

SWEETGOSPELHARMONY.COM

## PART IV

### CHAPTER XIX.

#### LOCAL ORIGIN OF THE PRIMITIVE WESTERN TEXT OF THE ACTS.

AND now we have at last succeeded in tracking the Western corruptions to their origin. At least we have gone so far with the matter as to say that we know to what cause (viz. systematic Latinization) to attribute the major part of the variants in the Acts of the Apostles: and although there is still much to be said with regard to the variants in the Western Gospels, I think we may safely attack the question of local origins, keeping our attention chiefly on the text of the Acts, and avoiding hasty generalisations with regard to the other parts of the New Testament. We have shewn, as we believe, if the canon hold that community of reading implies community of origin, that the Old Latin texts are all from one fountain; however much they may have emended their Greek from their Latin, and translated and re-translated, they go back into a single root which we call the primitive Western bilingual. And this primitive bilingual must be very ancient. A study of its interpolations in Luke and the Acts shewed it to be a Montanist text, probably known to the Martyrs of Carthage. A study of the relations between D and the Sahidic version intimates that it passed through the hands of those persons who made the eclectic Egyptian copies and versions; this carries it back beyond the time of Origen, who may be responsible for Alexandrian textual eclecticism, and who in any case was probably one of the worst textual critics the New Testament has ever had. The coincidences between D and Irenaeus take us again to a primitive translation that cannot be as late as the end of the second century. And finally, an

examination of the relics of Tatian's Harmony and of the Syriac versions shews reason for believing that the bilingual, at least as far as concerns the Gospels, is older than Tatian<sup>1</sup>.

But the actual determination of the local origin of the Latin text has been a problem that has hitherto defied solution; we must not even assume that the same origin will be the birthplace of the Latin Gospels and of the Latin Acts of the Apostles, nor that all the Gospels were primitively translated by the same hand and in the same place.

Now, the right way to settle such a question does not consist in citing puzzling remarks of Augustine as to the relative merits of Italian and African texts, and the superior verbal fidelity of the African rendering: these criticisms only result from Augustine's observation of discrepancy between texts current in North Africa and texts current in Italy in his own day: they are not scientific. It may be doubted whether Augustine or Jerome had the slightest idea as to where the New Testament was originally translated, or even that there was a single primitive translation. They merely saw a variety of types of Latin text around them, and they criticised them superficially and used them eclectically; Origen did much the same with the Greek texts in Alexandria.

One of the first suggestions to occur in such an enquiry as this is that we should test the various texts for Africanism. Indeed this is the only course open to those who undertake to

<sup>1</sup> It is pleasing to find that at this point my researches lead to the same conclusion as those of Reisch. I am surprised at this, for in many points I suspect my results are fatal to some of his reasonings with regard to the uncanonical sources of the New Testament; but in the following points we seem to agree.

Reisch, *Agrapha*, pp. 350, 351, "Es ist nämlich der Cod. Cantabr., oder vielmehr dessen Archetypus, mit welchem fast sämtliche patristischen Citate, vorab sämtliche lateinische zusammenhängen. Denn der Archetypus des Cod. D ist ohne Zweifel die Quelle der altlateinischen Versionen gewesen. Von diesen altlateinischen Versionen aber sind die lateinischen Autoren vor Hieronymus beherrscht, so namentlich Iuvencus, Hilarius, Augustinus.....Nun es ist aber ausser Zweifel, dass der Archetypus des Cod. D, welcher bis in das zweite Jahrhundert zurückzudatieren ist, auf die vortricianischen Väter griechischer Zunge, vorab Clemens und Origenes, wie überhaupt auf die Alexandriner, grossen Einfluss ausgeübt hat, dass er aber auch mit Tatian sich berührt, folglich bis in Iustins Zeiten seine Spuren zurückverfolgen lässt. Thatsächlich schrumpft also die grösste Zahl der griechischen und lateinischen Parallelcitate beinahe auf einen einzigen Hauptzeugen zusammen, welcher in einem Archetypus des Cod. D zu erkennen ist."

prove that the primitive text is African. It is not enough for them to say, as they do, that Tertullian evidently knew of a translation of the New Testament: for the underlying assumption that this translation could only have been made shortly before Tertullian used it is not verifiable, and indeed it is probably far from the truth. The search for individual Africanisms has not, however, been a very successful thing. Some persons deny altogether the existence of an African dialect distinct from the Vulgar-Latin. But such a position is hardly a tenable one: it is surely impossible that the Latin spoken in a Punic country should show no variations of style or matter from the Latin spoken amongst the Celts or the Lombards.

The best investigation of the subject is that made by Sittl<sup>1</sup>, who goes straight to the inscriptions for the peculiar forms of speech, and tests the literature by the inscriptions. But Sittl could find no satisfactory catalogue of Africanisms in the Old Latin texts, and while he admitted the substantial Africanism of some parts of the Latin Old Testament, and believed in the existence of a special version associated with Tertullian, he concluded that the so-called Italic version had its origin and home not in Africa but in Italy. He further conjectured that, if it had arisen in Rome, Augustine would have called it *Romana* and not *Itala*; and suggested some smaller Italian city—say Naples—as the centre of emanation of Latin texts. But, as we have already intimated, Augustine was not likely to know anything in the world about the primitive *habitat* of texts, so that this suggestion of Sittl is valueless.

On the whole we must admit that no very definite conclusions have as yet been reached, and I propose to begin the examination *de novo*, not with the hope of resolving the whole of the ambiguities of the ancient Western textual history, but because it is only by trying patiently to solve a part of the problem by a new examination, that the way can be made for some one else to solve the remaining part.

Let us begin then with the Western text of the Acts of the Apostles, and confine our attention for the present to that. When we say that it is an early text, and that it is a Montanizing

<sup>1</sup> *Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache*, Erlangen, 1882.

text and a Latinizing text, there is nothing decisive as to locality about either of these statements: but we cannot be far wrong in adding that this practically shuts us up, in seeking for the centre of textual distribution, to the three cities, Rome, Lyons and Carthage: because all these Churches have a strong Latin element, and all of them Montanize, the order of intensity being probably Carthage, Lyons, Rome: each city furnishing one noted teacher at least, who was tinctured more or less completely with the Montanist ideas, viz.: Tertullian, Hermas, and Irenaeus, the order of intensity being that of the names<sup>1</sup>. But before we can get any further, we must examine the data of the case more closely.

We must not assume that these Montanist glosses are coeval or colloocal with the primitive bilingual; but we may begin by saying that their distribution textually is very wide, and they must, *as a body of glosses*, be very early. Here we part company from Dr Salmon, who remarks that he has "found reason, on investigating the history of Montanism, which clearly is combated in the Muratorian fragment, to think that it did not make its appearance in the West until a little after the year 200!"

If a single one of the group of Montanist glosses be traced in the text of Tertullian, and another in the text of Irenaeus, it would be enough to prove that the Montanist edition of the Acts was much earlier than the year 200, and what becomes then of the theory of third-century Western Montanism? The fact is that neither the history nor the character of Montanism is as yet properly understood; the eyes of even judicious critics having been dimmed through a long heredity of heresy-hunting. But, when we once realize the fundamental spiritual aims of Montanism (instead of merely treating it as an outward division of the Church), however much such aims may be liable to fanatical extravagance, a number of difficulties become clear to us in the history and discipline of the Church, to say nothing of the illumination thrown upon the text of the Codex Bezae. Every verse of the Old Testament, or of the New, which treats of the descent of the spirit of prophecy is a hinge in the Montanist system. If

<sup>1</sup> We may limit the Montanism of Irenaeus to the earlier years of his life.

<sup>2</sup> *Introd. to New Test.* p. 62.



they read in the Old Testament that the Sophia enters into holy souls in all ages and makes them friends of God and prophets, this magnificent statement is the reason why S. Priscilla says that Christ appeared to her in female form and imparted to her the Sophia<sup>1</sup>. The passage in the book of Wisdom is seen to be a key-text, and so, when the Montanist glossator comes to the statement in the Acts that the opposers could not resist the wisdom that was in Stephen, he felt constrained to add a few remarks about the Sophia, which, as an imparted principle, dwelt in Stephen. We must also have a regard to Montanist proof-texts in the New Testament: for here one of the fundamental texts is John xvi. 8, "The Paraclete shall convince the world." That is why the gloss in Acts vi. 10 adds the words "since they were convinced by Him," meaning the Holy Spirit, and not Stephen; "quoniam probator illis ab illo." So that a study of a system of glosses like these in the Acts furnishes us with what we may call the quint-essence of the Montanist theology.

No less light is thrown by the same study upon the difficult questions of textual criticism. Let us give a single illustration: the case of the famous interpolation (or omission) in John vii. 53—viii. 11. Dr Hort thinks that "few in ancient times, there is reason to think, would have found the section a stumbling-block except *Montanists* and *Novatians*?"

Evidently Dr Hort did not think that Montanist tampering with the text amounted to much; we on the contrary have found reason to believe that it was a very far-reaching influence: and that in the present instance the Montanist Churches either did not receive this addition to the text, or else they are responsible for its omission; but at the same time it can be shewn that they knew the passage perfectly well in the West; for the Latin glossator of the Acts has borrowed a few words from the section in Acts v. 18,

ΚΑΙ ΕΠΟΡΕΥΘΗ ΕΙΣ ΕΚΑΤΟC ΕΙC ΤΑ ΙΔΙΑ  
ET ABIERVNT VNVSQVISQVE IN DOMICILIA<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Origen, *Homil. in Jerem.* xiv. 5, *τις δὲ γεννᾷ προφήτας; ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ λέγειν αὐτὸν τὸ· Οἶμαι ἐγὼ μῆτηρ, ὡς τίνα με ἔρεκες, ὦ σοφία;*

<sup>2</sup> *Introd. Notes on Select Readings*, p. 86.

<sup>3</sup> The origin of the gloss is confirmed by the words added a little lower down

I think it may be safely said that *more than forty* of the troublesome glosses in the Acts of the Apostles can be set down with a confidence that borders closely on certainty to the hand of the Latin Montanist referred to above. And nothing can be more important for the acquiring of right views with regard to the genesis of New Testament readings than such a fact as this. For the attestation of such a group of readings is demonstrably capable of combination and can be replaced by a single factor; and the evidence of this single factor, when it stands by itself, is of the nature of a proved corruption.

The reader will be interested to work this point out for himself, and he will be surprised to find the power of this Montanised copy: he will find its influence in almost all Latin texts and fathers; he will trace it in Cod. E, which is probably a direct descendant of Codex Bezae, and in a stray cursive or two; he will find it in the Sahidic and Ethiopic versions, shewing that it passed to Alexandria; in the margin of the later Syriac, which represents a Greek MS. which Thomas of Heraclea consulted in Alexandria; and probably in the Syriac text itself, perhaps in both of its recensions, though this is a point which may require more examination. It will not, however, be found in the Great Uncials, nor in the ordinary Greek texts and fathers. Wide as its scope is, this text and its descendants are not universal in their influence: The lines on which it moves can be marked out, the areas over which it is current can be shaded in. And if this explanation be a correct one for the diffusion of the single group of readings referred to, then it is a *vera causa* for similar textual phenomena; and we say unhesitatingly that *the occurrence of a given reading in*

in the text; viz. *ἐγερθεὺς το πρωι*, which is an adaptation of John viii. 1. The man who made this addition not only knew the Gospel of John, but knew it in its (supposed) interpolated form. Moreover, it looks as though the interpolation was made from the Latin side. Thus our body of glosses furnishes important evidence for the *antiquity* of the doubtful section.

Those who are interested in this particular subject will find that the semi-Montanist Hermas knows the disputed section; for in the fourth Mandate, Hermas discusses the problem of the woman who has been convicted of adultery, and the duties of the husband and wife are laid down by the Shepherd, who finally sums up his teaching by the words, *οὐ δίδωμι ἀφορμὴν ἵνα αἰτῇ ἢ πρᾶξις οὕτως συντελεῖται, ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἁμαρτάνειν τὸν ἁμαρτηκότα*. The disputed section was therefore known in Rome and to Hermas.

*Western texts and in the main body of the versions is no proof at all that the reading did not originate in Rome, or even Carthage, but rather is a suggestion to the contrary.*

We have only dealt hitherto with those glosses and changes which may be considered to be demonstrably Montanistic; it is probable that a number of the remaining textual excentricities in the Acts may have to be set down to the same cause; for it is extremely unlikely that we should always have been able to detect the glossator at his work, or that his corrections should always have been so highly coloured as to be capable of immediate identification. In any case, it can be proved that a number of the remaining glosses are from a Latin hand, whether contemporaneous with the former or not. For example, the first four glosses in the Acts are as follows:

- Acts i. 2 et praecepit praedicare evangelium [lux : sah : Aug : Vig. Taps.].
- i. 4 de ore meo [lux : aeth : Aug : Hil.].
- i. 5 et eum accipere habetis [tol : Aug : Hil : Max. Taur.].
- i. 5 usque ad pentecosten [sah : Aug.].

Of these the first, third and fourth belong to the Latin Montanized edition. What of the second? Its attestation shews it to be as decidedly Latin as the first or third or fourth; in its nature it is evidently the mere paraphrase of a translator: we may conclude then that it is a Latin gloss: whether it be by the Montanist hand or not, we can scarcely venture to say dogmatically; but the attestation agrees very well with such a supposition.

This belief in the fundamental Latinity of many of the eccentric Bezan readings is confirmed in another way: just as we were able to prove the Montanist glossator to be a Latin by the fact of the repetition of a clause of his text in the same Latin but in a different Greek dress, so we can argue for a number of readings in which the glosses in the Bezan text appear in a different Greek form elsewhere, as for instance in the Codex Laudianus.

For example, in Acts ii. 13 the Latin gloss appears as *iudicium* in *e* and in the Latin of Irenaeus, and in the equivalent *in iudicio* of *d*; but the Greek in Codices DE is different; *εἰς κρίσιν* D; *εἰς κριτήριον* E. Hence we see that the reading must be primitively Latin; and we shall probably be not far from the

mark when we say that Codex E is the resultant of two texts; one a Greek text, and the other the detached Latin of a bilingual.

Another good example is Acts v. 15, where we have

- D ἀπηλλάσσοντο γὰρ ἀπὸ πάσης ἀσθενίας  
ὡς εἶχεν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν.  
E καὶ ῥυσθώσιν ἀπὸ πάσης ἀσθενίας  
ἧς εἶχεν.  
d et liberabantur ab omnem valetudinem  
quem habebant unusquisque eorum.  
e et liberarentur ab omni valetudine  
quam habebant.

Here again it is clear that the Greek of E is a reformed rendering of what is substantially the same Latin as in the Bezan Codex.

Or we may examine Acts v. 38, where E has changed the *μιάναντες τὰς χεῖρας* = non coinquinatas manus of D into *μολύνοντες τὰς χεῖρας* = non coinquinantes manus. But this case is probably a part of a Montanist gloss which we have already discussed; so that we are the more sure here of the priority of the Latin.

It will be seen then by what precedes that the Latin origin of others of the glosses in the Acts, besides those which are more definitely Montanistic, can be clearly established <sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> The reasoning as to the fundamental Latinity of the Western text will apply also to those places in the Acts where the evidence of D, or of D and E, is not forthcoming, but where the attestation has otherwise the same constituents.

For example, when we find in Acts xxvii. 15 after *ἐπιδόντες* the addition *τῷ πλέοντι καὶ συστειλάντες τὰ ἱστία*, we should handle the reading in the following manner. First, we note the curious form *πλέοντι* for *πνέοντι*, which we recognize to be the Bezan form from Luke xii. 55 (*καὶ ὅταν νότον πλέοντα*). It stands, therefore, as the equivalent for the Latin *flanti*, and the three Greek mss. 44, 112, 137, which testify in favour of *πλέοντι*, may be assumed to have taken it from the same source, namely the glossed bilingual.

So much for the Greek spelling, which intimates a single Western copy, of the Bezan type. Tischendorf points out that the evidence of the Heracleian Syriac is for a text *flanti et collegimus artemonem*. Here again the combination of authorities is undoubtedly Western; but it cannot be the earliest form of the gloss, for *flanti* without a substantive makes no sense. It must therefore be a corruption for *flatui* (*FLANTI = FLATUI*). Accordingly we find in Bede the note "Haec alia translatio manifestius edidit: et arrepta navi cum non possent occurrere vento, commodata navi *flatibus* colligere vela coeperunt." The Greek text is therefore a literal trans-

With the view of confirming the reader's belief in the fundamental Latinity of these glosses, we will now draw attention to the remarkable results which follow from this analysis of the Latinizing factors, by turning to the passage Acts xiii. 12,

ΙΔΩΝ ΔΕ Ο ΑΝΘΥΠΑΤΟΣ  
ΤΟ ΓΕΓΟΝΟΣ ΕΘΑΥΜΑΣΕΝ  
ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙΣΤΕΥΣΕΝ ΤΩ ΘΩ  
ΕΚΠΛΗΘΥΣΣΟΜΕΝΟΣ ΕΠΙ ΤΗ ΔΙΔΑΧΗ ΤΟΥ ΚΥ  
TUNC CUM VIDISSET PROCONSUL  
QVOD FACTVM EST MIRATVS EST  
ET CREDIDIT IN DO  
STUPENS SVPER DOCTRINA DNI.

First remark that the words *ἐθαύμασεν καὶ* and *τῷ θεῷ* are glosses. The latter is an obvious translator's expansion and presents no difficulty. But the former is more obscure. Following the line of our previous experience with the glossed text, we suspect that we have here a double translation (or else an African pleonasm) in the rendering of *ἐκπληθυσσόμενος* by *miratus est* and *stupens*. If this be the true explanation we shall probably be able to support it by similar usage elsewhere. Let us turn to the Codex Bezae in Matt. xix. 25: here we have

ΑΚΟΥΣΑΝΤΕΣ ΔΕ ΟΙ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ ΕΞΕΠΛΗΘΥΝΟΝΤΟ  
ΚΑΙ ΕΦΟΒΗΘΗΚΑΝ ΣΦΟΔΡΑ ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕΣ  
ΑΥΔΙΕΝΤΕΣ ΑΥΤΕΜ ΔΙΣCΙPΥΛΙ ΣΤΥΠΕΒΑΝΤ  
ET TIMERVNT VALDE DICENTES.

lation of a misread Latin gloss. Other cases of the same kind can no doubt be given.

If the reader is interested in tracing the glosses to their common origin, he is advised to fix his attention closely on the pair of companion mss. D and E, and to study their glosses side by side, as shewn above in our text. Another pretty case of the same phenomenon will be found in Acts xiv. 7, where D has

ΚΑΙ ΕΚΕΙΝΗΘΗ ΟΛΟΝ ΤΟ ΠΛΗΘΟΣ ΕΠΙ ΤΗ ΔΙΔΑΧΗ  
Ο ΔΕ ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΒΑΡΝΑΒΑΣ  
ΔΙΕΤΡΙΒΟΝ ΕΝ ΛΥΣΤΡΟΙΣ  
ET COMMOTA EST OMNIS MVLTITVDO IN DOCTRINIS  
PAVLVS AVTEM ET BARNABAS  
MORAS FACIEBANT IN LYSTRIS.

E reads τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ ἐκπλήσσετο πᾶσα ἡ πολυπληθία ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτῶν· ὁ δὲ Παῦλος καὶ Βαρνάβας διέτριβον ἐν Λύστροις, while his Latin is practically the same as that of D.

Now here the same verb ἐκπλήττομαι turns up, and again we have a gloss in the Greek text, viz. the word ἐφοβήθησαν. Evidently it is a case of double translation agreeing almost verbatim with the former case; and it is certain that the primitive Latin rendering was pleonastic, for on turning to Cod. Vercellensis we have *mirabantur et timebant*, and so in Cod. Veronensis: other Old Latin texts shew the same pleonasm, though some reduce it back to a single term, no doubt by omission of the alternative rendering.

But if this reasoning be correct, since the pleonastic translation is found in *D a b c e f f<sup>2</sup> g<sup>2</sup>* it must be a part of the primitive rendering of the text of Matthew. And this arouses our suspicions that the original rendering in Matthew and the translation of the Acts are by the same hand; and that the particular gloss in the Acts of which we are speaking is due to the first translator.

Nor is this all: for the gloss in Matthew found its way into the text of the Curetonian Syriac, which gives

ܐܠܗܐ ܕܡܪܝܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܬܐ

So that we suspect that the Curetonian text was made from a Latinized copy. Moreover it is included in the preceding that the whole of the translation into Latin of the Gospels and Acts (more exactly, Matthew and Acts) is earlier than the Curetonian Syriac<sup>1</sup>.

There are doubtless many other cases of these pleonastic translations in the Gospels (as distinct from conflations), and we can sometimes detect them by noticing that separate Latin copies take up detached parts of an extant pleonastic rendering. For instance, if we find in Codex Bezae the form *possessionem hereditatis* for κληρονομίαν (as in Acts vii. 5), we may be pretty sure that Cod. E which is related to D will drop one or other of the words, and, as a matter of fact, on turning to the Codex we find that he contents himself with *hereditatem*. No doubt there is much to be done in the study of the parallel Latin versions, with a view to the detection of the pleonasms and barbarisms of the first rendering. The foregoing instance is given, as has been said, merely as a suggestion of the right method of procedure, and of the results

<sup>1</sup> The Arabic Tatian in the parallel passage Mark x. 26 shews a similar rendering of ἐκπλήττομαι, *admirabantur...iam timidi*.



that will follow. For the present, however, all that we need to deduce from the study of the case with which we started is that it furnishes no exception to the theory that the major part of the glosses in the Greek text of the Acts are primitively Latin glosses.

One other remarkable case of Latin glossing shall be given, before we plunge deeper into the question of local and temporal origins for the Latin text of the Acts; it is the gloss in Acts xii. 10:

et cum exissent descenderunt septem gradus  
et processerunt gradum unum.

I must confess that there are few things that have so deceived me in the Bezan text as this gloss about the seven steps of the prison at Jerusalem has done. Its innocent touch of originality had almost led me to join Bornemann in his worship of the Western idol. But we are saved by the study of other passages, from which we have learned that we must not expect in such a text to find the footprints of a commentator who had been in the prison at Jerusalem and had counted the steps as he came out. And knowing, as we do, that in one passage at least, and probably in a number of others, in the Gospel of Luke the text has Homerized, we see our way to explain the perplexing interpolation. First, we fix our minds upon the Latin text, which is clearly not the same as the Greek. On the hypothesis that the Greek is a rendering of the Latin, we need not assume that it was necessary to write τοὺς ζ' βαθμούς: it will be sufficient to translate *septem gradus* without the article; 'they (Peter and the angel) came down seven steps and went on one step.' The writer is imitating Poseidon's descent from the mountains of Thrace (*Iliad* xiii. 17),

Αὐτίκα δ' ἐξ ὄρεος κατεβήσεντο παιπαλόεντος  
Κραιπνὰ ποσὶ προβιάς, τρέμε δ' οὔρεα μακρὰ καὶ ὕλη,  
Τρὶς μὲν ὀρέξατ' ἰών, τὸ δὲ τέτρατον ἔκετο τέκμωρ.

And just as Poseidon makes his descent with a hop, skip and jump from Samos to Aegae, so rapidly does the angel carry Peter from the middle of the prison into the heart of the city. Notice the concurrence of the language,

κατεβήσето = descenderunt = κατέβησαν.

προβιβάς = processerunt = προσήλθαν.

The change in the numbers, from three steps and a step to seven steps and a step, is suggestive of metrical exigency, just as we found in the passage borrowed from the story of Polyphemus, where twenty carts had replaced the two and twenty carts of Homer, in order to make a Latin hexameter. We may suspect then that here the same hand has been at work as we detected in the Gospel of Luke<sup>1</sup>. It is a case of the use of a Latin metrical

<sup>1</sup> It may be asked, what was it that provoked Homerization of the passage in the first instance? In the Polyphemus passage it is the cave and the great stone; but what was the motive here? I am inclined to believe that the first thing which drew the attention of the annotator was the abrupt introduction of the ἄγγελος κυρίου. To one accustomed to pagan literature this would easily recall Hermes; and that the writer did make the mental connection with the winged herald of the gods, will be seen from the fact that he immediately alters the text from παράξας τὴν πλευρὰν τοῦ Πέτρου το νόξας δὲ κτέ (=pungens autem latus Petri). In other words the ἄγγελος wakes Peter by a thrust of his wand and not by a stroke of his hand. Readers of Homer will recall at once the conventional description of the ἄγγελοι.

εἶλετο δὲ ῥάβδον, τῇ τ' ἀνδρῶν ὄμματα θέλγει  
ὣν θέλει, τοὺς δ' αὖτε καὶ ὑπνώοντας ἐγείρει.  
τῇ μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχων πέτετο κρατὶς Ἀργειφόντης.

(Il. xxiv. 343.)

(Od. v. 47.)

This explains the perplexing νόξας, of which I. D. Michaelis rightly said in his *Curae in Versionem Syriacam*, p. 107, "Hic sine dubio ex latinizante codice corruptus est Syrus. Cum enim solus Cantabrigiensis legat νόξας, *pungens*, quam lectionem ex latinis patribus Lucifer Calaritanus expressit, Syrus habet ܢܘܟܣܐ = *purugit illum* atque ex ipso olim expresserat Arabs." Strange to say, Lagarde seems to have accepted νόξας as the primitive reading!

Returning to our commentator, the next thing that would strike him would be the directions given by the ἄγγελος κυρίου to Peter; *calcia te calciamenta* again suggests Homer, and the idea that Peter and the angel are going to fly through the air; we have only to recall the description given by Homer of the flights of Pallas and Hermes:

αὐτίκ' ἐπειθ' ὑπὸ ποσσὶν ἐδήσατο· καλὰ πέδιλα  
ἀμβρόσια, χρύσεια, τὰ μιν φέρον ἡμὲν ἐφ' ὕγρην  
ἥδ' ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν ἄμα πνοιῇς ἀνέμοιο.

The escape of Peter was then a genuine flight, in which he was assisted (i) by the presence of the angel, (ii) by the use of his sandals. We are thus able to explain all the perplexing corruptions in the passage. They are due to a Homerizing Latin scribe.

text of the New Testament, or of glosses from a Latin translation of Homer. In any case, I think we may feel some confidence in the theory which asserts the priority of the Latin glosses over their Greek conjugates.

But ought we not to go one step further, though I can well imagine some one suggesting that the steps already taken are sufficiently Olympic, and may we not in the final stride perhaps touch the goal? The writer who inserted that picture of a flight from prison into the city lived in a place where the prison was high above the city, and overlooked it: how else could he have used the word *κατέβη* or thought of Poseidon's descent from Olympus? He must have been in some city where people went up when they were committed to prison, and came down when they recovered their freedom. Such a case as that of S. Perpetua at Carthage suits the description, where the prison was on the Byrsa, hundreds of feet above the town, so that Perpetua describes the visit of her father to her in the words 'de civitate...ascendit ad me.' The suggestion, then, arises that perhaps the glossator in question was a Carthaginian. So we are brought back again to the question of the African origin of the Western text, and we must proceed to test for Africanisms, to the best of our limited ability.

Bearing in mind, then, the fundamental Latinity of nine tenths of the Western readings, let us turn to the gloss in Acts xv. 11,

ΚΥΝΚΑΤΑΤΕΘΕΜΕΝΩΝ ΔΕ ΤΩΝ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΩΝ  
ΤΟΙΣ ΥΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΠΕΤΡΟΥ ΕΙΡΗΜΕΝΟΙΣ  
DESPOONENTES AVTEM PRESBYTEROS  
QVAE A PETRO DICEBANTVR.

Here the Latin shews the remarkable feature of the accusative absolute instead of the ablative absolute. Now there is some reason to believe this usage to be an Africanism: the Corpus Inscriptionum shews eight cases of the peculiarity amongst the African inscriptions; and I see that Haussleiter in his tract on the Versions of Hermas<sup>1</sup> maintains that this is the most certain of Africanisms: "in certissimis Africae testimoniis numerandam esse puto miram accusativi absoluti pro ablativo absoluto

positi constructionem; quam, si inscriptionum latinarum volumina adhuc iuris publici facta perlustres, nusquam nisi in titulis Afrieis animadvertes. Ut legimus in titulo publico c. a. 290 (nr. 8924) (Aurelius Litua), qui...rebelles caesos, multos etiam et vivos adprehensos sed et praedas actas, repressa desperatione eorum victoriam reportaverit." Haussleiter is using the point in proof of his thesis of the Africanism of the Palatine Version of Hermas: and if his argument be a correct one, we must apply it to the case which we are discussing: let us see then whether there are any other cases of the kind, excluding of course such as arise from the intrusion or extrusion of a silent final *m*<sup>1</sup>.

In Acts xx. 12 we find the gloss

ΑΓΓΑΖΟΜΕΝΩΝ ΔΕ ΑΥΤΩΝ  
SALVTANTES ΑΥΤΕ[Μ Ε]ΟΣ,

which is another case of the same kind.

It may be urged that *salutantes* here is not really an accusative but a nominative, as is shewn by the following line

ΑΔΔΥΚΕΡΥΝΤ ΙΥΝΕΝΕΜ ΒΙΥΕΝΤΕΜ,

but we must remember that it has been rendered into Greek from the Latin as a genetive absolute, which is somewhat of a presumption in favour of the opinion that it was meant for an accusative.

In Acts v. 38 we have the curious gloss

ΑΗ ΜΙΑΝΑΝΤΕC ΤΑC ΧΕΙΡΑC  
NON COINQVINATAS MANVS.

Here again the Latin text has suspiciously the appearance of an accusative absolute, though the Greek has rendered as if it read *coinquinantes*, which we should certainly have expected. Further, we have in Acts xiv. 19,

ΜΟΡΑC ΦΑCΙΕΝΤΕC ΕΟC ΕΤ ΔΟCΕΝΤΕC

as the equivalent of a Greek genetive absolute.

Here then we have two clear cases, and two doubtful cases, of accusative absolute on the part of the translator or glossator; and this certainly invites the hypothesis that we have definite

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Acts ii. 33, pollicitationem <sup>sancti</sup> ~~sancti~~ accepta.

traces of Africanism. Let us see whether there are any other cases in the rest of the text.

Acts iii. 7 is doubtful

et adprehensum eum dextera manu suscitabit.

A more likely instance is Acts xvi. 37

anctios caesos nos publice  
indemnatos homines  
romanos ciues miserunt in carcerem,

but even this is not perfectly conclusive. It is conceivable that the same idea of the equivalence of the accusative and ablative when used absolutely is responsible for the rendering in Acts xix. 29, where we have

macedonibus comitibus pauli,

as a rendering of

Μακεδόνας συνεκδήμους Παύλου.

But it must be admitted that we have a very decided suggestion of the existence in the Acts of the supposed African accusative absolute, especially in the glosses.

Possibly the Gospels may furnish us with some cases: e.g. there is John xii. 37,

ΤΟΣΑΥΤΑ ΔΕ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΧΗΜΙΑ ΠΕΠΟΙΗΚΟΤΟΣ  
TANTA AVTEM AB ILLO SIGNA FACTA,

which looks extremely like the accusative absolute

Again, in Matt. xvii. 9,

ET DESCENDENTES DE MONTE  
PRAECEPIT EIS DICENS IHS,

where *descendentes* is the equivalent of *καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν*, but the Greek text has been corrected back from the Latin so as only to shew *καταβαίνοντες*<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> In the nature of the case such forms would rapidly be eliminated; and perhaps we ought to be surprised that there are so many traces of them left. Sometimes we may find the accusative absolute in the very article of death and disappearance. A case may be taken in Acts xiv. 20, where I feel pretty confident that the detached nominative absolute

CIRCUMVENYTER ENIM DISCIPULI EIVS

is a correction for an accusative. Here, too, the reader will find his Greek text coloured.

We must not, however, put more weight than it will bear on the theory of the Africanism of the accusative absolute. If Haussleiter's criterion is a correct one, it is so for the first centuries of the era. Later on we find cases of it in Merovingian documents, as Diez shews (*Gramm. der Rom. Sprachen*, III. 267). But most of the cases given by Diez are cases where there is no longer any distinction between accusative and ablative, the *m* of the accusative not being sonant: e.g. *adprehensum unum rusticum de civitate acceptum ab eo pacis praeium*, etc. More important are two instances from Bréquigny's *Diplomata* dated in 543 (*illas inspectas*), and in 712 (*inspectas ipsas praeceptiones*): but these seem to be legal formulæ, and so are not perhaps to be judged by grammatical standards. Our position is this, that the Old Latin texts of the New Testament shew primitive traces of the use of the accusative absolute, and that there is reason to believe the early accusative absolute to be African.

It is interesting to observe how near Middleton came to detecting this Latin accusative absolute in Codex Bezae: for he says (*Greek Article*, p. 460), "ἐξελθόντα (in Mark xi. 12) appears to me to be here purposely employed in the sense of a Genitive absolute, and the following passage is similar in a degree which can hardly be imputed to accident: in Luke ix. 37...if κατελθόντα αὐτόν do not mean *quum descendisset* I can make nothing of the place...no critic, I presume, will wish to regard them as examples of the elegant attic accusative absolute."

Let us turn to the other peculiarities which are supposed to characterize the African dialect.

Of these the most striking is the so-called *tumor Africanus*; which consists in the conjunction of a substantive with a synonymous genitive (e.g. *avaritiae cupido*, *feritatis crudelitas*, etc.<sup>1</sup>).

Let us see whether any of these are found in our texts. We naturally suppose that in a literal translation they will hardly occur; and moreover, if they do occur, the reviser who equalizes the Greek and Latin texts by the law of numerical justice, will probably excise them. But let us, at all events, examine the matter: for we may find traces of the original rendering.

<sup>1</sup> For examples, cf. Sittl, p. 93.



Acts vi. 5,

et non dedit ei possessionem hereditatis in ea,

where the single Greek word *κληρονομίαν* is rendered by the double expression in Latin. And we may also note the double translation *hereditate possidete* in Matt. xxv. 34.

It is quite possible that this mannerism is at the root of the perplexing reading in Acts vii. 46, where we have

et petiit tabernaculum inuenire  
sedes domui iacob.

Here we have a double rendering of *σκήνωμα*, and the second rendering is itself a double translation and is African, for *domui* is a genitive formation in the vulgar Latin (e.g. Luke ix. 55, *nescitis cuius spiritui estis*; Mark iii. 17, *quod est filius tonitruui*). But if such a rendering had ever stood in the text, it was almost certain to appear in the Greek as *τῷ οἴκῳ*; and this is actually found (*horresco referens*!) in *MBH* as well as in Codex D.

Possibly we might apply the same method to Acts xiii. 15,

ἀνδρες ἀδελφοὶ εἰ τις ἐστὶν λόγος σοφίας  
VIRI FRATRES SI QVIS EST SERMO ET INTELLECTVS.

Here the original Greek is certainly *λόγος*, without *σοφίας*; and one of two things has happened; either *λόγος* has been rendered by a double translation *sermo et intellectus*, which would thus contain the two possible meanings of *λόγος*; or else *sermo intellectus* is a pleonastic translation of *λόγος*, which would explain how the genitive *σοφίας* crept in, if we allow for a subsequent corruption of *λόγος*. But the first explanation may seem to many persons the more natural one.

In xix. 9 we have

ἐνὼπιον τοῦ πλῆθους  
IN CONSPECTU MULTITUDINIS GENTIVM,

and a subsequent insertion of *τῶν ἐθνῶν* in the Greek: but here the double genitive may conceivably, though I do not believe it, be nothing more than a conflation of two separate translations.

Acts xx. 19,

μετὰ πᾶσιν ταπεινοφροσύνην  
CVM OMNI HUMILITATI SENSVI,

where *sensui* is a genitive, is somewhat more like the African pleonastic usage, but, inasmuch as the two words are not equivalent, and both of them underlie the Greek, it would hardly be fair to call it a case of *tumor Africanus*. But, taking all the cases together, I think we have suggestions of something more than conflation. The same suspicion of African pleonasm is aroused in the text of the Gospels.

An interesting case, but again not a conclusive one, will be found in Mark ii. 5,

ΜΕΤ ΟΡΓΗΣ CYNΛΥΠΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ  
CVM IRA INDIGNATIONIS,

where a word seems to have dropped after *indignationis*, in which case we should have a double rendering, in true African style, of *ὀργῆς*.

So in Luke xvi. 24, we have τῇ φλογὶ ταύτῃ rendered by *in ustione ignis hujus*.

In Mark vi. 43,

ΚΑΙ ΗΡΑΝ ΚΛΑΣΜΑΤΩΝ  
ΙΒ • ΚΟΦΙΝΟΥΣ ΠΛΗΡΕΙΣ  
ET SVSTVLERVNT FRAGMENTORVM  
XII • COFINOS PLENOS.

Here, as we may see by reference to the other Old Latin texts (*a f ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> g<sup>2</sup> i l*), the original *κλάσματα* was translated by *reliquias fragmentorum*. Our text erases the first word (as also do *b c q*) and then changes the Greek of the second.

Other forms of pleonasm are current in African writers, such as the use of a synonymous adjective with a substantive, or of synonymous substantives or adjectives with no conjunction. In examining such cases in the Codex Bezae, the same uncertainty attaches to the matter as we have pointed out above; we are not able without a close study of documents to distinguish a pleonasm from a conflate translation. We shall content ourselves with pointing out a few scattered instances in the MS., leaving the reader to draw the conclusion.

John xvii. 23,

ἵνα ὡσιν τετελειωμένοι  
VT SINT PERFECTI CONSUMMATI.

John v. 2,

ΕΝ ΤΗ ΠΡΟΒΑΤΙΚῃ ΚΟΛΥΜΒΗΘΡΑ  
IN NATATORIA PISCINA,

where a word seems to have been dropped before *natatoria*. (Cf. *Actus Petri cum Simone* c. xiii. *piscinae adjacenti natatoriae*.)

Luke xx. 24,

figuram cuius habet imaginem et superinscriptionem.

Mark x. 18,

nisi solus unus deus,

where the pleonasm has coloured the Greek.

Luke viii. 8,

cecidit super terram bonam et uberam,

which goes back into the Greek as

ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καλὴν καὶ ἀγαθὴν,

where *ἀγαθὴν* is usually said to result from assimilation to the parallel gospels.

In Mark vi. 51 we have an original text *καὶ λίαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς* rendered by *et plus magis inter se*, and the effect of the pleonasm is to throw back an additional *περισσῶς* on the Greek text. In the Bezan text we find only *περισσῶς* extant; in **NBLΔ** we have *λίαν* only, which seems to be the original reading, but the Latin texts keep the pleonasm with much constancy (cf. *a f g<sup>1</sup> g<sup>2</sup> i q* which read *plus magis*, and *e* which has *magis plus*). But perhaps the best proof of the correctness of this theory of pleonastic African renderings with subsequent reflexion on the Greek text, will be to take a case which has hitherto baffled all explanation, and to indicate the progressive degeneration of the Western text.

Few passages have caused me so much perplexity as Luke xiii. 8,

σκαψῶ περὶ αὐτὴν καὶ βαλῶ κοφίνον  
κοπρίων  
FODIAM CIRCA ILLAM ET MITTAM QVALVM  
STERCORIS.

The word used by D (*qualum*) means a wicker-basket, and has

been changed in the other Western texts into *cofinum* agreeably to the Greek in Cod. Bezae; thus we find

*cofinum stercoris*

in *a b c f ff<sup>2</sup> i l* and *q*.

Now in such cases, if the Bezan Latin shews a different word from the other Latin codices, it will generally be found that the Bezan word is the older form; but how in the present case are we to explain either of the forms? We suspect, by long experience, that *κόφινον* in the Greek is merely a reflexion from the Latin, but why should the Western translator render *κόπρια* by *qualum stercoris*?

The answer is that he used the pleonastic form

*squalem stercoris*,

and the word *squalem* early became corrupted into *qualum*<sup>1</sup>.

Another verification of the theory may be found in the fact that where the primitive Latin rendering is suspected to be pleonastic we find the oldest Latin texts divide on the reading, one half of the reading being preserved in one group of texts and the other half of the reading being preserved in another; so that, while at first sight it seems as if we had two independent translations, a closer examination shews the *disjecta membra* of a single rendering. A good instance for study will be found in the translations of *κληρονομέω*, *κληρονομία*. In Matt. v. 4 we have in *d hereditabunt*, and in *b possidebunt*, while the original pleonasm is preserved in *a, hereditate possidebunt*. Or take the case of Mark x. 22, where an original translation of *κτῆματα* in the sense of 'real and personal estate' appears in the versions as follows: *b* has *multas pecunias et agros*; *k* the nearly equivalent *multas divitias et agros*; while *d* only shews *multas pecunias*, but has in its Greek a reflected *χρήματα*, which has displaced the original *κτῆματα*.

This bifurcation of the Latin versions is very noticeable with the adverbs and conjunctions<sup>2</sup> which, as Sittl points out, are often used pleonastically in the African dialect. For example, Sittl quotes

*licet et*

<sup>1</sup> Curiously Tischendorf quotes the ms. as actually reading *squalum*, but there is no trace of an 's' in the text.

<sup>2</sup> The simplest case of the kind is perhaps Acts xvii. 23, *inveni etiam et aram*.

from Tert. *De Virg. Vel.* § 6 where we have perhaps the remains of a primitive

licet etsi;

and from the African Latin of the commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Pauline epistles, he quotes

licet si (p. 202, 18),

and

licet si et (p. 197, 12),

which are cases, certainly of pleonasm, and probably of the tautological form

licet etsi.

What shall we say then of Mark vi. 23 which in the Codex Bezae reads

licet dimidium regni mei,

where *licet* is supported also by *a i q vg*; while, on the other hand, the MSS. *b c ff*<sup>2</sup> give

etiam si,

and *g*<sup>1</sup> has preserved

licet etsi,

which has a suspicious appearance of being the primitive pleonasm?

Three verses lower down in the same chapter, we find again a curious bifurcation in the testimony, for *d*, supported by *i*, reads

et contristatus est rex

mox audit,

but *c ff*<sup>2</sup> replace *mox* by *ut*.

The earliest form of the gloss (for it is a gloss, though it has been carried over into the Beza Greek as *ὡς ἤκουσεν*) was probably

mox ut audit,

and in fact the codex *g*<sup>2</sup> has preserved the double reading<sup>1</sup>.

We say, then, that both the Acts and the Gospels arouse suspicions of African pleonasm<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> These minute pleonasms meet us at all points in African documents and give rise to much confusion: there is a curious case in the Muratorian Canon, where *se publicare vero* arises out of a pleonastic *sed publicari vero*.

<sup>2</sup> Compare also what has been said above, p. 199, of the double renderings of *ἐκπλήρρωσαι*.

In the use of the degrees of comparison Sittl points out many peculiarities in African writers, though he is careful not to commit himself to the theory that the forms are exclusively African.

Such are the intensification of a comparative by *magis* and *plus*; the unsymmetrical use of connected adjectives in different degrees of comparison; the use of the genitive of comparison; comparatives constructed with *a* and *ab*; the use of comparatives and superlatives in the place of adjectives of the positive degree etc. For my own part, I cannot think that we are yet in a position to speak of such things positively as Africanisms, though they look very like it; yet there are many instances in the Codex Bezae which would fall under one or other of Sittl's classifications.

For example, Matt. xii. 42, *plus ionae* is a genitive of comparison, taken over from the Greek.

Matt. xii. 45 *peiora prioribus* shews a comparative where we should expect a positive in a literal translation (τῶν πρώτων).

The same verse shews *et generationi huic pessimae*, which is a possible African superlative for πονηρὰ.

Matt. xxii. 36 gives us *quod mandatum in lege maius* (μεγάλῃ).

Matt. xiii. 48 *collegerunt meliora in vasis*.

John xiii. 16 *neque apostolus maior eius qui misit eum*.

Luke vii. 28 *qui minor est eius in regno caelorum*.

Matt. xii. 6 *quia a templo maior est hic*.

The usage of the last case *a templo* may be the direct result of Punic influence: cf. the Hebrew comparative formed by prefixing the preposition *ב*.

Two interesting cases of the same kind occur in the Ziegler fragments of the Pauline Epp., viz. 2 Cor. i. 5 *nihil minus...ab his qui valde sunt apostoli*, and Heb. vii. 26 *altiozem a caelis*. These Ziegler texts are to be reckoned as African.

Now let us review the course of the argument as regards the origin of the Western text of the Acts.

The text was Montanized at a very early date, and the Montanist glosses shew a decided use of the African accusative absolute. We, therefore, ascribe the Montanization to an African hand.

Of the other glosses we find some which, while not definitely



Montanistic, are suspiciously Carthaginian. For example, there is the case of Peter flying down to the city from the prison. We have also the case of pleonastic translations which are best explained as Africanisms. One of these, viz. the expansion of the Latin and Greek in Acts xiii. 12, is suspected of being a primitive feature of the Latin text. It is possible, then, that we have to describe the Codex Bezae as a Carthaginian text which has been glossed by (mainly) Carthaginian hands. But if this be so, the text must have passed at a very early period in its history to Rome; for it became diffused (with the major part of its glosses) over the whole of the Western world, to say nothing of Upper Egypt and Syria. Moreover there is one passage in the Acts which seems to imply that the Codex Bezae or one of its ancestors actually passed through Rome. I refer to Acts xviii. 2

χωριζεσθαι πᾶντας ἰουδαίους ἀπὸ τῆς ρώμης  
DISCEDERE OMNES IUDAEOS EX VRBEM.

Now in Carthage *ex urbe* does not mean the same thing as ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης. We can see this in a variety of ways. For instance, in the Acts of Perpetua ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως (if any argument can be drawn from the Greek form: for the words are not in the Latin) probably means simply Carthage. Again, if Haussleiter's theory of the African origin of the Palatine version of Hermas be correct, the opening words of the book shew us the rendering of εἰς Ῥώμην by *in urbe Roma*. A Roman translator would probably have simply said *in urbe*. We might also refer to the Muratorian Canon for similar renderings, but this we will not do, because it is not yet agreed whether the original of the Canon was in prose, nor whether its translation into Latin is of Roman or African origin<sup>1</sup>.

We suspect, then, that the first translator of the Acts wrote *ex urbe Roma*; and that *Roma* was afterwards removed, possibly to balance the Greek and Latin texts, but more likely because the text had itself passed to Rome, where *ex urbe* was sufficient. Now, if the Montanized recension of the Acts passed to Rome it is clear from the diffusion of the text that it must have passed

<sup>1</sup> Moreover the Muratorian Canon shews both forms: "profectionem Pauli ab urbe," and "temporibus nostris in urbe Roma," "cathedra urbis Romae."

there very early, and have become the official Latin text. And this would seem to require that it was introduced at Rome when Montanism was in the ascendant there. The most likely period for this is the episcopate of Soter or Eleutherus. Tertullian tells us that when Praxeas came to Rome he persuaded the Roman bishop, who favoured the Montanists of Asia, and acknowledged the prophetic gifts of SS. Montanus, Priscilla and Maximilla, to recede from that position and recall the letters of peace which he had issued. In this way, says Tertullian, Praxeas "put to flight the Paraclete." This means that, historically, Montanism was at its highest point in Rome under a certain bishop, who is unhappily nameless. It is not an easy matter to determine which Roman bishop is meant. The evidence of the early Church would seem to point to Soter; for Praedestinatus tells us that Soter wrote against the Montanists and that Tertullian wrote against Soter<sup>1</sup>. This would place the *maximum* of Roman Montanism between the dates 160 and 170 A.D. Modern opinion, however, has inclined to see the bishop in question in the successor of Soter, Eleutherus, which would bring us to a slightly later date. The reader will, however, see that we cannot well go farther down in date consistently with the belief in the diffusion of the Montanized copy, which was known to Irenaeus when he wrote his treatise on Heresies, which Harvey places between 182 and 188. It seems to be difficult to place the Montanized Roman edition later than 170 A.D., and it may be a decade earlier. And then behind this glossed edition we have the unglossed (probably) Carthaginian text which must be a number of years earlier. How many years shall we say? *Festina lente.*

<sup>1</sup> Praedest. Haer. 26 and 86.

## CHAPTER XX.

### FURTHER ATTEMPTS AT CLASSIFICATION OF THE GLOSSES IN THE WESTERN TEXT OF THE ACTS.

WE will now try to carry the classification of the glosses in the Acts a step further: and by means of the unity of the attestations, the similarity of the doctrinal tendencies, and the parallelisms in the Greek or Latin texts of the glosses, we shall be able to reduce all or nearly all of these glosses to their proper groups.

First we will make a list of the principal glosses accompanied by the chief of the attesting authorities as given by Tischendorf, printing them in Latin where there is some good reason to believe them to have originated in that language, and in Greek when the matter is more doubtful. For convenience of reference we number the glosses successively as they occur in the text:

ACTS			
1	i. 2	et praecepit praedicare evangelium	D lux sah Aug Vig-Taps
2	i. 4	de ore meo	D lux aeth Aug Hil
3	i. 5	et eum accipere habetis	D tol Aug Hil Max-Taur
4	i. 5	usque ad pentecosten	D sah Aug
5	i. 12	τὸ διάστημα ὅσον δυνατόν Ἰουδαίων περιπατεῖν	40 aeth
6	ii. 1	καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις	D
7	ii. 33	hoc donum quod	DE tol sah syr <sup>sc</sup> syr <sup>sa</sup> ar <sup>c</sup> Iren Did Amb Phi- last
8	ii. 37	τότε πάντες οἱ συνελθόντες καὶ	D syr <sup>p-mg</sup>
9	ii. 37	et quidam ex ipsis	D
10	ii. 37	ostendite nobis	DE tol syr <sup>p-mg</sup> Aug
11	ii. 41	et credentes	D syr <sup>p-mg</sup> Aug
12	iii. 1	ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις	D
13	iii. 1	τὸ διελκύνον	D

Acts			
14	iii. 3	οὗτος ἀνένισας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ	D reg
15	iii. 7	stetit et	D reg
16	iii. 11	ἐκπορευομένου δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου κτέ	D reg
17	iii. 13	in iudicium	DE syr <sup>p.mg</sup> Iren
18	iii. 17	πονηρόν	D syr <sup>p.mg</sup> Iren Aug Ambrst
19	iii. 22	πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν	DE sah aeth Iren
20	iv. 1	τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα	D reg syr <sup>sch</sup> syr <sup>p.mg</sup> ar <sup>o</sup> Thphyl
21	iv. 9	a vobis	DE reg syr <sup>utr</sup> aeth <sup>pp</sup> ar <sup>o</sup> Iren Cyp
22	iv. 14	ποιῆσαι ἥ	D reg
23	iv. 18	συγκατατιθεμένων δὲ αὐτῶν τῇ γνώμῃ	D reg syr <sup>p.mg</sup> Lucif
24	iv. 24	et cognovissent dei virtutem	D
25	iv. 25	per spiritum sanctum	[reading early and attestation confused]
26	iv. 31	omni volenti credere	DE Iren Aug
27	iv. 32	et non erat accusatio in eis ulla	DE Cyp Ambr Zeno
28	v. 8	ἐπερωτήσω σε· εἰ ἄρα	D
29	v. 15	et liberabantur ab omne valetudine quem habebat unusquisque eorum	DE Lucif vg
30	v. 18	et abierunt unusquisque in domicilia	D
31	v. 21	exurgentes ante lucem	D
32	v. 22	et aperuissent carcerem	D syr <sup>p</sup> vg
33	v. 35	ad principes et concilium	D sah
34	v. 36	αὐτὸς δι' αὐτοῦ	D
35	v. 38	ἀδελφοί	D
36	v. 38	non coinquinatas manus	DE
37	v. 39	nec vos nec imperatores nec reges : discedite ergo ab hominibus istis	DE syr <sup>p</sup> demid D syr <sup>p</sup> demid 33 <sup>ms</sup> 180
38	v. 41	ἀπόστολοι	D syr <sup>p</sup> 180
39	vi. 1	ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ τῶν ἑβραίων	D
40	vi. 3	τί οὖν ἔστιν	D
41	vi. 5	τῶν μαθητῶν	D
42	vi. 8	per nomen domini Iesu Christi	DE sah syr <sup>p</sup> 180
43	vi. 10	quae erat in eo	DE
44	vi. 10	sancto	DE vg
45	vi. 10	quoniam probatur illis ab Illo cum omni fiducia	DE syr <sup>p.mg</sup>
46	vi. 10	non potentes autem resistere veritati	DE syr <sup>p.mg</sup> bohem
47	vi. 13	adversum eum	D aeth

ACTS		
48	vi. 15	ἐστῶτος ἐν μέσφ αὐτῶν
49	vii. 4	καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν
50	vii. 6	πρὸς αὐτόν
51	vii. 21	παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν
52	vii. 24	καὶ ἔκρυψεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἄμμφ
53	vii. 26	τί ποιεῖτε
54	vii. 33	καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ πρὸς αὐτόν
55	viii. 1	qui manserunt Hierusalem
56	viii. 6	ὡς δὲ ἤκουον
57	viii. 19	rogando et
58	viii. 24	παρακαλῶ
59	viii. 24	τούτων τῶν κακῶν
60	viii. 24	ὅς πολλὰ κλαίων οὐ διελύμπανεν
61	viii. 37	respondens dixit Philippus: si credis ex toto corde tuo licet: et respondens spado ait: credo filium dei esse Christum Jesum
62	ix. 4	σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν
63	ix. 5	σκληρόν σοι κτέ
64	ix. 20	cum omni fiducia.
65	ix. 37	quum autem esset Petrus Lyddae
66	ix. 40	in nomine domini nostri Jesu Christi
67	x. 25	προσεγγίζοντος δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου κτέ
68	x. 28	melius
69	x. 33	παρακαλῶν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ἡμᾶς
70	x. 33	ἐν τάχει
71	xi. 2	διὰ ἱκανοῦ χρόνου ἠθέλησεν πορευ- θῆναι
72	xi. 2	καὶ προσφωνήσας... χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ
73	xi. 17	ut non daret eis spiritum sanctum credentibus in eum
74	xi. 25	ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι Σαῦλος κτέ
75	xi. 27	erat autem magna exultatio; re- vertentibus autem nobis
76	xii. 1	ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ
77	xii. 3	comprehensio ejus
78	xii. 3	ἐπὶ τοὺς πιστοὺς
79	xii. 7	Petro
80	xii. 10	descenderunt septem grados et [processerunt] gradum [unum]
81	xii. 15	forsitam
82	xii. 20	ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν πόλεων
83	xii. 21	καταλλαγέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῖς Τυρίοις
		D
		DE syr <sup>p</sup> Aug
		D Iren
		DE syr <sup>p</sup>
		D aeth
		D
		D
		D sah Aug
		D syr <sup>sch</sup> ar <sup>s</sup> aeth
		D
		D syr <sup>p</sup> 137 180 Const
		DE
		D syr <sup>p.msc</sup>
		E vg demid tol arm syr <sup>p</sup>
		Iren Cyp Thphyl
		E syr <sup>sch</sup> syr <sup>p</sup> ar <sup>s</sup>
		vg tol syr <sup>p</sup>
		Iren
		syr <sup>p</sup>
		sah syr <sup>p</sup> arm Amb Cyp
		D syr <sup>p.msc</sup>
		D Aug
		D syr <sup>p.msc</sup>
		D
		D syr <sup>p</sup>
		D syr <sup>p</sup>
		D Aug
		D syr <sup>p</sup>
		D syr <sup>p.msc</sup>
		D syr <sup>p.msc</sup>
		D sah syr <sup>p</sup> aeth
		D
		D syr <sup>sch</sup> ar <sup>s</sup>
		D syr <sup>p</sup>
		D syr <sup>p</sup>

AOTS			
84	xii. 23	καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος	D
85	xii. 23	ἔτι ζῶν καὶ οὕτως	D
86	xiii. 8	quoniam libenter audiebat eos	DE syr <sup>p</sup>
87	xiii. 15	[λόγου] καὶ σοφίας	D
88	xiii. 19	τῶν ἀλλοφυλῶν	D syr <sup>p</sup>
89	xiii. 28	κρίναντες αὐτὸν παρέδωκαν	D
90	xiii. 41	καὶ ἐσίγησαν	D syr <sup>p</sup>
91	xiii. 44	ἐγένετο δὲ καθ' ὅλης κτέ	DE syr <sup>p</sup>
92	xiii. 44	πολὺν τε λόγον ποιησαμένου περὶ τοῦ κυ	D[E]
93	xiii. 45	contradicentes et	DEIP syr <sup>p</sup> Chr
94	xiii. 50	tribulationem magnam	D
95	xiv. 2	οἱ δὲ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι...δικαίων	D [syr <sup>p-ms</sup> ]
96	xiv. 2	ὁ δὲ κύριος ἔδωκεν ταχὺ εἰρήνην	DE demid syr <sup>p-ms</sup>
97	xiv. 4	adherentes propter verbum dei	D syr <sup>p-ms</sup>
98	xiv. 7	[verbum dei.] et commota est omnis multitudo in doctrinis. Paulus autem et Barnabas moras faciebant in Lystria	DE
99	xiv. 9	ὑπάρχων ἐν φόβῳ	DE
100	xiv. 9	ἀτενίσας δὲ ὁ Παῦλος	DE
101	xiv. 10	σοὶ λέγω ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυ ἡν χυ	CDE sah syr <sup>sch</sup> syr <sup>p-ms</sup> arm [Iren]
102	xiv. 19	moras facientes eos et docentes	CDE syr <sup>p-ms</sup> arm ar <sup>a</sup> etc.
103	xiv. 25	evangelizantes eos	D syr <sup>p</sup>
104	xiv. 27	μετὰ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν	D
105	xv. 1	καὶ περιπατήτε	D sah syr <sup>p-ms</sup>
106	xv. 2	ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος...ἀπὸ Ἱερου- σαλήμ	D syr <sup>p-ms</sup>
107	xv. 2	ὅπως κριθῶσιν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς	D syr <sup>p</sup> 137
108	xv. 4	καὶ ὅτι ἤνοιξεν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν θύραν πίστεως	HL etc. Thphyl
109	xv. 5	οἱ δὲ παραγγέλλοντες...τοὺς πρεσ- βυτέρους	D syr <sup>p-ms</sup>
110	xv. 7	ἐν πνεύματι	D syr <sup>p-ms</sup> 137
111	xv. 11	συγκατατεθεμένων δὲ τῶν πρεσβυτέ- ρων τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Πέτρου εἰρημένοις	D syr <sup>p</sup>
112	xv. 13	surgens	D syr <sup>sch</sup>
113	xv. 20	καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλουσιν...μὴ ποιεῖτε	D sah aeth Iren
114	xv. 23	ἐπιστολὴν περιέχουσιν τάδε	CD sah aeth syr <sup>p-ms</sup>
115	xv. 26	eis πάντα πειρασμόν	DE syr <sup>p-ms</sup> 137
116	xv. 29	καὶ ὅσα μὴ θέλετε κτέ	D sah syr <sup>p</sup> aeth Iren Cyp
117	xv. 29	ferentes in sancto spiritu	D Iren Tert
118	xv. 30	ἐν ἡμέραις ὀλίγαις	D



ACTS		
119	xv. 32	pleni spiritu sancto D
120	xv. 34	ἔδοξε δὲ τῷ Σίλῳ ἐπιμεῖναι αὐτοῦ CD sah aeth cop syr <sup>p</sup>
121	xv. 34	μόνος δὲ Ἰούδας ἐπορεύθη D tol arm
122	xv. 38	εἰς ὃ ἐπέμφθησαν, τοῦτον μὴ εἶναι D tol σὺν αὐτοῖς
123	xv. 41	παραδίδους τὰς ἐντολάς τῶν πρεσβυ- D tol syr <sup>p-mg</sup> τέρων
124	xvi. 1	διελθὼν δὲ τὰ ἔθνη ταῦτα D syr <sup>p-mg</sup>
125	xvi. 4	cum omni fiducia dominum Jesum D syr <sup>p-mg</sup> Christum simul tradentes et
126	xvi. 9	κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ D syr <sup>p</sup>
127	xvi. 10	exurgens ergo enarrabit visum D sah nobis et intellegimus quoniam provocavit nos dominus
128	xvi. 11	τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον D syr <sup>p-mg</sup> 137
129	xvi. 16	per hoc D
130	xvi. 19	ἥς εἶχαν δι' αὐτῆς D
131	xvi. 22	κράζοντες D
132	xvi. 30	τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀσφαλισάμενος D syr <sup>p</sup>
133	xvi. 35	συνῆλθον οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ D syr <sup>p-mg</sup> εἰς τὴν ἀγοράν, καὶ ἀναμνησθέντες τὸν σεισμὸν τὸν γεγονότα ἐφοβή- θησαν
134	xvi. 35	οὓς ἐχθὲς παρέλαβες D syr <sup>p</sup> 137
135	xvi. 39	παραγενόμενοι μετὰ φίλων πολλῶν D
136	xvi. 39	ἠγνοήσαμεν τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς ὅτι ἐστέ D syr <sup>p</sup> 137 ἄνδρες δίκαιοι κτέ
137	xvi. 40	ιδόντες τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς διηγῆσαντο D ὅσα κτέ
138	xvii. 6	et dicentes D
139	xvii. 12	quidam vero credere noluerunt D 137
140	xvii. 12	et viri et mulieres pleres credide- D runt
141	xvii. 13	οὐ διελίμπανον D syr <sup>sch</sup> ar <sup>o</sup>
142	xvii. 15	παρῆλθεν δὲ τὴν Θεσσαλίαν· ἐκωλύθη D γὰρ εἰς αὐτοὺς κηρύξαι τὸν λόγον
143	xvii. 19	cogitantes et D syr <sup>p</sup> 137
144	xviii. 2	οἱ καὶ κατόκησαν εἰς τὴν Ἀχαΐαν D syr <sup>p-mg</sup>
145	xviii. 4	et interponens nomen domini Jesu D syr <sup>p-mg</sup>
146	xviii. 6	πολλοῦ δὲ λόγου γεινομένου καὶ γρα- D syr <sup>p-mg</sup> φῶν διερμηνευομένων
147	xviii. 8	per nomen dñi nostri ihu xpi D syr <sup>p-mg</sup> 137
148	xviii. 11	ἐν Κορίνθῳ D syr <sup>sch</sup> syr <sup>p</sup> ar <sup>o</sup> aeth
149	xviii. 12	συνλαλήσαντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν D
150	xviii. 12	καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας D sah syr <sup>p</sup>

ACTS			
151	xviii. 13	clamantes et	D
152	xviii. 19	καὶ τῷ ἐπιόντι σαββάτῳ	D sah syr <sup>p.mg</sup> 137
153	xviii. 25	ἐν τῇ πατρίδι	D
154	xviii. 26	ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἐφέσῳ...συνκατανεύσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ	D syr <sup>p.mg</sup>
155	xviii. 27	ἐν Κορίνθῳ	D syr <sup>p.mg</sup>
156	xviii. 27	ὅπως ἀποδέξωνται τὸν ἄνδρα	D syr <sup>p.mg</sup>
157	xviii. 27	εἰς τὴν Ἀχαΐαν	D
158	xviii. 28	διαλεγόμενος καὶ	D 137
159	xix. 1	volente vero Paulo...reverti in Asiam	D syr <sup>p.mg</sup>
160	xix. 2	[neque spiritum sanctum] acci- piunt quidam [audivimus]	D
161	xix. 5	εἰς ἁφεισιν ἁμαρτιῶν	D syr <sup>p</sup>
162	xix. 6	ἐτέραις	D sah syr <sup>p.mg</sup>
163	xix. 6	et sentiebant in seipsis quod et interpretabantur illis hi ipsi : quidam autem [prophetabant]	syr <sup>p.mg</sup>
164	xix. 8	cum fiducia magna	D syr <sup>p.mg</sup>
165	xix. 9	τινὸς ἀπὸ ὧρας ε' ἕως δεκάτης	D 137 syr <sup>p.mg</sup>
166	xix. 14	et introierunt...coeperunt invocare nomen	D syr <sup>p.mg</sup>
167	xix. 14 (repeated from v. 13)	praecipimustibi[per]Jesu[m]quem Paulus praedicat	D syr <sup>p.mg</sup>
168	xix. 20	et fides dei convalescebat	D
169	xix. 25	συντεχνῶνται	D sah syr <sup>p</sup>
170	xix. 28	δραμόντες εἰς τὸ ἄμφοδον	D syr <sup>p.mg</sup> 137
171	xx. 3	εἶπεν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῷ	D syr <sup>p.mg</sup>
172	xx. 12	ἀσπαζομένων δὲ αὐτῶν	D
173	xx. 18	ὡς τριετίαν ἧ καὶ πλείον	D
174	xx. 24	τοῦ λόγου	D tol Lucif Amb
175	xx. 24	Ἰουδαίοις καὶ Ἑλλήσιν	D sah Lucif
176	xxi. 1	καὶ Μύρα	D sah
177	xxi. 5	sequenti autem die ambulavimus viam nostram	D
178	xxi. 16	et cum venerunt in quendam civi- tatem fuimus	D syr <sup>p.mg</sup>
179	xxii. 28	quam facile civem Romanum te dicis	bohem Beda
180	xxiii. 9	quid est in hoc	syr <sup>sch</sup> ar <sup>p</sup>
181	xxiii. 24	ἐφοβήθη γὰρ μήποτε ἀρπάσαντες αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτενῶσι καὶ αὐτὸς μεταξὺ ἐγκλημα ἔχη ὡς ἀρ- γύριον εἰληφώς	syr <sup>p</sup> 137

ACTS		
182	xxiv. 10	defensionem habere pro se: statum autem assumens divinum dixit ex multis annis es iudex
183	xxiv. 27	τὸν δὲ Παῦλον εἶπεν ἐν τηρήσει διὰ Δρουσίλλαν
184	xxv. 3	illi qui votum fecerant quomodo obtinerent...ut in manibus suis esset
185	xxv. 25	et hic ut traderem etc. etc.
186	xxvii. 15	flanti (l. flatui) et collegimus artemonem
187	xxvii. 41	eo ubi syrtis
188	xxviii. 30	Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἑλλήνας
189	xxviii. 31	quoniam hic est Christus
190	xxviii. 31	per quem incipiet totus mundus judicari

Here then are 190 selected glosses from the Acts, of which probably none will find a defender; so that they are not really various readings at all, but portions of commentary.

Let us now see whether and how far these are reducible to distinct hands, in the manner which has been pointed out previously. We quote the glosses by the numbers prefixed to them, and group them by their peculiarities in doctrine, language, and attestation, the classification being less certain where the number is placed within brackets. For convenience we will attach to the separate glossators a Greek letter.

α. The following glosses are Montanistic.

(a) Doctrine of the Reception of the Paraclete emphasized, and other allusions to the influence of the Spirit, as Energy, Sophia &c.:

3. 4. [7] 24. [25] 43. 44. 45. 73. 110. 117. 119. 159. 160. 171

(b) Doctrine of prophecy and of the reception of prophetic gifts:

75. 119. 163

(c) Doctrine of the power of the sacred Name:

42. 66. 101. 145. 147. [166]

(d) Visions and their manner of interpretation:

127

(e) Doctrine of *παρηγορία*:

37. 45. 64. 125. [164]

Probably gloss 37 carries with it the previous gloss 36.

(*f*) Sharp distinction between believers and unbelievers, and necessity for faith with baptism :

9. 11. 26. 61. 139. 140. [168]

(*g*) Contempt for runaways :

122

(*h*) Glosses to emphasize the fact that the Apostles preached the Gospel, to wit, the Word of the Lord and the Person of the Lord :

1. 92. 97. 98. 125

(*i*) Glosses to get rid of the bareness and unspirituality of the decree of the Council at Jerusalem :

113. 116. 117

(*k*) Similarity of attestation brings together such passages as

1. [2] 3.

$\beta$ . The following gloss belongs to the person whom I distinguish as the Homerizer :

80

$\gamma$ . The following are probably due to double translations, pleonasm, &c. of the first translator :

10. 15. 17. [35] 47. 50. [51] 57. 58. 59. 69. 70. [76] 79. 81. 87. 93. 94. 105. 112. 129. [130] 131. 138. 143. 148. 151. 156. 162

The following pairs of glosses fall together, from the coincidences in language :

$\delta$ . 60 and 141 (*διαλιμπάνω*).

$\epsilon$ . 72 and 92 (*multum verbum faciens*).

$\varsigma$ . The following are likely to be by the same hand, since they involve *obscure* assimilations to the text of the Gospels :

30 (which carries 31 with it). 86. 98

$\zeta$ . The two following glosses, which speak of the believers as the just men, probably go together :

95. 136

$\eta$ . The following involve textual repetitions in the Latin, made necessary in most cases by the interpolation of glosses, and giving rise to two types of Greek :

37. 46. [98] 167

$\theta$ . Glosses of the nature of lectionary prefaces, or reader's expansions and connections:

6. [8] 12. 16. 65. [71] 118. 124. 128. [146] 148. 155 and perhaps others.

$\iota$ . A group of bold and startling expansions of the narrative, the major part of which certainly proceeded from a common hand:

[32] [33] [59] 60. 74. [82] 83. 84. 85. 96. 106. 109. [120] [121] 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 142. 144. 154. [155] 156. 157. 158. [159] 165. 170. 177. 178. 179. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185

The remainder of the glosses are difficult to classify.

Now let us see whether these ten imagined glossators, whom we have selected from the conceivable 190 hands in the text, can be connected with one another.

If we turn to the group of glosses in Acts vi. 10, we have a natural feeling that they all belong to the same hand, for they occur at the same place, and have a common tendency: it seems reasonable to believe therefore that gloss 46 which is a mere repetition in the Latin belongs with 43, 44, 45 which rendered it necessary. This makes the glossator  $\eta$  the same as  $\alpha$ .

Again a comparison of glosses 97 and 98 shews the common connecting term "the word of God": it is likely then that these are by the same hand; for they are nearly adjacent in the text, and have a common idea. Hence we have placed 97 and 98 under  $\alpha(h)$ : but  $\eta$  also contains 98 (on suspicion); and this agrees with what has just been deduced that  $\eta$  and  $\alpha$  are the same hand.

But 98 also turns up in  $\sigma$  on the ground of its imitation of a sentence in the Gospels.

It may, therefore, be said tentatively that  $\alpha\sigma\eta$  are one and the same.

The identity of  $\eta$  with  $\alpha$  would seem to follow also from the fact that it contains the gloss 37, which is one of the very decided cases of the *παραφραση* which so often occurs in our text.

Let us say, then, tentatively that the groups of glosses are not all independent; but that the most important of them are the translator ( $\gamma$ ), the Montanist ( $\alpha + \sigma + \eta$ ), the Homerizer ( $\beta$ ), a scribe who has lectionary usage in his mind ( $\theta$ ), and a daring commentator ( $\iota$ ).

We credit the Montanist now with the glosses

1. [2] 3. 4. [7] 9. 11. 24. [25] 26. 30. 31. 36. 37. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 61.  
64. 66. 72. 73. 75. 86. 92. 95. 97. 98. 101. 110. [111] 113. 116. 117. 119.  
122. 125. 127. 136. 139. 140. 145. 147. 159. 160. 163. [164] [166] 167. [168]  
171. [172]

Now let us see how the attestation of these errors is grouped: we have traces of the Montanizer in

CDE 137 lux tol reg demid sah aeth syr<sup>sch</sup> ar<sup>c</sup> syr<sup>p. lat</sup> syr<sup>p. ms</sup> bohem  
Iren Tert Cyp Aug Vig-Taps Hil Did Amb Philastr Max-Taur.

Now the doubtful members in this very Western group are Codex C and the Peshito Syriac with its daughter the Arabic. It is hard to believe in the dependence of their text on the Montanized text when they occur so rarely in support of special readings.

The examination shews that Codex C only attests the gloss 101, and syr<sup>sch</sup> the two glosses 7, 101, and the Arabic the gloss 7. It would seem then that these two glosses are wrongly included in the body of the Montanist readings. We therefore detach them, and assign them provisionally to some earlier date.

This allows us to make the provisional statement that the Western elements in Cod. C, and the primitive Syriac translation, are earlier than the Western Montanist glosses.

But we can, upon this hypothesis, make the chronological landmarks more conspicuous. For we know that gloss 80 antedates the Syriac translation which took up and transmitted the *vúξas* of the Homerizer: we say then that the chronological order (since the Homerizer is certainly a Latin) is

Latin translation,  
Homeric gloss,  
Primitive Syriac.

Now let us turn for a moment to the glosses which are attested by Cod. C. We find that they are five in number, viz. 101, 102, 108, 114, 120. And it is possible that these Western elements of Cod. C are antecedent to the Latin rendering, though they belong to the Western text, geographically speaking. They shew no decided traces of Latinism, for the gloss 102, which is the most likely to be primitive Latin, may very likely be a part of the first translation, and have been found in the translator's Greek.

We say then, still in a tentative manner, that the probable order in time is

Western glosses of Cod. C,  
 Latin translation,  
 Homeric gloss,  
 Primitive Syriac,  
 Montanist glosses.

Now the Sahidic glosses have been shewn to contain a large proportion of the Montanist element: we recognize the Sahidic and its companion the Ethiopic in such a group as

1. [2] 42. 66. 113. 116. 127.

There is no mistaking the significance of this evidence: we cannot easily evade the conclusion that the Sahidic text is later in date than the body of the Montanist glosses. We, therefore, add the Sahidic to the previous list, so as to give

Western glosses of Cod. C,  
 Latin translation,  
 Homeric gloss,  
 Primitive Syriac,  
 Montanist glosses,  
 Sahidic version.

It will be remembered that we assign the Montanizer roughly to the date 160 A.D., or a little later. The original Latin rendering must evidently be many years earlier; indeed we suspect that it must have been in existence in the early part of the second century. But the reader will have seen that we have not pretended that our investigation is complete, or that our conclusions are final. We are throwing lines across chasms which we hope to bridge by-and-bye.

## CHAPTER XXI.

### LOCAL AND TEMPORAL ORIGIN OF THE PRIMITIVE WESTERN TEXT OF THE GOSPELS.

WHEN we pass to the text of the Gospels, we are discussing very much the same problem as the preceding; for the probability is very high that the translation of the Acts of the Apostles is only a sequel and complement to the rendering of the Gospels into the vulgar tongue. The translation of the Gospels might be perhaps the earlier work, but that is all the difference. Hence there is a presumption that if the Acts of the Apostles in its Latin dress passed from Carthage to Rome, the Gospels had preceded it; or if Rome was the place of publication for the one, it was probably so for the other. We can, if we wish, leave the exact direction of motion of the primitive copy an open question, until a definite conclusion forces itself upon us.

But in approaching the subject on its own merits, apart from such suggestions as have been presented in the previous enquiry, we have a harder problem in some respects in the case of the Gospels than in that of the Acts. For, although there are numerous glosses in the Gospels, they do not shew the same unity of design, nor the same definiteness as to the time and place of production, as do the Montanist glosses in the Acts. There is, indeed, one striking Western reading which is perhaps Montanistic; I mean that beautiful variation of the Lord's prayer which replaced the two clauses

*ἀγισθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου·  
ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου·*

by the single sentence

*ἐλθέτω τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐφ' ἡμᾶς  
καὶ καθαρίσάτω ἡμᾶς.*



Now this variation, which in the form we have given is taken from Gregory of Nyssa (*De Orat. Dom.* § 3), was known both to Tertullian and to the ancestry of Codex Bezae<sup>1</sup>. The former appears by a reference to Tertullian's treatise against Marcion (iv. 26) where, in discussing the successive clauses in the Lord's prayer (and we see no reason to assume that it was Marcion's text rather than his own), he proceeds in the following order "Cui dicam, pater?...A quo spiritum sanctum postulem?...Eius regnum optabo venire, quem numquam regem gloriæ audiui?... Quis dabit mihi panem quotidianum...?" Here Tertullian has certainly explained the second clause of the Lord's prayer in harmony with the peculiar form preserved by Gregory of Nyssa. And, as I think Dr Sanday pointed out, there are signs in the text of Cod. Bezae that something of the same kind once stood here: for we have in Luke xi. 2

ΑΓΙΑΘΗΤΩ ΟΝΟΜΑ ΣΟΥ ΕΦ ΗΜΑΣ  
SANCTIFICETVR NOMEN TVVM SVPER NOS.

(The article is omitted, as commonly in D, being unbalanced in the Latin.) We may then, I think, say we have here either a Montanistic or a Marcionite gloss: the former, if it belongs to the text immediately antecedent to the Tertullian text: the latter, if it can be pushed back to an earlier period. Beyond this somewhat obscure instance, I do not know of any definite Montanistic touches in the Gospels. So that the argument will not at first statement move *pari passu* with the case of the Acts: perhaps because the Gospels were well fixed in Latin before Montanus. We can however proceed in another way.

We may affirm that the earliest Western readings of which we have any historical knowledge are exactly like the rest of the Bezan readings in that they have a suspicion of Latinizing attaching to them. For example, what are we to say of the famous dispute in regard to the reading of Matt. xi. 27 (οὐδεὶς ἔγνω τὸν πατέρα), which was such a favourite passage from the Gnostic standpoint, and of such antiquity that we can trace it onwards from Justin and Marcion to Irenæus and Clement and Origen?

<sup>1</sup> It actually occurs in Mr Hoskier's Codex (Ev. 604). A full discussion of this variant will be found in Chase, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*, pp. 25—27.

Does it not look very much as if some one had harmonized the Latin 'novit' (which was a right translation of the Greek *γινώσκει* or *ἐπιγινώσκει*) with its bilingual conjugate by means of a new translation? We have had cases enough of this kind to make us speak very confidently on such a point. Nor is there any difficulty in the supposition, for Justin and Marcion are both Roman teachers, and Alexandrian texts can be shewn to inherit directly the earlier peculiarities of the Western bilingual. In dealing then with Western readings we suspect Latinization from the earliest periods of textual history. That is the first position we take.

In the next place we have learnt from our study of the growth of the Western text of the Acts to distrust entirely the assumption that there are no such things as heretical and factional depravations of the text. As far as we are able to judge, one half of the Roman world Montanized its Acts of the Apostles, and the readings thus produced are found from the banks of the Tyne to beyond the Cataracts of the Nile. Hence we find it difficult to believe that Dr Hort can be right when he says<sup>1</sup> that it is his distinct belief "that even among the numerous unquestionably spurious readings of the New Testament there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes." The statement seems too strong; and while we are willing to admit that the transcription of the New Testament in its successive stages has been accomplished, in the main, with excellent intentions, there are certainly places where a foreign and factional hand can be detected. Surely it is a curious thing that the *Latin* of Codex Bezae shews the reading in Luke xviii. 19

nemo bonus nisi unus  $\overline{\text{ds}}$  pater<sup>2</sup>.

Has that added word at the end of the sentence no meaning in the controversies of the second century? And if it has any

<sup>1</sup> *Introduction*, p. 282.

<sup>2</sup> From the Marcionite standpoint, Christ was not to be spoken of as either good or bad, but as occupying a middle position: hence Hippolytus sums up the teaching in the words *χωρὶς γενέσεως ἔτει πεντεκαίδεκάτῃ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος κατε-  
ληλυθότα αὐτὸν ἄνωθεν, μέσον οὖτα κακοῦ καὶ ἀγαθοῦ, διδάσκειν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς.* *Philos.* vii. 31.

meaning, is it not a dogmatic alteration? Is it not Marcionite in appearance? Does it not occur in the very Gospel of which Marcion gave a new recension, and in view of this is it a mere error that Epiphanius assigns the reading to the authorship of Marcion? Must not the reading go back in date to the days of Marcion, when we find that Irenaeus attacks the Gallican Gnostics for their use of the passage?

Or take another instance; it is the fashion to print Matt. xix. 17 in the form

*τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ;*

a text of which we should certainly say *à priori* that it was a Gnostic depravation. Most assuredly this is a Western reading, for it is given by D *a b c e ff*<sup>1,2</sup> *g*<sup>1</sup> *h l* and the *vulgate*, a striking piece of unanimity. Further we notice that D, as its custom is, has erased the unbalanced article τοῦ; and it is interesting to observe that of the three cursives which Tischendorf cites in support of the text (1. 22. 251) one has this same peculiarity of dropping the article, while the allusion which Origen makes to the passage shews the very same omission (ὡς περὶ ἀγαθοῦ ἔργου ἐρωτηθέντος). Surely these facts are significant enough to make one believe that the texts in question derive the passage from the Western bilingual.

But it will be said that we have also to deal with ~~N~~BL and certain versions. Well! According to Westcott and Hort ~~N~~ and B were both written in the West, probably at Rome. Did Roman texts never influence one another<sup>1</sup>? But we will simply say in a tentative manner, that if the clause in question be not genuine, it would go far towards proving that the Roman Gospels did not escape altogether from Gnostic glosses in the second century. The advantage of this position is that we may find a series of chronological landmarks by means of which to set in order the different stages of the Greek and Latin texts and the various versions.

One of the best things to attempt, then, is to test the Western

<sup>1</sup> We will admit that the subject demands a more careful consideration, and we remember that it has not really been proved that the two great Uncials are Roman in origin. *Their history remains to be written.*

text generally for Marcionism, and we cannot take a better example than Luke xxiii. 2

τοῦτον εὗρον διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν,  
καὶ κωλύοντα φόρους διδόναι Καίσαρι.

Here was a tempting passage for those whose anti-Judaic theology had brought them to the necessity of altering all those places where the Gospel of Luke had spoken approvingly of either the Jewish nation, the Jewish law, or the Jewish prophets. Christ himself was accused of hostility to the race! So, without stopping to enquire whether Christ was rightly or wrongly charged with antagonism to the Jews, a Marcionite or Gnostic hand added to the accusation words which Epiphanius gives in the form

καὶ καταλύοντα τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφήτας<sup>1</sup>.

(It was quite natural for a Marcionite to make this addition, for the same sect altered Luke xvi. 17 so as to read

εὐκοπώτερον δέ ἐστιν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν παρελθεῖν, ὥς καὶ ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἢ τῶν λόγων τοῦ Κυρίου μίαν κεραίαν πεσεῖν.)

By this means the Marcionite placed himself by the side of the Saviour at the moment of his trial; it was as if he said 'Εγὼ εἰμι Χριστοῦ. And so successful was the interpolation, and so widely was the Roman Church Marcionized in the middle of the second century, that the reading is found, not indeed in Cod. Bezae, but in

b c e ff<sup>3</sup> i l q etc.

Its Greek attestation is zero, except for the passage in Epiphanius: yet we need not doubt that it stood in the ancient Roman bilinguals.

But this is not all; the process of interpolation was carried still further. The Marcionites having made an ally of Christ, as against the reproaches of the orthodox, inserted a second gloss, by means of which another arrow of the orthodox hunter was diverted to the Founder of the Faith. There is a mysterious gloss at the same part of the text which we have quoted above, which has

<sup>1</sup> Epiph. c. Marc. 316. Cf. Iren. i. xxvii. 2 (= Mass. 106), Marcion dicit... "Iesum ... in hominis forma manifestatum his qui in Iudaea erant, dissolventem prophetas et legem et omnia opera eius Dei qui mundum fecit."

almost disappeared from current texts. It appears in Epiphanius in connection with the previous gloss, for Epiphanius says that Marcion also added the words,

καὶ ἀποστρέφοντα τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τὰ τέκνα,

at the close of the passage which we have quoted above. And when we turn to the Old Latin texts, we actually find the words in question, in a longer and more significant form, at the end of v. 5. Here Codd. *ce* give us

et filios nostros et uxores avertit a nobis;  
non enim baptizantur sicut et nos, nec se mundant.

Now what does this mysterious passage mean? Why should Christ be charged (absurd anachronism!) with erroneous forms of baptism, and with misleading women and children? The answer is that these are heads of the indictment against Marcion and his followers, who do not hold to the perfunctory method of baptism, but demand a severe ascetic preparation for the rite. Let us hear what Tertullian says on the matter:

(*adv. Marc.* i. 29): "Non tinguitur apud illum caro nisi virgo, nisi vidua, nisi coelebs, nisi divortio baptismata mercata, quasi non etiam spadonibus ex nuptiis nata," and again (*adv. Marc.* iv. 11): "nuptias non conjungit, conjunctas non admittit, neminem tingit, nisi caelibem aut spadonem, morti aut repudio baptismata servat."

These passages will, I think, shew conclusively what is meant by the curious gloss in *ce* concerning the alienation of wives and the refusal of baptism. We see, then, two stages of Latin Marcionite corruption in this passage. And although Cod. D has escaped, it is probably only by means of the grace of repentance; such an attestation as we find above must surely have involved the original of the Bezan text. It is sufficiently shewn then that the glosses are demonstrably of a Marcionite character.

And now we begin to stand on firmer ground, for the problem has again become similar to that which we worked out for the Acts; and the hypothesis is invited that the *primitive Western bilingual* is earlier than the days of Marcion and shews traces of having passed through a process of Marcionization. On this hypothesis we shall expect to find traces of Western textual disturbance in

the neighbourhood of those places where Tertullian and Epiphanius accuse Marcion of adulterating the records.

For instance, we are told that Marcion tampered with the text of Luke iv. 16, where Christ comes into the synagogue of His native place and reads from the prophets. We do not exactly know how far the knife of the reviser cut at this point; but we do know that he never called Christ a man of Nazareth, if he could help it, for fear of fulfilling a prophecy; and that, according to his theory and Gospel, Christ had appeared suddenly from heaven ("de caelo in synagogam"). It is generally reckoned, therefore, that Marcion omitted the words

οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος,

and

κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ.

Now let us see whether these Marcionite omissions have left any mark on the Western Latin text. First take Cod. *e*, and we find that the words *κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ* are omitted! Then turn to Codex Bezae and examine, first its Greek, and then its Latin:

ΕΛΘΩΝ ΔΕ ΕΙΣ ΝΑΖΑΡΕΘ ΟΠΟΥ ΗΝ  
ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟ ΕΙΩΘΟΣ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΗΜΕΡΑ ΤΩΝ ΣΑΒΒΑΤΩΝ  
ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗΝ.

Note the omission of *τεθραμμένος* and of *αὐτῷ* after *εἰωθὸς*, and it will be seen that the text has undergone Marcionite revision. The Lord was not reared in Nazareth, nor is it his custom to visit the Nazarene synagogue, but only there is a custom of visiting the synagogue generally: then turn to the Latin

VENIENS AUTEM IN NAZARETH VBI ERAT  
NUTRICATUS INTROIBIT . SECUNDUM CONSVETUDINEM  
IN SABBATO . IN SYNAGOGAM,

and notice how the colometry, as marked by the inserted points, has been deranged by the restoration of the missing words. Is it not curious that the confusion should occur at the very point where Marcion's history opens?

Why is it that, again, when we find Marcion in his book of Contradictions maintaining that the God of the Old Testament who sent down fire from heaven at the request of Elias could not be the good God who sent his Son (for Christ refused to bring down fire from heaven at the request of his disciples), that the

text of Luke ix. 54, 55, where the latter story is told, has such significant glosses? First we are told by a large company of uncial texts and Western authorities to add the words

ὥς καὶ Ἡλίας ἐποίησεν,

which was just the gloss for a Marcionite exegete to have made, since it kept before the reader's mind one of the main points of the system of Marcion.

Then we find the added sentence

ΚΑΙ ΕΙΠΕΝ  
ΟΥΚ ΟΙΔΑΤΕ ΠΟΙΟΥ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ ΕΣΤΕ  
ET DIXIT  
NESCITIS CIVIS SPIRITV<sup>1</sup> ESTIS.

Dr Hort says that both these passages are Western; we add that if so they are probably Marcionite, and that the meaning of the latter passage is that the disciples were acting as though they belonged to the Just God rather than to the Good God.

We should say then that Western copies of the Gospels suffered from deliberate Marcionization. But let us take a more simple instance of textual variation, where no dogmatic tendency is involved.

Marcion is charged with having removed the word *αἰώνιον* from Luke x. 25.

The Bezan text is

ΤΙ ΠΟΙΗΣΑΣ ΖΩΗΝ  
ΑΙΩΝΙΟΝ ΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΗΣΩ  
QVID FACIENS VITAM  
AETERNAM HEREDITABO.

Here there is no sign of any erasure having taken place. But it is extremely likely that such did occur in certain Old Latin texts<sup>2</sup>. We remember the fondness of the old translation for rendering *κληρονομέω, κληρονομία* by two words *possidere, hereditare*; and on turning to the other Old Latin texts, as for instance *a b*, we find 'possidebo' in place of 'hereditabo.' Does it not look as if the primitive bilingual had used both words? But if it did, 'aeternam' was very likely to have been ousted in the interests of numerical equivalence. We think it probable, then, that the same

<sup>1</sup> *Spiritui* is a genitive.

<sup>2</sup> The word *aeternam* is in fact missing in Cod. *g*<sup>2</sup>.

mode of reasoning, which we applied to the Montanist glosses in the Acts, applies also to cases of real or reputed Marcionization in the text of the Gospels, and especially of the Gospel of Luke. That is to say, the corruptions are Latinizations, and we believe the primitive translation lies behind Marcion and behind Justin.

The case of Marcion can hardly be distinguished textually, either as to time or locality, from that of Tatian. Now the text of Tatian has been known, for a long while, to be phenomenally Western. We do not believe that these Western readings arose either in Syria or in Asia Minor. Our opinion is that they are Roman and belong to bilingual texts of an early period. The subject demands a special treatment, but there is surely nothing incredible in the supposition. We know that Tatian studied and taught in Rome, and it is therefore reasonable to find him using Roman texts. Much of our perplexity has been cleared away by realizing the textually metropolitan character of the Eternal City. Much more has disappeared by tracing the effect of undoubtedly Latin texts on Egyptian copies and versions. If Rome furnished texts to Alexandria and Upper Egypt, there is not the slightest difficulty in her ministering to the needs of Edessa, especially when a great teacher from that part of the world was discipling and being disciplined in the City.

Closely connected with this question is that of the origin of the Curetonian Syriac, which furnishes another landmark for the textual variations. This subject also has to be investigated afresh: we are prepared to believe that the Curetonian text is a translation from a Western bilingual. But whether it is older than Tatian or younger is a point which must be carefully re-examined. On these questions, then, we may reserve our judgments, for it is probable that the life-histories of one or two other codices may have to be written before we can reach a definite conclusion. In the meanwhile we need not hesitate to affirm that every consideration that we know of indicates the antiquity of the Latin Gospels: and, whether they were rendered into the vulgar tongue in Carthage or Rome, their date is far earlier than one would suspect from the language of modern writers, who usually content themselves with saying that the Old Latin was made before the time of Tertullian.



## CHAPTER XXII.

### FURTHER SUGGESTIONS FOR THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM.

OUR next step must be to deal with the actual glosses in the Bezan text of the Gospels, in order that we may determine whether they can be classified, and to what periods in the history of the Church they ought to be referred. And we must try to find out in what order the various renderings of the Greek Gospels into other tongues occurred, the problem involving one more term for the Gospels than for the Acts, on account of the existence of the Tatian Harmony in Syriac. It is, however, rendered more simple by the fact that Tatian's name is itself a chronological landmark; and, if we only knew the primitive form of his work a little better, we should rapidly arrive at important conclusions, for we should have identified a body of Western readings that were necessarily anterior to a given date. It is unfortunate, then, that so much is still obscure with regard to the details of the primitive Harmony. Nevertheless, in spite of all difficulties and of our imperfect data, we feel sure that the problem is a soluble one.

But in conducting the investigation we must be prepared for surprises. In the field of New Testament Criticism the unexpected is always happening: hypotheses which have been reckoned outworn reappear, and popular and attractive modern theories have frequently to be discarded. One needs a new conscience in the matter of Church History, and a quickened conscience in the matter of palaeography, and the general history of literary transmission. The foregoing pages will have furnished sufficient instances of what we mean. Who would have supposed from the study of Ecclesiastical History, as usually read and

written, that the Montanist movement and the Marcionite movement which preceded it had so completely swept over the Western Church? We are accustomed, on the contrary, to regard the Roman Church as strained clear of every heresy, as if the successive heresies were a series of gnats which had settled accidentally in the "new wine's foaming flow," and which had merely to be removed by the deft hand of some Defender of the Faith. But Justin would have taught us differently if we had read him aright, for he tells us that Marcion's teaching was diffused amongst every race of men<sup>1</sup>. Tertullian, too, shews what the force of the first Marcionite teaching must have been by his comparison of the later heretics, in his day expelled from the Catholic Church, to swarms of wasps building combs in imitation of the bees<sup>2</sup>. Nor are there wanting other intimations, both literary and epigraphic, of the scope of the movement. When we understand this rightly, we are not so much surprised, as we should otherwise have been, at finding Marcionite readings in the Western text of the New Testament.

Again, as we have intimated above, we may have to allow for some unknown terms in palaeography. It has often been tacitly assumed that the earliest MSS. of the New Testament were faithful representations of the primitive script down to the minutest traces of punctuation and of abbreviation. We have, however, taken pains to shew that all things did not remain unchanged from the first century down to the time of production of the Vatican and Sinaitic Codices. And in particular we can give reasons for believing that the primitive abbreviations were quite different to what we find in the extant Codices; and that the text has in very early times been affected by false reductions and misunderstandings of these abbreviations.

So, also, with regard to the literary influences of the time. At first sight it seems strange that we should affirm that Homeric and metrical glosses crept into Western texts. But this difficulty simply arises from not realizing what a scholarly education was like in the first centuries of the Christian era. Homer was the Bible of the expiring faith, and the staple of pagan education.

<sup>1</sup> *Apol. i. 26 κατὰ πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων.*

<sup>2</sup> "Faciunt favos et vespae: faciunt ecclesias et Marcionitae."

It was no more strange that a scribe should gloss from Homer than that a modern writer should give a New Testament turn to his speech. The reader will find this brought out very clearly in Hatch's Hibbert Lectures, from which we give an extract which is peculiarly apposite:

"The main subject-matter of this literary education was the poets. They were read, not only for their literary, but also for their moral value. They were read as we read the Bible. They were committed to memory. The minds of men were saturated by them. A quotation from Homer or from a tragic poet was apposite on all occasions and in every kind of society. Dio Chrysostom, in an account of his travels, tells how he came to the Greek colony of the Borysthenitae, on the farthest borders of the empire, and found that even in those remote settlements almost all the inhabitants knew the Iliad by heart, and that they did not care to hear about anything else."

(*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 30.) Cf. pp. 52, 53.

In the second century we have evidence enough of the way in which the verses of Homer were threaded through all the literature of the time. Tertullian tells us<sup>1</sup> that we must not be so much astonished at the liberties which the heretics take with the Scriptures when we find that secular writings are treated with the same freedom (*cum de secularibus quoque scripturis exemplum praesto sit eiusmodi facilitatis*). "In our own day, says Tertullian, we have seen the verses of Virgil wrought into an entirely new story. Further, the tale of Medea has been told in Virgilian verse. A relation of my own has Virgilianized the Tablet of Cebes. And are there not persons who are called Homer-Centonists, who by gathering verses far and wide make new compositions of their own?"

It is possible that Tertullian's comparison was due to Irenaeus; for we find the Valentinians compared by Irenaeus to these very Homerizers, and their method of hermeneutic combinations of texts and terms from all parts of the New Testament to the artificial conjunctions of the Homeric Cento. And, to illustrate what he means, Irenaeus (i. ix. 4) gives a specimen, where the subject is the descent of Hercules to fetch the dog Cerberus, and the lines are borrowed from all parts of the Odyssey and Iliad. It is interesting to notice the attempts of the translator

<sup>1</sup> *De Praescript. Haeret.* 39.

of Irenaeus to do the new poem into Latin hexameters<sup>1</sup>. After reading this bit of diversion on the part of Irenaeus and his translator, we can believe anything of the second century; it is no longer strange that metrical glosses should occur, when we find men's minds so full of them; nor is it surprising, when we see the way that the translator of Irenaeus went to work, if we should find a doubtful or disputed quantity in the verse, as in the passage interpolated in the Bezan text.

But it is not merely in the glosses that have crept into the text of the New Testament that we trace the student of Homer; we suspect that there are some of the New Testament writers themselves that have felt his influence and reflected it in their speech. But be that as it may, we must certainly be prepared for such an influence in the accretions which occur so plentifully in Western New Testament texts.

A few concluding remarks may now be made as to the way in which we shall probably find the remainder of the solution of the riddle of the Western texts of the Gospels.

It is important to remember that we are dealing with a chronological problem; we have to determine the dates, or the superior and inferior limits, of certain textual phenomena. This chronology can be approached in three ways:

(1) The actual quotation of aberrant readings by second century Fathers. For instance, a Tatian reading must either have originated with Tatian or be antecedent to him: a Marcionite reading, if it contain definite Marcionite teaching, must have originated with, or be later than Marcion, and probably not much later. Thus we have a scale for the chronology of the readings which is marked with the names of such teachers as

Marcion,  
Justin,  
Tatian,  
Montanus,  
Irenaeus,  
Tertullian &c.

<sup>1</sup> E.g. "Et senes et pueri et nondum nuptae puellae Plorantes multum ac si mortem iret ad ipsam," but perhaps the verses have suffered in transcription.

(2) We have the chronology of the Versions: where the primitive form of a version can be inferred from the MSS. which constitute its tradition, each version furnishes an inferior limit for the time of origin of a large group of aberrant readings. The order of the versions must be determined; it will probably be found that the three most closely connected versions stand in the order:

Old Latin,  
Old Syriac,  
Sahidic.

(3) We have to find the times of the separate hands that can be traced in readings and glosses, as the Homerizer, the first Gnostic hand, the Montanizer and the like.

Now, it is probable that no solution would be reached by working with a single scale taken out of the three; to reach success we must keep them all three in mind, and work with them placed side by side. The moment we do this, the burning questions appear; such as these:

Is the Old Latin earlier than Marcion?

Is the Curetonian Syriac older than Tatian?

Does the Homerizer antedate the Curetonian text?

These and similar questions are the crucial points of the enquiry: and we have already given suggestions of the way in which they are to be answered in our study of the body of glosses in the Acts. Probably the best way to proceed would be to deal with the final chapters of Luke where the intrusive glosses are so thick. We must test them and try to find out whether they are by a single hand. One or two of them are suspiciously metrical and Homeric. If we go back five verses from the Homeric gloss in Luke xxiii. 53 we find,

xxiii. 48,

ΤΥΠΤΟΝΤΕΣ ΤΑ ΣΤΗΘΗ ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΜΕΤΩΠΑ  
ὑΠΕΣΤΡΕΦΑΝ  
PERCVTIENTES PECTORA ET FRONTES  
REVERTEBANTVR.

The man who wrote this expanded sentence seems to have had in his mind a Latin verse

reversi frontes et pectora percutiebant,

describing the wailing of the Trojan women over the death of Hector. But if this were the same hand as before, the attestation ought to shew signs of agreement in the two cases: in Luke xxiii. 53 it was D c theb: in the new case we have no traces in the Egyptian, but the ancestry of Cod. c once had the reading, for it has, by a happy fortune, erased *pectora* and left *frontes*. Here then is a second gloss by the same hand as the former.

If we work through the body of glosses we shall ultimately get a clear idea of the attestation of the collection, and be able to fix, with some closeness, the date of the glossator. But the problem is not solved by stating it; and we find that much searching of the extant Copies, Versions and Fathers is necessary before we can give the formal solution. Moreover, I find that it will probably be necessary for me to re-examine and perhaps to re-edit the extant Homeric Centones, and some associated documents which throw great light upon the textual questions of these last chapters of Luke. In our next chapter we shall take up a few points in dialect and palaeography which will help us towards a final settlement of the question.

## CHAPTER XXIII.

### ON THE COLOMETRY OF THE CODEX BEZAE.

SOMETHING ought to be said with regard to the line-division which prevails in the Codex Bezae, for it is certainly very ancient and often constitutes a traditional interpretation of the text, which is of the highest value.

The earliest known Greek texts contained in the famous Uncial MSS. of the fourth and fifth centuries are destitute of any but the most rudimentary division of sentences. It is true that a break in the sense is sometimes intimated by a slight space in the text, or the commencement of a new paragraph by a new line, or by thrusting out on the margin of the text the first letter in a new sentence which happens to fall on the margin. Sometimes, too, a catalogue of names, which is particularly hard to read in a continuous text, is found broken up into separate lines, as, for example, the genealogy in St Luke. But, in spite of these and similar attempts at interpunction, the early Uncials cannot be described as anything else than continuous texts.

When, however, the texts of the New Testament became regularly read and divided into sections, and especially when they were read in bilingual congregations, the attempt was made to break up the passage read into the proper limbs or *cola*: and this process so facilitated the translation of the Scripture, and the reading and understanding of what had been translated, that after a while the colometry became conventional, and was propagated from one MS. to another, by interpunction, and from one MS. to its descendants by copying the text line by line.

It is not then surprising that, as we read the text of the Codex Bezae, the conviction forces itself upon us that its colometry is very ancient.

Scrivener points this out (p. xvii.), remarking as follows :

"Now since it will appear clearly hereafter that the manuscript as it stands at present was closely and exactly copied from another, perhaps almost contemporary to itself, similarly divided in respect of *στίχοι* though not similarly paged, it will follow that the model from which the latter was taken is older still, dating perhaps as early as or earlier than the time of Origen. The reader will not doubt that the ancient *στίχοι* were being gradually dissolved in course of time by successive transcribers, if he pays any attention to their actual condition in Codex Bezae."

There is no reason to doubt the accuracy of Scrivener's statement, for which the evidence in the shape of dropped and repeated lines is abundantly sufficient. The restoration of the precise primitive colometry is, however, not so easy: though the scribe of the Bezan text has done his best to help us by means of interpunction in cases where his lines do not agree with the primitive model: and in almost every case where there is a dividing point in the middle of a line in the Bezan text, it is because two cola have been run together, or because in some other way the regular colometry has been deserted.

I do not hesitate to say that I believe this primitive colometry to be very early. For it is not confined to Codex Bezae. Take for example Codex *k* and study its interpunction, and we shall find that it is not original nor arbitrary, but that it is in the main the same as existed in the ancestral text from which Codex Bezae is derived. Here is a specimen, taken from a random page of Cod. *k* :

Mark x. 35 et accedunt ad eum iacobus  
et iohannes filii zepdaei dicen-  
tes magister quod petierimus .  
37 dona nobis . et dixerunt illi  
da nobis . ut unus a dextram  
38 et unus a sinistra . hi<sup>o</sup> autem  
respondens dixit illis . nescitis  
quit petatis potestis bibere ca-  
licem etc.

Here are five points of distinction in the sense of the passage :



how closely they coincide with the structure of the Bezan text may be seen by transcribing the lines of D at the same place :

et accesserunt ad eum iacobus  
 et iohannes . fili zebedei  
 et dicunt illi magister  
 uolumus ut quodcumque petierimus te  
 praestes nobis  
 ad ille dixit illis praestabo uobis  
 et dixerunt ei da nobis  
 ut unus ad dexteram tuam . et unus ad sinistrā  
 sedeamus in gloria tua  
 Et ihs respondens ait illis  
 nescitis quid petatis potestis bibere calicem.

Notice that the interpunction of *k* not only agrees closely with the D lines, but that where *k* has dropped portions of the text, it is *whole lines* of D that are missing.

Another instance will perhaps make the point clearer. Let us turn to Mark viii. 35 : here the text of D is arranged thus :

animam suam saluam facere . perdet eam .  
 propter euangelium saluam faciet eam,

and either the first hand or a revising second hand has added, for the missing line, partly at the end of the first line and partly between the lines, the words

qui autem  
 perdiderit eam.

Now turn to Cod. *k* and we find the passage given thus :

salua  
 re animam suam perdet illā  
 propter euangelium autem  
 saluauit illam,

where it is seen that the line dropped in D and afterwards restored is dropped also in *k* and not restored.

Clearly then, if the Western text could be edited in its primitive colometry, it would be an advantage from the standpoint of criticism, and would assist us in distinguishing between interpolations and omissions.

Moreover, we may strongly suspect that the same colometry underlies the Curetonian Syriac ; and that traces of it can still be

seen in the arrangement of that peculiar text. For example, in Matt. xvii. 12, 13 Codex Bezae has transposed two lines of text over two other lines, thus producing the following effect :

TOTE CYNHKAN OI MATHHTAI  
OTI PERI IWANNOY TOY BAPTICTOY EIPEN AYTOIC  
OYTWC KAI O YIOC TOY ANΘPΩΠOY • MEλλEI ΠACXῒ ὕΠ AYTῶ.

Now the Cureton text has restored the right arrangement of the verses, but it betrays heredity from the erroneous arrangement in repeating the word *οὕτως* at the end of the sentence after *εἰπεν αὐτοῖς* ("concerning John the Baptist he spake to them so"). Now this awakens our suspicion that the colometry of D is behind the arrangement of the Curetonian text<sup>1</sup>.

Such a theory will require a more extended examination than can be given in these pages; but we may easily find some tests and illustrations of it; and first let us open the text at random, say at Luke ix. 32. Let us transcribe a few lines from Codex Bezae, marking by a vertical bar the places where the punctuator's mark occurs in the Syriac.

petrus autem  
et qui cum eo erant . erant grauari somno |  
euigilantes autem uiderunt gloriam eius |  
et duos uiros qui simul stabant cum eo |  
et factum est cum separarentur ab eo |  
dixit petrus ad ihm | magister  
bonum est nobis hic esse | uis  
facio hic tria tabernacula | unum tibi |  
et unum moysi | et unum heliae  
nesciens quid dicit . | haec autem eo dicente |  
facta est nubs et obumbravit eos |

The colometry in the two texts is seen to be closely parallel: in the sixth line, 'magister' makes a slight displacement, and in the seventh, the Syriac does not render 'vis.' The Bezan text has slight spaces for the mention of the three tabernacles, and in the last line but one it has a dividing point where the Cureton text has one, intimating an original line in the words

nesciens quid dicit.

<sup>1</sup> The reader will be interested to know that the displacement is found also in the Old Latin texts *a b c e ff<sup>1</sup> ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup>*, and perhaps in Justin.

We may add a few striking instances of colometric agreement between the texts in question in order to make the point at issue clearer.

In Matt. xxi. 18 the final word in the verse (*esuriit*) is marked in the Cureton text with a point before and a point after, indicating that the word is a colon or line by itself. Turning to the Codex Bezae, where the Western colometry is so well preserved, we find

mane autem transiens in ciuitatem  
esuriit • et uidens &c.

where again the point that follows *esuriit* shews that it once ended a line.

Next let us turn to John vi. 64, where the Latin is

qui sunt qui non credunt  
et quis esset etc.

The first line, and by consequence the first word (*et*) of the next line, has been lost in Cod. *e* and in the Curetonian text. Note the agreement in line-omission between the Old Latin and Old Syriac texts: the fact is that Cod. *e* and the Old Syriac are closely related.

Again, let us turn to John vii. 5, where the Greek is

οιδε γαρ οι αδελφοι αυτου  
επιστευσαν εις αυτον τοτε  
λεγει αυτοις...

Here the inserted *τοτε* is simply a translator's 'tunc,' such as we so often find at the beginning of sentences in the Old Latin: but by mishap it got into the wrong *colon*, and so the effect produced was that the brethren of our Lord did not *at that time* believe on him. So suitable was the insertion, that it becomes a permanent Western addition, and is gradually pushed further and further back into the verse; it is added before *fratres* by *a c ff<sup>2</sup> q*, after *eius* by *e fl*, after *crediderunt* by *b d*. Moreover the error passed into the Curetonian Syriac and into the Tatian Harmony, if we may judge from the Arabic ("ad hoc usque tempus"). It is just from such points as these that we may safely argue, when we are discussing the genealogy of mss.; and we can see here an undoubted Western error, which in the first instance is due

merely to the colometric arrangement, travelling as far East as it was possible for it to travel.

In John iv. 24 we have a passage in the Curetonian text which Tischendorf rightly describes by the words "mire confusa sunt": he does not, however, notice that the confusion is capable of resolution, and that we can determine its cause. The genesis of the error is as follows: the Western colometry had divided the verse in the following manner:

spiritus deus  
et adorantes in spiritu  
et ueritate adorare oportet.

i.e. "God is a spirit: and those who worship Him in spirit it behoves also to worship in truth."

The Curetonian text took up the misunderstanding induced by the colometry and gave the sequence "Deus enim spiritus est, et illi qui adorant eum spiritu, etiam oportet eos adorare ueritate." Upon this text a corrector went to work, erasing the final *ueritate* and suggesting for insertion the correct reading

qui adorant eum spiritu et ueritate.

All of this goes into the text, with the following conglomeration as the final result:

"Deus enim spiritus est et illi qui adorant eum spiritu etiam oportet eos adorare qui adorant eum spiritu et ueritate."

But, as the comparison of the texts shews, we must regard the Western colometry as the prime cause of the error.

Many more instances may be given of similar phenomena. It is rare for the Curetonian text to do anything without Western assistance, and in most cases the Western bilingual is at the bottom of the matter. If the Cureton text, recklessly and to the damage of the sense, drops a *colon*, the omission will generally be supported or explained by the Old Latin: e.g. in John v. 28 the Curetonian text drops *ὅτι ἐρχεται ὥρα*. A reference to the Bezan text shews it to be a primitive line. If the Western text repeats a line or two, in its earliest copies, the chances are that the Curetonian text will shew signs of it. Take for instance John v. 39. There is reason to believe that in the early Western Greek there was a repetition of the words *ὅτι ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*

ἔχειν καὶ ἐκείναι εἶναι αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ (probably three lines repeated *ex errore*). Consequent upon the repetition we have a double translation in Cod. *a* and Cod. *b*, so that the passage runs as below: and not only so, but the repeated passage, in *two distinct renderings*, turns up in the Curetonian text. The reader may compare the versions.

Cod. *a*.

in quibus vos existimatis  
in illis vitam aeternam habere:  
illae sunt quae testimonium dicunt de me.  
in quibus putatis vos  
vitam habere:  
hae sunt quae de me testificantur.

Cod. *b*.

quoniam putatis vos  
in ipsis vitam aeternam habere:  
et ipsae sunt, quae testimonium perhibent de me.  
in quibus putatis vos  
vitam habere:  
haec sunt quae testificantur de me.

The Curetonian text is substantially the same as these Latin texts, omitting, naturally enough, the words 'sunt quae' in the last line: and the Armenian text has preserved a part of the repetition (probably from a Syriac original), for it reads the repeated part, excepting the last line. Does it not seem reasonable to refer the whole confusion to line-repetition in Western texts? But if the hypothesis of conflate renderings be preferred, we must still say that the Curetonian text owes its version to a Western copy.

Nor is the interest in this primitive colometry confined to textual questions: it has its bearing, as we have seen above, on the interpretation of the text. For a good example, we may take the first verses in St John's Gospel, allowing for the lines in Cod. Bezae and the punctuation in the Curetonian text, and restoring the primitive Western arrangement as follows:

1 7 Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν·  
καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.  
οὗτος ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν·

πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲν  
ὃ γέγονεν  
ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἐστίν.

Here it is clear that ὃ γέγονεν, which is marked by dividing points before and after, is a primitive line, evidently the remaining part of the preceding sentence: but unfortunately the second point became lost in the tradition of the text, and as a result the words became attached to the following line, so producing

ὃ γέγονεν ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἐστίν.

The text of Codex Bezae shews that this cannot have been the primitive colometry. Yet the new arrangement of the text has been made the basis of a good deal of exegetical subtlety!

Perhaps we have said enough to shew that there existed an early Western colometry, probably in the first bilingual (i.e. Graeco-Latin) text: that there is reason to believe that this text has by means of its colometric errors, and its actual transmitted line-division, affected the Old Syriac and probably all other Syriac texts: and if this be the case, we have another argument in favour of the derivation of the Curetonian text from an early Roman copy<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> In a note appended to his edition of the Acts of Perpetua (p. 97) Mr J. A. Robinson has pointed out a number of passages of the New Testament which are quoted in the letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons in a form which suggests retranslation from a Latin Bible. Moreover he shews very strong reasons for believing that this Latin text was already divided into *cola*; for the words of the Epistle (§ 22) τῆς πληγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος τῆς ζωῆς ἐξίοντος ἐκ τῆς νηδύος τοῦ χριστοῦ imply that in John vii. 37, 38 the words ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ were attached to the previous sentence πρὸς με καὶ πνέτω. And this is precisely the colometric division and interpretation which we find in Codd. *d. e.* If the colometric Latin text was current in the Rhône valley in A.D. 177 we may speak confidently of the antiquity of the Old Latin version.

## CHAPTER XXIV.

### ON THE ABBREVIATIONS IN THE TEXT OF THE CODEx BEZAE.

THE conventional forms of abbreviation of the Greek and Latin sides, respectively, of the Codex Bezae will be found roughly tabulated in Scrivener's account of the text, the Greek forms on p. xviii.: and the Latin on pp. xliii., xliv. There is, therefore, no need to repeat them; but a few remarks may perhaps be made on the subject.

The abbreviations which we find in Greek texts (and the same thing is true of the Latin texts, which shew an early agreement with the Greek) are the result of a tendency of the scribes to represent often-repeated words by a single sign; we may reasonably suppose, then, that the conventional abbreviations have been arrived at gradually, and not *per saltum*. It is more than likely that the word Θεός was abbreviated before the word πνεῦμα, and the word πνεῦμα probably before any one thought of abbreviating Ἰσραήλ or Ἱερουσαλήμ. For example, in the Codex Bezae we do not find any abbreviation at all for such forms as Δαβίδ, Ἱερουσαλήμ, &c. Hence we are entitled to assume that the number of conventional forms has been arrived at gradually.

In the next place we can see that the final form which was conventionally recognized has been arrived at, in many cases, by a number of *separate attempts* at the abbreviation of the repeated word. Thus the Codex Bezae shews us variations of a peculiar character; we find πατήρ sometimes written as παρ<sup>1</sup> though the conventional form is πῆρ, shewing that two attempts were made to abbreviate, by leaving out the middle consonant

<sup>1</sup> E.g. John xiv. 29; xv. 2.

and one or other of the vowels. In the same way we find *Ἰησοῦς* shortened into *ἰσ*, the usual form, and *ἰησ*, which we recognize at once as very ancient, for it is the same which appears in Latin as *īhs*, where the middle letter is commonly supposed to be an *h*, but is really the Greek *H*. The misunderstanding is very early, as may be seen from the attempts in early MSS. to write the name as if it contained a Latin *h*: thus Scrivener points out in Codex Laudianus the occurrence of the forms *ihesus* and *hiesum*: where the error is patent enough; the Greek letter having become an aspirate. It is clear, then, that behind the conventional abbreviations found in our early Uncial texts there is an array of earlier forms, attaching themselves to the more commonly repeated words and to the more sacred names.

But this is not all: a study of the Codex Bezae and kindred documents, whether Latin or Greek, will, I think, shew that in the early stages a single sign was employed for all cases of the substantives abbreviated. Now this may be seen in three ways: First, when a scribe finds an abbreviation of this kind, susceptible of misunderstanding or misreading, he frequently writes the word out at length, so as to avoid the misunderstanding; but sometimes he continues to copy the superposed bar or curve which intimates an abbreviation in the text. We may prove this from the Codex Bezae.

In Luke vii. 3 we have

qui erat illi honoratus et audiens de *īhs*,

where we notice that the scribe has given us the nominative case instead of the ablative, clearly because the abbreviation *īhs* stood for all cases.

So in John xvii. 3 we have *quem misisti īhs xpm*, and Acts xiii. 32 *suscitavit dnm īhs xpm*. But we often find the word written in full, under the sign of abbreviation, as Scrivener has pointed out: "thus *dei* is met with 122 times (but never in the Acts); *deo* 24 times (in the Acts only vii. 40; x. 4); *deum* only in John vi. 46; x. 33." These instances from the Codex Bezae can be paralleled from other sources.

But the next way in which we see the truth of our hypothesis



as to the existence of an early single sign of abbreviation for all cases of the noun is that it often happens that an ignorant scribe, in attempting to reduce the abbreviation to a more usual form, produces barbarisms. Perhaps the best cases of this kind occur in the old Latin Codex *k*. If we turn to Dr Sanday's account of this MS. in *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, No. *ii.*, we shall see this clearly enough: we may transcribe a passage (p. clviii.) by way of illustration:

"The usage of the MS. in regard to the sacred names is very peculiar and striking. There is great variety of forms, though some will be found to predominate. Here even more than elsewhere all the rules of grammar appear to be set at defiance: *any form is made to stand for any case.*"

Dr Sanday then collects from the MS. the various abbreviations, viz.:

$\overline{\text{DS}}$  = DEUS.

$\overline{\text{DI}}$  = DEUS, DEI, IHS.

$\overline{\text{DE}}$  = IHS.

$\overline{\text{DEI}}$  (thus, with the mark of abbreviation).

$\overline{\text{DM}}$  = DEUM.

$\overline{\text{DOM}}$  = DEI, DEUS (?), IHS (?), DEO, DEUM, DOMINUS, DOMINI, DOMINO, DOMINUM, DOMINE.

Also  $\overline{\text{DOM}}^s$ ,  $\overline{\text{DOM}}^n$ ,  $\overline{\text{DOM}}^a$ ,  $\overline{\text{DOM}}^t$ .

$\overline{\text{HI}}$  = HIESUS, HIESU, HIESUM.

Also  $\overline{\text{HI}}^n$ ,  $\overline{\text{IH}}^n$ ,  $\overline{\text{HI}}^a$ ,  $\overline{\text{HI}}^t$ ,  $\overline{\text{IH}}^a$ .

$\overline{\text{HI}}^s$  = HIESUS, HIESU, HIESUM.

$\overline{\text{HIS}}$  = HIESUS.

$\overline{\text{HS}}^s$  = HIESUS.

$\overline{\text{HI}}^t$  = HIESUS.

$\overline{\text{HS}}^t$  = HIESUS.

$\overline{\text{HS}}$  = HIESUS, HIESUM.

An examination of this list will shew that the early forms of abbreviation were very comprehensive and that much confusion resulted; one way out of the confusion seems to have been to attach a small letter to the abbreviation by which the termination could be indicated.

The third way in which we are confirmed in our belief of the existence of early simple and comprehensive forms of abbreviation is that the earliest MSS. shew signs of textual depravation which

can hardly result from any other cause than this. For instance, it was common in the second century to read John i. 18 in the form

ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ Θ̄C

in place of the received text

Ο ΜΟΝΟΓΕΝΗΣ ῩC.

It is conceivable that we have here a misunderstanding of a primitive abbreviation which stood for all cases alike, and in this particular instance represents the genitive case (*μονογενὴς θεοῦ*). The variant *θεός* is *not* explicable by the supposition of a misreading of *ῩC*, for it is extremely doubtful whether *ῩC* was abbreviated at all in the earliest texts: and it may be suspected that *ῩC* is merely an expansion derived from the Latin, *unigenitus filius Dei*.

Perhaps the instance which we have selected by way of illustration is an unfortunate one, in that the explanation may be challenged as falling under the condemnation of what Dr Hort calls "verdicts of oracular instinct"; but whether the illustration be a good one or a bad one, satisfactory or unsatisfactory, I think the point as to the nature of the early abbreviations of the text of the New Testament, and the misunderstandings to which they were liable, can be considered as established by the various instances to which we can draw attention.

In the Codex Bezae there are numerous various readings which have arisen from the confusion of the conventional abbreviations *inter se*. Whatever may have been the primitive abbreviations for the Latin *deus* and *dominus*, it is demonstrable that they were frequently in confusion. We may prove this by some selected cases.

In Acts xiii. 5 we have

adnuntiabant verbum dī (τοῦ κυ).

Here the Latin text is certainly right, for there is no variation worth mentioning in the critical apparatus; but the accommodated Greek text has read the Latin as *domini*.

<sup>1</sup> *Two Dissertations*, p. vii.

Turn next to Acts xiii. 43: where we have the opposite form to the preceding; and where the gloss

transire uerbum  $\overline{d}ni$

is the equivalent of

διελθεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ.

Without venturing to say which of these is the correct reading, we may remark their present divergence, and suspect that it is due to the misreading of a sign of abbreviation.

Next turn to Acts xiii. 46, where we have

loqui uerbum  $\overline{d}ni$  (τοῦ  $\overline{\theta v}$ ),

in which we see the same confusion: here the Greek is certainly right, and *domini* is a false correction of an abbreviated *dei*.

In Acts xvi. 34 we have

credens in  $\overline{d}no$

as the rendering of

πεπιστευκώς ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν.

It is almost certain that *θεός* and not *κύριος* is the right word in this passage; may we not then say that  $\overline{d}no$  is a misreading of the abbreviation for *deo*? Sometimes we may find the two Latin forms confused in almost adjacent passages: in John xx. 13 we have *quia tulerunt  $\overline{d}om$* , where the equivalent is certainly *κύριον*, but in xx. 17 *et  $\overline{d}om$  meum et  $\overline{d}om$  uestrum*, where the abbreviation no less certainly stands for *θεόν*.

Perhaps these instances will suffice (that we be not further tedious) to shew how the Western text has been affected by the transcriptional confusion of its primitive abbreviations.

Can we be wrong in saying further that in any case of variation between the parallel forms of *θεός* and *κύριος*, the authority of Western texts is the minimum? I know that here we are on difficult ground, and that the reader is already thinking of a famous disputed text, but I do not hesitate to say that I propose to read *ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ* in Acts xx. 28, regarding the adverse evidence of D, E, Irenaeus, and the general Western company as of very small weight upon the opposite side of the question. And this statement is not made in consequence of any special prejudice in favour of the combination of the two oldest uncials ( $\aleph B$ ), with which the received text happens at this point to agree.

## CHAPTER XXV.

### ON DOUBLE TRANSLATIONS OF THE GREEK TEXT IN THE OLD LATIN AND OLD SYRIAC VERSIONS.

WE will first make a table of some of the most remarkable of these double translations in the four Gospels.

|                |                                |  |
|----------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Matt. ii. 8    | venite renuntiate              | Tatian (arab) syr <sup>our</sup>   |
| Matt. viii. 5  | rogavit...et obsecravat        | syr <sup>our</sup>   |
| Matt. xiv. 32  | cessavit et quievit            | Tatian (arm) [cf. <i>a b d</i> ]   |
| Matt. xv. 23   | sequitur et clamat             | Tatian (arm) syr <sup>our</sup> <i>b</i>   |
| Matt. xix. 25  | stupebant et timuerunt         | <i>a b [d f] c e ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>2</sup> syr<sup>our</sup></i>              |
| Matt. xxv. 34  | hereditate possidete           | <i>d</i>   |
| Mark iii. 5    | ira indignationis              | <i>d</i>   |
| Mark v. 13     | impetum fecerunt et ceciderunt | <i>b e</i> Tatian (arab) Peshito   |
| Mark x. 26     | admirabantur...timidi          | Tatian (arab)  |
| Mark x. 51     | domine rabbi                   | <i>D a b ff<sup>2</sup> i</i> Tatian (arab)                                      |
| Mark xiv. 38   | alacer et promptus             | Tatian (arab) (arm)  |
| Luke i. 17     | perfectam consummatam          | [cf. <i>d a b</i> ]  |
| Luke ii. 48    | dolentes et tristes            | <i>a d e ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l q</i> syr <sup>our</sup> Tatian<br>(arm) |
| Luke iv. 20    | abiit ac sedit                 | Tatian (arab)  |
| Luke v. 8      | rogo exi                       | <i>c d e f</i> Tatian (arab) Peshito   |
| Luke viii. 8   | bonam et uberam                | <i>a c d e</i> syr <sup>our</sup> Tatian (arm)                                   |
| Luke ix. 61    | ire renuntiare                 | <i>a g<sup>1</sup></i> syr <sup>our</sup> Iren <sup>ist</sup>                    |
| Luke x. 39     | venit et sedit                 | Tatian (arab) syr <sup>our</sup>   |
| Luke xii. 13   | terram et hereditatem          | syr <sup>our</sup>   |
| Luke xv. 4     | vadit et quaerit               | <i>a d e f</i> syr <sup>our</sup> Tatian (arab)                                  |
| Luke xvi. 2    | veni redde                     | syr <sup>our</sup>   |
| Luke xvi. 24   | in ustione ignis               | <i>d</i>   |
| Luke xviii. 5  | vado et devindico              | <i>d</i>   |
| Luke xxiii. 28 | plangere et lugere             | [ <i>d</i> ]   |
| John xi. 39    | accedito et auferte            | Tatian (arm)   |
| John xvii. 23  | perfecti consummati            | <i>d</i>   |
| John xxi. 7    | misit se et salibit            | <i>d</i>   |
| John xx. 16    | domine magister                | <i>d</i>   |

Now a survey of these peculiar renderings will shew that there is a good deal of internal connection between pairs of them, which cannot be explained away by any theory of assimilation or cross-references. For let us examine some of them closely: the first reference (Matt. ii. 8) shews that Tatian and the Curetonian text agree in the formula *venite renuntiate* as a translation of ἀπαγγεῖλατε. But that it is not merely the trick of the first Syriac translator may be seen from the somewhat similar case where, in Luke ix. 61, we find *ire renuntiare* as a rendering of ἀποτάξασθαι in the Old Latin, the Old Syriac and in the translation of Irenaeus. It seems then that the reading of the Curetonian Syriac (ܠܐܘܬܐ ܠܕܝܬܐ) is arrived at by means of a Latin rendering which had translated ἀποτάξασθαι by *renuntiare* instead of *abrenuntiare*, and added the expansion *ite*.

Take the next case in the list: we find that the Curetonian Syriac in Matt. viii. 5 has rendered the verb παρακαλῶ by *rogo et obsecro*. How thoroughly conventional this is in Latin may be seen not only from Latin inscriptions, but from the text of the Old Latin Gospels. The Bezan text has frequent expansions by means of such a translation, which give rise to subsequent additions in the Greek, or to subtractions in the Latin, and not always to subtractions of the superfluous word, but sometimes some other word in the sentence. The object in such cases is to make the Greek and Latin as nearly as possible equal in the number of words.

For example, in Acts xxi. 39 δέομαί σου is rendered by *rogo obsecro*: and our list of selected double readings shews us ἐξέλθε rendered by *rogo exi* (Luke v. 8) both in the Bezan text and in the Arabic Tatian.

In the next passage, Matt. xiv. 32, which is from the Armenian Tatian, ἐκόπασεν has been rendered by two almost synonymous words: this of itself is suspicious, for it looks like a case of African pleonasm; and the suspicion thus awakened is confirmed by noticing that the Codex Vercellensis, the Codex Veronensis, and others have *cessavit*, but the Codex Bezae has *quievit*.

The passage Matt. xv. 23 shews a similar expansion in the Curetonian text, the Armenian Tatian and in the Codex Veronensis. The errors can hardly be independent, and, if that be

admitted, then either the Curetonian text has been drawn from a Western copy, or one of the great Western copies has been touched up by a Syriac hand.

In Matt. xix. 25 we find the translators in a perplexity over the rendering of ἐξεπλήσσοντα. The Bezan translation is certainly peculiar, consisting of an imperfect tense followed by a perfect: Codd. *a, b* read *mirabantur et timebant valde*; Cod. *f* *mirabantur valde*, as if by the erasure of one word from the combination in *a, b*. We may be sure, then, that there was a primitive double rendering in the Latin.

On turning to Acts xiii. 12, we find a double rendering of ἐκπλησσομένης by *miratus est stupens*, which is similar in character to the passage in Matthew, and has given rise to a reactionary error in the Greek text. So that we are confirmed in believing the error to be truly Western and Latin. But it appears in the Curetonian text; and not only so, but, on looking at the Tatian Arabic in Mark x. 26 (*admirabantur timidi*), we can see traces and signs of a similar error. In Mark vi. 52 we find ἐξίσταντο translated in a similar manner by *stupebant et mirabantur*, and καὶ ἐθαύμαζον added to the Greek. Is it not the simplest solution to carry all these errors back to a primitive Graeco-Latin text?

Matt. xxv. 34 shews the traces of a primitive Latin pleonastic rendering of κληρονομήσατε: we should be suspicious at once of such a rendering as that in Codex Bezae (*hereditate possidete*): it must be either a conflation, or a primitive African pleonasm: that it is the latter is seen from the fact that in Acts vii. 5 the Bezan text gives us

possessionem hereditatis

as a rendering of κληρονομίαν. We could hardly find a better example of the usage of the early African writers. Codd. *ab* remove the superfluous 'hereditate' in Matthew. But the Curetonian Syriac in Luke xii. 14 shews signs of having had two words in its primitive text, for it reads "terram et hereditatem," where 'terram' seems to stand for 'possessionem.' We suspect then again that the Curetonian pleonastic renderings are not all of them original.

In Mark v. 13 the Arabic Tatian has *et cucurrit grex ad ver-*

*ticem et praecipitatus est in mare*, which seems to represent the same Syriac as in the Peshito (*cucurrit et cecidit*), the Curetonian text being wanting. But this translation by means of a double verb is in Cod. *b*, *fecerunt impetu[m] ire...et ceciderunt*, and in Cod. *e*, *ierunt cum impetu...et ceciderunt*. The Syriac text seems to rest again on a Western bilingual.

Mark x. 51 shews a double translation of *ραββουι* by *domine rabbi*. This reading has coloured some of the oldest of the Western texts: so that it is hardly to be described as a conflation. For we find, on referring to John xx. 16 in the Codex Bezae, that the same word is expounded to mean *domine magister* ("illa dicit ei ebraice rabboni quod dicitur domine magister"). We may be sure, then, that the primitive Latin version had rendered the word pleonastically<sup>1</sup>.

What are we to say, then, when we find that the Tatian text has given us in the Arabic just such a double rendering? For in Mark x. 51 we find

Domine mi, et praeceptor, &c.

The primitive rendering of *κατεσκευασμένον* in Luke i. 17 was pleonastic, as we may see by comparing the parallel texts. For, though the text of D says

praeparare domino plebem consummatam,

Cod. *a* prefers to read *perfectum*, and *b* *perfectam*; we suspect then a primitive rendering

perfectam consummatam,

which would be decidedly African in character.

And our list of double readings shews us that at John xvii. 23 we have a very similar case, where the line

ἵνα ὡςιν τετελειωμένοι

is rendered by the Bezan text

¶

UT SINT PERFECTI CONSUMMATI.

Here we have no Syrian confirmation as far as I know, nor is it necessary that all of such compound readings should pass into the Syriac. What we notice is that the Old Latin texts originate

<sup>1</sup> In the passage in John we have *a*, 'domine'; *c*, 'magister et domine'; *f*<sup>2</sup>, 'magister, domine'; and of course, in the Greek of D, *κύριε διδάσκαλε*.

such readings freely, and in some cases pass them on to other versions, either directly or by means of a Greek text that has been doctored from its translation.

How wide this influence is may be seen from the gloss in Luke ii. 48, the effects of which are felt in almost all Old Latin texts, as well as in the Curetonian text and in Tatian. There is no reason to believe that this variant has any Greek support, except by accidental reflection from the Latin; and it will be difficult to maintain that it is not a genuine Latin one, although we see that all the Syriac texts have been influenced by it.

So in Luke xv. 4, where the vulgar Latin origin of the gloss is almost evident from the language (with which we may compare the *vado et devindico* in Luke xviii. 5). Yet here also we have the two Old Syriac versions in line.

We conclude, then, that some of the double renderings which we observe in the old so-called Western texts are Latinisms; and that the Syriac versions owe them to Western bilingual influence; and since we observe the same phenomenon in this group of readings which has been so often detected elsewhere, viz. the signs of an internal *nexus* between the Curetonian text and the Tatian Harmony, we are again brought to suspect that both these texts are to be traced ultimately to a Western bilingual origin; and that they are not independent one of the other.



## CHAPTER XXVI.

### SOME PECULIAR FORMS AND SPELLINGS IN THE CODEX BEZAR.

#### I. *On a curious African form of the verb 'habeo.'*

Every one who has worked at all at the study of the textual authority of the various versions of the New Testament will know how labyrinthine is the question of the tenses that are used, and how difficult it is to determine in each case the Greek tense which stood in the translator's copy.

Not only is the question affected by the Semitic instincts of the first composers who write Hebrew constructions in Greek, which they leave to later hands to emend and reform; but, as we have shewn abundantly in previous investigations, the fact that the tenses in Greek are not parallel to those in Latin has produced reactions upon the Greek text which are of the nature of the most deep-seated of textual errors.

But this is not all: the primitive Latin translation was not made into the classical tongue but into the tongue of the people, and this tongue is almost a different language to the polite Latin which scholars study. The vulgar not only used different words, but they used the same words differently as far as force and meaning are concerned. Their verbs, for instance, were far gone in the process of decline from full inflection; and, in particular, the future tense had become so like to the present tense in many verbs, partly by the disappearance of the futures in *-bo*, partly by the thinning of the characteristic vowels, that the auxiliary future, in its pre-Romance form, had already been called into service when the first Latin rendering of the New Testament was made. It becomes very important to collect and classify all the colloquial forms which we can find in our Old Latin texts, and to use them

both for the advancement of philological study, and for the interpretation of the texts in which they occur.

In working through the Bezan text, which is the best monument that we have of the Old Latin Gospels, I was struck with the recurrence of a peculiar form of the verb *habeo*. When, for example, one found in Matt. v. 46

quam mercedem habebetis,

the first thought was that it was a simple palaeographical error of a dittographed syllable, so that *habetis* had been made into something very like a future tense, and, as was to be expected, the Greek had been corrected to match the supposed future from ἔχετε to ἔξετε. But as one read through the codex, the error repeated itself so often and so variously that the theory of palaeographical cause broke down under the strain; and although it was perfectly true that the revising hand in the Greek had made the same assumption, viz. that *habebo* was a future tense, the second thought came that, perhaps, after all, it was not a future but an African form of the present. Let us then look at some of the cases where the doubtful word occurs.

In Matt. vi. 2 we have again

mercedem non habebitis,

and here the Greek has not been tampered with; it shews

μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχετε.

Next turn to John vi. 53

non habebitis in vobis vitam,

where the Greek is ἔχετε.

In John xvi. 22

nunc quidem tristitiam habebitis,

the Greek should be ἔχετε, but has been corrected under the influence of the Latin to ἔξετε.

In Acts xviii. 18 we have

habebeat enim orationem,

and I think these five instances will shew, and especially the last, that we are not dealing with a palaeographical blunder, but with an actual verb form.

Now if this be the case, we must look for further traces of the form, on the hypothesis that in many cases it has been corrected away. Are there any such signs that the eccentric form once stood more regularly than it now does in the Old Latin tradition of the New Testament text? Let us examine the Codex Bezae on the point.

In Luke xv. 4 the text is

TIC ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ ΕΞ ΥΜΩΝ ΟC ΕΞΕΙ  
QVIS EX VOBIS HOMO QVI HABET.

Here the true text is not  $\delta\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\xi}\epsilon\iota$  but  $\epsilon\acute{\chi}\omega\nu$ , and it is clear that the Greek is derived from the Latin; we suspect then that there originally stood *habebit* on the Latin side.

In John xiv. 30 the Latin text is

iam non multa  
loquar uobiscum uenit enim huius  
mundi princeps et in me non habet  
nihil [inuenire].

The text of this passage has undergone some peculiar changes: and the attestation of the variants is conflicting: but we can see that correctors have been at work to change the present tenses into futures (*ueniet*, *habebit*): for amongst the Old Latins *f g* we find *ueniet*; and the Arabic Tatian has both *ueniet* and *habebit*. We suspect then that the trouble began with a reading *habebit* in the Vulgar Latin: and that at a very early period this doubtful word was read as a future.

ii. *On the primitive translation of the word 'disciple' in the Old Latin.*

The first translation which was made of the Gospels and Acts did not render the word  $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  by the Latin *discipulus* but by the participle *discens*. This has been pointed out by Dr Sanday in his study of the Old Latin Codex *k*. He says<sup>1</sup>, "at the back of *k* is an older form of the Version still: a form not much dissimilar from *k*, but with some features of greater antiquity; a form which had systematically *discentes* for *discipuli*; *felix* for *beatus*, etc."

The same thing might have been suspected from the instances of the use of the word given in Rösensch, *Itala und Vulgata*, p. 107.

<sup>1</sup> *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, II. p. xc.

For Rönisch quotes instances of its use not only from the Codex Bezae, but from Codd. *b c*; and from Irenaeus and Tertullian.

I have a few words to say concerning this form, because it is one of the many little details which so constantly turn up in attestation of the theory of derivation of all Latin copies from a single primitive rendering.

Suppose, for example, we are comparing Codices *d* and *e* in the Acts: we soon find that there is a common root to the two manuscripts; and that much of the earlier common type that underlies the two texts can be recovered. It is interesting to see that the scribe of *E* also found the form *discens* in his manuscript, and in Acts vi. 5 we catch him altering the Greek to *μανθανόντων*, because he did not realize that *discens* could be a proper rendering of *μαθητής*.

The same form is also found in Cod. *e* of the Gospels, as may be seen from Luke xvi. 8 "dixit autem ad discentes suos."

We will now shew that it must have been in the ancestry of a number of other Old Latin Codices of the Gospels, besides *b c d e k* to which we have referred above.

Suppose we turn to Luke xix. 37, which in the Bezan text stands

ad discensum montis oliuarum  
coepit omnis multitudo discipulorum  
gaudentes laudare deum etc.

For 'discipulorum' there stood originally 'discentium'; but this, under the influence of the words in the previous line 'ad discensum,' was easily changed into 'descendentium,' so that it read "the whole multitude of those going down the mountain began to praise God, etc." Accordingly *f g* still read 'discentium,' not having fallen into the error: the codex *g*<sup>a</sup> reads 'descendentium,' so does the Amiatinus: the codex Fuldensis 'discendentium,' etc. There is, therefore, no doubt about the original reading, nor about the genesis of the error. But, as often happens, when a text has been corrupted in some respect, the short and drastic method of dealing with the difficulty is to leave the corrupted word or sentence out, so we find in the present case that the MSS. *a c i l* have omitted the word; and this is tantamount to a proof that they also at some time read 'discendentium,' and therefore

had 'discentes' in their ancestry. We knew this already of Cod. c: our list now includes *a b c d e f g<sup>1</sup> g<sup>2</sup> i k l*. Nor is this all, for we find the Curetonian Syriac in the same company, for the omission of the word: and we have one more suggestion of the Latin or Graeco-Latin text that lies behind this venerable translation.

iii. *On a curious phonetic change in the dialect of the translator of the Old Latin Version.*

In the text of the Codex Bezae there are some signs of an interchange between the *m* and *p* sounds, which seems to be incapable of any explanation except a phonetic one.

For example, in Acts xiii. 34 we have

suscitavit eum a portuis,

as if the last word were almost equivalent in sound to 'mortuis.'

In Luke xiv. 1 we have the reverse error,

manducare manem

for 'panem': the equivalence of the sounds being seen from the fact that the errors take place in either direction, *m* for *p* or *p* for *m*.

Now, that this confusion is not due to a later hand working on the Bezan tradition, but to the first hand, may be seen as follows. In John vi. 49 the translator had to render *οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἔφαγον τὸ μάννα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*: and just as in the passage in Luke he wrote 'panem' as 'manem,' so here he confounded 'mannam' with 'panem' and gave the latter word. Hence we find in the Bezan text

patres uestri manducauerunt panem  
in deserto.

From this the Greek text is then doctored, so as to bring in *τὸν ἄπρον* to match 'panem': and finally 'mannam' gets inserted, probably by a later hand, at the end of the sentence after 'deserto.'

Now, the antiquity of the error can be seen by the fact that 'panem' has been added in the four Latin texts *a b d e*. But further than this, it turns up in the Curetonian text, where it has displaced *τὸ μάννα*, which had not been restored in the text from which the materials of the Curetonian text were derived. If this explanation be correct, we have a decisive instance of the existence of Latin readings in the Curetonian text.

It would be rash to identify on such narrow data the nationality of the translator. But we may point out that, at all events, the circumstances are not adverse to the theory of a Carthaginian hand. For if the two sounds approximated, it must have been by the means of an agreement with the sound of the letter *b*. That the Punic speech, like the modern Arabic, tended to replace the *p* sound by *b* is seen from two inscriptions from Leptis, cited by Schröder<sup>1</sup>, where *medicus* is equated to הרבא, which is clearly the Hebrew הרפא. And the occurrence of an element of the *b* sound along with *m*<sup>2</sup> may be seen from the cases cited by Schröder from the *Poenulus* of Plautus where

combal=כִּי אַמְלִי

alonimb=אַלְנִים

sille mbalim=שְׁלִי מַעֲלִים

mucomp=מִקּוֹם.

It is quite possible, then, that the confusion which we have noted as surviving in the Bezan text between *m* and *p* is a trace of the Punic dialect. For in two of the instances quoted the betacized *m* is a final letter, so that the case is quite different from the inserted sound which we find in such a word, say, as Lampsacus, where the change in the consonant is due to the following sibilant.

We leave it, therefore, as a point to be enquired into further, whether the Vulgar Latin of North Africa did not betacize the *m*-sound<sup>3</sup>. If it did, we have something like the same phonetic phenomenon surviving in the Codex Bezae.

iv. *On a confusion between est and venit in the primitive form of the Old Latin New Testament.*

A study of the various Old Latin texts will bring to light a

<sup>1</sup> *Die Phönizische Sprache*, p. 113.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the phonetic changes by which Cod. *b* made *medianum* into *pede plano*. Remark also *pedimus* for *pedibus* in *Acta Perpetuae*, c. xi. (Cod. Casinensis).

<sup>3</sup> We may compare an error in the first chapter of Matthew (i. 5) in Cod. *k*, which is held to contain an African text: here *Rachab* is written *Pacham*: the confusion between R and P is due to the bilingualism of the scribe: the error in the last letter is phonetic. The same thing occurs in Cod. Bezae in Matt. i. 13, where we have *eliecib* and *heliacib* for *eliakim*.

number of cases in which there is a very decided confusion between the verb 'to be' and the verb 'to come.' For instance, in Matt. xxv. 6 the S. Germain Codex (*g*<sup>1</sup>) reads

ecce sponsus est uenit,

where Wordsworth remarks "there is a two-fold rendering representing a variation in the Greek text." That is, we have a conflation of translations of two different Greek words, according to the editor of the Codex. The Greek, however, seems not to have any verb; and, if there were no other cases besides this one, we should probably be justified in regarding it as a case where the literal translation

occe sponsus

which we find in Cod. Bezae had been filled up by two different expansions, one of which may find its motive in the following ἐξέρχεσθε of the text: e.g. Cod. *b* has *venit*, and Cod. Sangallensis has *venit* (ἐρχεται); while the other form *ecce sponsus est* may still be lurking in the Old Latin versions; its existence is, however, sufficiently proved from the S. Germain text.

But there are other similar instances; in Luke xxii. 27 we have

ego autem  
sum in medio uestrum ueni etc.

where again we notice the double rendering; and here it seems as if the verb εἰμί really belongs to the text. If so it is curious that it should have a double rendering. Was the word εἰμί originally absent from the text? If not, how did it get changed into *veni*? The whole passage is in great confusion in the Bezan text.

In Acts xxi. 27 we have the Latin

qui ab Asia erant Iudaei uenerant,

which probably represents an original text

οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας Ἰουδαῖοι,

though it has been altered in the Bezan text to

οἱ δὲ ἀ[πὸ] τῆς Ἀσίας Ἰουδαῖοι ἐληλυθότες,

so as to represent the Latin more closely.

This case, then, seems to be like the first, where the missing verb had been filled up by *erant* and *venerant* in two renderings,

and the results combined. But the recurrence of the double form in the Bezan Latin makes us suspicious that something primitive is lurking here. Is it possible that we are dealing with a feature of the African Latin in such expressions as *est venit, sum veni, erant venerant*?

Something of a similar character comes to light when we turn to Cod. *k* in Mark xiii. 33,

nescitis enim quando tempus ueniet,

where *d* reads *sit*. Cod. *a* does not shew any verb, being thus in more close harmony with the Greek: but Codd. *d k* are closely related to one another and to the primitive Latin version: how are we then to explain the concurrence of *sit* and *ueniet*?

In Luke vii. 12 the Codex Bezae gives

et multus populus  
ciuitatis cum ea erat,

and the Greek has taken on the form *συνεληλύθει αὐτῇ* as if to answer to a Latin *venerat* or *conuenerat*.

But it seems clear that the Greek text is *ἦν*, which we find in *ℳBCΞ* and other mss.: and in fact we have *erat* in the Latin of D. What are we to say to this? If there are two independent alternative translations of the Greek *ἦν*, viz. *erat* and *venerat*, how does it come to pass that traces of both of them are in the Codex Bezae, one of them in the Latin and the other by reflection in the Greek? Does it not look as if there had been a primitive rendering *erat venerat*?

In John xiii. 1 we have again a suspicious variation. Cod. Bezae reads in the Latin

quia uenerat eius hora,

and Codd. *a b* have *uenit* for *uenerat*.

The Greek texts divide over *ἦλθεν* and *ἐλήλυθεν*, but the Greek text of Cod. Bezae offers us a reading *παρῆν*, which is its own invention and therefore probably comes from its Latin. The word is a very good representation of the meaning, but it is suspicious that an attempt should have been made to introduce a verb which was a compound of *εἰμί*.



Now turn to Acts xvii. 6

ΟΤΙ ΟΙ ΤΗΝ ΟΙΚΟΥΜΕΝΗΝ ΔΝΑΚΤΑΤΩCΑΝΤΕC  
ΟΥΤΟΙ ΕΙCΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΝΘΑΔΕ ΠΑΡΕΙCΙΝ  
QVIA QVI ORBEM TERRAE INQVITAVERVNT  
HI SVNT ET HOC VENERVNT.

The word *εἰσίν* in the Greek is, of course, intrusive and comes from the Latin; and then the question arises as to the insertion of *sunt*. We may, perhaps, say that it was because the translator misunderstood the force of the strong *καὶ* in the Greek, and therefore supposed a verb to be required with *hi*. The explanation may be sufficient, but it is curious that we have the collocation of the same two verbs as before. Is it not conceivable that the sentence

*hi sunt et huc uenerunt,*

may, after all, be good African Latin for 'are come hither also,' and not need any correction or apology?

If this explanation be correct, we can see the motive for the textual variation in six at least out of the seven cases mentioned above. We suggest, therefore, that the African Latin had a usage, not unlike that of the Syriac, of combining a verb with the auxiliary in the same tense with itself.

If this could be established, it would be natural to refer to such a form of speech for the origin of the French and Italian use of the auxiliary *sum* with *venio*, as in *je suis venu* etc., which form is, I believe, generally explained by Romance philologers by a reference to the Latin *ventum est*.

## CHAPTER XXVII.

### CONCLUDING REMARKS ON THE GLOSSES IN LUKE.

WE may now fairly claim to have proved our theory of Latinization as regards the Western text of the New Testament; for the Greek text of Codex Bezae has been shewn to involve a series of re-translations from the Latin, and many of the added glosses are due to second century hands, which tampered with the text in the interests of elucidation and edification.

Of the books of the New Testament which have undergone revision in this way, the two which have suffered the most are the Gospel of Luke and the Acts: in the Gospel the later chapters have suffered most from the interpolator and the commentator.

In reference to the Acts we have already given the solution with sufficient detail, and there are not many interpolations or readings left unexplained. But with the Gospel the problem is more obscure; and the resolution of the difficulties is, as we intimated in a previous chapter, a harder piece of critical work. We shall however conclude our discussion by examining a single page of the Gospel of Luke in Codex Bezae, a page which is as full of errors and corruptions as any in the whole of the Gospel.

Turn, then, to fol. 279 *b* and fol. 280 *a* of the MS., which give respectively the Greek and Latin which stand on the 257th page of Scrivener's edition, and contain the text of Luke from c. xxiii. v. 34 to v. 45. The text of this page, judged by any imagined standard, is in great confusion. But taking our Ariadne's thread, the proved Latinization of notable passages in the Western text, we see at once how to remove a number of errors.

For example, in v. 35 *θεωρῶν* was rendered somewhat thinly by

the Latin *videns*: so the reviser corrected the Greek back to ὁρῶν, which was the exact equivalent of the Latin. Hence we have

καὶ εἰστήκει ὁ λαὸς ὁρῶν  
ET STABAT POPVLVS VIDENS.

Again in v. 36: the translator rendered the aorist ἐνέπαιξαν by the Latin imperfect *deludebant*, and the reviser who harmonized the text and the translation gives us accordingly an imperfect in the Greek,

ἐνεπίζον δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται  
DELVDEBANT AVTEM EVM ET MILITES.

In v. 38 the abrupt Greek ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὗτος was rendered *rex iudaeorum hic est*: and the added verb of the Latin was restored on the Greek side.

When the translator has varied the order in a construction made up out of a participle and verb, as he often does, and naturally enough, the reviser accommodates the Greek to the rendering: so we find in v. 34

διαμερίζομενοι δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἔβαλον κλήρους

is rendered by

partiebantur autem uestimenta eius mittentes sortem,

and the Greek finally becomes

διαμερίζοντο...βαλόντες (! βάλλοντες).

So in v. 40

ἐπιτιμῶν...ἔφη becomes *increpabat...dicens*,

and the final Greek is

ἐπιτίμα...λέγων.

These instances will shew that the same general influences are at work on the text at this point as we have detected elsewhere. Now let us turn to errors of a more pronounced kind: vv. 43, 44 read in our text as follows:

καὶ στραφεὶς  
πρὸς τὸν κν εἶπεν αὐτῷ μνησθῆτι μοι  
ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐλεγχέως σου  
ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ις εἶπεν αὐτῷ τῷ ἐπληρόντι  
θάρσει σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐσθι  
ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ

## ET CONVERSUS

AD DOM DIXIT ILLI MEMENTO ME

IN DIE ADVENTVS TVI

RESPONDENS AVTEM IHS DIXIT QVI OBIURGABAT EV

ANIMEQVIOR ESTO HODIE MECVM ERIS

IN PARADISO.

The first thing we notice is that the peculiar *στραφείς* has no attestation whatever except in one of the recensions of the *Acta Pilati* (B, c. x.), which gives the singular paraphrase

καὶ στραφείς πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγει αὐτῷ· κύριε, ὅταν βασιλεύσης, μὴ μου ἐπιλάβου.

Now let us look at the perplexing addition

ΤΩ ΕΠΛΗCONΤΙ.

The Latin rendering shews that this stands for

ΤΩ ΕΠΙΤΙΛΗCCONΤΙ,

and that as it stands it means 'the one who rebuked him,' i.e. the robber who rebuked the other robber. Now if we look closely at our text we shall see that this gloss has got into the text at the wrong spot: for there is no difficulty at this place in knowing which robber is in question; and we are inclined to believe that a displacement has occurred and that the original gloss was

ille qui obiurgabat eum,

and was meant to stand two lines higher up: but only the *ille* got into the text at this place where it was promptly changed into *illi* and a corresponding *αὐτῷ* was added in the Greek. We see then that *qui obiurgabat eum* was not meant for a dative as the Greek has taken it, and the gloss must have arisen on the Latin side. We see this, further, from the fact that *obiurgabat* is evidently the equivalent for the *ἐπετίμα* of v. 40, so that if the Greek had been the first form we should have had *ἐπιτιμήσαντι* and not *ἐπιπλήσσαντι*. It follows, then, that *obiurgabat* must have been the primitive Latin rendering in v. 40, and not *increpabat* which the Codex Bezae now shews. This is verified by turning to the Codex Vercellensis which has actually preserved the *obiurgabat*. So far, then, everything is clear: we are dealing with a misplaced

marginal Latin gloss which stood primitively in the margin as

ille  
qui  
obiurgabat  
eum,

and which finally broke into two, and got into two separate places in the text.

Now let us turn to the *Acta Pilati*: and here we find that several of the chief authorities for the text in recension A read

καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἐπιτίμησας τὸν ἕτερον αὐτοῦ τῷ Ἰησοῦ· μνησθητί μου κτέ.

Here then we have the very same gloss occurring at the place where our analysis shewed that it was meant to stand in Codex Bezae. But if this be the case, there is certainly some connection between the two texts. Nor does it seem perfectly clear that the *Acta Pilati* took it from a Western bilingual, for, as we see, the Latin gloss is in the Codex Bezae both wrongly inserted and wrongly translated. We should prefer to believe, if the position were tenable, that the gloss in the early Western text at this point is due to one of the sources of the *Acta Pilati*; but the matter is very obscure.

Now let us turn back to v. 37,

ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕΣ \* ΧΑΙΡΕ Ο ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΤΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ  
ΠΕΡΙΤΕΘΕΝΤΕΣ ΑΥΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΑΚΑΝΘΙΝΟΝ  
ΣΤΕΦΑΝΟΝ  
DICENTES HABE REX IYDAEORVM  
INPONENTES ILLI ET DE SPINIS  
CORONAM.

Not a word of this is genuine, except the introductory λέγοντες! Scrivener's remark upon this verse is as follows: "very much out of place, since the scene of this act of mockery, as assigned by the other three evangelists, is Pilate's Praetorium." No doubt it is very much out of place, but then there was a reason for it. The *Acta Pilati* do not refer to the scene in the soldiers' hall, but place the Coronation with thorns at the time of the Crucifixion. Accordingly the text of Tischendorf's first recension is as follows:

ε. x. καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκ τοῦ πραιτωρίου καὶ αἱ δύο κακούργοι σὺν αὐτῷ.  
καὶ ὅτε ἀπῆλθαν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον, ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἱματῖα αὐτοῦ καὶ περιέζωσαν  
αὐτὸν λέντιον· καὶ στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν περιέθηκαν αὐτῷ περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν.

It will be seen that the *Acta Pilati* definitely assign the proceedings on the part of the soldiers to the place and time of the Crucifixion, exactly as is done in the Bezan text.

Our readers will see how interesting and how difficult the discrimination of the sources here becomes. We might, of course, simply affirm that the *Acta Pilati* had borrowed from a Western copy of the Gospels: but this hardly seems adequate, for what motive can we assign for such a displacement in the Western text of the Gospel, unless perhaps it be found in the fact that no mention was made in Luke of the Crowning? Moreover we find in the same error with the Codex Bezae two other important authorities, viz. Cod. c and the Curetonian Syriac, for Cod. c reads

aue rex iudaeorum salua temetipsum  
imposuerunt autem et de spinis coronam,

and the Cureton text answers to

χαῖρε· εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων σώσον σεαυτὸν. καὶ περιέθηκαν ἐπὶ  
τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν.

It is clear then that the Western error in question is very ancient: nor is it easy to see from what early document these primitive Western texts could have derived their accretion. The presumption is that the source is Latin, but this carries us only a little way. But perhaps we ought not to expect to solve all these problems at the first statement; and if we have been successful, as we hope we have, in removing in our earlier pages many difficulties from the textual criticism of the New Testament, we may reasonably ask for longer time to discuss questions that resist resolution.

Clandite iam riuos, pueri: sat prata biberunt.