refer rare forms, when we meet with them, to mere accident or to the negligence of scribes. And in the grouping of the evidence and the estimation of the relative value of the possible solutions of the problem, a quick imagination must be side by side with a subtle reasoning power on the judgment-seat. It is too much to expect that all of these forms of fitness for critical work should be found in one person or in one school: each of the great New Testament scholars has his weak side; every successive school persists in neglecting some part or other of the evidence: and yet in spite of the slow steps by which the Textual Criticism of the New Testament is advancing, we are satisfied that it will not be long before resolute and patient labour will pluck the heart out of some of the mysteries which characterize the subject: the fields being white to the harvest, we may congratulate ourselves that the reapers are also ripening.

The object of this tract is to supply the workers with some fresh suggestions as to the handling of the central problem of the criticism of the New Testament, viz. the origin and meaning of the so-called Western Text. It is recognized that the earliest Eastern and Western witnesses to which we have access are characterized by a family likeness in their evidence: the Old Latin and the Old Syriac Versions of the Gospels bear witness to the diffusion of such a type of text in early times as we find in the Greek of the Codex Bezae: but all speculation as to the origin of this eccentric text has hitherto been unfruitful; we have run up against a dead wall, and to all appearance the wall is a pretty thick one. No one knows how this Western text came into being; we can indeed see it gradually corrected out of existence, or absorbed into revised texts both in the East and West; but its genesis is an enigma. It is clearly not altogether apostolic, for the interpolations which it contains resist such an inference; yet we cannot prove that it is unapostolic, for its antiquity is indisputable. Nor has the problem been rendered much easier by the recovery of the literature connected with the Tatian harmony: we may be sure that Tatian's text was Western, but whether it was Western in cause or effect, or both in cause and effect, is still unknown.

Now, in order to make the investigation a little easier, I propose to attack the question just at the hardest point: to make a new examination of the Western text in its leading monument, the great Cambridge manuscript, known as Codex Bezae, and to challenge it once again to tell its history.

The Codex Bezae in the Sixteenth Century.

It is well known that there have been very diverse opinions as to the origin of the MS. itself, to say nothing as to the origin of the text. Kipling, who edited the text so excellently for his day, was of opinion that the MS. had an Egyptian origin: in this belief he was followed by Schulz, who emphasised the same view in a valuable little dissertation on the subject. On the other hand, the moderns usually follow Scholz and Scrivener in the

opinion that the MS. is of Gallican origin, the Greek text being occasionally affected by Latin forms[1], and the Latin translation being vitiated by all sorts of decaying modes of speech, which intimate that the scribe was writing in the provinces, probably to the west of the Alps, and at a time when the Latin speech was breaking up. So that it is generally held that the Codex Bezae was written in the Rhône Valley, probably at Lyons where, according to Beza, it was found; and that it never was out of France (unless it be for a possible visit to the Council of Trent, whither it is said to have been carried by a French bishop) until it was presented by Beza to the University of Cambridge in the year A.D. 1581. And while the reasons for these conclusions are not perfectly decisive, they are cumulative and in the main convincing. Accordingly I shall not repeat in detail the arguments, which may be found in Scrivener's edition of the MS. or in any good textual handbook: our task lies in another direction. I am willing to grant the hypothesis of the Gallican origin of Codex Bezae as a basis upon which to build: if the foundation be a rotten one, the edifice will soon betray the fact. It may be further admitted that the MS. which Beza presented to the University of Cambridge is the same as the MS. which is quoted in the margin of Robert Stephen's New Testament of A.D. 1550 under the sign β, and which Stephen affirms to have been collated by certain of his friends in Italy: and it is possible that this identification may lead to the further admission, to which allusion was made above, that the Codex Bezae was carried to the Council of Trent in 1546 by William à Prato the bishop of Clermont in the Auvergne. But this point must be reserved for a closer examination. It is sufficient here to say that such a supposition at once explains the difficulty as to how a Lyons MS. could be collated in Italy.

But, while making these preliminary admissions, I do not admit that Beza ever recognized his own MS. in the β of Stephen; nor again, as Gregory[2] following Scrivener[3] asserts, that Beza had

---

[1] Such as λεπρωσος, φλαγελλωσας and the like, which might be expected from a Latin scribe writing a bilingual copy.

[2] *Prolegg. in Tischendorf*, pp. 213, 214.

[3] *Codex Bezae*, p. ix, note 3.

access to the collations of Henry Stephen. This last idea is a misunderstanding based on the prefaces of Beza's New Testament, which speak of a collation by Henry Stephen of all the good editions and of 25 MSS. But an examination of the annotations of Beza in his edition of 1598 will shew the following points: (1) that Beza quotes the sixteen authorities of Stephen from the margin of the edition of 1550, and treats them as sixteen MSS., although one of the authorities (α) is the Complutensian polyglott: (2) he numbers the authorities which he quotes as Stephen had numbered them; (3) he quotes the Codex Bezae and the β of Stephen as two distinct authorities: (4) the only other authorities which he uses are the Codex Claromontanus, and another MS. which had recently come into his possession. To establish these points it is only necessary to give a few instances. If we take the annotations to the 14th chapter of Matthew, we have

v. 2. *Iste*, Οὗτος. In secundo codice scriptum erat, μήτι οὗτος, id est, Num iste?

Baptista, ὁ Βαπτίστης. Veteres duo codices additum habent, ὃν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα, id est, quem ego decollaui.

Here a reference to the margin of Stephen shews

μήτι. β.
ὃν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα. β. δ.

v. 12. *Corpus*, σῶμα. Quoddam exemplar legit πτῶμα, id est cadauer, sicut etiam loquitur Marcus 6, 29. Praeterea in quibusdam codicibus additur relatiuum αὐτοῦ.

Here Stephen notes

πτῶμα. η.
αὐτοῦ. θ. ιδ´.

v. 19. *Et acceptis*, καὶ λαβών. Particula καὶ non erat in vetustis codic. neque reperitur in Vulgata versione.

Where Stephen notes against the καὶ

＼ἐν πᾶσι (＼ = deest).

v. 22. *Praeire sibi*, προάγειν αὐτόν... In quibusdam codicibus deest αὐτόν. Rursus in aliis legitur προάγειν sed mendosé.

Here there is no note in Stephen; *quibusdam codicibus* stands either for *quodam codice*, viz. the Codex Bezae: or for the Codex Bezae together with some other unknown copy. προάγειν (2°)

must be meant either for προσάγειν, which I cannot find the authority for, or for προάγιν, which is the spelling in Cod. Bezae. But as the itacism would surely not have been noticed, it is probably the former. The note is very confused.

v. 34. *Gennesaret*, Γεννησαρέτ. In duobus exemplaribus legimus Γεννησαρά, Gennesara. In alio quodam, Γεννσαρέθ, Genesareth.

Compare with this Stephen's margin

γεννησαρά. β.
γεννησαρέθ. γ.

It will be seen that the Codex Bezae appears in Beza as *duo exemplaria*, viz. D and β.

In the same way the famous interpolation concerning the man working on the Sabbath Day (Luke vi. 4) is referred to by Beza as found

in quodam exemplari et meo vetustissimo.

When Beza comes to the interpolation in John vi. 56, he does not notice that the passage is in his own beloved *vetustissimus*, but, seeing it quoted on the margin of Stephen as from β, he makes the following disgraceful note:

v. 53... Caeterum in uno codice vetusto mirum hic quiddam deprehendimus. Nam post ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, qui est finis versiculi 53, adscripta haec erant,... Haec ego sicut temere non expunxerim, ac praesertim priorem partem, quae totidem verbis alibi repetitur; ita non facile admiserim, quum in uno illo exemplari sint a nobis reperta. Certe alteram partem suppositam esse suspicor, quia simile nihil alibi invenio. Neque enim usquam fit mentio sumendi corporis, praeterito sanguine; et exemplar illud, unde haec desumpsimus, fuerat in Italia collatum, ubi facile fuit aliquid subiicere in Bohemorum (id est Evangelii) odium.

Similar distinction between Stephen's β and Cod. D may be seen in the case of the interpolations in Acts vi. 10 (*in meo vetustissimo et alio praeterea manuscripto*); in xvi. 35, which is quoted only from Stephen; and in xvi. 40, where Beza adds to Stephen's testimony the words, *et in meo vet. exemplari*. How closely his *apparatus* is identified with Stephen's may be seen in many cases: e.g. John xiii. 2, where Stephen merely says

γινομένου. β.

which Beza gives as

in vetustis codicibus omnibus, uno duntaxat excepto.

The foregoing specimens are sufficient to shew the accuracy of Hug's statements (*Introduction*, § lviii.), who shews reasons to believe that Beza's *apparatus* coincides closely with that of Stephen.

In fact Hug shews that, when in the first Bezan edition (A.D. 1565) we find that Beza used a collation of 25 MSS. (more or less) from the library of Stephen, we are to correct 25 to 15 (XV. for XXV.), and understand by this the *apparatus* on the margin of Stephen, with a possible deduction for the use of the Complutensian polyglott. In the second edition we have (A.D. 1576) seventeen MSS.; and this means the fifteen (or sixteen) of Stephen, *plus* either the Cod. Bezae or the Claromontanus or both. In the fourth edition, Beza has nineteen authorities, viz. the sixteen of Stephen, the Cod. Bezae, the Cod. Claromontanus, and another MS., which he says had recently come into his possession (e.g. in Matt. xxviii. 20 we have the note "caeterum in vetustissimo manuscr. codice, quem nuper sum nactus, sic ista scripta inueni" etc.). It will be seen that it is very doubtful whether we ought to take literally the statement that Beza handled the actual collations of Henry Stephen; these fifteen or sixteen collations could not have been contained in a single book, except in a printed book. And this means that if Beza handled anything, it was Stephen's text of A.D. 1550, with possibly a few additional notes. Hug is probably right in saying that "Stephanus scattered the various readings in his margin for that one, among his purchasers, who, at a future time, might desire to make use of them. This was Theodore Beza, a pupil of John Calvin, who appropriated the Scriptural collations, for which Robert was indebted to his son Henry."

And now let us go back from the time of Beza and Stephen towards the earlier history of our codex, and in particular to the sixth century when the MS. is supposed to have been written, and examine it with a view to detecting local peculiarities.

CHAPTER II.

THE LOCALITY OF THE CODEX BEZAE IN THE TENTH CENTURY.

As we ascend the stream of time we may take note of the marginal annotations which have been made in our MS. by different hands; and in particular there is a series of sentences in the margins of the text which would seem to intimate that the MS. was still in France in the tenth century. In order to explain this, I shall be obliged to refer to, and partly to reproduce, some notes which I made two or three years ago on the famous S. Germain Codex of the Latin Bible, known to New Testament students by the sign g^1, and published by Dr John Wordsworth in the first number of his *Old Latin Biblical Texts*[1].

Shortly after the publication of this text, this work was reviewed by M. Samuel Berger in the *Bulletin Critique* for 15 Sept. 1884, who remarked *inter alia* as follows: " L'Evangile de S. Jean est partagé dans le manuscrit en 316 sections, et 185 de ces paragraphes (si j'ai bien compté) sont accompagnés de courtes devises, sans aucune relation avec le texte de l'Evangile, écrites en un latin barbare, et dont voici, par exemple, quelques-unes. xxx. (c. iii. 1) *Perfectum opus.* xxxi. (iii. 3) *Insperata causa perficitur.* xxxii. (iii. 7) *Quod verum est dicito.* xxxiii. (iii. 9) *Si mentiris arguent te.* xxxiv. (iii. 12) *Gloria magna.* xxxv. (iii. 14) *Pro manifestatione.* xxxvi. (iii. 16) *De juditio quod verum est si dixeris, libens eris.* xxxviii. (iii. 19) *Ad peregrinationem itineris venies.* Il n'est pas possible de voir dans ces singulières notes autre chose que des formules de bonne aventure, de celle que l'on a appelées *sortes sanctorum.*"

---

[1] The Sortes Sanctorum in the S. Germain Codex, *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. IX., p. 58.

There is not the slightest doubt that M. Berger's explanation of these marginal sentences (which had been copied for Dr Wordsworth by Mr G. L. Youngman, but not understood by him) is correct. The book has been used for purposes of divination, a custom which seems to have prevailed widely in early times both in Civil and Ecclesiastical matters[1].

Without going into the matter in detail it will be sufficient to observe that the most probable method of using the *Sortes* would be by the selection of a number, for there are objections to the method of opening the book at random where the margins are thickly studded with sentences. Probably therefore a number was selected and the pages of the Gospel of John were turned until the sentence was found to which that number was attached.

By the kindness of Dr Wordsworth and the courteous assistance of one of the students in the Theological College at Salisbury, I have been furnished with a transcript of Mr Youngman's notes on these Sortes, and am enabled to draw one or two further conclusions. The transcript shews the successive sentences arranged with the attached numerals in a series running with frequent chasms from i. to ccxvi. (read cccxvi.). In a few cases the numeral is wanting, and there are occasionally slight clerical errors like the one just mentioned, which are capable of immediate rectification. We will examine the series of sentences more closely presently. Meanwhile let us turn to another peculiar feature of the Codex which has hitherto remained without explanation.

On fol. 89 b the following note is made by Dr Wordsworth (p. x.): "At the end of the letter to Damasus is a sort of wheel full of numbers, apparently some arrangement of the Canons which follow on 4½ pages." My attention was drawn to this wheel by Dr Wordsworth, with an enquiry whether any explanation could be given of it. In order to settle this point, I made a copy of the series of numbers in question. They are arranged in the separate compartments of a wheel with eight sectors; and a little examination shews that they have nothing to do, as far as can be seen by a cursory examination, with the Eusebian Canons; but,

---

[1] Prof. Robertson Smith has pointed out to me a curious analogous case of divination by opening the Koran at random, as practised by Walid. b. Yazīd who died A.H. 126. Cf. Ibn Athir (ed. Tornberg), v. 219.

observing that the numbers form a broken series from 1 to 316, we easily infer that the wheel is a part of the Sortes Sanctorum and that in some way or other its compartments are meant to be employed in the problem of determining one's destiny. So much is certain. We may not be able to say according to what method a number was selected from one of the eight compartments, but the relation between the wheel of numbers and the sections in St John's Gospel is certain. When we come to examine the numbered compartments more carefully in comparison with the numbered sentences, we find that in the majority of cases a number in one of the compartments corresponds to a number in the margins to which a sentence is attached, as of course it should do on the hypothesis of identity between the two series; but there are many cases in which the two series will not agree, and the suggestion arises in one's mind that perhaps the wheel of numbers was not made directly from the Codex, but that both it and the series may be derived from some earlier and more complete series. This supposition would easily explain the incomplete character of the numerical assonances; for example, in the first compartment of the wheel there are 33 numbers, of which 11 do not find a place in the numbers of the Sortes. We shall examine these and see whether the suspicion of an earlier set of divination sentences is confirmed in other directions.

Let us then turn to the Codex Bezae, where we shall find that the lower margins of the Gospel of St Mark contain, in a rude Greek hand, a succession of short sentences.

Of these Scrivener says (p. xxxvii.), "They consist of moral apophthegms, some of them silly enough." Amongst his facsimiles he gives a sentence from the margin of the verso of leaf 302:

εαν ψυση ελεγχουσιν σε

and conjectures that these rude uncials may be due to the hand that wrote the τίτλοι in Matthew and Mark, i.e. to a hand of the tenth century. Again, at the end of the book, he makes a collection of the sentences, 69 in number, but without noticing that they are a system of "Sortes Sanctorum."

When we examine these Greek Sortes by the side of the Latin system in the S. Germain MS. we easily see that they form a part

of the same system. For example, the sentence quoted above is evidently the same as appears in g^1, under the form "si mentiris, arguent te"; and this is only one out of a large number of coincidences so complete that we may be certain some connection exists between the two systems. Moreover the list in D may be seen to be a translation from the Latin, by a frequently prefixed word ἑρμηνεία: as if the sentences had originally stood in two languages in some bilingual codex.

In order to determine the nature of the relationship between our two series we must examine more closely, and we may easily assure ourselves in the first place that neither catalogue was taken from the other, for each list of sentences contains many things that are wanting in the other. But in the next place, if the two sets of sentences be arranged side by side, we can easily see that if a number be attached to each of the sentences in Codex Bezae corresponding to its place in the Codex, the sentences thus numbered will be in harmony with the actually numbered passages in the S. Germain Codex. In order to make this clear we may actually write down the first portions of each of the two catalogues as follows, the S. Germain list being given completely and the parallel sentences noted from the other list:

S. Germain Cod.	Codex Bezae.
(i) cessa ei certaueris.	(i) αφες μι φιλονικησις.
(ii) qd fit cõplebitũ.	(ii) το γενωμενον τελιουτε.
(iii) non ad ipsis causa.	(iii) ουκ επιτυχανις του παργμᾱτŏς.
(iv) perficitur causa.	(iv) τελιουμενον παραμα.
(? xiii) spes bona, gaudium fiet.	(xiv) απο λυπις ης χαραν.
(xv) est decẽ dies fiet.	(xv) μετα δεκα ημερας γινετε.
(xviii) et bene.	(xviii) ακολουθησον καϊ καλον ου γινετε.
(xxii) perfectũ opus.	(xxii) τεληουμενον παργμα καλον.
(xxii, l. xxiv) credere quia causa bona ū.	(xxiv) πιστευσον οτη το παργμα καλον εστιν.
etc.	etc.

The barbarisms are easily corrected in the foregoing: *ad ipsis*, for example = *adipisceris*, and so on. These corrections being made, it is seen that, as far as it goes, the list in Codex Bezae is complete, though only a fragment of the original scheme; and

that the list in the S. Germain MS. is a series of extracts from the original scheme.

The agreement between the numbers shews that the Beza sentences and the S. Germain sentences are taken from a numbered series of sentences similar to that in the S. Germain Codex, i.e. the numbers are not due to the sectional arrangement of St John in the S. Germain Codex into 316 paragraphs, but to a similar arrangement in a previous Codex. And since the S. Germain Codex has these paragraph divisions also in common with the original from which the Sortes were taken, it follows that this original may very well have been, at least in St John, the MS. from which the S. Germain Codex took the foundation of its text. We thus throw into very close relation the Codex Bezae, the S. Germain Codex, and the archetype of the latter in St John.

Moreover, the two series of annotations belong nearly to the same period of time; the S. Germain MS. being of the ninth century, and the Bezan annotator being referred by Scrivener to the tenth. And since the two Codices in question are both found in modern times in French abbeys, we may perhaps be allowed to assume that the Codex Bezae was in France in the tenth century.

2 *

CHAPTER III.

The Codex Bezae in the Ninth Century.

On fol. 150 b of the MS. there is a liturgical note by a hand of the ninth century, at the top of the left hand column, to the following effect

$$τη κυριακη των προφὅτησματων$$

accompanied by the labarum with α and ω. This note is rather perplexing: but it seems to be a corruption for

$$τη κυριακη των προφωτισματων$$

i.e. it indicates a lesson beginning at John xii. 1 which is the top of the column, for some Sunday connected with those who have been approved as candidates for baptism, and who in the language of the Church are already *φωτιζόμενοι, illuminati*. But what Sunday can this be, and what service can be especially given up to the imperfectly initiated Catechumens? I think the answer must be as follows: it is some Sunday before Easter when the Catechumens pass through another stage of their novitiate, and probably it will be the time of the delivery to them of the Symbol of the Faith (*traditio Symboli*). Now this rite took place in the Gallican Churches on Palm-Sunday, as we may see from the lectionary of Luxeuil, a thoroughly Gallican book of the seventh century, which marks the Legenda in Dominica Palmarum as follows:

Lectio *Hierimias prophetae.*
Epistola Pauli apostoli ad Hebraeos.
and Lectio *Sancti Evangelii secundum Iohannem.*

Diebus illis ante sex dies Paschae, venit Dominus Iesus Bethaniam, ubi fuerat Lazarus mortuus, etc... *usque* Nisi granum frumenti cadens in

terram mortuum fuerit, ipsum solum manet: si autem mortuum fuerit, multum fructum affert:

i.e. John xii. 1—24: and that this is the lesson for the *Missa in Symboli traditione* may be seen from numerous references in Western writers: it was the custom for example in Milan in the days of Ambrose, as the following extract from his 20th Epistle will shew: "Sequenti die, erat autem dominica, post lectiones atque tractatum, dimissis catechuminis, symbolum aliquibus competentibus in baptisteriis tradebam basilicae." He is speaking of what happened on a certain Palm-Sunday.

The same day is fixed by Isidore for the Spanish Churches; "hoc die Symbolum competentibus traditur propter confinem Dominicae Paschae solemnitatem: ut qui iam ad Dei gratiam percipiendam festinant fidem quam confiteantur agnoscant[1]."

Isidore tells us that the common name for this Sunday was Capitilavium, because, as we might almost have guessed from the lesson read, the baptized infants on this day received unction and had their heads washed, in remembrance of our Lord's visit to Bethany, and the washing and anointing of His *feet* by Mary.

We may add to the foregoing references the decree of the Council of Agde (A.D. 506). "Symbolum etiam placuit ab omnibus ecclesiis una die, id est ante octo dies dominicae resurrectionis, publice in ecclesia competentibus tradi."

We may be sure then that the lesson marked by the corrector, whom Scrivener calls J, is the old Gallican lesson for Palm-Sunday, as we find it in the seventh century lectionary of Luxeuil. We can hardly then allow that the Codex Bezae was far away from France in the ninth century, for by this time it is not likely that the Gallican use was still in force at Milan. And at any rate, when we put this piece of evidence side by side with what has gone before, it will be admitted that the Gallican features are becoming prominent.

It may be perhaps objected that substantially the same lesson is used in the Greek Church in the Liturgy for Palm-Sunday: but a Greek scribe would have simply called it the κυριακὴ τῶν βαΐων. Moreover we do not deny the occasional agreement between the Gallican and Greek systems. We simply observe that it is not

---

[1] Isidore, *De Offic. Eccl.*, c. 27.

the Roman system that we have here, and we try to interpret liturgically the Greek heading by which the day in question must have been known in the Western Calendar[1].

Almost contemporary with these liturgical annotations of the scribe J, but perhaps a few years later, there is a long series by another scribe L: there are 149 places where Scrivener notes his handiwork, and he refers all the lessons in question to the ordinary Greek synaxarion. No doubt there is a close connexion between the Greek and Gallican rituals, but the matter is by no means as simple as Scrivener represents it.

The lists of lessons introduced by L are usually given in the form *αναγνοσμα*, followed in many cases by *περι του σαββατου* or *περι του κυριακη*. But it is very seldom indeed that any indication is given of the Sabbath or Sunday that is intended.

This of itself is an indication that the lessons were not marked in from a synaxarion, but from a more simple order like the Lectiones Dominicales in the Bobbio Sacramentary[2] where a series of Missae Dominicales is given with an appropriate lesson, together with the special services for *Depositio Sacerdotis*, and for the *Missa Defunctorum*, etc.

The scribe L had a book something like this, with a series of Saturday and Sunday Lessons unattached to any special days: he had also the lesson for the Departed, and the lessons for Holy Week and a few great festivals.

We have not, however, succeeded in identifying his system.

---

[1] The so-called Missale Gothicum has a special service,

Missa in Symboli Traditione.

That this is meant for Palm Sunday may be seen by the various prayers: e.g.

Immolatio Missae.

Vere dignum et justum est......

Tibi enim cum lingua coma sorsivit arborea, cum arenosa itinera ramis viruerunt composita etc.

And that the lesson read is from John xii. may be seen *inter alia* from the

Collectio in Pacem.

Universorum ipse dominator qui conditor, creaturae tuae praestanter amabilis et amator, *cui Martha satagit, Maria pedes abluit, cum quo Lazarus redivivus accumbit* etc.

[2] Muratori, *Sacramentarium Gallicanum* in Musaeo Italico, I. p. 273 sqq.

If, for instance, we look on fol. 120 b of our MS. we find that L has noted a lesson, apparently John v. 19—24, as [π]ερι αναπαυ-αμενος; this Scrivener identifies with the lesson John v. 17—24, which is given in Greek synaxaria for the fourth day of the second week after Easter. The lesson, however, is evidently meant for the *Missa Defunctorum* (τῶν ἀναπαυομένων), and therefore the reference to Easter Week is meaningless.

That ἀναπαύω is the right word to describe the intermediate state may be seen from Luke xvi. 23, where the scribe has expanded the passage και λαζαρον εν τω κολπω αυτου by the addition of the word αναπαυομενον; cp. also Apoc. xiv. 13.

In the Bobbio Sacramentary, which is supposed to contain so much ancient Gallican matter, the lesson is not the one marked in Cod. Bezae; but the somewhat similar passage, John vi. 39, 40, is read in the *Missa Defunctorum*, and the lesson John v. 24—29 is read in connection with the *Missa Sacerdotis Defuncti*.

It seems, then, that the system of the scribe L was not unlike that of the Bobbio MS., but cannot be identified with it.

The same thing is true when we examine the systems more closely; on fol. 87 b, for instance, the lesson Matt. xxv. 31—46 is marked by L as αναγνοσμα περι του κυριακη: and Scrivener accordingly identifies it with the κυριακὴ τῆς ἀποκρέω: it is, however, marked in the Bobbio MS. as an ordinary Dominical Lection: and if we could find a sufficient number of similar coincidences, we should say that the system of this Sacramentary was the system of the Bezan annotator. The verifications, however, are not forthcoming, and we can only say that there is reason to suspect the existence of some liturgical usage current in Eastern or Southern France which would turn out to be exactly parallel to that in the Codex Bezae. Such a system would be derived ultimately from a very early and simple form of what we now know as the Greek Synaxarion.

We do not, however, pretend to have thrown much direct light upon the nationality of the corrector whom Scrivener calls L

CHAPTER IV.

SIXTH CENTURY GALLICISMS OF CODEX BEZAE.

THOSE who have held the theory of the Gallic origin of the Codex Bezae have done so on the ground that there were words in the Latin text which belonged not merely to the Vulgar Latin as distinguished from the classical speech, but to those dialectical forms of the Vulgar Latin which were supposed to be characteristic of Southern Gaul.

For example, Scholz in the Introduction to his New Testament[1] says

"In Gallia meridionali patria codicis quaerenda est. Etiam orthographia in vocibus latinis servata v. c. *temptatio, quotiens, thensaurus, anticus, locuntur, inicus, secuntur* huic certe regioni magis quam alii convenit; voces *soniis* (gallicè *soins*) (μερίμναις), *refectio* (κατάλυμα), *sideratos* (κυλλούς), *involet* (κλέψῃ), *demorari* (διατρίβειν), *natatoria piscina* (κολυμβήθρα), *taediari* (κηδεμονεῖν), *applaudat* (ῥήσσει), *certabatur* (διαχυρίζετο), *sestertia ducenta* (ἀργυρίου μυριάδας πέντε), *(δηνάριον), in aliam regionem plane non quadrant: sunt enim voces gallicae."

With this list Scholz practically dismisses the subject. It need scarcely be said that a modern student would hardly be convinced by such a list[2]: in fact the only word in all Scholz's array that carries much weight is the word *soniis*, used as an equivalent of μερίμναις. But even in this case (which we shall enquire into more carefully by and by) there is great difficulty in the determination of the origin of the form, and much doubt as to whether Scholz has given its true French equivalent. But leaving this on one side, and remembering that the student of

---

[1] p. xxxix.

[2] Imagine the geographical delineation of the sign * for *denarius*; the Diocletian edict which fixed prices throughout the whole Roman Empire uses this sign!

Latin inscriptions is constantly baffled in his work by too hasty attempts to give a local habitation to special forms and spellings, we think it best not to begin by discussing in detail every word which may be supposed to have a Gallic flavour, but to proceed in a new manner, independently of earlier investigators, so that our results may be based as far as possible upon new observations, and not derive their weight from their possible consensus with the conclusions of Kipling, or Scholz, or Scrivener.

On the hypothesis that the Codex Bezae was written in Gaul, presumably not very far from the place where Beza said it was found, i.e. at Lyons,—or if we prefer to think, from the fact that Beza in his last edition called it Claromontanus (as though he had found out in his last days that he had been misinformed as to its origin by the person who sold it to him), that it was written not far from Clermont,—we have to transport ourselves in thought to the Gaul of the sixth century at the time when the Keltic population was being hurled back by Frankish invaders, and when the earlier colonists from the Eastern shores of the Mediterranean, who had civilized the Rhône Valley, were far on the road to absorption and disintegration amongst the younger and more vigorous populations that were disputing the right to existence in Central and Southern France. Amongst these struggling populations we find an active Christian Church with a ritual and liturgy of its own, which can be distinguished in many ways from the corresponding Roman rituals, by the prevalence of many Greek and Oriental customs and formulae which never seem to have taken root in Rome itself. Whether these peculiarities be original with the Church that emigrated from Smyrna to the banks of the Rhône in the second century, or whether they are to be referred to some later influence, is not the immediate question for us. It is sufficient to say that the Gallican ritual had many Eastern features. Let us take an instance; in the Gallican Mass, after the entry of the officiating bishop and the preliminary sentences, the service proceeds with the *Trisagion*, the *Kyrie Eleison*, and the *Benedictus*, after which the lessons from the Scriptures begin. Now this use of the Trisagion in this connection is not a Roman custom; in fact we have in the place of it the *Gloria in excelsis*. But it was a custom of the early Gallic

Church, for we find it enforced by the second council of Vaison (A.D. 529) in a manner which shews that it was a feature of the worship of the settlements in the Rhône Valley[1]: the language of the Council is as follows:

"in omnibus missis, seu in matutinis, seu in quadrigesimalibus, seu in illis quae pro defunctorum commemoratione fiunt, semper Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus eo ordine quo modo ad missas publicas dicitur, dici debeat; quia tam sancta et tam dulcis et desiderabilis vox, etiam si die noctuque possit dici, fastidium non possit generare."

We see that the object of the Council is to make the use of the Trisagion a general feature of Christian worship.

Now let us see how the French Christians pronounced this often repeated Greek word.

A reference to the life of Saint Géry, the bishop of Cambrai in the seventh century, gives us the following, "Aius, Aius, Aius per trinum numerum imposuit in nomine Trinitatis[2]." It appears then that this word came to be pronounced *Aius* instead of *Agios*, which does not at all surprise us, knowing how easily the aspirates are misplaced in Low Latin, and how in French similar words wear away, as for example, Augustus passes into Août, so that the middle consonant weakens and disappears, especially when the accent is on the first syllable.

Now if we turn to the account of the Gallican ritual given by S. Germain of Paris[3] at the end of the sixth century, we find the canticles at the commencement of the service described as follows:

DE AIVS.

Aius vero ante prophetiam pro hoc cantatur in graeca lingua.... Incipiente praesule Aius psallit, dicens latino cum greco.

Further on in the service we have

DE AIUS ANTE EVANGELIUM.

Tunc in adventu sancti Evangelii claro modulamine denuo psallet clerus Aius in specie angelorum ante faciem Christi, &c.

[1] In this and the following paragraphs, I am drawing largely on the account of the Gallican Service given by Duchesne, *Origines du Culte Chrétien*, and on the Gallican liturgies published by Mabillon, Muratori &c.

[2] *Analecta Bollandiana*, t. VII. p. 393.

[3] Migne, *Patr. Lat.* t. LXXII. from Martene, *Thes. Anecd.* t. v.

Or if again we turn to the so-called Gallican Sacramentary published by Muratori from a Bobbio MS. of the seventh century[1], which Muratori himself believed to come from the province of Besançon, where was the abbey of Luxeuil from whence Columban migrated to Italy, we shall find another instance of the curious pronunciation of the word in question. The Missal referred to begins with a ritual of mixed Roman and Gallican usage, headed "Missa Romensis Cottidiana." Here we find the sentences

Dicitur post Aios

Tu, summe Deus, Aios, ipse sanctus, omnipotens Sabaoth, etc.

And near the end

Collectio post Aios

Iudicia tua, Deus, etc.

There is, therefore, no doubt as to the pronunciation of the word in the Gallican Church, and in fact the last MS. quoted carries the usage up to the seventh century. And this being so, we need not doubt that we have also the correct spelling in the MS. of S. Germain previously quoted.

It would, therefore, seem that the pronunciation of the word Ἅγιος was Ἅιος at a very early time in the Gallican Church, before the Greek had disappeared from the service and been replaced by the Latin: for we need not suppose that in the cases referred to the spelling is due to the transcribers of some later period. It is evidently the spelling, as the pronunciation is the pronunciation, of the end of the sixth century.

The question which we ask then is this: are there any traces of similar phonetic decline in the Codex Bezae? can we find the form Ἅιος, or in default of this any similar forms? We know that the French language from an early period is full of such weakenings: the names of places shew it even better than the parts of speech. That Lugdunum, for example, in some way passes from its Kelto-Roman form (Llwych-dun) into the French Lyons is certain[2]. So too Bordeaux stands for Burdigalium;

[1] Muratori, *Museum Italicum*, I. p. 273 sqq. Migne, *Patr. Lat.* LXXII. 448. Duchesne on p. 150 refers the publication of this sacramentary to Mabillon.

[2] The old catalogue of the Corbey MSS., which is referred to the eleventh

and Autun for an ancient Augustodunum; and Loire for Liger; in the same way the gulf of Lions derives its name, in all probability, from an original name 'sinus Ligusticus,' = Λιγύων, as it does not seem possible to connect it immediately with the city of Lyons[1]. Similarly in the case of some other letters, as Rhône for Rhodanus. Let us, then, see what similar forms occur in the Codex Bezae of the weakening of the "g" sound before a vowel either in the Greek or Latin.

In Luke viii. 36 we find in the Greek

ΑΠΗΓΓΕΙΛΑΝ ΓΑΡ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ ΟΙ ΙΔΟΝΤΕΣ ΠΩΣ ΕΣΩΘΗ Ο ΛΙΩΝ,

where ΛΙΩΝ stands for ΛΕΓΙΩΝ as the Latin shews.

Is this a mere scribe's slip of the pen, or is it an attempt to represent the pronunciation?

In Acts xiii. 5 we have

ΚΑΤΗΝΓΕΙΛΑΝ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΚΥ

Was the scribe assisted in the error of writing λόγον as λον by the weakness of the middle consonant? Probably the reader will laugh at the idea; but let him turn to Acts xiii. 46, where he will read

ΥΜΕΙΝ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ ΗΝ ΛΑΛΗΘΗΝΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΥ

and he will be obliged to admit that the repeated error is curious, if it be simply palaeographic, and not phonetic[2]. Again in John xiv. 9 he will read

ΚΑΙ ΠΩΣ ΣΥ ΛΕΙΣ ΔΕΙΞΟΝ ΗΜΕΙΝ...

Then turn to the Latin text of the MS. and notice how often similar loss of syllables occurs.

In Matt. xxii. 5 we have

qui autem neglentes abierunt,

where we should expect *negligentes*.

---

century, shews an early stage of the corruption of the word: it gives *Herenei episcopi Ludunensis contra omnes hereses.*

[1] The name 'Sinus Ligusticus' does not seem, however, to have been traced west of Genoa.

[2] Probably a similar error is found in Luke viii. 53 και κατελουν αυτον, where we should have κατεγελων: but the verb-form was changed to γελεω and the γ not sounded in the compound word.

In Luke xx. 27

> eius tacuerunt accentes autem,

for *accedentes*, is a similar case.

In Luke xxi. 23

> erit enim nessitas magna super terra,

for *necessitas*. We begin then to suspect that, instead of the Beza text being a collection of blunders, it may be a valuable storehouse of transitional forms in the language at a time when many changes were going on.

Are not these the very forms that we should expect in the early stages of a language which made *eo* and *jo* out of *ego*, *froid* out of *frigidus*, *soleil* out of *soleculus*, *genou* out of *genoculum*, *fraile* out of *fragile*, *trente* out of *triginta*, *bonheur* out of *bonum augurium*, and the like? We must clearly carry our enquiry after French and late Vulgar Latin forms in the Codex Bezae much further, and be prepared to find cases in which the scribe has been credited with blunders where he is phonetically perfectly correct.

Let us turn to Luke xi. 5

> et ibit ad eum
> media nocte et dicit illi amie.

We should naturally pass this *amie* as a pure blunder, but we turn to Matt. xxvi. 50 and find nearly the same form

> ad quod venisti ame,

so that the spelling is not an error of the unconscious kind: there is method in this scribe's noddings. We find ourselves here on the road to the French *ami*: and I think we may say that, if this instance is a good one, we part company at this point with any one who is disposed to hold that the scribe of the Beza MS. was an Italian; for the Italian language preserves the form *amico*, i.e. it has hardly deviated from the Latin. Or again let us look at Matt. xxviii. 15, we have

> apud iudaeos. usque in hoernum diem.

The word *hoernum* attracts attention from its deviation from the conventional *hodiernus*. We might pass it, but in Acts ii. 47 we find

cottie in unum in ecclesia,

where we should expect *cottidie*, and in Acts x. 30

et cornelius ait a nustertiana die,

where we ought to have *nudiustertiana*. In every case the syllable *di* has disappeared.

Now let us turn to the French language, and examine the form which the Latin *hodie* takes; we have as its equivalent *aujourd'hui* where *hui* evidently stands for *hodie*; the change being the same as in the Beza Codex. And again we see that this is not the change which we should expect from an Italian scribe, who would write something nearer to the modern form *oggi*.

Let us now look at some curious verb-forms. Turning to Luke ix. 3, we find

et sanare infirmos et dix ad eos,

where we should naturally say, ex errore pro *dixit*.

But let us compare Mark vi. 27,

sed statim mis speculatore,

for *misit speculatorem*, and we see that it is a similar case to the preceding; and the dropping of the final syllable is not accidental, it is the result of phonetic law. And as in the French the unaccented syllable weakens away so that *dixit* becomes in French *dit*, (for *dist?*), and in Italian *disse*, our scribe throws off the final syllable of his verb-forms.

In words of more than two syllables, the weakness is usually felt in the syllable after the tone, where the middle consonant, as we have shewn by many instances, will drop out and a new combination of vowels will take place.

In Mark i. 3,

rectas fate semitas dī nostri,

the first hand has written the letters *ci* over *fate*; but we may reasonably believe that he had a motive for his first erroneous transcription, i.e. the spelling which he gives is the local Vulgar Latin pronunciation of the verb: which is exactly represented by the modern Italian, and stands very near indeed to what the French form must have been before the supplemental *s* in *faites* was developed (probably by analogy).

We can support this reasoning by another similar case, of weakness in a word in common usage, in Matt. xviii 25,

Non hante eo unde redderet,

where we ought to have *habente.* This *hante* is the first stage towards the French *ayant.* And that the syllable in question really was subject to this weakness may be seen, as we shall shew by and by, by the French and other Romance futures, where we find the Vulgar Latin *cantare habeo* become *chanterai* because *habeo* itself reduces to *ai.*

This case speaks more strongly for a French locality than for an Italian, because, although the Italian exhibits some cases of the weakened forms of *habeo* (as *ho, hanno* against *ebbe,* etc.), yet in this participial form it writes *avendo* and thus preserves the *b* sound.

Occasionally in the Beza MS. we find a point placed over a letter, but it is not easy to see with what intention, whether it is to indicate something as to the breathing, or whether it is a simple erasure of the letter in question, or non-sounding of it by the reader. For instance, in Mark xiv. 3, we find

ampullam nardi pistici pretiosi,

where the word *ampullam,* which seems to be a diminutive of *amphora,* is marked with a point as if the writer wished to pronounce it *ammulam* or *amulam.* And he has done something of the same kind in Mark xiv. 13 where he has marked *amphorae* in the same way, as if again the letter *p* were not to be sounded. But did the Vulgar Latin speech really say *amula* in the time when the Codex Bezae is supposed to have been written? Let us examine; there is a ninth-century MS. of the Ordo Romanus (Cod. Parisinus 974) written probably by a Frankish hand, which Duchesne has published as an Appendix to his *Origines du Culte Chrétien.* The writer says expressly that he is writing in the Vulgar-Latin: "Curavimus, non grammatico sermone, sed aperte loquendo veritatem indicare." The MS. was originally in the possession of the church of Saint-Amand en Puelle, being inscribed with the words " Almae ecclesiae sancti Amandi in Pabula liber." We should naturally regard it, then, as a French MS.

When the writer describes the offerings made for the altar he expresses himself as follows:

Et diaconi recipiunt amulas et portatur stationarius calix a subdiacono regionario, et refundit diaconus ammulas in ipso calice sancto. Et dum repletus fuerit, devacuatur in sciffo quas portant acholithi.... Deinde revertitur (pontifex) ad permanent diaconi ad amulas recipiendas.

Further on he uses the alternative term *ampulla*; e.g.

tunc vadunt diaconi et tollent ampullas cum oleo que ponuntur a diversis etc.[1].

Et venit ad eum regionarius secundus et accipit ab eo ampullas cum balsamo.

Et vadet ante pontificem et stat ante eum cum ampulla[2].

It appears then from the MS. that it was proper in the Vulgar Latin of the period to pronounce the word as *amula*; and this explains the occurrence of the erasing point in the Codex Bezae.

This may seem to be a trifle; but it is just such trifles as these that confirm the argument for the Gallic origin of the scribe of Codex Bezae.

Having noticed, then, the way in which the scribe has indicated the pronunciation which he wished the reader to follow in the case of the word *ampulla*, let us see whether there are any similar cases in the text, where a letter is marked for erasure, or where attention is called to it for any other purpose.

In Acts xx. 31,

quia triennio noćte ac die,

it seems reasonable to suppose that the c in *nocte* was not sounded, so that the word was already far in decline towards the forms which we find in French as *nuit* and in Italian as *notte*. Nor is it surprising that the weakness of the speech should show itself early in a common word like this. The form given in the MS. is a shade nearer to the Italian than the French, but is recognized to be the parent of them both; the forms being taken from the oblique *noctem* where m is no longer sounded.

A very curious case occurs in Acts xix. 36,

oportet vos questos esse.

---

[1] Duchesne, l.c. p. 450.   [2] p. 451.

The erasing point comes in here on account of a tendency in the Vulgar Latin to break up words artificially into imaginary compounds: thus they separated *prodest prodesse* etc. into *prode est* and *prode esse*, until at last *prode* came to be regarded as a real word, even as early as in the Codex Claromontanus. It is found also in Cod. Bezae in Luke ix. 25. Something similar seems to have happened to *oportet*: for Schuchardt quotes one case of its decomposition[1] (viz. *oportum est*), and it is possible that the pronunciation of our MS. intimates a similar change.

In Acts vi. 8 the scribe has marked the *p* in *stephanus* with a point of erasure; meaning, as I suppose, that it was no longer sounded: the letter is, in fact, absent from the French *Étienne*, but is preserved in Italian (*Stefano*).

In Acts xx. 9,

> sedens autem quidam iubenis,

the scribe intimates the non-pronunciation of the final *s* in *sedens*; sometimes he actually drops the participial ending, as in Acts xix. 16,

> insilien in eos homo.

These participial endings we shall discuss more at length by and by.

If we compare the French *celui* with its old form *icelui*, we shall see that the first word of the pair *ecce illui*, out of which it has been derived, has been subject to aphaeresis; and a similar thing must be said of the form *icist = cist*, and of the Italian *costui* which must be traced to *ecce istui*. It is interesting to notice the traces of this weakening in the first syllable of *ecce* in the writing of our MS.

In Luke xvii. 21,

> neque dicent ecce hic aut cce illi,

where we should pass it as a blunder if it were not that the same thing occurred in Luke xiv. 2,

> observantes eum et cce homo.

We may take it then that our scribe was disposed not to sound the initial vowel, and this feature is the first stage of

---

[1] *Der Vokalismus des Vulgar-lateins*, ii. 504, 505.

the aphaeresis of the syllable in the Romance languages. In Matt. iv. 11 we have

et e'cce angeli accesserunt,

which is a curious case of the syllable-division, but whether the initial letter is sounded is uncertain. The point is near the top of the line and may intimate the erasure of the *e*.

Reviewing the series of illustrations which have been given above of forms which may properly be called Romance Forms, we may conclude that the balance of the evidence is in favour of regarding the MS. as a Gallic rather than an Italian production. And if this were so, we should hardly expect that in the sixth century it was very far from the place where Beza said it was found; i.e. Lyons, or, as Beza says in his last edition (probably acting on better information), Clermont in the Auvergne.

We shall now pass from those forms which belong to the Romance languages to the forms which belong more nearly to the Vulgar Latin of the Empire, and try and extract from them some account of their local habitations.

Additional Note to c. IV. on Scholz's list of Gallicisms in the Codex Bezae.

We are now in a position to examine Scholz's crucial instance of Gallicism in the Codex Bezae: viz. the use of the word *soniis* as a translation of *μεριμναις* in Luke xxi. 34. Concerning this word Scrivener notes (pp. xliv f.):

"Scholz and others have noticed *soniis* (μεριμναις) in Luke xxi. 34 only, for which *a*, *c* have *solicitudinibus*; *b*, *f* *cogitationibus*; *e* and the Vulgate *curis*. That *sonius*, which is not a Latin word at all, is connected with *svinus* and the French *soin* is plain enough, and Ducange cites from one Latin and Greek Glossary 'somnium φροντις ιδιωτικως,' from another 'somnior μεριμνω,' whence was corrupted *sonius*, thence *soinus* and *soin*. ('Nisi competens soinus eum detineat.' Leges Henr. I. Regis Angliae cap. 29 in Ducange *Medii Aevi Latinitas*, sub voce *Sunnis*.)"

Now in the first place, we need not hesitate to regard *somnium* in the Glossaries quoted as a mere error, or at all events an equivalent of *sonium*. For Ducange points out the following cases of substitution of the former word for the latter:

Vetus placitum in Vita Aldrici episc. Cenoman. p. 110. Ne infirmitas aut legitima somnis eum detinuerit, etc.

Ita perperam *somnis* habetur in lege Langobard. lib. 2, tit. 43, § 1, et *sumnis* lib. 3, tit. 23, § 3.

It seems clear that these alternative spellings are mere scribe's errors, and that the real spelling of the word is *sunnis* or *sonnis*, which would answer very well to the *sonium* of our text ; and would certainly be the parent of the French word *soin*.

Two things may be said with regard to this word ; on the one hand, it has every appearance of being a German word : on the other, it occurs in all the Romance languages, and must therefore be regarded as Low Latin. Its earliest appearance is in the laws of the Franks. Let us turn to the Salic Law, and we shall find as follows :

xlvii.   ...Et si quis commonitus fuerit et eum sunnis non tenuerit et ad placitum venire distulerit tunc ille qui cum eum negotiavit mittat tres testes quomodo ei nunciasset ut ad placitum veniret.

We have only to compare with this allusion to a detention by *sunnis*, the authorities cited by Ducange under *essoin*, to see that the two words are equivalent :

Essonia, exonia, exonium. Essonium de malo lecti, cum quis morbo ita detinetur in lecto ut ad judicium venire non potest...Prima statuta Roberti Regis Scotiae. *Pro essonio, quod Gallice vocatur mal de lit, hoc est malum de lecto, Anglice Bed evill.* Essoine de maladie residente in Consuet. MS. Normann.

Essoine is therefore the French equivalent of *exonium*, artificially formed from *sonium*.

But if the word occurs so early as the Salic Law, it may be suggested that it is a Frankish word ; and if we turn to Kern's account of the Frankish words in the lex Salica[1] we find the following suggestions :

§ 231. *Sunni*, stem *sunnia* (which occurs already in Tit. I, and which we find again in Sect. 2), means a lawful excuse, impedimentum legitimum, exceptio. The M. D. (Middle Dutch) word is *nootsinne*; O. N. nauðsyn; a derivative is N. D. verb *vernootsingen* to excuse (sig = oneself) by proving a lawful impediment ; in the municipal law of Zutphen "ten ware sake dat hij sig dede vernootsinnigen, te weten dat hij door lijfsmoodt, watersmoodt, ofti heerengebodt verhindert ware geweest."

Kern goes on to suggest a connexion with the Gothic *sunja*, truth ; *sunjon sik ἀπολογεῖσθαι, sunjons ἀπολογία,* and the Latin *sontica causa, insons.*

That is, Kern does not feel quite clear in his mind as to whether he is dealing with a word derived from the Gothic *sunja* or the Latin *sons*. What is certain is that the word in question is in use among the Salian Franks at the very earliest period, viz. before the time of writing of the Codex Bezae. And since the word passes over into the French language, it is not surprising that its occurrence was hailed as a convincing proof of Gallicism. But we must not make such conclusion too rapidly, for, as we have intimated, the

3 *

---

[1] Hessel's edition, p. 538.

word turns up in all the Romance languages: if we are to regard *soin* and *essoin* as belonging to this stem, we can hardly exclude *besoin*: and this group of words is widely diffused: we have the Provençal *besonh bezonh*, the old Catalonian *besonh*, the Italian *bisogno*, and the Rhaeto-romanian *basengs*, to set against the Old French *besoing*; and just in the same way as the French *témoin* is derived by *temoing* from the Latin *testimonium*, we may infer a Low-Latin word *sonium* if not *besonium*. In the same way we find the Provençal *sonh soing*, *suenh*, and the Old Italian *sogna*, and the Wallachian *sogn*, over against the French *soin*.

It will be seen that we have here a veritable problem: if we say that we are dealing with a Germanic stem, we must go on to recognize that *besoin* contains a Germanic prefix *bi* equivalent to the modern German *bei*; and we have then to assume that the words in question came into France with the Frankish invaders and into Italy with the Lombards, which would of course explain why it turns up in the Salic laws, in the laws of Childebert and Chlotarius[1] and in the laws of the Lombards.

But it is very difficult to believe that *besoin* is a German word, in view of the fact that no trace of it can be found in the German speech, while *every* Romance language has it.

The other supposition is that the word is truly a Romance word, and the prefix *bes* has been added, which in Romance languages gives a bad sense to the word to which it is attached, so that if *soin* meant simply *care*, *besoin* would mean *anxiety* and so *necessity*.

To this Diez objects that in that case the Romance languages ought to show the word written with a double *s*: and Littré replies that the double letter does occur in the Old Catalonian.

It seems to me that this latter hypothesis must be the true one: we may take it for granted that the Latin term *sontica causa* is the equivalent in the Roman Law for the *sunnis* of the Law books quoted above: but if that be the case, it can hardly be an accident that Frankish lawyers called a legal excuse by the name of *sunnis* which compares so well with the Roman *sons*, which is the root of *sontica*. The early Frankish and Lombard lawyers must therefore have been under the influence of the Roman Law, and the word which they use is a Roman legal loan-word.

There is then no difficulty about the diffusion of the word in the Roman speech.

In any case it will be difficult to limit the word as found in the Codex Bezae to the position of the country under the power of the Frankish invaders. It might just as easily be an Italian word: and while we readily admit that if the Frankish origin could be established, the word in the Codex would fairly belong to a scribe writing under Frankish dominion, and so Scholz's contention would be established; yet we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the word may after all be Vulgar Latin and not necessarily Vulgar Latin of as late a

---

[1] Ducange. Adde placitum Childeberti et Chlotarii § 5. *Si placitum sunnis non detricaverit.*

period as the sixth century. I do not then think that it is clear that *sonis* has been substituted for some earlier word *solicitudinibus* or *cogitationibus*: it is quite possible that it may be an archaic translation, for which various substitutes have been suggested by transcribers and re-translators.

Scholz also points out that in the Codex Bezae in John x. 10 *involet* is a translation of κλέψη, and we may suppose that it was the similarity between the word and the French *voler* which made him register the form as Gallic. More cautiously Scrivener, discussing the theory of Scholz, says, "less certain is the inference drawn from *involet* as a translation of κλέψη in John x. 10 only, all the other versions having *furetur* in this place. *Involo* is rendered by Ducange *per vim auferre* and compared with the French *voler*, but Servius, the Commentator on Virgil in the 5th century, says 'Vola dicitur media pars manus...unde et involare dicimus, quum aliquid furtim vola manus substrahitur.'" He then refers to Catullus, *Carm.* xxv. for a case of the use of the word, and might equally well have referred to Pliny. This, of itself, is enough to make one suspicious about the Gallican theory[1]. And when we notice further that the word on one side appears in the Salic Law in the form *embulare* (whence the Old French *embler*), and on the other that it is a common word in modern Italian (*involare involatore* &c.), we need scarcely hesitate to say that the proofs of its exclusively Gallican usage are not forthcoming.

Probably a more convincing way of proving Gallicism in the Codex Bezae would be to compare its palaeographic and phonetic peculiarities with those of a companion MS. which has a similar presumption in favour of a French origin, viz. the famous Old Latin Pentateuch of Lyons, which was published in 1881 by M. Ulysse Robert with a very complete exposition.

The Lyons Pentateuch is not nearly so eccentric a MS. as the Codex Bezae; it is more carefully written and the text shows signs of more thorough revision. Yet there are not wanting signs by which we can determine something as to the nationality of the first scribe.

Suppose, for example, we were to test the MS. in order to see whether it ever dropped the weak intervocalic *g* whose omission is so common in Cod. Bezae. We should, I think, find only a single instance, viz.

sarcophaum for *sarcophagum*.

But this single instance would have to be set with the *aios* of the French Churches and λ[εγ]ἰων and other cases in the Codex Bezae.

Again if we were to look for the similar case of the disappearance of intervocalic *c*, as in the Beza form *fate* for *facite* &c., we should find the Lyons Pentateuch writing *feerit* for *fecerit*. It may be an accident, but it is just such cases that make one suspicious.

---

[1] Vaniçek derives the word from the Sanskrit *gvola*.

Many other minor coincidences of spelling may be noted, such as the metathesis of the aspiration in proper names etc., e.g. while Cod. Bezae in Acts xvi. 16 writes *phytonem* for *pythonem*, the Lyons Pentateuch in Exod. i. 11 turns *Pithom* into *Phythonam*.

These are trifling instances and the subject demands a close and careful examination. I believe it would turn out, upon investigation, that both of the MSS. in question are bona-fide Rhône-valley MSS. as far as their scribes are concerned, but the problem only begins at this point; for what we really want to know is the nationality of the first translators of the Septuagint and New Testament.

We shall, from time to time, as our argument proceeds, point out any phonetic and linguistic concurrences between the two MSS. in question.

The very same results appear, when we proceed to test the Old Latin MS. of S. Germain (*g¹*), in order to see whether it shews any traces of the striking disappearance of the intervocalic *c* and *g* in the Old French, or of similar phonetic weaknesses. A reference to Wordsworth's edition of this MS. will give us the following information on the point[1].

"G appears to have had a very slight sound between two vowels, being often omitted in *tetii* (Matt. ix. 21, 29; xiv. 35; xx. 34), and so in xxvii. 31, *crucifierent*: cf. xiv. 25 *uilia* for *uigilia*, and *dinus* for *dignus* in Luke xii. 16."

These cases must be added to our previous ones; they furnish us with confirmation of our theory that Cod. Bezae and Cod. Sangermanensis are both French in origin. In *vilia* for *vigilia* we have the equivalent of the French *veille*.

[1] *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, No. I., p. xxxix.

CHAPTER V.

VULGAR LATIN OF THE CODEX BEZAE.

WE now return to the discussion of the Vulgar-latinisms. The
MS. is full of Vulgar Latin forms, which seem to cover a good
period of time; some of them we have already discussed, where
they were so far advanced as to be capable of identification
with known forms in Provençal, Italian or Old French. But there
are many which belong to a more remote period and which do
not admit of such definite classification. We do not know what
was the primitive text from which Codex Bezae derived its Latin
or its Greek; it is an open question yet whether it is European
or African, Roman or Gallican. We must be prepared for any-
thing in the way of philological surprises. If in our new enquiry
into the Vulgar Latin we should find Africanisms we shall simply
have to say that, so far as these are traceable, the MS. must
be described as a Gallican MS. made upon an African base. If
forms occur which are Roman rather than Gallican, or South-
Italian rather than North-Italian, we must say similar things.
The whole problem of the origin of the Latin versions is to be left
an open question: for our text may well contain by inheritance
many peculiarities which are not capable of explanation as Galli-
cisms of the sixth century.

One caution must be premised: we know enough now of the
Codex Bezae to make us very careful not to refer to the blunders
of scribes the rare forms which we find in the Latin and in the
Greek: these forms are our best landmarks, and we must be
very careful not to reject them hastily. When we find an
assumed error of spelling repeating itself in the text at different

parts, we learn that we are dealing not with an error, but with a phonetic peculiarity. Sufficient instances of this have already been given, and more are yet to follow.

When, for instance, we find that the scribe spells *carcar* twice[1] against *carcer* twenty-eight times, we must reflect that *carcar* is a genuine collateral form, which may be frequently found in the Acta Fratrum Arvalium[2], and is also attested by the Greek loan-word κάρκαρος.

So when we find *jajunare* seven times against fifteen times of *jejuno*, we shall register the spelling as giving us another side-form.

When we find in Acts xx. 20, 27 the forms *substraxerim substraxi*, we do not say that this is a mere cockneyism of the scribe; for we recall the French *soustraire* which is commonly referred to a Vulgar Latin *subtustraho*, for which the classical Latin knows only *subtraho*[3].

Again when we find *congaudebant* in Luke i. 58 and *cum-gaudete* in Luke xv. 6 etc., we may not refer it, as Scrivener does, to the barbarism of a scribe who is trying to render literally συγχαίρω, for the word is not only attested in the oldest Romance speech, e.g. Provençal *congauzir*; French, *conjouir*, but it appears also in the Latin of Tertullian and Cyprian[4].

We shall then regard it, for the present, as a genuine Vulgar Latin form of wide diffusion; for it cannot be shewn that all these writers and dialects have taken it from a translation of the Scriptures.

But in order to impress the reader more forcibly with the need that there is for a fresh scrutiny of Codex Bezae in search of lost or obsolescent forms, we will point out one very striking case in which it has preserved an early Latin form, undoubtedly archaic and belonging to prae-classical times.

---

[1] Luke iii. 20; Acts xxi. 12.

[2] Cf. *C. I. L.* vol. vi. pars 1, p. 513 (A.D. 87), p. 517 (A.D. 89), p. 533 (A.D. 105), p. 536 (A.D. 117), p. 541 (A.D. 120), etc.

[3] Here the Italian is *sottrarre*: which seems to come from the classical form.

[4] Rönsch, *Itala u. Vulgata*, shews the word to belong to all the Old Latin texts in 1 Cor. xii. 26, and refers to Cyprian, *Ep.* 50, Ambrose, *Ep.* 6. 34 and Sulp. Severus, *Ep.* ii. *ad Aurel.* 11.

Let us look at Acts v. 38

ΟΤΙ ΕΑΝ Η ΕΞ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΝ Η ΒΟΥΛΗ ΑΥΤΗ
QVIA SIC ERIT AB HOMINIBVS CONSILIVM ISTVD.

Notice that ἐὰν is translated by *sic*: we should naturally let this pass as a scribe's blunder; but as we read on, we find in Acts vii. 2

ΕΙΠΕΝ ΔΕ Ο ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΥC ΤΩ CΤΕΦΑΝΩ
ΕΙ ΑΡΑ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΟΥΤΩC ΕΧΕΙ · Ο ΔΕ ΕΦΗ

for which the Latin is

AIT AVTEM PONTIFEX STEPHANO
SIC HAEC SIC HABENT · AD ILLE DIXIT.

Here we notice that the Latin translator, who is following the Greek word for word, has again translated εἰ (more exactly εἰ ἄρα) by *sic*. Now it might be maintained that this was merely an anticipation of the following *sic*: but this is insufficient when we recall that there has been a suspicion in our own minds from the previously observed case, and in the minds of philologers in general, that the Latin *si* was derived from an original *sic*. And indeed we find the word in Plautus in the form *sice*[1], and hence (see Vaniček, p. 971) we are entitled to regard the word as made up from a root *sa* + enclitic *ke*; and so to equate it directly with the Greek εἴ κε. Let us now turn back to John xxi. 22, where we find

ΚΕ ΟΥΤΟC ΔΕ ΤΙ · ΛΕΓΕΙ ΑΥΤΩ Ο ΙΗC
ΕΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΘΕΛΩ ΜΕΝΕΙΝ ΟΥΤΩC

DME HIC AVTEM QVID · DICIT ILLI IHS
SI EVM VOLO SIC MANERE.

Bearing in mind that our translator has been convicted twice of rendering εἰ and ἐὰν by *sic*, we see at once the cause of the eccentric reading in the MS. Evidently it once stood

SIC EVM VOLO MANERE,

and this has been corrected, probably on the margin, and the correction has found its way into the text without displacing the original reading. A study of other Western texts shews the same feature with slight variations, and it even passed into the Vulgate;

[1] Probably *sic erit* in Acts v. 38 was originally *sice sit*.

my collation of the Amiatinus (a copy which Tregelles made and lent to Tischendorf) has the following note in Tischendorf's hand on the margin against vv. 22 and 23;

> Ed. Fleckii bis *Sic*
> nec ego quicquam
> contra notavi.

So that we see the reading to belong to the regular tradition of the Vulgate; and to have been registered by Fleck, though apparently overlooked by Tregelles, in this Codex.

Further, we find the reading *sic eum volo* in *b c g* and in Ambrose: in *v.* 23, where *a* is extant, we also find it. A reference to the Codex Fuldensis shews the same reading in both places: in *v.* 22 the text stood *si sic eum volo manere*, but Victor of Capua erased the *si*. The Corbey MS. *ff₂* seems to have the same conflate reading (*si sic*) in *v.* 22, though it omits the disputed word altogether in *v.* 23[1].

Now here we have a most interesting study of an undoubtedly Western reading. We need have no hesitation in saying that all early Western texts read originally *sic eum volo* in both verses. Moreover the reading is a perfectly correct one, as long as we take *sic* in its archaic meaning εἴ κε. But when this form became obsolete, the Latin texts became subject to correction and so to conflation; and after a time the Greek text was re-acted upon either from the primitive or from the conflated Latin, and the word οὕτως was inserted as we find it in Codex Bezae: so that we have a crucial case by which we shew that to some extent the Western Greek text has latinized, though how far that influence extended is a great problem. Moreover this reading shews that all these Latin texts have a common Latin root if we go back far enough: for it is very unlikely that separate translators should have agreed in writing in this passage the archaic form *sic* for *si*. The common root into which they recede is the first line-for-line translation of the Latin Gospels of which we have a somewhat late form exhibited in Codex Bezae.

---

[1] I do not wish to complicate the question by discussing at the same time the origin of Cod. *k* : and so will simply note that in Mark ix. 43 this MS. shews "et sic scandaliziauerit manus tua." The Lyons Pentateuch also in Lev. v. 1 renders ἐὰν μὴ ἀπαγγείλῃ λήψεται τὴν ἁμαρτίαν by *sic non rettulerit accipiet delictum*.

This will seem to be rather a summary method of dealing with the Old Latin texts, and I am afraid that it will seem especially suspicious to Dr Sanday who has done such excellent pioneer work in the classification of the early Latin copies. In *Old Latin Bible Texts* No. ii. p. 122 Dr Sanday expresses his belief that "it is only by the method here pursued, viz. by the systematic examination of whole groups of readings, that a satisfactory conclusion will ever be arrived at." The caution expressed is in the main a wise one. And yet Dr Sanday sometimes sees the necessity of building high upon what seems to be a narrow foundation; for on p. 116 he says, "In St Mark ix. 15, the Greek προστρέχοντες has been corrupted to προσχέροντες (for προσχαίροντες), which is represented by *gaudentes* in the Latin of c d ff₂ i k. It seems difficult to avoid the inference that these MSS. in spite of all their divergences have after all a common origin." No doubt it is difficult to avoid the conclusion, but was the origin a Greek MS. or a Latin? Is the unity one of derivation from a version or from a copy? The question is an important one, because, besides the authorities quoted by Dr Sanday, the same evidence is given by Cod. *b*, which reads *calentes* for *gaudentes*, and *by the Tatian Harmony*. Perhaps the evidence accumulated by Dr Sanday is not quite decisive on the question, but we may at least affirm that we may build upon a single passage in the Gospels, provided we interpret it rightly. And the case which we have proposed above has the advantage over Dr Sanday's case in this that it is *certain* that the common error (if we indeed are right in calling it an error, for we have shewn that *sic* is a lawful form for *si*) is a translator's error, and the translator is the ancestor of Codex Bezae. From this translation all the others that we have named depend. And we may suspect that the Old Latin texts a b c g¹ and the copy used by Ambrose, to say nothing of other copies, are framed upon a primitive bilingual text of which Codex Bezae is the great representative. We shall develop the proof of this position as the argument proceeds. Meanwhile it will be a good study to set these early translations, sentence by sentence, over against the text of Codex Bezae, and watch the way in which one copy or another evaded the harshness and removed the provincialisms from the parent text. In

not a few cases it will be found that peculiar readings of our
Codex escape correction, and so appear in texts whose Latin is
of a very correct type; while, on the opposite hand, there are
no doubt cases where the comparison will throw back archaisms
from the younger texts upon the parent text of the Beza manu-
script.

Having said so much by way of suggestion, let us now return
to the curious Latin reading *sic* for *si*, from the consideration of
which we have digressed.

We may now go a step further: Scrivener[1] suggests that in
the year 1546 the Codex Bezae was in Italy. His reasoning is as
follows: " William à Prato, Bishop of the city of Clermont in the
adjoining[2] province of Auvergne, produced to the Council of Trent
in 1546 a very ancient Greek manuscript confirming the Latin
reading *sic eum volo* in John xxi. 22, which Cod. D alone of all
known authorities might appear to do: when his end was served,
the Bishop would of course restore it to his neighbours the monks
of St Irenaeus, from whom he had borrowed it."

Scrivener is quoting from Wetstein N. T. proll. p. 28, who says

Postquam diu latuisset codex noster, iterum in lucem productus est
circa tempora Concilii Tridentini, quod conjicio ex Mariani Victorii notis
in Hieronymum, in quibus citatur "antiquissimus Graecus Codex, quem
Tridentum attulerat *Claromontanus Episcopus* A° 1546": is erat, ut ex
Actis Synodicis constat, Gulielmus a Prato, qui, ad locum Ioann. xxi. 22,
prout in Latinis exemplaribus legitur, confirmandum istius codicis Graeca
protulit, ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν οὕτως, ἕως ἔρχομαι, *si eum volo sic manere,
usque dum venio.* Haec enim lectio hactenus in solo Cantabrigiensi reperta
est.

But have we the right to go so far as to say that the bishop of
Clermont's Codex was the Codex Bezae? Wetstein's quotation is
evidently from the Codex Bezae; but what of Marianus Victorius?
Evidently he wished for some reason or other to confirm the
reading οὕτως. But what was the reason, and whence did
Marianus Victorius get his information? A reference to the
notes on the first book of Jerome against Jovinianus will give the
actual words of the editor:

Si eum sic volo esse, quid ad te? D. Hieronymus legit, sicut habet anti-

---

[1] Codex Bezae p. viii.   [2] i.e. to Lyons.

quissimus quidam Graecus Codex quem Tridentum attulit Claromontanensis Episcopus anno Domini 1549, *ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν οὕτως ἕως ἔρχομαι.* Cui consentit Latinus qui est in Basilica S. Pauli, a Carolo Magno illi Ecclesiae donatus, et vulgatus ubique Sacrarum Missarum Codex, et alii tres, duo qui sunt in monasterio Sublacensi, et tertius quem ego legi in monasterio S. Dionysii Parisiensis.

It appears, then, that Marianus Victorius was adducing the bishop of Clermont as confirming the reading not in its archaic form *sic eum volo*, but in a more evolved form, after conflation had taken place. But since he gives us the Greek text, there is little reason to doubt that the Codex Bezae is the MS. in question, the agreement on this point being exact.

The reason for referring to the passage at all in the Council of Trent is a little more difficult to detect. But we may make one or two points with some confidence.

It might at first be supposed that the verse was a test question as to the authority of the Vulgate against the Greek in a matter of divergent texts; and this would agree with the fact that the bishop of Clermont was present in the Council and took part in the debates on the question of the authority of the Scriptures. But I can find no allusion in the published accounts of the Tridentine Council to any such dispute over the verse in John xxi. And indeed the selection of such a passage as a test-case would imply a degree of scholarship altogether too refined. We may suspect then that the question at issue was something of a different kind, to which the verse in dispute was more applicable than the rest of the Scripture: and it is easy to see what this question was; for Jerome quotes the passage in order to base on it an argument for the perpetual virginity of St John; *sic manere* is the expression of the perpetual celibacy of the beloved disciple. Now this question comes up in the Council in connexion with the dispute as to which estate of life has the higher sanctity, the married or the single. It is true that it does not come up during the first part of the Council at which William à Prato was present, but many years later, when the Council had been re-assembled. But this need not prevent us from believing that the question was much discussed in private, in the earlier years of the Council.

The fact is that the verse in St John, as read in the Latin or in the Beza-text, formed a very appropriate pendant to the doctrine of 1 Cor. vii. 40 μακαριωτέρα δέ ἐστιν ἐὰν οὕτως μείνῃ: and the similarity of the language invited the interpretation which we find in Jerome. Consequently we find, when the Canon on Virginity is brought forward in the Council, after the twenty-third formal session, that it appears in the following forms: on July 20th, 1563, it is the IXth Canon:

IX. Si quis dixerit matrimonium anteponendum esse virginitati, vel coelibatui, et non esse melius et *beatius manere* in virginitate et coelibatu (= οὕτως) quam iungi in matrimonio, anathema sit.

On Oct. 26 it is the Xth Canon,

X. Si quis dixerit statum conjugalem anteponendum esse statui virginitatis vel coelibatui, et non esse melius ac *beatius manere* in virginitate aut coelibatu, quam iungi matrimonio, anathema sit.

And we suspect, as we have said, that the reason for the quotation from St John was that it was supposed to have a bearing on the question of virginity, as implied in οὕτως μείνῃ of 1 Cor. We need have no hesitation in accepting Marianus Victorius' evidence about the Greek MS. and its reading, for he is an almost contemporary Italian bishop and had therefore every reason, both as a cleric and a scholar, to know the facts of the case. His Jerome was published at Rome in 1566, and he himself died in 1572, not long after he had been elected bishop of Rieti.

We may correct the date 1549, which I find in the notes to Jerome; it must stand 1546, for the Council was hardly in active existence in 1549; nor is there any evidence that the bishop of Clermont was at any session later than the seventh, i.e. up to March 1547; though he made a powerful address before the assembled fathers on Jan. 9th, 1547 (a copy of which may be found in Le Plat, III. 481), and frequently took part in the earlier debates[1].

[1] His bishopric is Clermont-Ferrand in the Auvergne; he was elected to the see on Feb. 15, 1528 and died in the year 1561 (according to Gams 22 x. 1560, which seems to be the same date differently reckoned). He was the founder of the Jesuit College of Clermont at Paris and of several other institutions. He was buried in the Convent of the Friars Minims of Beauregard, which again seems to have been one of his own foundations.

We have seen then that there is reason to believe that the Codex Bezae was at the Council of Trent; and that it was referred to in order to support a Latin rendering, when, as a matter of fact, the Greek had already been corrected to the Latin, although there was not the least reason to have made a correction at all, if only the vulgar speech had been kept in mind!

The proof that the archaic Latin rendering of the New Testament employed the form *sic* for *si* may be confirmed by shewing how widely this form prevails in the popular Latin literature of the same period. If the reader will take the trouble to examine the Old Latin of Irenaeus, he will find that the MSS. and edited texts are full of misunderstandings arising out of the interpretation and correction of the ambiguous word. A few instances may be given.

It will be remembered that the text of Irenaeus is based upon three principal MSS.: the Clermont MS. (formerly in the Jesuit College at Paris), the Arundel MS. in the British Museum, and the Vossian Codex at Leyden. Other MSS. are occasionally alluded to by the first editors, but their whereabouts is in most cases unknown.

Irenaeus ed. Harvey, II. 318 = Mass. 293.

Si autem non salvetur haec videlicet, nec Dominus sanguine suo redemit nos, neque calix Eucharistiae communicatio sanguinis ejus est.

This reading, according to Harvey and Stieren, is found in the Clermont and Vossian MSS. while the Arundel MS. reads *sic autem* and is supported by an Ottobonian Codex. The latter form is, no doubt, to be restored.

II. 339 = Mass. 301.

Sic ergo pignus hoc habitans in nobis iam spirituales efficit, et absorbetur mortale ab immortalitate.

Here the Clermont and Vossian MSS. (with perhaps some collateral support known to the earlier editors of Irenaeus) read *sic* for *si*. The form should again be restored.

II. 356 = Mass. 308.

Sic enim proprie de carne hoc dictum dicent, et non de carnalibus operationibus, quemadmodum demonstrabimus, ipsum sibi contraria Apostolum dicentem contraria ostendentes.

Here, according to Harvey, the Clermont, Arundel and Vossian MSS. read *sic*, other authorities *si*. Stieren merely says "Ita

Clarom. Voss. et Mass.: melius quam reliqui *si enim.*" The sense requires *si enim*, but the older form should be printed.

II. 384 = Mass. 319.

Sic igitur manifeste ostendente Domino quoniam Dominus verus et unus Deus qui a lege declaratus fuerat...iam non oportet quaerere alium Patrem.

Here the editors Harvey and Stieren read *sic* against the Vossian and Clermont MSS. which have *si*. The confusion between the two forms is again apparent. We follow the editors in restoring the form *sic*, and leave the interpretation of the word an open question.

II. 395 = Mass. 324.

Si ergo Deus magnus significavit per Danielem futura et per Filium confirmavit,...confutati resipiscant qui Demiurgum respuunt, etc.

Here Stieren notes: "Feuardentius e codice veteri, quocum Voss. consentit, scripsit *sic ergo*. Sed cum Grab. et Mass. nostram lectionem restitui propter meliorem connexionem verborum, quae sequuntur: *confutati resipiscant.*"

Harvey adopts *si* which is clearly right, as far as the sense goes, without even a question or a note. But it is again a case of misunderstanding, and we should restore *sic* to the text.

II. 414 = Mass. 332.

Si ergo huic promisit Deus hereditatem terrae, non accepit autem in omni suo incolatu, oportet eum accipere, etc.

where Stieren notes on the reading *si*; "Ita cum Mass. scripsi. Reliqui e codd. habent *sic*, quod errore scribarum scriptum est."

The error is clearly one of interpretation, and the scribes are to be justified in preserving the old Vulgar Latin form.

Enough has been said to shew that the pages of Irenaeus are full of misunderstandings similar to the one which we detected in Cod. Bezae. The instances might be multiplied, but as the present discourse is not immediately concerned with the character of the Old Latin of Irenaeus, it is not necessary to deal with the subject exhaustively.

CHAPTER VI.

Is the Codex Bezae a Latinizing Codex?

It will be seen that we have run up against a notable and apparently incontrovertible instance of what is called Latinization in the Codex Bezae. And as we have thus reopened what was a burning question of the last century, it will be well to stop and ask ourselves whether it is really true that such a retranslation of Latin into Greek can be admitted, and whether there are any other such cases. Leaving then, for a while, the discussion of the Vulgar-latinisms of the MS., we proceed to shew that the instance in question is not an isolated case, but that the whole of the Greek text of Codex Bezae from the beginning of Matthew to the end of Acts is a re-adjustment of an earlier text to the Latin version.

This was the view of the earlier critics, such as Mill, Wetstein, Middleton, etc.: but it was supposed to have received a final quietus, by the discovery of the wide extent to which the so-called Western readings prevailed in manuscripts of all periods (and especially of early periods), and coming from all parts of the world.

Mill expressed himself, as follows, in his Greek Testament A.D. 1707[1].

Vidimus jam qualia fuerint Graeca, qualia item Latina hujusce codicis. De Graecis unum illud ultra quaeritur, an aliqua ex parte castigata fuerint ad Latinum exemplar? ea enim erat de libris hujus generis eruditorum quorundam nostrae et superioris aetatis diserta sententia. Nempe cum mirifice consenserint ista cum Latinis, contra quam reliqui Graeciae libri, iique optimi, facile ipsis persuasum est, ea vel non omnino fuisse Graecae originis, sed tota, quanta quanta, traducta de Latinis, vel saltem recensita et emendata fuisse variis sui partibus, ad Latinam Versionem. Sic de ipsis pronuntiant Erasmus, Lucas Brugensis, Estius, Grotius, alii ; quorum sententiam nil mirum si in hac editione nostram fecerimus.

[1] *Proleg. in N. T.* p. cxxxiv.

De hac re jam ita videtur.   Exscripta erant apud Latinos, ex librorum, ad quos confecta erat Itala versio, apographis, varia Graeca exemplaria, ex ignorantia scribarum, doctiorumque e Latinis quorundam περιεργία (qui mutuata e Graecorum libris scholia, et Apocrypha fragmenta in codices ex suis descriptos inserenda curabant) graviter laesa et interpolata. Istis mox adaptabatur a quibusdam Latina Versio. Ex hac autem consensione forte factum est, ut indocta manus paucula hinc inde in textu Graeco ad formam Latinorum et e Latina versione mutaverit. Illud enim apparet in Graecis *Cum, Ἡρώδους, Ἰωάννου, Σαμαριτάνων*, aliaque id genus ad Latinorum formam confecta sunt. Matt. v. 24, cum latinum esset *offeres*, πρόσφερε mutavit librarius in προσφερεῖς. ea enim ipsi erat secunda persona futuri. καταβαῖνον, factum καταβαίνοντα ob lat. *descendentem*, iii. 16. Cap. xi. 22, 24 cum esset in lat. *quam vobis* et vero Graecum esset ἣ ὑμῖν, *quae vobis* (sic enim videbatur) mutavit in ἣν ὑμῖν ut latino responderet. Sic cap. ejusd. v. 28, factum est πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι ἐστὶ ob lat. *omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis*. Cap. xv. 18, 20, ob *latina obsoleta* (sed genuina interpretis *Vulgati*) communicant communicant i.e. polluit, polluunt, pro κοινοῖ, κοινοῦντα reposuit absurde κοινοῖ κοινονοῦντα. uti et Act. xxi. 28, ἐκοινώσε τὸν ἅγιον τόπον τοῦτον, ob lat. *communicavit sanctum locum hunc*. Sic Matt. xviii. 22, ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτάκις ob lat. *septies*. Act. v. 9, Συνεφώνησεν (pro συνεφωνήθη) ὑμῖν ob lat. *convenit vobis*. Mitto alia.

One would certainly have thought that such an array of instances, with the suggestion that there were others, would have provoked a very close examination of at least the syntax on the two sides of the MS. Perhaps the real fault was that people accepted the opinion as to the Latinization of the Western Greek Codices too readily. There were polemic feelings which, in some cases at least, were still provoked by the suggestions of Latin authority. Wetstein in his prolegomena takes up very decided ground with Mill as to the fact of Latinization: and inveighs fiercely against Morinus who had in his *Exercitationes Biblicae* defended the consentient testimony of Latin and Latinizing codices as being the criterion of the true text: and concludes Morinus on this ground, as well as on that of private scandals, to be wholly unacquainted with the Greek language[1].

The very strong case made out by Mill and Wetstein was met by a temperate reply made in 1787 by J. D. Michaelis. He admits that some of the examples brought forward are very extraordinary, but replies that the Greek text in Codex Bezae sometimes varies

[1] Wetstein, *Prolegg.*, Amstelodami (A.D. 1751), p. 32.

from the Latin, and he carries the war into the enemies' camp by suggesting that the Latin has in some cases been corrupted from the Greek. And he concludes by saying[1]

> The result of the preceding remarks is that the manuscript in question cannot possibly have been altered from the Latin, according to the charge which has been usually laid to it.... But till we are fully informed what readings are to be ascribed to the text itself and what to subsequent corrections, it is impossible to decide on this subject with any certainty ; which we shall more easily obtain, if to the above mentioned information be added a diligent use of the Sahidic version.

And so he concludes to wait until Kipling's promised edition shall come out. The allusion to the Sahidic version was significant, for this version had been shewn to be full of Western readings.

Griesbach[2] threw the whole weight of his great authority against the theory of Latinization. In describing Codex L, which has such affinity in many readings with Cod. D, he refuses to admit that the consensus between readings of the Alexandrian and Western recensions is anything more than a consensus: very many Western readings had been introduced by mixture into Alexandrian texts. Such Greek readings were to be reckoned as derived from Greek MSS. unless it could be shewn that they could not have been derived from such a source, and that they could on the other hand have been derived from the Latin. The illustrations brought forward by the Latinizers shewed *consent* but not *corruption:* ("nil praeter illorum cum hac *consensum* ostendunt, neutiquam vero istos ex hac *corruptos* esse"). He will not be so wedded to his own opinion as to say that no glosses or readings ever crept from the Latin into the Greek: but most of these cases are of slight importance and there was no deliberate intent at latinizing the Greek. He instances λέπρωσος, and φλαγελλώσας. But actual readings of a latinizing kind are very rare. Griesbach intimates that a few such occur in the Acts in the Codex Alexandrinus. In any case, if one or two such readings occur, that is no reason for despising the rest of the MS.

It is evident that Griesbach's views must have been the chief cause in the change of opinion upon the question of Latinization.

4　*　[1] Marsh's *Michaelis*, II. 235.　　　　[2] *Symbolae Criticae*, p. cxi.

And he was followed by Herbert Marsh, who in his notes on Michaelis' Introduction takes up the same ground[1]. Marsh points out that Semler, who at first, in 1764, when he had not emancipated himself from the influence of Wetstein, had expressed himself against the Western Graeco-Latin texts, put himself right in his *Spicilegium Observationum* in 1766 by saying "non licet mihi amplius eam tenere (sententiam) aut hunc codicem (sc. D) et graeco-latinos tam vehementer adspernari...Itaque istae accusationes omnes vanae sunt jam et temerariae." To which Marsh adds that the authors of the Latin versions must have found in the Greek manuscripts, from which they translated, the readings which are common to them and to the Codex Bezae: and this very agreement is a strong argument for the genuineness of the Western readings. No instance has been produced from the Codex Bezae of supposed latinizing which might not just as well be a genuine reading of the Greek.

Marsh's edition of Michaelis' Introduction and valuable supplementary notes on the same were published in 1793. And he remarks that Griesbach's system is at present received by every critic in Europe. It would seem, therefore, that by the end of last century Griesbach had converted almost the whole world to his opinions. Matthaei alone seems to have held to the ancient opinion, and Matthaei was not popular in the west.

In his New Testament published at Riga in 1786 Matthaei had expressed himself very strongly as to the origin of the corruptions in Cod. D. They were due to a Latin monk who knew a moderate amount of Greek, and had made a farrago of readings from other copies and from the fathers and from other parallel passages. It must be owned that this is not very clear. The indictment had too many counts.

In 1808, however, there appeared Middleton's *Doctrine of the Greek Article*, to which was attached a far more close examination of the subject than had yet been made[2]. Middleton had fallen foul of the Codex Bezae in his attempt to apply his theories of the Greek Article to the text of the New Testament: and he subjoins an Appendix, containing some remarks on this Codex.

---

[1] Vol. II. pt 2, pp. 676 sqq.

[2] I use the edition of 1841, published after Middleton's death by H. J. Rose.

This Appendix is really an excellent piece of work, for so small a compass. The writer begins by making a collection of some rare and unique readings in the Codex Bezae in the first twelve chapters of Mark. Then he analyses the variants under eight heads: (1) Synonyms. (2) Transpositions. (3) Compound for Simple and Simple for Compound verbs. (4) Wrong moods and tenses. (5) Alterations in the sense. (6) Questionable Greek. (7) Latinisms. (8) The uses of the Article. Under all these heads Middleton finds evidence of latinizing corruption, and he concludes that "the Cambridge MS. though a most venerable remain of antiquity, is not to be considered, in a critical view, of much importance. It is of use to the translator and to the dogmatic theologian, but not, as I think, generally speaking, to the editor of the N.T., whose object it is to give a text approaching as nearly as possible to the Autographs." But he adds very fairly "As to the goodness of its readings, considered with regard to the *sense*, I have already observed that for this fact we may in part account by the natural supposition of the great antiquity of the MS. which was the basis of the Codex Bezae."

In the present century the general opinion as to the excellence of the text underlying Codex D has become more and more decided. It is regarded as an exploded fiction to speak of latinizing, and as a rule the Latin text is only quoted where the Greek is lost, or where there is some peculiarity attaching to it which constitutes a fresh point in the evidence.

Accordingly Dr Hort says[1] "a large proportion of the Latin texts of these MSS. 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 arbitrary; so that for the criticism of the Greek text the Latin reading has here no independent authority." And his account of the genesis of the bilingual texts is that "a genuine (independent) Old Latin text has been adopted as the basis, but altered throughout into verbal conformity with the Greek text by the side of which it was intended to stand." It will be seen from these quotations how completely the Greek text of Cod. Bezae has come to be regarded

---

[1] *Introduction* to *N. T.* pp. 82, 83.

as independent of the translation which accompanies it. Our question, then, is whether this belief in the independence of the Greek text is well-founded; and it is clear that, if the critics have come to a wrong conclusion on this point, it will not be easy to make progress in the study of the New Testament origins until the error is rectified. We proceed then to examine the question again in the light of the instances of Latinization quoted above, and such others as may be detected.

Now, when we say that there has been action and re-action between the Greek and Latin texts in Codex Bezae, we do not merely mean that a bilingual scribe makes bilingual mistakes. It is quite true and worthy of notice that there are errors by the writing of Greek letters in the Latin words, etc. Thus there are several cases where the letters of one language are used erroneously in the words of the other language. Perhaps the most curious is in Matt. v. 22, where the present text runs thus:

> Ego autem dico uobis: quia omnes qui irascitur.

There is reason to believe that in the archetype of the Western texts there once stood *pascitur* instead of *irascitur*; the first letter of the last word being lost in the last letter of *qui*; and the *r* becoming *p* by the confusion prevalent in Graeco-Latin palaeography. Our reason for believing this error to be wide spread and original is the fact that it is found at this point in Codex *k*, which is said to be African Latin: and also in the Latin of Irenaeus, ii. 32, 1, in the Codex Claromontanus. There is no more curious error than this in the whole New Testament; one would have supposed it would hardly have escaped correction by a single copyist; and it seems safe to trace to a common origin MSS. which shew such a feature.

But such instances, while they constitute a striking feature of family likeness in the Codices where they occur, do not prove anything at all with regard to the character of the texts. There is always cross-play in a bilingual MS.

The same thing must be said of such cases as λεπρωσος, φλαγελλωσας, Σαμαριτανων and the like: these are things such as may belong to any bilingual Codex whatever. They are the natural accidents of the case. We must examine the matter much more closely before we can come to a conclusion.

CHAPTER VII.

Case of a Latin Hexameter Verse carried over into the Greek text of Codex Bezae.

But now let us turn to Luke xxiii. 53, and examine a notable addition which Codex Bezae here makes to the text. The whole verse reads

```
.........ΚΑΙ ΚΑΘΕΛⲰΝ
ΕΝΕΤΥΛΙΞΕΝ ΤΟ CⲰΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΙΗΥ ΕΝ CΙΝΔΟΝΙ
ΚΑΙ ΕΘΗΚΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΕΝ ΜΝΗΜΕΙⲰ
ΛΕΛΑΤΟΜΗΜΕΝⲰ ΟΥ ΟΥΚ ΗΝ ΟΥΠⲰ
ΟΥΔΕΙC ΚΕΙΜΕΝΟC ΚΑΙ ΘΕΝΤΟC ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΠΕΘΗΚΕ͞
ΤⲰ ΜΝΗΜΕΙⲰ ΛΕΙΘΟΝ ΟΝ ΜΟΓΙC ΕΙΚΟCΙ
ΕΚΥΛΙΟΝ
```

```
                    ET DEPONENS
INVOLVIT CORPVS IHV IN SINDONE
ET POSVIT EVM IN MONVMENTO
SCVLPTO VBI ADHVC
NEMO POSITVS ET POSITO EO IMPOSVIT
IN MONVMENTO LAPIDEM QVEM VIX VIGINTI
MOVEBANT.
```

Now concerning this added sentence (και θεντος...εκυλιον) Scrivener remarks acutely that it is "conceived somewhat in the Homeric spirit." Let us examine then whether either in the Greek or Latin the added words shew traces of having once been in metre. Fixing our attention on the added words in the Latin, we see that the words *posito eo* and *in monumento* are a repetition from the preceding words *posuit eum in monumento*. And if we erase them we have left what is certainly meant for a hexameter verse,

Imposuit lapidem quem uix uiginti mouebant.

It is clear, then, that the scribe of Codex Bezae, or, if we prefer it, an ancestor of his, *has deliberately incorporated into his text a verse of Latin poetry*, which he has then turned into Greek, following closely the order of the Latin verse. The only difficulty lies in the quantity of the last syllable of *viginti*, which would in Virgil be strictly long: but this objection may be over-ruled, for the poetry of our interpolator may be popular, and in any case we are in a position to point out the ultimate poetical origin from which his verse is derived. In fact, as Scrivener suggested, the origin of the gloss is Homeric, and the stone which covered the entrance to the Lord's tomb has been compared with the great stone which Polyphemus rolls to the mouth of his cave. Of this we are told that it was such a great stone that two and twenty waggons would not be able to stir it: (*Odyssey* IX. 240)

Αὐτὰρ ἔπειτ' ἐπέθηκε θυρεὸν μέγαν ὑψόσ' ἀείρας,
Ὄβριμον· οὐκ ἂν τόνγε δύω καὶ εἴκοσ' ἄμαξαι
Ἐσθλαὶ τετράκυκλοι ἀπ' οὔδεος ὀχλίσσειαν,

with which we may compare IX. 304,

Οὐ γάρ κεν δυναίμεσθα θυράων ὑψηλάων
Χερσὶν ἀπώσασθαι λίθον ὄβριμον ὃν προσέθηκεν.

There are other similar comparisons in Homer, when great stones are thrown by Ajax and other warriors in battle; but this passage in the Odyssey is undoubtedly the one from which our writer has derived his gloss. The "twenty" insufficient stone-movers are the equivalent of the twenty-two waggons in Homer; and this of itself makes one suspect that the Codex Bezae has borrowed from a Latin version of the Odyssey, and that the next line to the one which he appropriated began with the word "Plaustra."

Moreover the passage is identified with the story of Polyphemus by the fact that the Evangelic allusion is to *a cave* closed by a stone, which finds a much more exact parallel in the passage from the Odyssey than any of the other Homeric references to the handling of huge stones.

We might compare by way of illustration the following lines from the Ilias Latina 458—462:

Postquam utrique diu steterant nec uulnera magnus
Qua daret infesto Tydides ense uidebat,
Saxum ingens, medio quod forte iacebat in agro,
Bis seni quod uix iuuenes tellure mouerent,
Sustulit et magno conamine misit in hostem ;

but while this passage furnishes a very instructive parallel, it is not nearly so close to our text as what would be furnished by the incident in the Odyssey.

If further confirmation of the correctness of our theory as to the source of the Bezan gloss were needed, it might be found in the following considerations. The leading facts of the Gospel History were at a very early period (far earlier than most people suppose) transferred into poetry by using the language of Homer, and translating into this speech the record of the Miracles and Passion of our Lord. These curious patchworks of verses and half-verses of Homer were known by the name of Homeric Centones, Ὁμηροκέντρωνες or Ὁμηρόκεντρα. It is not generally known that these collections have exercised a very great influence over the primitive Christian literature. But such is the case, as I hope at some future time to demonstrate. As far as I know, no attention has been given to the subject, and I only refer to it here in order to point out that, when the Homeric Centonists went to work to write the story of our Lord's burial in Greek Hexameters, they made the very same connexion with Polyphemus as we find in the Codex Bezae. To prove this, we will transcribe a few lines of the Homeric Centones, as found in the Paris edition of the *Poetae Graeci Christiani* of A.D. 1609.

Περὶ τῆς ταφῆς.

Τορνώσαντο δὲ σῆμα, θεμείλιά τε προβάλοντο.
Ἀγκὰς δ᾽ ἀλλήλων λαβέτην χερσὶ στιβαρῇσιν·
Οἱ δ᾽ ὥσθ᾽ ἡμίονοι κρατερὸν μένος ἀμφιβαλόντες,
Ἕλκουσ᾽ ἐξ ὄρεος κατὰ παιπαλόεσσαν ἀταρπὸν
Ἢ δόκον, ἠὲ δόρυ μέγα νήιον, ἐν δέ τε θυμὸς
Τείρεθ᾽ ὁμοῦ καμάτῳ τε καὶ ἱδρῷ σπευδόντεσσιν.
Ὣς αἵ γ᾽ ἐμμεμαῶτε, νέκυν φέρον. αὐτὰρ ὕπερθεν,
Χερσὶ μέγαν λίθον ἀείραντές τε προσέθηκαν
Ὄμβριμον· οὐκ ἂν τόνδε δύω καὶ εἴκοσ᾽ ἄμαξαι
Ἐσθλαὶ, τετράκυκλοι, ἀπ᾽ οὔδεος ὀχλίσσειαν.

The striking coincidence in the treatment of the case by the Centonist with the gloss in the Bezan text renders it certain that

we have referred the latter to its true origin in the pages of Homer. The intermediate link was either some Latin form of the Odyssey, or it was a version of the Gospels made by a Latin Centonist.

Further light is thrown on the subject by the consideration that the same gloss which we have detected in Cod. Bezae is found in one other Latin copy and in one of the Egyptian versions.

The Latin MS. which is denoted by the sign c (Cod. Colbertinus), whose text will be found in Sabatier's *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae*, gives the additional matter in the form

> et cum positus esset in monumento,
> posuerunt lapidem quem uix uiginti
> uoluebant.

Some changes have here been introduced into the original form; *posito eo* has been replaced by *cum positus esset*; *inposuit* becomes *posuerunt*; and *mouebant* has been corrected to *uoluebant*. Now clearly *mouebant* is the original word, for it is coupled, if our suggestion be correct, with *plaustra*; but since *mouebant* went back into Greek as ἐκύλιον, it seems that in Cod. c we have a re-translation from the Greek with greater exactness; and the same supposition explains *cum positus esset* as a new translation of καὶ θέντος αὐτοῦ, and *posuerunt* may be due to a reading ἐπέθηκαν in the Greek, or to a desire to avoid the difficulty of the rolling of such a stone by a single man. We suspect then that the text of c is a re-translation of the Western Greek. The other version to which we have alluded is the Sahidic or Thebaic, which gives a reading answering to

> cum uero posuissent eum posuit
> lapidem in porta sepulcri quem
> uiginti homines uoluere possent.

It is interesting again to observe the changes that have taken place, the explanatory gloss *in porta sepulcri*, the express introduction of *homines* after the numeral, the dropping of *uix*, and the change from *mouebant* to *uoluere possent*.

The reading, moreover, proves, and it is a fact of immense textual importance, that the Thebaic version ultimately leans, in

part, on a Latin base.   It has always been a problem to account
for the large Western element in the Thebaic version ; we now see
in what direction to look for the explanation.   It is not, in the
present case, a question of early Greek recensions ; if the Thebaic
version took the gloss in question from a Greek copy, it was from
a Greek MS. which was the *umbra* of a Latin text, and it is even
possible that it may have borrowed from the Latin directly.

Further, we may say that the text from which the verse in
question was originally taken, whether it be a metrical Gospel or
a collection of Latin Centones, or a Latin Odyssey, must have been
an early work ; for it has every appearance of being older than
the common origin of the group of authorities

<div style="text-align:center">D + c + theb.</div>

It is commonly held that the Bezan text is a fourth century
product ; I believe it to be in the main, including the glosses,
two hundred years earlier than this ; the Thebaic version is
usually referred to the third century at least, against which date
we know no reason ; and it seems, therefore, that the metrical
gloss must be very ancient, and this consideration will help
us in finding the date, not only of the special corruption which we
are studying, but of associated and similarly attested errors.

For example, the reasoning in the preceding paragraph would
exclude the possibility of the gloss in question being taken, say,
from the Evangelical History of Juvencus.

It is true that Juvencus in his account of the entombment
draws upon the Polyphemus passage, as the following extract will
shew :

> Concessit praeses, et corpus fulgida lino
> Texta tegunt, saxique nouo componitur antro :
> Limen concludunt immensa uolumina petrae.
>
> Lib. iv. 724—726.

Here Juvencus has borrowed 'immensa uolumina' from Virgil,
but he seems to have Homer also in his mind, for his verses have
a ring very like *Odyssey* IX. 235, and 243.

> Ἔντοσθεν δ᾽ ἄντροιο βαλὼν ὀρυμαγδὸν ἔθηκεν
> ....
> Τόσσην ἠλίβατον πέτρην ἐπέθηκε θύρῃσιν.

4—2

Juvencus then shews the same tendency to use the language of the Polyphemus story, but he makes no use of the line descriptive of the size of the stone, and, as we have shewn above, this line must belong to an earlier writer.

The question now is, whether we can refer the original gloss to any definite time or person?

My friend Dr M°Cabe[1], who first pointed out that my Beza hexameter was substantially a verse of the Odyssey, suggested that it might possibly be a fragment from Livius Andronicus. The Odyssey was translated into Latin verse at a very early date indeed, and the translation is, in fact, one of the first efforts at Latin poetry. Livius Andronicus, nearly 250 years before the Christian era, transferred the Odyssey into Saturnian verse: and the translated poem was still used as a school-book in Horace's day. Moreover, when we say that the metre was Saturnian, this is not meant to exclude an occasional hexameter; for these early poets used a good deal of freedom: and, in fact, the fragments of Livius Andronicus which are preserved shew some decided cases of hexameter writing.

Unfortunately, we are not able to test the conjecture in question by means of a direct reference, for by far the major part of the Latin Odyssey is wanting.

Moreover, we shall see bye and bye, that this case of demonstrated Homerization is only one out of a number of such cases occurring in Codex Bezae and other Christian writings that seem to be connected with it. We shall, therefore, leave it for the present an open question who was responsible for the Latin verse injected into the account of the Entombment; if we were forced to make a suggestion, we should say it was due to an early Christian Centonist, probably of the second century.

[1] Of the Seminary of S. Carlo Borromeo, Pennsylvania.

CHAPTER VIII.

TRACES OF AN ATTEMPT AT NUMERICAL VERBAL EQUALITY BETWEEN THE GREEK AND THE LATIN ON THE PART OF THE SCRIBES OF THE ANCESTRY OF CODEX BEZAE.

IT is interesting to notice that this reflex action of the Latin on the Greek had been observed by Bentley, who had the MS. for so many years in his personal keeping at Trinity College. If we turn to Luke xv. 28,

ο ΔΕ ΠΑΤΗΡ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΞΕΛΘΩΝ ΗΡΞΑΤΟ ΑΥΤΟΝ

PATER AVTEM EIVS EXIENS ROGABAT EVM,

we shall see that the word παρακαλεῖν has dropped from the end of the Greek line, apparently because there was nothing to balance it in the Latin, which had however rightly translated ἤρξατο παρακαλεῖν, or perhaps a primitive παρεκάλει, by rogabat[1]. And Bentley, who noticed this, remarked[2], " Exciderat τὸ 'παρακαλεῖν' in Graeco; quod in Latino rependit eodem (ut solet) verborum ordine."

No doubt Bentley was right in his explanation, and there are too many such instances for us to regard the omissions as accidental. For example, two pages further on in the MS., Luke xvi. 16, we have

ΚΑΙ ΠΑC ΕΙC ΑΥΤΗΝ ΒΙΑΖΕΤΑΙ

ET OMNES IN EAM CONATVR,

where it is possible that the translator wrote conatur introire: in this case then the Latin text has been shorn of a word. It is much to be wished that Bentley had followed his clue a little

[1] Rogabat is also found in Cod. e.
[2] Ellis, Bentleii Critica Sacra, p. 15.

farther into the mysteries of the Beza text: unfortunately, though he was quite alive to the question, he was misled in a passage in the Acts and came to conclude that the Greek had not been corrected to the Latin, and so did not give himself full scope in the perplexing problems offered in his text. We shall find, for instance, that he studied the discrepant Greek and Latin of Acts vi. 14,

ΚΑΤΑΛΥϹΕΙ ΤΟΝ ΤΟΠΟΝ ΤΟΥΤΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΛΛΑΖΕΙ ΤΑ ΕΘΗ

DESTRVET LOCVM ISTVM MVTAVIT ITERVM,

where *mutauit* stands for *mutabit*.

Here Bentley says: "$\H{\epsilon}\theta\eta$ accepit pro eo quod est $\H{\epsilon}\tau\iota$.   N.B. non correxisse Graeca ad Latina."

We should take a different view from Bentley: for it seems to us that the translator rendered $\mathring{a}\lambda\lambda\acute{a}\xi\epsilon\iota$ by *mutauit iterum*, and $\tau\mathring{a}$ $\H{\epsilon}\theta\eta$, probably, by *consuetudines*; but having thus allowed the Latin text to gain on the Greek, a word was subtracted, viz. the final one in the sentence. If this explanation be the correct one, it will be seen that Bentley missed a case which exactly confirmed his theory in Luke.

We must certainly examine for other cases of the same kind, and see to what conclusions they lead us with regard to the manner of building and rebuilding of the two texts involved.

Here is another curious specimen of the kind referred to by Bentley:

In Matt. xx. 11,

ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΟΙΚΟΔΕϹΠΟΤΟΥ ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕϹ

ADVERSVS FAMILIAM DICENTES,

because *patrem familias* gave a word in excess.

But it is time to take the matter up more in detail.

Let us examine, then, how far the attempt to make the Greek words and the Latin words numerically and in other respects to agree has operated to affect either the Greek or the Latin tradition of the MS.

We may be sure that, if such a tendency existed, it would be found in cases where the usage of one language is more elliptical than the other. For example, it may be remembered that Daillé based one of his objections to the genuineness of the Epistle of

Polycarp on the use of the expression "qui cum eo sunt," which seemed to imply that Ignatius was alive after his martyrdom, whereas the expression was in reality only a rather unfortunate translation of τοῖς μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ. Now, if a bilingual text of the Epistle of Polycarp had been current, written in the style of the Codex Bezae, and some stupid scribe had attempted to make a numerical equality between the translation and the text, he would have been obliged either to erase the *sunt* or to introduce a verb, probably οὖσι or ὑπάρχουσι, on the Greek side. Now this imaginary case is one which can be readily paralleled from the Codex Bezae: we may begin almost anywhere.

John iv. 9 should read

ΠΩC CY ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟC ΩΝ ΠΑΡ ΕΜΟΥ
ΠΕΙΝ ΑΙΤΕΙC ΓΥΝΑΙΚΟC CΑΜΑΡΕΙΤΙΔΟC ΟΥCΗC.

But the Latin had rendered it

TV CVM SIS IVDAEVS · QVOMODO A ME
BIBERE PETIS · MVLIERE SAMARITANAE,

and the word οὔσης, being now unbalanced, was erased; further, since *quomodo* has shifted to a part of the sentence remote from πῶς, the scribe corrects the order of the Greek, and finally we have

CY ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟC ΩΝ ΠΩC ΠΑΡ ΕΜΟΥ
ΠΕΙΝ ΑΙΤΕΙC ΓΥΝΑΙΚΟC CΑΜΑΡΙΤΙΔΟC.

For a second instance take Acts xiii. 29,

ΩC ΔΕ ΕΤΕΛΟΥΝ
ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑ ΠΕΡΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΓΕΓΡΑΜΜΕΝΑ ΕΙCΙΝ·

Here the word εἰσιν was added, because the Latin had rendered the sentence

ET CONSVMMAVERVNT
OMNIA QVAE DE ILLO SCRIPTA SVNT.

In Matthew v. 12 we should have

ΟΥΤΩC ΓΑΡ ΕΔΙΩΞΑΝ
ΤΟΥC ΠΡΟΦΗΤΑC · ΤΟΥC ΠΡΟ ΥΜΩΝ,

which was rendered

ITA ENIM PERSECVTI SVNT
PROPHETAS · QVI ANTE VOS FVERVNT,

and to balance the added *fuerunt* the scribe has inserted in the Greek the word ὑπάρχοντας.

In Matthew xi. 28 (a case to which Mill drew attention),

ΔΕΥΤΕ ΠΡΟC ΜΕ ΠΑΝΤΕC ΟΙ ΚΟΠΙѠΝΤΕC
ΚΑΙ ΠΕΦΟΡΤΙCΜΕΝΟΙ ΕCΤΑΙ

where the last word ἐστέ seems to have been derived from the Latin

VENITE AD ME OMNES QVI LAVORATIS
ET ONERATI ESTIS.

In Mark v. 40 the Greek

ΠΑΡΑΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΙ ΤΟΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΑ
ΤΟΥ ΠΑΙΔΙΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΜΗΤΕΡΑ
ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥC ΜΕΤ ΑΥΤΟΥ

has been rendered

ADSVMPTO PATRE
ET MATRE PVELLAE
ET QVI CVM ILLO ERANT,

and the revising hand has added the equivalent of the word *erant* to the Greek, and harmonized the order of the words, giving us

ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΜΗΤΕΡΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΙΔΙΟΥ
ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥC ΜΕΤ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΟΝΤΑC.

So in Mark ii. 25,

ΑΥΤΟC ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΜΕΤ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΟΝΤΕC

because of the Latin

IPSE ET QVI CVM ILLO ERANT.

In Luke xv. 24,

ΝΕΚΡΟC ΗΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΕΖΗCΕΝ ΑΠΟΛѠΛѠC
ΚΑΙ ΑΡΤΙ ΕΥΡΕΘΗ

the Latin is

MORTVVS ERAT ET REVIXIT PERIERAT
ET MODO INVENTVS EST,

where one word is used to translate ἀπολωλὼς ἦν, is the reason for the omission of ἦν in the Greek of our Codex.

In Luke xxiii. 38,

Ο ΒΑCΙΛΕΥC ΤѠΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙѠΝ ΟΥΤΟC ΕCΤΙΝ
REX IVDAEORVM HIC EST,

where again ἐστιν has been added.

In Mark ii. 4 the original text

> ΚΑΙ ΧΑΛωΣΙ ΤΟΝ ΚΡΑΒΑΤΤΟΝ ΟΠΟΥ
> Ο ΠΑΡΑΛΥΤΙΚΟΣ ΚΑΤΕΚΕΙΤΟ

was translated

> ET DIMISERVNT GRABATTVM IN QVO ERAT
> PARALYTICVS IACENS ;

and this rendering of the imperfect tense by means of the auxiliary and the participle is the reason why in our text we find the passage written

> ΚΑΙ ΧΑΛωΣΙ ΤΟΝ ΚΡΑΒΑΤΤΟΝ ΟΠΟΥ ΗΝ
> Ο ΠΑΡΑΛΥΤΙΚΟΣ ΚΑΤΑΚΕΙΜΕΝΟΣ,

and this ὅπου ἦν made it further necessary to add in the previous line the words ὁ ἰησοῦς, viz. ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην ὅπου ἦν ὁ ἰησοῦς.

In Mark iv. 31,

> ΜΕΙΚΡΟΤΕΡΟΝ ΕΣΤΙΝ
> ΠΑΝΤωΝ ΤωΝ ΣΠΕΡΜΑΤωΝ ΤωΝ ΕΠΙ ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ

was rendered

> MINOR EST
> OMNIBVS SEMINIBVS · QVAE SVNT IN TERRA,

and in consequence of this, τῶν is replaced in the Codex Bezae by ἅ εἰσιν.

In Mark v. 9,

> ΤΙ ΣΟΙ ΟΝΟΜΑ ΚΑΙ ΑΠΕΚΡΙΘΗ
> ΟΝΟΜΑ ΜΟΙ ΛΕΓΕωΝ

is a sufficient equivalent to the Latin

> QVOD TIBI NOMEN EST · ET RESPONDIT
> EST MIHI NOMEN LEGIO.

But to make the parallelism more exact, we have the Greek altered to

> ΤΙ ΣΟΙ ΟΝΟΜΑ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΠΕΚΡΙΘΗ
> ΕΣΤΙΝ ΜΟΙ ΟΝΟΜΑ ΛΕΓΙωΝ.

In Mark vi. 3 the original text

> ΚΑΙ ΟΥΚ ΕΙΣΙΝ ΑΙ ΑΔΕΛΦΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ
> ωΔΕ ΠΡΟΣ ΗΜΑΣ

would naturally be rendered

> NONNE ET SORORES EIVS
> HIC NOBISCVM SVNT.

Hence the word εἰσὶν was erased in the first line of the Greek and carried into the second ; and further *nonne et* was replaced by the more exactly equivalent οὐχὶ καί.

In Mark vi. 20,

ΕΙΔωΣ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΑΝΔΡΑ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ
ΚΑΙ ΑΓΙΟΝ

was rendered

SCIENS EVM VIRVM IVSTVM
ET SANCTVM ESSE.

Accordingly εἶναι has been added after ἅγιον in the Greek.

The auxiliary verb would seem to have been also carried into the Greek in Mark viii. 2 : it probably stood at first

ΟΤΙ ΗΜΕΡΑΙΣ ΤΡΙCΙΝ ΠΡΟCΜΕΝΟΥCΙ ΜΟΙ.

The Latin translator rendered the first words

QVONIAM IAM TRIDVVM EST ;

and paraphrased the last word or words, by saying

EX QVO HIC SVNT ;

and then the attempt was made to turn *triduum est* literally into Greek, giving us ἡμέραι τρεῖς εἰσίν ; and further *ex quo hic sunt* has been restored verbatim to the Greek, with the final and fearful result

ΟΤΙ ΗΔΗ ΗΜΕΡΑΙ ΤΡΙC ΕΙCΙΝ · ΑΠΟ ΠΟΤΕ ωΔΕ ΕΙCΙΝ.

Very similar treatment will be found in Matt. xv. 32.

In Mark ix. 34 the Greek had

ΠΡΟC ΑΛΛΗΛΟΥC ΓΑΡ ΔΙΕΛΕΧΘΗCΑΝ
ΤΙC ΜΙΖωΝ.

The idiomatic τίς μείζων had to be paraphrased, and the Latin shews

QVIS ESSE[T] ILLORVM MAIOR.

Consequently the Greek of Codex Bezae has added two words and reads

ΤΙC ΜΙΖωΝ ΓΕΝΗΤΑΙ ΑΥΤωΝ.

In Mark x. 27,

ΠΑΡΑ ΑΝΘΡωΠΟΙC ΤΟΥΤΟ ΑΔΥΝΑΤΟΝ

becomes in Latin

> APVT HOMINES HOC · IMPOSSIBILE EST,

and so ἐστιν is inserted at the end of the Greek, and the natural ellipticity of the Greek speech gives way before the law of numerical verbal equivalence.

In Mark xiv. 21,

> ΚΑΘΩΣ ΓΕΓΡΑΠΤΑΙ ΠΕΡΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ

was properly rendered

> SICVT SCRIPTVM EST DE ILLO,

but since *scriptum est* is two words, a correction is made to the Greek, and we have

> ΚΑΘΩΣ ЄΣΤΙΝ ΓΕΓΡΑΜΜΕΝΟΝ ΠΕΡΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ·

In Acts iv. 34 the texts run

> ΟΥΔЄ ΓΑΡ ΕΝΔΕΗΣ ΤΙΣ ΥΠΗΡΧΕΝ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ
> ΟΣΟΙ ΓΑΡ ΚΤΗΤΟΡΕΣ ΗΣΑΝ ΧΩΡΙΩΝ
> Η ΟΙΚΕΙΩΝ ΥΠΗΡΧΟΝ·
>
> NEC ENIM INOSP QVISQVAM ERAT IN EIS
> QVODQVOD POSSESSORES ERANT PRAEDIORVM
> AVT DOMVM.

Here we see that ὑπῆρχον in the third line has been translated by *erant* in the second Latin line: therefore the scribe has added the word ἦσαν to the second line of the Greek for the sake of correspondence.

In Acts v. 38 the Latin translator had to deal with

> ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΝΥΝ ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ ΛΕΓΩ ΥΜΕΙΝ,

so he translated τὰ νῦν by *quae nunc sunt* and the necessary εἰσιν was then carried back into the Greek. Curiously enough, probably because *nunc* and *sunt* have a similar appearance, the word *sunt* slipped from the Latin which actually stands

> ET QVAE NVNC FRATRES DICO VOBIS;

but its equivalent stays in the Greek

> ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΝΥΝ ЄΙΣΙΝ.................

In Matthew x. 10 we find

5 *   ΑΞΙΟΣ ΓΑΡ ЄΣΤΙΝ Ο ΕΡΓΑΤΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΤΡΟΦΗΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ,

where ἐστιν has been introduced because the Latin, with very pardonable freedom, has given us

<div align="center">DIGNVS EST ENIM OPERARIVS ESCA SVA.</div>

In Acts xvii. 6,

<div align="center">ΟΤΙ ΟΙ ΤΗΝ ΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΗΝ ΑΝΑCΤΑΤΩCΑΝΤΕC
ΟΥΤΟΙ ΕΙCΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΝΘΑΔΕ ΠΑΡΕΙCΙΝ,</div>

the translator took καὶ as a connective of two sentences, and accordingly translated

<div align="center">QVIA QVI ORBEM TERRAE INQVITAVERVNT
HI SVNT ET HOC VENERVNT.</div>

Hence *sunt* has given rise to the word *εἰσιν* which we see to be added in the Greek text.

In Acts xxi. 21 we find

<div align="center">ΟΤΙ ΑΠΟCΤΑCΙΑΝ ΔΙΔΑCΚΕΙC ΑΠΟ ΜΩCΕΩC
ΤΟΥC ΚΑΤΑ ΕΘΝΗ ΕΙCΙΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΥC.
QVIA ABSCENSIONEM DOCENS A MOYSEN
QVI IN GENTIBVS SVNT IVDAEOS.</div>

This is a very ragged piece of work; *docens* is for *doces*; there is no immediate antecedent to *qui*, but, if we may judge from other texts there probably once stood in the Greek in the second line πάντας, and in that case *omnes* would have been at the beginning of the corresponding Latin. Now since, according to his method, the translator rendered τοὺς κατὰ τὰ ἔθνη by *qui in gentibus sunt*, we are not surprised to see *εἰσιν* thrust into the Greek text; and at the same time the superfluous τὰ disappeared.

In Matt. xvii. 2 the auxiliary has been dropped from the Latin, leaving

<div align="center">ET TRANSFIGVRATVS IHS CORAM ILLIS.</div>

Hence the Greek

<div align="center">ΚΑΙ ΜΕΤΑΜΟΡΦΩΘΕΙC Ο ΙΗC ʹ ΕΝΠΡΟCΘΕΝ ΑΥΤΩΝ.</div>

In Matt. xxv. 25,

<div align="center">ΕΙΔΟΥ ΕΧΕΙC ΤΟ CΟΝ
ECCE HABES QVOD TVVM,</div>

we see that *est* has been removed from the Latin, in the interests of equality.

In Matt. xxv. 41,

TOTε εΡΙ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΙϹ εΞ εΥωΝΥΜωΝ
TVNC AIT ET HIS QVI A SINISTRIS,

where *sunt* has dropped from the Latin.

Cf. xxv. 34, where the same thing occurs

HIS QVI A DEXTRIS EIVS.

Note also in the same verse the dropping of *quod* before *praeparatum est*.

In Mark xiv. 36,

ΔΥΝΑΤΑ ΠΑΝΤΑ
ϹΟΙ εΙϹΙΝ,

εἰσιν has been added because of the Latin

POSSIBILIA OMNIA
TIBI SVNT.

We should at least have expected *ἐστιν*.

Luke viii. 25,

ΠΟΥ εϹΤΙΝ Η ΠΙϹΤΙϹ ΥΜωΝ
VBI EST FIDES VESTRA,

where *ἐστιν* is intrusive from the Latin.

We have shewn then, conclusively, that the auxiliary verb shews the same phenomena of intrusion and extrusion that we should have expected on the hypothesis of Latinization. Let us then examine some other cases where reflex action between Greek and Latin texts is likely to have occurred.