

SWEET GOSPEL HARMONY. *concl*

PART IV

CHARACTER OF THE GLOSSES IN THE WESTERN TEXT OF THE ACTS¹.

We have, in a preceding lecture, completely justified Mr Chase in his hypothesis of an Old Syriac text of the Acts behind the venerable Peshito, and we must now turn for a brief survey of his contention that the hypothesis which we have verified for him is an adequate one to explain the peculiarities of the Western text in general, and of the Bezan Acts in particular.

It will not be possible for us to make a complete examination of a theory which is only partially brought out, and, as we shall show, not very adequately thought out. But we will place ourselves as far as possible in Mr Chase's position, and see whether the glosses look natural and explicable in the light of his hypothesis. When we have done that, we must make a similar attempt to appreciate Dr Blass's view that the Bezan text is a true Lucan text, and the forcible arguments by which he vindicates so many of the expressions in the much abused Codex. Or better, since the investigation is a series of examinations of various passages, we shall try to look at them one by one from every point of view and see whether they suggest Greek, Latin or Syriac individualisms.

Now with regard to the question of Syriasm in the Codex Bezae, I feel sure that no one who had a good knowledge of Semitic languages would read the MS. through without admitting that there were a number of things which were immediately explicable by Syriac influence. Some of these were pointed out in my tract on the Codex Bezae. But at the same time I have no doubt that there would arise a suspicion that other explanations were possible; and further, there would be

¹ This lecture was delivered in the Divinity School, Cambridge, January 24, 1894.

a number of textual expansions of which the assumed Semitic scholar would say, "This cannot be credited to any Syriac hand"; and others of which he would say that if they stood for Syriac, it was very bad Syriac. To take an instance under each head, the first that occur to one's mind, no one would be willing to credit the Syriac language with the addition of the word *ἐστίν* to the Greek question in Mark v. 9, *τί σοι ὄνομα ἐστίν*, because a formula of that kind would be in Syriac either

ܡܬܝܢ ܐܢܝܢ or *ܡܬܝܢ ܕܢܝܢ*

and while we may freely admit that a complete retranslation of the Syriac into Greek or Latin might give the added vocable, the process of glossing an already existing text so as to make up its deficiencies from another text would not give the desired expansion. Even if we explain it as an assimilation to Luc. viii. 30, the connexion cannot be made through the Syriac. Such a case as this, and numerous parallel cases might be cited for which I refer to my book, must either be a case of primitive variation in the Greek, or it must be a case of Latinisation. Blass would perhaps say the former, though I do not quite know whether he is prepared to extend his theory of a primitive dual text beyond the limits of the Acts and the Gospel of Luke. I should, probably, adhere to my view that it is a case of Latin influence. But in any case it can hardly be Syriac, unless we assume that a complete new Greek or Latin version was made from the Syriac.

In a similar manner, if we draw attention to the very interesting gloss in Acts xiv. 2,

Ο ΔΕ ΚΕ ΕΔΩΚΕΝ ΤΑΧΥ ΕΙΡΗΝΗΝ,

we should hesitate to say 'this is a Syriac gloss,' because the expression in Syriac 'to give peace' means 'to say farewell.' For this reason the translators of the Old Testament have sometimes felt obliged to change the literal rendering of the corresponding Hebrew expression and substitute another word that would be clear of misunderstanding. For instance, in Numbers xxvi. 6, instead of transferring "the Lord lift up

His face upon thee and give thee peace," the Syriac says 'and make thee peace.' In the same way in 1 Chron. xxii. 9 the words 'and I will give peace and quiet in his days' are translated 'and peace and tranquillity shall be in his days.' No doubt these changes in the translation were intended to remove possible misunderstanding. At first sight then, this gloss in the Bezan Acts does not look like good Syriac. Probably Mr Chase would say that the occurrence of the gloss in the companion document (Codex E) in the form "God made peace" (ὁ δὲ θεὸς εἰρήνην ἐποίησεν) furnishes the clue to the underlying Syriac: and of course this may be so; I am only pointing out that there are a number of things on the face of the Bezan text which do not look like Syriac at all. Perhaps that is inevitable in such a complicated enquiry, and where we know next to nothing of the changes which the documents have passed through.

But let us assume for a while that Mr Chase's explanation of the Western variants is the true one, and read the text in the light of it, and examine carefully some of his illustrations of the theory. Since all the glosses are in his view Syriac, we may begin anywhere.

The first thing that we desire to draw attention to is that a number of the glosses in the Codex Bezae are wrongly inserted, and the non-appreciation of this palaeographical feature of the MS. has misled Mr Chase (as well as some other writers) into a variety of impossible explanations of the meaning and origin of the glosses. We are to prove first that this displacement of the glosses is a fact. Let us begin with the interesting gloss at the close of Acts vi. in which we are told by the Bezan text

καὶ εἶδον τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ
ὥσει πρόσωπον ἀγγελοῦ
ἐστῶτος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν

where the last line is supposed to be a gloss.

The Latin of the text and gloss is as follows:

et uiderunt faciem eius
quasi faciem angeli
stans in medio eorum.

The gloss appears also in the Fleury palimpsest¹ in the form

uidebant uultu eius tamquam
uultum angeli dī stantis inter illos

where the variations from the Latin of Codex Bezae must be carefully noted. The Fleury text is generally held to be an independent translation from a Greek text which is in substantial agreement with that of the Codex Bezae; and to furnish evidence that the Bezan Greek is not the solitary phenomenon which it sometimes seems to be. In the present case it follows the Greek of Codex Bezae in translating ἐστῶτος, but it does not render the supposed ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν literally, and it adds (if indeed it be an addition) the word *dei* after *angeli*.

Prof. Bernard has recently pointed out that the same gloss on the text is contained in a citation of the passage in an Irish MS., the Leabhar Breac or Speckled Book². He remarks as follows:

‘In Acts vi. 15 we have *uidebant...faciem angeli stantis inter illos* which is almost the same as the reading of the Fleury Palimpsest (h) ...*angeli dei stantis inter illos*. The verbal variations here from Codex Bezae (d) = *faciem angeli stans in medio eorum* seem to indicate that this gloss, at all events, originated in the Greek and not in the Latin text.’

We have then two fresh Latin authorities to add to the evidence of Codex Bezae (the only authority for the gloss known to Tischendorf).

Mr Bernard is naturally staggered at the thought that the apparently impossible and ungrammatical reading of the Codex Bezae can be responsible for the grammatical Greek, and for the variant forms of the Latin tradition. We will justify the Bezan Latin presently.

Having now registered the variant forms in which the gloss has come down to us, we ask the question, what possible

¹ *reg* of Tischendorf; *h* of Hort.

² *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy*. Vol. xxx. Pt. viii., p. 322.

motive can be assigned to the expansion in question? If we cannot answer the enquiry 'Who made the gloss?' we ought at all events to be able to assign some motive for the conduct of the anonymous scribe and to say why he made it. To this enquiry two answers are made. Prof. Blass counts the passage as one of those in which the primitive dual redaction of the Acts can be recognized; and praises the gloss, which is really a part of St Luke's own text, on account of the vividness which it obviously imparts to the account¹.

The other explanation is that of Mr Chase and is as follows:

"The last line is an interpolation, due to assimilation to xxiv. 21 where the Greek is *ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐστὼς* but the Syriac Vulgate has

ܐܡܪܬܬܐ ܕܝܠܐ ܕܝܠܐ ܕܝܠܐ ܕܝܠܐ

The word *ܐܡܪܬܬܐ* is used to translate *ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν* in Matt. xviii. 2, 20, Lc. xxiv. 36. Note the order of the words in the Bezan gloss and in the Syriac of xxiv. 21. The Greek gloss must therefore be the rendering of an old Syriac gloss."

The reader will, of course, turn to Acts xxiv. 21 in order to see whether there is any possible reason for the reference made by Mr Chase's Syriac glossator. He will look for 'the angel' who is glossed and not find him; nor will he be able to make any connexion between the language of St Paul about himself in the xxivth chapter, and the language of St Luke about St Stephen in the vith. In fact, there is no connexion between the two passages, and one can only conclude that Mr Chase turned the gloss back into Syriac, and then looked for the scriptural words which in other places most closely agreed with the language of the glossator. The rest of his identification is equally devoid of force.

For, be it observed, *the gloss does not belong* in the last sentence of the vith chapter of the Acts at all, but in the next sentence at the beginning of the viith chapter: where the Bezan text is

¹ *Stud. u. Krit.* 1894, p. 115, "anschaulicher als in α."

ΕΙΠΕΝ ΔΕ Ο ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΤΩ ΣΤΕΦΑΝΩ
ait autem pontifex Stephano.

We proceed to show that the gloss belongs after the word *ἀρχιερεῦς* in the Greek, and after *pontifex* in the Latin.

The words are added in the sense that 'the high-priest stood in the midst and said to Stephen'; we have the exact parallel in the language of the Gospel in Mark xiv. 60

καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς μέσον.

If then there has been assimilation, this must be the passage to which reference has been made. The situations are similar, and the language of the unglossed passage furnishes the requisite link with the passage from which the addition has been made¹; Stephen before the high-priest has been equated with Christ before Caiaphas, and the judicial examination of the disciple has been coloured from that of his Lord.

So much being clear, it is also clear that (1) the Bezan Latin *is more archaic than the Bezan Greek*², for it has preserved the necessary *stans* where the Bezan Greek has followed the exigencies of grammar and replaced *ἐστώς* by *ἐστῶτος*; (2) that the expansion made by the Fleury text *angeli dei* is probably a later addition and not a part of the original Western gloss; (3) that the Bezan Greek and Latin (*ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν*) are nearer to the primitive form than the *inter illos* of the Fleury palimpsest and the Leabhar Breac; (4) that Mr Bernard was wrong in praising the Greek of the gloss as nearer to the source than the Latin; (5) that Prof. Blass was wrong in calling it a part of the primitive text; (6) that Mr Chase was wrong in the source which he assigned to the gloss and in everything he said about it; (7) that I myself am an idiot for not having seen all this sooner.

¹ The importance of this consideration seems often to have escaped Mr Chase; it is not sufficient to establish assimilation between passages after glossation; the assimilation must be found in nucleus before glossation; something must suggest it before it is made.

² Chase, p. 5. 'The formation of the Bezan Latin must be independent of and later in time than the formation of the Bezan Greek.'

So much being premised we have still to ask the question as to the language in which the gloss was made.

It appears from the Fleury text as if there had been more of the passage in S. Mark borrowed than now appears, or as if the assimilation had been carried further by some later hand. For we have instead of the blunt text of the edited Acts

εἶπεν δὲ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς

the longer form

et interrogavit sacerdos Stefanum,

where notice that both D and E (Cod. Laudianus) are in evidence for τῷ Στεφάνῳ, and that the text of Mark is *καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς μέσον ἐπηρώτησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, λέγων·*

[*d* interrogabat ihm dicens],

and further the Peshito shows signs of the existence of something answering to *ἐπηρώτησεν*, since it reads the opening sentence

ܠܡܐ ܕܝ ܡܠܟܐ

= *et interrogavit eum summus sacerdos.*

The genesis of the passage seems, therefore, pretty clear.

But it may be asked, was not the gloss originally added in Syriac rather than in Greek or Latin? Possibly it may have been; but while there are some things which look like it, there are others which are doubtful. The strongest argument would be the replacement of the primitive *ἀναστὰς* by *ἐστὼς* which might easily have been accomplished through the Syriac *ܡܠܐ*; on the other hand the Syriac would almost certainly have broken up the participial construction; moreover we miss the *ܠܡܐ ܕܝ* in the Syriac where it must have been perfectly natural, and we notice also that the text of Mc. xiv. 60 has the equivalent of *ἐν μέσῳ* (as also the Diatessaron), and not the Bezan *ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν*. Probably Mr Chase can clear up the matter, now that we have given him the clue. I may remark that the displacement of glosses (of which this is our first instance) is more natural in Syriac MSS. than in Greek Codices, on account of the glosses being often written along

the margin, vertically; this custom carries the gloss along so much of the margin that the risk of displacement is much increased. The occurrence of frequent displacement in the glosses is, therefore, a palaeographical feature which is more in harmony with Syriac originals than with Greek texts¹.

Our next passage shall be the difficult gloss in Acts xv. 29

αφ' ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς
 εὖ πράζετε φερόμενοι
 ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνι ἐρρωθεῖ
 = a quibus conuersantes uos ipsos
 bene agitis ferentes
 in santo spo ualete.

The gloss is more interesting than the previous one, on account of the antiquity of its attestation. It is found in Irenaeus and in Tertullian; and found in forms which suggest either a primitive difficulty or an initial roughness of translation.

Irenaeus has *ambulantes in spiritu sancto*, the Greek of the gloss being problematic², and Tertullian has either

rectante uos spiritu sancto,
 or vectante uos spiritu sancto,

either of which is conceivably correct, *vectante* being near to the Greek *φερόμενοι*, and *rectante* being a good representation of the idea of guidance which underlies the word.

The occurrence of three such distinct Latin forms shows, as we have said, that there was either a difficult word somewhere to be translated, which has met with varied treatment at the hand of translators; or that the first translator into Latin made a bad or obscure rendering, which others have had to emend.

¹ Note however that the occurrence of 'stans' in the Bezan Latin shows that the gloss was meant to go into the next line in the Latin: which almost implies that it had stood outside on the margin of a [Graeco-] Latin text.

² We are perfectly safe in reasoning from the existence of the gloss in the Latin to its existence in the Greek. But whether the Greek was *ἀγόμενοι* or *φερόμενοι* or *περιπατοῦντες*, we cannot, at present, undertake to say. Probably a comparative study of the Latin of Irenaeus with the extant Greek would throw some light upon the question.

What are we then to say of the gloss: is it a part of the primitive dual redaction; a sentence truly belonging to the first period of genesis of the document? Or is it an insertion resulting from the tendency of scribe or commentator?

I believe the first suggestion with a view to explaining the gloss was that which I made in my 'Study of Cod. Bezae,' that it was the attempt of a later hand to refine upon the obvious unspirituality and insufficiency of the Jerusalem Concordat.

No doubt such a feeling would exist, both amongst the more spiritual people, like the Montanists, and amongst the more anti-Judaic like the Marcionites. The former would naturally desire some reference to the Paraclete, the latter would resent an apostolical communication which so partially removed the yoke of Judaism from the religious world.

I am sorry, however, that I made this suggestion as to the need for reforming and expanding the Jerusalem decrees because it has misled my friend Mr Chase, who has adopted the reason given by me for the gloss, and endorsed it by a number of arguments which are, I am afraid, all wide of the mark. His language is as follows:

"The Old Syriac¹ has 'well-ye-shall-be, be strong in our Lord.' Probably the Bezan εὖ πράξατε (true text εὖ πράξετε) represents an Old Syriac reading 'well-be-ye.' But what of the Bezan interpolation? I believe that the desire to make the apostolic decree more spiritual led to the introduction into the Old Syriac text of a phrase from a Pauline epistle which dealt with the Judaistic controversy. See Gal. v. 18. 'But if in the Spirit led (ܠܝܚܕܝܐ) are ye, ye are not under the law'; and compare Rom. viii. 14, Jn. xvi. 13, Lc. iv. 1: 'There led him (ܠܝܚܕܝܐ) the Spirit into the wilderness'; it will be remembered that we saw reason to think that the context of this last passage suggested the gloss in v. 26². The rendering of the Syriac 'led' by *φερόμενοι* is quite natural (see the use of the Greek word in Mc. xv. 22, John xxi. 18, Acts xiv. 13),

¹ He means the Peshito.

² We shall show, bye and bye, that this is a delusion.

especially as the Bezan scribe in translating Syriac glosses frequently avoids the most obvious Greek word. The choice of the word was *possibly* influenced by 2 Pet. i. 21 (where the Syriac has another word).

This suggestion as to the source of the gloss is strongly confirmed by the fact that Irenaeus (iii. 17) preserves another Pauline form of the gloss 'ambulantes in spiritu sancto' (Gal. v. 16). It would appear that in this passage Irenaeus, like Cod. E in v. 39, vi. 10, preserves an Old Syriac reading different from that implied in Cod. D. My position that these are Syriac glosses is confirmed by the fact that the Syriac Vulgate preserves yet another expedient for spiritualizing the decree. In place of the simple 'be-strong' (ܝܫܬܪܫܬܐ), it has the phrase (see above) 'be strong in our Lord.' With this compare Eph. iv. 15, ܝܫܬܪܫܬܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ. This Bezan gloss....together with that preserved in Irenaeus, implies an Old Syriac version of the Pauline Epistles."

I have quoted this passage almost at length on account of the illustration which it furnishes of Mr Chase's methods. Of the whole of this imposing mass of arguments, the only thing that is correct is the statement, which might have been made in half a line, that *φερόμενοι* may conceivably be equated with the Syriac ܝܫܬܪܫܬܐ.

For the gloss does not belong where Mr Chase imagines and where I first thought it to belong, but is a part of the following sentence, describing the Apostolic Mission to Antioch. The current text of this passage is

οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀπολυθέντες κατήλθον εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν,
with which we must compare the parallel passage (xiii. 4),

οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος
κατήλθον εἰς Σελεύκειαν.

Accordingly, the sentence in Acts xv. 30 should run,

'So they were led by the Holy Spirit, and came down to Antioch.'

The gloss, inserted here, makes perfect sense; it is in fact merely an expansion, or, if you will, merely an explanation of ἀπολυθέντες. There is no need to invoke Montanus or Marcion, or any anti-Judaic commentator, nor to make references to Galatians and parallels in Romans, John and Luke. Such references could not in any case have been in the mind of the glossator, unless indeed he were writing a sermon instead of transcribing a text.

Neither is there any reason to assume three separate forms of the Old Syriac in order to meet the exigences of the theory, one for Beza, and one for Irenaeus, and one for Tertullian¹. Three separate Syriac origins, with perhaps a fourth for the Peshito, is rather a large order to explain so early a corruption. Neither is it necessary to explain the translation of the supposed Syriac word by φερόμενοι on the theory of translation by unlikely words, and a possible influence of 2 Pet. i. 21, where the Syriac has another word.

I am not quite sure whether I understand Mr Chase at this point. Does he mean that there was an Old Syriac text of 2 Peter? If so, he ought certainly to make a definite statement of his discovery of that lost text. But even so, he will still have to assign a reason why a passage from 2 Pet. should have any influence in the rendering of another passage in the Acts with which it is not in verbal agreement. If the reference to 2 Pet. is a good one, why is it not adequate to explain the gloss as from a Greek original? and does not the comment of Ephrem (p. 277) "ye shall receive the Holy Spirit to speak all tongues," imply the equivalent of a primitive φερόμενοι which has been interpreted as in 2 Pet. i. 21? It will be seen that we entirely dissent from Mr Chase's methods, but that is not the same thing as proving his theory invalid at every point, nor is it a reason for discarding it at all. Let us ask the question whether the gloss, as replaced in the sequence of Acts xv. 30, can be referred to its original language.

When we turn to the text of the Peshito, in the two passages which we have ventured to compare, we find the

¹ See the note on p. 95 of Chase. "It is quite possible that this (Tertullian's form) is to be traced to a Syriac gloss derived directly from Lc. iv. 1."

desiderated word ܐܝܬܐ in neither, nor any trace of the gloss in xv. 30. But we do find, and this is worthy of note, that the two passages are in harmony, as far as the principal verb is concerned, in the Peshito: compare Acts xiii. 4

ܐܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܐ
ܐܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܐ

and Acts xv. 30

ܐܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܐ ܐܝܬܐ

But whether any conclusion can be drawn from this we are not able to say. For the very same approximation of the accounts appears in Cod. Bezae which reads in xiii. 4

· ipsi vero dismissi ab sp̄o sancto

and in xv. 30

illi quidem dismissi.

A translation from a richer language into a poorer vocabulary often results in an approximation of similar accounts: and as we have said, there does not seem any trace of the word ܐܝܬܐ which Mr Chase suggests: but perhaps this suggestion also is a mistake. Possibly Mr Chase may be able to find the traces of the missing or requisite word. We have no prejudice against his theory: for the sooner the problem is solved the better for all persons concerned.

Let us turn in the next place to the passage Acts v. 38, and see whether the supposition of a Syriac original will throw light upon the glosses, and in particular upon the curious gloss which appears in Cod. D in the form

MH MIANANTEC TAC ΧΕΙΡΑΣ

= non coinquinatas manus

and in Cod. E

MH ΜΟΛΥΝΟΝΤΕC TAC ΧΕΙΡΑΣ ΥΜΩΝ

= non coinquinantes manus vestras.

The passage is one to which I drew special attention (1) on

explanation seems to me quite impossible, then the gloss has again got into a wrong place in the text¹, as we saw in the two previous cases. If then the gloss be Syriac, we have drawn attention to three cases of displacement in the inserted glosses. We thus arrive at the conclusion that 'the glosses in the Codex Bezae show signs of having been inserted from the margin, either from the margin of the ancestry of the Codex or from the margin of some other Codex, the language of which Codex is not yet quite clear'; and further 'the displacement which is observable in certain of the glosses, is a strong though not a conclusive argument, against the theory that those glosses formed a part of a primitive redaction of the text.' Prof. Blass's theory will be much weakened if we can show that any of the glosses on which he relies are out of their true place. It is true that the theory of contamination of one of the forms of the primitive redaction by the other may help him to evade the difficulty; for if there were two primitive forms of the text, the second form (which Blass calls β , and which represents what Hort calls the Western text) does not exist unmixed, but, as we have it in D, in the form of an α -text contaminated by a β -text, or conversely; and this leaves open the possibility that sentences of the β -text may be wrongly affixed, as it can be shown that single words are often wrongly restored from some companion document. But it is doubtful whether this hypothesis would bear the strain of the cases of displacement which we are able to bring forward.

Returning to the gloss which we were just now discussing, we do not think that the explanation given of the displacement is decisive in the same sense as in the two previous cases, where there is really no room for doubt. But it would seem to be much more natural to explain the added words in this way, than to translate the sentence back into Syriac as Mr Chase does, and then search for obscure parallels to the language in the Old Testament².

¹ Or rather it has moved away from its right place.

² Mr Chase's argument is "In Isaiah lix. 3 there occur the words 'your hands are defiled with blood.'...From this verse came, I believe, an Old Syriac gloss (=and do not defile your hands)." Credo, quia impossibile est. There is no motive to take either a transcriber or glossator into Isaiah.

Having now shown that certain of the glosses do not lend themselves to Mr Chase's elaborate explanations, nor to Prof. Blass's justifications, on account of their not standing where the explanations assume them to stand, we pass on to make a few remarks on the question of the assimilations of the text, as when one passage of the Acts is conformed to or expanded from another passage of the Acts or as when the text of the Acts is similarly expanded from the Gospels, the Diatessaron, the Epistles, the Prophets, the writings of Papias (in Syriac), and the like, according to Mr Chase's explanations.

The question between Blass and the rest of the critics really turns upon the extent to which assimilation can be detected in the supposed glosses: if they are merely textual parallelisms developed in a version, and projected back upon the original text, the position defended by Blass becomes a hopeless one. But here, also, much will depend upon the extent to which the corrupting influence can be proved to work; it is quite possible that there may be an occasional assimilation in the text without our being obliged to condemn as non-original those many vivid historical and geographical details with which the Codex Bezae abounds. No assimilation will explain the tarriance at Trogyllium, the fright of the Philippian magistrates over the earthquake, the visit of S. Paul to Myra (to which Ramsay has drawn especial attention on account of its influence on the story of Paul and Thekla), or the statement that Paul spent the night somewhere on the way from Cesarea to Jerusalem. The geographical details must be original or else they are the work of a man who was thoroughly familiar with the navigation of the Levant¹ and the topography of the Holy Land.

But, then, on the other hand, it is quite possible that many of the apparently original details are due to assimilation. We have pointed out two trifling instances already. Let us take one of the most striking cases, the passing by Thessaly in Acts xvii. 15. The man who added it, if it is an addition, was a Levantine traveller. Was he the original writer of the book, or a later wanderer?

¹ It is in such questions as these that Prof. Ramsay's criticism is so valuable and suggestive.

The added passage in Cod. Bezae is

παρῆλθεν δὲ τὴν θεσσαλίαν
ἐκωλύθη γὰρ εἰς ἀγτοῦς
κηρυῖναι τὸν λόγον

and we have shown that something like it was current in the Old Syriac.

The obvious parallel is Acts xvi. 6 where the current text is

Διῆλθον δὲ τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν, κωλυθέντες
ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος (D adds μηδενὶ) λαλῆσαι τὸν λόγον
(D adds τοῦ θεοῦ) ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ.....παρελθόντες (D διελθόντες)
δὲ τὴν Μυσίαν κατέβησαν (D κατήντησαν) εἰς Τρωάδα.

The suggestion that the expansion in c. xvii. 15 was made by a reviser in D, under the influence of the parallel passage in xvi. 6, leads to the supposition that he found in his text which he was reproducing the word *παρελθόντες* and not the *διελθόντες* which now stands in the Codex Bezae. That is he was revising from what Blass calls the *a*-text. But this is too hasty a conclusion, for the reviser, who is nothing if not a geographer, may be using the word *παρῆλθον* because he wishes to imply that St Paul went to Athens by sea (as we may be morally certain that he did go), and so did not go through Thessaly, but coasted by it¹.

The precision of the language is such that it seems difficult to ascribe it to a translator, who is merely incorporating an assimilation in a Syriac or other version. And this same precision of geographical knowledge seems to come out in the counter-change in Acts xvi. 6 where the D text substitutes *διελθόντες* because he imagines St Paul to have gone through Mysia. Here again the change is so delicate that it hardly seems likely that casual retranslations from the Latin or Syriac could effect so much².

¹ Hence Prof. Ramsay is perhaps incorrect in saying (*Church in the Roman Empire*, ed. 3, p. 160) that the reviser did not observe that Paul probably sailed direct from the coast of Macedonia to Athens.

² Prof. Ramsay points out to me that "there was in reality no need for the latter change, because in the Travel-document *διέρχονται* is used with an accusative of locality to indicate 'going from point to point along a road or over a country'

Moreover when we turn to the Syriac of Acts xvi. 6, we find

ܐܠܠܗܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ
ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ (v. 8) ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ ܕܝܗܘܐ
ܕܝܗܘܐ

"and the Holy Spirit forbade them to speak the word of God in Asia;...and when they came out of Mysia," and this construction, which has every appearance of being close to the original rendering (for it agrees with D in the insertion of the 'word of God' and implies the journey through Mysia in a form which certainly suggests dependence upon the text of D) can hardly furnish us with the material for the gloss in xvii. 15: for this gloss does not imitate the construction, nor take up the equivalent of *τοῦ θεοῦ*, nor translate the equivalent Syriac word into *λαλῆσαι*. It will be seen, therefore, that there is a good deal to be said against the hypothesis of Syriac assimilation. Was it then a Greek assimilation? This has more probability; the language is similar; the passage to which assimilation is made stands as in the *a*-text without any addition to *τὸν λόγον*; and it is possible that this may be the explanation. But I can believe that Blass would find it possible to defend the originality (and I may say the Lucanity) of the gloss on the ground that *παρῆλθεν* in Acts xvii. 15 could equally be taken in the sense of 'neglect Thessaly,' especially when the explanation was made that 'he was forbidden to preach the word to them.'

On the whole the examination of the passage leans rather to the side of Blass, and in favour of an original element in the Bezan text, than to the theory of a revision; and certainly there is little to be said in support of Chase's position. We must remember, also, in dealing with these parallel passages, that Luke is a writer who repeats himself occasionally *with variations*,

in the performance of one's purpose, viz. preaching. This construction is found only in the Travel-document and in 1 Cor. xvi. 5—and nowhere else in Greek. Luke uses *διέρχ.* *διὰ* or *κατὰ...εὐαγγελιζόμενος* both in the Gospel and in Acts i—xii. In contrast to this *παρῆλθον* means 'neglect' 'leave unevangelized,' without laying any stress on the topography of the journey. The narrator of the Acts has never the faintest interest in topography and geography: he thinks only of the missionary character of the journey."

so as often to suggest a double use of some source, or the existence of a document which has been translated. One has only to compare two such passages as Acts ii. 44 sqq. and Acts iv. 32 to see what I mean. One account has *καὶ εἶχον ὅπαντα κοινά*, the other *ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτοῖς πάντα κοινά*; one account says *καὶ διεμέριζον*, the other *καὶ διεδίδετο*; one account has *πᾶσι*, the other *ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ*; while they both agree in the expression *καθότι ἂν τις χρεῖαν εἶχεν*. What are we to say to this? is it the twofold use of some primitive document, or is it the natural variation of a writer recording similar phenomena twice over? If it is the latter, then we must not be hasty in assuming assimilations nor in determining their origin. For Luke repeats himself with slight variations¹. So much may be said on behalf of Blass's theory.

Resuming now our discussion of the subject from Mr Chase's point of view, we shall show briefly and rapidly that, as in the case of the glosses, Mr Chase interprets the assimilations wrongly, and assigns incorrect and unnecessarily obscure origins to them, in those cases where a theory of Syriac assimilation is most plausible.

I am going to draw his attention to what I consider to be the best example extant of a Syriac assimilation in the text of the Acts: and then to ask him to compare his own theory of the genesis of the error, and see if he adheres to it. The passage is Acts xv. 26 which stands in the Codex Bezae

ΠΑΡΑΔΕΔΩΚΑΣΙΝ ΤΗΝ ΨΥΧΗΝ ΑΥΤΩΝ
ΥΠΕΡ ΤΟΥ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΚΥ ΗΜΩΝ ΙΗΣΥ ΧΡΥ
ΕΙΣ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΠΕΙΡΑΣΜΟΝ.

The gloss is in the last line; it should come a line higher up,

¹ Compare also the case which we discussed previously where xiii. 4 and xv. 30 are contrasted and note the variation in the similar accounts. Observe further that the reviser (if he be different from the author) can be proved not to make his assimilations in a *verbatim* manner. Take the great gloss, for instance, which the Heracleian margin has preserved for us in Acts xxv. 24, and compare such sentences as "dicebam ut sequeretur me in Caesaream ubi custodiebatur...quum autem dicerem, Vis judicari cum iis Hierosolymae," with the parallels in the received text, and it will be seen how freely the author of these sentences handles his materials. Assimilation does not mean agreement.

It is a hard exercise of faith to be told to connect two such unlike situations by means of the sound of a single ambiguous word which is admitted to be used in two opposite senses! We will make Mr Chase a present of our interpretation, for the better propagation of his theory. His assimilation to the Gospel is a false assumption, and must be abandoned.

It would also be wise to remove from his pages such cases as make the prophets of the Old Testament responsible for ordinary turns of speech in Syriac. For example, Acts vii. 43 appears in the ordinary text as

καὶ μετοικιῶ ὑμᾶς ἐπέκεινα Βαβυλῶνος,

which the Codex Bezae, as far as we can judge, altered into

ἐπὶ τὰ μέρη Βαβυλῶνος

= in illas partes Babylonis.

The passage is an interesting one, because the peculiar word ἐπέκεινα inspires confidence, and is the very word used in the LXX. of Amos v. 27, from which the quotation comes. If it is not genuine, we should have a prophetic assimilation indeed, but on the wrong side of the house and, as far as Mr Chase is concerned, in the wrong tongue! But it must surely be genuine.

Now Mr Chase suggests that ἐπὶ τὰ μέρη is a re-translation of a Syriac ܕܒܒܝܠ ܕܗܝܬܝܠܐ, and under the influence of a number of passages in the prophets. No one could I suppose object to a translation of the name of a country which either in Syriac or in Latin took the form *in partes Babylonis*. The idiom is sufficiently common in both languages. It occurs constantly in Syriac, at all events, and here are a couple of cases from the recently published Commentary of Ephrem on the Pauline Epistles:

1 Cor. xi. 16: nos, in partibus nimirum Syriae,
talem consuetudinem non habemus,

where the idiom is Ephrem's own = we Syrians; and

2 Cor. i. 8: de tribulatione nostra, quae facta
est in partibus Asiaticorum,

where the idiom is that of the primitive translator of the Pauline epistles, rendering ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ.

Surely we need not spend time in proving further that either in Syriac or in Latin *in partes Babylonis* is idiomatic. Now let us transcribe Mr Chase's explanation, p. 73:

"The Vulgate Syriac does not help us; it has the phrase used in the Syriac of Amos v. 27 (comp. Matt. viii. 30, 2 Cor. x. 16). It is, however, through the Syriac that a solution of the problem comes. The word ܠܝܕܝܢ (=the place) is used to translate τὰ μέρη in Matt. ii. 22, xvi. 13 by the Old and Vulgar Syriac, and by the latter version (the Curetonian fragments here failing us) in Mc. viii. 10. In Acts ii. 10, xix. 1, xx. 2 the same Greek phrase is represented by ܠܝܕܝܢܐ (=the places). But this word 'places' takes us back to a series of passages in the Prophets: Jer. viii. 3 'all the residue...which remain in all the *places* whither I have driven them,' Jer. xxiv. 9, xxix. 14, xl. 12 'then all the Jews returned out of all *places* whither they were driven,' Ezek. xxxiv. 12 'I will deliver them out of all *places* whither they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day.' Thus in the Prophets of the Captivity 'the places' is almost a technical expression meaning 'the foreign countries of exile'.¹ The Syriac O. T. has ܠܝܕܝܢܐ in all these passages (comp. Jer. xlv. 5, Amos iv. 6) except Jer. xxix. 14 where the Syriac is varied, possibly because the word in the singular occurs later in the verse ('I will bring you again unto *the place* whence I caused you to be carried away captive'). We may therefore with some confidence believe that the Old Syriac read in Acts vii. 43 ܠܝܕܝܢܐ ܕܒܒܒܝܠ (to-the-places of-Babylon) and we can see the rationale of the reading. The Old Syriac is *more suo* harmonising, embellishing a quotation from one Prophet with a characteristic expression of other Prophets who deal with the same subject of the exile."

I forbear to criticise a passage where I can only praise the industry of the author; I am afraid it will offend Syriac

¹ I suppose like 'in partibus' in ecclesiastical circles for 'in partibus infidelium'!

scholars, and prejudice them against the theory which Mr Chase is propounding, and indeed I doubt whether a single one of the many references to the Syriac Old Testament which he detects, either here or elsewhere, will be accepted.

There are, no doubt, passages which will lend themselves to elucidation on the hypothesis of glossing in and from the Syriac; and there are passages which will not do anything of the kind. We have done something, in the foregoing argument, to remove obstacles from the pathway of Mr Chase's readers: but the more we think of it, the more complex does the Bezan text become. It has passed through the hands of a number of people of active mind, whose remarks are stratified in the Western text; they are not all of them Syrians; and it is not yet even proved that there are no Western expansions which are original. The whole history of the text requires renewed and careful inquisition, without prejudice in favour of the solvent power of a single hypothesis.

I shall conclude my discourse, in the interests of poetical justice, by showing that there is one important gloss in the Acts which Mr Chase was unable to explain, and which does not seem to yield to any theory except that of a primitive Latin reaction.

In Acts iv. 31, we have in the Codex Bezae

ΚΑΙ ΕΛΑΛΟΥΝ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΥ ΜΕΤΑ ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑΣ
ΠΑΝΤΙ ΤΩ ΘΕΛΟΝΤΙ ΠΙΣΤΕΥΕΙΝ,

= et loquebantur uerbum dī cum fiducia
omni uolenti credere.

The gloss is an old one, occurring in Irenaeus, both in Greek and Latin, and in a less pronounced form in Augustine, who omits the last word.

Its origin is evidently an attempt to assimilate the fulfilment of the prayer to the prayer itself which is in v. 29

ΜΕΤΑ ΠΑΧΗΣ ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑΣ ΛΑΛΕΙΝ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΣΟΥ
cum fiducia omni loqui uerbum tuum.

Hence we expect naturally the addition of *πάσης*, and a number of MSS. show it. (For example, the Gigas reads

loquebantur verbum dei cum omni fiducia.) This is the cause of the *omni* at the beginning of the gloss: but this *omni* separated from *fiducia* by the line division has been read as a dative, and turned back into Greek as *πάντι* with the result that it has itself become the subject of expansion, in order to limit the extravagance of the statement and to round off the sentence. (The Syriac, of course, has no parallel phenomena; it cannot translate *παρησία* except by a circumlocution, nor, when it does translate, can it make any distinction between *παρησία* and *πάσα παρησία*.) Such is, we believe, the origin of the gloss. But as we have used so much *παρησία* in explaining to other people the errors into which they have fallen, we must also promise to be modest, and to retract this opinion, and any others which we hold, as soon as a better explanation can be offered, and we can fairly be shown to have made an erroneous statement¹.

¹ In the foregoing remarks I have avoided the discussion of certain test passages which Mr Chase considers decisive, because they are not, at all events as presented by him, of the nature of proof. It is not fair, for example, to quote the reading "their sons and their daughters" in Acts ii. 17, in proof of a Syriac origin of the Bezan text of the Acts, and to support the statement by reference to Tertullian (*adv. Marc.* v. 8), without at the same time informing the reader that Tertullian is expressly, and from the necessities of the case, quoting *Joel* against Marcion, and that the Bezan text shows signs of having been corrected to the text of *Joel*! The argument needs re-statement, to say the least.

NOTE.

ON A POSSIBLE CONNEXION BETWEEN CHRYSOStOM AND EPHREM.

The foregoing pages have been largely occupied with a discussion of the character of the text of the Acts which underlies the commentary of Ephrem, some of whose fragments we have collected from the Venice Catena. And it has been shown that the text upon which Ephrem was working was a text which, at all events in the latter half of the book, was closely related to that of the Codex Bezae.

We are now going to ask the question whether the lost commentary of Ephrem has had any effect upon the extant commentary of Chrysostom; did Chrysostom know Ephrem's commentary, either in Syriac or by a translation, and was he under the influence of it? The question is interesting, not only on account of the explanation which it may possibly furnish of certain textual phenomena in Chrysostom's writings, but also because there has been a wide-spread suspicion of some foreign element in Chrysostom's commentary on the Acts. Many scholars have gone so far as to deny that the work is rightly ascribed to Chrysostom, on account of the repetitions and other literary imperfections which characterise it; and while, on the other hand, a comparison of the general method of interpretation with that employed on the Pauline epistles would seem to justify the belief in a common authorship, there still remains the suspicion which is provoked by the internal evidence of the commentary, which leads us to say that it cannot be wholly due to Chrysostom, and certainly not to Chrysostom at his smoothest and best.

Now it will be interesting to see whether the Venice Catena throws any light upon the question of authorship suggested in the

foregoing remarks. It will not be easy to draw conclusions from the study of a Catena which is largely made up out of Ephrem and Chrysostom, on account of the confusions and errors to which Catenae are peculiarly liable. If, for example, we were to remark that a certain section was ascribed to both Ephrem and Chrysostom, we should not be justified in assuming that the Catenist found similar matter in the commentaries of both writers, and therefore assigned a double authorship; for, in the first place, it is not an uncommon thing for a Catenist to dovetail together extracts from different writers; and in the next place, we have no collateral evidence for Ephrem's Commentary to which we can appeal in order to show that the Catenist's ascription of authorship is correct. Unless we can find, then, cumulative evidence of a number of passages ascribed to Ephrem-Chrysostom, of which the whole matter is substantially Chrysostom, we can hardly argue that there was common matter in the two commentaries.

Nor would the difficulty be much less in cases which were ascribed to Ephrem alone, but which were shown, by a reference to the printed text, to belong to Chrysostom. The heading might be an error of the original Catenist or one of his transcribers. So that we should again demand cumulative evidence, before we could discard the suggestion of error in the titles, and say, this passage is both Ephrem (as is proved from the Armenian Catena) and Chrysostom as is shown by his printed works.

Probably the best test would be to examine the Commentary of Chrysostom for evidence of another biblical text underlying his remarks, which should not only differ from his own text upon which the remarks are ostensibly made, but should agree with the text of Ephrem, or, which is the same thing, with those peculiar features of the Bezan text which we have shown to characterise the text of Ephrem. If such an analysis led to a satisfactory conclusion, we could then with some confidence go over the sections which had a double ascription, and those which seemed to have an incorrect ascription, and perhaps justify the headings in doubtful cases.

The following remarks are meant to suggest the line which such an enquiry should take. We will begin by examining Chrysostom's remarks on certain passages (in which our references are made to Savile's edition).

p. 845 (c. xix. 21) *ἔθετο ὁ Παῦλος ἐν τῷ πνεύματι διελθὼν τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαΐαν, πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.* The text is the

current one; but Chrysostom goes on οὐκ ἔτι ἀνθρωπίνως ἐνταῦθα ποιεῖ, ἀλλὰ πνεύματι ᾧ καὶ προσέλετο διελθεῖν. The suggestion that Paul had at one time been wishing to act ἀνθρωπίνως, in his prospect of the journey to Jerusalem, takes us back to the gloss at the beginning of the chapter (Acts xix. 1) where the Bezan text tells us

ΘΕΛΟΝΤΟΣ ΔΕ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΥΛΟΥ
ΚΑΤΑ ΤΗΝ ΙΔΙΑΝ ΒΟΥΛΗΝ
ΠΟΡΕΥΕΣΘΑΙ ΕΙΣ ΙΕΡΟΣΟΛΥΜΑ,

and the Armenian Catena expressly assigns this peculiar reading to the text of Ephrem. We must therefore say that, as the demonstration has already been clearly made of the agreement of the Ephrem text with that of Cod. Bezae, we have traces of an acquaintance of Chrysostom with a famous Bezan-Ephrem reading. There is no question here of an error in the heading of the Armenian Catena. The commentary, then, made by Chrysostom belongs to the Ephrem-text rather than to his own.

If now we keep before our minds the term which Chrysostom uses (ἀνθρωπίνως) to describe the action of Paul when he plans in his own will and has to be restrained by the Spirit, we can throw some light on the following passage, p. 816 (c. xvii. 14) ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν· ὑπέμενον δὲ ὁ τε Σίλας καὶ ὁ Τιμόθεος ἐκεῖ. Ὅρα αὐτὸν καὶ ὑποχωροῦντα καὶ ἐνιστάμενον καὶ πολλὰ ἀνθρωπίνως ποιοῦντα.

The passage is one in which the Bezan glossator has told us that Paul was acting under the peculiar restraint of the Spirit,

ΠΑΡΗΛΘΕΝ ΔΕ ΤΗΝ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΙΑΝ
ΕΚΩΛΓΘΗ ΓΑΡ ΕΙΣ ΑΓΤΟΥΣ
ΚΗΡΥΖΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ.

It is implied, as a comparison with parallel passages shows, that Paul had been planning to do something else than go to Athens: he had been acting ἀνθρωπίνως. And Chrysostom points out what he had been doing; he had been *retreating* and *pressing forward*; now if we refer to Ephrem's remarks on this passage, we shall find that Chrysostom's word ὑποχωρῶν exactly corresponds to 'giving way' or 'receding' which we detected in the extract of Ephrem; and it was shown, also, that at this very point Ephrem must have had the Bezan gloss quoted above.

Either then this word ὑποχωρέω is a part of Ephrem's commentary, in which case Chrysostom's use of that commentary is demonstrated; or it was a part of its text; in which case we have a second time

shown that the Bezan-Ephrem text underlies the remarks of Chrysostom.

We will next show that certain remarkable Bezan additions were known to Chrysostom, for which we have not yet recovered the evidence of Ephrem. Take the case of the tears of Simon Magus, the antiquity of which gloss is, as Mr Chase has pointed out, demonstrated by Tertullian's allusion (*Simon Samarites... frustra flevit*)¹.

Chrysostom says that his tears were merely formal; p. 714, Δέον ἀπὸ καρδίας μετανοῆσαι, δέον κλαῦσαι καὶ πενθῆσαι· ὁ δὲ ἀφοσιώσῃ μόνον τοῦτο ποιῇ· εἰ ἄρα ἀφεθήσεται σοι· τοῦτο εἶπεν, οὐχ ὥς οὐ συγχωρηθέντος ἂν αὐτῷ, εἰ ἔκλαυσεν κτέ. It is, therefore, certain that Chrysostom knew the tradition about Simon Magus' tears.

The importance of this piece of evidence is that we are almost obliged to equate the *frustra* of Tertullian with the ἀφοσιώσῃ of Chrysostom and to carry their equivalent into the Western text; now if this could be done through the Syriac ܡܠ ܠܗ ܠܐ ܠܐ (=and he did not really care), we could perhaps connect the Bezan reading by ܡܠ ܠܗ ܠܐ ܠܐ (=and he did not cease); we should thus find an original for the curious καὶ οὐ διελίμπανεν of the Bezan Codex. The question would then arise as to the primitive form and language of the gloss, which was extant originally in the sense that 'Simon Magus pretended to weep².'

By the foregoing instances, we have done something to prove that there underlies the Commentary of Chrysostom a glossed text of the Acts something like the Bezan-Ephrem text, and differing from the text that accompanies the commentary. Bearing this in mind, let us now turn to Chrysostom on Acts xviii. 19 (Savile, p. 831): he tells us

διὰ τοῦτο ἐκωλύετο εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐλθεῖν, πρὸς τὰ κατεπείγοντα οἶμαι ἐλαυνόμενος. ὅρα γοῦν ἐνταῦθα καὶ παρακαλούμενον αὐτὸν μείναι, καὶ οὐκ ἀνεχόμενον, ἐπειδὴ ἡπείγετο ἀπελθεῖν· οὐ μὲν ἀπλῶς αὐτοὺς εἴασεν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ ὑποσχέσεως.

¹ *De anima*, c. 34.

² The somewhat similar case is that of the peculiar description of Gallio's conduct (Acts xviii. 17, "Gallio cared for none of these things"), which appears in the Bezan Latin as

tunc gallio fingeat eum non uidere

and in the Fleury text as

et gallio simulabat se non uidere.

If we compare this with the extract of Ephrem, printed on p. 48 of the present tract, we find the words

“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 that they should expect his coming by the will of God.”

The exact coincidence both in thought and language between the two extracts is obvious; but there is enough difference in the handling of the argument to show that we cannot correct the ascription of the Catenist from Ephrem to Chrysostom: on the other hand the sentence *ὅρα γοῦν κτέ* is exactly in Chrysostom's manner; and we can only conclude that the two commentaries were substantially giving the same thoughts in the same language: and as we are clearly dealing here with commentary and not with text, this means that Chrysostom has been incorporating the idea of Ephrem.

Turn in the next instance to Chrysostom's note on xvi. 39 (p. 812):

φοβοῦνται ὅτι Ῥωμαῖοί εἰσιν, οὐχ ὅτι ἀδίκως ἐνέβαλον καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτοὺς ἐξελεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως· χάριν ᾗτησαν ταύτην κτέ.

and a reference to Ephrem *in loc.* shows that the concluding words are either a gloss in the text, or borrowed from the commentary of Ephrem: “So then *we ask of you this favour*, depart from this city, lest the same men, etc.”

But a reference to the Bezan text renders it tolerably certain that the words in question are merely an equivalent to the *παρεκάλεσαν* of the text: so that we are obliged again to conclude that Chrysostom has been borrowing from Ephrem.

Next let us compare p. 721 (c. ix. 4):

ἀλλὰ τοῦτον μόνον ἐπήρωσε καὶ ἔσβεσεν αὐτοῦ τὸν θυμὸν τῷ φόβῳ ὥστε αὐτὸν ἀκοῦσαι τὰ λεγόμενα

where Ephrem's remark is (if we may trust the Catena), “With the light he blinded him and so frightened him and with awful fear of his glory he extinguished his rage”; here, again, the dependence of Chrysostom on Ephrem seems to be established.

Our last instance shall be from p. 713 (c. viii. 19):

πῶς οὖν, φησι, πνεῦμα οὐκ ἔλαβον οὗτοι; πνεῦμα ἔλαβον τὸ τῆς ἀφύσεως· τὸ δὲ τῶν σημείων οὐπω ᾗσαν λαβόντες· καὶ ὅτι τοῦτο ἔστι, καὶ

τὸ τῶν σημείων πνεῦμα οὐκ ἔλαβον, ὅρα πῶς ἰδὼν ὁ Σίμων προσῆλθε
τοῦτο αἰτεῖν.

We notice here the curious distinction between the Spirit of grace and the Spirit of gifts, by which distinction Chrysostom tries to explain the fact that baptized persons had not received the Spirit. The expression which he uses, the Spirit of signs, is taken from Ephrem, as may be seen from the extract quoted on p. 41 ('they sent Peter and John that by their laying on of hands the Samaritans may receive the *Spirit of signs*').

Reviewing the instances which have been brought forward, we think a good case has been made out for the theory that the roughness of Chrysostom's commentary on the Acts is due, in part, to the fact that it is based upon the previously existing commentary of the great Syrian father.

ADDENDUM.

The Marcionite reading of Galatians iv. 27, referred to on p. 19 of the present work, will be found again, though in a less obvious form, in Ephrem's Commentary on the Diatessaron (p. 34, ed. Mösinger), as follows: 'Vide quomodo isti filii tui locum principalem acceperunt in Jerusalem, quae sursum est, matre nostra, quam laudamus (*more correctly* confessi sumus) quae Moysi apparuit in monte.'