

THE  
SYRO-LATIN TEXT  
OF  
THE GOSPELS.

THE  
SYRO-LATIN TEXT  
OF  
THE GOSPELS



BY

FREDERIC HENRY CHASE, D.D.

LECTURER IN THEOLOGY AT CHRIST'S COLLEGE,  
PRINCIPAL OF THE CLERGY TRAINING SCHOOL, CAMBRIDGE,  
AND EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.

London:  
MACMILLAN AND CO.  
AND NEW YORK.

1895

[*All Rights reserved.*]

Cambridge:  
PRINTED BY J. & C. F. CLAY,  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

TO THE  
RIGHT REVEREND FREDERIC WALLIS D.D.

BISHOP OF WELLINGTON NEW ZEALAND  
FELLOW OF GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE

THIS ESSAY IS DEDICATED  
WITH GRATEFUL AND TRUE AFFECTION

BY ONE  
OF HIS MANY FRIENDS AND FELLOW-WORKERS  
IN CAMBRIDGE

## PREFACE.

THE present volume is the sequel of an Essay which I published two years ago on *the Old Syriac Element in the text of Codex Bezae*. The latter, primarily an offshoot of a larger work on the Acts on which I am engaged, dealt with the Bezan text of that Book. Several critics, whose opinion I respect, urged against my conclusions the not unnatural objection, which I had fully anticipated in the Preface, that I could produce no direct evidence for an old Syriac text of the Acts. Convinced that assimilation to Old Syriac texts was a predominant factor in the genesis of the Bezan and of cognate texts, I felt that it was almost a matter of honour to extend the investigation to the Gospels, where ample evidence for Old Syriac readings is supplied by the Sinaitic and Curetonian MSS., by the Arabic Tatian, by Ephrem's Commentary on the Diatessaron, and by Aphraat's quotations.

The rough draft of this Essay was drawn up before the publication of the Sinaitic Palimpsest in October 1894. Since that time the whole has been re-written. One note however—that on Luke ii. 5 (see p. 28 f.)—I have ventured to leave exactly as it stood before I saw the Sinaitic text, appending a statement of the evidence derived from that MS., because, as a concrete example, it seems to me to indicate how far results obtained by a critical process are likely to be right. I may be allowed to add that again and again I have found my conclusions confirmed by the Sinaitic text.

An apology is perhaps required for the title of this volume. The term, the 'Western' text, is generally allowed

to be misleading. 'The time is, we hope, not far distant,' if I may quote and adopt as my own some words of the Rev. H. Lucas, S.J. (*Dublin Review*, July 1894, p. 52), 'when the term "Western" will, for the future, give place to the term "Syro-Latin," the only one which truly represents, in our opinion, the facts of the case.'

In my references to Tatian's Diatessaron I have generally used the convenient volume of Mr J. Hamlyn Hill, which bears the somewhat quaint title '*The Earliest Life of Christ ever compiled from the Four Gospels*.' In the parts of this book which have been of service to me Mr Hill has secured the cooperation of other scholars. Mr G. Buchanan Gray, B.A., of Oxford, collated with the Arabic text Mr Hill's English rendering of Ciasca's Latin, while Professor Armitage Robinson is responsible for the English translation of the evangelical quotations in the Armenian version of Ephrem's Commentary. In regard to the Latin texts of the Gospels, I have made continual use of the Oxford edition of the Vulgate, for which scholars owe a great debt to the Bishop of Salisbury and Mr H. J. White. The volume however containing St John's Gospel did not appear until the pages of Chapter I., which deal with that Gospel, had passed out of my hands. The third volume of Dr Resch's *Aussercanonische Paralleltex-te—Paralleltex-te zu Lucas*—reached me too late for me to make any use of its rich stores of Patristic citations.


It only remains for me to express my sincere gratitude to several friends in Cambridge, and especially to a younger friend, Mr F. Lillingston B.A., late Scholar of Pembroke College, for their kindness in helping me in the correction of proof-sheets. I wish also to thank the readers and workmen of the University Press for the pains which they have bestowed on the printing of the present volume and of its predecessor.

CAMBRIDGE.

July, 1895.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGES
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND PLAN.	1—2
 1. SELECT PASSAGES FROM ST MATTHEW, ST JOHN, AND ST LUKE.	 3—75
St Matthew, i. 16 [3 f.]; x. 11—13 [4 f.]; x. 42 [6]; xv. 26, xvi. 16 [7]; xvii. 27 [7 f.]; xviii. 2, 20 [8]; xx. 28 [9 ff.]; xxi. 28 ff. [15]; xxii. 34 [15 f.]; xxiii. 9 [16]; xxv. 41 [16 ff.]; xxvi. 15 [18].	
St John, iv. 42 [19]; vi. 17 [19 f.]; vi. 23 [20 f.]; vi. 56 [21 f.]; viii. 53 [23]; xi. 9 f. [23 f.]; xi. 14, 28, 35 [24 f.]; xii. 32 [25]; xiii. 14 [25 f.]; xxi. 7 [26]; xxi. 13 [27].	
St Luke, i. 79 [27]; ii. 5 [28 f.]; ii. 48 [29 f.]; iii. 10, 12, 14 [34 f.]; v. 7 f. [35 f.]; ix. 16 [36 f.]; x. 5 [37 f.]; xi. 52 ff. [38 ff.]; xiii. 11 [41 f.]; xiii. 17 [42 ff.]; xiii. 24 f. [44]; xiv. 9 [45]; xv. 4 [46]; xv. 29 f. [46 f.]; xvi. 31 [52]; xviii. 14 [52 f.]; xix. 4 [53 f.]; xx. 34 [55]; xxii. 12 (Mc. xiv. 15) [56 f.]; xxiii. 36 f. [57 f.]; xxiii. 40 ff. [58 ff.]; xxiii. 53 [62 f.]; xxiv. 32 f. [68 ff.]; xxiv. 37 [72 ff.].	
Double renderings [30 ff.]; assimilation to the Old Testament [47 ff.].	
Notes: Lc. xxii. 27 [14 n.]; Mc. xii. 14 [18 n.]; Mr Rendel Harris' note on Acts xv. 29 [70 n.].	
 2. HARMONISTIC INFLUENCE.	 76—100
St Matthew, xxi. 18, xxiv. 31 f. [77]; xxvi. 59 ff. [78 ff.]; xxvii. 28 [81].	
St Luke, iii. 23—38 [81 f.]; iv. 31 [82 f.]; v. 10 f. [83 f.]; v. 14 f. [84 ff.]; vi. 42 [89 f.]; viii. 35 [90 ff.]; xi. 2 [92 f.]; xx. 20 [93 f.]; xxi. 7 [94 f.]; xxiii. 45 ff. [95 f.]; xxiv. 1. [96 f.].	
St Mark, viii. 10 [97 f.]; xiii. 2 [98]; xv. 25 ff. [99 f.].	
Notes: Confusion of Syriac suffixes 'your,' 'their' [86 n.]; Mr Rendel Harris' note on Acts ii. 17 [86 n.]; An indication of an early <i>Greek</i> harmony [97 n.].	

	PAGES
3. PROPER NAMES AND FORMS OF WORDS.	101—111
Prefixed  [101 f.]; Iscariot [102 ff.]; termination-forms [104]; Gen- nesar, Lazar [105 f.]; Caiphas [106]; Matt. xxvii. 46, Mc. xv. 34 [106 f.]; John i. 6 [107]; xi. 54 [108]; Luke xxiv. 13 [109]; Mark v. 41 [109 ff.].	
4. GRAMMATICAL POINTS.	112—127
(1) The definite article [112 f.]. (2) Prepositions: repetition of a preposition [113 f.]; the preposition 'upon' [114 f.]. (3) Con- structions of the verb: resolution of participle in Bezan text [115 f.]; this due to Syriac, not Latin, influence as shewn by (i) examination of e.g. Matt. ii. 7—12 (Syr. Lat.) [116 ff.], (ii) cases of partial resolution in Bezan text (Gr. Lat.) [118 ff.]. Three other classes of passages in D: (a) converse of resolution of participle [121]; (b) Syriacised indicative [121 f.]; (c) Syriacised participle [122 f.]. Verbal constructions—final, temporal, circumstantial—in Matt. xxiii. 15, xxv. 10, xxvii. 1, Mc. xiv. 55 [123 f.], in Jn. vi. 61, Lc. xxi. 36, Mc. v. 17 [124], in Mc. vi. 48 [126]; insertion and omission of ' <i>he (they) began</i> ' in Syriac texts and in D [124 ff.].	
SUMMARY OF FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS.	128—142
Summary of facts [128 ff.]. Conclusions: (1) Date of Syro-Latin text of Gospels [132 ff.]; (2) Its genesis (i) Bilingual texts [134 f.]; (ii) Bi- lingual scribes [135 f.]; (iii) Interpolations [136 ff.]; (3) Its birthplace: conditions of problem [138]; these satisfied by Antioch [138]; (i) its vigorous life [138 f.]; (ii) a bilingual city [139 f.]; (iii) a trading centre [140 ff.]. Notes; Dr Hort's theory of 'Western non-interpolations' [130 n.]; Dr Blass' theory as to the Bezan text of Acts [133 n.]; Relation of Old Latin texts to the birthplace of the Syro-Latin (Western) text [141 n.].	
INDEX I. MSS., VERSIONS, PATRISTIC WRITINGS.	143—146
INDEX II. GENERAL.	147, 148



## THE SYRO-LATIN TEXT OF THE GOSPELS.

It seems advisable briefly to state the purpose and the plan of this essay.

The *purpose* of the investigation which follows is to gather and review evidence which supports the theory that assimilation to Old Syriac texts was a predominant factor in the formation of the Greek and Latin (so called) 'Western' texts of the Gospels.

The *plan* which I shall follow is this. I shall take Codex Bezae as the spokesman of the 'Western,' or, to use a more accurate phrase, the 'Syro-Latin' authorities. I shall, that is, take the text of Codex Bezae as the chief subject of the investigation, in connexion with it adducing and examining the readings of kindred authorities, especially those of the Old Latin MSS.

The discussion will, for convenience sake, be conducted under four heads:

(1) Select Passages. These I have taken from the first three Gospels as they stand in Codex Bezae, i.e., St Matthew, St John, St Luke. I have confined myself (as far as the selected passages are concerned) to these Gospels, because, while of St Mark's Gospel the Curetonian has only a few verses, at least in large sections of the other Gospels we have now the two Old Syriac texts, the Sinaitic and the Curetonian.

(2) Harmonistic influence. The principle of assimilation played an important part in the genesis of the 'Syro-Latin' text of the New Testament generally. Naturally this is

especially true of the text of the Gospels. For in the case of the Gospels the tendency to assimilate kindred passages took definite form in at least one well known Harmony. It does not however fall within the scope of my work to deal directly with the complicated questions which gather round Tatian's *Diatessaron*.

- (3) Proper Names and forms of words.
- (4) Grammatical points.

A reading from the text of Codex Bezae, the first time it is quoted, is printed in small uncials. A fine line underneath any of its words denotes divergence from the normal text: a thick line indicates an interpolation: the sign ^ marks an omission. I have used the term 'the true text' to denote the common form of the Greek text, as distinguished from the eccentric 'Syro-Latin' text. As the true text in this sense I have printed that given in Dr Westcott's and Dr Hort's edition of the New Testament. The term 'the Bezan scribe' I have used to denote the scribe who in any particular passage altered 'the true text', and produced 'the Bezan text' at this place.

To this brief general statement I add two remarks.

The evidence in support of my main thesis, afforded by the consideration of the phenomena of the 'Syro-Latin' text, varies infinitely in point of cogency, sometimes amounting, as it appears to me, to that kind of demonstration which alone is possible in critical and literary investigations, sometimes hardly, if at all, rising above simple illustration.

Again, the strength of such evidence lies in its cumulative character. It is always possible, in criticising such a theory as mine, to allege some cause, other than the one suggested, as having produced this or that particular reading. If however a single theory supplies a natural explanation of a series of readings differing from each other in kind, though in the several cases other explanations of various sorts are not impossible, the legitimate conclusion is that that theory must be taken (at least provisionally) as true.

I.

SELECT PASSAGES FROM ST MATTHEW,  
ST JOHN, AND ST LUKE.

Matt. i. 16. iacob autem genuit ioseph  
cui desponsata uirgo maria  
peperit xpm ihm.

The Bezan Greek is wanting at this point, but there is no reason to doubt that it corresponded to the Latin.

The true text is Ἰακώβ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωσήφ τὸν ἄνδρα  
Μαρίας, ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός.

The phrase *cui desponsata uirgo Maria* is obviously suggested by v. 18 (μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰωσήφ), compare Lc. i. 27 (πρὸς παρθένον ἐμνηστευμένην ἀνδρὶ κ.τ.λ.).

There are strong reasons for holding that this case of context assimilation arose in an Old Syriac version and passed thence into other texts. (1) The Sinaitic and the Curetonian texts, as it is well known, seriously differ in this passage. The problems suggested by this difference lie outside the present enquiry. But the very seriousness of their divergence emphasises their agreement in the words under discussion. I give the two texts side by side :

SIN.

Jacob begat Joseph :  
Joseph, to whom betrothed was  
Mary the-Virgin,  
begat Jesus,  
who-called (was) the-Messiah.

CUR.

Jacob begat Joseph,  
him to whom betrothed was  
Mary the-Virgin,  
she who-bare Jesus  
the-Messiah.

The agreement (amid such difference) in the words underlined seems to stamp these as relics of a primitive Syriac text. (2) The fact that in *v.* 20 (*παραλαβεῖν* *M. τὴν γυναῖκά σου*) the Curetonian reading 'to-take *Mary thy-betrothed*'—a reading, so far as I know, found in no other authority—is assimilated to *v.* 18, confirms the impression that this type of phrase was characteristic of the early Syriac texts of this Gospel. (3) The use of the active verb—*peperit Christum Jesum*—in place of the passive in the true text, is a very natural corollary of the reading in the earlier part of the verse. The change of a passive clause into a corresponding active clause is very common in the Old Syriac texts of the New Testament (see below, p. 17).

This reading is found in the Ferrar-group<sup>1</sup>—*ῥ μνηστευθεῖσα παρθένος Μαριάμ ἐγέννησεν Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγόμενον Χριστόν*: in the Old Latin *a g<sup>1</sup> k q* (*cui desponsata uirgo* (om. *q*) *maria genuit ihm̄*), *b c* (*cui desponsata erat uirgo maria: uirgo autem maria genuit ihm̄*), and in the Armenian version.

Matt. x. 11—13.

11. *ἡ πόλις ᾧ εἰς ἣν ἂν εἰσελθῆτε εἰς αὐτήν*  
*ἐξετάσατε.....*

12. *εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν*  
*ἀσπασάσθαι αὐτήν λεγόντες*  
*εἰρήνη τῷ οἰκῷ τούτῳ*

13. *ᾧ εἰάν μὲν ἡ οἰκία ἀξία ἐστὲ ἡ εἰρήνη*  
*ὑμῶν ἐπὶ αὐτήν.*

The true text is: 11 *εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν ἡ κώμην εἰσέλθητε, ἐξετάσατε...* 13 *καὶ εἰάν... ἐλθάτω ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν ἐπ' αὐτήν.*

The Curetonian is wanting at this point. The Sinaitic is

<sup>1</sup> The cursives 13, 69, 124, 346 form the so-called Ferrar-group. It seems certain that these MSS. are derived from a common lost original, an original which Ferrar and Abbott (*A Collation of Four Important MSS.*, Dublin, 1877) approximately restore. Mr Rendel Harris (*On the Origin of the Ferrar-group*, 1893) concludes his discussion of the superscriptions and of certain readings found in these MSS. thus: 'I think we may take it to be demonstrated that there is a decided streak of Syriac in the Ferrar-text' (p. 19).

as follows: 'Into-whatsoever city entering (are) ye (ܠܝܠܝܢ ܕܝܬܝܢ ܕܝܬܝܢ), be asking who (is) worthy and-there be (ܐܕܡܝܢ)<sup>1</sup> till... And-when entering (are) ye it, (even) the-house, *give peace* to that house, and-if worthy (is) that house, your-peace *shall-be* (ܠܐܡܝܢ) upon-it.'

The points of the passage are these: (1) In the last line but one D has ἔσται for ἐλθάτω. So far as I know, the Sinaitic is the only other authority which has this reading. It is one which would naturally arise in translation. (2) In the first line note (a) D, like Sin., omits ἡ κώμην; so 1-118-209 604 a b ff<sup>1</sup> h k; (b) the order of words in D has the appearance of being due to rough retranslation, the relative, as in the Syriac, being brought near the verb; (c) the words εἰς ἣν ...εἰς αὐτήν are the reproduction of a Syriac idiom. The Peshitta has ܡܠ...ܝܬܝܢ ܕܝܬܝܢ (into-whatsoever...into-it), and so has the Curetonian in the parallel passage Lc. x. 5, 8, 10 (so Sin. in v. 5, wanting in v. 10). Thus the Bezan Greek in this line reveals clear signs of retranslation from a Syriac text differing only from the Sinaitic by the addition of the word ܡܠ (into-it). The only MS., it appears, which coincides with D in this line is 28. (3) The addition in v. 12 λέγοντες...τούτῳ from the parallel passage (Lc. x. 6) is found in a large number of authorities including  $\aleph^*$  L $\phi$  1-209 Old and Vulg. Lat. MSS., the Armenian. It might well arise independently in different texts. It may be noticed however that it would be suggested by the Syriac rendering (*give peace*) of ἀσπάσασθε, and that Ephrem's quotation shews that it had a place in the Diatessaron (Hill, p. 344).

<sup>1</sup> This 'be' (so Pesh.) represents the *melvare* of the Greek. *Either* it is an instance of the use of 'to be' in the Syriac to represent a more definite verb in the Greek; compare Matt. xxi. 17 'that-He-might-be (ܠܐܡܝܢ)' (=ἡὐλίσθη) in Cur., and below, 'your-peace *shall-be*' (=ἐλθάτω); *or* it is a corruption of a primitive reading ܐܕܡ (abide); compare Lc. xix. 5, where Sin. Cur. Pesh. have ܠܐܡܝܢ (*I-should-be*) to represent μεῖναι; compare my *Old Syriac Element*, p. 9.

Matt. x. 42. ΚΑΙ ΟΣ ΑΝ ΠΟΤΕΙΧΗ·ΕΝΑ ΤΩΝ ΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΩΝ ΤΟΥΤΩΝ  
 ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ ὕδατος ψυχροῦ· ἅ ΕΙΣ ΟΝΟΜΑ ΜΑΘΗΤΟΥ  
 ΔΑΜΗΝ ΛΕΓΩ ΥΜΙΝ· ΟΥ ΜΗ ΑΠΟΛΗΤΑΙ Ο ΜΙΣΘΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ.

The true text has *καὶ ὅς ἂν ποτίσῃ ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ποτήριον ψυχροῦ μόνον εἰς ὄνομα...οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ.*

The points of the passage are these: (1) The Sinaitic and Curetonian add '*of water*'; so most of the Old Latin MSS. and the Latin Vulgate. (2) The Sinaitic and the Curetonian omit the word '*only*': it is retained in the Old Latin MSS., and in the Memphitic. The addition of '*of water*' and the omission of '*only*' bring the clause (so far) into conformity with the parallel in St Mark (ix. 41). (3) *οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ.* The Sinaitic Syriac has '*Verily I-say to-you that-not shall-there-perish his-reward.*' In Mark, where Sin. has '*has lost* (ܐܒܕ), the Peshitta (alone of all authorities) has the same phrase which Sin. has in Matt. On somewhat similar renderings in the Syriac see p. 17. This reading is also found in the Memphitic, in most Old Latin MSS., and in Cyprian. The difference between the two phrases in Syriac is very slight, for it consists in the simple interchange of ܐܒܕ (shall-perish) and ܐܒܕܐ (shall-lose). The two phrases in the Latin are '*non perdet mercedem suam*' (e.g. f vg), '*non peribit merces eius*' (e.g. g<sup>1</sup> k q). (4) *τῶν ἐλαχίστων τούτων.* The Bezan Latin, with the Old Latin and Vulgate MSS. generally, has *minimis*. It is of course possible that the Bezan Greek is here assimilated to the Bezan Latin. But it is at least worthy of note that the Syriac phrase here is that used (Sin. Cur. Pesh.) to render *τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων* in Matt. v. 19. It is instructive to compare Matt. xiii. 48, where the Sinaitic and the Curetonian read '*They-chose the-fishes which-good (were) (as) good.*' Here it would appear that the repetition '*good good*' was misunderstood and taken as a superlative: hence D τὰ καλλίστα, d *meliora*, Old Latin MSS. generally *optimos, optima*.

Matt. xv. 26. οὐκ ἐξεστὶν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων.

The true text has *οὐκ ἔστιν καλόν κ.τ.λ.* The Sinaitic and the Curetonian have ܠܐ ܠܐ ('not necessary'). The word ܠܐ, though commonly the equivalent of *δεῖ*, is used in the Peshitta and the Curetonian of Matt. xx. 4 to render *δίκαιον*; in the Pesh. to render *ἄξιον* (2 Thess. i. 3), *καθήκοντα* (Rom. i. 28). In Rom. ii. 18 ܠܐܠܐ (fem. plur.) appears as the equivalent of *τὰ διαφέροντα*. Hence this Syriac word ܠܐ would be a very natural rendering of *καλόν*, and of this Syriac word the Bezan *ἔξεστιν* a natural retranslation.

It is of course quite possible that the reading may have originated in a very early *Greek* copy of the Gospel, in which the word *καλόν* was accidentally omitted and hence the reading *οὐκ ἔστιν λαβεῖν* produced. Compare Tert. *adv. Marc.* iv. 7 (non *est* auferre), Eus. *in Psal.* xxi. (Migne *P. G.* xxiii. 209). This *ἔστιν* must then have suggested the emendation *ἔξεστιν*.

The Bezan reading seems to be implied in Clem. *Hom.* ii. 19 ὁ δὲ...εἶπεν· οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἰᾶσθαι τὰ ἔθνη, ἐοικότα κυσίν. It is found in Origen, the Old Latin MSS. a b c ff<sup>1,2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> l, and Latin Fathers.

Matt. xvi. 16. κύριε υἱοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος.

In place of *σώζοντας* the true text has *ζῶντος*.

We have here a reading which at once betrays its Syriac origin. The Syriac versions (Cur. Pesh.; Sin. wanting) have here ܠܐ ܠܐܠܐ (of-God living). In Syriac the verb *to live* is the regular equivalent of *σώζεσθαι*, and the Aphel of the same verb (*to make to live*) the regular equivalent of *σώζειν*. Hence the word *living* in Syriac would at once suggest the ideas of *being saved*, *saving*. The change implied in the Bezan reading from ܠܐ (living) to ܠܐܠܐ (making-to-live, i.e. saving) is small. Compare the note below on Lc. iii. 10.

Matt. xvii. 27. εἰρησεὶς ἐκεῖ στατήρα.

The added word *ἐκεῖ* is found in the Old Syriac (Sin. Cur.) —'And-thou-shalt-find *there* a-stater.' The addition of the

word *there* is quite in harmony with the additions which the Old Syriac frequently makes to define time and place (see Baethgen, *Evangelienfragmente*, p. 22). Compare e.g. Matt. ii. 23 'and-he-came *thither*' (Sin. Cur.); iv. 20 'and they immediately left the nets *there*' (Tatian, Hill, p. 62); xix. 3 'and-there-came-near to-Him *there* the-Pharisees' (Sin. not Cur.); Lc. xiv. 8 'lest there-shall-be invited *there*' (Sin. Cur. Pesh.); xxiv. 23 'angels we-saw *there*' (Sin. Cur. Pesh.). In these passages, so far as I know, the Syriac authorities stand alone.

The addition appears in different forms in Latin MSS.—  
(a) a b c g<sup>1</sup> n L Q R *ibi*; (b) d *illic*; (c) f *in eo*; (d) e *in illum*.

Matt. xviii. 2. καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος ὁ ἰησὺς τὰ παιδία ἐν.

The Old Syriac (Sin. Cur.) has here: 'There-called Jesus *one* boy.' The addition of the word *one* is characteristic of the Syriac texts. Thus in St Matthew we find ii. 23 'in-a-city *one*' (Cur., not Sin.); viii. 2 'and-behold *one* man a-leper' (Cur. Pesh. ('*one* leper'); Sin. wanting); xv. 22 'and-behold *one* woman' (Cur., not Sin.); xxi. 2 '*one* ass' (Cur.; Sin. wanting)—passages where, so far as I know, the only authority for the insertion is the Syriac. In our present passage the only authority for *one* besides the Old Syriac and D is that constant ally of the latter, the Old Latin e.

Matt. xviii. 20.

οὐκ εἰσιν γὰρ ἄλλοι ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι  
εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα  
παρ' οἷς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν.

The true text is οὐ γὰρ εἰσιν...ὄνομα, ἐκεῖ εἰμὶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν.

This reading would obviously most easily arise in a version, where the initial *ou* was taken as a negative, a negative being inserted in the subsequent clause to make sense. This is exactly what has taken place in the Sinaitic Syriac, which reads here 'For there-are-not (~~ἰν~~ ~~δὲ~~) two or three who (-are)-assembled in-my-name, in whose midst I (am) not (~~οὐδὲς κικ~~ ~~ἐστίν~~).' Of this Syriac reading the Bezan



reading is a somewhat literal though awkward translation—*παρ' οἷς...ἐν μέσφ' αὐτῶν* (*d apud quos non ero in medio eorum*—a close rendering of the Greek).

The Old Latin g<sup>1</sup> has a conflate reading. After giving the true text it adds, after *in medio eorum*, the words *non enim sunt congregati in nomine meo inter quos ego non sum*. The character of this Latin reading shews that it is not the source of the corruption.

Matt. xx. 28.

1 ὙΜΕΙΣ ΔΕ ΖΗΤΕΙΤΕ· ΕΚ ΜΙΚΡΟΥ ΑΓΨΗCΑΙ  
 ΚΑΙ ΕΚ ΜΕΙΖΟΝΟC ΕΛΑΤΤΟΝ ΕΙΝΑΙ  
 3 ΕΙCΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΙ ΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΘΕΝΤΕC  
 ΔΕΙΠΝΗCΑΙ· ΜΗ ΑΝΑΚΛΕΙΝΕCΘΑΙ  
 5 ΕΙC ΤΟΥC ΕΞΕΧΟΝΤΑC ΤΟΠΟΥC  
 ΜΗ ΠΟΤΕ ΕΝΔΟΞΟΤΕΡΟC CΟΥ ΕΠΕΛΘΗ  
 7 ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟCΕΛΘΩΝ Ο ΔΕΙΠΝΟΚΛΗΤΩΡ ΕΙΠΗ CΟΙ  
 ΕΤΙ ΚΑΤΩ ΧΩΡΕΙ· ΚΑΙ ΚΑΤΑΙCΧΥΝΘΗCΗ  
 9 ΕΑΝ ΔΕ ΑΝΑΠΕCΗC· ΕΙC ΤΟΝ ΗΤΤΟΝΑ ΤΟΠΟΝ  
 ΚΑΙ ΕΠΕΛΘΗ CΟΥ ΗΤΤΩΝ  
 11 ΕΡΕΙ CΟΙ Ο ΔΕΙΠΝΟΚΛΗΤΩΡ· CΥΝΑΓΕ ΕΤΙ ΑΝΩ  
 ΚΑΙ ΕCΤΑΙ CΟΙ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΧΡΗCΙΜΟΝ.

The above passage is an interpolation in the text. The only other Greek authority which contains this paragraph is *φ* (*Codex Purpureus*). This text (except in small matters of spelling, e.g. *ζητιτε*) differs from that of D in the following points alone: line 2 *ἐλάττων*; ll. 4, 5 *μὴ εἰς τοὺς ἐξέχοντας τόπους ἀνακλίνεσθε*; l. 10 om. *καί*; l. 11 *ἄγε*; l. 12 *χρησιμώτερον*. The Sinaitic is wanting at this point. The Curetonian text contains the following interpolation at the same point in St Matthew's Gospel<sup>1</sup>:

<sup>1</sup> Cureton (*Gospels*, Preface, p. xxxvi) writes thus: 'This same passage is also read in the margin of the Philoxenian version in the Vatican, and is cited by Adler in full: and I have found it in the margin of a copy of the Peshito of the Nitrian manuscripts, No. 14,456 in the British Museum. As it stands in these copies, it is plain that it has been translated immediately from the Greek and not been taken from another copy of this Syriac text, from which, indeed, it varies in language considerably, as it will be seen by comparing them.'

ܐܝܢܬܐ ܠܗܘܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܐ ܡܢ ܐܘܪܝܬܐ 1  
ye-may-be-great littleness that-from seek-ye but ye

ܐܝܢܬܐ ܠܗܘܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܠܐ 2  
ye-may-be-little greatness from and-not

ܠܥܬܐܢܐ ܕܡܢ ܐܘܪܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܠܐ 3  
a-supper to-the-house-of are-ye bidden when

ܠܗܘܝܬܐ ܠܗܘܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܠܐ 4  
honoured in-the-place reclining be-ye not

ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ 5  
more-than-thou who-honoured (is) he there-may-come that-not

ܕܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ 6  
below draw-near the-supper the-lord-of to-thee and-there-say

ܠܥܬܐܢܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ 7  
those-reclining in-the-eyes-of and-thou-be-ashamed

ܠܥܬܐܢܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ 8  
mean in-the-place thou-shalt-recline but if

ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ 9  
than-thou who-mean (meaner) he and-there-come

ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ 10  
draw-near the-supper the-lord-of to-thee and-there-shall-say

ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ  
and-recline and-go-up

ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ 11  
in-the-eyes-of honourable glory to-thee and-there-shall-be

ܡܢ ܥܠܝܬܐ  
those-reclining

When we examine the Greek of D and  $\phi$  we find indications that we have not before us the original form of the gloss. (1) The awkwardness of the Greek points to retrans-

lation: see especially the first two lines. (2) The gloss evidently takes its rise from words in the context (v. 26), which are as follows: *ὅς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι ἔσται* (v. l. *ἔστω*) *ὑμῶν διάκονος*. But the phraseology of the gloss itself bears no resemblance to that of the context. (3) The main body of the gloss is obviously based on Lc. xiv. 8—10 *ὅταν κληθῇς ὑπὸ τινος εἰς γάμους, μὴ κατακληθῇς εἰς τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν, μὴ ποτε ἐντιμότερός σου ᾖ κεκλημένος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ σὲ καὶ αὐτὸν καλέσας ἐρεῖ σοι Δὸς τούτῳ τόπον, καὶ τότε ἄρξῃ μετὰ αἰσχύνης τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον κατέχειν. ἀλλ' ὅταν κληθῇς πορευθεὶς ἀνάπεσε εἰς τὸν ἔσχατον τόπον, ἵνα ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ κεκληκὼς σε ἐρεῖ σοι Φίλε, προσανάβηθι ἀνώτερον· τότε ἔσται σοι δόξα ἐνώπιον πάντων τῶν συνακειμένων σοι*. The verbal links between this part of the gloss and its original, it will be seen, are but few.

From the Greek we turn to the Syriac. (1) The contrast between the halting and awkward character of the former and the simple and forcible nature of the other is striking. Notice, for example, the first two lines—how the presence of the negative in the second clears up what in the Greek is obscure. We see at once how parallel these two sentences are to the two parts of the Lord's saying (Lc. xiv. 11, xviii. 14) 'Everyone that exalteth himself shall be humbled, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.' (2) Two key-words of the first two lines are taken from the context (v. 26): 'Whoso (is) wishing among-you that-he-should-be great (ܠܒܝ)'; hence ܠܒܝܬܐ, ܠܬܠܒܝ<sup>1</sup>. (3) The words 'littleness', 'ye-may-be-little' seem to be derived from the parallel passage Lc. xxii. 26 (*ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν γινέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος*), where the Old Syriac (Sin. Cur.) has: 'but whosoever great among-you shall-be as the-little-one (ܠܬܠܒܝ)'. (4) The language of the main body of the gloss is modelled

<sup>1</sup> It will be noticed that, while nothing in the context in the Greek suggests *αὐξῆσαι*, the Syriac verb 'to be great' is the regular equivalent of *αὐξάνειν* (Matt. vi. 28, xiii. 32, Mc. iv. 8, Lc. i. 80, ii. 40, xii. 27, xiii. 19, Jn. iii. 30), and therefore, if the Syriac form of the gloss is the original, the Syriac verb would naturally suggest this Greek verb here; see p. 14 n.

on that of Lc. xiv. 8—10, which runs thus in the Old Syriac (Sin. Cur.):

[ܐܢܬܐ] ܠܐ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܕܢܐ ܥܡܝܢܐ ܕܢܐ ܥܡܝܢܐ  
 [Cur. shalt-thou-go] not to-a-feast (art) thou bidden when  
 ܠܐ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ  
 lest honourable in-the-place [om. Cur.] for-thee shalt-thou-recline  
 ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ  
 more-than-thou who-honourable (is) he there [om. Cur.] bidden there-be  
 ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ  
 give to-thee and-say bade and-him that-thee he and-there-come  
 ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ  
 thou ashamed while and-then to-this-man [Cur. place] place  
 ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ  
 thou-art-bidden when but last in-the-place shalt-recline  
 ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ  
 that-when last in-the-place [om. Cur.] for-thee recline go  
 ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ  
 my-friend to-thee he-may-say who-bade-thee [Cur.] he there-has-come  
 ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ  
 in-the-eyes-of glory to-thee and-there-shall-be above ascend  
 ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ ܐܬܝܬܝܬ  
 [Cur. all-of-them] those-reclining

The phrase 'lord of the supper' is drawn from the immediate context of the passage just quoted (Lc. xiv. 12) 'And-He-said also *to-the-lord-of the-supper*' (Sin. Cur.), the word *supper* being used in vv. 12, 13, 16, 24<sup>2</sup>. (5) There are

<sup>1</sup> Cur. has the Ethpaal part. ܐܬܝܬܝܬ. In the next line Cur. has ܠܐ (lest).

<sup>2</sup> The compound Greek word in D— $\delta$   $\delta\epsilon\iota\pi\nu\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\omega\rho$ —seems intended to represent the Syriac compound expression 'the lord of the supper.'

certain correspondences in the Syriac which seem to point to this as the original form. The 'draw near' of l. 6 answers to the 'draw near' of l. 10; 'in the eyes of those reclining' of l. 7 to the same words in l. 11; the 'mean' of l. 8, applied to the seat at table, prepares the way for the 'mean' of l. 9 applied to the guest, just as the 'honoured' of l. 4 corresponds to the 'honoured' of l. 5. This last word indeed may be said to be a key-word, for it has a place in the final promise of commendation. 'There shall be to thee honourable (or abundant) glory.' Further, the word ܠܕܝܕܡܐ in the last line is a link between the Bezan and the Curetonian texts. For this Syriac root connotes utility, profit; thus, words from this root are used in rendering *χρήσιμον* in 2 Tim. ii. 14, *ὠφέλιμα* in Tit. iii. 8, *ὠφέλεια* in Rom. iii. 1. To sum up: a review of the Syriac form of the gloss shews (i) that it runs smoothly and naturally; (ii) that it itself reveals its origin: it springs out of the language in the context, and it is composed of phrases derived from certain passages of the Gospels which would be naturally brought together (Lc. xiv. 8 ff., xxii. 26).

The gloss is found also in many Old Latin MSS., viz. a b c e ff<sup>1,2</sup> h n; the first part (*ὑμεῖς—εἶναι*) is also preserved in m g<sup>1</sup>, the second part (*εἰσερχόμενοι—the end*) in g<sup>2</sup>. It is also given (see Bp Wordsworth *in loco*) in some MSS. of the Vulgate. The form of the gloss in the Old Latin Cod. Vercellensis (a), the chief variants being noted, is as follows (see Tischendorf *in loco*)—

'uos autem (e *enim*) quaeritis de (m *in*) pusillo (m *modicis*, emm *modico*) crescere (m *extolli*),

et de maiore (and *magnis*, m *maximis*, emm *maximo*, b g<sup>1</sup> theo *minore*) minores (c *minor*, m emm *minui*, e *minorari*, b g<sup>1</sup> and theo *maiores*) esse (e *om.*, ff<sup>1</sup> g<sup>1</sup> *fieri*).

Intrantes (m g<sup>2</sup> emm *cum autem introieritis*) autem et (e ff<sup>1</sup> om.) rogati (and om. *et rogati*, m g<sup>2</sup> emm *ad cenam uocati*) ad cenam (theo *cenare*)

nolite recumbere (ff<sup>1</sup> h *discumbere*) in locis eminentioribus (g<sup>2</sup> emm theo *superioribus loc.*, m *honorificis locis*)

ne forte clarior (m g<sup>2</sup> emm theo *dignior*, e *honoratior*) te superueniat

et accedens (g<sup>2</sup> emm add. *is*) qui ad cenam uocauit te (ff<sup>1</sup> *qui inuitauit te*, m *inuitator*) dicat tibi: adhuc deorsum (g<sup>2</sup> emm *inferius*, m *infra*) accede,

et confundaris (ff<sup>1</sup> theo *et erit tibi confusio*).

Si autem in loco inferiori recubueris (ff<sup>1</sup> h *disc.*),

et superuenerit (g<sup>2</sup> emm *aduenerit*) humilior te,

(e add. *tunc*) dicet tibi qui te ad cenam uocauit (and *inuitauit*): accede adhuc (e *om.*) superius (b ff<sup>1</sup> h and *sursum*, m *in superiori loco*),

et erit hoc tibi utilius (e *et tunc erit tibi gloriam coram discumbentibus*).<sup>1</sup>

It is sufficient to give two reasons for the belief that we cannot seek the original form of the gloss in the Latin. (1) Putting aside those variations which imply difference of reading, the number of synonymous variants seems to imply different attempts to render a common original. (2) In the first line an imperative is required. 'Seek ye from a lower position to rise to a higher.' This is demanded by the illustration of the feast which follows. The imperative then—'seek ye'—must be the original form. The Greek *ζητεῖτε* is ambiguous. The Latin authorities agree in having the indicative. The *quaeritis* then of the Latins has every appearance of being a mistaken rendering of the Greek *ζητεῖτε*<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> In Lc. xxii. 27 D reads ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν ἦλθον οὐχ ὡς ὁ ἀνακειμένος ἀλλ' ὡς ὁ διακονῶν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἡγξήθητε ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ μου ὡς ὁ διακονῶν. The points are: (1) The passage is assimilated to the passage in Matt. xx. 28; for the Bezan *ἦλθον* comes from *ἦλθεν* (Matt.). (2) With the *οὐχ ὡς ἀνακειμένος ἀλλ' ὡς διακ.* compare the Curetonian of Lc. xxii. 26 'And-he-that(-is)-chief is as the-server and-not as he-that-reclineth' (*οὐχὶ ὁ ἀνακ.*; being read as if it had been *οὐχ ὁ ἀνακ.*, and transplanted into an earlier clause). This incorporation in the gloss of a reading peculiar to Cur. suggests that the gloss was originally Syriac. (3) This suggestion is confirmed by *ἡγξήθητε*, which would naturally represent the Syriac word 'ye-became-great,' derived from 'Whosoever (is) great among-you' (v. 26), 'who-is great?' (v. 27); see p. 11 n.

Matt. xxi. 28 ff.

ΥΠΑΓΕ ΣΗΜΕΡΟΝ ΕΡΓΑΖΟΥ ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΑΜΠΕΛΩΝΑ  
 Ο ΔΕ ΑΠΟΚΡΕΙΘΕΙΣ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΟΥ ΘΕΛΩ  
 ΥΣΤΕΡΟΝ ΔΕ ΜΕΤΑΜΕΤΑΜΕΛΗΘΕΙΣ  
 ΑΠΗΛΘΕΝ ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ ΑΜΠΕΛΩΝΑ  
 ΠΡΟΣΕΛΘΩΝ ΔΕ ΤΩ ΕΤΕΡΩ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΩΣΑΥΤΩΣ  
 Ο ΔΕ ΑΠΟΚΡΕΙΘΕΙΣ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΕΓΩ ΚΕ ΥΠΑΓΩ  
 ΚΑΙ ΟΥΚ ΑΠΗΛΘΕΝ· ΤΙΣ ΕΚ ΤΩΝ ΔΥΩ  
 ΤΟ ΘΕΛΗΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕΝ  
 ΛΕΓΟΥΣΙΝ Ο ΔΙΣΧΑΤΟΣ.

The true text has *ὑπάγε σ. ἐργ. ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι· ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν Ἐγὼ, κύριε· καὶ οὐκ ἀπῆλθεν. προσελθὼν δὲ τῷ δευτέρῳ εἶπεν ὡσαύτως· ὁ δὲ ἀποκρ. εἶπεν Οὐ θέλω· ὕστερον μεταμεληθεὶς ἀπῆλθεν. τίς ἐκ τῶν δύο ἐποίησεν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς; λέγουσιν Ὁ ὕστερος.*

The Sinaitic Syriac has: 'He-said to-the-first, Go, my-son [*Cur. add.* to-day] work the-work in-the-vineyard. He-said to-him I-will not; and-in-the-sequel there-repented-him his-soul, and-he-went to-the-vineyard. And-he-said to-the-other (ⲕⲓⲱⲣⲉ) likewise; and-he-answered and-said, Yea, my-Lord; and he-went not. Which of these [*Cur. add.* two seemeth to-you that-he-] did the-will of-his-father? Saying (were they) to-Him, That last [*Cur.* first].'

The Bezan, it will be seen, agrees with the Old Syriac (Sin. Cur.) in (a) the transposition of the two sons: so also the Peshitta and Old Latin MSS.; (b) the interpolation 'into-the-vineyard' in line 4; so many Latin MSS. Further, the Sinaitic agrees with D 604 and Latin MSS. in transposing the order of the sons and at the same time in reading '*the last*' in the answer of the crowd.

Matt. xxii. 34. *συνήχθησαν ἐπ' αὐτόν.*

The true text has *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό*. The Sinaitic and the Curetonian have 'there-were-assembled *unto-Him* (or *against-Him*, ⲙⲃⲁⲗ). The Arabic Tatian (Hill, p. 180) has: 'The

Pharisees...assembled themselves *together* against Him, to strive with Him.' As this reading differs from that of the Peshitta 'there-assembled *together*' (= ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό), it is probable that the Arabic here preserves the true Tatianic reading. The substitution of 'unto-Him' for 'together' (ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό) is quite in harmony with the pronoun-loving Syriac.

This apparently Syriac reading is preserved in b c e ff<sup>2</sup> h ; aeth. ; Hil. Like the Arabic Tatian, f has the conflate reading *in unum ad eum*.

Matt. xxiii. 9.

ΚΑΙ ΠΑΤΕΡΑ ΜΗ ΚΑΛΕΣΧΤΕ ΥΜΕΙΝ ΕΠΙ ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ  
ΕΙΣ ΓΑΡ ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΠΑΤΗΡ ΥΜΩΝ Ο ΕΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΙΣ.

The true text has καὶ πατέρα μὴ καλέσητε ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, εἰς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ὁ πατὴρ ὁ οὐράνιος.

The Syriac (Sin. Cur. Pesh.) has: 'And-father ye shall not call *for-you* (ܐܢܬܝܢ) on-earth: for one is (ܐܬܐ) *your-father, who-(is-)in-heaven.*' Compare Aphraat's paraphrase (p. ܡܡ): 'Father shall not we call *for-us* (ܐܢܝܢ) on-earth.' This use of the preposition ܐܢܝܢ with the reflexive pronoun is very common in Syriac (Nöldeke *Gram.* § 224); see e.g. above, p. 12, ll. 2, 7.

This 'for you' is found in 26<sup>ev</sup>, Old and Vulgate Latin MSS., the Egyptian Versions, and in Clem. Alex. (*Strom.* iii. 12, p. 551 ed. Potter).

Matt. xxv. 41.

ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΠΥΡ ΤΟ ΑΙΩΝΙΟΝ  
Ο ΗΤΟΙΜΑΣΕΝ Ο ΠΑΤΗΡ ΜΟΥ  
ΤΩ ΔΙΑΒΟΛΩ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΙΣ ΑΓΓΕΛΟΙΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ·

For the second line the true text has τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον. Neither the Sinaitic nor the Curetonian is extant at this point. Aphraat (p. ܡܡ) has 'to that fire *which-(is-)prepared* (ܡܡܐܬܐ) for-the-evil-one and-for-his-angels.' The mention of the Father however in the Bezan text shews that in that text the passage has been assimilated to Matt.



xx. 23<sup>1</sup> (οἷς ἡτοιμάσται ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου). This latter passage is literally translated in the Curetonian and in the Peshitta, but in the Sinaitic it runs thus: 'for whom my-Father prepareth (ܐܬܝܢ ܐܬܝܢ ܐܬܝܢ).' Further, the Arabic Tatian (Hill, p. 165) has: 'for whom my Father hath prepared it.' This resolution of a passive verb (with the agent) into an active verb (with the subject) is specially characteristic of the Old Syriac version. I have noticed the following instances in the Sinaitic Syriac of St Matthew: iii. 6 (ἐβαπτίζοντο... ὑπ' αὐτοῦ) 'he was baptising them'; ix. 17 (ῥήγνυνται οἱ ἀσκοί) 'lest the wine split those skins'; ix. 32 (δαιμονιζόμενον) 'whom a devil rode'; x. 22 (ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων) 'men shall be hating you'; xiv. 11 (ἡνέχθη ἡ κεφαλὴ αὐτοῦ) 'they brought the head of John'; xviii. 30 (τὸ ὀφειλόμενον) 'what he owed'; xix. 12 (εὐνοῦχοι οἵτινες εὐνουχίσθησαν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων) 'eunuchs whom men have made (ܐܬܝܢ)'; xxiii. 7 (καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων) 'that men should be calling them'; xxvii. 12 (ἐν τῷ κατηγορεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων) 'when the chief priests and Pharisees accused Him'; xxvii. 64 (κέλευσον οὖν ἀσφαλισθῆναι τὸν τάφον) 'command that they watch the sepulchre.' Compare also ii. 16, iii. 13, v. 13, xviii. 25, xxiv. 9; see Baethgen, *Evangelienfragmente*, p. 29, for similar instances in the Curetonian.

Thus a Syriac reading in Matt. xx. 23 has been introduced into the Bezan text of Matt. xxv. 41; or—may we say?—into the Syriac text which underlies parts at least of the Bezan text.

The Bezan reading in Matt. xxv. 41 has a special interest through its wide attestation in quite early Patristic authorities<sup>2</sup>, viz. Justin *Dial.* 301 D; Clem. *Hom.* xix. 2; Iren. ii. 6 § 1,

<sup>1</sup> It is worth noting that in the parallel passage, Mc. x. 40 (ἀλλ' οἷς ἡτοιμάσται), Sin. taking ἀλλ' οἷς as ἀλλοῖς has 'for-others however it-is-prepared.' The converse confusion is found in the Curetonian of Jn. iv. 38 (ἄλλοι κεκοπιάκασιν) 'but those who laboured.' In Mc. x. 40 D a b ff<sup>2</sup> k aeth have the same misreading as Sin. Comp. Jn. vi. 23 (below, p. 20).

<sup>2</sup> For the Patristic authorities see Dr Hort's note (*Introduction, Notes on Select Readings*) and Resch, *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte*, p. 313 ff.

iii. § 33, 2, iv. 55 § 1, 65, 66; Clem., *Coh. ad Gentes*, ix.; Tert. *Hermog.* xi. (the true reading being found in *De carne* xiv.); Cyprian *Test.* ii. 30, iii. 1, *De opere* 23. It is found also in 1 22 a b c ff<sup>1,2</sup> g<sup>1</sup> h r r<sup>2</sup> R.

Matt. xxvi. 15. οἱς δὲ ἑστηκαν αὐτῷ .λ. στατήρας.

The true text has ἀργύρια.

There is no special reason why such a reading should arise in the Greek. For Greek has the convenient neuter plural ἀργύρια. The Sinaitic and the Peshitta have here 'thirty of-silver (ܠܬܝܠܬ ܕܠܝܬܝܬܐ).' It would be very easy for a Syriac reading or gloss to arise, inserting the coin after the numeral. The cursives 1-209<sup>1</sup> have στατήρας ἀργυρίου, the latter word exactly answering to the Syriac 'of-silver'; compare *h stateres argenteos*. It should be further noticed that the Arabic Tatian (Hill, p. 218) inserts a mention of the coin—'thirty dirhems (i.e. drachmas) of money\*.'

The Bezan reading is found in a b q and in Euseb. *Dem.*

<sup>1</sup> Mr F. C. Burkitt in his notice of the Sinaitic Syriac MS. (*Guardian*, Oct. 31, 1894) writes thus: 'Two groups of cursives with mixed texts stand out as having a special affinity with Syr-vt. These are 1-(118-131)-209 and the "Ferrar group".' Though these two cursives do not here coincide with Sin., their relation to the Old Syriac text makes it not improbable that they preserve here an Old Syriac reading, a supposition confirmed by the genitive ἀργυρίου.

<sup>2</sup> I take this opportunity to notice the Bezan reading in Mc. xii. 14 ΔΟΥΝΑΙ ΕΠΙΚΑΙΦΑΛΑΙΟΝ (true text κῆνσος) ΚΑΙ ΔΑΡΙ (d, dare *tributum* Caesari). The word κῆνσος occurs in the N. T. only in Matt. xvii. 25, xxii. 17, 19, Mc. xii. 14. In Matt. Sin. Cur. Pesh., in Mc. (where Cur. is wanting) Sin. Pesh. translate κῆνσος by the words 'money-of-the-head' (ܠܬܝܠܬ ܕܠܝܬܝܬܐ), 'money-of-the-heads' (ܠܬܝܠܬ ܕܠܝܬܝܬܐ, Sin. in Mc.). The word φόρος is so translated by Sin. Cur. Pesh. in Lc. xx. 22, xxiii. 2, and by the Peshitta in Rom. xiii. 6 f. The last named version renders the words ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς ἀπογραφῆς (Acts v. 37) by the paraphrase 'in-the-days (in) which-written were the-men in-the-money-of-the-head.' Thus the regular Syriac equivalent of the Greek words denoting 'tribute' is a phrase meaning 'poll-tax.' It would seem then that a bilingual scribe, familiar with this Syriac phrase, introduced into the Bezan text the Greek word for 'poll-tax' (ἐπικεφάλαιον, [Arist.] *Oecon.* i., xv.). The Old Latin k (which has a text closely akin to that of e, the constant ally of D; see Dr Sanday in *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, No. 11. pp. lxxvii ff., xciv ff.) has the corresponding Latin term—capitularium.

*Evan.* (Migne, *P. G.* xxii. 743), Origen (lat. interp.: Migne, *P. G.* xiii. 1726).

John iv. 42. οἰκεῖ διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν μαρτυρίαν πιστεύομεν.

The true text has *λαλιὰν* in place of *μαρτυρίαν*. The Sinaitic Syriac is wanting iv. 37—v. 6. The Curetonian in v. 42 has: 'And-saying were-they to *that woman*, Now it-is not *because-of thy-word* (ܐܕܠܟܐ ܕܠܗܐ) *believing* (are) we *in-Him*.' In v. 39 (...πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν τῶν Σαμ. διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικὸς μαρτυροῦσης...) the same version has: 'And-from that city many *believed in-Him...because-of her-witness* (ܐܕܠܟܐ ܕܠܗܐ) (even) *of-that woman* who-saying was All that which-I-have-done He-told me.' In the latter verse the Curetonian gives the ideas connoted by the Greek, but changes the form of the phrase: the notion of *witness* comes early in the sentence, being expressed by the substantive. Thus the phraseology of the Curetonian in v. 39 is perfectly natural: no other authority has the reading. Clearly v. 42 is closely parallel to v. 39. In the Bezan text we have an instance of context-assimilation, v. 42 being apparently assimilated to the Old Syriac text of v. 39. Is it not probable that in v. 42 D reproduces an old Syriac reading?

The Bezan reading is found in  $\aleph^*$  b1.

John vi. 17. κατέλαβεν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἡ σκοτία.

The true text has *καὶ σκοτία ἤδη ἐγεγόνει*.

The Curetonian and Peshitta have<sup>1</sup>: ܐܠ ܕܠܗܐ ܕܠܗܐ (and-darkness was to-it (i.e. the boat)). There are thus two points common to the Bezan and the Syriac texts, (1) the omission of *now*; (2) the insertion of a pronoun.

Further, if in the Syriac sentence the word ܕܠܗܐ—the verb used as the equivalent of *καταλαβεῖν* in reference to darkness in Jn. i. 5, xii. 35—were inserted before ܕܠܗܐ, then

<sup>1</sup> The only words legible in Sin. at this point are: 'To-Capernaum because... to-it (or it).'

the Syriac (the **Δ** now denoting the object) becomes 'And-darkness had taken (*or* took) it'—the equivalent of the Bezan Greek. Thus, while to produce the Greek Bezan reading the whole sentence is remoulded, the corresponding reading in Syriac would be generated by the simple insertion of a single word, suggested by two parallel passages.

The Bezan reading is found elsewhere only in **ℵ**.

This theory as to the reading under discussion is, I think, confirmed when we remark that we have evidence that in the Diatessaron the same verb apparently was inserted in a similar passage. In Matt. xxvii. 45 we read *σκότος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πᾶσαν* (Mc. xv. 33, Lc. xxiii. 44 *ἐφ' ὅλην*) *τὴν γῆν*—a sentence literally translated in the Syriac versions. The Arabic Tatian has: 'Tenebrae *occupauerunt* uniuersam terram' (Ciasca, p. 92); 'darkness *covered* the whole land' (Hill, p. 248). Further, the *Gospel according to Peter* (ed. Swete, p. 7) has *σκότος κατέσχε πᾶσαν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν*<sup>1</sup>.

John vi. 23. ἄλλων πλοιαρείων ἐλθόντων.

The true text has *ἀλλὰ ἦλθεν πλοῖα*.

It is evident that *ἄλλων* comes from the *ἀλλά* of the true text misread as *ἄλλα*. But this misreading, taken in connexion with the recasting of the sentence, implies the medium of a version. The Curetonian<sup>2</sup>, making this mistake of reading *ἀλλά* as *ἄλλα*, has: 'And-when there-came boats *other* (**ܐܕܘܝܐ**) from Tiberias.' Of this natural Syriac representation of the true text (misread) the Bezan Greek is the natural retranslation.

**ℵ** has *ἐπελθόντων οὖν τῶν πλοίων*. Here we must take account of (1) the construction, which, like that in D, recalls the Syriac; (2) the omission of 'other' and 'but'; (3) the compound verb. Was the **ܐܕܘܝܐ** ('other') *either* changed in some Syriac text, *or* read by some Greek scribe as though

<sup>1</sup> For indications that this document is in large part based on the Syriac Diatessaron see my *Old Syriac Element*, pp. 116 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The following words alone appear to be legible in Sin.: 'Boats came from T....'

it had been changed, into **ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲛ** ('postremae') or **ⲟⲩⲱⲛ** ('postea')? If so, we have an explanation of the compound verb **ἐπελθόντων**. The Old Latin b has a conflate reading: 'et cum *super*uenissent *aliae* naues'; e has: 'uenerunt *aliae* nauculae.'

In v. 23 the words **εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου** are omitted in the Curetonian D 69\* a e arm.

John vi. 56. **ΕΝ ΕΜΟΙ ΜΕΝΕΙ ΚΑΓΩ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ**  
**ΚΑΘΩΣ ΕΝ ΕΜΟΙ Ο ΠΑΤΗΡ ΚΑΓΩ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΠΑΤΡΙ**  
**ΔΜΗΝ ΔΜΗΝ ΛΕΓΩ ΥΜΕΙΝ**  
**ΕΑΝ ΜΗ ΛΑΒΗΤΕ ΤΟ ΣΩΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΥΙΟΥ**  
**ΤΟΥ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ ΩΣ ΤΟΝ ἈΡΤΟΝ ΤΗΣ ΖΩΗΣ**  
**ΟΥΚ ΕΧΕΤΕ ΖΩΗΝ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ.**

The first line of the gloss is modelled on v. 57, x. 14, xiv. 10, xv. 9. How easily these words would arise is seen in the following passage of Aphraat (p. 100): 'When a man gathers his soul in the name of Christ, Christ abides in him, and God abides in Christ. So then that one man is of three parts, himself, and Christ who abides in him, and God (v. l. the Father) who is in Christ, as our Lord said: I in my Father and my Father in me.'

The last four lines are founded on v. 53 **ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε τὴν σάρκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πίνητε αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς**. The differences between this verse and the gloss (over and above the substitution of **ἐν αὐτῷ** for **ἐν ἑαυτοῖς** and the omission of the reference to the blood) are (1) the substitution of **τὸ σῶμα** for **τὴν σάρκα**, (2) of **λάβητε** for **φάγητε**, (3) the insertion of the words **ὡς τὸν ἄρτον τῆς ζωῆς**.

To take first the substitution of **τὸ σῶμα** for **τὴν σάρκα**: in v. 53 the Syriac (Sin. Cur. Pesh.) has: 'Verily, verily, saying-(am-)I to-you that except ye-eat *His-body* (**ⲙⲓⲃⲁ**) (even) of-the-Son of-Man and-drink His-blood there-is-not to-you life in-you<sup>1</sup>.' The Syriac versions (Sin., which how-

<sup>1</sup> **ⲙⲓⲃⲁ** (Sin. Cur.) **ⲙⲓⲃⲁⲙⲉⲥ** (Pesh.)

ever is wanting in *v.* 52, Cur. Pesh.) have 'body' throughout John vi. to translate *σάρξ*. So also in John i. 13, 14 the Curetonian (not Pesh., Sin. wanting); Aphraat does not quote i. 13, but he twice (pp. ٧٥, ١٥٥) quotes i. 14 in this form. No other authority, so far as I know, reads 'body' in any of these passages, with the one exception of the Old Latin *m* in John vi. 51 (*et hic panis quem ego dabo pro huius mundi uita corpus meum est*). The word 'body' then is a frequent and characteristic rendering of *σάρξ* in the Syriac versions of St John. The use of the word *σῶμα* in the Bezan interpolation seems to be a clear proof of its Syriac origin.

We pass on to consider *λάβητε* in place of *φάγητε*. Compare the reading of *D* in *v.* 53 *ΕΑΝ ΜΗ ΛΑΒΗΤΕ* (true text *φάγητε*) *ΤΗΝ ΣΑΡΚΑ* and in *v.* 57 *Ο ΛΑΜΒΑΝΩΝ* (true text *τρώγων*) *ΜΕ*. Clearly the substitution of 'take' for 'eat' follows upon the Syriac substitution of 'body' for 'flesh,' since the word 'body' at once recalls the 'take' of the words of Institution (Matt. xxvi. 26 *λάβετε, φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου*, Mc. xiv. 22 *λάβετε, τοῦτο κ.τ.λ.*)<sup>1</sup>. We have moreover some direct evidence for the substitution of 'take' for 'eat' in an Old Syriac text of John vi. 53, since Ephrem (Moesinger, p. 245) has the words 'Si quis carnem meam non *sumpserit*, uitam non habet.'

The interpolation is found in a somewhat different form in the Old Latin *a ff*<sup>2</sup>: 'si *acceperit* homo *corpus* filii hominis quemadmodum panem uitae, habebit uitam in eo (*ff*<sup>2</sup> illo).' Here the word *homo* should perhaps be compared with the Syriac (Sin. Cur. Pesh.) of *v.* 50: 'This is the bread which came down from heaven that a *man* (ܐܢܫܐ = *τις*) should eat thereof.'

It should be added that *a* and Victorinus in *v.* 53 have the interpolated words *sicut panem uitae*.

<sup>1</sup> Aphraat (p. ٢١) gives the words of Institution thus: 'This is my body; take, eat of it all of you.'

John viii. 53. ΜΗ ΟΥ ΜΕΙΖΩΝ ΕΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΒΡΑΑΜ· ΟΤΙ ΑΠΕΘΑΝΕΝ.

The true text has (a) *ὅστις*, not *ὅτι*, (b) *πατὴρ ἡμῶν* before *Ἀβραάμ*.

In regard to the *ὅτι*, while it is of course possible that it is to be explained as an *itacism* for *ὅστις*, it should be noticed that the Syriac ܕܠܡܢܐ means *because he died* or *who died*<sup>1</sup>. The Old Latin a seems to be the only companion of D in this reading.

The omission of '*our father*' would be easier in Syriac than in Greek or Latin. For in Syriac (1) it would be the omission of a single word; (2) the word ܐܒܐ (our-father) would easily fall out before ܐܒܪܗܡ (Abraham), the words beginning with the same two letters. As a matter of fact '*our-father*' is omitted in the Sinaitic Syriac, which has: '*Art-Thou greater than Abraham and-than the-prophets who-died (or because-they-died)?*' The same omission is found in the Old Latin a b c e ff<sup>1</sup>l.

John xi. 9 f. ΟΥΧΕΙ ΔΩΔΕΚΑ ΩΡΑΣ ΕΧΕΙ Η ΗΜΕΡΑ...

ΕΑΝ ΔΕ ΤΙΣ ΠΕΡΙΠΑΤΗ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΝΥΚΤΙ ΠΡΟΣΚΟΠΤΕΙ  
ΟΤΙ ΤΟ ΦΩΣ ΟΥΚ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΗ.

The true text is *οὐχὶ δώδεκα ὥραι εἰσιν τῆς ἡμέρας;...ἐν αὐτῷ*.

There are two points here. (1) The Syriac (Sin. Pesh.) of the first line is: '*Not twelve hours are-there (ܕܠܡܢܐ) in-the-day?*' The Syriac ܕܠܡܢܐ (there-is in), like ܕܠܡܢܐ (there-is to), is a not infrequent equivalent of *ἔχει*. Thus *δαιμόνιον ἔχει* (Lc. vii. 33) becomes in the Syriac '*A-devil there-is in-him.*' If therefore the Bezan scribe were following the Syriac at this point, he would naturally retranslate the Syriac by its most obvious Greek equivalent, i.e. by the words of the Bezan text. D here seems to stand alone. Compare p. 41 f.

<sup>1</sup> The Bezan Latin is *quoniam*. Had the word there been *quia*, it might have been urged that *quia* arose from *qui*.

(2) The Sinaitic Syriac of the last two lines is : 'Whosoever in-the-night however walketh stumbleth, because the-light (or light) is not in-him or in-it (ܡܢܐ).' The last word ܡܢܐ can grammatically refer either to the man or to the night. It is in itself quite ambiguous. In Latin, it should be noticed, there is no ambiguity (nocte...in eo)<sup>1</sup>. The reading therefore is important in view of somewhat similar Bezan readings, which might be regarded as due to the influence of an ambiguity either in the Syriac or in the Latin. Thus in Lc. ii. 22 D has ܕܝ ܗܡܝܪܝ ܬܘܓ ܕܠܗܝܫܡܝܘܬܝ ܕܝܬܘܓ. Here the Syriac suffix (ܡܢܐܝܬܐ, his- or her-purification) and the Latin *eius* are alike indeterminate. Compare *Old Syriac Element*, pp. 81, 152.

John xi. 28. ܕܝܬܘܓ ܕܝܬܘܓ ܕܝܬܘܓ ܕܝܬܘܓ ܕܝܬܘܓ  
ܬܘܓ ܕܠܗܝܫܡܝܘܬܝ ܕܝܬܘܓ ܕܝܬܘܓ ܕܝܬܘܓ ܕܝܬܘܓ

The true text has in the last line M. ܬܘܓ ܕܠܗܝܫܡܝܘܬܝ ܕܝܬܘܓ.

The Sinaitic Syriac has : 'And-when she-had-said these-things she-went *silently*' (ܕܝܬܘܓ ܕܝܬܘܓ) she-called Mary and (was) saying.' In connexion with the verb *she went* the word *silently* is natural and forcible. It becomes paradoxical in the place to which it is transplanted in D, most Old Latin MSS. and Latin Vulgate (*uocauit Mariam sororem eius silentio*).

Two other readings in this chapter may be noticed :

(i) xi. 14. ܕܠܐܝܕܝܐ ܕܝܬܘܓ ܕܝܬܘܓ ܕܝܬܘܓ ܕܝܬܘܓ ܕܝܬܘܓ

The only other authority, so far as I know, in which the words 'our friend' are added here from v. 11, is Ephrem's quotation from the Diatessaron, 'Lazarus our friend is dead' (Hill, p. 367). Here then we have a Tatianic reading, due to context-assimilation, preserved in D alone.

<sup>1</sup> Apparently the only other authority in which the Bezan reading is found is the Thebaic (ed. Woid).

<sup>2</sup> In Matt. i. 19 the Old Syriac (Sin. Cur.) translates ܕܠܗܝܫܡܝܘܬܝ by ܕܝܬܘܓ (quietly, silently).



(ii) xi. 35. καὶ ἐδάκρυεν ὁ ἰησ.

The added 'and' appears in Ephrem's quotation—'And our Lord wept<sup>1</sup>.' The addition is also found in  $\aleph 61^{**}$  69–346 (the two last belonging to the Ferrar-group) 6<sup>pe</sup>, Old Latin MSS., Lat.-vg. me. arm. aeth. There is no doubt that the 'and' was added in an early Syriac text; but clearly such an addition might arise independently in different copies and versions.

Similarly in v. 48 D has καὶ εἰν ἀφωμεν with the Sinaitic, Ephrem, and the Peshitta—'And if we suffer Him.' It is found also in 235 me. aeth. In the same verse  $\aleph^{*}$  ff<sup>2</sup> arm. join the Sinaitic (which has the simple participle *believing*) and Ephrem ('all men *believe* on Him') in having the present tense (true text *πιστεύουσιν*).

John xii. 32.

ἐγὼ εἰν ὑψωθῶ

ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐλκύσω πάντα πρὸς ἐμαυτὸν.

The true text has *ἐκ* in place of *ἀπὸ* and reads *πάντας ἐλκύσω*. The Peshitta<sup>3</sup> has 'And-I, when that-I-have-been-raised from the-earth, will-draw every-man (*ܠܠܗ*) to-me.' Two points are to be noted: (1) The order in D agrees with that in the Peshitta—'I-will-draw every-man,' (2) *πάντας* (true text) = *ܠܠܗ* (cf. e.g. Matt. xix. 11, xxvi. 33, Lc. xxi. 17, John i. 7, xiii. 35) = *πάντα* (D). Thus, when these two points are considered together, it seems likely that *πάντα* is the *masculine singular*, a retranslation of the Syriac *ܠܠܗ*. The reading *πάντα* is found in  $\aleph^{*}$  56. The Latins (Old Latin and Vulgate) took *πάντα* as *neuter plural*: hence their *omnia*. If this explanation is correct, this reading has a peculiar value as being an instance of a Syrism in the Latin text, which has clearly come through a Greek medium.

John xiii. 14. ποσῶ μᾶλλον καὶ ὑμεῖς ὀφείλετε.

The true text has *καὶ ὑμεῖς ὀφείλετε*.

<sup>1</sup> Sin. and Pesh. have 'And-coming there-were His-tears (even) of-Jesus.'

<sup>2</sup> Sin. Cur. wanting.



John xxi. 13.

ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ ΙΗΣ

ΚΑΙ ΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΙ ΤΟΝ ἈΡΤΟΝ ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΣΑΣ ΕΔΩΚΕ

ΑΥΤΟΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΟΨΑΡΙΟΝ ΟΜΟΙΩΣ.

The true text has ...τὸν ἄρτον καὶ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.

The Sinaitic Syriac is as follows: 'And-He-took-up (even) Jesus the-bread and-the-fish *and-blessed upon-them* and-gave to-them.' The passage is evidently assimilated to the accounts of the earlier miracles. Thus compare e.g. Mc. vi. 41 (καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέκλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς), which runs thus in the Sinaitic Syriac: 'And He took-up these five loaves and-two fishes and-looked to-heaven and-blessed and-brake the-bread and-gave to-His-disciples<sup>1</sup>.' It will be noticed that, while the Sinaitic has 'He-blessed,' D has the synonymous expression *εὐχαριστήσας*. The Jerusalem Lectionary (p. 423) has 'He-gave-thanks and-gave.' The Old Latin authorities have the word used in the Sinaitic<sup>2</sup>, the gloss in them taking two forms (a) *d f et benedicens*—a reading which looks like the translation of a Greek aorist participle; (b) *g mm et benedixit et*.

Luke i. 79. ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὑψους ἐπιφαναι φῶς.

It appears that D is the only authority which adds *φῶς*. The word would not unnaturally arise in a text assimilated to a Syriac text. The Sinaitic has 'it-shall-make-light (*ܝܬܥܝܠ*),' the Peshitta 'to-make-light (*ܐܝܬܥܝܠ*)'; the Syriac versions, that is, here use the causative of the verb which is of the same family as the Syriac word for light—*ܠܝܬܝܠ*.

<sup>1</sup> It is worth noting that whereas in the Greek two words are used to describe the fish—*οἱ ἰχθύες* and *τὸ ὀψάριον*—the Syriac has only one word.

<sup>2</sup> The Greek and Latin of D, it will be seen, differ (*εὐχαριστήσας*, *benedicens*). Are they independent representatives here of the Syro-Latin text? Or is the Latin an inaccurate reading of the Greek? The participle (*benedicens*) of the Latin favours the latter alternative.

Luke ii. 5.

...ΒΗΘΛΕΕΜ Α ΑΠΟΓΡΑΦΕΣΘΑΙ

ΣΥΝ ΜΑΡΙΑ ΤΗ ΕΜΝΗΣΤΕΥΜΕΝΗ ΑΥΤΩ

ΟΥΧΙ ΕΝΚΥΩ ΔΙΑ ΤΟ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΕΞ ΟΙΚΟΥ

ΚΑΙ ΠΑΤΡΙΔΟΣ ΔΑΥΕΙΔ.

D appears to be the only<sup>1</sup> authority which places the last clause (*διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτόν κ.τ.λ.*) *after*, instead of (as in the true text) immediately *before*, the clause 'to enrol himself with Mary &c.'

It will be convenient to give the whole passage in the English: 'And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judæa, to the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, *because he was of the house and family of David*; to enrol himself with Mary, who was betrothed to him, being great with child. And it came to pass, while they were there, the days &c.'

I hope to make it probable that D here gives the Tatianic order of the clauses, though it fails to reproduce what seems to have been the Tatianic reading.

There is an important passage in Aphraat (p. ۳۵۵, Bert, p. 388), which is as follows: 'And Jesus was born from Mary, the Virgin, from the seed of the house of David, from the Spirit of holiness, *as it is written that Joseph and Mary his espoused (were<sup>2</sup>) both of them (۳۵۵) from the house of David.*' With this passage we must compare the following from Ephrem's commentary on the Diatessaron (Moesinger, p. 16): 'Quodsi, quia Scriptura dixit: "Elisabeth soror tua," ideo hoc dictum esse putas, ut manifestaretur, Mariam esse ex domo Levi, alio loco *eadem Scriptura dixit, utrumque, Josephum et Mariam, esse ex domo David.*'

These two passages<sup>3</sup> seem to make it clear that the text of the Diatessaron (note 'as it is written' (Aph.), 'eadem

<sup>1</sup> Except Sin.; see the end of this note.

<sup>2</sup> Cod. A inserts ۳۵۵.

<sup>3</sup> They are brought together in Zahn, *Forschungen zur Gesch. des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 1. Theil, p. 118.

Scriptura' (Eph.)) expressly asserted that Joseph and Mary were *both* of Davidic descent. It would seem probable then that in place of 'because *he was* (Pesh. ܡܪܝܝܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܝܬܐ ܕܕܐܘܕܐ) of the house and family of David,' Tatian by a very simple alteration read 'because *they were* (ܡܪܝܝܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܝܬܐ ܕܕܐܘܕܐ) of the house &c.' But this emendation of the text of the clause must have been accompanied by a change in its position. As emended it could not stand *before* the words 'with Mary his espoused one,' for Mary had not been mentioned in the previous context. It would naturally be placed where it stands in the Bezan text, *after* the mention of Mary.

The evidence then of Aphraat, Ephrem, and D enables us with great probability to restore a Tatianic reading. D, it will be seen, witnesses indirectly to the reading, though it has not preserved the actual reading itself. The Bezan scribe gives the Tatianic order of the clauses; but he simply *transcribes* the true Greek text διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτόν (not αὐτούς).

I have left this note precisely as it was written some months ago. The subsequent publication of the Sinaitic Syriac reveals to us (1) the actual readings, (2) the order of the clauses in an Old Syriac text. The passage is as follows: 'And-also Joseph...[went] from Nazareth, a-city of-Galilee, to-Judæa to-the-city of-David which(-is)-called Bethlehem, *he and-Mary his-wife while great-with-child, that-there they-might-be enrolled, because that-both-of-them* (ܡܪܝܝܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܝܬܐ ܕܕܐܘܕܐ) *from his-house were (even) of-David.*' Thus the discovery of the Old Syriac text entirely confirms the conclusion reached on critical grounds as to the position of the clause διὰ τὸ εἶναι κ.τ.λ. in the Old Syriac text of St Luke.

Luke ii. 48. ܝܕܘܝ ܕܡܪܝܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܬܐ ܕܕܐܘܕܐ  
ܕܡܪܝܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܬܐ ܕܕܐܘܕܐ ܕܡܪܝܬܐ ܕܡܪܝܬܐ ܕܕܐܘܕܐ

The Sinaitic Syriac has simply 'in-grief much seeking were-we Thee.' The Curetonian however amplifies the phrase:

'*in-anxiety and-in-grief*<sup>1</sup> much seeking were-we Thee.' Tatian, as quoted by Ephrem (Hill, p. 337), has: 'Behold, I and Thy father *sorrowing* (and) *grieving* were going about and seeking<sup>2</sup> Thee.' In two Old Syriac texts then (the one using substantives, the other verbs) two words are employed as the equivalent of a single Greek word. The Bezan reading coincides with that of Tatian. This double rendering is found in many Latin authorities—a e ff<sup>1</sup> l q r D<sup>ms</sup> G L gat.

It will be convenient to bring together the double renderings found in the Bezan text of the Gospels, and to discuss briefly this characteristic feature of the Syro-Latin text.

Matt. xix. 25. ἐξεπλησσοντο καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν σφοδρὰ.

The Sinaitic is fragmentary at this point. The Curetonian has: 'Wondering were-they *and-they-feared* much.' The Arabic Tatian (Hill, p. 157) has in this place: 'And they that heard were the more astonished, saying among themselves, *being now afraid*, Who, think you, can be saved?' As the Arabic Tatian here differs from the Peshitta, which has not the interpolated words, we probably have here the genuine Tatianic reading. The words *et timebant* are added in a large number of Latin texts—a b c e ff<sup>2</sup> g<sup>3</sup> ℞ L Q R.

Matt. xxv. 1. εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ νυμφίου καὶ τῆς νυμφῆς.

This reading is rather of the character of a deliberate interpolation than of a double rendering. It may however for convenience sake be noticed here. The added words are found in the Sinaitic Syriac (the Curetonian is not extant here), the Peshitta<sup>3</sup>; also in X\* 1\*-209 262\*, the Latin MSS. (lat-vt-vg), arm., Origen, Hilary: on the reading of the Ferrar-group see Ferrar's note *in loco*.

<sup>1</sup> Comp. the Arabic Tatian (Hill, p. 234): 'Their eyes were weighed down for sorrow and anxiety' (Matt. xxvi. 43, Mc. xiv. 40).

<sup>2</sup> The amplification 'going about and seeking' should be noticed.

<sup>3</sup> The added words are given in the Arabic Tatian (Hill, p. 214). But the addition may be due simply to assimilation to Pesh.

Luke viii. 8. ΕΠΙ ΤΗΝ ΓΗΝ ΤΗΝ ΑΓΑΘΗΝ ΚΑΙ ΚΑΛΗΝ.

Ephrem, as represented by the Armenian translator, gives Tatian's reading as 'fat (and) good ground' (Hill, p. 350); in the commentary (Moesinger, p. 125) he has the epithets in the reverse order. The Curetonian has a second epithet derived from the context. The words are: 'And-other fell on-ground good *and-giving fruit*, and-sprang-up *and-gave fruit* a-hundred-fold.' The Old Latin MSS. c e r have '*bonam et optimam*,' a has '*optimam et bonam*.' I believe that the Bezan Greek and Latin are independent here, the latter having, it would appear, a genuine Old Latin reading—'*bonam et uberam*'<sup>1</sup>—coinciding with, perhaps derived from, the reading preserved in Ephrem's Tatian. The relation of D to this series of readings it seems impossible to settle. It has perhaps employed the epithet *καλήν*, the epithet used in Matt. xiii. 8, 23, Mc. iv. 8, 20, to represent the interpolated epithet of some version<sup>2</sup>. The evidence at our disposal at present does not seem to take us further than this point.

Luke ix. 16. ΠΡΟΧΥΖΑΤΟ ΚΑΙ ΕΥΛΟΓΗΣΕΝ.

It seems that D alone has this double phrase. See below, p. 36.

Luke xxiii. 28. ΜΗ ΚΛΑΙΕΤΕ ΕΜΕ ΜΗΔΕ ΠΕΝΘΕΙΤΕ.

The true text has *ἐπ' ἐμέ*. In regard to this interpolation, so far as I know, D stands alone.

Luke xxiii. 48. ΤΥΠΤΟΝΤΕΣ ΤΑ ΣΤΗΘΗ ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΜΕΤΩΠΑ.

No other authority, so far as I know, has this interpolation. The Old Latin c however has *frontes suas* in place of *pectora sua*.

<sup>1</sup> Is it possible that in some Latin MS., high in the stream of descent, an original *opimam* was emended into *optimam*? In that case *opimam* and *uberam* (d) might be divergent representations of the reading found in Tatian (Eph.).

<sup>2</sup> Pesh. has: 'land good (*ܠܬܝܒܐ*), the word used in Matt., Mc.) and-beautiful (*ܠܬܝܒܐܝܪܐ*). This reading has the appearance of being a rendering of the reading which we find in D.

So far I have cited only such double renderings as are found in Codex Bezae. I proceed to give those which are found in the Old Syriac textual authorities, limiting myself to the Gospel of St Matthew.

ii. 8. ἀπαγγείλατέ μοι. 'Come shew-me' (Sin. Cur. Pesh.).

iv. 5. παραλαμβάνει αὐτὸν ὁ διάβ. εἰς τὴν ἁγ. πόλιν. 'The-devil led-Him *and-made-Him-to-go* to-the-city of-holiness' (Sin. Cur.). Compare v. 8 παραλαμβάνει αὐτὸν...εἰς ὄρος. 'Satan led-Him *and-made(-Him)-go-up and-placed-Him* upon a-mountain' (Sin., not Cur.). Tatian (Eph., Hill, p. 339) has: 'He brought (Him and) *took* (Him and) *set Him* on a corner of the temple...Brought Him (and) *took* (Him) into an exceeding high mountain.'

v. 13. μωρανθῇ. 'Be-insipid *and-be-foolish*' (Cur.).

viii. 5. παρακαλῶν αὐτόν. 'Seeking was-he *from-Him* and-entreating Him' (Cur.).

xii. 43. διέρχεται. 'Going (is it) *wandering*' (Sin. Cur.). In Lc. xi. 24 (the parallel passage) the Curetonian (Sin. wanting) uses the same paraphrase to render the same Greek verb.

xii. 44. εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ἐπιστρέψω. 'I-will-return *I-will-go* to-my-house' (Sin. Cur.).

xiv. 32. ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος. 'The winds *rested and* ceased' (Tatian (Eph.), Hill, p. 352).

xv. 23. κράζει ὁπισθεν ἡμῶν. 'She(-is)-crying *and-coming* after-us' (Sin. Cur.). Tatian (Eph., Hill, p. 353) has: 'The woman was crying out *and following* Him.' The Old Latin b has: quia sequitur et clamat post nos.

xvi. 21. πολλὰ παθεῖν. 'Endure much *and-suffer*' (Cur.; Sin. wanting).

xvi. 21. ἀποκτανθῆναι (so Lc. ix. 22). Tatian (Eph., Hill, p. 357) has: 'The Son of Man must *be crucified and* die and rise again.'

xxiv. 20 (so Mc. xiii. 18). προσεύχεσθε. 'Pray ye *and ask*' (Tatian (Eph.), Hill, p. 370).

xxvii. 5. ἀπήγγατο. 'He hung *and-was-strangled*' (Sin.; Cur. wanting). Tatian (Eph., Hill, p. 374) has: 'hanged himself *and died*.'



xxvii. 41. ἐμπαίζοντες. 'Mocking were-they at-Him *and-insulting were-they Him*' (Sin.). Tatian (Arabic, Hill, p. 247) has: 'mocked Him *and laughed to each other*.'

For other examples in the Curetonian see Baethgen, *Evangelienfragmente*, p. 15 f.

An examination of these double renderings<sup>1</sup>, which are clearly characteristic of the Syriac texts of the New Testament, shews that they are chiefly due to (1) the essentially pleonastic character of Syriac; (2) its inability to render Greek compound words except by some kind of periphrasis; (3) a desire to bring out the full force of Greek prepositions; (4) the principle of assimilation—a potent factor in the Syriac texts of the New Testament (see above, p. 31, on the Curetonian reading in Lc. viii. 8).

The evidence seems clearly to lead to the conclusion that, speaking broadly, double renderings found in the Greek and Latin authorities for the Syro-Latin text are derived from a Syriac text.

It is instructive to compare Bp Lightfoot's statement as to the characteristics of the Syriac version of Clement's Epistle. Here at least Latin influence can hardly be a factor<sup>2</sup>. The Syriac version, he says (Clement, vol. i., p. 136 f.), 'has a tendency to run into paraphrase in the translation of individual words and expressions. This tendency most commonly takes the form of double renderings for a word, more especially in the case of compounds.' Bp Lightfoot proceeds to give a large selection of examples, e.g. § 1 περίπτωσεις *lapsus et damna* [*impedimenta*]; § 6 παθούσαι *quum passi essent et sustinuissent* [*passi*]; § 15 μεθ' ὑποκρίσεως *cum assumptione personarum et illusionē* [*simulatores*: sentence recast]; § 19 ἐπαναδράμωμεν *curramus denuo* (*et*) *revertamur*


<sup>1</sup> Compare *Old Syriac Element*, p. 78. I have there collected instances of such double renderings in the Peshitta of the Acts—readings in which Pesh. seems to stand alone.

<sup>2</sup> I have in each passage appended to Bp Lightfoot's translation of the Syriac version the renderings given in the newly discovered Latin version of Clement (*Anecdota Maredsolana*, vol. ii.), enclosing them in square brackets.

[*recurramus*]; ἀτενίσωμεν *videamus et contemplemur* [*intuamur*]. 'Sometimes however,' he continues, 'the love of paraphrase transgresses these limits and runs into greater excesses.' Among other illustrations he quotes § 21 μὴ λιποτακτεῖν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ *ne rebellantes et deserentes ordinem faciamus aliquid extra voluntatem ejus* [*non desertores nos esse a voluntate illius*]. 'The characteristic,' he proceeds, 'which has been noticed arose from the desire to do full justice to the Greek. The peculiarity of which I have now to speak is a concession to the demands of the Syriac. The translation not unfrequently transposes the order of words connected together: e.g. ταπεινοφροσύνη καὶ πραΰτης.... This transposition is most commonly found when the first word is incapable of a simple rendering in Syriac, so that several words are required in the translation, and it is advisable therefore to throw it to the end in order to avoid an ambiguous or confused syntax (the Syriac having no case endings). Thus...ταπεινοφροσύνη is *humilitas cogitationis*.'

Luke iii. 10, 12, 14. ΤΙ ΠΟΙΗΣΩΜΕΝ ἵνα σωθώμεν.

In vv. 12, 14 the gloss is found only in D. In v. 10 however b q gat G have the interpolation in the following form *ut uiuamus*. How are we to account for this double form of the gloss? The answer is clear when we turn to the Curetonian (v. 10). We there read:

  
 and-live *or* and-be-saved shall-we-do what

The Syriac verb *to live* is the constant equivalent in the N.T. of the Greek *σωθῆναι* (compare above, p. 7, on Matt. xvi. 16). Here then it is indisputable that the Latin authorities have incorporated in the text the translation of an Old Syriac gloss. The Syriac word being capable of two interpretations, we find one of these in D<sup>1</sup>, the other in the Latin MSS.; compare the note on Matt. xxvi. 60 (τὸ ἐξῆς), p. 78 ff. The interpolation is doubtless due to assimilation to

<sup>1</sup> The analogy of e.g. Matt. xxvi. 60 is against, but does not exclude, the supposition that the gloss first arose in Greek, and passed thence into the Syriac.

Acts xvi. 30 (τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν ἵνα σωθῶ ;), where the Peshitta has: 'What is-it-necessary for-me to-do in-order that-I-may-be-saved (or-live; ܠܘܬܐ ܚܝܬ) ?'

Luke v. 7 f.

ΕΛΘΟΝΤΕΣ ΟΥΝ ΕΠΛΗΣΑΝ ΑΜΦΟΤΕΡΑ  
ΤΑ ΠΛΟΙΑ ΩΤΕ ΠΑΡΑ ΤΙ ΒΥΘΙΖΕΣΘΑΙ,  
Ο ΔΕ ΣΙΜΩΝ ΠΡΟΣΕΠΕΣΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΙΣ ΠΟCΙΝ  
ΛΕΓΩΝ ΠΑΡΑΚΑΛΩ ΕΞΕΛΘΕ ΑΠ' ΕΜΟΥ.

The true text is: καὶ ἦλθαν, καὶ ἔπλησαν ἀμφότερα τὰ πλοῖα ὥστε βυθίζεσθαι αὐτά. ἰδὼν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος προσέπεσεν τοῖς γόνασιν Ἰησοῦ λέγων· ἔξελθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

It will be convenient at once to give the words of the Sinaitic Syriac and of the Peshitta (Cur. being wanting):

SIN.	PESH.
And-when they-came, They-got-aboard the-fish, And-they-filled the-ships both-of-them, <i>And-near were-they from-their-weight to-sink.</i> And-when there-saw(it) Simon, He-fell on his-face <i>before the-feet of-Jesus,</i> And-said to-Him, My-Lord, Depart for-Thee from-me.	And-when they-came, They-filled those ships both-of-them, <i>So that-near were-they to-sink.</i> When there-saw(it) however Simon Peter, He-fell <i>before the-feet of-Jesus,</i> And-said to-Him, <i>Asking (am)I from-Thee</i> my-Lord, Depart for-Thee from-me.

The points in the Bezan text are three. (1) The *παρά τι* represents a phrase found (Cur. being wanting) in the two Syriac versions. Compare the Arabic Tatian (Hill, p. 62) 'They filled both the boats, so that they were *almost* sunk.' The naturalness of the Syriac phrase here used is clear when we turn to two other passages. In Lc. viii. 23 (καὶ συνεπληροῦντο καὶ ἐκινδύνεον), where practically there is no variation of reading in Greek or Latin authorities, we find the Syriac texts having—'And-there-was-filled their-ship *and-near were-*



the phrase 'and-also *upon*-them when *He-had-blessed*'—a phrase retained in the Peshitta ('and-also *upon*-them *He-blessed*'). In Jn. xxi. 13 the Sinaitic has 'He-took-up (even) Jesus the-bread and-the-fish and-*blessed upon*-them.' We compare also the Sinaitic in Lc. xxii. 19, 17 (εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν, εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν) 'He-gave-thanks *upon*-it (ܐܒܪܬܐ ܐܡܪܐ) and-brake....He-gave-thanks *upon*-it and-said.' There can, I think, be no doubt that here we have a Syriac idiom reproduced in the Bezan text. (2) In view of the frequency of double renderings in the Syriac New Testament and of the fact that, where we have two Old Syriac texts of a passage, we find such a rendering in one and not in the other (see above, p. 32), we can hardly resist the conclusion that, though the Curetonian has simply 'He-blessed *upon*-them,' yet in the Old Syriac text, which lies behind the Bezan text at this point, the phrase was 'He-*prayed and*-blessed *upon*-them<sup>1</sup>.'

It should be added that the Syrism '*He blessed upon*' reappears in the Latin MSS. a b ff<sup>1</sup> l q r G (*super illos*; d *super eos*). Epiphanius (p. 313, comp. p. 327) includes the reading ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐλόγησεν ἐπ' αὐτούς in his list of what he considers as Marcion's wilful corruptions of the text of St Luke.

Luke x. 5.

ΕΙΣ ΗΝ ΔΕ ΕΙΣΕΛΘΗΤΕ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ ΟΙΚΙΑΝ  
ΛΕΓΕΤΕ ΕΙΡΗΝΗ ΤΩ ΟΙΚΩ ΤΟΥΤΩ.

The true text has εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν εἰσέλθητε οἰκίαν πρῶτον λέγετε Εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ.

The Old Syriac (Sin. Cur.) has: 'And-into-whatsoever house *the-first-one* entering are-ye into-it, be saying Peace *in*-the-house (Cur., this).' The πρῶτον of the true text could be taken with the first part of the clause—'into whatsoever house ye enter first.' The actual displacement of the word

<sup>1</sup> For the construction 'to-pray upon' (though the preposition here bears a different meaning) see e.g. the Sinaitic of Matt. v. 44 (προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ κ.τ.λ.).

'first' to an earlier position in the sentence would be likely to arise in a version. It did occur, as we see, in two early Syriac texts. The reading, whether it arose independently, as would seem not improbable, or not, is found in more than one form in Old Latin MSS.: a *primum domum intraueritis*, b1q *domum primum intraueritis*, c *primam domum intraueritis primum*.

The Old Syriac reading 'Peace in the house' is found elsewhere only, so far as I know, in the Ferrar-group—*εἰρήνη ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ*.

Luke xi. 52 ff.

ΟΥΑΙ ΥΜΕΙΝ ΤΟΙΣ  
ΝΟΜΙΚΟΙΣ ΟΤΙ ΕΚΡΥΨΑΤΕ ΤΗΝ ΚΛΕΙΝ  
ΤΗΣ ΓΝΩΣΕΩΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΙ ΟΥΚ ΙΣΗΛΘΑΤΕ  
ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΙΣΠΟΡΕΥΟΜΕΝΟΥΣ ΕΚΩΛΥΣΑΤΕ  
ΛΕΓΟΝΤΘΣ ΔΕ ΤΑΥΤΑ ΠΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ  
ΕΝΩΠΙΟΝ ΠΑΝΤΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΛΑΟΥ ΗΡΞΑΝΤΟ  
ΟΙ ΦΑΡΙΣΑΙΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΝΟΜΙΚΟΙ ΔΕΙΝΩΣ  
ΕΧΕΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΣΥΝΒΑΛΛΕΙΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΠΕΡΙ  
ΠΛΕΙΟΝΩΝ ΖΗΤΟΥΝΤΕΣ ΑΦΟΡΜΗΝ  
ΤΙΝΑ ΛΑΒΕΙΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΙΝΑ ΕΥΡΩΣΙΝ  
ΚΑΤΗΓΟΡΗΣΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΠΟΛΛΩΝ ΔΕ  
ΟΧΛΩΝ ΣΥΝΠΕΡΙΕΧΟΝΤΩΝ ΚΥΚΛΩ  
ΩΣΤΕ ΑΛΛΗΛΟΥΣ ΣΥΝΠΝΙΓΕΙΝ Κ.Τ.Λ.

The true text is as follows: οὐαὶ.....ὅτι ἤρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως· αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσῆλθατε καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἐκωλ. κακεῖθεν ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ φ. δεινῶς ἐνέχειν καὶ ἀποστοματίζειν αὐτὸν περὶ πλείονων, ἐνεδρεύοντες αὐτὸν θηρεύσαι τι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ. ἐν οἷς ἐπισυναχθεῖσών τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ ὄχλου, ὥστε καταπατεῖν ἀλλήλους κ.τ.λ.

It will be convenient at once to give the Old Syriac. The Sinaitic and the Curetonian agree here, except that the former omits the clause, which is printed below in italics.

'Woe to-you Scribes because-ye-hid (~~ܐܕܡܝܬܝܢ~~) the-keys of-knowledge. Ye entered not, and-those who-entering (were) ye-hindered. And-while saying was-He these-things against-them in-the-presence-of all the-people, He-began abominated was-He to-the-Scribes and-to(om. Cur.)-the-Pharisees, and-disputing were-they with-Him about many-things, and-seeking were-they to-take (~~ܐܡܪܝܢ~~) against-Him a-cause (~~ܕܡܝܬܝܢ~~) *that-they-might-be-able* (or *find*) *they-should-accuse Him*. And-when there-assembled unto-Him a-multitude great, so-that they-trod one on-one &c.'

The chief points in the passage are these: (1) *ἐκρύψατε* in place of *ἤρατε*, the former being found in 157, in the Old Latin MSS. a b c d (*abscondistis*) e q (*absconditis*), and in the Armenian<sup>1</sup>. The reading is also found in Ephrem's Commentary on the Diatessaron: 'Woe unto you, lawyers, for ye *hide* the key.' It is clear that the reading is not due to the Armenian translator of Ephrem, but is really Tatian's, because Ephrem comments on the word. So too Ciasca (not Pesh.), 'ye have *hidden* the keys' (Hill, pp. 203, 369). The concurrence of the Sinaitic, the Curetonian, and Tatian goes far to shew that this was the primitive Syriac equivalent of *ἤρατε*. (2) The Bezan text exactly coincides with the Old Syriac in the words *λέγοντος... τοῦ λαοῦ*. In the words which follow (*ἤρξαντο... ἔχειν*) the Bezan scribe in the main gives the true text substituting (a) *νομικοί* for *γραμματεῖς*<sup>2</sup> and (b) *ἔχειν* for *ἐνέχειν*. (3) The clauses in the true text *ἀποστοματίζειν... ἐκ τοῦ στόμ. αὐτοῦ* are less simple than is commonly the case with the Gospel narrative: hence in a version they were almost certain to be more or less paraphrased. I believe that an examination of the Old

<sup>1</sup> The verb is in the present tense in the Armenian version of Ephrem's *Commentary on Tatian* as in the Armenian Vulgate (see Hill, p. 369), and as in the two Old Latin MSS (e q). The Aethiopic has a conflate reading—'ye took away and hid.'

<sup>2</sup> This is perhaps due to the last 'woe' (v. 52). It should however further be noticed that Sin. Cur. Pesh. translate *νομικός* by the word used to translate *γραμματεῖς* except in Matt. xxii. 35 (Sin. Pesh.), Lc. x. 25 (Sin. Cur.).





Syriac into harmony with the Bezan text<sup>1</sup>; (b) the Syriac has nothing to answer to the κύκλῳ reinforced by the -περι- of the compound verb; (c) the Syriac has 'so-that they-trod one on-another'; D has ὥστε συνπνίγειν. This reading, whether it arose in a Syriac or in a Greek text, is due to assimilation to Lc. viii. 42 (οἱ ὄχλοι συνέπνιγον αὐτόν).

It remains to add a few notes to shew how the Syriacised text of the passage (v. 53 f.) spread.

(i) The Ferrar-group have coincidences with D. ἔχειν (for ἐνέχειν) is found in 124, συμβάλλειν (for ἀποστομ.) in 69.

(ii) I subjoin the text of the Old Latin Cod. Brixianus (f), noticing the chief variations in other MSS. 'Cum haec ad illos diceret coram omni populo (plebe, b l q; in conspectu totius populi, c e) coeperunt pharisaei et legisperiti (legis doctores, c e; tam scribae quam et legis doctores, a) contristari (male (+ se, a) habere, a b q; grauiter habere, c e i; grauiter ferre, l; moleste ferre, r) et altercari cum illo (comminare illi, a; committere cum illo, b l q r; conferre cum eo, c; conferre illi, e) de multis (de pluribus, a c e) interrogantes eum quaerentes (+ de multis, b) capere aliquid ex ore eius. ut occasionem inuenirent accusare eum (occasionem aliquam inuenire ab illo (de illo, b q; in illo, i; om. c e l) a b c e i l q r). The variety of rendering in the Latin texts seems to indicate that they are different representations of a common original.

Luke xiii. 11.

ΚΑΙ ἰδοὺ ΓΥΝΗ ΕΝ ΑΣΘΕΝΕΙΑ ΗΝ

ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΕΤΙ ΙΗ.

The true text has καὶ ἰδοὺ γυναῖκα πνεῦμα ἔχουσα ἀσθενείας ἔτη δέκα ὀκτώ. The character of the reading suggests retranslation from the Syriac. For Syriac has no word which exactly represents ἔχει. Hence any such phrase as δαιμόνιον ἔχει has to be paraphrased in Syriac, e.g. 'a devil is to (in) him' (Matt. xi. 18, Mc. iii. 11, 30, Lc. iv. 33, vii. 33, viii. 27); and

<sup>1</sup> The Arabic Tatian (Hill, p. 206) has: 'Now when many multitudes were gathered together.' As this differs from the Peshitta ('and-when there-were-assembled (plur.) an-abundance of-crowds many') it very probably represents the Tatianic reading.

in the present passage the Old Syriac (Sin. Cur.) has 'to whom there was a spirit' (Pesh. adds 'of infirmity'). Now in (a) the statement as to the number of years, and (b) the use of the word 'infirmity' there are points of affinity between the present passage and Jn. v. 5 (τριακοντα ὀκτὼ ἔτη ἔχων ἐν τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ αὐτοῦ<sup>1</sup>). In Jn. v. 5 the Peshitta (Sin. wanting; Cur., 'who...was infirm') has: 'There was there a-man a-certain-one who-thirty and-eight years was (ܐܡܢܐܘܪܐ ܕܥܡܐ) in-infirmity<sup>2</sup>.' We know how potent a factor assimilation was in the Syriac texts. Hence in view of Jn. v. 5 a Syriac reading might easily arise in Lc. xiii. 11—'who-in-infirmity of-spirit was eighteen years.'

Three other passages may be noticed where this Syriac mode of dealing with ἔχει seems to have affected other texts: (1) Jn. ii. 3 οἶνον οὐκ ἔχουσιν. This necessarily becomes in the Peshitta (Sin. Cur. wanting) 'Wine is-not to-them.' 𐤒 (whose 'Western' readings deserve careful attention) has οἶνος οὐκ ἔστιν. (2) Lc. xix. 34 ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει. The Sinaitic and Curetonian have: 'For-his-Lord (Pesh. for-our-Lord) required (is he).' The Old Latin a f have: 'domino (+ suo, a) necessarius est.' (3) Mc. viii. 17 ἔτι πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; The Sinaitic is not extant here. The Peshitta has: 'Still the-heart hard is-it to-you?' D 2<sup>vo</sup> have πεπωρωμένη<sup>3</sup> ἐστὶν ἡ καρδία ὑμῶν; Among the Latin MSS. (i) f g<sup>1</sup> l vg. have: caecatum *habetis* cor uestrum? (ii) a q obtusum *est* cor uestrum? (iii) b c d ff<sup>2</sup> i obtusa *sunt* corda uestra?

Luke xiii. 17.

ΚΑΙ ΠΑΣ Ο ΟΧΛΟΣ  
ΕΧΑΙΡΕΝ ΕΝ ΠΑΣΙΝ ΟΙΣ ΕΘΕΩΡΟΥΝ  
Α ΕΝΔΟΞΟΙΣ Α ΥΠΙ ΔΥΤΟΥ ΓΕΙΝΟΜΕΝΟΙΣ.

<sup>1</sup> Similarly in L Matt. ix. 20 is assimilated to Jn. v. 5; for after the words δώδεκα ἔτη L adds εχουσα εν τη ασθενεια.

<sup>2</sup> The similarity of Lc. to Jn. is more striking in the Syriac than in the Greek; for the Syriac (Sin. Cur. Pesh.) has in Lc.: 'There was *there* (om. Sin.) a-woman a-certain-one (om. Pesh.).'

<sup>3</sup> D has πεπρωμένη, the correction apparently being made by the original scribe.

The true text is *καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἔχαιρεν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐνδόξοις τοῖς γινομένοις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ*. What account can be given of the interpolated words *οἷς ἐθεώρουν*? When we remember the love which the 'Syro-Latin' text has for assimilation, we can hardly doubt that they are derived from the very similar passage in Lc. xix. 37, *ἤρξαντο ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῶν μαθητῶν χαίροντες αἰνεῖν τὸν θεὸν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ* (D om. φ. μ.) *περὶ πασῶν ὧν εἶδον δυνάμεων* (D *περὶ πάντων ὧν εἶδον γινομένων*). But the Bezan form of the interpolation must have come through the medium of a version. This version cannot be the Bezan *Latin*; for that slavishly follows the Greek idiom: '*in omnibus quibus uidebant mirabilibus ab eo fieri.*' We accordingly turn to the Syriac. The Curetonian (the Sinaitic being illegible) has in xiii. 17: 'And-all the-people rejoicing was *in-all* the-wonders which-being(done) were in-His-hand.' The preposition '*in-all*,' answering to the Bezan *ἐν πᾶσιν*, will be noticed. In xix. 37 the Old Syriac (Sin. Cur.) has: 'There-began all the-crowd *of-the-disciples* (om. Cur.) rejoicing [were-they, Cur.] and-praising God with a-great voice about everything *which-they-saw* (ܐܘܬܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ).' If in an Old Syriac text the single word *ܐܘܬܐ* (*which-they-saw*) were interpolated in xiii. 17 after the word '*wonders*,' the passage would read thus: 'rejoicing *in-all* the-wonders *which-they-saw* that-being(done) were-they in-His-hand.' Thus the insertion of the word '*which-they-saw*' is very easy, and it at once, without any alteration of the surrounding words, takes a natural place in the sentence. Of that Syriac sentence the Bezan Greek is a natural rendering. The Bezan scribe would be likely to translate the Syriac *ܐܘܬܐ* by *θεωροῦσιν*, for this Syriac verb is the constant equivalent of this Greek verb (see e.g. Matt. xxvii. 55, xxviii. 1, Mc. iii. 11, v. 15).

The theory that Lc. xiii. 17 was assimilated to Lc. xix. 37 in an Old Syriac text is confirmed by the fact that in the Curetonian text of Matt. xxi. 9 (Sin. is wanting here) we find an interpolation based largely on Lc. xix. 37. The verse is as follows: '...Hosanna in-the-highest. And-there-went-

out to-meet-Him many, *and-rejoicing were-they and-praising God about all that which-they-saw* (ܐܘܢ ܠܥܡ ܕܥܡܪܐ ܕܥܡܪܐ).<sup>1</sup> This interpolation seems to be found elsewhere only in φ (*Codex Purpureus*): ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις· ἀπῆντων δὲ αὐτῷ πολλοὶ χαίροντες καὶ δοξάζοντες τὸν θεὸν περὶ πάντων ὧν εἶδον (MS. ἰδον). καὶ εἰσελθόντος κ.τ.λ.<sup>1</sup>

The interpolation in Lc. xiii. 17 has found its way into Latin texts: in *praeclaris quae uiderant* fieri ab ipso, b c (eo) ff<sup>2</sup> (*uidebant*) i l q r (— ab ipso fieri); in *omnibus quae uidebant* *praeclara* fieri ab illo, e; in *uniuersis praeclaris uirtutibus quae uidebantur* fieri ab eo, f. The diversity of phrase seems to imply that the Latin texts present here various attempts to render a common original.

Luke xiii. 24 f.

ΟΤΙ ΠΟΛΛΟΙ ΛΕΓΩ ὙΜΕΙΝ ΖΗΤΗΣΟΥΣΙΝ  
ΕΙΣΕΛΘΕΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΟΥΧ ΕΥΡΗΣΟΥΣΙΝ : ΑΦ' ΟΤΟΥ  
ΑΝ Ο ΟΙΚΟΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ ΕΙΣΕΛΘΗ ΚΑΙ  
ΑΠΟΚΛΕΙΣΗ ΤΗΝ ΘΥΡΑΝ.

The true text is: ὅτι πολλοί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ζητήσουσιν εἰσελθεῖν καὶ οὐκ ἰσχύσουσιν, ἀφ' οὗ ἂν ἐγερθῇ ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης καὶ ἀποκλ. τὴν θ.

The points are: (1) The reading οὐχ εὐρήσουσιν is peculiar to D. The Syriac rendering of the true text οὐκ ἰσχύσουσιν is ܐܡܥܝ ܕܥܡܪܐ. The Syriac verb means both 'to be able' and 'to find.' Hence the Bezan οὐχ εὐρήσουσιν is a natural retranslation of the Syriac. (2) The reading εἰσέλθῃ is found in the Ferrar-group, in most Old Latin MSS., and in the Latin Vulgate. It is doubtless due to assimilation to the very parallel passage in Matt. xxv. 10, αἱ ἑτοιμοὶ εἰσῆλθον μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς γάμους, καὶ ἐκλείσθη ἡ θύρα. Just below, the doubled κύριε (κύριε, κύριε ἄνοιξον

<sup>1</sup> It will be observed that the interpolation in Cur. is the original of φ and not *vice versa*; for the words 'there-went-out to-meet-Him' (Cur.) are precisely those of the parallel passage (Jn. xii. 13) as given in Sin. Pesh., and their origin is thus accounted for. The Greek (Jn. xii. 13) is ἐξῆλθον εἰς ὑπάντησιν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκραύγαζον ὡσαννά.

ἡμῶν), found in a very large number of MSS., is derived from Matt. xxv. 11.

Luke xiv. 9.

ΚΑΙ ΤΟΤΕ ΕΧΙ ΜΕΤΑ

ΔΙΣΧΥΝΗΣ Α ΕΣΧΑΤΟΝ ΤΟΠΟΝ ΚΑΤΕΧΕΙΝ.

The true text has ἄρξῃ instead of ἔσῃ, and inserts τὸν before ἔσχατον.

The Bezan Latin preserves the true text—‘et tunc *incipiens* (=incipies) cum confusione nouissimum locum tenere.’

The Old Syriac (Sin. Cur.) represents the ἄρξῃ...κατέχειν by the simple future—‘And-then while ashamed thou shalt-recline in-the-place the-last-one.’ Elsewhere however the Syriac versions represent a similar Greek phrase by the verb ‘to be’ followed by the participle<sup>1</sup>. Thus in Lc. xiii. 25 (καὶ ἄρξησθε ἔξω ἐστάναι καὶ κρούειν τὴν θύραν) the Old Syriac (Sin. Cur.) and the Peshitta have: ‘*And-ye-shall-be standing without and-knocking at-the-door.*’ Again, in xiv. 29 (ἵνα μὴ)...ἄρξωνται αὐτῷ ἐμπαίξειν) they (Sin. Cur. Pesh.) read: ‘that-not...*they-be mocking at-him.*’ In Lc. xiv. 9 therefore the Bezan construction (ἔσῃ...κατέχειν), which could not arise simply in Greek, seems to witness to a similar rendering of ἄρξῃ...κατέχειν in an Old Syriac text lying at this point behind the text of D—‘and-then *thou-shalt-be reclining in-the-place the-last-one.*’ The Bezan scribe, instead of writing κατέχων, has suffered the κατέχειν of the true text to remain. The Old Latin e, the constant companion of D, has a reading which exactly answers to that of D—‘et tunc *eris...tenere.*’ The chances are infinite against this reading having arisen independently in two allied texts. We are forced to the conclusion that e has here simply translated the Greek phrase which we find in D. Thus we are led once more to notice the remarkable kinship which subsists between D and e.

<sup>1</sup> Similarly the Old Syriac neglects μέλλει. Thus in Lc. xix. 4 (ὅτι ἐκεῖνης ἡμελλεν διέρχεσθαι) Cur. has ‘because thus *passing was* Jesus.’ In John vii. 35 (ποῦ οὗτος μέλλει πορεύεσθαι;) Sin. and Cur. have ‘Whither then going(is) this-man?’ The word δεῖ is dealt with in a similar way in Matt. xxiii. 23 (Sin. Cur.), Lc. xi. 42 (Cur., Sin. has the proper equivalent of δεῖ), xviii. 1 (Sin. Cur.). See Baethgen, *Evangelienfragmente*, p. 14.

Luke xv. 4. ΚΑΙ ΑΠΕΛΘΩΝ ΤΟ ΑΠΟΛΩΛΟΣ ΖΗΤΕΙ.

The true text has *καὶ πορεύεται ἐπὶ τὸ ἀπολωλός.*

The Old Syriac (Sin. Cur.) and the Peshitta have: 'He-goeth (ܕܝܟ) *seeketh* that which-perished.' Here there are two points: (1) The Bezan *ἀπελθών* is clearly derived from the *πορεύεται* of the true text; but it arises through the medium of a version. The Syriac ܕܝܟ is the natural rendering of *πορεύεται* (see e.g. Matt. ii. 8, 9). But the verb *ἀπελθεῖν* is an equally natural retranslation of this Syriac verb (see e.g. Matt. viii. 18, 19, 21, 33). (2) The words 'goeth *seeketh*' is a characteristic Syriac periphrasis to bring out the meaning of the preposition *ἐπὶ*. Note the following renderings in the Old Syriac—Lc. viii. 33 (*ὤρμησεν ...κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν λίμνην*) 'there-rushed all that flock to-the-precipice *and-they-fell* in-the-sea' (Sin. Cur.); xix. 29 (*ἤγγισεν εἰς Βηθφαγή...πρὸς τὸ ὄρος*) 'He-came to-Beth Phage...*and-came* to the-mountain' (Sin. Cur.); xxiv. 5 (*κλινουσὼν τὰ πρόσωπα εἰς τὴν γῆν*) 'They-bowed their-heads *and-looking were* on-the-earth' (Sin. Cur.); Jn. i. 42 (*ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν*) 'He-led-him *and-came* to Jesus' (Sin. Cur.); Jn. iv. 35 (*λευκαὶ εἰσιν πρὸς θερισμόν*) 'they-are-white *and-they-have-come* to-the-harvest' (Sin. Cur.). See above p. 32 f., and Baethgen, *Evangelienfragmente*, p. 17.

In the present passage the periphrasis, which we have seen to be characteristically Syriac, has passed in different forms into the Old Latin MSS.:—a e uadit ad illam quae perit (e perierat) *quaerens*; f uadit *quaerere* eam quae errauit. The Bezan Latin is: uadit *et quaerit* quod perierat.

Luke xv. 29 f.

ΚΑΙ ΟΥΔΕΠΟΤΕ

ΠΑΡΕΒΗΝ COY ΕΝΤΟΛΗΝ ΚΑΙ ΟΥΔΕΠΟΤΕ

ΕΔΩΚΑΣ ΜΟΙ ΕΡΙΦΟΝ ΕΞ ΔΙΓΩΝ ΙΝΑ ΜΕΤΑ ΤΩΝ

ΦΙΛΩΝ ΜΟΥ ΑΡΙΣΤΗΣΩ ΤΩ ΔΕ ΥΙΩ COY

ΤΩ ΚΑΦΑΓΟΝΤΙ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΜΕΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΠΟΡΝΩΝ

ΚΑΙ ΕΛΘΟΝΤΙ ΕΘΥΣΑΣ Α ΤΟΝ ΣΕΙΤΕΥΤΟΝ ΜΟΣΧΟΝ.

The true text is *καὶ οὐδέποτε ἐντολήν σου παρήλθον, καὶ ἐμοὶ οὐδέποτε ἔδωκας ἔριφον ἵνα...εὐφρανθῶ. ὅτε δὲ ὁ υἱός σου οὗτος ὁ καταφαγὼν σου τὸν βίον μετὰ [τῶν] πορνῶν ἦλθεν, ἔθυσας αὐτῷ τὸν σιτευτὸν μόσχον.*

Two points call for attention. (1) We have here a good example of a passage rewritten—the ideas preserved, the language altogether changed. The phenomena imply re-translation. The Sinaitic and the Peshitta have<sup>1</sup>: ‘And-not (ever, Pesh.) did-I-transgress against (om. Pesh.) thy-com-mands (thy-command, Pesh.), and-from ever one kid (a-kid, Pesh.) not didst-thou-give to-me that-I-might-be-merry with my-friends; and-this thy-son (to-this-man however thy-son, Pesh.) when he-had-devoured thy-property with-harlots (and-came, Pesh.), thou-didst-kill for-him that calf (the-calf, Pesh.) of-fatting.’ It will be seen that the recasting of the clauses in the Sinaitic and the Peshitta is quite natural in a Syriac translation, and that this form of the clauses is pretty closely followed in D. The *πάντα* of the last line but one seems due to context-assimilation to *v. 31* (*πάντα τὰ ἐμά*); this suggestion is confirmed by the fuller form in which the reading is preserved in that constant ally of D, the Old Latin e: ‘filio autem tuo qui comedit *omnia tua* cum fornicariis adueniente laniasti saginatum uitulum.’ (2) The reading *ἔριφον ἐξ αἰγῶν* is important as being a clear instance of the assimilation in the Syro-Latin text of a passage in the New Testament to the language of the Old Testament (see Gen. xxvii. 9, xxxviii. 17, 20, Judg. vi. 19, xiii. 15). The phrase itself is too simple to reveal in what language the assimilation was first made.

I take this opportunity of bringing together some passages from Syro-Latin texts of the Gospels in which we can clearly trace assimilation to the Old Testament.

<sup>1</sup> Cur. is wanting here.

## (i) Luke iii. 22.

ΚΑΙ ΦΩΝΗΝ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΥ  
 ΓΕΝΕΣΘΑΙ ΥΙΟΣ ΜΟΥ ΕΙ ΣΥ Α ΕΓΩ ΧΗΜΕΡΟΝ  
ΓΕΓΕΝΝΗΚΑ ΣΕ.

The interpolation from Ps. ii., as is well known, is found in connexion with the Baptism in many early authorities—the Old Latin MSS. a b c ff<sup>1</sup> 1 (Lc. iii. 22), Justin *Dial.* 88, 103, Clem. Alex. *Paed.* i. 6, the 'Ebionite' Gospel quoted by Epiphanius, p. 138<sup>1</sup>. It will be noticed that the words 'Thou art My Son' are common to Lc. and the Ps. I cannot doubt that these words were a link between Lc. and the Ps., which led to the insertion in Lc. of the clause from the Ps. On the use of the Old Testament in the Early Church see below, p. 51 f.

## (ii) Mark x. 11 f.

ΟC ΔΝ ΑΠΟΛΥCΗ ΤΗΝ ΓΥΝΑΙΚΑ ΔΥΤΟΥ  
 ΚΑΙ ΑΛΛΗΝ ΓΑΜΗCΗ' ΜΟΙΧΑΤΑΙ ΕΠ ΑΥΤΗΝ  
 ΚΑΙ ΕΑΝ ΓΥΝΗ ΕΞΕΛΘΗ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΑΝΔΡΟC  
ΚΑΙ ΑΛΛΟΝ ΓΑΜΗCΗ' ΜΟΙΧΑΤΑΙ.

For the words underlined the true text has *ἐὰν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήσῃ ἄλλον*. The Bezan *ἐξέλθῃ* is found in the Ferrar-group 28 2<sup>m</sup> 604, a *discesserit*, b *exiet*, ff<sup>2</sup> *exeat*, q *exierit*; compare c *reliquerit*, k *relinquit*. There can, I think, be little doubt that it is due to assimilation to Jer. iii. 1 'They say, If a man put away (הִשָּׁחֵט) his wife, and she go from him (וְהָיָה כִּי יֵצֵא מִן הָאִשָּׁה), and become another man's, shall he return unto her again?'

In what language did the reading in question arise? The versions are as follows:

LXX.: *ἐὰν ἐξαποστείλῃ ἀνὴρ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπέλθῃ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ κ.τ.λ.*

Latin Vulgate (Cod. Amiatinus): *Si dimiserit uir uxorem suam, et recedens ab eo duxerit uirum alterum...*

<sup>1</sup> For later Patristic evidence see Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 346 ff.



Syriac:

ܡܠ ܕܝܟܬܐ ܡܪܝܬܐ ܕܝܬܐ ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ  
from and-she-go-away his-wife a-man there-put-away and-if

ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ  
.another to-a-man and-she-be with-him

In regard to the Syriac it should be added that Aphraat (p. 46) quotes Jer. iii. 1 in the following form<sup>1</sup>:

ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ  
with-him from and-she-go-out a-wife a-man there-taketh when

ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ ܡܠ  
.another to-a-man and-she-be

It will be noticed that the Syriac of Jer. has two points of contact with the Syriac of Mc.<sup>2</sup>; (1) the word ܡܠ (Sin.) answers to ἀπολύσαι (Mc., comp. e.g. Matt. v. 32, xix. 9) and is used in Jer.; (2) the phrase 'to be to another man,' in the sense of 'to marry another man,' is common to Mc. (Sin. Pesh.) and Jer. The evidence does not perhaps warrant a decided verdict, but it certainly points to the Bezan reading having arisen in an Old Syriac text.

(iii) Luke xxi. 25 (καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς συνοχή ἐθνῶν ἐν ἀπορίᾳ ἡχοῦς θαλάσσης καὶ σάλου, ἀποψυχόντων ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ φόβου κ.τ.λ.). The Sinaitic Syriac has: 'And-distress on-the-earth and-feebleness-of hands (ܡܠ ܡܠ) of-the-peoples &c.' It is clear that the Syriac translator had before him, or translated as if he had before him, a Greek text as follows: ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς συνοχή, ἐθνῶν ἀπορία, and that he represented this last word by the paraphrastic expression 'feebleness of hands.' What is the source of this phrase? I cannot doubt that it is a reminiscence of descriptions in the prophets of the coming of judgment—Ezek. vii. 15 ff.<sup>3</sup>:

<sup>1</sup> The words 'when a man taketh a wife' are due to assimilation to Deut. xxiv. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Sin. has (Mc. x. 11): 'Whatsoever woman (is) putting-away (ܡܠ) her-husband and being to-another-man (is) committing adultery.'

<sup>3</sup> The whole passage in Ezek. should be compared with the context in Lc.

'The sword is without and the pestilence and the famine within...All *hands shall be feeble* (ܐܝܕܝܢ ܠܥܝܐ), and all knees shall be weak as water'; xxi. 7 'And it shall be, when they say unto thee, Wherefore sighest thou? that thou shalt say, Because of the tidings, for it cometh: and every heart shall melt, and *all hands shall be feeble* (ܥܡܠܐ ܐܝܕܝܢ ܠܥܝܐ), and every spirit shall faint.' Compare Jer. l. 43 'The king of Babylon hath heard the fame of them, and *his hands wax feeble* (ܐܝܕܝܢ).'<sup>1</sup> Thus in the Syriac version of the Old Testament a certain phrase is used in the pictures of men's fear of divine judgment; in the Syriac Gospel in our Lord's discourse on the coming woes, an adaptation of that phrase is employed, the verb giving place to the corresponding substantive.

It would seem that the Curetonian reading<sup>1</sup> ܐܝܕܝܢ ܠܥܝܐ (waving of hands: see Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.*) was derived from that of the Sinaitic. Syriac words from the root ܐܝܕ are the constant equivalents of Greek words belonging to the same family as ἀπορία (see Payne Smith, *Thes. Syr.*). The word ܐܝܕܝܢ (waving) seems to have been substituted for ܠܥܝܐ (feebleness), the two words having the same general meaning, but the former being nearer to the Greek ἀπορία.

(iv) Luke xxiii. 9 (αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτῷ). The Old Latin c adds *quasi non audiens*. The source of this gloss is suggested to us by a passage of Cyril's Lectures (*Cat.* xiii. xvi.), where he is speaking of our Lord's silence before Pilate: καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐσιώπα. λέγει ὁ ψαλμῳδός Καὶ ἐγενόμην ὥσει ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἀκούων καὶ οὐκ ἔχων ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ ἐλεγμούς (Ps. xxxvii. 15)<sup>2</sup>.

With these passages, where the language of the Gospels is

<sup>1</sup> So Pesh. The Arabic Tatian (Hill, p. 211) has 'wringing of hands.'

<sup>2</sup> It is impossible not to connect this gloss in c with the gloss in the Curetonian Syriac: 'But Jesus returned him not any answer, *as though he had not been there.*' But on the relation between the two glosses it is vain to speculate. On a somewhat similar phrase in the *Gospel of Peter* see *Old Syriac Element*, p. 123.



century it was the Books of the Old, rather than those of the New, Testament which were regarded as possessed of primary authority. With these the apostolic writings were gradually becoming coordinated. The harmonies even in small points, which the devout thought of the early Christians discovered between the Old and the New Scriptures, were thus invested with a peculiar importance. Coincidences in language were, as we know from early Christian literature, reverently and eagerly noted.

Luke xvi. 31.

ΟΥΔΕ ΑΝ ΤΙΣ ΕΚ ΝΕΚΡΩΝ  
ΑΝΑΣΤΗ ΚΑΙ ΑΠΕΛΘΗ ΠΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ  
ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΥΣΙΝ.

The true text is: οὐδ' ἐάν τις ἐκ νεκ. ἀναστῇ πεισθήσονται.

The interpolated words are clearly a context-supplement, and come from *v.* 30 πορευθῇ πρὸς αὐτούς. But the variation in the verb (ἀπέλθῃ, πορευθῇ) implies the intervention of a version. When we turn to the Sinaitic Syriac we read (*vv.* 30, 31), 'If one from the-dead go (ܕܝܟܐ) to-them, repenting (are they). He-said to-him If Moses and-the-prophets they-hear not, not-even if one from the-dead go (ܕܝܟܐ). (will they be) believing him.' Thus πορευθῇ (true text, *v.* 30) = ܕܝܟܐ = ἀπέλθῃ (*D.* *v.* 31).

The reading appears in various authorities in different forms: 225 245 πορευθῇ; a ff<sup>3</sup> il ad illos ierit (-int il), b c q ad illos abierit (-int b), e abierit a mortuis, d r surrexerit et ierit ad eos; Iren. IV. ii. 3 (lat. int.) a mortuis resurgens ad illos eat, credent ei; Dial. contr. Marc.<sup>1</sup> πορευθῇ.

Luke xviii. 14.

ΚΑΤΕΒΗ. ΟΥΤΟΣ ΔΕΔΙΚΑΙΩΜΕΝΟΣ ^  
ΜΑΛΛΟΝ ΠΑΡ ΔΙΚΕΙΝΟΝ ΤΟΝ ΦΑΡΙΣΑΙΟΝ.

The true text is: κατέβη οὗτος δεδ. εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ παρ' ἐκεῖνον.

<sup>1</sup> See Dict. Chr. Biog. (Adamantius), Prof. Robinson, *Philocalia*, p. xlviif.

The Old Syriac (Sin. Cur.) and the Peshitta have: 'There-went-down this-man to-his-house (Cur., to-his-house this-man; Pesh., this-man justified to-his-house) justified rather than (lit. from) that-man (Pesh., that Pharisee).'

There are three points: (1) The omission of 'to his house' would be easy in Syriac, for it would be the omission of a single word. The fact that the word has a different position in the sentence in each of the three texts (Sin. Cur. Pesh.) is an indication how easily it would fall out altogether. As a matter of fact it has no place in Tatian as quoted by Ephrem—'This man went down justified more than (he)' (Hill, p. 362). (2) Baethgen, *Evangelienfrag.*, p. 18, gives a long list of additions in the Old Syriac similar to 'that *Pharisee*' here. (3) The Syriac rendering of the idiomatic *παρά* of comparison is the natural, indeed the necessary, one. It is retranslated in the Bezan Greek through the added *μᾶλλον* (= *ἰ.δ.*). It is instructive to notice that a literal rendering of the Syriac *ܡܢ* (from) has passed into some Latin texts—*magis ab illo*, E; *magis ille pharisaeus ab illo*, gat; *ab illo fariseo*, T<sup>1</sup>. The sequel is curious. This *ab illo*, a Syriasm transplanted into the Latin, was unintelligible. Hence, though it was retained, it was put to a fresh use—*ab illo magis quam ille fariseus*, Q; *descendit hic iustificatus in domum suam ab illo*, vg. Thus Bede *ad loc.*, 'iniustus ad templum uenit, iustificatus a templo rediit.' Or perhaps *ab illo* (taken with *iustificatus*) was referred to God (*v.* 13).

Luke xix. 4.

καὶ προλαβὼν

ⲕ ⲉⲙⲡⲣⲟⲥⲑⲉⲛ ⲁⲛⲉⲃⲏ ⲉⲡⲓ ⲥⲓⲕⲟⲙⲱⲣⲉⲁⲛ

ἵνα ἴδῃ αὐτὸν ὅτι ἐκεῖνῃ ἠμελλεν

διερχέσθαι καὶ εἰπεν ἐν τῷ

διερχέσθαι αὐτὸν εἶδεν καὶ ⲕ εἶπεν αὐτῷ

ζακχαῖε σπεῦσον καταβῆθι.

The true text is: καὶ προδραμών εἰς τὸ ἔμπροσθεν ἀνέβη

<sup>1</sup> Similarly in Matt. xii. 6 the Bezan Latin (*quia a templo maior est hic*) seems to preserve a Syriacised Old Latin reading.

ἐπὶ σ. ἵνα...ἐκείνης...καὶ ὡς ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον, ἀναβλέψας  
[δ] Ἰησοῦς...εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν Ζακχαῖε, σπεύσας κατὰβηθι.

The Curetonian is: 'And-he-ran, *anticipated* - Him (ܐܢܬܐܢܐ), and-climbed-up into-a-fig-tree a-tasteless-one that-he-might-see-Him, because-so passing was Jesus; *and-when* He-passed (even) Jesus, He-saw-him (ܐܢܬܐܢܐ), He-said, Hasten, come-down, Zacai<sup>1</sup>.' The points in the passage are these: (1) *προλαβών*. If the reading stood alone, we should regard it as an *itacism* arising from *προδραμών*. But it will be noticed that the Curetonian, as so often, represents the *προ-* of the compound word *προδραμών* by the addition of the verb 'he anticipated.' It would seem then that the Bezan scribe, following the Syriac, retranslated this, the most emphatic word in the sentence<sup>2</sup>. (2) The Curetonian and the Bezan texts agree in substituting for ὡς ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον the phrase (drawn from the context) 'And when He passed,' the Bezan text being a little fuller. (3) *εἶδεν*. The (a) word and the (b) mood must alike be noticed. (a) Syriac has no compound verbs. In representing the compound verbs of the Greek it *either* has recourse to a periphrasis *or* contents itself with an inadequate rendering by a roughly equivalent (simple) verb. In the present case, as elsewhere (see e.g. Matt. xi. 5, Mc. x. 51 f., Jn. ix. 18), it used the common verb ܐܝܬܐܢܐ (to-see) to represent ἀναβλέψαι. Hence the Bezan translation *εἶδεν*. (b) The Syriac regularly resolves the Greek aorist participle into an indicative followed by 'and' (see below, p. 115): hence the Bezan *εἶδεν καὶ εἶπεν*. (4) *σπεύσον κατὰβηθι*. Here again the Syriac is unable to represent exactly the participle *σπεύσας* (see below, p. 116). It therefore, as so often, uses two imperatives *asyndeta*. Hence the Bezan retranslation *σπεύσον κατὰβηθι*.

<sup>1</sup> The Sinaitic is only partially legible at this point. It has: 'And-he-ran before-Him and-climbed-up into-a-fig-tree a-tasteless-one...because.... He was... He-said to-him Hasten, come-down, Zacai.'

<sup>2</sup> So *e praecessit*. Below (ἐγένετο...αὐτόν) there agree with D the following: 157 a b c e ff<sup>2</sup> i l q r s. In the following clause a large number of MSS. (Gr. Lat.) have a conflate reading of some form, e.g. 157 *εἶδεν αὐτόν· ἀναβλέψας δὲ κ.τ.λ.*

The significance of these coincidences between the Bezan and the Syriac texts lies in their combination.

Luke xx. 34.

ΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΙΩΝΟΣ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΓΕΝΝΩΝΤΑΙ  
ΚΑΙ ΓΕΝΝΩCΙΝ ΓΑΜΟΥCΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΓΑΜΟΥΝΤΑΙ.

The Old Syriac (Sin. Cur.) has: 'The-sons of this age (are) *bearing and-begetting* (ܡܠܝܬܐ ܡܠܝܬܐ), and(-are)-taking wives and-becoming (ܡܥܡܐ) wives to-men.' The word ܡܠܝܬܐ, which I have ventured to translate (are) *bearing*, seems to be commonly emended into ܡܠܝܬܐ, and taken in the sense of (are) *begotten*<sup>1</sup>. But the discovery of the Sinaitic MS. furnishes what seems to be a conclusive reason against this interpretation; for it is almost impossible to suppose that the Sinaitic and the Curetonian should have independently preserved the same *itacism* (ܡܠܝܬܐ for ܡܠܝܬܐ). The interpretation which I propose introduces no new difficulty. For the awkwardness of the phrase 'The sons of this age are bearing' is parallel to the awkwardness of the phrase 'The sons of this age...are becoming wives to men.' On the other hand the interpolated clause thus becomes strictly parallel to the clause which follows it, both clauses speaking of the respective parts which men and women play in this world. Such we may, I think, say with certainty was the original meaning, and such the original form, of the gloss. There are two stages in its later history. (1) When it was transplanted into a Greek text, where it was followed by a clause with an active and a passive verb (γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται), it was natural to conform it to that clause and to render ܡܠܝܬܐ as though it were ܡܠܝܬܐ (begotten): hence the Bezan γεννῶνται καὶ γεννῶσιν. The gloss is found in this form in some Latin MSS. viz. ff<sup>2</sup> i q gat\* E Q (*generantur et generant*<sup>2</sup>), r (*nascuntur*

<sup>1</sup> So e.g. Cureton and Baethgen (p. 82) adopting the Bezan Greek (γεννῶνται καὶ γεννῶσιν). So too Mrs Lewis in her translation of the Sinaitic Syriac.

<sup>2</sup> In E the interpolation stands *after* the clause: *nubunt et traduntur ad nuptias*. Cyprian Aug. ce ff<sup>2</sup> i l q gat omit the clause *they marry* &c. altogether. The Bezan Latin is: *pariuntur et pariunt, nubunt et nubuntur*.

*et generant*). (2) The gloss was next further conformed to the following clause, in which the active verb comes first. In this form it is found in a c 1 Cypr. *Test.* iii. 32, *de Hab. Uirg.*, 22 (*generant et generantur*), in Clem., *Strom.*, iii. 12, Origen, Augustine.

Luke xxii. 12.

ΕΚΕΙΝΟΣ ΥΜΕΙΝ ΔΕΙΞΕΙ ΑΝΑΓΑΙΟΝ ΟΙΚΟΝ  
ΕΣΤΡΩΜΕΝΟΝ.

In place of *οίκου* the true text has *μέγα*. The explanation of this strange substitution is, I believe, simple if we look for its origin in a Syriac text. The Syriac versions (Sin. Cur. Pesh.) have

ܠܐܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ  
.which(-is)-furnished large an (one) upper-room

In some Syriac text in place of *ܡܝܬܐ* (large) the word *ܠܐܝܬܐ* (of-a-house)—‘an upper-room *of-a-house* which(-is)-furnished’—was written, or was read by a copyist. The confusion between *ܐ* and *ܝ* is too common to need illustration; in the present passage the substitution of *ܐ* for *ܝ* would be especially obvious, as the following word begins with *ܐ*. The emendation, whether intentional or not, makes excellent sense. The ‘Bezan scribe’ however, when he reproduced this Syriac reading, or perhaps his own misreading of the Syriac word (*large*), in Greek, instead of *οικοῦ* wrote *οικόν*, assimilating the termination to that of the previous word *ΑΝΑΓΑΙΟΝ*<sup>1</sup>.

The Bezan Latin scribe took the word *ἀνάγαιον* as an adjective meaning ‘upper’: hence his *superiorem domum* (*sup. locum*, q).

In Mark xiv. 15 D has:

ΑΝΑΓΑΙΟΝ ΟΙΚΟΝ ΕΣΤΡΩΜΕΝΟΝ  
ΜΕΓΑΝ ΕΤΟΙΜΟΝ.

The true text is *ἀνάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον ἔτοιμον*. The

<sup>1</sup> For such an assimilation in the Bezan text comp. e.g. Matt. v. 12 τοὺς προφῆτας τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν ὑπαρχόντων.



Bezan Latin is: *stratum paratum grande*. It would seem that the Bezan (Greek) scribe repeated in Mc. the reading which had been introduced into the parallel passage in Lc., later in the sentence adding *μέγαν* from the true text (*μέγα*). The word 'large' has the same position in ff<sup>2</sup> i q Or<sup>int.</sup> as it has in D. It is omitted in several cursives (see Tisch. *in loc.*), among these being 131 (see above, p. 18 n.) and 346 (see above, p. 4 n.).

Luke xxiii. 36 f.

ΕΝΕΠΕΖΟΝ ΔΕ ΑΥΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΣΤΡΑΤΙΩΤΑΙ  
 ΠΡΟCΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟΙ ΟΪΟΣ ΤΕ ΠΡΟCΕΦΕΡΟΝ ^  
 ^ ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕC· ΧΑΙΡΕ Ο ΒΑCΙΛΕΥC ΤΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ  
ΠΕΡΙΤΕΘΕΝΤΕC ΑΥΤΩ ΚΑΙ ΑΚΑΝΘΙΝΟΝ  
CΤΕΦΑΝΟΝ.

The true text is *ἐνέπαιξαν... ὄξος προσφέροντες αὐτῷ καὶ λέγοντες* Εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, σῶσον σεαυτόν.

The Old Syriac (Sin. Cur.) has: 'And-mocking were-they at-Him also the-soldiers (Cur., at-Him were they; and-also the-soldiers) and-approaching (Cur., approaching) were-they to-Him (Sin. ܡܕܐܠ, Cur. ܡܠ) and-saying Peace to-Thee; if Thou art the-King of-the-Jews, save Thyself. And-they-set *also* (om. Cur.) on-His-head a-crown of-thorns.'

The Old Latin c has the same remarkable addition which is found in D and the Old Syriac: 'aue rex iudaeorum, libera te; imposuerunt autem illi et spineam coronam.' In a shorter form it stands at the beginning of the verse in a Milan MS. (= M) (see Bp J. Wordsworth *in loc.*): 'et imposuerunt in capud eius spineam coronam.'

There is nothing, so far as I know, in any of the different forms of the gloss to indicate in what language it first arose. But it is important to note that it is clearly due to assimilation. Three points in Lc. xxiii. 36 f., viz. (1) the mention of the soldiers; (2) the mention of mockery; (3) the phrase 'king of the Jews,' link this passage with Matt. xxvii. 27 ff., John xix. 1 f., both which latter passages speak of the

soldiers placing on the Lord's head the crown of thorns and of their derisive salutation 'Hail king of the Jews.' The addition at this point (Lc. xxiii. 36) then is natural.

We find a similar addition in one form of the *Gesta Pilati* (Tischendorf, *Evangelia Aproc.*, p. 231): *ὅτε ἀπῆλθαν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον, ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ καὶ περιέζωσαν αὐτὸν λέντιον, καὶ στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν περιέθηκαν αὐτῷ περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν. καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν.* Here, it will be observed, the addition is inserted at an earlier stage of the history. If then its insertion where it occurs in the Old Syriac D c M was natural, it seems likely that the interpolation was originally made in the Syro-Latin text, and was thence taken by the author of the *Gesta Pilati* and placed in a different setting<sup>1</sup>.

Luke xxiii. 40 ff. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἕτερος  
ΕΠΕΤΕΙΜΑ ΔΥΤΩ ΛΕΓΩΝ ΟΤΙ ΟΥ ΦΟΒΗ ΣΥ  
 ΤΟΝ ΘΝ ΟΤΙ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΔΥΤΩ ΚΡΙΜΑΤΙ ΕΙ  
ΚΑΙ ΗΜΕΙΣ ΕΣΜΕΝ ΚΑΙ ΗΜΕΙΣ ΜΕΝ  
 ΔΙΚΑΙΩΣ ΔΞΙΑ ΓΑΡ ΩΝ ΕΠΡΑΞΑΜΕΝ  
 ΑΠΟΛΑΜΒΑΝΟΜΕΝ ΟΥΤΟΣ ΔΕ ΟΥΔΕΝ  
ΠΟΝΗΡΟΝ ΕΠΡΑΞΕΝ ΚΑΙ ΣΤΡΑΦΕΙΣ  
ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΝ ΚΝ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΔΥΤΩ Α ΜΝΗΣΘΗΤΙ ΜΟΥ  
ΕΝ ΤΗ ΗΜΕΡΑ ΤΗΣ ΕΛΕΥΣΕΩΣ ΣΟΥ  
ΑΠΟΚΡΙΘΕΙΣ ΔΕ Ο ΙΗΣ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΔΥΤΩ ΤΩ ΕΠΛΗΚΟΝΤΙ  
ΘΑΡΧΕΙ Α ΣΗΜΕΡΟΝ ΜΕΤ' ΕΜΟΥ ΕΣΗ  
 ΕΝ ΤΩ ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΩ.

The true text has: ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἕτερος ἐπιτιμῶν αὐτῷ ἔφη Οὐδὲ φοβῆ σὺ τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι εἶ; καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν δικαίως, ἄξια γὰρ ὧν ἐπράξαμεν ἀπολαμβάνομεν· οὗτος δὲ οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἔπραξεν. καὶ ἔλεγεν Ἰησοῦ, μνήσθητί μου ὅταν ἔλθῃς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν (v. l. ἐν τῇ β.) σου. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἀμήν σοι λέγω, σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ.

The Old Syriac (Sin. Cur.) is as follows (v. 39 ff.): 'One of

<sup>1</sup> Yet the context in the *Gesta Pilati* has a point of contact with Matt. xxvii. 28 (καὶ ἐκδύσαντες αὐτὸν χλαμύδα κοκκίνην περιέθηκαν αὐτῷ).

those however doers-of evil-things (*or* evil) who-crucified were (with-Him, Cur.) blaspheming was at-Him, and-he-said *to-Him* (om. Cur.): Art not Thou the-Christ? save Thyself and-also us (and-us also us, Cur.). And-there-rebuked him his-fellow the-(that, Cur.) other, and-he-said to-him: Not-even of God afraid-art-thou (afraid thou, Cur.), because-lo also we in-it we in-the-judgment [i.e. we also are in the same judgment]? And-lo we as deserving are-we (Sin. ܡܠܟܐ, Cur. ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ), and-as we-did we-are-requited. But this-man not-even anything that-hateful (is) (is) done by-Him. And-he-said to-Jesus: My-Lord remember-me when Thou-comest (coming (art) Thou, Cur.) in-Thy-kingdom. There-said to-him Jesus: Verily I-say to-thee that-to-day with-me thou-shalt-be in-Paradise (I say to-thee to-day that-with-me thou-shalt-be in-the-garden-of Eden, Cur.).'

The chief points in the passage are as follows: (1) *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν*<sup>1</sup>. When we turn to the Old Syriac we see that the words 'because lo *also we* (are) in the same judgment (ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ)' are due to assimilation to the context as given in the Syriac, where in the previous verse (σωσον σεαυτὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς) the Sinaitic has: 'Save Thyself and *also us* (ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ),' the Curetonian the more emphatic words 'Save Thyself and *us also us* (ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ).' Thus in the Old Syriac the 'and also us' (Sin.), 'and us also us' (Cur.) of the one robber suggests the 'lo, also we' of the other. The Bezan scribe copied the *ei* of the true text and thus confused his assimilation to the Syriac. It should be added that the simple *ἐσμεν* in place of *εἰ* is found in C\* me theb aeth, *Gesta Pilati* x. (Cod. A), Chrys. vii. 287 A, xi. 249 D, 760 C. (2) οὐδὲν πονηρὸν ἔπραξε. Chrysostom (ii. 480) has οὐδὲν πονηρὸν ἐποίησεν. One MS., viz. C (Tisch. p. lxxi), of the *Gesta Pilati* and Cyril, *Cat.*, xiii. 3 have οὐδὲν κακὸν ἐποίησεν. Another form of the *Gesta* (Tisch. p. 286) has οὗτος δὲ πάντως οὐδὲν κακὸν ἔπραξε. Compare the *Gospel*

<sup>1</sup> If we considered this reading by itself, it might be plausibly suggested that it arose from the following words *καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν* having been dittographed.

of *Peter* iv. ἡμεῖς διὰ τὰ κακὰ ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν οὕτω πεπόνθαμεν<sup>1</sup>. It is easy to see how the word ܠܡܕܐ (evil), which might be translated by κακόν or πονηρόν, would naturally arise as a reading or a gloss in Syriac. ἔπραξεν is rendered by ܡܠ ܕܠܗܝܐ (done by-Him). This at once recalls the phrase used to render κακοῦργοι (v. 39), viz. ܠܡܕܐ ܕܠܗܝܐ (doers-of evil-things, or evil). If the word 'evil' were introduced into the speech of the penitent robber, this point would be added to his words—'We have been doers of evil things: not any thing evil has been done by Him. He is not to be ranked among us malefactors, us doers of evil things.' We may compare the interpolation found in the Sinaitic Syriac at Matt. xxvii. 16: 'A prisoner...whose name was Jesus Bar Abba. He had been thrown into prison because of *the evil things which he had done* (ܠܡܕܐ ܕܠܗܝܐ ܠܡܕܐ), and because he was a murderer'; so in Lc. xxiii. 19 'because of *evil things* and murder.' Thus in Syriac *evil* (Lc. xxiii. 41) would be due to context-assimilation. (3) καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τὸν κύριον εἶπεν. This reading is, so far as I know, found only in two other authorities. One form of the *Gesta Pilati* (Tisch. p. 286) has καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγει αὐτῷ Κύριε, ὅταν βασιλεύσης, μή μου ἐπιλάβου. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Σήμερον λέγω σοι ἀλήθειαν ἵνα σε ἔχω εἰς τὸν παράδεισον μετ' ἐμοῦ. Again, in the Armenian translation of the *Acts of St Polyeuctes* (Conybeare, p. 138) we read as follows: 'Bethink thee of the thief who was crucified on the right side; what did he say to the thief who was crucified on the left, and who reviled the Lord? "We suffer justly for what we have done, but our Saviour<sup>2</sup> was guiltless and sinless of the cross," and as he said this *he turned and said* "Remember me, Lord, in Thy kingdom<sup>3</sup>."...He said "This day art thou with me in Paradise."

<sup>1</sup> For this οὕτω πεπόνθαμεν compare *Gesta Pilati* (Tisch. p. 286) ἡμεῖς δὲ ἡμεῖς ὡς ἐπράξαμεν ἐπάθομεν, and the Old Latin b: 'et nos quidem iuste haec patimur'; see also the Armenian *Acts of Polyeuctes* quoted below.

<sup>2</sup> Comp. the *Gospel of Peter* οὗτος δὲ σωτὴρ γενόμενος τῶν ἀνθρώπων τί ἡδίκησεν ὑμᾶς;

<sup>3</sup> This seems to have been Tatian's reading—'Lord, remember me in Thy

The addition seems due to the vivid fancy which would fain picture all the details of a scene, which appealed profoundly to Christian feeling.

(4) *μνήσθητί μου ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐλεύσεως σου*. It should be noticed (see below, p. 94 f.) that the Bezan scribe has the word *ἐλευσις* in Lc. xxi. 7 in a phrase which seems to come from Matt. xxiv. 3 through the medium of the Syriac. The reading before us, whether it arose in Greek or in Syriac, seems due to context-assimilation. The robber is made to ask our Lord to remember him 'in the day of His coming.' The answer is 'To-day shalt thou be with me!'

(5) *αὐτῷ τῷ ἐπιπλήσσουντι*. The addition seems to be a context-supplement and to be derived from the *ἐπιτιμῶν* of v. 40. But the variation of the word, as indeed the phraseology (*αὐτῷ τῷ ἐπιπλ.*), implies the medium of a version<sup>1</sup>. I would suggest therefore that the Bezan scribe is here following a Syriac reading or a Syriac gloss:

ܠܐܘ ܠܠܐܝ ܐܡܝܢ ܕܐܝܬܝ ܡܝܢ ܝܫܘܥ  
was who-rebuking to-him Jesus to-him there-said

kingdom' (Hill, p. 375). So *Gesta Pilati* (Tisch. p. 233), *μνήσθητί μου, Κύριε, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου*.

<sup>1</sup> This is the connexion of *to-day* in Aphraat (p. ܐܡܝܢ), as in the Sinaitic Syriac, 'Verily I say unto-thee that-to-day with-me &c.' In another place (p. ܕܠܐ) Aph. omits *to-day*—'And to one of them that were crucified with Him, who believed in Him, He swore that "with-Me shalt-thou-be in the garden of Eden."' The omission is probably due to the fact that *to-day* is not required in connexion with the purpose of the quotation. The Curetonian on the other hand has a different connexion: 'Verily I say to-thee to-day that-with-me &c.' This reading seems implied in Ephrem's *Commentary on Tatian* (Hill, p. 375). Compare also *Gesta Pilati* (Tisch. p. 286), quoted above. This arrangement of the words was perhaps due to an early misunderstanding of the word 'Paradise' (or 'Garden of Eden'), as though it meant the final state of glory, whereas the Lord 'descended into Hades.' In later times we know that such a misunderstanding did suggest this connexion of the words (see Archbp Trench, *Studies in the Gospels*, p. 306 f.). Other difficulties were felt as to the words in early times; see the passages from Origen and Chrysostom quoted by Tischendorf *in loc.* Marcion according to Epiphanius omitted (apparently) the whole verse (see Dr Hort, *Notes on Select Readings*, p. 68 f.).

<sup>2</sup> The supposition that this version was Latin is excluded by the fact that the Bezan Latin has *alius increpabat eum* (v. 40), *qui obiurgabat eū* (v. 43).

The word ܠܡܠܐ is used in v. 40. The word ἐπιπλήσσειν is a word which the Bezan scribe uses in another passage, where the phraseology makes it probable that he is re-translating. In Matt. xii. 16 (καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς) D reads ΠΑΝΤΑΣ ΔΕ ΟΥΣ ΕΘΕΡΑΠΕΥΣΕΝ ΕΠΕΠΛΗΞΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ. The Curetonian (Sin. wanting) and the Peshitta here render ἐπετίμησεν by ܠܡܠܐ.

(6) θάρσει. The addition is obviously due to assimilation to other words of absolution and promise; see Matt. ix. 2, 22<sup>1</sup>. No other authority for this reading is given by Tischendorf. It is found however in Cyril, *Cat.*, xiii. 31 διὸ καὶ δικαίως ἤκουσε Θάρσει· οὐχ ὅτι τὰ πράγματά σου τοῦ θαρσεῖν ἄξια, ἀλλ' ὅτι βασιλεὺς παρέστι χαριζόμενος.... οὐ λέγω σοι Σήμερον ἀπέρχῃ· ἀλλὰ Σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ. θάρσησον· οὐ ἐκβληθήσῃ. Touttée in his note refers to the *epistola de uera circumcissione* printed in the Appendix to Jerome's works (v. p. 164): 'Forti animo esto: Amen dico tibi, hodie mecum &c.' He adds 'Idem quoque uerbum ab aliis auctoribus citatum legi.' The only other reference however which he gives is to Codex Bezae.

To sum up: the examination of the readings in this passage seems to shew (i) that pious fancy was especially active in regard to the story of the penitent robber, and was not without effect on the Biblical text; (ii) that the principle of assimilation accounts for some of the Bezan readings; (iii) that there are signs that Syriac influence had at least some share in the genesis of the Bezan text at this point.

Luke xxiii. 53. ܟܐܝ ܐܬܗܟܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܢ ܐܢ ܡܢܗܡܝܘ  
ܠܐܠܕܐܬܡܗܡܝܢܘ ܐܝܢ ܐܝܢ ܗܢ ܐܝܢ  
ܐܝܢ ܟܝܡܝܢܘܨ ܟܐܝ ܬܝܢܘܨ ܐܝܬܝܢ ܐܝܬܝܢ  
ܬܘ ܡܢܗܡܝܘ ܠܝܬܝܢ ܐܢ ܡܝܢ ܐܝܢ ܐܝܢ  
ܐܝܢ.

<sup>1</sup> For a somewhat similar assimilation of words spoken by our Lord on the cross to words spoken during His ministry, compare Tatian's version of our Lord's commendation of the Virgin to St John (Eph.; Hill, p. 375): 'Θου young man, behold, thy mother.' See Lc. vii. 14 f. 'And He said, Young man, I say unto thee, Arise...And He gave him to his mother.'

The true text is *καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ οὐ οὐκ ἦν οὐδεὶς οὐπὼ κείμενος.*

In regard to this remarkable passage there are two questions for discussion. They are these: (1) To what source or sources can we trace this strange gloss? (2) Are there in the passage and in the immediate context any signs of retranslation? These two questions, it should be added, are quite distinct.

(1) Whence did this perplexing gloss come? (a) First of all it is plain that the account of St Luke is supplemented by the addition of words from the parallel passage in St Matthew (xxvii. 60)—*καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸ [τὸ σῶμα] ἐν τῷ καινῷ αὐτοῦ μνημείῳ ὃ ἐλατόμησεν ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ, καὶ προσκυλίσας λίθον μέγαν τῇ θύρᾳ τοῦ μνημείου ἀπήλθεν.* Compare Mc. xv. 46 *καὶ προσεκύλισεν λίθον ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τοῦ μνημείου.* Certain MSS., viz. U, the Ferrar-group and, according to Tischendorf, fifteen others, together with the Memphitic Version and two MSS. of the Aethiopic, insert words clearly derived from Matt. (cf. Mc.)—*καὶ προσεκύλισεν λίθον μέγαν ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τοῦ μνημείου.* If Ciasca's Arabic truly represents Tatian, his history of the burial was as follows (Hill, p. 251 f.): Jn. xix. 38-42 (...There then, because the sabbath had entered in, and because the tomb was nigh at hand, they left Jesus); Matt. xxvii. 60 b (and they *rolled a great stone* and thrust it to the door of the tomb, and departed); Mc. xv. 47 a (And Mary Magdalene and Mary named after Joses came after them unto the tomb); Matt. xxvii. 61 b (and sat down over against the tomb); Lc. xxiii. 55 b (and saw how they brought in and placed the body there). It appears then that in the Diatessaron, just before the mention of the women, the phrase about the stone derived from Matt. (cf. Mc.) had a place. Thus the interpolation is one of the many instances in which, as it appears, a Tatianic reading influenced the Bezan text. (b) But in the Bezan text the *μέγαν* of Matt. gives place to the description—*ὃν μόγις εἴκοσι ἐκύλιον.* The phrase is, I believe, derived from Joseph., *de Bello Jud.*, vi. 5. 3 (ed. Niese, vol. vi. p. 551), or, it may be, from

a traditional account of what Josephus there records. The passage is part of the description of the portents which, as Josephus tells us, took place shortly before the destruction of the Holy City. It runs as follows: 'During the same feast [i.e. 'the feast of unleavened bread']...the eastern gate of the inner sanctuary (τοῦ ἐνδοτέρω ναοῦ), which was of brass and very solid (στιβαρωτάτη), which *in the evening* was with difficulty shut by twenty men (κλειομένη δὲ περὶ δέλην μόλις ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων εἴκοσι), and which was supported by iron-bound bars and had posts reaching far down, let into the floor of solid stone, was seen about the sixth hour of the night to have been opened of its own accord (αὐτομάτως ἡνοιγμένη). The guards of the Temple ran and told the officer (τῷ στρατηγῷ); and he went up and was with difficulty able to shut it (μόλις αὐτὴν ἴσχυσε κλείσαι). This also seemed to the ignorant a portent of most happy meaning; for they fancied that God had opened to them the door of His blessings. But the learned were of opinion that the security of the sanctuary was of "its own accord" being broken up, and that—a free gift to the foe—the gate was being opened, and among themselves they explained the sign as indicative of desolation.'

That this story made a deep impression and was widely known appears from the fact that it is referred to by the Roman historian (Tac., *Hist.*, v. 13): 'Euenerant prodigia.... Uisae per caelum concurrere acies, rutilantia arma, et subito nubium igne collucere templum. *Expasae repente delubri fores, et audita maior humana uox, excedere deos.*' Thus there is nothing violent in the supposition that this story was well known in the birthplace of the Bezan text, especially if, as I believe, there are strong reasons for thinking that that birthplace was the Syrian Antioch. Moreover, the desolation of the Holy City after the revolt in Hadrian's reign would revive the memory of, and give special point to, the stories current as to the siege of Jerusalem under Vespasian. It would appear that at this time, that is, in the second quarter of the second century, the 'Syro-Latin' text of the Gospels was taking shape.



But what are the links which connect the story of the Temple gate in Josephus with the description of the tomb in St Luke? What would carry the mind of a reader, or transcriber, of St Luke's words, to the portent in the Temple on the eve of the destruction of Jerusalem? The points of connexion are these: (1) In both cases the size and weight of the barrier are emphasised (comp. Mc. xvi. 3 f.). In both cases it is miraculously removed without human intervention<sup>1</sup>. (2) The gate in Josephus closed the way into the sanctuary (*ναός*). The stone in the Gospel lay at the mouth of the tomb where there lay 'the sanctuary of His body' (*ὁ ναὸς τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ*, Jn. ii. 21). (3) The miraculous opening of the Temple gate was an omen of the destruction of Jerusalem. The murder of our Lord ensured the doom of Israel. Besides these, other minor coincidences may be noted: (a) Both events took place at the time of the Passover. (b) The gate was shut at evening. The stone was placed at the door of the sepulchre at evening. (c) The floor was of solid stone. The tomb was hewn out of the rock. (d) When the gate was miraculously opened, the temple guards (*οἱ τοῦ ἱεροῦ φύλακες*) ran and told the officer (*τῷ στρατηγῷ*). When the soldiers at the tomb saw the wonders of the Easter morning, some of them went into the city and told the chief priests what had happened.

The coincidences then are striking. Such coincidences might well appeal to the imagination of second century Christians, and their sense of them find expression in the substitution of the description of the Temple gate for the Evangelist's simple epithet *μέγαν*.

The gloss is found in (a) the Old Latin c: 'et cum positus esset in monumento, posuerunt lapidem quem uix uiginti uoluebant.' The Bezan Latin is: 'et posito eo inposuit in monumento lapidem quem uix uiginti mouebant.' (β) the Thebaic Version: 'When he placed Him however, he

<sup>1</sup> With the *αὐτομάτως ἡνοιγμένη* of Josephus compare the phrase in the *Gospel of Peter* (ix.): *ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ κυλισθεὶς ἐπεχώρησε παρὰ μέρος*.

placed a stone in the mouth of the tomb, which twenty men would be able to roll.' It would seem that the two Latin texts (c d) understood *θέντος* as though it were *τεθέντος* and, though in different ways, gave a passive verb (cum positus esset, posito eo). The difference of phraseology implies translation from a common original. Thus all the phenomena point to the Greek as prior to the Latin.

But if the Bezan Greek is prior to the Latin, is the Bezan Greek itself the original form of the gloss? There is of course no *a priori* objection to this view. A careful examination of the language of the most famous of the Bezan glosses—the man working on the Sabbath (Lc. vi. 4 f.)—does not reveal any indication of retranslation. The case might be the same here. It is simply a matter of evidence. We must examine (i) the immediate context, (ii) the gloss itself, and see whether the language shews signs of retranslation.

(i) The context: (a) *ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ* (v. 53; true text *ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ*). The Syriac (Cur. Pesh.; Sin. wanting) naturally renders *λαξευτῷ* by the passive participle, of which the Bezan *λελατομηγνένῳ* is an exact representation. This coincidence however cannot be pressed into an argument, since in Mc. xv. 46 we have *ἐν μνήματι ὃ ἦν λελατομημένον*. (b) In v. 55 we have the form *ἀγαλλιαίας*; see below, p. 102. (c) *κατηκολούθησαν δὲ δύο<sup>1</sup> γυναῖκες...καὶ εθεάσαντο* (v. 55; true text *κατακολουθήσασαι...εθεάσαντο*). The Bezan Greek reproduces the Syriac rendering of the Greek participle: 'Those women who-went with-Him from Galilee *went* to the sepulchre in-their-footsteps *and-saw*...' (Sin. Cur.); comp. p. 115.

(ii) The gloss itself: (a) The words *καὶ θέντος αὐτοῦ ἐπέθηκεν* read to me like a somewhat halting piece of translation. This however is a matter of impression. (b) In the Greek Gospels the only word used to describe the placing the stone at the sepulchre is *προσκυλίσαι* (Matt. xxvii. 60, Mc. xv. 46). The Old Syriac (Sin.; Cur. wanting) however has in

<sup>1</sup> The *δύο* (also found in 29 a b e ff<sup>3</sup> q r Q) is probably due to the mention of the two Maries (see the Arabic Tatian quoted above, p. 63).

Matt. xxvii. 60 'And-*he-placed* (lit. *he-cast*, ܐܝܬܐ) a great stone *at* (lit. *upon*, ܕܠ) the-door of the sepulchre'; in Mc. xv. 46 'He-rolled a-stone, *he-placed* (ܐܝܬܐ) (it) *at* (ܕܠ) the-door of the sepulchre.' The Syriac words 'he-placed...upon (at)' would precisely suggest the Bezan ἐπέθηκεν. (c) The word ἐκύλιον is to be noticed on two grounds. (i) On the one hand we have here the simple verb. In the Greek Gospels the compound forms of this verb (προσκυλ., ἀποκυλ., ἀνακυλ.) alone are used. The Syriac of course has only an uncompounded verb (ܕܠܝܢ). (ii) On the other hand the imperfect tense is to be remarked. The sense required is 'could roll' rather than 'were rolling.' Now this 'could roll' would be concisely expressed by the Syriac imperfect (see Nöldeke, *Syr. Gram.*, § 266). It seems as if this idiomatic Syriac imperfect were literally translated by the Greek imperfect.

Further, the story of the miraculously opened *gate* of the temple, as told by Josephus, would to a reader of the Syriac Gospels very naturally connect itself with the history of our Lord's Passion. The phrase τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ ἐσχίσθη becomes in the Old Syriac 'there was rent the front of the *gate* (ܕܠܝܢ) of the sanctuary (Matt., Sin.), of the temple (Mc., Sin.; Lc., Sin. Cur.)' Josephus tells us that the supernatural opening of the gate was regarded as prophetic of the destruction of the temple. Ephrem gives a similar explanation of the rending 'of the veil'—'in scisso uelo imaginem templi diruendi proposuit, quia Spiritus eius ex eo exierat' (Moesinger, p. 256).

When these indications of Syriac influence in the gloss itself and in the context, in which it is embedded, are considered together, there seems to be good, though not perhaps conclusive, reason for thinking that it came into the Bezan text from a Syriac source.

One question remains. Can the gloss, assuming that it is derived from the story as to the Temple gate, have been *originally* Syriac? If the gloss is derived from oral tradition,

there is no difficulty in giving an affirmative answer to this question. But if the source of the gloss is literary, not traditional, i.e. if it is derived from the narrative of Josephus, is the supposition that it first found its way into a *Syriac* text of St Luke excluded? The story occurs in Josephus' treatise *The Jewish War*. It appears from the Preface to that treatise (comp. *Contra Ap.* i. 9) that Josephus first wrote the history in his native Aramaic and circulated it in the East, and then translated it into Greek for use in the Roman Empire<sup>1</sup>. Thus there is nothing at all improbable in the supposition that Syriac-speaking Christians knew the *de Bello Judaico* of Josephus in its original Aramaic form.

Briefly to sum up: I have given reasons for thinking that we have in this Bezan gloss, found also in one Latin MS., and in one Egyptian version, a reference to a story connected with the destruction of the Holy City. The Bezan gloss itself has probably come from an Old Syriac text. If so, it must remain uncertain whether the gloss was original in this Syriac form, or whether it came into the Syriac from a Greek text; but there is nothing improbable in the former of these two suppositions.

Luke xxiv. 32 f.

ΟΙ ΔΕ ΕΙΠΟΝ ΠΡΟΣ ΕΑΥΤΟΥΣ

ΟΥΧΙ Η ΚΑΡΔΙΑ ΗΝ ΗΜΩΝ ΚΕΚΑΛΥΜΜΕΝΗ

ΩΣ ΕΛΑΛΕΙ ΗΜΕΙΝ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΟΔΩ

ΩΣ ΗΝΥΓΕΝ ΗΜΕΙΝ ΤΑΣ ΓΡΑΦΑΣ

ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΣΤΑΝΤΕΣ ΛΥΠΟΥΜΕΝΟΙ ΑΥΤΗ ΤΗ ΩΡΑ

ΥΠΕΣΤΡΕΨΑΝ.

The true text is *καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους Οὐχὶ ἡ κ. ἡμῶν καιομένη ἦν ὥς...ὁδῷ, ὥς διήνοιγεν κ.τ.λ.*

The points to be considered are these: (1) *κεκαλυμμένη*. The Syriac rendering of the true text (*καιομένη*) is ܟܝܘܡܝܢܐ, which is the reading of the Peshitta. But this Syriac word suggested either to the original Syriac translator or to an

<sup>1</sup> Ἑλλάδι γλώσση μεταβαλὼν ἃ τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις τῇ πατρὶς συντάξας ἀπέπεμψε πρότερον.

early copyist an obvious and attractive emendation which would assimilate this verse to v. 25 **ܠܐ ܝܚܒ** (= *βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ*). Hence both in the Sinaitic and in the Curetonian we have 'Our-heart *heavy* (**ܝܚܒ**) was.' This obviously Syriac reading appears in the Old Latin l (*optusum*<sup>1</sup>), the Thebaic and the Armenian. This emendation in the Old Syriac text seems to lie at the root of the other variations. It changed the whole tone of the sentence: the predicate became one expressive of disparagement. The remaining readings are three in number. (a) The Old Latin e has *exterminatum*. The word *exterminare* is very common in Old Latin Biblical texts and in early Latin Christian literature in the sense of *to destroy*: see the instances quoted by Röscher (*Itala u. Vulgata*, p. 365 f., comp. pp. 56, 74), and note especially the rendering of Ps. xxii. 17, twice given by Tertullian (*Adv. Jud.* x. xiii.): '*Exterminauerunt* (= *ᾠρυξαν*) manus meas et pedes.' I believe that this *exterminatum* of e arose from a very obvious *itacism* in some Syriac text which here lies behind e, or possibly from a misreading of the Syriac word on the part of a bilingual scribe. The common Old Syriac reading was, as we see in the Sinaitic and the Curetonian, **ܝܚܒ** (*heavy*). This word by mistake was written or read as **ܝܚܒ** (= *hewn out*, Matt. xxvii. 60, Mc. xv. 46, Lc. xxiii. 53), and this perplexing *itacism* is somewhat skilfully represented by the *exterminatum* of e. (b) The Old Latin c has *excecatum*. It would be very natural, when once the adjective in the sentence under discussion got a disparaging tone, to compare with this passage, dealing with the Christian interpretation of the Old Testament by Jews, the words of St Paul in which he treats of precisely the same subject (2 Cor. iii. 13 ff.) 'The children of Israel...*their minds were hardened* (*ἐπωρώθη τὰ νοήματα αὐτῶν*): for until this very day at the reading of the old covenant the same veil remaineth unlifted... Unto this day, whensoever Moses is read, a *veil lieth upon their heart*.' Now

<sup>1</sup> This *optusum* may however come from 2 Cor. iii. 14 (*optusi sunt sensus eorum*): see below.

in the Peshitta the phrase ἐπωρώθη τὰ ν. αὐτῶν is rendered 'But they-were-blinded (ܐܝܬܐ ܕܝܗܝܢ) in-their-minds.' Hence it appears likely that the Old Latin c *excecaturum* is derived from 2 Cor. iii. 14 through the medium of a Syriac text. (c) Lastly there is the Bezan reading (κεκαλυμμένη). It also comes from 2 Cor. iii. 13 ff.<sup>1</sup>, like the reading of c. But in itself

<sup>1</sup> 'Probably from 2 Cor. iii. 14 f.' (Dr Hort, *Notes on Select Readings*, p. 72). With these readings derived from 2 Cor. iii. compare the Bezan text of Acts xv. 29 ΑΦ ΩΝ ΔΙΑΤΗΡΟΥΝΤΕΣ ΕΑΥΤΟΥΣ ΕΥ ΠΡΑΞΑΤΕ ΦΕΡΟΜΕΝΟΙ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΑΓΙΩ ΠΝΙ ερρωσθε. Irenaeus (iii. 17, ed. Harvey) has: 'a quibus custodientes uos ipsos, bene agetis, *ambulantes in Spiritu Sancto*.' Tert., *de Pudic.* xii, gives the gloss in the form 'uectante uos Spiritu Sancto.' On this interpolation I wrote (*Old Syriac Element*, p. 95) thus: 'I believe that the desire to make the Apostolic decree more spiritual led to the introduction into the Old Syriac text [which here lies behind the Bezan text] of a phrase from a Pauline Epistle, which deals with the Judaistic controversy. See Gal. v. 18.' Mr Rendel Harris (*Four Lectures on the Western Text*, p. 75 ff.) makes two criticisms on this position. (i) He does not allow that in the Bezan text an attempt is made to *spiritualize* the decree. In answer to this criticism I can only appeal to the decree as a whole in the Bezan text, and to the amplification in that text of the reference to the decree in xvi. 4 (true text *παρεδίδωσαν αὐτοῖς φυλάσσειν τὰ δόγματα τὰ κεκρυμμένα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστ. καὶ πρεσβ.*): ΕΚΗΡΥΞΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΕΔΙΔΟΞΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ ΜΕΤΑ ΠΑΧΗΣ ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑΣ ΤΟΝ ΚΝ ΙΗΝ ΧΡΝ ΑΜΑ ΠΑΡΑΔΙΔΟΝΤΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΑΣ ΕΝΤΟΛΑΣ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΩΝ. The 'tendency' here cannot be mistaken. On τὰς ἐντολάς (which exactly represents the Syriac equivalent in the N. T. of τὰ δόγματα) see *Old Syriac Element*, p. 95 n. (ii) Mr Harris gives his own theory thus (p. 77): "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 [sic: lege αὐτοὶ] μὲν οὖν ἐκπεμφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος κατήλθον εἰς Σελευκείαν.

Accordingly, the sentence in Acts xv. 30 should run, 'So they were led by the Holy Spirit, and came down to Antioch.' I note in passing that the real difficulty of Mr Harris' theory lurks under the English phrase 'they were led.' Later on (p. 79) Mr Harris notices that "the two passages are in harmony, as far as the principal verb is concerned, in the Peshito." Thus, 'And-they when they-were-sent-forth (ܐܘܠܕܝܗܝܢ) by (ܡܢ) the-Spirit of-Holiness' (xiii. 4); 'They however who-were-sent-forth' (xv. 30). "The same approximation of the account,"

it offers no indication whether or no it is a reading originally Greek. (2) λυπούμενοι (so c e theb.). This gloss is so meaningless that it must have arisen from some transcriptional accident. Can any clue to its genesis be found? In this verse the καὶ ἀνάσταντες becomes in the Syriac Versions (Sin. Cur. Pesh.) ܐܬܬܬܐܠܥܝܬܐ (and-they-rose-up). In v. 17 the true text has καὶ ἐστάθησαν σκυθρωποί. The Syriac Versions (Sin. Cur. Pesh.) have the common reading ܐܬܬܬܐܠܥܝܬܐ—‘while (Pesh. and-) sad (ܥܬܝܬܐ) (are)ye.’ If however we put the reading of the true Greek text into Syriac, it is ܥܬܝܬܐ ܕܐܬܬܬܐܠܥܝܬܐ (and-they-stood-still while sad); for ܥܬܝܬܐ means ‘to stand still’ as well as ‘to rise up’ (see e.g. Lc. vii.

he continues, “appears in Cod. Bezae [i.e. the Bezan Latin] which reads in xiii. 4 *ipsi uero dismissi ab sp̄o sancto*, and in xv. 30 *illi quidem dismissi*.”

Whatever may be thought in general of Mr Harris’ new theory of foundling glosses, it is clear that in the present case (in whatever language the gloss may be supposed to have arisen) all that he has shewn is that under the influence of xiii. 4 the gloss ‘by the Holy Spirit’ might have been naturally added in xv. 30. His theory accounts for the words ‘by the Holy Spirit,’ but not for the word *φερόμενοι*, *ambulantes*, since there is already in xv. 30 a participle (an indicative in Syriac).

It remains that I should very briefly explain my own position. The decree (Acts xv. 23–29) deals with two chief points: (i) Were the Gentile converts under the law? (ii) What were their duties? In regard to the latter point it should be noticed that in the Bezan text, in which καὶ νικτῶν (v. 28, cf. v. 20) is omitted, the words ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων καὶ αἵματος καὶ πορνείας are most naturally interpreted as enjoining abstinence from idolatry, *murder*, fornication—three ‘works of the flesh.’ The whole passage—Gal. v. 13–25—deals precisely with these two subjects of the decree. I transcribe the chief phrases, italicising the words which, as I believe, suggested the gloss in Acts xv. 29 in D and Irenaeus: ‘(v. 13) For ye, brethren, were called for freedom; only use not your freedom for an occasion to the flesh.... (16) But I say, *Walk by the Spirit* (πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε), and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.... (18) *But if ye are led by the Spirit* (πνεύματι ἄγεσθε), ye are not under the law. (19) Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these, fornication...idolatry...enmities, strife, etc.... (22) But the fruit of the Spirit is love.... (23) Against such there is no law.’ There are indications that the gloss comes through the medium of a Syriac text. (1) The word *φερόμενοι* points to retranslation. The medium cannot be the Bezan Latin; for *ferentes* in d is obviously a meaningless translation of *φερόμενοι* (taken as the middle voice). The Syriac ܥܬܝܬܐ (= ἄγεσθε, Gal. v. 18) would be very naturally translated by *φερόμενοι*. (2) The preposition (D ἐν, Iren. *in*) will be noticed. The Peshitta has ‘in-the-Spirit’ (ܐܢܝܢܐ) in Gal. v. 16, 18 (πνεύματι).

14). If we may assume, and it is no great assumption<sup>1</sup>, that the true reading of *v.* 17 appeared in some Syriac text, we have a natural explanation of the Bezan reading in *v.* 33. In this latter verse some Syriac scribe, with *v.* 17 in his mind, after **ܐܡܥܐ** (and-they-rose-up) wrote the words **ܠܝܬܐܝܢܐ** (while sad) which followed the **ܐܡܥܐ** (and-they-stood-still) of *v.* 17: the **ܐܡܥܐ**, common to both verses, brought with it into *v.* 33 the 'while sad' of *v.* 17<sup>2</sup>. We may compare a somewhat similar phenomenon in *v.* 13 (see below, p. 109). Thus in a Syriac text, which here lies behind the Bezan text, there arose in *v.* 33 the reading 'and-they-rose-up while sad (**ܠܝܬܐܝܢܐ**).' The Bezan translation of the last two words by *λυπούμενοι* is very natural, *λυπεῖσθαι* being translated by the Ethpeel of **ܝܬܐܝܢܐ** in Matt. xxvi. 37.

Luke xxiv. 37.

ΑΥΤΟΙ ΔΕ ΠΤΟΗΘΕΝΤΕΣ

ΚΑΙ ΕΜΦΟΒΟΙ ΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΙ ΕΔΟΚΟΥΝ ΦΑΝΤΑΣΜΑ

ΘΕΩΡΕΙΝ.

(1) The Sinaitic and the Peshitta begin the sentence with the word **ܐܡܥܐ** (and-they). (2) What of *φάντασμα* in place of *πνεῦμα*? We compare at once the somewhat similar passage Matt. xiv. 26 (comp. Mc. vi. 49): *οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης περιπατοῦντα ἐταράχθησαν λέγοντες ὅτι Φάντασμα ἔστιν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου ἔκραξαν*. It is a

<sup>1</sup> The Old Latin *e* (*et steterunt tristes*) alone among Latin MSS. has this reading. If *e* had been lost, there would have been no Latin authority for this reading.

<sup>2</sup> In connexion with this verb I take the opportunity of noticing the Bezan reading in Mc. vii. 9 *ἵνα τὴν παραδοσὶν ὑμῶν στήχηται*. The true text has *τηρήσητε*. The Bezan Latin reads: *ut traditionem uestram tradatis*. The Old Syriac (Sin.) has: 'Forsaking (are) ye the-commandments of God, that-ye-may-establish (**ܐܡܥܥܝܬܐ**) your-commandments' (for the word *commandments* = *tradition* cf. Matt. xv. 2 ff.). Pesh. also has 'that-ye-may-establish.' It would seem as if the translation arose through a misreading of *τηρήσητε*. For such a misreading in the Old Syriac (Sin.) compare 'that-they-might-hang Him (= *κρεμάσαι* for *κρημνίσαι*, Lc. iv. 29)'; see Baethgen, p. 8. The reading is also found in 1-209 28 a b c f f<sup>2</sup> i q r (*statuatis*) arm., Cyprian *De Cath. Eccl. unilate* 19, *Epist.* xliii. 6.



sufficient explanation of the Bezan reading to suppose that the word *φάντασμα* is due to assimilation of this passage to Matt. Mc. In connexion however with this reading it is impossible not to take into consideration the remarkable passage in Ignat. *Smyr.* 3: ἔφη αὐτοῖς Λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με, καὶ ἴδετε ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον<sup>1</sup>. Jerome (*de Vir. Ill.* 2) ascribes this saying to the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, the Aramaic original of which he himself translated into Greek and Latin. Bp Lightfoot points out in regard to the Ignatian passage that 'the reference is plainly to the same incident which is related in Luke xxiv. 36 sq.; see esp. vv. 38, 39.' What then of the strange word *δαιμόνιον*? It is difficult to suppose that it would have been chosen for its own sake as the word which our Lord used of Himself. When however we turn to the Sinaitic of Mc. vi. 49 (ἔδοξαν ὅτι φάντασμά ἐστιν), we find the words 'they-thought that-a-devil (ܐܝܠܐܝܠܐ) (was)He'; and in Matt. xiv. 26 (where the Sinaitic is illegible) the Curetonian has: 'And-saying were-they that-a-devil (was)He.' The word ܐܝܠܐܝܠܐ, here used to denote a spectral form, is a common equivalent of *δαιμόνιον* (see Matt. vii. 22, xvii. 18; Mc. vi. 13, xvi. 9). Hence we are led to ask whether the *δαιμόνιον* of Ignatius is not the exact rendering of the Syriac ܐܝܠܐܝܠܐ; whether in fact this saying of our Lord's, preserved to us by Ignatius of bilingual Antioch, is not derived from some Syriac account of the Resurrection, identical with, or closely allied to, the account of St Luke.

The evidence of Ignatius seems to shew that in some Syriac gloss on, if not in some Syriac text of, Lc. xxiv. 37 the word *devil* (in the sense of *apparition*) was introduced from Matt. xiv. 26, Mc. vi. 49. It is then at least possible that the Bezan word *φάντασμα* may be a retranslation of a Syriac

<sup>1</sup> Compare Ephrem's comment on Matt. xiv. 26 (Mc. vi. 49): 'Cur ergo mirati sunt? Si eum *incorporeum* nouerunt, imprudenter admirati sunt.... Si uero *corporalis* erat, recte obstupuerunt.... Et quia ipse Dominus sciuit, quod recte obstupuerunt, animum eorum confortauit dicens: *Ego sum, nolite timere*, i.e. ego sum ille *corporalis*, quem uos cognoscitis' (Moesinger, p. 135).

reading or gloss. There are indeed indications of Syriac influence in the context. (1) D has οστα ογκ εχει και σαρκας (v. 39; true text, σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει). The Syriac (Sin. Cur. Pesh.) has the common order ('flesh and bones'). It is however in Syriac, in whatever order the words stand, that we see how easily the plural σάρκας would arise. The Syriac words (Sin. Cur. Pesh.) are these; ܠܝܬܐ ܠܝܬܐ (flesh and-bones). Even when the words stand in this order, we see at once how readily the terminations would become assimilated and ܠܝܬܐ be pointed as a plural (compare *The Old Syriac Element* (p. 18) on Acts ii. 17, ἐπὶ πᾶσας σαρκας D). The reading is found in N\* and appears to have made its way into an Old Latin text: for in the Latin translation of Irenaeus (v. 2) we read: '...Spiritus enim neque ossa neque carnes (Gr. σάρκα) habet; sed de ea dispositione, quae est secundum uerum hominem quae ex carnibus (Gr. ἐκ σαρκός)...'. It occurs also in the Dialogue printed among Origen's works (i., p. 857 (ed. Delarue); see above, p. 52), ὀστέα καὶ σάρκας οὐκ ἔχει. (2) Again, D has in v. 39 βλέπετε (true text θεωρεῖτε). The Syriac (Sin. Cur. Pesh.) has the common word ܠܝܬܐ (seeing). The word θεωρεῖν is rendered by this verb in Syriac e.g. in Matt. xxvii. 55, xxviii. 1; Mc. iii. 11. Further, this Syriac verb is the constant equivalent of βλέπειν; see e.g. Matt. v. 28, vi. 4, vii. 3.

It is impossible to refrain from considering a remarkable gloss in the immediate context (v. 43), though D does not contain it. The true text is οἱ δὲ ἐπέδωκαν αὐτῷ ἰχθύος ὀπτοῦ μέρος· καὶ λαβὼν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ἔφαγεν. The interpolation in question, which is inserted after ἔφαγεν, comes to us in several forms: (1) The Ferrar-group, KΠ\*, and many cursives have καὶ τὰ ἐπίλοιπα ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς<sup>1</sup>. (2) 88 has the same reading with τὰ περισσεύματα in place of τὰ ἐπίλοιπα. (3) 130 with τὸ ἐπαναλειφθῆν in the same position. (4) r has

<sup>1</sup> It will be noted that the interpolation is not found in Sin. Some MSS. of the Memphitic have the following words: 'He ate and He took the remainder, He gave to them.' Epiph. *Haer.* i. ii. xxx. ch. xix. has: λαβὼν ἔφαγε καὶ ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς.

'reliqua accepit et dedit illis.' (5) c has a reading found also in Aug. *de Consensu* (iii. 74) and the Latin Vulgate: 'sumens reliquias dedit eis.' (6) The Curetonian Syriac has:

ܐܡܠ ܕܡܝ ܝܕܝܢ ܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܢ  
to-them He-gave which-(was)-left that and-He-took

When we look at the variations in the form of the gloss as found in Greek authorities (τὰ ἐπιλοιπα, τὰ περισσεύματα, τὸ ἐπαναλειφθέν), it is impossible not to feel that we are dealing with retranslations of a gloss in some other language than Greek, based on the expressions used in connexion with the two miracles of feeding the Thousands. When, in order to gain light on the question—Through the medium of what language did the gloss come?—we compare the gloss with the passages in the Gospels (Matt. xiv. 20, xv. 37; Mc. vi. 43, viii. 8; Lc. ix. 17), we are struck with the constancy in the phraseology of the Syriac Versions: for (1) the word **ܐܠܡ** (= they-took-up), (2) some word from the root **ܝܕܝܢ**, are always used. Such constancy is not found in the Latin renderings of the several passages—thus (a) sustulerunt, collegerunt, sublatum est, (b) reliquias, reliquum, quod superfuit, quod superavit, quod abundavit—all these phrases are found in their respective places. Thus, so far as the indications go, it appears that the Syriac has a better title than the Latin to be the source whence this gloss found its way into Greek and other authorities.