

LECTURE II

THE OLD SYRIAC TEXT OF THE ACTS¹.

Mr Chase's theory of the Western text is that the peculiarities of the Codex Bezae are due to retranslation from an Old Syriac version; and apparently to this cause only, since he states that the demonstration of the Syriacization of the Greek text excludes the theory of its Latinization, and I suppose would equally, from his point of view, exclude the theory of every other form of textual reaction and bifurcation. In other words, the hypothesis of re-translation from the Syriac is an adequate one to explain the peculiarities of the Bezan Text².

The hypothesis here presented is, in one sense, not a new one. It is, in fact, the theory of J. D. Michaelis in the last century and D. Schulz in the present century. Michaelis' statement is as follows³: "an alteration of the Syriac from the Latin cannot possibly be supposed;...in Syria, where Greek was understood, no man could have thought of correcting the Syriac Testament from a Latin translation, and those Syrians, who were acquainted with Greek, were undoubtedly ignorant of Latin....More probable is the supposition that the Syriac has had influence on the Latin, especially in those examples where an error is committed, that might happen more easily to the Syrian than the Latin translator. The Latin text is properly a composition of several ancient versions, one of

¹ This lecture was delivered in the Divinity School, Cambridge, January 19th, 1894.

² It even explains, from Mr Chase's point of view, the itacisms of the scribe (*ἀδελφῇ* for *ἀδελφοί*) and the Alexandrian verb-forms (as *ἐθορυβουσιν* = *ἐθορυβουν ἦσαν*). But we must not judge a theory by the extravagances into which it may lead its promoter.

³ Marsh's *Michaelis*, Vol. II., part 1, p. 25.

which must have been made by a native Syrian¹, as appears from the Syriasms found in the Latin text of several ancient MSS., which greatly exceed in harshness the Syriasms of the Greek Testament: this Syriac translator was probably guided, in obscure passages, by the version of his own country, the effects of which appear to be felt at this very day in the Vulgate.... But the foregoing hypothesis is very insufficient to account for that general coincidence observed between the Old Syriac², the Old Latin, and those ancient Greek manuscripts, which were undoubtedly written in the West, as appears from the Latin translations with which they are accompanied. The wonderful harmony between the two most ancient versions of the New Testament, one of which was spread throughout Europe and the North of Africa, the other propagated from Edessa to China, could have no other cause than a similarity of the Greek manuscripts in the West of Europe and the East of Asia, which must have deviated in an equal degree from our printed text and the manuscripts of what is called the Greek edition³."

From the foregoing it appears that Michaelis had attempted to explain the Western readings by means of reactions from the Syriac (and he refers his readers for further details of the theory to his *Curæ*, pp. 169—173), but that he clearly held the theory very doubtfully, regarding it at best as a partial explanation, and that he settled down into what has been, since his day, the accepted theory, that the Western readings are a bifurcation in the primitive Greek text. Apparently he did not exclude the idea of some Syriac reaction on the Greek; for he says (Vol. I. p. 321), "It is not improbable that the Syriac and Coptic versions have had some influence on the Greek copies of the New Testament."

¹ This does not seem to agree with the previous statement that "those Syrians who were acquainted with Greek were undoubtedly ignorant of Latin."

² By the Old Syriac, Michaelis does not mean what is implied in that term to modern ears; he is speaking of the Peshito, in contradistinction from the Philoxenian version.

³ He means the *Recensio Constantinopolitana* of Griesbach (as Marsh explains).

His commentator, Marsh, observes that Michaelis' theory would require that the Syriac version must have been made before the end of the first century (in order that it might be employed in the structure of the primitive Latin rendering): but he regards the premises as resting on very unstable ground, denies the necessity for supposing that a primitive Syriac version earlier than the Latin existed, or the probability that, if it existed, it would have been employed so as to colour the early Latin translations. No doubt the connexion between the Peshito and the Old Latin was not an easy one to establish¹; nor does it seem that the attempt to forge the critical link between the two versions has been successfully re-attempted since the publication of the Curetonian fragments.

Now in what respect does Mr Chase's theory differ from the obscure and somewhat self-contradictory statements of Michaelis, or the suggestion of Schulz that the Codex Bezae has been under direct Syriac influence?

In the first place, it involves the substitution of the Old Syriac (in the modern sense) for the Peshito; this step was an obvious one, if the text of the Gospels was to be handled in the light of a proposed theory of Syriac reaction; for it is in the Curetonian fragments and in the recovered Tatian Harmony that we find those decisive proofs of the agreement between the ancient Eastern and Western texts, which was at first suggested by the comparison between the Peshito and the Old Latin versions.

But, in the second place, Mr Chase does not choose as the ground of his re-statement of the theory of Syriacization, the text of the Four Gospels, in which it was possible to reason from the Old Syriac of Cureton, and the Old Syriac quotations in Ephrem, Aphraates and other Syriac writers to the early Western text of the Codex Bezae and the Latins; but he chooses for his ground of debate the text of the Acts of the

¹ The support brought to Michaelis' theory by D. Schulz in 1827 (*Disp. de Cod. Cant.*) was not sufficient to bring the hypothesis into public favour or reception; it consisted chiefly in laying emphasis on coincidences in reading between D and the Peshito version. Michaelis refers also to a work by Storr which I have not seen (*Observ. sup. ver. Syr. Stuttgart, 1772*).

Apostles, where, up to the present time, no evidence of an Old Syriac text has been forthcoming, and starts on his enquiry with the hypothesis that there once existed an Old Syriac version of the Acts. Such a hypothesis is, in his view, adequate to explain the Western readings which are so thickly strewn in the Bezan text of the Acts, which readings bear in themselves, according to him, the marks of derivation from a Syriac original.

The boldness of this hypothesis is evident; and it has naturally provoked opposition. The question is immediately asked, 'Why do you not test the theory of Syriacization in the Gospels where the Old Syriac does in great part exist [and we might add, where it has lately come to light in an almost complete form], instead of flying off in search of an Old Syriac text which is not yet known to exist?' Mr Chase's answer is two-fold; first, that he is especially interested in the text of the Acts; second, that the intrusive phenomena in the text which he has to explain are more decided in the Bezan Acts than in the Bezan Gospels. We might add that the wisdom of the choice of ground is also seen in the fact that we are in the Acts of the Apostles free from some of the disturbing factors which occur in the text of the Gospels; the assimilations of one Gospel to another do not obtrude themselves on the reasoning, and the probability of Aramaic elements in the sources (that death-trap for the man who is calculating Syriac influences) is, to say the least, much smaller in the Acts than in the Gospels, and may, perhaps, be entirely absent.

In this sense, then, the ground is wisely chosen; but what of the hypothesis, which is to explain the phenomena of the text, and to be accepted as a true hypothesis on the ground that it does so explain them? Naturally the first question that would be asked by a critic would be whether there was any tangible evidence for the existence of an Old Syriac version of the Acts of the Apostles; it ought to be possible, for instance, to demonstrate the existence of such a text, either from the quotations in the Homilies of Aphrahat, or from the works of Ephrem, or by making a scientific demonstration that either the Peshito, or the primitive form of the Philoxenian version,

leans on an earlier text of which it constitutes the revision. Unfortunately no attempt seems to have been made either by Mr Chase or any one who preceded him to clear up these points. The five places where Aphrahat quotes the Acts do not furnish any satisfactory evidence on the point; not a single one of the 190 glosses which in my first studies I selected from the text of the Acts for special examination has, if we may judge from Tischendorf's apparatus, the attestation of either of the great Syrian fathers in question; and as to the known versions, we have not yet succeeded in getting behind the text of Thomas of Heraclea to that of his predecessor Philoxenus of Mabug, much less have we been able to analyze this important textual nucleus into its primitive parts: and it is the same with that imperfectly studied version, the Peshito.

It is, however, certain that an Old Syriac text of the Acts did exist, and that Mr Chase's hypothesis can be removed into the region of facts. We are in a position to prove that the Old Syriac text is, in a certain sense, extant, and has been before the public for more than half a century. The demonstration which we are going to give of the existence of this ancient text is of great critical importance, and while we must not conclude from the fact of the text's existence that it was necessarily the source of the Western variants it will certainly help us towards the final solution of the question.

Precisely as the commentary of Ephrem on the Harmony of the Gospels, which now attracts such constant study and is the centre of such lively critical interest, lay dormant in the Armenian text published by the fathers of the Monastery of S. Lazaro at Venice, until it was made accessible by the Latin translation of Mössinger, so have certain other works of Ephrem been blushing unseen and wasting their sweetness on what is, critically at all events, a desert air.

The first to be noticed amongst these translated works of Ephrem which the Armenian has preserved are his commentaries on the Pauline Epistles; which have, in the course of the last few months, appeared in a Latin dress, and so have become accessible to general criticism. As soon as the book appeared it was made the subject of review in three brilliant

articles in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* by Zahn, who had long ago petitioned for its publication in Latin¹.

Zahn pointed out the peculiar features in the commentary which identified it as a work of the same hand as had commented on the Diatessaron, and the peculiar features of the text which characterized it as belonging to what is called the Western tradition, and as being an older form of the Syriac than that which is found in the Peshito.

The most interesting of all the peculiar readings in the new text is perhaps the expansion of the anti-Judaic verses in Gal. iv. 21—27.

The text and commentary of these verses is as follows (we print them without distinction of type on account of the difficulty of distinguishing, in a text which has gone through some process of glossing, the commentary from the text).

Hae vero fuerunt symbola duorum testamentorum. Una populi Judaeorum secundum legem in servitute generans ad similitudinem eiusdem Agar.

Agar enim ipsa est mons Sina in Arabia; est autem illa similitudo huius Jerusalem, quia in subiectione est, et una cum filiis suis servit Romanis.

Superior autem Jerusalem libera est, sicut Sara; et eminet supra omnes potestates ac principatus. Ipsa est Mater nostra, Ecclesia Sancta, quam confessi sumus.

When we compare this passage with the current Greek text, or with the critical apparatus of the New Testament, there is not at first sight anything that suggests a very different text to the common text of the epistle; but when we turn to Tertullian's fourth book against Marcion, or to Zahn's reconstructed text of the epistle as used by Marcion, we find, to our surprise, that a large part of the apparent commentary is part of the text of Marcion; and since there is no reason for doubting Tertullian's tradition of this text, nor for supposing that Ephrem's text has had any connexion with a faulty interpretation made by Tertullian, we have no other alternative than to conclude that Ephrem is commenting on a Marcionized text.

¹ *Theol. Lit.-Blatt*, for Sept. 29, 1893 and two following weeks.

That this is really the case appears, as we have said, from the language of Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* iv. 4):

“unum a monte Sina in synagogam Judaeorum secundum legem generans in servitutem, aliud super omnem principatum generans, vim, dominationem et omne nomen quod nominatur non tantum in hoc aevo sed et in futuro, quae est mater nostra in quam repromisimus sanctam ecclesiam.”

It will be seen that Tertullian's text, like Ephrem's, had incorporated a passage from the Epistle to the Ephesians (i. 21), describing the Church, in sufficiently bold language (but which can be justified by a little interpretation), as seated, with the Lord, far above all principality and power. And the explanation is also added, both by Tertullian and Ephrem, that this Upper Jerusalem who is our Mother is the Holy Church, whom we have confessed. True, Tertullian's text differs at first sight in that it uses the word 'repromisimus'; but this may very well have been due to a variant rendering of a primitive *ὁμολογήκαμεν*, which may equally mean 'to promise' and 'to confess'.

This remarkable passage then formed a part of Marcion's text; it may well startle us as a textual phenomenon, not only for its own sake as indicating a very free handling of the biblical text for dogmatic ends, but also as containing a reference to the Symbol of the Faith, in the Old Roman form (*credo in sanctam ecclesiam*). That it is the hand of Marcion we do not doubt, not only because we have Tertullian directly in evidence on the subject, but also because there is no passage in the Epistles that would be more satisfactory to his anti-Judaic mind. There can be little doubt that the verses in Galatians were stock quotations with Marcion and his followers. We find also that the passage affirming the true Mother and

¹ For a similar instance take Acts vii. 17 where the original Greek appears to have been

τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἧς ὁμολόγησεν

for which the Bezan Latin is

promissionis quam pollicitus est,

and the Bezan Greek shows the alternative reading *ἐπηγγέλαιο*

real Jerusalem to be the Church became one of the watchwords of the Paulician heresy which derives so much from Marcion. When the question came up amongst them as to the degree of honour to be given to the Mother of God, they used to say, "the true Theotokos is the heavenly Jerusalem, the Mother of believers."

But while we do not doubt that we have here the hand of Marcion, we hardly expected to find biblical evidence from before the middle of the second century for the currency of one of the Articles of the Old Roman Symbol, in the form which preceded the conventional 'holy catholic church'.

While we are drawing attention to the newly-published commentary and to its Marcionite reading it may be worth while to examine whether in a consecutive commentary on the Epistles, which shows Marcionite influence, we find any suggestions of the same arrangement of the Epistles as was found in Marcion's Apostolicon. If we may judge from Tertullian, the epistles stood in the order

Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, 1 and 2 Thess., Ephes.,
Col., Phil., Philem.

The Armenian Commentary is arranged according to the current usage, which Zahn calls the Alexandrian usage, but there are suspicious traces of its having been re-arranged by the Armenian translator. In the opening of the epistle to the Romans, Ephrem adds to the text "that I may impart unto you some spiritual grace" the words "as I have done to your

¹ The natural suggestion was made by Zahn (l. c. col. 465) that the text of the Epistles upon which Ephrem is commenting was, like that of the Gospel, a text which had passed through Tatian's own hands, and which may have been brought back by him from Rome to Edessa, and have furnished the text from which the first Syriac version of the Pauline Epistles was made. "Wenn Marcion um 145 in Rom einen catholischen Text der Paulusbriefe in der Hand gehabt hat, welcher in sehr auffälligen Punkten mit dem ältesten erreichbaren syrischen Text zusammentrifft, so weiss ich dafür keine andere annehmbare Erklärung, als dass der erste syrische Uebersetzer der Paulusbriefe eine im Abendland geschriebene Handschrift seiner Arbeit zu Grunde gelegt hat. Am einfachsten bleibt die Annahme, dass der von Rom nach Mesopotamien heimgekehrte Tatian seinen Landsleuten den ersten 'Apostolos' wie das erste 'Evangelium' in ihrer Sprache gegeben hat."

fellows the Galatians and Corinthians." The suggestion is that the commentator, who frequently poses as Paul, observes the order, Galatians, Corinthians, Romans, and the suspicion is confirmed when we find at the beginning of the epistle to the Hebrews the words:

"Cum nec in epistolis scriptis ad Galatos, nec Corinthios, et ad proximos quos viderat, id fecerit, neque in epistolis ad Romanos datis, et ad caeteros quos non viderat, tale quoddam egerit."

We may fairly conclude that the Epistles, at all events the first ones, stood in the order which they occupied in Marcion's Apostolicon. But Zahn points out that in the preface to Philippians, Ephrem intimates that Colossians is to follow, whereas in Marcion's order, Colossians preceded. I cannot, however, in view of what has been noted as to the priority of Galatians, believe he is right in saying that the order of the Epistles in the Armenian text is certainly that of Ephrem.

Leaving now on one side the demonstration which Zahn makes of the thoroughly Western character of the text of the Epistles commented on by Ephrem, we pass on to the question which we proposed to examine: viz. the existence or non-existence of an Old Syriac text of the Acts. Are there any traces of such a text in the Commentary on the Epistles?

We must premise that in dealing with a question of this kind which has to be resolved by the study of an Armenian translation, we shall never be safe in concluding from the existence of certain readings in the Armenian text to their existence in the lost Syriac original unless the text vary from the popular Armenian; for the simple reason that the translator accommodates his translation sometimes consciously and sometimes unconsciously to the Armenian Vulgate, which has undergone revision from the Latin. We need, therefore, to be very careful with our steps in those cases where the Armenian book before us agrees with the Armenian Vulgate. Let us, then, ask the question whether Ephrem in this recovered commentary makes any quotations from the Acts of the Apostles, and what sort of text is involved in the Syriac

of such quotations. We will begin by taking a passage from 2 Tim. iii. 11, where S. Paul reminds Timothy of the persecutions which happened to him in Antioch, Iconium, Lystra. Ephrem begins by explaining that it is Antioch of Phrygia, not Antioch of Syria that is meant: *Antiochia autem non ista Syriae, sed illa Phrygiae; ubi excitarunt Judaei rectores civitatis, et mulieres divites, et fecerunt tribulationem magnam super eos, expulsis eis extra fines suos.*

For this account we turn to Acts xiii. 50, where the text is *οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι παρώτρυναν τὰς σεβομένας γυναῖκας τὰς εὐσχήμονας καὶ τοὺς πρώτους τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἐπήγειραν διωγμὸν ἐπὶ τὸν Παῦλον καὶ Βαρνάβαν καὶ ἐξέβαλον αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ὁρίων αὐτῶν.*

Ephrem's text agrees with the Peshito in translating *εὐσχήμονας* by *divites*; but the expression 'fecerunt tribulationem' appears in the Bezan version of the passage which has

θλείψειν μεγάλην καὶ διωγμόν.

Ephrem goes on to tell us that "Iconii autem post anteriorem tribulationem suscitarunt persecutionem, Judaei et Gentiles, et lapidantes eum ac Barnabam, ejecerunt illos a civitate."

The common text of the Acts knows nothing of two persecutions at Iconium, nor of any actual stoning of Paul and Barnabas, yet something like a previous persecution is implied in the common text of Acts xiv. 2, where 'the Jews that were disobedient stirred up and evilly affected the minds of the Gentiles against the brethren.' Neither does the account say that Paul and Barnabas were expelled from the city.

When we turn to the Bezan text, we find first of all that two distinct Iconian persecutions are given, the first being concluded by the intimation that 'the Lord promptly gave peace'; the second stage of the persecution does not shew any actual stoning on the part of the Iconians, at least not in the Greek text, but when we turn to the Latin, which so often is superior to the Greek in archaism, we find

ut autem factum est impetus gentilium
et iudaeorum cum magistris ipsorum
et iniuriauerunt et lapidauerunt eos

It may, of course, be said that the last line is simply a transcriptional error for

ut iniuriarent et lapidarent;

but we notice that it is in agreement with the text of Ephrem, and suspect the Bezan Latin to be more archaic than its Greek. (Cf. also the Laudian Latin: *et contumeliis adficerunt eos et lapidarent (sic).*)

In 1 Cor. xiv. 23 (p. 77) Ephrem says "de Apostolis dixerunt eos musto plenos inebriatos esse"; the combination of the two passages involved is perfectly natural, but there is reason for believing it to have been in the Old Syriac, since a slightly different form of the combination is in the Peshito (of Acts ii. 13), which reads "They have drunk new wine and are intoxicated."

A more striking case will be Ephesians iv. 10 (p. 150), where the writer has not only quoted the text of the Acts, but incorporated two of the famous Western glosses (cf. Acts i. 5 in Cod. Bezae):

'Qui descendit, ipse est et qui ascendit super omnes caelos, id est, super omnes altitudines caelorum; ut impleret omnia quae dixit; istud est, quod dixerat; *quam recipitis vos non post multos dies, sed usque ad Pentecosten.*'

The addition of these glosses can hardly be due to a later hand than Ephrem; moreover there is no sign of them in the text of the Acts in the Peshito nor in the Armenian Vulgate; they are among the glosses for which no Syriac evidence has as yet been forthcoming; in fact their whole attestation, outside the Codex Bezae, seems to consist of certain passages of Augustine and of the Sahidic version.

The occurrence of this famous gloss from Acts i. 5 in the text of Ephrem must be considered very significant: moreover, the conjunction (*sed*) by which the gloss is connected with the text is important; the clause occupies the same place in

Ephrem's text as it does in the Codex Bezae, and it looks as if the motive for the gloss had been in the peculiar Greek order

οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας,

instead of *μετ' οὐ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας*.

Whether its origin be in a Greek antithesis or in a translator's expansion or the remark of a commentator, we will not discuss further at present. What we are occupied with is the existence of Western elements in the Syriac used by Ephrem.

Enough has been said to demonstrate this from the Commentary of Ephrem on the Pauline Epistles. Mr Chase's hypothesis of the existence of an Old Syriac text of the Acts is therefore a good one whatever may be the origin of the text. We will now pass on to prove it still more conclusively and in another way.

It would naturally suggest itself to any one who was in search of the Old Syriac of the Acts, to examine the commentaries on the Acts made by the Old Syrian fathers. The question then arises, Did Ephrem write any connected commentary on the Acts? If so, why should we spend our time in hunting out stray references to the Acts in commentaries on other books?

Unfortunately, though there is reason to believe that Ephrem wrote a commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, there are no traces of it in his published works, as far as I know; there remains, then, the possibility that fragments of it may be preserved in Greek or Syriac Catenae. As far as I have been able to make a search, no Syriac catena on the Acts has come to light; but happily for our investigation, the Armenians at Venice have published for us¹ a complete Catena on the Acts which is either a translation from the Syriac, or was made from materials existing in Armenian, which were derived from the Syriac by translation, and this Catena contains a large number of extracts from Ephrem. The greater part of the book is, however, taken from the writings of Chrysostom. If we assume that the Catena was made, as seems likely, late in the eleventh century, it is probable

¹ *Comm. on Act. Apost.* Venice, 1839.

that it was made up out of works existing in Armenian ; in that case it is not unreasonable to hope that the complete text may some day be recovered in Armenian. But whatever may have been the manner of its composition we shall be able (by the kind help of my good friend Mr Conybeare who has responded to my appeal for a translation) to extract a good deal of Ephrem from its pages, and to come to a decided opinion as to the nature of the text upon which Ephrem worked.

The first thing that will be noticed is that the compiler of the Catena is largely under the influence of the Armenian Vulgate, so that we shall have to be careful in our interpretations on account of the difficulty of discriminating between the sources of the Armenian text. We will, therefore, bracket the texts from the Catena where they agree closely with the Vulgate.

The Catena is divided into chapters, and the initial excerpt of each chapter is left unasccribed ; perhaps the scribe meant to illuminate the first names and afterwards omitted to do so ; these sections had better be laid on one side. They are very likely Chrysostom's in view of the preponderance of extracts from that writer.

We shall first discuss some of the more striking sections from the lost Commentary, and then we will subjoin the text of the major part of the Ephrem fragments as an Appendix.

We will first draw attention to the account of Paul's visit to Philippi, which is, as is well known, much expanded in the Bezan text, and often with great appearance of originality.


The commentary on Acts xvi. 35 begins as follows (from Ephrem ?):

p. 300. " Perhaps the heads of the army knew all the great wonders which had occurred ; and so they did not venture of themselves to release them, but sent to the gaoler to dismiss them, as it were, by stealth.

p. 301 (Ephr.). The Astaritai were afraid and full of fear, they the mighty of the city, of the earthquake, and knew truly that this earthquake happened on account of them, but they did not undertake to avow it. They sent secretly to bring them out."

Here it seems clear that the text before Ephrem must have contained a statement very like that in Codex Bezae :

ΣΥΝΗΛΘΟΝ ΟΙΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΙ
ΕΠΙ ΤΟ ΑΥΤΟ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΑΓΟΡΑΝ
ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΜΝΗΣΘΕΝΤΕΣ
ΤΟΝ ΣΕΙΣΜΟΝ ΤΟΝ ΓΕΓΟΝΟΤΑ ΕΦΟΒΗΘΗΣΑΝ.

(Astaritai is probably a misreading of a transliterated Syriac ; in fact the word is so transferred in the Peshito.)

The Commentary then proceeds with vv. 35—37 as in the Armenian Vulgate; then follows (p. 302)

c. xvi. 39 (Ephr.). "So then that this favour might be unto them, they came and besought of them, saying, We knew not that ye were just, even as the earthquake indeed presaged about you. So then we ask of you this favour, depart from this city, lest the same men gather together after the earthquake against you, (the same) who before the earthquake were gathered together."

Cf. with this the verse as current in the Codex Bezae :

ΕΦΟΒΗΘΗΣΑΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΑΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΙ
ΜΕΤΑ ΦΙΛΩΝ ΠΟΛΛΩΝ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΦΥΛΑΚΗΝ
ΠΑΡΕΚΑΛΕΣΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ ΕΞΕΛΘΕΙΝ ΕΙΠΟΝΤΕΣ
ΗΓΝΟΗΣΑΜΕΝ ΤΑ ΚΑΘ ΎΜΑΣ
ΟΤΙ ΕΣΤΑΙ ΑΝΔΡΕΣ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΙ
ΚΑΙ ΕΞΑΓΑΓΟΝΤΕΣ
ΠΑΡΕΚΑΛΕΣΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕΣ
ΕΚ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΛΕΩΣ ΤΑΥΤΗΣ ΕΞΕΛΘΑΤΕ
ΜΗΠΟΤΕ ΠΑΛΙΝ ΣΥΝΣΤΡΑΦΩΣΙΝ ΗΜΕΙΝ
ΕΠΙΚΡΑΖΟΝΤΕΣ ΚΑΘ ΎΜΩΝ.

It is clear that some text very like that of Codex Bezae must have been before Ephrem.

Turn in the next place to c. xvii. 15 (p. 310):

(Ephr.) "So he came as far as the shore, receding. But the Holy Spirit prevented him from preaching lest they should slay him. [And those who conducted Paul, led him as far as

Athens and having received] from Paul [a command to Silas and Timotheus that they should at once come to him] at Athens. [And they went] to him when they received the command."

The Bezan text with which we may make comparison is as follows (the chief expansions being bracketed):

ΤΟΝ ΜΕΝ ΟΥΝ ΠΑΥΛΟΝ
ΟΙ ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ ΕΞΑΠΕΣΤΕΙΛΑΝ
ΑΠΕΛΘΕΙΝ ΕΠΙ ΤΗΝ ΘΑΛΑΣΣΑΝ
ΥΠΕΜΕΙΝΕΝ ΔΕ Ο ΚΕΙΛΑΣ ΚΑΙ Ο ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΣ ΕΚΕΙ
ΟΙ ΔΕ ΚΑΤΑΚΤΑΝΟΝΤΕΣ ΤΟΝ ΠΑΥΛΟΝ
ΗΓΑΓΟΝ ΕΩΣ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ
[ΠΑΡΗΛΘΕΝ ΔΕ ΤΗΝ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΙΑΝ
ΕΚΩΛΥΘΗ ΓΑΡ ΕΙΣ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ
ΚΗΡΥΞΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ]
ΛΑΒΟΝΤΕΣ ΔΕ ΕΝΤΟΛΗΝ [ΠΑΡΑ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ]
ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΝ ΚΕΙΛΑΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΝ
ΟΠΩΣ ΕΝ ΤΑΧΕΙ ΕΛΘΩΣΙΝ
ΠΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΕΖΗΕΣΑΝ.

It is clear, then, that Ephrem had before him an expanded text like that of D; the statement that Paul was prevented by the Holy Spirit from preaching in Thessaly must have been in his copy. One of the smaller glosses in the Codex Bezae was also present (*παρα παυλου*) and perhaps the words *εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας* were also in the text. The peculiar expression of Ephrem that 'Paul came to the sea, receding,' is obscure. The words mean literally 'giving way' (? = *ἀναχωρῶν*). It is curious that the Latin of Cod. Bezae has

abire ad mare uersus

where *ad mare uersus* is perfectly good Latin¹.

Is it possible that this *uersus* has been understood as *conuersus* or *reuersus*? Whatever be the origin of the statement there can be no doubt that Ephrem had a Bezan text.

¹ Cp. Caesar, *B. G.* vi. 33, Labienum ad Oceanum uersus in illas partes proficisci iubet.

One more proof shall be given : from Acts xix. 38, 39, p. 352 [Ephr. ?], " This Demetrius, vile and shameless, he says, he and the children (*παῖδες*) of his craft, if they have any suit with one another, let them stand forward and make it clear to the hegemon. And [if there be] any other [enquiry let] it be [pronounced on in the lawful assembly].

We compare as before

ΕΙ ΜΕΝ ΟΥΝ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ [ΟΥΤΟΣ]
ΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΣΥΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΤΕΧΝΕΙΤΕ
ΕΧΟΥΣΙ ΠΡΟΣ [ΑΥΤΟΥΣ] ΤΙΝΑ ΛΟΓΟΝ
ΑΓΟΡΑΙΟΙ ΑΓΟΝΤΑΙ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΘΥΠΑΤΟΙ ΕΙΣΙΝ
ΕΝΚΑΛΙΤΩΣΑΝ ΑΛΛΗΛΟΙΣ
ΕΙ ΔΕ ΠΕΡΙ ΕΤΕΡΩΝ ΕΠΙΖΗΤΕΙΤΕ
ΕΝ ΤΩ ΝΟΜΩ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ ΕΠΙΛΥΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ.

Here Ephrem has the added *οὗτος* of the Bezan text; he has also the added *αὐτοὺς* which has been understood as *ἐαυτοὺς*, as if Demetrius and his fellows might have quarrels *inter se*; further he has read *περαιτέρω* (which surely must be original) as *περι ετερων* which we find in D. (This variant is therefore a primitive Greek error on the part of a copyist.) It is clear, therefore, and instances might be abundantly multiplied, that Ephrem's text was in the later chapters of the Acts closely connected with that of the Codex Bezae¹.

Another passage in the commentary on the Pauline Epistles which invites study, but from which it is not easy to draw very definite conclusions, is 1 Cor. ii. 8, where Ephrem remarks :

Id est, quod apostoli dixerunt, " Scimus, quia per errorem deceptionis haec fecistis; convertimini igitur, et poenitemini, et nemo id vobis reputabit ad peccatum."

¹ The last extract seems to be acephalous, but it evidently belongs to the same fabric as the others. The Peshito helps us to restore the original Syriac

ܡܕܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܝܬܐ

It looks as if *οὗτος* were due to a wrong line-division; we should read

ΕΙ ΜΕΝ ΟΥΝ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ
ΟΥΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΣΥΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΤΕΧΝΕΙΤΑΙ

The reference is to Acts iii. 17: and although it is not quite easy to detach the text of the passage from its setting, there seems to be no reason to doubt that the text of Ephrem had the Western reading which appears in Cod. Bezae as *ἐπιστάμεθα* ($d^2 = scimus$) and instead of *οἶδα* (where Irenaeus has *scio*).

The origin of the variant appears to be Greek, and to be an attempt to avoid the confusion caused by the presence in the text of *μὲν* after *οἶδα*, which might be read as *οἶδα μὲν* or as *οἶδαμεν*. The existence of this *μὲν* is evidenced by the double fact that Cod. Bezae has carried it into the next line (*ὑμεῖς μὲν*), and instead of *οἶδαμεν* has the equivalent *ἐπιστάμεθα*.

We notice also that the text used by Ephrem did not contain the expansion at the end of the expression

κατὰ ἀγνοίαν ἐπράξατε [πονηρόν],

which is found in the Codex Bezae, in Irenaeus and elsewhere, but some simpler expansion, probably the same as occurs in the Peshito, 'ye did this (ܠܐܝܢܐ).'

The rest of the verse as quoted by Ephrem is obscure and paraphrastic, and may be from his own hand. On the whole the text seems to be Western in character, but not as decidedly as we should have expected.

Acts xx. 29 is also quoted by Ephrem in the introduction to the apocryphal 3rd Epistle to the Corinthians, but apparently in the terms of the Peshito¹.

Probably we should also notice the commentary of Ephrem on Rom. viii. 7 (p. 26), in which he contrasts the imperfection of the law with the fulness of the Gospel: he says that Christians really do obey the law,

"etsi circumcisi, ac sabbati observatores, existiment nos adversarios esse legis, eo quod superflua illa legis soluta sunt desuper. Si autem illa occidisset atque salvasset, oportuisset

¹ But observe that 'ut convertant auditores ad sequendos se' where the Greek text is *τοῦ ἀποσπᾶν* is in agreement with Irenaeus 'ut convertant' and Cod. Bezae *τοῦ ἀποστρέφειν* as well as with the Peshito

ܐܡܝܕܐ ܐܠܝܢܐ ܠܐܝܢܐ ܠܐܝܢܐ ܠܐܝܢܐ ܠܐܝܢܐ ܠܐܝܢܐ

We have also an allusion to the story of Elymas on p. 247, but without any Old Syriac traces, as far as I see.

eam prius in cordibus inscriptam fuisse. Tu autem vide, quia neque justitia plena est illa, neque in ea est illa justitia, quae dicit, Quod tibi malum videtur, proximo ne facias."

The argument is that circumcision is a superfluous part of the law which has been abolished. If it had been a part of the true law which kills and makes alive, it would have had to be heart-circumcision. But the old imperfect statement of the law did not contain the precept to do nothing to the neighbour which we should ourselves dislike.

It seems not unreasonable to enquire whether Ephrem in his text of Acts xv. (vv. 20 and 29) may not have had the addition of the famous negative precept to the Jerusalem Concordat. This is an important and interesting question, inasmuch as the reading is perhaps the oldest reading extant of those which are called Western. It has been pointed out by Seeberg¹ that the interpolation in Acts xv. 29 must have been in the text of the Acts used by Aristides the Apologist: for Aristides tells us in his summary of the early Christian ethics, that "they do not worship idols in the form of man; and whatever they do not wish that others should do to them, they do not practise towards any one; and they do not eat of the meats of idol sacrifices, for they are undefiled." The apparent want of sequence in the precepts is explained at once by a reference to the interpolated passage in the Acts in which the negative Golden Rule is made a pendent to the regulations against eating idol-meats, &c. Accordingly Seeberg says, and I do not see that exception can be taken to his reasoning (except by denying the genuineness of the Syriac text) that

"Hieraus folgt deutlich, dass Aristides den Spruch nicht in der Form der Didache, sondern in der in das N. T. übergegangenen Form gekannt hat. Da er nun den Spruch mit der Enthaltung von den *εἰδωλόθυστα* zusammen anführt, so kann nicht bezweifelt werden, dass er in seinem Text der Apostelgeschichte diesen Spruch, wie Irenäus, bereits gelesen hat. Dann ist Aristides der älteste Zeuge für diese Interpolation..... Bald darauf folgt übrigens bei Aristides die Enthaltung von der

¹ *Die Apologie des Aristides*, p. 213.

συνουσία ἄνομος (cf. die *πορνεία* der Apgesch.). Diese Stelle erweist also sowol die kirchliche Benützung der Apgesch. zur Zeit des Aristides als das Vorhandensein der Interpolation in der Mitte des 2. Jarh."

The genuineness of the Syriac text appears further to be established by the consideration that no reason can be assigned for the insertion of the precept by a translation at a point where its connexion with the context is not at first sight obvious, as well as by the reflection that the passage, if genuine, would be out of date and almost unintelligible to a literary pirate in the seventh century¹.

Whatever, then, be the date of the first appearance of the variant in the text of the Acts, we are sure that it was extant very early, and need not be surprised if we should find it current in the text commented on by Ephrem. We do not, however, wish to speak too positively as to the source of the quotation in Ephrem: and that for various reasons: the negative precept turns up everywhere in the early Church, having been absorbed, in the first instance, from Jewish ethics. Moreover it seems likely that it was not only interpolated into the Acts, but, if we may judge from certain remarks of Tertullian against Marcion, it also was current in Marcionized copies of the Gospel of Luke. Further the form in which

¹ Mr Chase, I observe, quotes the incorrect Greek of the Apology, and so avoids the conclusions of the foregoing argument; and explains the occurrence of the negative precept in Aristides as a case of apologetic absorption from the text of some form of the *Διδαχή*. But even in the incorrect text, the connexion between Aristides and the interpolated Acts is so close that he is forced to admit that "from such an apologetic passage the saying naturally passed into a similar context in Acts xv." [This is dangerously near to the admission of a Greek original for the gloss. Did the Apologists write in Syriac?] He then makes a laboured and obscure argument to prove that after the passage had been absorbed into the text of the Acts from Aristides or some similar Apologist, it passed into the text of Theophilus of Antioch from the text of the Acts through the medium of a Syriac version (cp. Theoph. *ad Autol.* ii. 34). The difference in the treatment of the two cases is, we may conjecture, due to the fact that Mr Chase wishes to go to Antioch for the origin of his textual corruptions; and does not wish to go to Athens! He deals in a somewhat similar manner with the Western text of the Acts which is quoted in Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians: if it had only been Ignatius! (Cf. Chase, p. 21 on Acts ii. 24.)

Ephrem quotes is not the exact form in the Acts; he uses the expression "quod tibi malum videtur" which is much nearer to the Talmudic form of the precept: and the same peculiarity appears where Ephrem quotes the precept in Romans iii. 21; where it is expressly called, in opposition to the statement previously quoted¹, a precept of the *law* (aut ipsam legem docere mansuetudinem et fidem; ut exempli gratia quum dicit: *quod tibi malum videtur ne aliis feceris*): we should not then feel justified in employing the passage quoted from Rom. viii. as a proof that Ephrem had the famous interpolation in his copy of the Acts.

From two separate lines of enquiry, therefore, we have discussed the question of the existence of an Old Syriac text of the Acts, and have removed Mr Chase's hypothesis into the region of fact. Setting on one side the question as to what the result of this discovery will be upon the criticism of the text, and it cannot fail to be far-reaching, we can only most cordially congratulate Mr Chase on the complete and thorough verification of the assumption with which he commences his investigation into the peculiarities of the Western text. It is not often that a speculation is so rapidly justified from unexpected quarters². It remains to be seen whether the reason-

¹ Ephrem is no model of consistent interpretation; he loves alternatives: the *ἄλλως* whose equivalent is employed so often in his works is his own, and not the suggestion of a later hand.

² Of course I am aware that Mr Chase desiderates in the working out of his theory, not merely one old Syriac text, but many: in one single passage he requires sometimes as many as three separate versions! He justifies this view of the variety of the primitive Syriac texts by quoting the following remarks of Dr Hort with regard to the Curetonian text of the Gospels. "The rapid variation which we know the Greek and Latin texts to have undergone in the earlier centuries could hardly be absent in Syria; so that a single MS. cannot be expected to tell us more of the Old Syriac generally than we could learn from any one average Old Latin MS. respecting Old Latin texts generally." Mr Chase does not notice that when he has assigned the Syriac version as the *cause* of the Greek and Latin Western Variants, these remarks of Dr Hort no longer apply. The comparison in that case between the progressive changes of the Syriac and those of the Graeco-Latin texts must be made between the Syriac version and the Western texts *considered as unaffected by the Syriac version*, if any analogy between the two sets of phenomena is to hold good. But on Mr Chase's theory the variation of Graeco-Latin texts is almost *nil* when the Syriac reactions are removed.

ing which he has based upon the hypothesis can also be justified.

We will now add as an appendix the more important of the extracts which we have been able to collect of the commentary of Ephrem on the Acts.

APPENDIX.

EXTRACTS FROM THE ARMENIAN VERSION OF EPHREM'S
COMMENTARY ON THE ACTS. Translated by F. C. CONY-
BEARE, with some additional notes.

p. 13 (Ephrem). The author of the Acts of the Apostles was Luke the Evangelist. He was not indeed with Christ from the commencement of his preaching, but he attached himself to the apostles of Christ from the very first descent of the Spirit and before. And although his gospel was only written by him according as he heard from the apostles of Christ, yet of the Acts of the Apostles which he wrote he was himself an eye-witness. He wrote his Gospel, because he saw that certain impostors had written out of their heads a gospel under the name of "the infancy of Christ our Lord," and other books of questions (*hartzouadzots*, but ? read *herd-zouadzots* = of heresies) under the name of Mary and of the disciples of Christ, in which they say that after the resurrection that first-born one ascended after 18 months; whereas the disciples write about him that he after the fortieth day exactly ascended into heaven. Luke then in order to hinder the false books of heterodox writers by (? or from) the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who concoct about the Lord Jesus an old age and a youth of works (narrating some things before his baptism and others after his ascension on the fortieth day)—therefore he sets in his book of the Acts of the Apostles a beginning and an end of the works of our Lord, in imitation of the other Evangelists, beginning from the baptism of the Lord by John, and continuing to his ascension on the 40th day: in order to shew that every work whatever ascribed to Christ earlier than his baptism and subsequent to his ascension after 40 days, is a work alien to Christ our Lord. And it is clear from

the fact that Christ himself said to his disciples, "If I go not, the Comforter will not come." And the Comforter came on the completion of Pentecost, the 50th day after his resurrection. It is, therefore, manifest that on the completion of the 40 days' term, as the Apostles say, Jesus ascended. And those impostors are false who say he ascended after 18 months. So Luke wrote about the resurrection of our Lord, about his Ascension and the Coming of the Spirit and the increase of the disciples and about all that followed¹.

p. 19. Acts i. 2 (Ephrem). [Until the day of commanding the Apostles by the Holy Spirit.] As I said above, at the beginning of the Acts of the Lord he also sets a term, saying 'until the day of commanding,' which is the day of his ascent, —in order to silence the liars.

p. 20 (Ephrem). Now he shewed that he remained after the Cross not without miracles (*σημεῖα*), but in many miracles (*σημεῖα*) and many signs (*τεκμήρια*) which he wrought in the forty days: as he appeared to them in all likenesses, now known and now unknown: according as in another place it saith: "Their eyes were holden that they should not know him," and "He was made known to them."

p. 21. Acts i. 4 (Ephrem). Not as having any natural wants, therefore, of food, but making a concession in order to a convincing demonstration of the resurrection.

p. 22 (Ephrem²). And because they were frightened, first he led them forth into Galilee, that without suspicion they might hear what was said. And when they heard, lo! for forty days he tarried with them, and commanded them not to leave Jerusalem nor to go forth to preach before receiving the Spirit. As no one allows soldiers to engage in battle before being armed, so he did not allow them to enter the affray and conquer (? be conquered) before the Coming of the Spirit.

¹ For the doctrine of an Ascension after 18 months see Irenaeus (ed. Mass. p. 14) where the belief is given as a peculiarity of the Valentinians. "*καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς δεκαοκτῶ Ἀλῶνας φανεροῦσθαι, διὰ τοῦ μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν δεκαοκτῶ μηνὶ λέγειν διατέτριφέναι αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς.*" See also *Ascensio Isaiæ* (ed. Dillmann, c. ix. p. 43).

² Almost all of this section will be found in Chrysostom *in loc.* (ed. Savile, p. 611).

And again because of the many who were about to believe in Jerusalem, he made it necessary for them to abide there; and again that the Jews might not say that they left alone those whom they knew and went forth to strangers, because of their hatred or of glory, and lest being attacked they might run away from them, even for sake of the very crucifiers they give out the tidings of the resurrection in that city, where the unjust slaying of Christ by them took place, in order that the outer heathen might easily believe, seeing the slayers of Christ come to believe in Him, and the crucifiers become preachers of his resurrection.

But that the disciples might not say: 'how shall we remain among the cruel slayers?' nor flee after his removal he dissolves their suspicion by the promise of the Spirit; to first bestow it on them there. For by this hope as with a chain, he will detain them in Jerusalem, sitting and awaiting there the promise of the good news of the Father, who by the prophets saith 'I will pour out of my spirit upon all flesh.'

p. 24. Acts i. 5 (Ephrem, Chrysostom, *sic*!). And not only doth he avow himself to be great beyond comparison, but * he shews his disciples to be greater than John, saying, Ye shall be baptised (? baptise), for they were destined to baptise even others in the Holy Spirit. And he did not say, I baptise you, but, Ye shall be baptised, teaching us to be humble. But that he himself it was that baptised them by the Spirit, is clear from the testimony of John; for he said; "He shall baptise you with the Holy Spirit and with fire."*

And that they received the Spirit in the upper-chamber is clear. * But how saith he, 'ye shall be baptised,' there being no water in the upper-chamber? I answer that the Spirit is supreme, by which the water also energises (*ἐνεργεῖ*). In like manner he himself is called anointed, not with sensible oil indeed, but with the Spirit of joy. And in another fashion (we may explain it): they had long before been baptised with water by John: for if publicans were baptised, much more they,

* The words between asterisks are from Chrysostom as may be seen by reference to his published Commentary. The double heading is therefore doubtful.

whose destiny it was to be baptised and to baptise with the Holy Spirit. For though in our time it is possible to be baptised at once with water and Spirit, it was then in the time of the disciples (only possible) in separate times.*

p. 28 (c. i. 7) (Ephr.). And this with so much firmness, because he willed not to reveal to them these days of his ascending, which they saw with their own eyes.

p. 30 (c. i. 8) (Ephr.). [For ye shall receive power] and courage at the coming of the Spirit on you. And ye shall go out from the upper-room, and shall be manifest to the world, witnesses of my resurrection and of what ye heard and saw from me not only in Jerusalem, city of crucifiers, where indeed ye are afraid, but also among the Samaritans, and all races.

p. 31 (c. i. 10) (Ephr.). [And the cloud] hid (*or covered*) [him from their eyes.]

p. 34 (c. i. 12) (acephalous but probably Ephrem).

Then [they returned to Jerusalem from the mountain called of Olives...which is near to Jerusalem according to a Sabbath's journey].

(c. i. 13). [And when they entered] Jerusalem, as they received a command not to leave Jerusalem, [they went into the upper-room, where the lodgings of course were, etc.]... But Simeon (Shmawon) the Zealot is by Matthew and Mark called Simon the Cananaean. Perhaps in the Hebrew tongue he is called Zealot. And it is averred by many that he is son of Joseph father of the Lord, and brother of the Lord. Moreover Judas (brother) of Jacob, was brother of the same Simon and son of Joseph, who also was brother of the Lord. This one wrote the Catholic epistle which in his name is called the epistle of Judas, in which at the beginning out of humility instead of calling himself brother of the Lord, he writes brother of Jacob. And hence it is clear that he is the same whom Matthew and Mark call Lebaeus and Thadaeus, so that they and Luke do not respectively name different persons, but only one and the same person by different names. And no wonder if in Hebrew there was a plenty of double names and multiple names, whence the ambiguity in question of the Evangelists as to Thadaeus and Judas is one of name only, not of persons. For of the first set

chosen by Christ not one perished, but only Judas the traitor. It is certain then that the other Thadaeus who was with Abgar was of the Seventy, to which fact their tombs also testify. For Thadaeus, one of the Seventy, died in Armenia in the region Artazon; but Judas of Jacob who in Matthew and Mark is Thadaeus, one of the Twelve, died in Ormi in Armenia. Thus the agreement of the Evangelists as to the names of the Apostles is confirmed.

p. 38 (c. i. 17) (Ephr.). [because he was in our number along with us . . . and there had fallen to him the lot of this service.]

p. 42 (c. i. 25) (Ephr.). [From which passed away Judas to go to his own place] . . . not to that which is full of light, which the Lord promised him, but into darkness.

p. 45 (c. ii. 2) (Ephr.). A violent sound of a wind came about in the house where were gathered together the disciples of Jesus and a sweet smell was wafted from the violence of the wind and filled all the house¹.

p. 45 (c. ii. 2) (Nyss. Ephr.). [And filled all the house in which they were sitting.] And how did the wind fill the house? Manifestly with a sweet smell and with a bright light.

p. 47 (c. ii. 3) (Ephr.). [And it sat upon each of them.] That is to say, the tongues appeared and sat upon one by one of them. It is clear that they severally (*ἑκαστοι*) sat on each, the whole of the parts sitting on one by one of them. For which reason and because of the sameness of the nature, he gathers the whole of the parts into one, and says in the singular: It sat upon each of them.

p. 49 (c. ii. 6) (Ephr.). [When there was this voice, there came together the crowd and was confused.] The voice which came from heaven was audible to all the citizens. And the smell, which from the violence of the wind was wafted, gathered and brought thither the many. This is the voice which there was.

¹ Compare the following section and ii. 6, also ii. 32. We may suspect that there was something in the text which provoked the comment about the sweet smell. Was it an assimilation to Isaiah vi. 'The house was filled with smoke,' viz. of incense?

p. 49 (c. ii. 6) (Ephr.). These then are those whom the terrible¹ voice moved to fear and the smell of fragrance brought and mustered together—when they saw the Galileans talking in all tongues, were amazed as he says: [For they heard them speak in their own tongues].

p. 52 (c. ii. 14) (aceph.). [Ye men etc. . . . not as ye think] that we are filled with new wine. [For it is but the third hour of the day.]

p. 55 (c. ii. 20) (Ephr.). For as the dawn is sign of the rising of the sun, so the signs on the day of the cross of Christ are prognostics of the pouring out of the Spirit of God.

p. 56 (c. ii. 20) (Ephr.). Whose light was given to the heathen and the vapour of smoke for the exacting from them of the requital of the blood of Christ and of the just. And there is darkened upon them the sun before the taking of them into a lake of fire, of which he says, [Until there be come the day of the Lord great and famous].

p. 58 (c. ii. 22) (Ephr.). He proclaims him man, that as with milk he may feed them with the Gospel, and so that when they be perfected, they may proclaim him judge, creator and God.

p. 62 (c. ii. 32) (Ephr.). [To whom all we] are witnesses. And to us are witness the violent voice which breathed and the sweet smell which was wafted and the strange tongues which we speak.

p. 66 (c. ii. 38) (Ephr.). For the remission which is hidden in his baptism absolves you from lawlessness, for you crucified him. And when ye are absolved and pure, then ye become worthy of the gift of the Spirit which ye saw in us, ye also. And he confirms his argument and says [For to you is the good news and to your children]. Manifest is that good tidings given by Joel, 'I will pour out of my spirit.'

p. 73 (c. iii. 1) (Ephr.). But some say, because he was inexperienced, and did not know how to walk, for he had never walked.

p. 94 (c. iv. 26, 27) (Ephr.). [Because of the Lord and his anointed.] Because in dishonouring Christ they dishonoured

¹ Probably a misreading of a Syriac text 'the voice of power.' Cp. p. 62.

the Father whom they did not dishonour(?). [For there were gathered indeed in this city against thy holy Son Jesus whom thou anointedst, Herod and Pontius Pilate with tribes and multitudes of Israel to do whatever thy hand and will afore-time determined to come to pass.]

p. 102 (c. v. 1) (Ephr.). Thus were slain the house of Ananias, not only because they thieved and hid, but because they feared not, wishing to trick those in whom the Holy Spirit that searches all was dwelling.

p. 115 (c. v. 37) (Ephr.). [After him, he says, arose Judas a Galilean in the days of there being a district-writing, and caused to revolt a great multitude after him.] Satan then raised them up before the birth and at the birth of our Lord. For he heard about his birth from the words of the angel who was with Zachariah and Mariam, and beheld that Simeon the old man was prevented, so as not to taste death till he should see our Lord Jesus Christ, and he was eager by this revolt to damage the plan of Christ. But through his haste as [he], so also this one [was destroyed] and those who [complied] with him [were scattered].

p. 127 (c. iv. 13) (Ephr.). But because they ridiculed the apostles as being simple and unlearned, he began to repeat to them the Scriptures, beginning from Abraham he summarises down to Christ and to their shamelessness.

p. 144 (c. vii. 43) (Ephr.). [Ye took, he says, the tent of Moloch] that is the cause of sacrifice, [and the star of your god Hrempha]...[the images which ye made to worship them]... For because thereof [I will transplant you to the other side of Babylon¹]....But even [the tent of witness was with our fathers in the wilderness, as he commanded who spake with Moses, to make it according to the model which he saw]....He declares then that all this was so, and they had no temple. Nay more, there being the tent, there were no sacrifices. [Surely ye did not bring to me] victims [and offerings] he says. Mark how, although they had the tent of witness, it helped them nothing, nor the signs that were previous and subsequent. But all the

¹ It will be noticed that here the text [= Arm. Vulg.] is against that of Cod. D which for *ἐπέκεινα Βαβυλῶνος* has *ἐπὶ τὰ μέρη* B.

bones were destroyed and fell to the ground¹. And he adds [in the desert,...which our fathers received and bore] succeeding one another [along with Joshua] in the possession of the Canaanites,...[whom] also [God drove out, from the face of our fathers...Until the days of David], he says, there was no temple. He [found grace before God and prayed to find a home for the God of Jacob...Furthermore Solomon built to him a house.] But not that the Highest² dwells in temples made by hands... [the heavens are my throne and the earth the footstool of my feet...What sort of house will ye build me], he says, [or what place of my repose? For all this did my hand make.]

p. 146 (c. vii. 51) (Ephr.). [O ye stiff-necked], he says, [and uncircumcised in heart].

p. 152 (c. vii. 59) (Ephr.). [They stoned Stephen who was crying aloud and saying: Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.]

p. 153 (c. viii. 1) (Ephr.). And it is similar that on this day he took their goods as spoil; which things the apostle praises: "Receive with joy the plundering of your goods³." And they all were dispersed into the villages of Judaea and Samaria, except the disciples³.

p. 154 (c. viii. 3) (Ephr.). [But Saul was doing harm to the Church. From house to house he went, dragged off men and women, threw them into prison.]

p. 155 (c. viii. 5) (Ephr.). Philip then went down thither and at the power of his signs he filled the land of Samaria with his teaching, on such a scale that Simon Magus also, who startled the Samaritans with his magic, undertook to come down with the Samaritans for the washing of the font, as the Evangelist relates in due order.

p. 158 (c. viii. 14) (Ephr.). And therefore they sent Peter and John that by their laying on of hands the Samaritans may receive the Spirit of signs and may astonish the children of Jerusalem by the works of the Spirit which the Samaritans

¹ An allusion to 1 Kings xiii. 3; or is it the equivalent of 'whose carcasses fell in the wilderness'?

² Heb. x. 34.

³ Here we should have looked for the Western gloss 'who remained in Jerusalem.'

performed. [Then they laid hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit.] It is clear that making prayer (as has been said) they laid their hands. For the Holy Spirit was not simply given nor could they give it, but there was need of much asking. For it is not the same thing to get healing and to get the power of healing. [Simon having seen that when the Apostles laid on] hands [there was given the Holy Spirit, he gave them money and said: Give also to me this power, that on whomsoever I may lay hands, he may receive the Holy Spirit]. Simon, he says, having seen. But perhaps he did not see that no signs were manifested by the Samaritans...(p. 159) he laid silver before them: why?...wherefore Peter says to him: [Thy silver be with thee unto destruction] for thou dost not use it as it is right:...[because thou hast thought to obtain the gifts of God by money] thinking little of the freedom of God's gifts... [there is not for thee part and share in that matter...thy heart] he says [is not right before God...Repent thou] he says [of those evil] thoughts [of thine, and pray the Lord that there may be remission to thee of the sinful thoughts of thy heart]... he said that there may be remission to thee of the deceitful thoughts of thy heart and from the bitter bonds of greed in which thou art entrammelled...[For unto the bitterness of wrath and unto the entanglement of unrighteousness I behold thee]...the magician said [Do ye pray for me unto the Lord, that there come not upon me aught of the things of which ye have spoken¹].

p. 163 (c. viii. 27) (Ephr.). But it is likely that on this account he came, for that he received it in succession from the tradition of the queen of the South who came to worship in the temple in the days of Solomon.

p. 166 (c. viii. 40) (Ephr.). Wherefore as he went up out of the font of baptism, there settled forthwith on him the Spirit of the power of works. That by works of the Spirit which he wrought in India, the cross which he preached might be faith-

¹ Here there do not seem to be any signs of the influence of the Western text which we should expect, such as the addition of the word 'evil' in the last line, or the account of Simon's ceaseless weeping.

fully revered¹. And an angel of the Lord snatched up Philip and the Eunuch no longer saw him. But in the old copies of the translation he says: the Spirit of the Lord snatched up Philip²: and often he repeats 'the Spirit'; I think because he would make it clear that in the snatching up by the angel of Philip he became invisible to the Eunuch, lest the angel appearing in gross form, as to many in human shape, the Eunuch should think him to be a man.

p. 168 (c. ix. 2) (Ephr.). But he, as if no one sent him, himself with obstinate will, [having come to the High Priest, asked of him letters to Damascus to the synagogues; in order that if he find anyone of that way, men or women, he may bring them bound to Jerusalem.]

p. 169 (c. ix. 3) (Ephr.). With the light then he blinded him and so frightened him and with awful fear of his glory he extinguished his rage, and with gentle voice he mollified him, in which also he was persuaded to confide. And because he feared to condemn the humility of our Lord, who appeared to him with so gentle an utterance, and he was struck with fear of dishonouring his might, who by the mighty light startled him. And while he lay prone on the earth, dazed not after the voice but before the voice, lost in wonder as to who from heaven blinded him, for Jesus was not risen from the dead as he thought. But when he said to him in censure; [Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?] what wrong hast thou suffered from me that thou doest this to me? he fainted (?) in his mind, saying, I persecute, because of the Lord of heaven; and not, I persecute him who dwells in heaven. So he asked: Who art thou, Lord, who in thy heavens art persecuted? For I persecute Jesus who is among the dead, along with his disciples.

p. 171 (c. ix. 7) (Ephr.). But the strong illumination they saw not, lest they too be blinded and there be confusion. But he blinded Saul strictly, but pitied them out of his grace.

¹ Lit. *ashamed*, but there is probably an error in the text.

² It is probable that the Armenian translator has confused and perhaps amplified the passage. The printed Vulgate has 'the angel of the Lord,' but a 12th century Codex of Paris, written by a certain Nerses, has 'the Spirit of the Lord.'

p. 171 (c. ix. 8) (Ephr.). For that reason he then raised him up into the third heaven in an inscrutable way and taught him *ἀπόρρητα* in supernatural wise...but instantly Saul rose afresh from the ground and [with open eyes, saw no one...by his hand they took him and brought him to Damascus] whither he set out to go so proudly...

p. 172 (c. ix. 10) (Ephr.). The Lord was revealed in a vision by night to Ananias, that without fear he might come and baptise the persecutor. It (?) again was revealed to Saul, that without hesitation he might awake in presence of his physician.

p. 184 (ix. 27) (Ephr.). But as he was persecuted by the Jews who were there, and as he was not trusted by the disciples who were there, for they did not, he says, believe that he was a disciple; then Barnabas presented him to all his companions who were in Jerusalem, took him by the hand and led him to the Apostles.

p. 195 (c. x. 11, 12) as in the Armenian Vulgate.

p. 201 (c. x. 34 from *εἰπεν* to 35) as in Armenian Vulgate, then the comment "that also among the heathen who to us seemed despicable, if there be found one who worships him truly, he is acceptable before him."

p. 205 (c. x.) (Ephr.). While then Peter having come in, recounted the preaching of our Lord, whence and where he began and where he finished by the Cross, and about his resurrection and about the 40 days that he remained and afterwards ascended, and that all the prophets witness to him, and that every one is forgiven who believes and is baptised in his name; so on the spot the Holy Spirit came by means of tongues and settled on all the hearers of the word, and they began to speak with tongues, as the course of the history shews.

p. 230 (c. xii. 19) (Ephr.). [But Herod, when he sought him and found him not, having asked the guards ordered them to be slain.]

p. 256 (c. xiv. 20) as in the Arm. Vulgate. Then the comment "when the day declined and it became dark, the disciples brought him into the city¹."

¹ Cf. Fleury "*cum recessisset populus vespere*," and the Sahidic version.

p. 257 (c. xiv. 23) as in Arm. Vulgate, and the following comment:

Mark the power of the Gospel. For in those very cities whence they drove them out along with their gospelling which they preached, lo! they made elders and deacons fearlessly.

p. 262 (c. xv. 6) and since there was a great dispute between the synagogue and the heathen¹ and with the Apostles and their friends, the Apostles came and gathered together and the priests along with the multitude to see what issue would come forth about this subject (λόγον). [And after much discussion Peter stood up and said to them]: for Paul stood forward in Jerusalem before Simeon and his companions against the law, as also he spoke in Antioch before them against the keeping of the law. But this Simeon, who was silent in Antioch, when Paul came forward and spoke against the law in Jerusalem, there dwelt in him the Holy Spirit², and he began to speak against the upholders of the law thus:...

p. 277 (c. xv. 29?). For as you shall keep faithfully all this without circumcision and observation of the law, ye shall receive the Holy Spirit to speak all tongues³; even as your companions received, the party of Cornelius, who were chosen before you.

p. 289 (c. xvi. 9). So then that they may hasten to come to Macedonia, where things were ready for them, there appeared to Paul as it were⁴ a man of Macedonia, for he came and prayed and besought him to come and help in Macedonia (after which c. xvi. 10—12 as in Arm. Vulg. except Philippopolis for Philippi⁵).

p. 294 (c. xvi. 19). And instead of the price of healing which

¹ It looks as if this were meant for 'the synagogue of the Gentiles,' in which case we have a suggestion of the double deputation from Antioch to Jerusalem which appears in Codex Bezae.

² We have here something like the text of Codex Bezae

ἀνεστησεν ἐν τῷ Πέτρος.

³ Does this imply the equivalent of *φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι* in the text?

⁴ The *ὡσεὶ* of Codex Bezae.

⁵ So some MSS. of the Arm. Vulg.

the masters of the girl owed to Paul, they stirred up the city against him and accused him of the laws of the Jews which he did not preach to them.

p. 296 (c. xvi. 22, 23) (Chrys. Ephr.). From *καὶ οἱ στρατηγοὶ* to *τηρεῖν αὐτοὺς* acc. to Arm. Vulg. (but add *αὐτοὺς* after *ῥαβδίσειν*). Then the commentary thus: The heads of the city in rending their garments wished to quiet the tumult of the crowd. They tried to prevent it. Because they saw the crowd set on in fury they wished to quiet their rage by the scourging. And to please the will of the crowd which was collected they pinioned the party of Paul and had them cast into the prison, and gave order to keep them carefully, wishing later on to hear about their cause.

p. 299 (c. xvi. 27) (Ephr.). Then there was a shock in the city and the doors of the prison were opened, and the bonds of the prisoners fell off them. But that there might be no sorrow to the gaoler who was about to believe, none of them fled. For because of this the gaoler deserved the baptism of the font along with his household as he says [then c. xvi. 27—31 as in Arm. Vulg.]...

Then follow vv. 31—35 acc. to Arm. Vulg. On v. 35 the comm. is as follows:

Perhaps the heads of the army knew all the great wonders¹ which had occurred, and so they did not venture of themselves to release them, but sent to the gaoler to dismiss them as it were by stealth.

p. 301 (Ephr.). The Astaritai (= *στρατηγοί*) were afraid and full of fear, they the mighty of the city, of the earthquake; and knew truly that this earthquake happened² on account of them, but they did not undertake to avow it (? = *ὁμολογεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ*). They sent secretly to bring them out.

Then vv. 35—37 acc. to Arm. Vulgate.

p. 302 (c. xvi. 39) (Ephr.). So then that this favour might

¹ It seems to be Chrysostom (ed. Savile iv. 811), but cf. Cod. D,

ΚΑΙ ΔΑΔΑΜΝΗΘΕΝΤΕΣ

ΤΟΝ ΣΕΙΣΜΟΝ ΤΟΝ ΓΕΓΟΝΟΤΑ ΕΦΟΒΗΘΗΚΑΝ.

² τὸν σεισμόν τὸν γεγνότα (D).

be unto them, they came¹ and besought of them, (saying), We knew not that ye were just²: even as the earthquake indeed presaged about you. So then we ask of you this favour, depart from this city, lest the same men gather together after the earthquake against you, (the same) who before the earthquake were gathered together³.

p. 310 (c. xvii. 14) (Ephr.). So he came as far as the sea shore, receding⁴. But the Holy Spirit prevented him from preaching, lest they should slay him⁵. [And those who conducted Paul, led him as far as Athens, and having received] from Paul⁶ [a command to Silas and Timothy that they should at once come to him] in Athens. [And they went] to him when they received the command⁷.

¹ Cod. D.

ΠΑΡΑΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΙ.

² Cod. D.

ΗΓΝΟΗΣΑΜΕΝ ΤΑ ΚΑΘ' ΥΜΑΣ
ΟΤΙ ΕΣΤΑΙ ΑΝΔΡΕΣ ΔΙΚΑΙΟΙ.

³ Cod. D.

ΠΑΡΕΚΑΛΕΣΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕΣ
ΕΚ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΛΕΩΣ ΤΑΥΤΗΣ ΕΞΕΛΘΑΤΕ
ΜΗΠΟΤΕ ΠΑΛΙΝ ΣΥΝΣΤΡΑΦΩΣΙΝ ΗΜΕΙΝ
ΕΠΙΚΡΑΖΟΝΤΕΣ ΚΑΘ' ΥΜΩΝ.

⁴ Cod. D.

ΑΠΕΛΘΕΙΝ ΕΠΙ ΤΗΝ ΘΑΛΑССΑΝ
abire ad mare uersus.

⁵ Cod. D.

ΠΑΡΗΛΘΕΝ ΔΕ ΤΗΝ ΘΕССΑΛΙΑΝ
ΕΚΩΛΥΘΗ ΓΑΡ ΕΙΣ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ
ΚΗΡΥΞΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ.

⁶ Cod. D.

ΛΑΒΟΝΤΕΣ ΔΕ ΕΝΤΟΛΗΝ ΠΑΡΑ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ.

⁷ The words 'and they went to him' are due to the arrangement of the text in the Bezan Greek, which runs

ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΝ ΣΕΙΛΑΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΝ
ΟΠΩС ΕΝ ΤΑΧΕΙ ΕΛΘΩСΙΝ
ΠΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΕΞΗΕCΑΝ
=ad eum proficiscebantur.

The last line has been detached from the previous ones by the reader or translator, and made into a separate sentence. If this is the correct explanation (and it is almost certain in view of the absence of the verb *ἐξήεσαν* in the rendering of the previous sentence), then we have again an instance of the early currency of the Bezan line-division.

p. 329 (c. xviii. 17) (Ephr.). "The believing Greeks beat Sosthenes the head of the Synagogue"...and that the governor when he saw it might not require vengeance of the indignity offered to him, i.e. to Sosthenes, he became as though he saw not, that their blows might be redoubled yet more¹.

p. 331 (c. xviii. 19, 20) (Ephr.). So Paul came and arrived at Ephesus and with him Aquila's party and he spoke there in the Synagogue. And they asked him to remain with them; but he did not choose to stay longer with them; because whither he was concerned (to go) thither he had to go. However he did not simply leave them, but with a promise again that they should expect his coming by the will of God. This he says, that they may pray God for his coming, that He may will it.

p. 334 (c. xix. 1) (Ephr.). Paul wished of his own will to go to Jerusalem; but the Spirit sent him back to Asia², as he relates; [it came to pass], he says [while Apollo was in Corinth, Paul went round the upper regions and came down to Ephesus and found certain of the disciples and said to them: If ye received the Holy Spirit in believing. But they say, But not even if the Holy Spirit is have we heard etc.] as far as v. 7, inclusive acc. to Arm. Vulg., only reading *κ. Ἰησου Χριστου* v. 5.

p. 340 (c. xix. 15) (Ephr.). You, he says, mutilated and broken-backed by the devils, who are you who bid the devils depart? And the devil straitened (= *συνέστελλε*) them right and left and drove them forth from the house.

p. 352 (c. xix. 38, 39) (Ephr.). This Demetrius³, vile and

¹ This involves the reading of D *tunc gallio fingeat eum non uidere*. Cf. the Fleury text: *et gallio simulabat se non uidere*.

² Cod. D.

ΘΕΛΟΝΤΟΣ ΔΕ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ
ΚΑΤΑ ΤΗΝ ΙΔΙΑΝ ΒΟΥΛΗΝ
ΠΟΡΕΥΕΣΘΑΙ ΕΙΣ ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΑ
ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΤΟ ΠΝΑ ΥΠΟστρεφειν εις την ασιαν.

³ Cod. D.

ΕΙ ΜΕΝ ΟΥΝ ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ ΟΥΤΟΣ
ΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΣΥΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΤΕΧΝΕΙΤΕ.

shameless, he says, and the children (*παῖδες*) of his craft, if they have any suit with one another¹, let them stand forward and make it clear to the hegemon. And [if there be] any other² [enquiry, let] it be [pronounced on in the lawful assembly].

p. 354 (c. xx. 3) (Ephr.). According to the Armenian Vulgate, and then as follows: For that the Jews plotted against him, he wished to go into Syria, but the Spirit turned him back into Macedonia³.

p. 356 (c. xx. 7) (Ephr.). For as Paul was speaking from dawn until midnight, the youth fell asleep and fell from three stories, because he was sitting there; and gave up the ghost. But Paul went down, fell on him and restored him to life, as he relates. After which vv. 8—11 inclusive according to the Armenian Vulgate.

p. 363 (c. xx. 24) (Ephr.). When he began to tell truly what he was to undergo in Jerusalem from priests and scribes, but he for the sake of the saints who were in Jerusalem was going to comfort them; and again, that he taught, if ill-treatment does not appal him, then without scruple or fear, without shrinking, he was hastening forward to meet difficulties. Nevertheless he adds this saying: *non aestimata mihi anima mea pretiosior quam labores Evangelii vitae et quam ministerium Evangelii verbi quod a domino nostro recepi, id est, testimonium dabo Judaeis et Graecis*⁴.

p. 410 (c. xxiv.) (Ephr.). When the Rhetor spoke about the peace of their people, and about the disturbance which in all places Paul excited against them, then an order came to Paul to make a defence of himself. (Then c. xxiv. 10 as far as *ἐπι-*

¹ Cod. D.

ΕΧΟΥΣΙΝ ΠΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ ΤΙΝΑ ΛΟΓΟΝ.

² Cod. D.

ΕΙ ΔΕ ΠΕΡΙ ΕΤΕΡΩΝ ΕΠΙΖΗΤΕΙΤΕ.

³ Cf. D.

ΚΑΙ ΓΕΝΗΘΕΙΣ ΑΥΤΩ ΕΠΙΒΟΥΛΗΣ ΥΠΟ ΤΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ
ΗΘΕΛΗΣΕΝ ΑΝΑΧΘΗΝΑΙ ΕΙΣ ΣΥΡΙΑΝ
ΕΙΠΕΝ ΔΕ ΤΟ ΠΝΑ ΑΥΤΩ ΥΠΟΣΤΡΕΦΕΙΝ
ΔΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΑΣ.

⁴ Observe the agreement in the concluding words with Cod. Bezae:

ΔΙΑΜΑΡΤΥΡΑΣΘΑΙ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΛΛΗΣΙΝ.

στάρμενος acc. to Arm. Vulg.) Therefore Paul was no stranger or new comer, if he had known the judge for many years.

p. 410 (c. xxiv. 11) (Ephr.). But he stood forward and said: They have accounted me a raving maniac and a disturber of the synagogue. Be cognisant, O hegemon, that in this city I am but a few days and not any considerable number. And in the temple, as I was worshipping, they came and found me, I will not say a crowd mustered apart; I was teaching. So then if in their synagogue outside the city or here in the city they could not catch me and find me teaching a crowd mustered together, how where all these events were not found, do they come and accuse me as an impostor¹?

p. 411 (c. xxiv. 14) (Ephr.). However though I were even a Christian, as they say, yet I also worship the God of our fathers, the family of Abraham who without the law worshipped God. So that I believe in the law and in the prophets, whatsoever is written.

p. 439 (c. xxvii. 23) (Ephr.). Paul told them about the angel who appeared to him and said to him: Before the Caesar thou art to stand and your ship is broken, and not one man of the 270 men in it shall be lost.

After which vv. 27—32 acc. to Arm. Vulg.

p. 454 (c. xxviii. 30) (Ephr.). And he was a space of two years in all at his own expense, and received all who came in unto him. So when (ὥς) he discoursed to Jews from dawn till night about Christ from the law and prophets and reiterated about the unfaithful who received not the words of Isaiah; Luke turned and remembered his actions and the labours of his hands, which he gave as hire of his house for one biennium². And that he ceased not to discourse about Christ

¹ The Armenian literally.

² This apparently inexplicable sentence means, I suspect, that there was a gloss in the text concerning the cloak and books, which Paul left in Troas (2 Tim. iv. 13), and used them to pay for the rent of the Roman lodging. The word 'actions' stands for the Syriac ܐܡܠܬܝܢ, and this is a misreading of the transliterated Greek φερόν. (The Peshito, however, makes it a book-case ܐܡܠܬܝܢ ܕܡܝܬܐ; as of course, it might be; cf. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen*, p. 65.) The Philoxenian transliterates ܐܡܠܬܝܢ.

to Jews and heathen, who went out and came in to him. And he was saying that Jesus Christ is the son of God¹. For for his sake we labour and attain to crowns by means of Christ.

That Ephrem really imagined the house was to be paid for by the proceeds of the cloak and books, may be seen from the following extract from the prologue to 2 Tim. in Ephrem's Comm. on the Pauline Epp.

"Penulam (*phighon*, evidently from a Syriac transliteration) autem et libros iussit afferre, aut ut venditis illis, *penderet pro domo conducta* ; aut ut haereditare faceret, cui iustum esset."

This reference in Ephrem on the Pauline epistles renders almost certain our explanation of the obscure passage in Ephrem on the Acts.

¹ Cf. the Philoxenian text, and the Latin codd. *tol.* and *demidov*.