

PART III

CHAPTER XIII.

SOME PHONETIC PECULIARITIES OF THE BEZA GREEK.

1. *On the Graecisms of the Latin text of Codex Bezae.*

Whether the Codex Bezae is ultimately derived from an African, a Roman or an Old French rendering, we must not forget that the Roman Church was a Greek Church in many respects, and the Old Gallican Church was Greek in almost every respect, while even the African Church had a Greek element: so that we need not wonder if we find some Graecisms on the Latin side. For an illustration of the diffusion of Greek forms, it may be noted that the *Peregrinatio Sylviae*, of the end of the IVth century, which has been referred to Southern Gaul, contains traces of the influence of the Greek colonists' speech upon the Vulgar Latin.

Thus Sylvia says of the services in Jerusalem,

"et cata singulos ymnos fit oratio"

"qui cata singulos ymnos vel antiphonas
orationes dicunt¹."

Moreover the Vulgar Latin knew such forms as *cata unum*, however harsh they may seem to us, and out of this form was developed the Old French *chadun* = *chēun*.

Our MS. shews one curious use of *ava* on the Latin side: it is in Luke ix. 3,

nequae ana duas tunicas habere.

This is the more curious, inasmuch as *ava* is omitted in the Greek of \aleph BCFL Ξ , and so we must either say that it belongs purely to the Latin translator, or that it had been dropped from

¹ Gamurrini, *Peregrinatio Sylviae*, p. 45.

the Greek text in early times; in which latter case might it not be a Greek correction carried into the wrong column?

2. *Dialectical changes in the Greek of Cod. Bezae.*

Now let us examine the peculiar forms of the Greek text of our MS. just as we did in the case of the Latin.

One of the first things that we shall notice is the irregularity of the aspiration. Scrivener gives a list of specimens of this peculiarity¹ and makes no attempt to analyse them, thus leaving the impression that the greatest confusion prevailed in the mind of the primitive scribe to whom we owe our Western Greek.

An analysis of the instances given will shew the following results.

Four times we have an unusual smooth breathing before εἰρίσκω (Matt. [2] + Luke + Acts); three times a similar feature with ἐξῆς (κατεξῆς), all in Acts; once with οὗτος (Mark) and once with ἐαυτῶν (Mark).

For the irregular rough breathing we have ἡδύνατο once (Mark); three times the rough breathing is found with the stem εἶδον (Luke + Acts [2]); three times with ἴδιος (Matt. [2] + Mark); once with ὀλίγος (Acts); once we have ἐφίστασθε (Acts) and once ἐφαγάγειν (Acts): twice we have such cases as ἐμοῦ, ἐμέ (Mark + Acts); observe also the forms ἐλπίζω and ἐλπίς (Luke + Acts).

Now, if this be madness, there is a method in it: for the same words shew a tendency to the same aspiration. The rough breathing with εἶδον is, of course, the lost digamma; the same is true of ἴδιος whether its earlier form be σφέδιος or φέδιος².

We cannot be quite sure that the sixth-century scribe is responsible for the spelling of this latter word, because it occurs often in the Vatican MS. and once at least in the Sinaitic; but we may regard it as a genuine dialectical form and not as an error. The same thing is true of ἐλπίς which had a digamma, and consequently appears in the Latin inscriptions as a proper name *Helpis*, and occasionally with a strong breathing in mss.³ of the

¹ p. xlvii.

² Vaníček, *Etym.* 1035. Note that the form καθ' ἰδίαν is discussed in Keil, *Inscrip. Thessal. tres*, p. 10.

³ See Hort, *Introd.* 145.

New Testament. With *ἄγω* the case is more difficult: according to Curtius, *Griech. Etym.* p. 676, "there can be no doubt in other cases that the spiritus asper has crept in irregularly, in *ἄγειν* &c. ...The case is the same with *ἡγεῖσθαι* which no one thinks of separating from *ἄγειν*: by the side of which we get the very rare *ἄγειν*—especially as the derived verb now and then itself shows the lenis." It is sufficient then to remark that this case also is a recognized variation and not a scribe's blunder.

ἐπίσταμαι is again quite a possible form: the formation of the word *ἐπίσταμαι* is uncertain, and we cannot say positively that the word is a derivative from *ἵστημι*. If, however, its origin should be sought elsewhere, the analogy of the forms would be sure to invite the aspirate and some dialects would shew it.

The case of *ἐμέ* and *ἐμοῦ* is more difficult: it is complicated with the problem of the origin of the aspirated *ἡμεῖς* (which some hold to be merely an imitation of *ύμεῖς*, while others will have it to be due to a misplaced spirant from the middle of the word, cf. Sanskrit *asmat*). There are traces of aspiration in the inflexion of the first personal pronoun which have hardly been adequately explained. Thus we have the Boeotian *ίών* and the Sanskrit *aḥam* to equate with the normal Greek form *ἐγών*. Then there is the Latin dative *mihi* against the Greek *ἐμοί*. It is possible then that the primitive root had an aspirated letter, which shews itself in the dialectical forms of our transcriber. Or it may be a mere vulgarism of the province where he was brought up.

ὀλίγος and *ἡδέναντο* are more obscure. The former is usually derived from a primitive root *lik*, and Curtius draws an analogy between the case of *μίσγω* from the root *mik*, and asks whether it is possible that a spirant has been lost from the middle of the word and compensated for by a rough breathing. In the Æolic dialect the word was accentuated on the first syllable, which would account for the regression of the spirant. Nor is it without importance that in this dialect and its neighbour the Thessalian, the form *ὀλιζος* was current, which is the more curious in that the Æolic dialects usually replaced the *ζ* by *σδ*. We suspect then that the form of our MS. is an Asian dialect form, not without connection with the form *ὀλιζος* (cf. Ahrens, *De Gr. Ling. Dial.* i.

219). But we must be careful again in identifying this form with the dialect of our scribe; it recurs in other early MSS., e.g. in Acts xix. 23 in $\aleph B$, and it may be the primitive form for the Acts. For the other word $\eta\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron$ I can give no reason.

So much for the eccentrically aspirated forms¹. As to the unaspirated cases, they can probably be put in a satisfactory light. The most curious is the very decided case $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\xi\eta\varsigma$. Curtius (p. 192) equates this with $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\iota\eta\varsigma$ and takes it to the same root as $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$. We may regard it as certain that in the district represented by our writer the word was pronounced without a breathing, which almost implies that $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ itself had the lenis ($\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omega$). In any case the scribe is quite decided as to the form, as he is also with regard to $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\omega$.

We may say then that the group of words shewing eccentric aspiration in Codex Bezae constitutes a series of dialectical peculiarities which ought to enable us to identify the nationality of the writer. Let us examine into some more of his peculiarities. A very interesting case is his spelling of the word $\chi\iota\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$.

Matt. x. 10,

$\mu\eta\tau\epsilon\ \lambda\gamma\omicron\ \chi\epsilon\iota\theta\omega\acute{\nu}\alpha\varsigma\ \mu\eta\tau\epsilon\ \gamma\upsilon\tau\omicron\lambda\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha.$

Luke iii. 11,

$\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\ \lambda\gamma\omicron\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \omicron\ \epsilon\chi\omega\acute{\nu}\ \lambda\gamma\omicron\ \chi\iota\tau\acute{\omega}\acute{\nu}\alpha\varsigma.$

Everywhere else we have the usual form. Now, from the second of these instances we can see that the scribe of D has corrected his copy: he not merely has τ for θ , but he emphasises it by putting in a smooth breathing over the vowel. We may be sure then that he read $\chi\iota\theta\omega\acute{\nu}\alpha\varsigma$ and, taking this with the first case, we have clearly the form $\chi\iota\theta\omega\acute{\nu}$ for the original translator. This might be due to the influence of the original Semitic form, but when we find that the Ionic form is $\kappa\iota\theta\acute{\omega}\nu$, we shall probably be able to divine what was meant by the scribe of the Codex Bezae. He has given us an Asian dialectical form. Indeed the difference between the Bezan uncorrected form $\chi\iota\theta\acute{\omega}\nu$, and the Ionic $\kappa\iota\theta\acute{\omega}\nu$ is not so great as might be supposed; for the Ionic

¹ The study of these mutations of the breathings is not without effect on the text of the N. T.: for instance, it is quite within the bounds of possibility that $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega\acute{\nu}$ has been written $\tau\epsilon\chi\gamma\acute{\omega}\nu$ in Matt. xi. 19, and hence corrected to $\epsilon\pi\gamma\omega\acute{\nu}$.

and some other Asiatic dialects retained an explosive element in the pronunciation of the aspirates; and we see this constantly in the transliterations made by our scribe: e.g. in *Betsaida* for *Βηθσαΐδα*; and the apparent metathesis of the breathing from *χιτῶν* to *κιθῶν* occurs often in our text, as in Acts xvi. 16, where we have *πίθωνα* represented by *phytonem*; and Acts xvi. 11, *samotrachiam* for *σαμοθράκην*; cf. also Mark vii. 9, *ἀρεθεῖτε* for *ἀθετεῖτε*.

Let us examine more closely this question of the explosive element in the pronunciation of the aspirates. It has been pointed out by Mullach¹ that this substitution of *κ* for *χ* exists even in modern times, especially in the dialect of Rhodes; where we find *ἔκω*, *στοκάζομαι*, *τεκνίτης*; *τέλω* is found for *θέλω* amongst certain Asiatic Greeks², and very commonly the vulgar speech puts *στ* in the place of *σθ*; as *ἐγνωρίστην*, *γραφόμαστε*. This last error is very common in Cod. Bezae, since we find in Mark iv. 1, *καθῆσται* for *καθήσθαι*, where the word cannot be an indicative since it answers to the Latin *sedere*. In Acts xix. 25 we find *ἐπίστασται* for *ἐπίστασθε*. Now, it is concerning such forms as these that Curtius wrote (*Gr. Etym.* p. 418) as follows: "as early as in my review of Mullach (*Zeitschr.* vi. 236) I argued that this circumstance was only to be explained from a pronunciation of *θ* in which a hard explosive element was heard." And this explanation is probably correct; Arendt's objection that, upon this hypothesis, the forms *χθ*, *φθ* would be unpronounceable falls to the ground when it is shewn from our MS. that such sounds were not pronounced. Thus we find, Mark ii. 2, *συνήκθησαν*: Mark vii. 34, *διανέκθητι*: and the form *ἐκθρός* occurs in Matt. x. 36; xiii. 35; xxii. 44; Luke i. 74; Acts ii. 35; xiii. 10: so that this must have been the regular form of our primitive scribe, and it is owing to correction of his spelling that we get such forms as Mark xii. 36, *ἐκχθους* (for *ἐκθρους*)³.

¹ *Grammatik der griechischen Vulgarsprachen*, Berlin, 1856.

² Will this help us to explain how our scribe in Matt. xi. 19 came to write *τελώνων* for *τελωνῶν*?

³ Cf. Karsten, *De Titulorum Ionicorum Dialecto Commentatio*, p. 13, "antiquissimis temporibus iis locis, quibus litera aspirata non genuina erat, sed ex literis t et b, p et h, k et h oritur, i.e. in elisione eam ob causam omissam esse, quod assimilatio literarum tenuium ad sequentem spiritum asperum nondum facta erat, sed uterque

The same phonetic explanation furnishes us with the reason for the transcription of certain proper names; thus we find *μαθθαῖος* constantly as against the Latin *matthaeus*, shewing that the first *θ* was sounded nearly as *τ*. Cf. *σαφφύρα* = *sapphira* in Acts v. 1.

We may say then that the Greek dialect of the original scribe of the bilingual tradition (and perhaps this means to a certain extent his successors the later copyists) was marked by an early pronunciation of the aspirated sounds such as probably prevailed amongst the Asiatic Greeks and in some of the islands near the coast of Asia Minor. It is necessary to bear this peculiarity carefully in mind, or we may be in danger, as we have shewn in similar cases, of referring important and characteristic forms to mere scribal errors instead of to nationality.

Further, when we find, for instance, in Mark vi. 21, the form *γενεχλῖος* we are not to dismiss it as the absurd mistake of a half-educated person. There are similar changes in early and modern Greek dialects. And we must ask ourselves the question as to what Greek dialects, early or late, exhibit the change of *θ* into *χ*. Curtius draws attention to the occurrence of the Doric forms *ὄρνι-χ* by the side of the ordinary Greek *ὄρνι-θ*, and the shorter form *ὄρνι-*, as seen in the accusative form *ὄρνιν*. The suggestion is the more appropriate to our case inasmuch as our MS. actually gives the very form *ὄρνιξ* in Luke xiii. 34¹. Moreover this form, occurring as it does in the spontaneous variations of the scribe, is not likely to be other than a genuine dialectical form. I mean that Buttmann's objection to it as being a mere grammatical refinement is probably wrongly taken. His criticism was based upon the fact that the literary Doric of Pindar and Alkman shews *ὄρνιχος*, *ὄρνιχα*, etc., but *ὄρνις* and *ὄρνιν*². But the evidence of Photius (*Δωριεὺς ὄρνιξ, παρ' Ἀλεξανδρίῳ δὲ ἄπαξ ὄρνις*) would seem to shew that the form is genuine.

Now this form is set down as a Dorism³: and if the grammarians disjunctim pronuntiabatur. Hanc autem legem non solum apud Ionas et Aeolae a quibus haec sonorum disjunctio diutissima servata videtur esse, sed etiam apud reliquos Graecos antiquiorum temporum quondam valuisse."

¹ It appears also probably as a Western reading in the Sinaitic Codex.

² Ahrens, II. 243.

³ Ahrens quotes a similar change of *πλήχω* for *πλήθω* from Cramer, *Anecd. Oxon.*

rians and philologists are right in recognizing it as such, it is probable that our form *γενεχλῖσις* belongs to the same school, which gives us two possible cases of Dorism in Codex Bezae. The Dorian Dialect held its own against the common speech in many of the Greek islands and in outlying parts of the Roman empire. For example, Suetonius observes that they spoke Doric in the island of Rhodes down to the time of Tiberius. And even where the set speech disappeared, the traces of it were never wholly lost.

But as to the explanation of the form in question we are left in obscurity. Curtius thinks that the *χ* of *ορνιχ* is the mark of a diminutive suffix, and compares the "*χ* with the often recurring diminutive *κ*, and the *θ* with the *τ* that serves the same purpose in the related languages." This diminutive idea is not altogether foreign to such forms as *γένεθλον* from *γένος*.

A further peculiarity of our writer's dialect is a weakness and shifting of the liquids. In this respect his speech was marked by a feature something like that of the Romance languages where, in final syllables, *rln* are extremely mutable: e.g. the Spanish *hombre* = *hominem*: the French *timbre* = *tympa-num* and perhaps *trésor* for *tensaurus*¹. The Codex Bezae shews one curious substitution of *ἐρχορται* for *ἐρχονται*, Mark xvi. 2. More common still is its change of *λ* and *ν*. Thus we have, Luke xii. 35, *οἱ λύχλοι*; John v. 35, *ὁ λύχλον ex errore* for *ὁ λύχλος*; Luke xii. 55, *πνέοντα* is changed to *πλέοντα*. These are not mere barbarisms: the occurrence of the phenomenon twice shews that *λύχλος* is the scribe's dialectical form: the other case we should dismiss if it were not for the precisely similar case of the Greek *πλεύμων* as a variation of *πνεύμων*, along with the Latin *pulmo* (for *pulmon*). The two words evidently belong to the same classification. Pauli's explanation that *πνεύμων* is the later form, arrived at by an attempt to bring the word into harmony with *πνέω*, breaks down in view of the fact that the ms. shews *πνέω* changed to *πλέω*. Yet the antiquity of the form *πλεύμων* would seem to be shewn by the Latin. We shall at all

1. 149. 6, as an Æolism, observing however that the regular form *πλήθοισα* is found in Sappho.

² See Curtius, *Griech. Etym.* p. 444.

events say that $\pi\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ is an early collateral form of $\pi\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, preserved for us through the Latin *pulmon* and through the vocabulary of the Greek who wrote the Beza ms.¹ The genuineness of the form $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\chi\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ is, I think, also capable of demonstration, however eccentric it may seem at first sight. A similar change of sounds may be noted in Luke i. 15 ($\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\rho\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\pi\iota\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\bar{\upsilon}$), with which note that Curtius, *Gr. Etym.* 329, says that $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\omega$ is "from a stem with ρ instead of the λ appearing in $\mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\omicron$."²

No doubt many other forms in our Greek text are capable of a similar dialectical elucidation. For instance, the form $\pi\alpha\nu\delta\omicron\kappa\epsilon\iota$ in Luke x. 35 is in harmony with the Ionic spelling of the verb $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ (as for instance in Herodotus), and with the proper name of a Trojan $\Pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\omicron\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ mentioned in *Iliad* xi. 490³. The same spelling turns up in Æolic Greek, as in Sappho i. 22, where Ahrens observes that it is not a peculiarity confined to that dialect. Moreover it occurs commonly in Doric, as upon the Heracleean Tables i. 57, and in Pindar⁴. We need not then be surprised at its occurrence in our ms.

Again, we find in our text twice the form $\mu\alpha\sigma\theta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ (Luke xi. 27, xxiii. 29). The origin of this form seems to be as follows: both the Æolic and Doric dialects replace the ζ of the primitive form $\mu\alpha\zeta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ by $\sigma\delta$. And there is some grammatical authority for believing that the Dorians changed their $\mu\alpha\sigma\delta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ into $\mu\alpha\sigma\theta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$. Accordingly Ahrens (ii. 84) quotes, though without committing himself on the point, the following from Eustathius: $\text{Ἡρακλείδης... λέγει ὅτι καὶ τὸν μασδὸν οὕτω μασθὸν λέγουσιν οἱ Δωριεῖς καὶ τὸ ψεύδος δέ, φησὶν, ἄρα πάντες τὸ ε ψύθος φασί.}$ The authority of grammarians, without some support from philological or epigraphic considerations, is uncertain enough. But the suggestion as to the existence of the Dorism is worth examination. Other forms will

¹ Cf. the Latin *flare* and the English *blow*. We shall shew later on that the same form underlies the corrupt Western text of Acts xxvii. 15.

² From p. 547 it appears that he is quoting Buttmann, *Lexilogus*, i. 259.

³ Vanicek, p. 334.

⁴ Lindemann, *De Dialecto Ionica recentiore*, p. 73, shews the persistence of these forms in the Asiatic Greek. "Iones in nonnullis vocabulis tenues servarunt, velut in $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\mu\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$. In libellis Luciani mira Codicum constantia non leguntur formae nisi Ionicæ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ et $\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\varsigma$, uno excepto loco libri de astrologia." He gives a number of similar cases from the later literature (Arrian &c.).

suggest themselves in this connexion: *όδαγος* and *όδαγεω* occur in Matt. xv. 14 and Luke vi. 39¹.

In Luke x. 31 we have *κατα τυχα* (for *τυχαν*) where we should expect *τυχην*. This is a characteristic of the Æolic and Doric dialects.

In Acts viii. 21 we have *ανεθραψατο* implying the form *τράφω*, which, like *τράπω*, *τάμνω*, characterizes the Doric and Ionic dialects; as a matter of fact it may be the primitive form².

In Luke xx. 42 we have

εν τη βυβλω των ψαλμων,

and Matt. xii. 26,

εν τη βυβλω μουσεως.

We may infer that the scribe preferred the spelling *βυβλος* if not *βυβλιον*. It is a question whether he is Ionizing or not. According to Smyth³

"Herodotus has *βύβλος*, *βύβλινος*, *βυβλίον*. A complete mustering of these words in Stein's edition shews that the chief support of the forms with *ι* is derived from mss. P, R, while in one-seventh of all passages there is no variant... The variants in favour of *ι* are due to the scribes rather than to the influence of such actual forms in *ι* as we find as early as 400 B.C. in Attic. The forms in *ι* continue in Attic inscription until the second century B.C., after which *βυβλίον* is the normal form."

The evidence, then, is hardly sufficient to demonstrate, while it may suggest, Ionism; it is worthy of note that our scribe's dialect shews the form *βύβλος* only and not *βυβλίον*, the reason being that in the latter case the change in the accent gives the advantage to the *ι* vowel and accelerates the change of the *υ* by assimilating it to the accented syllable. This makes us believe the scribe's forms to be dialectical rather than literary⁴.

¹ There is a trace of this form also in the Vatican ms.

² A pretty case of dialectical variation, which I am unable to localize further than to say that it has an Asiatic look, is *νησος* of Acts xiii. 6. Taken along with the Ionic *νησσα* (duck), we ought to be able to decide that the idea in both words is that of *swimming*.

³ *Vowel System of the Ionic Dialect*, p. 35 in *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 1889.

⁴ Cf. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, p. 13 note.

A curious feature of the Ionic dialect is its exchange of ϵ for α in certain verb-forms, such as $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, $\tau\omicron\lambda\acute{\mu}\epsilon\omega$, $\omicron\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ etc.¹

And the same feature is to be found in the Codex Bezae, where we have $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (Matt. xv. 23 $\eta\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$); $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\beta\rho\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (John xi. 33 $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\beta\rho\iota\mu\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\mu\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$); $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (Luke viii. 53 $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$); $\kappa\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (Acts xii. 6 $\kappa\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\mu\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$); $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (Mark vii. 10 $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\iota\tau\omega$). These forms can hardly be regarded as accidental, and if not accidental, then they are dialectically significant.

For $\theta\upsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ and one or two similar forms I am unable to give an explanation.

Reviewing the cases which we have brought forward, we find many traces of Ionism, and a few Dorisms: if we could neglect the Dorisms we should probably say that the conditions were satisfied by an Asiatic dialect somewhere north of Smyrna; and if the Ionisms could be neglected we should probably refer to that last stronghold of Dorism, the island of Rhodes.

Now, when we take the two together may we not say that, since the name of the Rhône and of certain cities in the Rhône Valley indicate an original Rhodian migration², and since the history of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne shews that there was also a later Ionic migration, all the conditions for the production of such a dialect as we find in Codex Bezae are met by the hypothesis of a Greek scribe writing in some one of the churches or monasteries in that part of France: always bearing in mind that there will be residual peculiarities which are to be traced to the primitive hands that laboured on the autographs of the New Testament books³?

We see nothing, then, in the Greek text that militates against the theory that we have so strongly supported from the Latin; viz. that Codex Bezae is a Gallican bilingual of the sixth century.

¹ See Smyth, p. 21.

² Cf. Jerome, in *Galat.* lib. ii. "Massiliam Phocaei condiderunt, quos ait Varro trilingues esse, quod et Graece loquuntur et Latine et Gallice. Oppidum Rhoda coloni Rhodiorum locaverunt, unde amnis Rhodanus nomen accepit."

³ We ought not to omit a reference to one other Ionism of our text; the pluperfect formations without the augment are very common. Scrivener points out seven such cases: and these are quite sufficient to indicate a characteristic of the transcriber's dialect, especially when we bear in mind that they occur all through the ms. from Matthew to Acts, and not in any special section of it.

3. *Decay of the Greek prepositions.*

There are a few residual forms in the Greek which need a word or two of explanation. We must expect an occasional streak of Latin influence; indeed this has already been alluded to. Such cases are *λεπρωσος*, *φλαγελλωσας* etc. Probably to the same influence is due the exchange of the *m* sound for *s* in *σκολης*, which we find in Mark ix. 48. The typical change of this kind is *senes* for *senex*; which is one of Dr Hamann's test cases for Italian forms. It is doubtful whether the geographical limits can be so sharply drawn.

Besides these occasional forms we have to notice that the Greek prepositions are already in a state of decay: we find *με* for *μετά*, *κα* for *κατά*, and *ἀ* for *ἀνά*. The following are some of the instances:

Luke xv. 30. *καφαγοντι* for *καταφαγοντι*.

Mark v. 27. *πε του ιην* for *περι του ιησου*.

Mark x. 1. *και εκειθεν αστας* for *και εκειθεν αναστας*.

Luke iv. 17. *απτυξας* for *αναπτυξας*.

Acts v. 39. *αν δυνασσεσθαι καλυσαι αυτους* for *καταλυσαι αυτους*.

Perhaps

Luke xxiii. 43. *τω επλησονται* for *επιπλησονται*

should be referred to a similar decline of the language.

It will be said that these are accidents; I think not; we find similar traces of linguistic change elsewhere; for instance, the text of *Hermas* in the *Codex Sinaiticus* is not free from them.

4. *Supposed Alexandrian forms.*

Concerning the supposed Alexandrianism of such forms as *εξηλθοσαν* (Mark viii. 11), *ειδοσαν* (Mark ix. 9), *ηλθοσαν* (Mark ix. 33) I have no information to add to the well-known fact that similar forms occur in the *Septuagint*.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE CODEX BEZAE A MONTANIST MANUSCRIPT.

WE shall now endeavour to shew that the ancestry of the Codex Bezae has passed in its earliest stages through Montanist hands.

The first point to which we desire to draw attention relates to the line-division of the Codex: it is recognized that the Codex Bezae has been copied from a MS. similarly divided to itself with respect to the lines; which is much the same thing as saying that the line-division is ancient. Indeed it was natural that such a system of division should spring up in connexion with bilingual codices.

Now turn to Luke xiii. 29, 30,

ΚΑΙ ΗΞΟΥCΙΝ ΑΠΟ ΑΝΑΤΟΛΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΔΥCΜΩΝ
ΚΑΙ ΒΟΡΡΑ ΚΑΙ ΝΟΤΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΚΛΕΙΘΗCΟΝΤΑΙ
ΕΝ ΤΗ ΒΑCΙΛΕΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΘΥ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΔΟΥ ΕΙCΙΝ
ΕCΧΑΤΟΙ ΟΙ ΕCΟΝΤΑΙ ΠΡΩΤΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΕΙCΙΝ
ΠΡΩΤΟΙ ΟΙ ΕCΟΝΤΑΙ ΕCΧΑΤΟΙ
ET VENIENT AB ORIENTE ET OCCIDENTEM
ET AB AQUILONE ET AVSTRO ET RECVMBENT
IN REGNO DEI ET ECCE SVNT
NOVISSIMI QVI ERVNT PRIMI ET SVNT
PRIMI QVI ERVNT NOVISSIMI

The point to be noticed is the way in which the words *καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰσὶν* = ET ECCE SVNT have attached themselves to the third line. We shall now shew reason to believe that they have this position by a long inheritance.

Let us turn to the Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas (c. xi.), where, in the vision of Saturus we find a description of the rapture of the Martyrs under the care of four angels to the gates

of Paradise, where they were received and welcomed by four other angels. Now, the angels who bear them on their way are, I think, derived from the Gospel, "He shall send forth his angels...and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds"¹; hence these angels are four in number: they are the angels of the four winds.

But according to the passage quoted from Luke, the elect do indeed come from the four winds, but the description is worded so as to end a clause with the words *καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐλθόν*. Accordingly we find in the *Acta Perpetuae* the following sentence, "et dixerunt (sc. alii quatuor angeli) ceteris angelis: Ecce sunt, ecce sunt: cum admiratione." This passage has, hitherto, been unexplained: but in the light of the text as arranged in Codex Bezae, we begin to see what it means: it is an early commentary upon a badly divided text.

Here then we have our first suggestion that the Codex Bezae has as regards its ancestry passed through Montanist hands; we find a similarly divided text in the hands of the martyrs of Carthage. Let us follow the matter a little further and see whether there is anything in the actual text to confirm this opinion. We naturally look for such points as (i) the manipulation of favourite passages: (ii) the insertion of glosses which carry some special mode of interpretation; and, in particular, we should look for light on the work of the Spirit, and on the communication and interpretation of visions.

Under the heading of favourite texts, we draw attention to the singular coincidence between the reading of our ms. in Acts ii. 17,

ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΥΟΥΣΙΝ ΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΑΥΤΩΝ
ΚΑΙ ΘΥΓΑΤΕΡΕΣ ΑΥΤΩΝ
ET PROPHETABUNT FILII EORVM
ET FILIAS EORVM,

and the Latin of the *Acta Perpetuae* (c. i.)

et prophetabunt filii filiaeque eorum.

(The Greek text of the *Acta* has corrected the textual aberration.) The same reading that we have observed in Codex Bezae is found in Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* v. 8) and elsewhere.

¹ Matt. xxiv. 31.

Is it unreasonable to suggest that the change to *fili eorum* has been made by some one who was interested to prove what we know Justin to have affirmed, that the gift of prophecy had passed over from the Jewish Church to the Christian? May not such a change be Montanistic? In any case, note the striking coincidence between the text of D and the Carthaginian text of the second century.

Again; we know that the Acts of the Apostles is everywhere decorated with glosses, so that we might almost call it a text and a commentary, and some of the glosses are very suggestive and valuable. Are any of them Montanist? That is the question. Are there any glosses that refer to the work of the Paraclete, and to His indwelling?

In Acts vi. 10, we find

ΟΙΤΙΝΕΣ ΟΥΚ ΙΧΧΥΟΝ ΑΝΤΙΣΤΗΝΑΙ ΤΗ ΣΟΦΙΑ
ΤΗ ΟΥΧΗ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΤΩ ΠΝΙ ΤΩ ΑΓΙΩ Ω ΕΛΑΛΕΙ
QVI NON POTERANT RESISTERE SAPIENTIAE
QVAE ERAT IN EO ET SPO SANCTO IN QVO LOQVEBATVR.

Here the added words are *τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ*, and *τῷ ἁγίῳ*: the wisdom of Stephen was an indwelling Wisdom; the spirit which he spake by was the Holy Spirit. "Wisdom in all ages enters into holy souls and makes them friends of God and prophets."

In Acts xv. 32 the statement that Judas and Silas were prophets is enlarged on, by the addition that this was because they were filled with the Holy Spirit:

ΙΟΥΔΑΣ ΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΣΕΙΛΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΙ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΑΙ
ΟΝΤΕΣ ΠΛΗΡΕΙΣ ΠΝC ΑΓΙΟΥ
IYDAS QVOQVE ET SILAS ETIAM IPSI PROPHEΤAE
CVM ESSENT PLENI SPO SANCTO.

In Acts xv. 29 the Apostolic injunction to Gentile converts is embellished with the addition

ΕΥ ΠΡΑΞΑΤΕ ΦΕΡΟΜΕΝΟΙ
ΕΝ ΤΩ ΑΓΙΩ ΠΝΙ
BENE AGITIS FERENTES
IN SANTO SPO.

In Acts xix. 2, as might almost have been expected, special attention has been paid to the statement about the Ephesians who did not know whether there was a Holy Ghost; and they are made to say that they do not know whether any people do receive Him.

ΟΙ ΔΕ ΠΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΑΛΛ ΟΥΔΕ ΠΝΑ ΑΓΙΟΝ ΛΑΜΒΑΝΟΥΣΙΝ
ΤΙΝΕΣ ΗΚΟΥΣΑΜΕΝ,

where οὐδέ stands for οὐδὲ εἰ.

Moreover the attention of the reader is drawn by the glossator, in not a few cases, to the fact that the holy men were moved of the Holy Ghost: thus, instead of saying in Acts xx. 3 that Paul was minded to return through Macedonia, the writer of the Western text tells us

ΕΙΠΕΝ ΔΕ ΤΟ ΠΝΑ ΑΥΤΩ ΥΠΟΣΤΡΕΦΕΙΝ
ΔΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΑΣ.

In Acts xix. 1 a whole sentence is prefixed to shew that Paul came to Ephesus under the special direction of the Holy Spirit: he had been intending to go to Jerusalem, but, as in so many other cases, the Spirit suffered him not:

ΘΕΛΟΝΤΟΣ ΔΕ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ
ΚΑΤΑ ΤΗΝ ΙΔΙΑΝ ΒΟΥΛΗΝ
ΠΟΡΕΥΕΣΘΑΙ ΕΙΣ ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΑ
ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΤΟ ΠΝΑ ΥΠΟΣΤΡΕΦΕΙΝ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΑΣΙΑΝ.

Probably it is to the same hand that we owe the addition *διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου* in Acts iv. 25.

Just as the commentator has shewn that the true prophet is possessed by the indwelling good Spirit, so he enlarges on the opposite kind of possession. The girl with a spirit of Python practises divination through this spirit;

ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΜΑΝΤΕΥΟΜΕΝΗ,

where the words *διὰ τούτου* are an addition.

Now let us come to the question of visions.

In Acts xvi. 10, where Paul sees the man of Macedonia, the translator adds the explanation

ΔΙΕΓΕΡΘΕΙC ΟΥΝ ΔΙΗΓΗCΑΤΟ ΤΟ ΟΡΑΜΑ ΗΜΙΝ
ΚΑΙ ΕΝΟΗCΑΜΕΝ

EXURGENS ERGO ENARRAVIT VISVM NOBIS
ET INTELLEGIMVS...

Now compare with this the Montanist visions in the *Acta Perpetuae* : Perpetua's vision (c. iv.) concludes with the words

et retuli statim fratri meo et intelleximus passionem esse futuram = *κατ' εὐθείας δογησάμην τῷ ἀδελφῷ καὶ ἐνοήσαμεν ὅτι δεῖοι παθεῖν κτέ.*

Again, in c. viii. the visions concerning Dinocrates end with the same terms

καὶ ἐνόησα ὅτι μετετέθη ἐκ τῶν τιμωριῶν = *tunc intellexi translatum eum esse de poena.*

So in c. x. (Vision of the Wrestling-Match) we end with

et expectata sum : et intellexi, etc. = *καὶ ἐξυπνίσθην καὶ ἐνόησα κτέ.*

It seems then that there is a close parallel in manner between Perpetua's account of her visions and the interpolating hand in the Pauline vision.

One other parallel to the Martyrdom shall be given from the glosses of the Acts. In Acts iv. 24, when the apostles return from the Sanhedrin, the interpolator tells us that the Church recognized the operation of a Divine Energy in what had occurred :

ΟΙ ΔΕ ΑΚΟΥCΑΝΤΕC ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙΓΝΟΝΤΕC ΤΗΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΥ ΕΝΕΡΓΕΙΑ
AD ILLI CVM AUDISSENT ET COGNOVISSENT DI VIRTUTE.

Compare with this the effect which the prison-life of the Martyrs of Carthage produced upon their keepers; it runs in Latin as follows :

c. ix. Deinde post dies paucos Pudens, miles optio, praepositus carceris, qui nos magni facere coepit, *intellegens magnam virtutem [Dei] esse in nobis.*

The Greek is as follows :

καὶ μετ' ὀλίγας ἡμέρας Πούδης τις στρατιώτης ὁ τῆς φυλακῆς προϊστάμενος μετα πολλῆς σπουδῆς ἤρξατο ἡμᾶς τιμᾶν καὶ δοξάζειν τὸν θεὸν ἐννοῶν δύναμιν μεγάλην εἶναι περὶ ἡμᾶς.

Now I think it will be admitted that this passage in the Acts of the Martyrdom is decidedly Montanistic; that it was so felt and understood may be seen from the fact that the Greek text

has been slightly reformed, as by reading *περὶ ἡμᾶς* for *ἐν ἡμῖν*, and by the addition of *τὸν θεόν*. But the idea of the indwelling energy is Montanistic.

The conclusion which we draw from the series of coincidences here described is that the Western text of Luke and the Acts is a Montanist text, earlier in date than the time of Perpetua, and that it was a familiar subject of study amongst the Carthaginian Martyrs. Whether this implies a local origin for the text must not be hastily decided; for it is probable that all the three Churches, Rome, Carthage and Lyons, Montanized in the second century.

CHAPTER XV.

FURTHER PROOFS IN THE TEXTUAL INTERPOLATIONS OF THE THEORY OF LATINIZATION OF THE BEZAN TEXT IN THE ACTS.

WE have shewn reason to believe that the Codex Bezae is a Montanist MS., basing our conclusion upon observed phenomena in the Gospel of Luke and in the Acts of the Apostles. But now let us see whether these interpolations were first made on the Greek or the Latin side of the text. Happily the very first case that presents itself in the Acts is a crucial instance. In order to elucidate it we will transcribe Acts i. 2, in the Greek and Latin :

ΑΧΡΙ ΗΣ ΗΜΕΡΑΣ
ΑΝΕΛΗΜΦΘΗ ΕΝΤΕΙΛΑΜΕΝΟΣ ΤΟΙΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΙΣ
ΔΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΟΥΣ ΕΞΕΛΕΞΑΤΟ [ΚΑΙ ΕΚΕΛΕΥΣΕ
ΚΗΡΥΣΣΕΙΝ ΤΟ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ]

where we have bracketed the words which constitute the gloss.

The Latin is

VSQVE IN EVM DIEM
QVEM SVSCEPTVS EST QVO PRAECEPIT APOSTOLIS
PER SEM SANCTVM QVOS ELEGIT [ET PRAECEPIT
PRAEDICARE EVANGELIVM].

Now, in order to clear up some of the confusion, observe that *quo* in the second line of the Latin is merely a wrongly inserted correction for the erroneous *quem* at the beginning of the line. Probably a conjunction has been displaced by the *quo* (? *et*).

In the next place observe that the commentator, in order to make clear what it was which our Lord enjoined upon His disciples, adds the words

et praecepit praedicare euangelium.

Obviously this gloss was in Latin, *praecepit* occurring in the text as the word to be explained, and appearing again in the commentary. The Greek then has taken the Latin back by a new translation without any regard to the equivalence between the first *praecepit* and the Greek verb ἐντέλλομαι.

But if this was a Latin gloss, we shall only find it in Latin copies, or in those Greek copies whose ancestry passes through the first form of Codex Bezae.

Now, the addition is found either wholly or in part in *Augustine*, in *Vigilius Tapsensis*, in the *Sahidic Version* and in the *Luxeuil Lectionary*: i.e. we have a Gallican Lectionary of the earliest period, an Egyptian Version, and two African fathers of the fifth century. It must be owned that this is very instructive; we are not surprised at the conduct of the Sahidic version, for we detected this in the transference of a Latin hexameter in Luke; but we are at first a little surprised at the wide area of country covered by the reading. The Sahidic text probably is based ultimately upon a Roman original; D and the Luxeuil Lectionary are Gallican; and the fathers quoted would most likely get their texts by way of Carthage. Is it possible that an interpolated text could spread so far?

There are two more glosses on the same page, probably by the very same hand:

Acts i. 5,

καὶ ὁ μελλεῖται λαμβάνειν
ET EVM ACCIPERE HABETIS,

which is attested by Hilary, Augustine, Maximus of Turin, and the Toledo Lectionary.

And in the same verse

ἕως τῆς πεντηκοστῆς
VSQVE AD PENTECOSTEN

is attested by Augustine and the Sahidic version.

We note again the concurrence of these last two authorities.

Just in the same way as we recognize a Latin hand in the glosses in the Acts by means of the word *praecepit*, common to the text and the gloss; so we can detect some other instances of the same workmanship.

In Acts v. 39 the words are added

ΟΥΤΕ ΥΜΕΙΣ ΟΥΤΕ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΣ ΟΥΤΕ ΤΥΡΑΝΝΟΙ
 ΑΠΕΧΕCΘΑΙ ΟΥΝ ΑΠΟ ΤΩΝ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΝ ΤΟΥΤΩ
 NEC VOS NEC IMPERATORES NEC REGES
 DISCEDITE ERGO AB HOMINIBVS ISTIS.

Now, here the last line is a recapitulation from the 38th verse, and it is in the Latin that the repetition occurs, and not in the Greek, as we may see by comparing the text with

Acts v. 38,

ΑΠΟCΤΗΤΕ ΑΠΟ ΤΩΝ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΝ ΤΟΥΤΩΝ
 DISCEDITE AB HOMINIBVS ISTIS.

The gloss is then a Latin one, and evidently by the same hand as before: its Greek is merely a re-translation.

A similar argument applies to Acts vi. 10, where the words

ΟΙΤΙΝΕC ΟΥΚ ΙCΧΥΟΝ ΑΝΤΙCΤΗΝΑΙ ΤΗ CΟΦΙΑ
 QVI NON POTERANT RESISTERE SAPIENTIAE

are repeated at the end of the verse in the form

NON POTENTES AVTEM RESISTERE VERITATI,

and done into Greek with a new word *ἀντοφθαλμεῖν* for *ἀντιστῆναι* (the former word may itself be borrowed from the xxviiith chapter), so that we have

ΤΗ ΟΥCΗ ΕΝ' ΑΥΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΤΩ ΠΝΙ ΤΩ ΔΡΙΩ Ω ΕΛΑΛΕΙ
 ΜΗ ΔΥΝΑΜΕΝΟΙ ΟΥ ΑΝΤΟΦΘΑΛΜΕΙΝ ΤΗ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑ,

where οὐ stands for οὖν.

But if this verse be glossed by a Montanist, as we suggested above with regard to the words *τῇ οὐσῇ ἐν αὐτῷ* and *τῷ ἁγίῳ* then we may say that the rest of the matter added to the verse is by the same hand. We also include in the list of Montanist glosses the other words which intervene and which made the repetition necessary

ΔΙΑ ΤΟ ΕΛΕΓΧΕCΘΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΥC ΕΠ' ΑΥΤΟΥ
 ΜΕΤΑ ΠΑCΗC ΠΑΡΡΗCΙΑC
 QVONIAM PROBATVR ILLIS AB ILLO
 CVM OMNI FIDVCIA.

But this expression *μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας* is frequently inserted as a gloss in the text: is it then a Montanist expression?

Now, in the Acts of the Apostles the gloss appears again in ch. ix. 20: though this part of Codex Bezae is missing; for we can restore it by means of Irenaeus' quotation of the passage, which undoubtedly comes from the same text-tradition;

ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, φησὶν, ἐν Δαμασκῷ ἐκήρυσσε [μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας] τὸν Ἰησοῦν=in synagoga, ait, in Damasco praedicabat [cum omni fiducia] Iesum.

Harvey II. 63=Mass. 197.

And it appears also in the gloss added in xvi. 4,

μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας τὸν κν̄ ἰη̄ν χ̄ρν̄
ἀλλὰ παραδιδόντες
CUM OMNEM FIDUCIAM DOM̄NI IH̄SU X̄RISTO
SIMUL TRADENTES.

The reason why the Montanists were so constant in using this expression is that it occurs in connexion with the prophetic enthusiasm: we find that in Acts iv. 31 the sentence *καὶ ἐλάλουν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ μετὰ παρρησίας* is preceded by *ἐπλήσθησαν ἅπαντες τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*.

But the recognition of this gloss concerning the delegates from the Church at Jerusalem as Montanistic probably carries with it the two similar glosses, in which the attempt is made to improve upon the unspiritual decrees of the Jerusalem Council by the addition of some evangelical expansion. And this consideration carries us to Acts xv. 29, where we had already recognized the words *φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι* as being Montanistic, and must now ascribe to the same hand the insertion of the famous sentence

καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι ἐτέρῳ μὴ ποιεῖν.

And we have also Acts xv. 20,

καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλουσιν ἑαυτοῖς γίνεσθαι ἐτέροις μὴ ποιεῖτε,

the Greek forms of the two passages being a little nearer together than the Latin.

It is becoming, by this time, clear that there is an internal connexion between the greater part of the glosses in the Acts. The supposition is not an unnatural one, and it is interesting to see how capable of confirmation it is. There is a suspicious

family resemblance in the character of the glosses, in the language in which they were made, and in the copies, versions and fathers that attest them. A number of these witnesses have already been alluded to; but we may further note that a gloss in iv. 32, which appears to belong to the same family, is attested by DE, Cyprian, Ambrose and Zeno, while in the previous verse another gloss has the support of DE, Irenaeus and Augustine, where again it is certainly the original text of Irenaeus and not a translator's addition.

In v. 38, to which we have alluded above, the added words are attested by DE 34. In v. 39, the gloss is attested in some form or other by DE, *demid.*, the later Syriac, Cod. 180 and the margin of Cod. 33.

In vi. 10, we apparently have for the first gloss in the verse DE; then DE and the Luxeuil Lectionary. Then DE and the margin of the Heracleian Syriac: and last of all DE, the Heracleian margin and the Bohemian version.

The famous gloss at the end of xv. 20 brings together D, Sahidic version, Ethiopic version, and eleven cursives, together with Irenaeus. While in xv. 29, the first part of the gloss brings together very nearly the same attestation with the addition of Cyprian: and the last part brings in Irenaeus and Tertullian.

Numbers of similar coincidences of attestation may be found: but we need not record them all. It has always been recognized that there was a peculiar affinity between certain members of the various classes mentioned above. But it becomes intelligible now that we have seen reason to suspect that these glosses, or at least a great part of them, are due to a single hand, and that probably the hand of a Latin Montanist.

We have no hesitation in saying that the influence of this Latinized and Montanized copy is to be seen in the following copies, versions and fathers.

DE, *tol.*, *luxov.*, *demid.*, *Sahidic*, *Heracleian Syriac* (and its marg.), *Bohemian*, *Irenaeus*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, *Hilary*, *Zeno*, *Maximus Taur.*, *Vigilius Taps.*

No doubt it may seem, at first sight, rather absurd to suppose that the errors of a single copy could spread so far as Poitiers, Lyons, Turin, Verona, North Africa and Egypt; to which must

probably be added Sardinia which is supposed to be the birth-place of Cod. E, and perhaps even Spain; but this is just the point that always is hard in connexion with the Western text: the way to understand it is by recognizing that the errors in question are undoubtedly errors of a great antiquity, and, if that is not sufficient to explain their diffusion, we must go further and shew that they occurred in or near the centre of ecclesiastical distribution for Latin texts: and we must examine the errors in question carefully with a view to recognizing the locality to which they originally belong.

CHAPTER XVI.

RELATIONS OF THE BEZAN TEXT TO THAT USED BY IRENAEUS.

BUT if the Codex Bezae was in Lyons as far back as the sixth century, as we have tried to prove by a variety of considerations, it was presumably copied from an earlier bilingual, also in Lyons: and although suspicions have arisen in our mind that the ultimate origin of the Bezan tradition is Cisalpine if not African, yet we have still to ask the question as to the time that the Lyonnese succession has been kept up. How far back does the Gallican history of the ms. go? Are we to say with Scrivener that "it is, on the whole, an independent translation made either directly from the Greek on the opposite page, or from a text almost identical with it; that the translator often retained in his memory, and perhaps occasionally consulted, both the Old Latin version, and Jerome's revised Vulgate; and that he probably executed his work in Gaul about the close of the fifth century!"?

Each of the three statements is probably an error: the translation was, indeed, made from a companion Greek text, but not the Greek text as now read in the ms., for this has been harmonized with the Latin, to say nothing of some other changes which have crept into it. The translator not merely remembers the Old Latin version; he is himself the author of the Old Latin version; the reference to Jerome is probably a delusion; last of all, the translation is much older than the fifth century, as we have by this time pretty well proved.

¹ p. xxxi. Cf. p. lxiv, 'We assign to the Latin version of Codex Bezae a western province (most probably Gaul) and a date not higher than the fifth century.'

Or shall we follow Dr Hort's theory which makes the Codex Bezae a product of the fourth century? Its structure he describes as follows: "The Greek text of Codex Bezae is substantially a Western text of cent. ii. with occasional readings probably belonging to cent. iv.¹," while in speaking of the Latin versions he says, "In the fourth century we find current in Western Europe, and especially in North Italy, a second type of text the precise relation of which to the African text of the second and third centuries has not yet been clearly ascertained²."

I take this to mean that the Latin of Cod. Bezae, which has such close affinities with Codices Vercellensis and Veronensis and the MSS. used by Ambrose, is substantially a fourth century text. Its method of composition is described by Dr Hort as follows³:

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. Here and there the assimilation has accidentally been incomplete, and the scattered discrepant readings thus left are the only direct Old Latin evidence for the Greek text of the New Testament which the bilingual mss. supply. 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 artificial; so that for the criticism of the Greek text the Latin reading has here no independent authority.

Now if our investigation shows anything it proves that the artificial agreement of which Dr Hort speaks is due to a specific cause, viz. Latinization of the Greek text; and that consequently it is the Bezan Latin that is of prime importance⁴, while *the Greek has no certain value except where it differs from its own Latin, and must not any longer be regarded as an independent authority*. And if the Greek be thus relegated to a secondary position, the case not only calls for a re-statement of the theory as to the building of D, and of the date of the translation, but it brings up another question with it, that namely of the Bibles respectively in use

¹ Introduction, p. 148.

² Introduction, p. 78.

³ Introduction, p. 82.

⁴ Consequently Tischendorf was right when he said, *Cod. Sin. proleg.* p. xxxii. note 2, "Italus ejusdem codicis textus (sc. D) a quo ipsam Graecum pendisse certum est etc."

by Irenaeus and his translator. Dr Hort explained the wonderful agreement between the Latin of Codex Bezae and the Latin of Irenaeus (for there are many cases in which the translator of Irenaeus is nearer to the Latin of D than to the Greek) by representing the Bezan Greek as co-eval with Irenaeus, and the Bezan Latin as belonging to the time of his translator. And this led him to deny Massuet's theory that the text of Irenaeus was translated before the end of the second century and was, in fact, in the hands of Tertullian. Accordingly we find him saying¹, "We are convinced not only by the internal character of this biblical text [i.e. the text followed by the translator], but by comparison of all the passages borrowed in substance by Tertullian, ... that the true date of the translation is the fourth century." This I take to mean that the Bezan Latin being of the fourth century (as seen from its concurrence with the great North Italian texts), the Latin quotations in Irenaeus are very largely Bezan Latin. I shall attempt to shew that this conviction is a misapprehension; and shall take the Bezan Latin, which we have seen to be the real authority, right back to the time of Irenaeus, instead of to the fifth century, as Scrivener suggests, or to the fourth, as Hort allows: and I shall try to take the translator of Irenaeus back with him, for the sake of companionship.

It is admitted then in the first place that there is a wonderful concurrence between the Biblical text of Irenaeus and the text of Codex Bezae. They combine, especially in the Acts, in readings that are nowhere else found, and which are so obviously erroneous that it would be absurd to deny genealogical contiguity to the texts that contain them, especially when, as in the present case, geographical contiguity has been practically proved. Perhaps the most conspicuous instance of all these is a coincidence in the Latin in Acts iii. 14,

ΥΜΕΙΣ ΔΕ ΤΟΝ ΑΓΙΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ
ΕΒΑΡΥΝΑΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΗΥΘΥΝΑΤΕ ΑΝΔΡΑ ΦΟΝΕΙΑ
VOS AVTEM IPSVM SANCTVM ET IVSTVM
GRABASTIS ET POSTVLASTIS VIRVM HOMICIDA,

¹ *Introduction*, p. 160.

which Irenaeus quotes as¹

vos autem sanctum et iustum
aggravastis et petistis virum homicidam.

Now, concerning this peculiar reading, we first find out its origin, which was as follows; observe that the Greek text as generally edited reads

ἠρνήσασθε καὶ ἠτήσασθε,

while D reads in the second place ἠτήσατε, probably for the sake of a more exact agreement with its Latin. But at some period in the transcriptional history this ἠτήσατε perhaps written as a marginal correction of ἠρνήσασθε affected the first word ἠρνήσασθε, which was sufficiently like to it in appearance, and the latter was read as ἠτήσατε by the insertion of a single letter. The translator did his best with this ἠτήσατε and gave it a signification, which it has in later Greek, so as to mean "ye insulted (or slighted) the holy one and the just &c."; for this *aggravastis* was a very good rendering: but, as was to be expected, the revising hand took the Greek to task for insufficient correspondence and wrote ἐβapύνατε.

Now of this error we say that, although it was primitively a Greek error, yet, as far as our text goes, it is a Latinizing error, and the Latin text has precedence of the Greek. But the translator of Irenaeus had this rendering, though unfortunately there is no Greek text extant at this point by which we could determine whether Irenaeus read ἐβapύνατε. Lastly, Augustine was under the influence of it, for Tischendorf quotes the text

Aug.^{pecc. mer.} 23 inhonorastis et negastis,

which would seem to shew that Augustine used a text in which *aggravastis* had been corrected to a more conventional word.

Whether, then, our explanation of the origin of the error in this passage be correct or not (and we shall draw attention in a future chapter² to another solution of the difficulty which has been proposed) it is clear that the text of the Codex Bezae at this point is closely related to that of the Latin Irenaeus; and since the instance quoted is only one out of many similar

¹ Ed. Harvey, ii. 56 = Mass. 194.

² c. xviii. p. 187.

cases, we are warranted in describing the two texts as genealogically contiguous. And this means on the one hand that, if the translation of the Codex Bezae were made in the fourth century, then the translation of Irenaeus cannot have been made in the second; and on the other hand, if the Codex Bezae is proved to contain a Latin text of the second century, there is no *a priori* objection to the theory that the translation of Irenaeus belongs to the same century, and in fact there is no objection at all provided only that reasonable grounds be asserted for such a belief.

Now the difficulty of the case lies in the relations between the Greek and Latin of Irenaeus. So little of the Greek of Irenaeus is preserved, that in appealing to the evidence of that father, we are liable at any moment to the counter-assertion that the text is not really that of the Greek, but is merely an expansion or alteration of the translating scribe. And even in those readings which may safely be carried back to the original text of Irenaeus, we have to prove not merely that the Codex Bezae and Irenaeus are in agreement, but that they are in agreement in Latinized readings, if we are to shew that the translation in the Codex must be earlier as to its origin than the great work on Heresies.

Perhaps the simplest way to resolve the difficulty is to confine ourselves to the glosses in the manner suggested in the last chapter; for these glosses have a frequent internal nexus which betrays a common hand, and the evidence of one gloss in a group can be used to confirm the evidence of another in the same group. And moreover it is precisely in the matter of expansions of the current text that we are safest in arguing from the text of the translation to the original Greek of Irenaeus; for, while a scribe may translate a biblical text which he finds before him in the language with which he is familiar, he is very unlikely to complicate his rendering by additional sentences from his own copy of the scriptures. We say then, (i) that the Biblical glosses in the Latin Irenaeus are probably to be referred to Irenaeus himself; (ii) where these glosses shew a Latin origin (since Latin glosses imply a Latin text), they are decisive as to the antiquity of the Latin translation.

Take, for example, the glosses which describe the freedom of

speech which the apostles experienced under the influence of the Holy Spirit; and which consist in the insertion of the terms *μετὰ παρρησίας, μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας, cum fiducia, cum omni fiducia*; which certainly betray a single hand.

In Acts vi. 10, where Codex Bezae makes the addition, the passage is not quoted at all by Irenaeus.

In Acts ix. 20, the page of Codex Bezae is lost, but the passage is quoted in Irenaeus, and the same gloss occurs, and at this point happily the Greek text of Irenaeus is extant as well as the Latin: we have as follows (II. 63 = Mass. 197).

ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, φησὶν, ἐν Δαμασκῷ ἐκήρυσσε μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁ Χριστός.

=In synagogis, ait, in Damasco praedicabat cum omni fiducia Iesum, quoniam hic est Christus filius Dei.

In Acts xvi. 4, we find the same gloss in Codex Bezae, where it forms a part of a longer passage, in which the glossator has attempted to reform the unspiritual character of the decrees of the Jerusalem Council:

ΜΕΤΑ ΠΑΧΗΣ ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑΣ ΤΟΝ ΚΝ ΙΗΝ ΧΡΝ
ΑΜΑ ΠΑΡΑΔΙΔΟΝΤΕΣ.

Now since these three Western glosses are due to the same hand, we infer that they are earlier than Irenaeus, who quotes one of them, and that they were extant in the early Western text, for the Codex Bezae has two of them (and probably had the third in the unmutilated form of the MS.).

This group of glosses was, therefore, in the Western text before the time of Irenaeus.

The only question that remains is that of Latinity; were they originally made on a Latin copy?

Now there is nothing in the words themselves that is decisive one way or the other: *μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας* might just as easily be inserted in a Greek tradition as *cum omni fiducia* in the Latin; but in the context there is much that is indicative of Latin hands. We have already pointed out that in Acts vi. 10 the remainder of the gloss of which we have quoted part is certainly Latin. And we have further shewn that there is reason to connect these glosses with others in the Acts which are clearly the work of a Montanist

interpolator, the greater part of whose insertions, if not the whole of them, were certainly made in Latin.

We conclude, then, that the Western glosses in question were extant in Latin before the time of Irenaeus. Even where we are not able to say decisively that the glosses in the Acts come from a Latin original, we are able to prove their antiquity, which makes it so much easier for us to argue from their occurrence in the Latin of Irenaeus to their existence in the lost Greek.

For instance it is not at first sight easy to determine whether the gloss in Codex Bezae Acts xv. 29,

ΦΕΡΟΜΕΝΟΙ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΔΥΩ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ
FERENTES IN SANTO SPO,

is from a Latin or Greek original; but since it is found in Tertullian (*De pudic.* 12) in the form

rectante (=vectante) vos spiritu sancto,

and in Irenaeus' Latin in the form (II. 70 = Mass. 199)

ambulantes in spiritu sancto,

we need not hesitate to refer the use of the gloss to Irenaeus himself. And, indeed, it will be found generally true that the glosses of the translator of Irenaeus were in the text which he worked upon. The preserved fragments of the Greek text confirm us strongly in this belief. For instance in Acts iv. 31 we find in Codex Bezae the gloss

ΠΑΝΤΙ ΤΩ ΘΕΛΟΝΤΙ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΕΙΝ
OMNI VOLENTI CREDERE.

This passage is preserved in the Greek of Irenaeus as well as in the Latin; and the words are extant in both, although Harvey, following Massuet, declines to print them as a biblical quotation. If the Greek of Irenaeus had been lost at this point, we should, perhaps, have had difficulty in making people believe that the added words belonged to Irenaeus himself. But they are fortunately preserved, and we have one more proof of the safety in reasoning from the gloss of the translator's text to the gloss of his copy. Moreover in this case, we are fortunate in being able to detect the hand that made the gloss: for the favourite expression of the author of the group of glosses which we were

just now discussing occurs as a part of the genuine text at this very point:

ΜΕΤΑ ΠΑΡΡΗΧΙΑΣ
ΠΑΝΤΙ ΤΩ ΘΕΛΟΝΤΙ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΕΙΝ.

We can hardly doubt that it was the sight of this favourite expression which inspired the glossator at this point to add a few more words by way of explanation.

Again why should we hesitate, when we find Acts iii. 17 quoted in Irenaeus (II, 55 = Mass. 194) in the form

secundum ignorantiam fecistis nequam,

to carry back the *nequam* to his Greek text, which unfortunately is lost? But this word is clearly due to the Latin translator of the Acts, who, in rendering *κατὰ ἄγνοiαν ἐπαύξατε*, disliked to have an active verb in his text without an object; and so inserted a word, which was promptly reflected on the Greek. Hence in Codex Bezae we have

per ignorantiam egistis iniquitatem,

the primitive form being doubtless *nequam*. Does not this look like a Latin addition to the text of the Acts? Many similar cases might, no doubt, be brought forward. But perhaps we have said enough, in view of the proved pre-eminence of the Latin of Codex Bezae over the Greek, in view of the proofs and suspicions of Latinity in the glosses of the Acts, and the certainty that some of them were extant in the Greek of Irenaeus, to convince our readers that the Western bilingual is not a fourth century product but that it goes back to the times before Irenaeus and before Tertullian. Whether any readings of later times may be current in Codex Bezae is, of course, an open question: but the actual translation and many of the glosses of the translation seem to belong to the period which we have indicated.

We will examine presently the whole body of these glosses in the Acts in a special chapter. Now let us turn to the question of the Latin of Irenaeus. If our reasoning be correct, it is no longer *necessary* to regard this as a fourth century product. Are there any reasons for referring it to an earlier period?

Let us then say a few words about Massuet's theory that the Latin translation of Irenaeus was known to Tertullian. The point is not exactly material to our argument, but it is an interesting one. If we are wrong, it will be easy for Dr Hort or some other scholar who holds with him to put us right.

I take it that the translation of Irenaeus was made either in Lyons, Rome or Carthage: the problem is thus very like the one of determining the original home of the Western bilingual. But Carthage is, perhaps, excluded by the fact that Africanisms do not seem to have as yet been adequately proved in the text. A translation, however, which was made either at Rome or Lyons would rapidly pass to the sister Montanist Church, and furnish the material for any quotations made by Tertullian. There is nothing, then, in the nature of an *a priori* objection against Massuet's theory. The case for that theory is stated as follows by Harvey¹:

Internal evidence persuades the judgment that Tertullian wrote his treatise *c. Valentinum* after A.D. 199, with this version before his eyes: Massuet's comparison of the two texts in his second dissertation is very convincing: when the translator trips, Tertullian also stumbles; and too many minute peculiarities of nomenclature and style are found to agree in both, to be the result of accident. Cyprian possibly², and Augustine certainly, copied this version³.

The evidence of Augustine is admitted, and we may turn to Cyprian: the extract is as follows:

Quins [Marcionis] magister Cerdon sub Hygino tunc episcopo, qui in urbe nonus fuit, Romam venit; quem Marcion secutus, additis ad crimen augmentis, impudentius caeteris et abruptius in Deum Patrem creatorem blasphemare instituit.

With which we have to compare the Latin of Irenaeus:

Et Cerdon... occasionem accipiens cum venisset Romam sub Hygino qui nonum locum episcopatus per successionem ab apostolis habuit... Succedens autem ei Marcion Ponticus adampliarit doctrinam, impudorate blasphemans eum qui a lege et prophetis annunciatum est Deus.

It seems evident that Cyprian has been reading Irenaeus either in the Greek or in the Latin; or in the Greek as quoted by Hippolytus⁴.

¹ p. clxiv.

² *Ep. ad Pompeium (de Cerdone)*.

³ *C. Julian. Pelag.* i. 3, 7.

⁴ I suppose we should correct ἡδῆγε διδασκαλεῖον of Hippolytus into ἡδῆγε διδασ-

Now we have seen that in some form, either Greek or Latin, the works of Irenaeus were current in North Africa before Cyprian's time, and it is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that Cyprian is referring to Irenaeus: and Massuet says bluntly that Cyprian knew no Greek. Dr Hort would seem to believe the same, when, after speaking of the way in which Tertullian's Scripture quotations are complicated by independent translations from the Greek, he remarks¹, "This disturbing element is absent, however, from Cyprian's quotations, which are fortunately copious and carefully made." But if Cyprian was not in the habit of using the Scriptures except in the African Latin form, still less is he likely to have consulted the original Greek of Irenaeus.

I do not, however, lay any stress on the fact that Cyprian agrees with the translator of Irenaeus in making Hyginus the ninth bishop of Rome, where we should, from Irenaeus' statement elsewhere, have expected *eighth*, for the recovered text of Irenaeus in the *Philosophumena* shews the same reading in Greek. On the whole, however, there is a fair possibility that Cyprian used a Latin Irenaeus.

This brings us very near to Tertullian; and we may say that the only objection to Massuet's theory is that Tertullian seems to have often translated independently from the Greek in the case of the New Testament, and therefore any coincidence which may be found in his extracts from Irenaeus with the Latin translation, made at Lyons or Rome, may be purely accidental. Let us see then whether Tertullian is translating entirely *de novo*. We admit that in handling the New Testament he was fond of "immediate and original renderings, the proportion of which to his quotations from the existing version is indeterminate but certainly large²."

For instance, we find in Irenaeus³ that the translator had to deal with the sentence

ὁ ἐνῆργητο μὲν ἐν τοῖς περὶ τὸν Νοῦν καὶ τὴν Ἀλήθειαν, ἀπέσκηψε δὲ εἰς τοῦτον τὸν παρατραπέντα.

καλῶν if we are to retain an agreement with the Latin. Irenaeus must surely mean that Marcion exaggerated the teaching of Cerdon: and so does Cyprian.

¹ p. 78.

² Hort, *Introd.* p. 78.

³ Ed. Harvey, i. 14 = Mass. 8.

He renders it as follows :

quae exorsa quidem fuerat in iis quae sunt erga Nun et Alethiam; derivavit autem in hunc [Aeonem, id est Sophiam] demutatam, (l. demutatam) :

where a reference to the Latin of (309 l. = Mass. 130), "audent dicere, quia a Logo quidem coepit, *derivatio* autem in Sophiam," shews that there is no doubt about the reading, *derivatio* in this case standing for *ἀπόσκημμα* or *ἀπόσκηψις*.

Now, according to Stieren, this is not the right rendering; "hæc vox non respondet græcæ ἀπέσκηψε. Vertendum erat *irrupit* seu *incidit*." If Stieren be right it is curious that Tertullian should translate in the same way. But whether it be a right translation or not of the medical term used by Irenæus, and we are not disposed to support Stieren's objection, it is certain that Tertullian uses the word, and not merely uses it, but explains it, *just as one explains a word in a difficult text, and just as one does not do in making one's own translations with any degree of freedom*. Accordingly Tertullian says "in hunc autem id est Sophiam derivavit, ut solent vitia in corpore alibi connata in aliud membrum perniciem suam efflare." If Tertullian had been translating *de novo* he would not have needed this long explanation of the obscure translation; nor would he have added the other gloss "*id est Sophiam*," for he would have simply translated *in hanc*, with or without the addition of *Sophiam*. The fact is, he had a rude rendering to handle, and just as later copyists inserted in Irenæus the explanation (*Aeonem, id est Sophiam*), so Tertullian adds *id est Sophiam*. He may even have found the gloss already in his Latin text.

No doubt much more might be said in favour of the opinion that Tertullian glosses, comments on and amends an already existing text. He could not have done otherwise with a barbarous Gallic or Vulgar Latin version, and we ought not to be surprised at the treatment. We are disposed then to believe that Massuet's theory, to which we refer the reader, may after all be true, and that the Latin version of Irenæus found its way very early into the library of the Church of Carthage.

CHAPTER XVII.

RELATION BETWEEN THE TATIAN HARMONY AND THE BEZAN TEXT.

WE have now shown reason for believing that the whole body of Western Latin readings go back into a single bilingual copy, the remote ancestor of the Codex Bezae: and we have also seen that the Greek of the Beza text owes the greater part of its textual and grammatical peculiarities to the reflex action of its own Latin.

We have also furnished material for a very decided belief that this peculiar revised Greek or its Latin, and perhaps both of them, passed into Egypt, presumably to Alexandria, and there became the parent of one at least of the corrupt Egyptian versions, viz. the Thebaic or Sahidic.

So that it is not at all surprising if the belief should expand to a conviction that Western readings are to be looked for in Alexandrian Codices; and that not because of the great antiquity and consequent world-wide diffusion of Western readings, but simply because Rome is the ecclesiastical parent of Alexandria.

But it will be said that this suggestion is nullified by the fact that the Syriac readings present the same eccentric forms and features as the Western Latin texts; and surely, it will be said, no one can possibly maintain that the Syriac versions date from any such origin as a Graeco-Latin bilingual. Let us then examine a little into this point, and without prejudice: the New Testament criticism is so full of burning questions that we must be careful not to anticipate solutions; but it also bristles with unsolved problems, so that we may be prepared for surprises.

The Syriac texts of the New Testament are usually reckoned to be a series of successive revisions, the two earliest forms being the so-called Curetonian Syriac or Old Syriac, and the Peshito Syriac or Syriac Vulgate. Closely connected with these is the Harmony of Tatian, which has recently been recovered in an Arabic version and was already known by the extracts from it and the running commentary made upon it by Ephrem the Syrian. This Harmony then was current in the second century, and it is certainly very closely related to the Old Syriac and the Vulgate Syriac.

The prevalent belief as to the true relation between them is that the Harmony is the elder, and that the Old Syriac of Cureton stands in relation to it just as one of the Old Latin versions might stand to a primitive Latin Harmony; only its relation may be closer than that, for it is suspected that the Old Syriac may have been constructed indirectly out of the very fragments of the Harmony by a scribe who was perfectly familiar therewith. However that may be, we have to ask ourselves the explanation of these Eastern-Western readings. And we must interrogate them until we get a series of satisfactory answers, which may lead us to a hypothesis that is adequate for the explanation of the known coincidences between the readings.

We begin with John xvi. 21, which appears in Ciasca's Latin translation from the Arabic in the following form

"Mulier enim, cum ei appropinquat tempus pariendi, opprimit eam adventus diei partus eius."

Now the following considerations will shew that Tatian used a text in which was the word *ἡμέρα* instead of *ᾠρα*. First the words *adventus diei partus* convince us of this: and next, a reference to the critical apparatus shews the same reading in

D 248 *a b c e ff*² and syr^{ach},

the latter version, which probably derives ultimately from Tatian, shewing the words which are equivalent to *dies parturitionis*. So that Tatian and the Peshito agree in their text at this point, and the reading is a conspicuously Western one: it has only two Greek texts chronicled for it by Tischendorf, and of these one is conspicuously Latinized. The reading then is a decidedly

Western one: it belongs to that errant crew which we have so often detected in following the primitive Latinized bilingual. Does it not seem as if the translator of this text had used a translator's freedom and paraphrased the expression "the woman's hour," and explained it by "the day of parturition," or at all events had translated ὥρα as if it were ἡμέρα? But if this be so, Tatian has used the primitive bilingual or some associated text. It is even conceivable that he never used a Greek text at all; but only a Latin copy.

The second instance to examine is one to which allusion has already been made; I mean the reading προσχέροντες for προτρέχοντες in Mark ix. 15, where the corrupt Greek is read by D and supported by *b c ff^a i k*, and the Arabic is represented by *prae gaudio properantes*.

Did Tatian use a Greek copy which had the corruption? It is certainly possible, though perhaps not likely, when no other Greek traces of the reading are forthcoming than those in D; on the other hand, if he used a Latin copy, the error was not only possible, but almost inevitable; for we may easily see that the error must have been, at first, universal in Latin texts. Certainly in this case the probability is in favour of a Latin original.

Now let us turn to Luke xxi. 25,

καὶ ἐτι τῆς γῆς κύνοξῃ ἐθῆων
ET SUPER TERRAM CONFLICTIO GENTIUM.

So the text runs in Codex Bezae.

The word σφυοχῇ was not a very easy one to render, but I think it will be admitted that D has made a very spirited translation, carrying with it the idea of the hurling together of masses of men in battle. Codex Vercellensis renders it *compressio*, Brixianus *occursus*, others *pressura*, as if the Latin versions had found especial difficulty with the word as it stood in the Greek or in the first Latin rendering. Now, the Curetonian Syriac and the Peshito have given us words equivalent to

complosio manuum gentium,

and that this stood originally in Tatian may be derived, not merely from the coincidence of the Old and Vulgate Syriac texts, but from the conflate text which appears in Ciasca's edition

et in terra pressura gentium
 et frictio manuum prae gemitu
 sonitus maris etc.

Here *pressura gentium* stands for *συνοχή ἐθνῶν*; but *frictio manuum* is the equivalent also of *συνοχή*, as may be seen from the Cureton text; the text is therefore conflate, and the correct reading is *frictio manuum gentium*. But how does this *manuum* come in? Evidently it must have arisen, not from the Greek *συνοχή* which might easily have found an equivalent, but from a reviser's reflection upon the spirited word *conflictio*. *Conflictio* of what? and the imagination suggested the completion of the elliptical expression by means of the word *manuum*.

Does not this look as if the archetype from which Tatian made his mosaic was a Latin or Latinized text?

Now let us turn to Luke v. 8. In the Beza text it stands

ΛΕΓΩΝ ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΩ ΕΞΕΛΘΕ ΑΠ' ΕΜΟΥ
 DICENS ROGO EXI A ME.

Here the word 'rogo' is a translator's addition to the Latin: it occurs elsewhere in our text as an expansion: for instance there is Acts xxi. 39, where *δέομαι* is rendered by *rogo obsecro*, and a number of similar cases may be pointed out in the Old Latin.

Now, the word in the passage quoted from Luke goes back into the Greek, and it appears in the Old Latin authorities, as *c e f*.

But it is clearly a Western reading of an early type; we may say then, when we find it also in the Peshito, that it probably came there by way of Tatian, and a reference to Ciasca's Latin shews us

Domine, peto a te, ut a me recedas.

We are disposed, then, to the belief that Tatian has here absorbed a Latin reading, nor is our conviction sensibly weakened by the fact that the reading turns up also in the Gothic version.

In Mark i. 13 we find Codex Bezae reading

ΠΡΟΣ ΤΗΝ ΘΥΡΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ
 AD IANVAM EIVS,

and supported in the added word *αὐτοῦ* by *c ff² g¹ q*. We should certainly be disposed to call this a genuine Western reading: but notice that it is in Tatian in a slightly modified form

et orat omnis ciuitas congregata ad ianuam Jesu.

In John xiii. 14 D reads

ΠΡΟΣΩ ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΥΜΕΙΣ ΟΦΕΙΛΕΤΕ
ΑΛΛΗΛΩΝ ΝΙΠΤΕΙΝ ΤΟΥΣ ΠΟΔΑΣ.

Here the words *πρόσω μάλλον* are due to the free translation of the Latin scribe who gave

QUANTO MAGIS ET VOS DEVETIS
INVICEM LAVARE PEDES.

But this reading acquired great Latin currency, for we find it in *a ff²g*, &c.

It appears also in the Peshito Syriac, which must have derived it ultimately from Tatian, for Ciasca's Latin has

quanto magis aequum est etc.,

and the text of the early Syrian father Aphraates had the same or similar prefixed words¹.

Again, we see that the phenomena are explicable by the use of a Latinized text on Tatian's part.

In John xiv. 9 the Latin of the Beza text is against the Greek in reading

et non cognovistis me philippe.

The error was an extremely easy one in the Latin text, a mere matter of a single letter; but it spread widely, for it is in

a b c f ff² e g

and the Vulgate, in Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hilary and Novatian.

Surely this is a distinctively Latin reading, and not the less so because we find it in the Ethiopic version. Observe then that Tatian had the plural (teste *Ephrem*²); and the Latin of Ciasca is *nondum cognovistis me*.

Now let us look at Luke xxiv. 29. The Bezan text is

ΜΕΙΝΟΝ ΜΕΘ ΗΜΩΝ ΟΤΙ ΠΡΟΣ ΕΣΠΕΡΑΝ
ΚΑΙΚΛΕΙΚΕΝ Η ΗΜΕΡΑ
MANE NOBISCUM QVIA AD VESPERVM
DECLINAVIT DIES.

¹ Zahn, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, p. 203, gives "wie müsst dann ihr etc."

² Zahn, p. 206.

Notice here that at the beginning of the second line *καὶ* has dropped before *κέκλικεν* (read by itacism as *καίκελικεν*). Under the influence of this error *ἐστὶν*, which stood at the end of the first line, has been removed from the Greek text. Accordingly the Latin texts *a b c e ff² l* represent a text from which *ἐστὶν καὶ* is absent. Surely this is an error which may properly be called Western; because the Latin texts all agree in dropping the repeated syllable *καί*, and no other Greek authority than D is found for the reading. Now, the Tatian text as given by Ciasca reads

Mane apud nos quia dies iam declinavit ad tenebras,

and the Curetonian Syriac shews the influence of a similar reading.

We see then that the influence of the Western bilingual is perceptible in the Tatian text. The same thing is true of the associated Curetonian version; for example

In Luke xxiii. 39 Codex Bezae reads

ΟΤΙ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΑΥΤΩ ΚΡΙΜΑΤΙ ΕΙ
ΚΑΙ ΗΜΕΙΣ ΕΣΜΕΝ ΚΑΙ ΗΜΕΙΣ ΜΕΝ
ΔΙΚΑΙΩΣ ΔΪΔΑ ΓΑΡ ΩΝ ΕΠΡΑΞΑΜΕΝ
ΑΠΟΛΑΜΒΑΝΟΜΕΝ

QUONIAM IN IPSO IUDICIO
ET NOS SUMUS ET NOS QUIDEM
IVSTE DIGNE ENIM SECUNDUM QVOD EGIMUS
RECIPIMUS.

Now here the Greek text has dittographed the words *καὶ ἡμεῖς μέν* and made *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμέν* out of them, which the Latin renders, omitting the superfluous word *ei*. The addition has affected Cod. C, the Sahidic and Coptic versions, and the Curetonian Syriac.

Reviewing the instances which have here been given, we see that the Western text which Tatian used was not merely a Greek text into which transcriptional errors had crept, but a text which had stood in a bilingual copy and had been affected by its accompanying translation. For some of the errors in Tatian are Latinizing errors. But if this be true *for a single one* of the errors examined, we are obliged to admit that a Latin translation of the Gospels already existed in Tatian's time; and that being so,

we conclude further that the text which Tatian employed was either an early Latin text, or the Greek of an early bilingual text. The two hypotheses are not so very far apart; and either can be supported from the phenomena exhibited by the variants of Tatian's text: upon the whole, I incline to think that a Latin text was employed. But it is not necessary to be too decided on this point, until further evidence is produced. We shall discuss in a separate chapter the cases where the pleonasm of the Latin translator have been projected on the text of Tatian.

The conclusion to which we have been led is an astonishing one: the hydra-headed Western text has been resolved into a single form; that form is the primitive Western bilingual; its apparently Eastern character is a delusion, for the Old Syriac texts lean on a Graeco-Latin, and perhaps simply on a Latin base. That the Sahidic version, and other Egyptian attestation, sometimes complicates the question by an apparently greater geographical distribution than would seem to be possible for truly Occidental readings, is an illusion arising from the fact of our ignorance that the Sahidic version demonstrably has stolen Latin readings. The Western text is now no longer the 'conceivably apostolic' edition which Dr Hort suggests, but it represents the successive translations and retranslations of actual Occidental tradition.

This text was translated into Latin before the time of Tatian, and the primitive bilingual in which the translation stood is a document of a patriarchal dignity and largely capable of restoration. We will presently proceed to intimate where this translation was made.

But before going further we must ask a similar question to the important one which occupied us in relation to the Latin translations; the question of reflex action. If either the Greek or the Latin of the Western text passed into Syriac, was there any reaction from the Syriac on the Greek or Latin?

CHAPTER XVIII.

DOES THE CODEX BEZAE SYRIACIZE?

THOSE who have, like ourselves, sought to explain the perplexing textual anomalies of the Western readings, have generally fallen back either upon the hypothesis of reflex Latinism or upon reflex Syriasm. And it has usually happened that the Syriac hypothesis has been taken up, because the Latinizing theory was supposed to be no longer tenable.

Certainly it is not a theory against which we ought to be prejudiced in advance. There are some things in the New Testament that perhaps will never yield to any other mode of elucidation. Take for example Mark viii. 10, which in Cod. D reads

ΚΑΙ ΗΛΘΕΝ ΕΙΣ ΤΑ ΟΡΙΑ ΜΕΛΕΓΑΔΑ
ET VENIT IN PARTES MAGIDAN.

Here most early texts give us *Δαλμανουθά*, so as to read

ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ μέρη Δαλμανουθά.

But since the letters *λμανουθα* are an almost exact transcript of the Syriac for *εἰς τὰ μέρη*, we have a text which is equivalent to

καθαίται καθαίται.

and it is clear that the text is dittographed and that the real name has dropped out.

If this explanation be the right one, we have lighted upon a case in which all Greek mss. except D have a Syriac error! An astonishing thing, but not an impossibility.

Let this instance suffice to shew that it is by no means an unreasonable thing to look for Syriac corruptions in the New Testament text.

Such a suspicion is confirmed when we turn to history: the Western Church, especially in Gaul, was constantly and from the first under Oriental and Greek influences. First and foremost amongst these influences was the presence of traders. Let us look at what Salvian of Marseilles (writing in the fifth century) says about that city¹.

Nam ut de alio hominum genere non dicam consideremus solas negotiatorum et siricorum² omnium turbas, quae majorem ferme civitatem universam partem occupaverunt, si aliud est vita istorum omnium quam meditatio doli et fritura mendacii, aut si non perire admodum verba aestimant quae nihil loquentibus prosunt.

And that this influence of Eastern traders is not limited to Marseilles and the neighbourhood may be seen from the stories in Gregory of Tours: for example, a Syrian trader got himself appointed bishop of Paris, apparently by unfair means, and when elected applied to the Church offices the principle that 'to the victor belong the spoils.' Accordingly Gregory tells us³

Ragnimodus quoque Parisiæ urbis episcopus obiit. Cumque germanus eius Faramodus presbiter pro episcopato concurreret, Eusebius quidam negotiator genere Syrus, datis multis muneribus, in locum eius subrogatus est; isque, accepto episcopato omnem scilicet decessoris sui abiciens, Syros de genere suo ecclesiasticæ domui ministros statuit.

The same Gregory of Tours tells us⁴ that he translated the story of the Seven Sleepers into Latin by the aid of John the Syrian: "quod passio eorum, quam Siro quodam interpretante in Latino transtulimus, plenius pandit"; but it is difficult to determine from what language the translation was made. Under the date A.D. 585⁵ he relates an account of the entry of the king into the city of Orleans, and of his being met by a crowd of people carrying banners and singing in the language of the Latins, the Syrians, and even the Jews⁶.

¹ Salvian, *De Gubern. Dei*, iv. 14.

² Rittershusius suggests *sericorum*, but it is more likely *syrorum*.

³ Greg. Tur. Bk x. p. 438 (ed. Arndt et Krusch).

⁴ Greg. Tur. *Glor. Mart.* c. 94.

⁵ Bk viii. p. 326.

⁶ "Sed cum ad urbem Aureliensem venisset, erat ea die solemnitas beati Martini, id est quarto nonas mensis quinti. Processitque in obviam eius immensa populi turba cum signis adque vixillis, canentes laudes. Et hinc lingua Syrorum, hinc Latinorum, hinc etiam ipsorum Iudaeorum, in diversis laudibus varie concrepabat, dicens: Vivat rex, regnumque eius in populis annis innumeris dilatetur."

The only difficulty with such statements is that of determining whether the term Syrus means anything more than a Greek. It is certain that the Oriental influence in Gaul, say in the fifth century, was very great; but they do not seem to have discriminated much between the various Eastern nationalities. Occasionally we meet with more specific statements. For example, there is the case of St Abraham, of whom Sidonius Apollinaris gives us an account. This good man came to France from the East, probably from the kingdom of Persia¹, having fled from the persecutions brought on the Christian people beyond the Euphrates by King Isdigerdes (A.D. 420). He settled not far from Clermont, and built a church in honour of Saint Cyriacus, where miracles were performed after his death, if we may believe Gregory of Tours. Here then is a bona-fide case of an Eastern ascetic, a Syrian, transplanted into the very region to which our manuscript belongs: and we have no doubt that many more such cases occurred, and that communications between the East and the West were even more open in the first centuries of the Christian era than they are to-day.

There is nothing, then, which is à priori absurd or difficult in the theory that Syriac texts may have re-acted on the Western texts from which they were derived, whether those texts be found in Gaul or elsewhere. We are not limited to any possible influence of the immediate school of Irenaeus and his successors. Even political influences come to our aid in this investigation; for, as Duchesne points out², we have to bear in mind that many reunions of Oriental bishops took place in Milan in the fourth century, and in particular that Auxentius, who was bishop of Milan from A.D. 355—374, was a Cappadocian.

In dealing then with the Codex Bezae, which was certainly in Gaul in the sixth century and whose text may be under ancestral Gallican influences for some time before the sixth century, even if the translation itself be not primitively Gallican, we hold ourselves at liberty to use with freedom the hypothesis of Semitic re-actions on a Greek text.

¹ Sidonius, *ep.* 17; Tillemont, xvi. 257; Stokes, *Ireland and the Celtic Church*, p. 173.

² *Revue Critique* for 15 July, 1890.

It is interesting to notice that a similar question has come up in connexion with the translation of Irenaeus and with the text of Irenaeus himself. Harvey, for instance, claims for Irenaeus "a respectable knowledge of the Hebrew tongue, and a very perceptible familiarity with the Scriptures of the New Testament in a Syriac version¹." He even goes so far as to suggest that the name Irenaeus may be a substitute for some Semitic name; and says²: "S. Irenaeus, who was of eastern extraction, had in all probability a more familiar acquaintance in his early years with some Syriac translation than with the Greek original of the Scriptures of the New Testament." Accordingly he makes many attempts to show how the Western readings of Irenaeus' New Testament are to be arrived at by the process of corruption of Syriac texts: for example, in the opening words of Irenaeus' preface the expression λόγους ψευδεῖς καὶ γενεαλογίας ματαίας αἵτινες ζητήσεις μᾶλλον παρέχουσι is brought into harmony with the current Greek texts of the New Testament by equating ματαίας = ἐν αἷς ματαιότης = ܡܬܐܠܡܐܬܐ = ܡܬܐܠܡܐܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܡܬܐܠܡܐܬܐ, which is the Syriac equivalent for ἀπεράντους. And he applies the same method more or less successfully in a number of other cases.

I do not however see that his method is very different from the general attempt to explain Western readings in the New Testament by means of Syriasms. It has been recognized that many of what are called Western readings are just as much Eastern readings; they are supposed by Dr Hort to have had their origin in Asia Minor, while we, for our part, hold that they are truly Western: whichever of these hypotheses be correct, the affinity between the text of the Old Syriac and the Diatessaron of Tatian, and the so-called Western Greek and Latin versions, is so decided that they have to be treated together. Consequently there have from time to time been suggestions made that the texts of the New Testament which we call Western contain a Syriac element, which is something different from the Aramaisms that may have coloured the speech of the primitive evangelical writers; an element which can be eliminated, and by the study of which we can explain the occurrence of some at least of the

¹ Harvey, *Irenaeus*, p. cliii.

² p. 1, note.

primitive and perplexing forms in the early text of the New Testament.

Now, this hypothesis is a very inviting one and has engaged the attention of a number of writers, especially those who desired to explain the text of the Codex Bezae. For example, a reference may be made to L. D. Michaelis' *Introduction to the N. T.*, and the notes of Herbert Marsh on the same¹, from which we will quote a sentence or two by way of illustration. Michaelis speaks of the probability that

The Syriac has had an influence on the Latin, especially in those examples where an error is committed that might happen more easily to the Syrian than the Latin translator. The Latin text is properly a composition of several ancient Latin versions, one of which must have been made by a native Syrian, as appears from the Syriasms found in the Latin text of several ancient mss. that greatly exceed in harshness the Syriasms of the Greek Testament: this Syriac translator was probably guided, in obscure passages, by the version of his own country, the effects of which appear to this very day in the Vulgate.

But Michaelis does not push this theory to an extreme, for he recognizes that

The wonderful harmony between the two most ancient versions of the New Testament, one of which was spread throughout Europe and the north of Africa, the other propagated from Edessa to China, could have had no other cause than similarity of the Greek mss. in the West of Europe and the East of Asia.

Since Michaelis wrote these words the textual affinities have become more decided by the discovery of older forms of the Syriac version, yet it cannot be said that his hypothesis has been confirmed or demonstrated.

Another hypothesis nearly related to that of Michaelis is that of Schulz, who in his discussion of our MS.² maintained

Etiam Graecum codicis D sermonem ab interpretatione aliqua eaque Orientali (forsan Syra) primitus pependisse, aut eiusmodi versionem in exarando hocce libro...una cum Graeco quodam antigrapho adhibitam fuisse. Nam alia ratione sumpta haud facile crediderim solvi posse cuncta, quae libri mira indoles divinationi nostrae obiicit, aenigmata.

¹ Marsh's *Michaelis*, Vol. II. part 1, p. 26.

² *Disputatio de Codice Cantabrigiensi*, Wratislaviae, MDCCCXXVII. p. 16.

Schulz, then, in modern language maintains that the Western Greek text, as exhibited by D, is corrected from or conflated with a Syriac copy. But he does not do more in illustration of his thesis than collect a number of readings in which D and the Peshito Syriac agree. He could scarcely get to the heart of the mystery that way.

Now, when we note these suggestions which are made in the hope of explaining Western readings, we ought to ask whether there is any promise of the obtaining of any further light in this direction, or whether, on the other hand, the idea of Syriac reaction upon Greek and Latin texts ought to be dismissed with as much confidence as we should, for example, dismiss the opinion of Kipling and Schulz that the Codex Bezae was written in Egypt, or Bengel's view that it was related to the Anglo-Saxon.

Now it seems to me that the best way to approach such an enquiry would be to examine the Codex Bezae for individual Syriasms, rather than for coincidences of reading with Syriac versions; just as we began our study of the Old Latin text by detecting some of its archaisms.

For instance, when in John xi. 14 we have *Lazar* for the translation of *Lazarus*, and note the same error in the Old Latin Cod. *a*, which perhaps derives it from the same source as *d*, we may say that there is either a Syriasm or a Hebraism in the text, and apparently on the Latin side of the house. In Luke xiii. 14 again we find *in die sabbat*, which need not be a scribe's blunder. When we find in Luke ix. 1, *καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πᾶσαν δαίμονιον* we suspect that the feminine adjective is due to the Semitic; in fact the Curetonian text has in this place *καὶ οἱ*. When, again, we frequently find the scribe of D spelling *camellus* instead of the conventional form, both in Greek and in Latin, and remember that the last letter of the Hebrew *למל* is a double letter, we might perhaps suspect Semitic influence; but on the other hand observe it is the spelling of the Lyons Pentateuch and of some Romance languages.

In Acts xiii. 6 we have

1 3

ONOMATI ΚΑΛΟΥΜΕΝΟΝ ΒΑΡΪΗCOYΑ
NOMINE QVI VOCATVR BARIESVAM,

and the form of the name suggests at once a Syriasm both in the text and in the rendering. The true reading in this passage is very difficult to determine, but it seems as though some copyists had taken offence at the name *βαριησοῦς* in such a connexion and had deliberately changed it, something in the same way as the Rabbis changed Moses into Manasseh in the account of the idolatrous priest in the Old Testament; accordingly the Syriac version reads **ܠܒܢܐ ܝܫܘܥ** or *son of the Name*. In the West, however, it seems to have been held sufficient to change the common Greek form *Ἰησοῦς* to the Semitic form. There are, then, at least shadowy hints of non-primitive Syriasms.

Now let us turn to a more decisive instance:

In John xi. 54 we have

ἈΛΛΑ ἈΠΗΛΘΕΝ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΧΩΡΑ
ΣΑΜΦΟΥΡΕΙΝ ΕΓΓΥΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΡΗΜΟΥ ΕΙΣ ΕΦΡΑΙΜ ΛΕΓΟΜΕΝΗΝ
ΠΟΛΙΝ

SED ABIIIT IN REGIONEM
SEPPHURIM IUXTA DESERTVM EFREM QVAE DICITVR
CIVITAS.

On this curious reading Dr Hort remarks as follows: "perhaps a local tradition, though the name has not been identified with any certainty. Sepphoris is apparently excluded by its geographical position."

It would be extremely interesting if tradition had here preserved the name of our Lord's brief sanctuary in a time of increasing hostility on the part of the Jewish rulers; but we are inclined to suspect that *Σαμφουρείμ* is a mere corruption from the Syriac words answering to "whose name is Ephraim"; it is easy to see how a Syriac text which contained the words

ܠܒܢܐ ܡܨܝܪܐ ܠܒܢܐ ܝܫܘܥ

could be read as "the city of Samphurim."

Nor is this a mere random conjecture; notice how artificially the word has been thrust into the text so as to lengthen the line unreasonably, so that we might call it both in appearance and in matter a conflate text. And then let us pass on to another precisely similar instance. In Ephrem's commentary on Tatian's *Harmony*¹ we find "Patres nostri in hoc monte adoraverunt.

¹ Ed. Moesinger, p. 142.

Haec de Jacob et filiis ejus dixit, quia in Monte Sichem aut in Bethel aut in Monte *Samgriazim* adorarunt." Ephrem is commenting upon the verse John iv. 20, and he is in some confusion as to the identification of the mountain, as to whether it be the mountain of Shechem which might mean either Ebal or Gerizim, or whether it means Bethel, or the mountain Samgriazim. Now this is a similar case to the preceding, and involves a misunderstanding of the Syriac words "whose name is Gerizim,"

ܡܝܢ ܓܪܝܝܡ

Of course it is possible that in either of the cases we have mentioned the letters $\Sigma\alpha\mu$ might be the first syllable of a lost *Σαμάρια*, but the concurrence in error is so peculiar that we can hardly accept such an explanation, against the simple and natural one given above.

In this last case Mar Ephrem is evidently perplexed about the name which, if his text had been quite clear, would have needed no comment; that is, he found it in the text upon which he had been working, and we have therefore to suggest that *Tatian had inserted the name of the mountain in his text*. Such a proceeding would be quite in harmony with many of his other expansions and elucidations of the Scripture. But this drives us back to the first case; for the two belong so suspiciously together that we are obliged to ask whether *Σαμφορπεῖν* is not also a corruption of a Tatian text. And this leads us again to the wider question; has the Tatian Harmony in any way reacted on the Western text? and are any of the assimilations or conflations in D due to reflex action from this source?

In Acts xiv. 27 we have

ἀνηγγείλον ὅσα ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν αὐτοῖς
μετὰ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν,

where the reading has every appearance of conflation and is singular to our MS. The ordinary reading *ἐν αὐτοῖς* seems to have been replaced by *μετ' αὐτῶν*, which passed into the Syriac as ܡܝܬܐ ܡܝܬܐ ܡܝܬܐ for *μεθ' ἐαυτῶν*, and has come back to reside in a literal translation in the Greek text.

These are the principal traces of actual Semitism which we

find in our MS. Such as they are, *they are either the accidents of a Semitic hand or they are reflex actions from the Tatian Harmony.* It does not seem as though they constituted a general solution to the New Testament text riddle.

If we had not known that the MS. was French, we might possibly have urged that the use of *de* for a genitive was a form of speech to which a Semitic hand was disposed: cf. the Syriac use of the prefix ܐ. Or we might have drawn attention to the use of the prosthetic vowel which prevails in Syriac as widely as in old French (e.g. ܐܠܦܐ for *στάδιον*, ܐܠܦܐ for *στοά*, ܐܠܦܐ for *στοιχεῖα* and the like). But we are satisfied that where such forms occur in our MS. they are Gallicisms, even though they should occur in the Greek (as in Mark xi. 8, *ἐστιβύδας* for *στριβύδας*).

If we had not known, by examination, the extent to which the Latin had re-acted on the Greek, we should perhaps have been tempted with Kipling to scent Semitism in the recurrence and superfluity of the connective *καί*. But we see clearly that it arises from the translation of a participle and finite verb by two verbs with a conjunction, which said conjunction has a trick of returning on the Greek text. As to the instances brought forward by Michaelis and Harvey, they deserve a closer examination. Perhaps the best of them are as follows.

In Mark i. 41¹ the reading *καὶ ὀργισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ* is explained by a confusion between ܡܠܝܬܐ and ܡܠܝܬܐ which would give the necessary *σπλαγχνισθεὶς*.

We are convinced, however, that the real explanation is something much more simple; it arose out of a misunderstanding of the African Latin *motus*, which was ambiguous in its meaning. If the reader will refer to the Acts of Perpetua he will find two instances of the use of the word. In c. 3 we have

"tunc pater motus in hoc verbo"

where the corresponding Greek is *ταραχθεὶς*, and in c. 13

"et moti sumus et complexi illos sumus,"

¹ Marsh's *Michaelis*, II. 233.

where the Greek is *σπλαγχνισθέντες*. The word might be used both of *passion* and of *compassion*.

We may be sure then that the primitive Latin text was *motus*, which was misunderstood by some later readers, and a correction imported into the Greek. We have a modern instance of the very same peculiarity in Zahn's recent restoration of the text of Marcion¹. Zahn quotes from Tertullian the following remark on Luke xiv. 21, "Hoc ut patrifamiliae renuntiatum est, motus tunc (bene quod et motus, negat enim moveri deum suum, ita et hoc [v. l. hic] meus est), mandat de plateis et vicis civitatis facere sublectionem": and having established the word *motus* for Marcion's text, which certainly looks as if Tertullian were quoting from a known Latin version, Zahn goes on to say: *also sicherlich nicht ὀργισθεῖς*. Accordingly he projects back an impossible *κινηθεῖς* upon Marcion's text. A beautiful but unnecessary instance of modern Latinization!

In Acts iii. 14,

ΥΜΕΙΣ ΔΕ ΤΟΝ ἍΓΙΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΝ
ΕΒΑΡΥΝΑΤΕ
VOS AUTEM IPSVM SANCTVM ET IVSTVM
GRABASTIS,

it is proposed to explain the reading by a change of **ⲓⲁⲁ** (*negare*) to **ⲓⲁⲃ** (*gravare*). The reading is an important one², on account of its occurrence in Irenaeus; we have already endeavoured to explain it in a previous chapter as a Latinization of a misread Greek text.

In Acts iii. 17,

ΟΤΙ ΥΜΕΙΣ ΜΕΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΑΓΝΟΙΑΝ ΕΠΙΡΑΞΑΤΕ ΠΟΝΗΡΟ
ΩΣΠΕΡ ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΑΡΧΟΝΤΕΣ ΥΜΩΝ
QVIA VOS
QVIDEM PER INORANTIAM EGISTIS INIQUITATEM
SICVT ET PRINCIPES VESTRI,

where the *ἐπράξατε πονηρόν* is said to be for **ⲉⲡⲣⲁⲗⲁⲧⲉ**, perhaps under the influence of **ⲉⲡⲣⲁⲗⲁⲧⲉ** in the next line³. But here too

¹ *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons* Bd. ii. Zweite Hälfte, 1 Abtheilung, p. 478.

² See Harvey, *Irenaeus*, II. 55 = Mass. 194.

³ Harvey, *Ibid.*

we have probably nothing more than a reflex action from the translation into Latin.

Many other cases may be found in Michaelis and in Harvey, but they are by no means as convincing as one has a right to expect. (Harvey's textual criticism is never of a very high order.) We cannot then say that they or we have brought forward any clear evidence of wide-spread Syriacizing in the Codex Bezae. Sporadic traces there may be, and perhaps a few Tatianisms; but not much beside. The latter form of corruption may appear not only in the use of actual readings but perhaps also in the form of harmonistic confusion.

It is undeniable that there is a great deal of harmonistic error in the Codex Bezae. The only trouble in laying such errors at any individual door lies in the fact that all Harmonists are likely to make certain combinations, and to some of them a scribe is liable who never used a Harmony in his life. We will point out a few cases of this tendency, without any desire to draw an extreme conclusion from them.

In Luke xi. 30 there is added at the end of the verse,

ΚΑΙ ΚΑΘΩΣ ΙΩΝΑΣ
ΕΝ ΤΗ ΚΟΙΛΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΚΗΤΟΥ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ
ΤΡΙΣ ΗΜΕΡΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΡΙΣ ΝΥΚΤΑΣ
ΟΥΤΩΣ ΚΑΙ Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΓΗ.

The appendix is a somewhat rude representation of Matt. xii. 40, and can scarcely be in its primitive form, one would think. But, in any case, in Tatian the passage Matt. xii. 40 followed Luke xii. 30, as we may see by a reference to the Arabic version published by Giasca.

In Luke xxiv. 1 we have the addition

ΕΛΟΓΙΖΟΝΤΟ ΕΝ ΕΔΥΤΑΙΣ
ΤΙΣ ΔΡΑ ΑΠΟΚΥΛΙΞΕΙ ΤΟΝ ΛΙΘΟΝ.

This is, perhaps, from Mark xvi. 3, and we notice that the Arabic Harmony puts the passages together:

Luke xxiv. 1,

portantes quae paraverant
aromata ;

Mark xvi. 3,

et dicebant in semetipsis
quis revolvat nobis lapidem
ab ostio monumenti.

Here D has the following of *c* and the Sahidic, and we should prefer to believe that the error had a Latin origin, so as to agree with a previously observed delinquency of this group. But, on the other hand, it may be harmonistic.

In Luke xix. 45 the text of D is very involved: he has expanded the account of the cleansing of the temple from John and Matthew; but this need not surprise us; for Tatian regards the account in John as the same as that in the Synoptics, and welds the two stories together. According to D then we have

ΕΛΘΩΝ ΔΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΙΕΡΟΝ ΗΡΞΑΤΟ ΕΚΒΑΛΛΕΙΝ
ΤΟΥΣ ΠΩΛΟΥΝΤΑΣ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΑΓΟΡΑΖΟΝΤΑΣ
ΚΑΙ ΤΑΣ ΤΡΑΠΕΖΑΣ ΤΩΝ ΚΟΛΛΥΒΙΣΤΩΝ
ΕΞΕΧΕΕΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΑΣ ΚΑΘΕΔΡΑΣ ΤΩΝ ΠΩΛΟΥΝΤΩ
ΤΑΣ ΠΕΡΙΣΤΕΡΑΣ...

Here we follow Luke as far as *πωλοῦντας*, where it is pretty evident that the text of Luke ended; the next words answer to Matt. xxi. 12, *καὶ ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν*, but here something has dropped out, probably the words *κατέστρεψεν* (from Matt.) and *ὧν τὰ κέρματα* (from John ii. 15); *ἐξέχεεν* is from John, and the rest of the passage is from Matthew.

We can now compare with the Arabic Tatian which shews

et numularios quorum aes effudit et subvertit mensas et cathedras vendentium columbas.

It is then possible that a mental or an actual reference to Tatian, or to some other Harmonist, may be the cause of the expansion of the narrative.

The case of Luke xix. 27 is somewhat more difficult: we have Matt. xxv. 30 added at the end of the verse. Now, the Arabic Tatian carefully separates the two parables of the talents and the minae; but, on the other hand, Zahn seems to think that in the primitive Tatian they formed part of one account. Accordingly he shews how the passages run together in Ephrem's Commentary and in the Homilies of Aphraates. In particular the text of Ephrem

ran thus (Moesinger, p. 218), "Talenta sua...abscondit illud...auferte ab illo talentum...sint lumbi vestri praecincti...et accensae lucernae vestrae," where the beginning is from Matt. and the end from Luke. Now, if Tatian or some earlier Harmonist really joined the passages together, as we may well believe, we need not be surprised at the added verse in Cod. D.

Other instances for study, in the line of harmonisation, will readily present themselves. We will examine one further case before leaving the point.

Let us turn to Matt. xxvii. 8; we may verify the following statement from the forms of the Tatian Harmony that have come down to us, that Tatian not merely harmonised his four Gospels, but that he also expanded them, when he thought fit, from the Acts and Epistles. One such case is this apparently double account of the death of Judas, where Tatian appended the details which he found in the Acts (*ἐλάκησε μέσος*), as a post-mortem experience. Thus in Ephrem's Commentary we have "abiit et se suspendit et mortuus est"; followed by references to Acts i. 18.

Now, when the scribe of the Bezan text copies Matt. xxvii. 8, he writes

propter quod appellatus est ager ille • echeldemach hoc est ager sanguinis • usque in hodiernum.

The peculiar spelling of *echeldemach* shews that we have here a transposition from the first chapter of the Acts: but this would be natural enough for Tatian, first, because we know he borrows from the account in Acts; next, because he was obliged to exhibit some such form in translating the Greek *χωρίον αἵματος*¹.

Finally, it may be interesting to contrast the method of Tatian with that of the Western text; Tatian aims at supplementing the Gospel of Matthew from the other three: the Bezan text, which is conceivably Tatianized, makes its chief expansions in the text of Luke.

¹ I pass by the difficult question as to the form of the word: merely saying here that I believe the primitive form was *ܕܡܚܠܩܬܐ* the sleeper's field or *κοιμητήριον*, which in Galilean patois was pronounced nearly as *ܕܡܚܠܩܬܐ*.