

THE TEXT AND CANON
OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT

By

ALEXANDER SOUTER

LATE YATES PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK
AND EXEGESIS IN MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD

Revised by

C. S. C. WILLIAMS

FELLOW AND TUTOR OF MERTON COLLEGE, OXFORD



GERALD DUCKWORTH & CO. LTD.

3 Henrietta Street, London, W.C.2

PREFACE

TO THE FIRST EDITION

THE chief justification for the appearance of the present work is that a series of the comprehensiveness of 'Studies in Theology' would not be complete without some treatment of the Text and Canon of the New Testament. There is a further reason in the fact that the progress made in these subjects is such, that every ten years or so, a brief treatment of them, an attempt to gather together the results of multitudinous books and articles, is a necessity, if any beyond the narrow circle of experts are to be put in possession of the new facts. The writer gained some knowledge of these facts during the eight years in which it was his privilege to teach those subjects in Mansfield College, Oxford. The preparation, also, of an up-to-date critical apparatus to the New Testament, which has been published by the Clarendon Press in conjunction with the 'Revisers' Text' (November 1910, and later¹), gave him some acquaintance with the materials of New Testament textual criticism. The first part of the present book is intended not merely to present as briefly as possible what students ought to know, but also to act as an encouragement to them to take up some branch of the textual criticism of the New Testament. For this reason some repetition in the course of the work may be excused. I would fain allure some Churchmen from the fascinating pursuit of liturgiology, and some Nonconformists from the equally if not more fascinating pursuit of speculative theology, to the study, say, of the abundant manuscript materials which exist for the writing of the history of the Latin Bible. Why, for instance, should we still lack a scientific edition of the biblical commentaries of our countryman, the Venerable Bede? The materials exist in abundance and are of superlative quality.

Some critics may find the part of the book on the Canon too brief. Here I have preferred to let the documents

¹ 2nd ed. 1947.

speak for themselves, and have presented them in greater number and more accurate text than the English reader will be able to find them elsewhere in a volume of this compass. That I am able to do so is partly due to the kindness of Mr. C. H. Turner and the Delegates of the Clarendon Press, who have kindly authorized the republication of certain documents from the *Journal of Theological Studies*. For the general study of the Canon I am mostly beholden to the second edition of Theodor von Zahn's *Grundriss der Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*. It is a continual surprise to me that this work has not yet been translated into English: we have nothing to compare with it. Other obligations incurred in both parts of the book are acknowledged in their places.

This book was more than half written before I was called away from Oxford to other work. I hope it may be in some sense regarded as a legacy to my former students there.

*May Cottage, Torphins,
Aberdeenshire.*

July 7, 1912

Postscript.—The 'Damascine' Council of 382 must now disappear from history, thanks to the epoch-making results of Professor E. von Dobschütz of Breslau (see notes to Documents G and S and p. 180 Note).

PREFACE

TO THE SECOND EDITION

Thirty-two years after Westcott and Hort's first edition of the New Testament in Greek (1881), appeared Alexander Souter's first edition of this work and in the forty years that have elapsed since 1913, both 'W.-H.' and 'Souter' have remained standard works, despite the new discoveries of manuscripts, the new groupings of Uncials and Minuscules into families, and despite the results of research into patristic citations and into the history of the versions as well as into that of the Canon. Especially on the Latin manuscripts, as in the field of Latin vocabulary, Souter's work has abiding value. The purpose of this revision is to present 'Souter' in modern dress, allowing him as far as possible to speak in his own words and keeping even his use of the first person singular, for 'he being dead yet speaketh'. If this revision prompts a beginner to go on and to consult larger works, like B. H. Streeter's *The Four Gospels*, Pt. i, or Lagrange's *Critique textuelle* or his *Histoire ancienne du Canon*, or M. M. Parvis and A. Wikgren's *New Testament Manuscript Studies*; or to study the sixty or so New Testament papyri most of which have been discovered since 1913; or perhaps to face the drudgery of learning Syriac, Coptic, Armenian or Georgian in order to pursue his research further, it will not have been in vain.

C. S. C. W.

5 Holywell Street,
Oxford.

St. Margaret's Day, 1953

CHAPTER I

ANCIENT TEXTS AND THEIR TRANSMISSION

§ 1. TEXTUAL CRITICISM

TEXTUAL criticism seeks, by the exercise of knowledge and trained judgement, to restore the very words of some original document which has perished, and survives only in copies complete or incomplete, accurate or inaccurate, ancient or modern. If we possessed the twenty-seven documents now composing our New Testament exactly in the form in which they were dictated or written by their original authors, there would be no textual criticism of the New Testament. The original documents, however, have long perished, and we have to make the best of the copies which have survived, by howsoever many removes they may be distant from their ultimate originals. Every fresh copy introduces fresh possibilities of error. We have only to try to copy anything ourselves to see how liable to error we are. Some persons are absolutely unable to copy a document with even reasonable accuracy, and the most careful copyists will discover errors made by them if they compare their copy afresh with the original. The same liability to error occurs in the reprinting of printed texts. For example, the earliest printed edition of the commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, published under the name of Primasius at Lyons in 1537, was reprinted at Cologne in 1538, and at Paris in 1543, and from this latter edition a reprint was made, which in its turn was the origin of the copy published in Migne's Latin Patrology in the middle of last century. In all this long interval conscious alteration there was practically none, yet the Migne edition, accurate as it is considered, is wrong in scores of places where the earliest edition is right.

If such things are possible in the case of printed texts seldom reprinted, the possibilities of error are greatly increased where manuscripts are concerned, because sometimes the copyist found difficulties with his predecessor's

handwriting, or was unable to expand correctly contractions used by him. As a rule, the old copyists did their best to make an accurate copy of what they saw before them, and it is in so far as they did this that their work has real value. If, in addition to using their eyes, they used their brains, and altered what seemed to them the errors of their predecessors into what they thought these predecessors ought to have written, they introduce confusion into the tradition and add to the difficulties of the modern textual critic. As a matter of fact, they rarely restore the real text, even where they hit the right sense. On the whole, it may be said that this vice of 'correcting' is rare in the period to which the earliest surviving MSS. belong, and increasingly common from about the eleventh century. Again, errors of ear are found, the scribes writing from dictation at speed in a *scriptorium*. The critic must possess, in addition to a knowledge of the language in which the manuscripts are written, a familiarity with the external characteristics of manuscripts in all periods, their size, the material on which they are written, the arrangement of columns, pages, and so forth, with the history of handwriting in all its forms, with punctuation, contractions, and such like matters: in other words, he must be a palæographer, or acquainted with the results attained by palæographers. The extraordinarily extended use of photography in relation to manuscripts has made it possible not only to obtain splendid photographs of single pages, but even to reproduce whole manuscripts in photographic facsimile, either in the size of the originals, or in a reduced size. Such reproductions for many purposes may take the place of the originals. The textual critic must not, however, be content even with this knowledge, which will tell him what errors *might* occur: he must also possess a thorough acquaintance with errors which actually *have* occurred,¹ and this it is not easy to acquire in any other way than by first-hand acquaintance with manuscripts. The principles of textual criticism will meet us later.

¹ A model enumeration of examples from the Latin classical writers is in Prof. A. E. Housman's *M. Manilii Astronomicum Liber Primus* (London, 1903), pp. liv-liz.

§ 2. MATERIAL OF BOOKS AND STYLES OF WRITING

Roughly speaking, we may divide the history of manuscripts, as far as the New Testament student is concerned with them, into three periods: a papyrus period, lasting to the seventh century; a vellum or parchment period, stretching from the end of the third to the fifteenth century; and a paper period, beginning about the fourteenth century. The period of uncial writing, that is, of rounded capitals, lasts down to the tenth century, but already about the end of the eighth the old cursive hand, refined into a book hand, began the reign of minuscules. We speak of manuscripts older than the end of the tenth century as old; those of the eleventh and twelfth centuries are of the middle period; others are late. Two causes tended to the change from papyrus to vellum. The first was the decrease in the supply of the former material, but the second and more potent cause was the greater usefulness and durability of vellum. While papyrus generally bore writing only on one side, and being commonly in roll form was both inconvenient to consult and could contain only one of any of the longer New Testament books, vellum could bear writing on both sides, was in sheets, and therefore capable of being bound up as a modern book, and could contain the whole New Testament if necessary. An increase in the cost of vellum gave the impetus to the sale of paper, a product of the East, in the century or two preceding the inventing of printing, which took place about 1450.

With the possible exception of such tiny writings as the Epistle to Philemon, and the Second and Third Epistles of St. John, which may have been written on waxed tablets with an iron pen or *stilus*, all the writings of the New Testament must have been written in the first instance on papyrus, with reed-pen (*calamus*) and ink, and it is of some interest and importance to realize their external appearance and character. This has become possible through the extensive discovery of papyrus rolls at Herculaneum in Italy in the eighteenth century, and particularly in Egypt in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The nature of papyrus being such that a damp climate reduces it to pulp, the vast quantity of papyrus which must have existed in other countries of the Roman world has all perished, and it

is to the action of Vesuvius on the one hand, and the dry climate of Egypt on the other, that we are indebted for the papyrus rolls that survive. The visitor to museums will note that the Herculanean papyrus fragments are generally charred, while those from Egypt are brittle, but when the papyrus was new it was soft and flexible.

The papyrus plant grew in abundance in Egypt in ancient times, and its use as writing material was familiar at least three thousand years before Christ. The inner bark of the shrub was cut longitudinally into thin strips which were laid side by side. These were crossed by other strips. The combined strips were pressed hard together, and the whole was then dried in the sun. The edges were then made smooth by pumice-stone, probably after the sheet had been rolled up, separate portions having been glued together with the aid of Nile water, regarded as specially suitable for the purpose, until the desired length was attained. Papyrus was sold from six to eighteen inches in height, at so much a length, just as paper is sold by the quire to-day, and the unused part could be clipped off, or extra parts added. The writing *which ran over the 'joins'* was in the first instance on the side where the fibres were horizontal, for the obvious reason that it was easier to write on that side. The custom was to write in very narrow columns, without separation of words, without accents, or breathings, and almost entirely without punctuation; these columns were sometimes numbered. In carefully written manuscripts a new paragraph was shown by a gap in the text, and a short horizontal line in the margin opposite, which line written at the side (*para, graphein*) is the origin of the English word paragraph. The title of a book was either added at the end of the roll, or on a little slip containing it gummed to the top edge, or it was given in both places.¹ The roll was held in the hands in such a way that the left hand rolled up what had been read, while the right hand unrolled what was still to be read. A core of papyrus or another stick was used round which it was rolled and thus kept smooth. For practical convenience a roll had not to exceed a certain length, and we can see that St. Luke, who wrote the two longest books in the

¹ Hardly any of the slips have survived. An instance of the title at the foot of the final column is *Ξενοφώντος Κύρου Παιδεία*—a (*Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part iv., No. 698: London, 1904).

New Testament, crushed the utmost amount he could into both rolls, being doubtless possessed of much more material on the life and sayings of Jesus and the apostles than he was actually able to use in his Gospel and Acts. Many New Testament papyri are in codex (book) form, which Christians favoured (perhaps as early as St. Mark himself) for ease of reference.

The narrow columns familiar to the reader of papyrus books were retained in the oldest vellum MSS., and as the leaves were generally square, each page could hold more than one such column, the number being determined by the size of the page. The number of columns per page probably never exceeded four, and two became very fashionable. In other respects, also, the customs of the papyri were retained. There was, in fact, no proper separation of words, and no fully developed use of accents and breathings before the ninth century, at which period the uncial writing was dying; so that we may almost say that these facilities for reading were unknown till the days of minuscule writing. Sheets of vellum, prepared from the skin of the sheep, antelope, and other animals, were so arranged that hair side was put next hair side and flesh side next flesh side. The number of such, folded together to form a sheet in the technical sense, varied considerably in the Greek world—four, five, and six, for example, being found, thus making eight, ten, and twelve leaves, or sixteen, twenty, and twenty-four pages respectively. In the Latin world the arrangement of four sheets laid one above the other and folded across the middle to form eight leaves or sixteen pages, and called a *quaternio* (hence, English 'quire'), is so regular, that exceptions can nearly always be explained as due either to some accident, or to the fact that a quaternion was insufficient, or more than sufficient, to contain the portion of writing desired. These sheets were commonly numbered, and served out one by one to the scribe: leaves were not commonly numbered till a very late period, say the fifteenth century, and pages were not numbered till the sixteenth—in fact, till the age of printed books was well begun. It is obvious that this custom of numbering the sheets is very convenient for the modern investigator, as it enables him to calculate the number of leaves lost in a MS., and thus to estimate what amount of text is lacking; or, contrariwise, if he knows the

length of the text, he can calculate how much space the missing part would require. The number of lines per page in a carefully written MS. remains constant, and care was taken, by means of a vertical row of prickings and the use of a hard point for the drawing of lines, to keep them straight and of equal length. Books were not always bound, but when this was done, wooden boards were employed. As time goes on, the use of contractions in writing becomes in general more and more complicated, and a work in consequence takes up less and less space. In earlier days a complete vellum Bible in one volume is an excessive rarity, but in the thirteenth century thousands of them were produced in single volumes of comparatively small bulk.

The paper manuscripts vary in nothing but material from the later vellum manuscripts, and we need not dwell on them, as they are of little consequence for our purpose. The transition from them to printed books was an easy one, and it is sometimes a little difficult to tell at first sight whether a book is a late MS. or an *incunabulum*.

Scribes (*librarii, antiquarii*), at least in the West, were a professional class down to the sixth century A.D., till which time Rome remained the centre of the book trade. From that time manuscripts were commonly produced in monasteries throughout Western Europe, especially in those of the Benedictine Order, which have practically preserved all we have got of Latin literature, both Christian and non-Christian. Among the more beautiful products of the ancient *scriptoria* the purple MSS. deserve mention. The vellum was first stained with purple, and on this purple-stained surface the letters were penned in silver and sometimes in gold. Of these ancient *editions de luxe* we possess several Gospel MSS. both in Greek and Latin, all, or nearly all, of which were written in the sixth century, the Greek ones probably in Constantinople, the Latin in North Italy.

Note: For references to the *New Testament papyri*, a student should consult G. Maldfeld's article in the *Zeitschrift f. d. neutest. Wissenschaft*, xlii. (1949), pp. 228 ff. and his and B. M. Metzger's article in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 68 (1949), to see where the papyri are, where they have been edited, their date, whether they were originally in roll or codex (book) form and to what textual family they

belong; cf. Metzger's article, *Expository Times*, July, 1952. The following also should be consulted: Sir F. G. Kenyon, *Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome*, 2nd ed. 1951; his article in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, xl. (1939), pp. 56 ff.; cf. C. H. Roberts, *ib.* l. (1949), pp. 155 ff. and W. G. Wilson, *ib.*, pp. 59 ff.

CHAPTER II

SOURCES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT

FOR the reconstruction of the New Testament text in Greek, three kinds of sources are available. The first is actual manuscripts written in Greek, professing to give the words of the sacred text as written by the authors. The second is translations made from this original Greek, especially if directly made from it, and not through the medium of another language, which is itself a direct translation from the original Greek. If such a translation was carefully made, and has survived in the precise form and text in which the translator himself issued it, what we possess in it is tantamount to the Greek copy in front of the translator when he made his translation. We must always allow, of course, for the fact that we cannot always say for certain which of two Greek synonyms was before the translator, or which was the order of words in the Greek text used by him, where two or more slight differences in order are known to have existed in Greek MSS.; in general, we must allow for differences of idiom in the two languages and for the effects they produce. The third class of evidence is that of quotations made from the New Testament by other writers. Here, again, if a quotation is copied by a Greek writer exactly from a Greek New Testament in front of him, and this quotation has come down to us in the exact form in which the writer saw it, we have, with regard to the verse or verses quoted, substantially the very copy which he used. Similarly, if it was a Latin or a Syriac writer, we have got practically that portion of the Latin or Syriac sacred text which lay before the particular writer, and we can treat it as we do the translations just mentioned.

GREEK MANUSCRIPTS

In the previous chapter some account has been given of the external characteristics of manuscripts. At this point

we may fitly introduce some further details about them, deferring a minute description of particular Greek MSS. to our next chapter.

A person or Church in possession of a New Testament, say in the period A.D. 250 to 300, would not have it complete in one volume. The first and most important volume would be ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ, 'the Gospel,' for the singular was regularly used of the fourfold Gospel, and it was not till about a hundred years later that people began to speak of each Gospel separately as a Gospel, and to use the plural of the four. As to the order of the Gospels in this vellum *codex*, Matthew would certainly come first, and certainly, from about 350 onwards, and probably earlier also, the order of the others would be that to which we are accustomed; the position of Matthew as the most important, and in the view of the Church the earliest, of the Gospels, was early secure. Each Gospel would be entitled merely ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΘΘΑΙΟΝ, etc. Certain, also, if not all, copies would be provided with a preface to each Gospel giving an account of the author, and also with a set of chapter headings, with divisions longer than our modern verses, corresponding to those chapter headings marked in the margin of the text. In the fourth century Eusebius made a set of tables, the use of which became widespread, by which one could ascertain at a glance in how many Gospels a particular section occurred, an early help to the study of the relation between the Gospels. The margins of such MSS. contain numbers (for which, of course, the Greeks used the letters of their alphabet) which correspond to the numbers, etc., in the preliminary tables.¹

The second volume of our early New Testament would be entitled ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΟΣ, for Paul became early known as 'the Apostle' *par excellence*, and such a copy would contain, being Greek, the Epistle to the Hebrews. The order of the Epistles would be slightly different from that to which we are accustomed, the Epistle to the Hebrews coming in after Second Thessalonians (though in p⁴⁶ it stands second to Romans), so that all the Epistles addressed to churches might be together, Hebrews coming last as one on which doubts had been cast, or from anti-Jewish prejudice. But we have information about a much earlier 'Apostolos,' which deserves to be mentioned. The

¹ Cf. Nestle, *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, xix. (1908), pp. 107 ff.

heretic Marcion prepared an edition of the Epistles of Paul in Greek about the middle of the second century at Rome. The Epistles were in the following order: Galatians, First and Second Corinthians, Romans, First and Second Thessalonians, Laodiceans (the name he gave to our 'Ephesians'), Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon. The text also was altered considerably to suit Marcion's special views. He also composed a set of prologues to these Epistles, as well as chapter headings and sections, which, though they have perished in the original Greek, are all extant in an early Latin translation, the use of which became practically universal in the Western Church. Another editor of the Epistles of St. Paul, Euthalius, lived at a much later period.

The third volume would contain Acts, either taken as plural (ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ) or as singular (ΠΡΑΞΙΣ), and along with it the Catholic Epistles.

As fourth volume, if there were one at all, we should have the Apocalypse.

The contents of our existing MSS. enable us to argue safely as to the practice of the early centuries of the Church. The great majority of those still surviving are not MSS. of the whole New Testament, but MSS. of portions as distinguished above. Most of them, too, are provided with such prefatory matter as has been indicated, often also with notes for liturgical use, calendars, lists of saints revered in particular districts, and so on. Occasionally, also, they bear the dates when they were written and the names of the scribes who wrote them. The total number of existing manuscripts containing all or part of the Greek New Testament, so far as known to experts, is about four thousand five hundred. A subsidiary class of Greek manuscripts is that of lectionaries or service books, some of respectable age, which contain extracts from the New Testament. As yet they have been only in part examined: between one and two thousand are known to exist, the earliest being of the sixth century A.D.¹

ANCIENT VERSIONS

The use of translations of the New Testament books became necessary as soon as there were churches outside

¹ See E. C. Colwell and D. W. Riddle, *Studies in the Lectionary Text of the Greek New Testament* (1933).

the bounds of the Roman Empire, or actually within it, to which Greek was an unknown language. The period of such translations begins probably about the middle of the second century. If we could obtain an autograph copy of one of these early translations it would be a prize indeed. But just as we have lost the original autographs of the Greek New Testament books, so in the case of the versions we have to depend on various copies, and here, too, critical reconstruction is required. When, too, as was undoubtedly sometimes the case, there were added to the errors of transcription the attempts of revisers to polish or correct the original translation in details, or to make a thorough revision of it with the Greek original as known to the reviser rather than as known to the first translator, obviously confusion would enter in, and the scholar who desires to recover the Greek text used by the original translator will have a task of almost insuperable difficulty. These translators did not make their translations in order that we might recover the Greek behind them, but to be useful to the Christians who could not speak or read Greek. They are rather rough and ready as a rule in their character, and one may doubt if the translators were always quite competent for their task. But the toil of examining the MSS. now surviving, and reconstructing their text, is worth while, if we only reach a somewhat imperfect knowledge of one Greek copy which a translator had before him at a date earlier than the earliest surviving Greek manuscript. In general it may be said that translations are not of so much use for delicate textual work as they are in cases of omissions or additions, especially if they be considerable in size, and otherwise attested also.

Translations sometimes form part of bilingual codices. It is difficult from our surviving examples to say how widespread the use of such bilinguals was. Some scholars think that the earliest Latin MSS. were always bilingual, that is, manuscripts in which both the original Greek and the Latin were provided either in parallel columns or on opposite pages. Examples, some of them fragmentary, exist in the case of the following bilinguals: Greek and Latin, Greek and Sahidic, Latin and Gothic, Bohairic and Arabic, Arabic and Latin. It is easy to understand how historical conditions, whether in church or home, would make such manuscripts useful.

Guides to the sense were provided by sense-lines, the arrangement of the text in clauses or parts of clauses, each representing a thought more or less complete in itself. This, of course, would be particularly useful for reading aloud to a congregation, and, though the practice arose in the case of Greek copies, it is more characteristic of Latin.

The order of books was not always the same in translations as in surviving Greek copies. While in the Bohairic version, for instance, the order of the Gospels and Epistles of Paul was that of Greek copies, manuscripts of the Old-Latin Gospels generally had them in the order Matthew, John, Luke, Mark; and the Epistles to the Thessalonians were in very many Latin copies placed immediately after Philippians, while Hebrews was wanting. The *raison d'être* in the first case would be to keep the two apostles together, and leave the shortest Gospel to the last; and in the second case to keep the Epistles to Macedonian churches together. In the older Latin copies, as in the Greek, the Gospel was a volume by itself, and the other parts of the New Testament were probably constituted in the same way as in the East, with the exception that the Apocalypse would be regularly present in a collection of biblical volumes.

PATRISTIC CITATIONS

The third source of evidence for the New Testament text is in some ways the most interesting of all. For, if our oldest papyrus fragment, p⁵², belongs to the first half of the second century, and our oldest translation of any part is only a little later than that, the New Testament books began to be quoted in other writings before the close of the first century, and a first-century copy of a New Testament book is within easy reach of the original autograph. These very early quotations are, however, seldom made *diserte*—that is, explicitly from the New Testament book concerned, and accurate quotation was not generally aimed at in ancient times. Also, these quotations are very few in number and tell us little. It is not, in fact, till towards the end of the second century that the great volume of Biblical quotation really begins. From that time onwards there is a constant stream, and the older the writer the

more likely he is to provide us with evidence as to valuable copies of New Testament books which have no longer survived. Let us briefly consider the importance of this class of evidence, and at the same time point out the care with which it must be used.

The history of the New Testament text is only a part of Church history, and Church history is only a part of the history of the world; and just as Church history cannot be thoroughly understood without a knowledge of general history—and not the least part of the value of Harnack's work consists in his never-failing recognition of this fact—so the history of the New Testament text cannot be understood without a knowledge of the history of the Church. This is true, of course, of the history of dogmatic movements, and so on, but what we are here concerned with is especially the history of the lives and writings of individual Christian teachers. We know exactly where and when these writers wrote, and thus by a study of their quotations we can say that in such and such a place at such and such a time a copy, say, of the Gospels of a certain character was to be found. There will, no doubt, be many gaps in our evidence, both because not every Church contained an author, and not every author's work has survived by any means, but we shall still have in our hands a foundation of evidence on which alone anything like a history of the New Testament text can be built, and into which any fresh bit of evidence which turns up will have to be fitted. The value, then, of patristic evidence is that it is early, dated, and localized, whereas the great bulk of our Greek manuscripts and most of our versions bear no precise date or place of their origin. But there are certain drawbacks in this class of evidence as a whole.

The majority of Fathers quote only small portions of a book, and we can only tell the character of their MS. for that part, whereas Greek MSS. and versions are generally relatively complete. There is one class, however, which has not hitherto received adequate attention—that is, the class of patristic commentators who generally quote in clauses or sections the whole book on which they are commenting. Sometimes we can substantially reconstruct the MS. they used.

There is, second, the prevalent practice of quotation from memory, which makes it quite impossible in many

cases to regard the words quoted as an accurate quotation from a copy of a biblical MS. in front of the writer. A close study of a writer's comments will, however, often tell us which of two competing readings he must have had.

The third and most serious qualification is, that even where the quotation was accurately made, we cannot be sure that it is preserved exactly as the Father made it. The texts of Fathers themselves also depend on manuscripts. Here also the original autographs are lost, and here, too, we must reconstruct the text of the Father, quotations and all, by critical methods. Especially in the case of much read books, the scribes who copied out the writings of great Fathers were apt at times to harmonize their biblical quotations with the form they had in the Bibles with which they themselves were familiar: ¹ sometimes, when they have got weary of doing this, they finally give it up, and we can detect by critical methods the procedure to which down to that point they have been subjecting the text. Early editors of printed editions have probably committed the same fault also, both of course with motives worthy enough in themselves. No edition of a patristic work is really valuable for the textual criticism of the New Testament which has not itself been the product of strict scientific method.

Another qualification, allied to the last, is one with regard to ancient translations of patristic works. For example, but for the zeal of the Western Church in the golden age of patristic literature we should have irretrievably lost many of the works of Origen. But it would be a mistake to treat the quotations in such Latin translations of Origen's works as exact translations of the Greek biblical quotations as they were made by Origen himself. The translations are sometimes not only loose in the representation of Origenian matter, but often provide the quotations in a form suited to the Latin Bible used by the translator a hundred and fifty years after the original composition of the work by Origen.² Translations, then, except where criticism leaves one free to break this rule,

¹ See, for example, *Journal of Theological Studies*, xi. (1909-10), 143-4.

² See, for instance, Westcott's article 'Origen' in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*; Engelbrecht's introduction to his edition of Rufinus' translation of Gregory of Nazianzus' *Sermons* (Vienna, 1910).

can only be used as evidence for the biblical text of the date, the locality, and the language into which the translation has been made.¹

In our later chapters we shall see how all classification of texts is made possible only by a co-ordinated and combined study of the three sources of evidence, to which we have briefly alluded, in a pure state.

Finally, the need for caution may be illustrated from B. H. Streeter's attempt to localize the 'Caesarean' text at Caesarea.² He thought that when Origen left Alexandria for Caesarea in A.D. 231 he soon forsook an Alexandrian text for a 'Caesarean' text of the Gospels, that is, for a text which reads like a compromise between the Alexandrian and the 'Western'. Since Streeter advanced this view, Lake and his colleagues³ showed that Origen while still in Alexandria had used a 'Caesarean' text; recently discovered papyri have shown that the Western text was known in Egypt and that an early form of the 'Caesarean' text was used there probably before it was carried to Palestine.

¹ See also chapter vii. (on Irenaeus).

² *The Four Gospels* (1926), pp. 77-107.

³ *Harvard Theological Reviews*, **xxi.** (1928), pp. 338-57.

CHAPTER III

GREEK MANUSCRIPTS

IN this chapter some account of the older and more important Greek manuscripts of all or part of the New Testament may be given, more by way of their external characteristics than in regard to their textual quality, which will be more profitably discussed later. A manuscript's importance does not of course depend solely on its age. An old manuscript is likely to be a more faithful representative of its ultimate original only because in its case there has been less time for corruptions to accumulate. It is also useful in considering the history of the text. But a late manuscript may be the last of a series of faithful copies, and may thus preserve a better tradition than another manuscript actually much earlier in date than it. As a matter of fact, we shall see that there is a family likeness between most of the latter MSS., and a manuscript's importance to the critic really depends on the extent of its divergence from the normal in readings.

The oldest known piece of New Testament MS. is p⁵², now in the John Ryland's Library, Manchester: it is a fragment of a second century codex, giving the text of John xviii. 31-34, 37-38: see C. H. Roberts' *An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Ryland's Library* (1935). The most considerable papyrological finds recently are those of p^{45, 46, 47}, the Chester Beatty papyri of the Gospels and Acts, St. Paul, and Revelation in large portions: see Sir F. G. Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, fasc. II and III and Supplement.

The oldest vellum MS., and the most valuable of all existing MSS. of the New Testament, is that commonly known as B (*Codex Vaticanus graecus*, 1209). This MS. has been in the Vatican Library, Rome, at least since the year 1481, in which one of the oldest extant catalogues was made. It once contained the whole Greek Bible, with the exception of the Books of Maccabees and the possible

exception of the Apocalypse. In its actual state the New Testament lacks the Epistle to the Hebrews from chap. ix. ver. 14, the Pastoral Epistles, and the Epistle to Philemon also. The existence, and also the merits of this MS., were to some extent known in previous centuries, and during the nineteenth century our knowledge of it became gradually more and more accurate, the climax being reached in the superb photograph issued by Hoepli of Milan in 1904.¹ Unfortunately even a photograph cannot give a satisfactory reproduction of the beauty of the original writing, as those letters in the MS. which had faded were inked over in the tenth or eleventh century, and equipped with accents and breathings. The Gospels are divided into chapters according to a system almost unique but probably not earlier than that in A and other MSS.² The order of the parts of the New Testament is Gospels, Acts, Catholic Epistles, Paul.

The MS. is written on very fine vellum, as is usual with our oldest MSS., said to be made of antelopes' skins. It is 27 centimetres square and has now 759 leaves, of which the New Testament occupies 142. There are three narrow columns to the page, recalling the appearance of a papyrus roll, from 40 to 44 lines per column, and from 16 to 18 letters in a line. Gatherings are in five sheets or ten leaves (twenty pages). The Old Testament was written by two scribes, both of whom are different from the scribe who wrote nearly all the New Testament (actually from Matt. ix. 5 onwards).³

There can be no doubt that the manuscript was written in the fourth century, and as to the place of writing, the various clues which have been skilfully followed out have been gradually leading to a result. It is obvious that a large MS. like this will offer many points, textual (including grammatical, etc.) and palæographical, which will help to a conclusion. The text of the Psalms represents, according to Rahlfs,⁴ the recension made by Hesychius of Egypt. In the Gospels, again, the readings of our MS. are strikingly supported by the oldest papyrus fragments as they turn up in Egypt, as well as by many of Origen's and Cyril of

¹ An exhaustive study of the MS. is expected from the hands of Monsignor Giovanni Mercati, D.D., of the Vatican Library.

² Cf. R. P. Casey, *Theology*, lv. (1952), p. 368.

³ Traube, *Nomina Sacra*, pp. 66 f.

⁴ *Septuaginta-Studien*, ii. (Göttingen, 1907); cf. his *Septuaginta*, 1935.

Alexandria's¹ quotations. In Acts, too, there is the most striking resemblance between the text of B and the quotations of the Alexandrian traveller, Cosmos Indicopleustes, who lived in the sixth century. Further, in the Epistle to the Hebrews (chap. i. 3) a reading of B has the sole support of an Egyptian Greek work attributed to Serapion, and in chap. iii. 2, it alone of Greek MSS. agrees with ρ^{13} of Egyptian origin in a reading undoubtedly right, cf. iii. 6 where it agrees with ρ^{13} , ρ^{46} and 1739. The Egyptian versions, especially the older, the Sahidic, were made from a text very much of this type. Of course, such arguments do not conclusively prove an Egyptian origin for our MS., but they certainly make it highly probable. It is practically decisive, however, that instances of vulgar Egyptian orthography occur in this MS., especially in the central portions of Isaiah.²

The consideration of the text of B will come more fitly later. Here it may simply be stated that, after all criticisms of those who uphold its high character, it remains the greatest and most important MS. for the New Testament text. There are secondary traces here and there in its text: for example, $\mu\eta\ \epsilon\tau\omicron\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma\ \eta\ \rho\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ in Luke xii. 47 has all the appearance of an early and widespread conflation, and in Luke xix. 37 $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \acute{\omega}\nu\ \epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\nu\ \delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\omega\nu$, ungrammatical as it is, represents a transition stage to the ordinary reading $\pi\alpha\sigma\acute{\omega}\nu$, κ.τ.λ., which would have ousted the original reading $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \acute{\omega}\nu\ \epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\nu$ (simply, without $\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\omega\nu$), but for the fortunate discovery of the Sinai MS. of the Old-Syriac: $\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\omega\nu$ is, in fact, a marginal gloss to explain the indefinite $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$: Acts xix. 34 probably contains a dittography.

Next in value to B comes \aleph , written later in the fourth century, the *Codex Sinaiticus*, discovered by Tischendorf at the monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai. What remains of it is now preserved mainly in London, having been bought from the Soviet Government, but a small

¹ In the Cyril Papyrus (saec. vi.); Serruys in *Revue de Philologie*, xxxiii. (1910), 113 ff.

² H. St. J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, vol. i. (Cambridge, 1909), p. 114, etc. It is right to mention, however, that Traube, on the basis of the practice in the use of contractions for sacred names, decided that B was less Egyptian than Alexandrinus. In *Nomina Sacra*, p. 42, however, he says explicitly of B, 'gewiss aus Agypten stammt'.

portion is at Leipzig. Like B, it was once a complete Bible, but, unlike it, it still has the New Testament complete, with the Apocalypse, the so-called Epistle of Barnabas, and a portion of the Shepherd of Hermas. Certain lost leaves may have contained the Didache. It has been conjectured that this MS. and B were two of the fifty Bibles ordered by Constantine from Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea, for the churches in Constantinople. Tischendorf was of opinion that one scribe of this MS. was identical with one of the scribes of B. Certainly the two MSS. are textually closely allied in the New Testament. In this MS. the Epistles of Paul come before Acts. There are some indications that the manuscript from which \aleph was copied was defective or difficult to read in parts; for example, it reads *ἐπαγγελίαν* for *ἐπιταγήν* in 1 Tim. i. 1, and *θέλημα* for *χάρισμα* in 2 Tim. i. 6. Many correctors have been at work on the text.¹ Perhaps the most interesting is one of the seventh century (indicated now by \aleph^{ca}), who wrote the subscription to the book of Ezra: 'It has been collated with a very old copy (*παλαιότατον αντίγραφον*), which was collated by the hand of the holy martyr Pamphilus, which copy at the end had a subscription in his own hand to the following effect: "Taken and corrected according to the Hexapla of Origen. Antonius collated; I, Pamphilus, corrected." ' Pamphilus is the venerated friend of Eusebius of Caesarea, who died a martyr's death in 309. Together they founded at Caesarea a library of biblical and patristic writings on papyrus rolls, the nucleus of which consisted of Origen's voluminous writings, especially his editions and interpretations of biblical books. After the Book of Esther there is a similar subscription, and with regard to the Book of Psalms it is certain that the corrector's copy agreed with that of Eusebius, while that of the original scribe was of a different type. It is clear, therefore, that in the seventh century our MS. was at Caesarea. As to its original home authorities vary. It is perfectly clear, however, that the prophetic portion of the Old Testament was either written by an Egyptian scribe, or copied from a parent MS. written by an Egyptian scribe.² The palæography of the MS. is

¹ Scribes best distinguished in L. Traube, *Nomina Sacra*, pp. 66 ff. See Lake's *Introduction*, pp. xvii ff., for an account of the correctors.

² The peculiar orthography makes this clear: Thackeray, *Grammar of the O.T. in Greek*, pp. 112 ff.

also, according to Crum, closely akin to many of the older Coptic hands.¹ It would seem, therefore, that we must look to Egypt for the origin of this MS. also. St. Jerome at Bethlehem had a MS. closely related to α , in St. Matthew's Gospel, as we learn from his references in his commentary on that Gospel.²

In all, 346½ leaves of this MS. have survived, of which the New Testament occupies 147½. The manuscript is written on thin vellum. The pages measure 43 by 37·8 centimetres, arranged in four narrow columns of writing, each containing 48 lines. The writing is rather a large uncial. The margins of the text bear the section numbers compiled for the Gospels by Eusebius, who died in 340.

The next uncial which falls to be mentioned is that known by the symbol A, the *Codex 'Alexandrinus'*, which has been much the best known to Western scholars during the past three centuries. Now the chief ornament of the manuscript department of the British Museum, this manuscript was offered to James I of England³ by Cyril Lucar, who was Patriarch of Alexandria till 1621, and afterwards of Constantinople (1621-38). The history of the MS., prior to its coming into the hands of Lucar, is obscure. An Arabic note in it shows that it was in the Patriarchal Library at Cairo at the time the note was written by 'the humble Athanasius', who would appear to be, as Professor Burkitt thinks, the librarian of that library in Lucar's day. According to the statement of a deacon of Cyril's, Cyril obtained the MS. from Mount Athos in 1616. If this be true, the connexion of the MS. with Alexandria is fortuitous, and it is really a Constantinople MS., as indeed the character of its text at least of the Gospels would lead one to conjecture.⁴

The manuscript, written in the fifth century, now contains 773 leaves, but originally had 822, of which the New Testament with the Letters of Clement occupies 143. Each leaf measures 32 by 26·3 centimetres, there are two

¹ Thackeray, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

² *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine*, ed. Wordsworth and White, i. 658 f.

³ And actually received by Charles I. through Sir Thomas Roe, our Ambassador to the Porte, as James had died.

⁴ Cf. Burkitt's account (*Journal of Theological Studies*, xi. 603 ff., July 1910). Streeter, *op. cit.*, p. 120, suggests it was written somewhere between Antioch and Alexandria.

columns to the page, and the writing is in a firm and fairly large square uncial hand. When complete, the manuscript contained the whole of the Old and New Testaments, as well as the First Epistle of Clement of Rome, the homily which is usually known as Second Clement, and the apocryphal work known as the Psalms of Solomon. The following parts are now wanting: Matt. i. 1-xxv. 6, John vi. 50-viii. 52, 2 Cor. iv. 13-xii. 6, and the Psalms of Solomon.

The manuscript known by the symbol C, the *Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus*, is now the mere débris of what was once a stately codex. Written in the fifth century, the manuscript contained originally the whole of the Greek Bible, but when it had become old-fashioned and mutilated, the portions of it we now possess were used in the twelfth century to receive thirty-eight treatises in Syriac of St. Ephraem the Syrian Father († 373). Vellum was in many places scarce at the time, and it was possible to wash or rub off the writing with sufficient thoroughness to permit of the reception of fresh writing on the old sheets. A manuscript so treated is known as a *palimpsest* (πάλιν, again, ψάω, I wipe). The libraries of Europe contain a fair number of such manuscripts,¹ the decipherment of which puts a great strain on the eyesight. Tischendorf was able to recover some portions of every book in the New Testament except the Second Epistle of John and the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians.

Of the 238 leaves, which the New Testament would have occupied when complete, only 145 remain. They measure 33 by 26.6 centimetres, have one column only to the page, usually of forty-one lines, each containing about forty letters, which are a little larger than those in B, κ , and A.

No manuscript surpasses in interest the celebrated Graeco-Latin *Codex Bezae* (D), the greatest literary treasure of the University of Cambridge, England. It comes first into notice in the sixteenth century, when it was brought by the Bishop of Clermont to the Council of Trent (1546).²

¹ A list of them has been published by Emile Chatelain.

² I assume with Dom. H. Quentin (*Revue Benedictine* [1906], pp. 1-23) that the 'antiquissimus quidam Graecus codex, quem Tridentum attulit Claromontanensis Episcopus anno Domini 1546' (*S. Hieronymi Stridonensis Opera . . . diligentia et labore Mariani Victorii Reatini, Episcopi Amerini . . . tom. i. (Paris, 1609), p. 509 F.*), which read οὕτως after μένειν in Ioh. xxi. 22, is the same as the 'antiquissimo codice Lugdunensi' (*op. cit.* p. 510 F.), which read uocabis in Matt. i. 23, though it looks as if Victorius himself had not been aware of their identity. There is just a possibility that there were

It was used by Henricus Stephanus for his *editio regia* of the Greek New Testament, published at Paris in 1550. Theodorus Beza, the Genevan Reformer, who had obtained it from the monastery of St. Irenaeus at Lyons in 1562, gave it to the University of Cambridge in 1581, accompanied by a characteristic epistle. As to its early history there has been much speculation. On the whole, there seems most reason to connect it with Lyons itself though A. C. Clark¹ connected it with Egypt. The archetype of its Greek side shared most striking readings with the copies of the Gospels and Acts used by St. Irenaeus of Lyons himself. Again, in the ninth century, the martyrologist Ado, who probably wrote at Lyons, makes use of a text of Acts which is the same as that in *Codex Bezae*, but otherwise unknown.²

The manuscript has been commonly assigned to the sixth century, but there is just as much reason to attribute it to the fifth. It now contains Matthew, John, Luke, Mark (in this order), 3 John 11-15 (in Latin only), and Acts.³ Dom John Chapman has calculated from the make-up of the manuscript that it originally comprised also the Apocalypse and 1 and 2 John, these following immediately on Mark (in that order).⁴ The books that survive are not in themselves complete, as the following parts are lacking: in the Greek (which is always on the left), Matt. i. 1-20, vi. 20-ix. 2, xxvii. 2-12, John i. 16-iii. 26, Acts viii. 29-x. 14, xxi. 2-10, 15-18, xxii. 10-20, xxii. 29-xxviii. 31; in the Latin (always on the right), Matt. i. 1-11, vi. 8-viii. 27, xxvi. 65-xxvii. 1, John i. 1-iii. 16, Acts viii. 20-x. 4, xx. 31-xxi. 2, xxi. 7-10, xxii. 2-10, xxii. 20-xxviii. 31. Whereas it has now 406 leaves, it must have had originally at least 510. Each page contains only one column (and therefore writing in one language only), and measures 26 by 21.5 centimetres. The lines are short sense-lines, suitable for reading aloud. The writing is rather a large uncial, betraying a certain awkwardness, and there is a decided likeness between the shapes of the Greek and Latin letters.

In the particular community in which the book was

two kindred MSS., one at Clermont (in Auvergne), the other at Lyons. (The original edition of Victorius's *Jerome* appeared at Rome in 1566.)

¹ *The Acts of the Apostles* (1933), p. lxii.

² Dom Quentin, *op. cit.*

³ But Acts followed immediately on Mark in the archetype.

⁴ *Expositor*, 1905, ii. 46 ff.

used, the Bible was read in Greek either generally or occasionally, but the community itself was Latin-speaking. The Latin side (*d*) is then a sort of 'crib' to the Greek side (*D*). The vulgarisms and errors in it forbid us to suppose that it was intended for formal and public reading. Neither side is simply a rendering of the other. There are many discrepancies between the two, and the two texts are in a sense of separate origin. The actual character of *Codex Bezae* is best explained in the words of Professor Burkitt, whom I am following in this section, as so often elsewhere: ¹ 'This, of course, might take place in many ways. The most obvious is that the immediate ancestor of *Codex Bezae* was a Greek MS., of which a Latin translation was made by some one who was familiar with one of the current Latin versions; ² on this hypothesis some readings of this Latin translation were the result of literal translation from the opposite side, others will differ from the Greek side and agree with the current ecclesiastical Latin. Under these circumstances the Greek side might be corrected here and there to agree verbally with the Latin on the opposite page. Our *Codex Bezae* (on this hypothesis) is a transcript of this bilingual so corrected: *D* therefore contains some readings which are a mere literal translation of a not absolutely literal Latin version, while most of the differences of *d* from the bulk of Latin MSS. are instances where the scholar who produced the translation deserted the ordinary Latin renderings to make his work agree more literally with the Greek on the opposite side.' Burkitt gave three examples to prove his points. In Luke xxii. 61 the two sides differ: *D* (with one other Greek MS., and three Old-Latin) adds *μὴ εἰδέναι με* after *ἀπαρνήσῃ με*, but *d* omits with the bulk of the authorities, here retaining the basal Latin rendering. In Matt. xx. 2 *D* and *d* (as often) agree against other Latin texts (*ἡμέραν*, *diem*, against *diurno*). In Matt. x. 24 the *προσφέρεις* of *D* (for *πρόσφερε*) is best explained by supposing that the *offeres* of the Latin side (really a colloquial form of the

¹ 'The Date of *Codex Bezae*', in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. iii. (1901-2), pp. 501-13.

² May I, not Professor Burkitt, point out that in Luke xv., which I have specially studied, there are several interesting agreements with *a* (for which see the next chapter), where all other Old-Latin authorities go a different way? Elsewhere we find *d* sometimes in agreement with *k*. (See the next chapter.)

imperative) was mistaken for an indicative, and thus rendered back into a Greek indicative.

More than a dozen later scribes have left their marks on the MS. Only one need be considered here, the one called by Scrivener G. He was a scholar, not a professional scribe; probably, in fact, the bishop for whose church the MS. was made, and therefore contemporary with the original writing. He makes alterations in the Latin in the interests of scholarship throughout St. Matthew and in the early chapters of Acts.

Another manuscript, also known as D, but to distinguish it from the last as \bar{D} , or D^{Paul} , is the Graeco-Latin *Codex Claromontanus*, so called because formerly at Clermont in Beauvais, but now preserved at Paris. It contains the Epistles of Paul, including Hebrews (a later addition to the MS.), with the exception of Rom. i. 1-7, 27-30, and 1 Cor. xiv. 13-22, of which the Greek side is lost. The MS. was written in the sixth century, contains 533 leaves, measuring 24.6 by 19.5 centimetres, with one column of twenty-one lines to the page. The Greek is on the left side and the Latin on the right. The MS. is the leading 'Western' authority for the text of the Epistles. The Latin side is not always dependent on the Greek. In fact, with the exception of harmonizations with the Vulgate Latin text in the longer Epistles, the Latin side is precisely the same text as Lucifer of Cagliari (in Sardinia) uses in his writings in the fourth century. It was this fact that led me, taking into account the fact that Sardinia in the sixth century became a province of the Byzantine Empire, and therefore officially Greek-speaking, to conjecture that the MS. is of Sardinian origin.¹ It contains an interesting transposition in 1 Cor. xiv., where verses 34 and 35 come after verse 40.²

E, a Latino-Greek manuscript of the Acts of the Apostles, preserved at Oxford, has had a romantic history. Written in Sardinia towards the end of the sixth century, it somehow found its way to Northumbria, where the Bede used it

¹ *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. vi. pp. 240-3. The suggestion was considered worthy of mention by Traube, *Nomina Sacra*, p. 177, and Gregory, *Textkritik*, p. 1040, but has been ignored by Nestle, *Einf.* (ed. 3), 73. There is a close relationship in abbreviations, etc., between D^{Paul} and D^{Vv} . (Traube, *op. cit.*, pp. 178 f.). It may be that D^{Vv} is also a Sardinian book: Nestle, *loc. cit.*, goes so far as to say that D^{Paul} is 'offenbar ursprünglich damit (i.e. with D^{Vv}) zusammengelöhrt'. See below on E.

² For other authorities see my critical apparatus (ed. 1947).

in the compilation of his commentary on Acts (between 709 and 716).¹ Given soon after to Boniface, when he started on his mission to the Continent, it was probably later transferred by him to Burchard, when Boniface consecrated him Bishop of Würzburg (Bavaria). In the Thirty Years' War Würzburg was sacked, and this manuscript among others was acquired from the Swedish army by Archbishop Laud, who in due course presented it to the Bodleian Library. The MS. lacks from chap. xxvi. 29 to the end. Its Greek is based on a non-Western MS. which had been collated with a Latin version: hence its lack of value.²

H (or H^p), once a complete manuscript of the Epistles of St. Paul, was already in the thirteenth century (and perhaps earlier) used by bookbinders as fly-leaves for other books in one of the monasteries on Mount Athos. Forty-one leaves only out of about 450 are known, and are divided between six different places: 22 at Paris, 8 at Athos, 3 at Leningrad, 3 at Moscow, 3 at Kiev, and 2 at Turin. The ingenuity of Omont, Robinson, and Lake has recovered the readings of twenty-two other pages from the 'off-sets' left by them on the pages opposite. We thus possess the text of the following parts of the Epistles, about a ninth of the entire text: 1 Cor. x. 19-32, xi. 6-20; 2 Cor. iv. 2-7, x. 5-xi. 8, xi. 12-xii. 4; Gal. capitula 9-12, i. 1-10, ii. 9-17, iv. 27-v. 10; Col. i. 23-ii. 11, ii. 17-iii. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 9-13, iv. 4-11; Hebr. capitula 6-11, i. 3-8, ii. 9-18, iii. 13-18, iv. 12-15, x. 1-7, 32-38, xii. 10-18, xiii. 21-25 and title; 1 Tim. capitula 1-18, i. 4-iii. 2, iii. 7-14, vi. 9-13; 2 Tim. i. 17-ii. 9; Tit. capitula 2-6, and i. 1-3, i. 15-ii. 5, iii. 13-15 and title, with the colophon to the whole book, stating that it was written *στυχηδόν* (*i.e.* in sense-lines), and was collated with the copy in the library of Caesarea written by the hand of Pamphilus. The writing in its present state is clumsy, but this is due to the fact that the original characters have been worked over. The MS. dates from the latter half of the fifth or from the sixth century. Its interest, apart from the purity of its text, centres mainly in the fact that it purports to be a copy of an early edition of the Epistles of Paul, equipped with prolegomena

¹ *Venerabilis Baedae Historiam Ecclesiasticam . . . recogn. . . C. Plummer*, tom. i. (Oxon. 1896), p. cxlvii.

² Cf. A. C. Clark, *op. cit.*, pp. 234 ff.

chapter divisions and chapter headings by one Euthalius (or Evagrius—the name cannot be read for certain).¹

The *Codex Regius*, known as L, is an eighth-century MS. of the Gospels in Paris. It wants portions of Matthew, Mark, and John, the chief point of interest being that it contains both endings to Mark, a peculiarity shared with four other uncials, one minuscule, and one form of the Sahidic and of the Ethiopic versions.² The text of the MS. as a whole is interesting as preserving many early elements amidst later material.

The Gospel manuscripts known as N, O, Σ, and Φ may fitly be treated together. All are of the sixth century, written in gold or silver letters on purple-stained vellum, perhaps in the same workshop at Constantinople. All are defective, but each serves in a measure to supplement the defects of the others. Finally, all represent the same type of text; according to Burkitt, that which was most in vogue at Constantinople in the age of Justinian;³ according to Von Soden, the text used by the great Cappadocian Fathers, Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory of Nazianzus, in the last third of the fourth century;⁴ according to Streeter, Caesarean. What remains of N is distributed between five different libraries: 182 leaves being at Leningrad, 53 at Patmos, 6 in Rome, 4 in London, and 2 in Vienna. O, which contains most of the second half of St. Matthew, was bought in 1899 by an officer of the French army at or near Sinope in Pontus, and is now in Paris, except for one leaf, which is at Mariupolis on the Sea of Azov. Σ is at Rossano, in South Italy, and contains only Matthew and Mark: it is remarkable from the artistic point of view. Φ, at Berat, in Albania, contains the same two Gospels with *lacunae*. Of these four, only one was known to scholars before 1880, and that very imperfectly. It is not at all impossible that others of the same kind, or lost portions of these, may turn up any day in the Levant.

W.—Formerly in the library of the monastery of Schenute

¹ See p. 12.

² See the evidence in my note at the end of Mark, and add a Graeco-Sahidic MS. since published by Heer in *Oriens Christianus* for 1912, pp. 1-47.

³ *Journal of Theological Studies*, i. 626. (He is speaking of N and Σ only.)

⁴ *Die Schriften des N.T.*, u.s.w. Bd. i. (Berlin, 1902-10), pp. 1466 ff. The three views need not be inconsistent.

at Atripe (near Sohag), opposite Akhmim, in Egypt,¹ it is a complete codex of the Gospels, which came into the possession of C. L. Freer early in 1906. Written probably in the fifth century, it is remarkable in giving the Gospels in the 'Western' order, Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, and in containing an interpolation within the longer ending of St. Mark, for which no other Greek authority is known to be extant, but which was known partly from Jerome (*Contra Pel.* ii. 15). It lacks John xiv. 26-xvi. 7 and Mark xv. 12-38. In Mark the text is strongly Western for Mark i. 1-v. 30 but so much less Western for the rest that Streeter thought it Caesarean after v. 31. Luke i. 1-viii. 12 is chiefly Alexandrian. John i. 1-v. 11 was written by a different hand and on different parchment.

⊙.—The Koridethi MS. was found in Caucasia and in 1913 it was edited by Beermann and Gregory. It was written probably about the eighth century by a scribe whose knowledge of Greek was slight. It contains the Gospels in the usual order but lacks parts of Matt. i. 1-v. 4. Its readings are important because where the text has not been harmonized with the late ecclesiastical ('Syrian' or 'Byzantine') text, it supports the Caesarean clan. Streeter could make it the primary evidence for this family, but recent research suggests that there was a pre-Caesarean group in Egypt older than the group in Palestine from which ⊙ was derived.

Considerations of space do not permit much reference to the minuscule MSS. Their interest, like that of all other MSS., depends on the extent of their deviation from the normal, and their classification, which began about a generation ago, has been very far advanced by Von Soden and his collaborators. An interesting group is the so-called Ferrar group, which comprises now about a dozen manuscripts, fam.¹³, distinguished from all others principally by the fact that they give the section about the adulterous woman (John vii. 53-viii. 11) not in John's Gospel at all, but after Luke xxi. 38. Either position is of course due to some editor, as the section in question is no part of the Fourth Gospel, but the Ferrar group alone contains it in the position named. The manuscripts forming this group were written at various dates between the eleventh and

¹ This origin is, however, disputed by Sanders in his 1911 edition of the *Deuteronomy* and *Joshua* MS. from the same hoard, cf. his edition of W.

fifteenth centuries, and by carefully following up clues afforded by the characteristics of the MSS. themselves, scholars have proved that the archetype (or original) of all must have been either in Calabria or in Sicily.

Another important group, fam.¹, isolated by Lake, is treated by Streeter together with fam.¹³, as 'Caesarean'.

CHAPTER IV

THE OLDER VERSIONS: LATIN AND SYRIAC

§ 1. LATIN (OLD)

FROM about the beginning of the second century B.C. Greek became almost a second language in Italy. Especially after the annexation of Greece as a Roman Province in 146 B.C., under the name of Achaia, the influx of Greeks to Rome was enormous. The Greek peoples were strong where the Romans were weak. The Roman had all the genius for law and order; he was the perfect soldier, but the Greek excelled in all the subtler arts. Very soon the medical profession, for instance, was practically confined to Greeks: from them also were drawn the painters, sculptors, teachers, and cooks of the rapidly developing Roman Republic. Multitudes of the slaves and freedmen were Greeks: the lower orders in Rome, much recruited from this class, acquired an easy familiarity with the Greek language. At the other pole of society education was not complete without a study of Greek. As the language was left in possession by the Romans in the East, and became a second official language of the State, it was necessary that all administrators should have facility in its use. Society from the top to the bottom was bilingual, and Greek and Latin were referred to usually by the simple phrase *both languages* (*utraque lingua*, *ἑκατέρα γλώσσα*).¹

It is necessary to realize this fact fully in order to understand the genesis and history of Latin versions of Scripture or parts of Scripture in the West. Christianity came to the West in the first instance as a Greek thing. The Church of Rome is addressed by Paul in Greek (A.D. 56-7); the Church of Rome through Clement writes a letter in Greek to the Church of Corinth (A.D. 95-6); the bishops have all got Greek names down to Victor (A.D. 189). The

¹ See my article *Did St. Paul Speak Latin?* in the *Expositor* for April, 1911, p. 338.

anti-pope Hippolytus as late as the period 200 to 230 writes all his voluminous works in Greek, and good Greek too. Irenaeus, native of Asia Minor, writes his five books against the Gnostic heresies in Greek about 185, though his church was Lyons. Briefly it may be said that every one in Italy and Sicily understood Greek, and in certain parts of Gaul and Spain, particularly on the Mediterranean seaboard, it was equally well known.

This being the case, it will be seen that the translation of the sacred books into Latin becomes unnecessary until a reading population is reached which is ignorant of Greek. Christianity doubtless first influenced the middle class, which is always of higher morality and not infrequently of better education than the other classes of society.¹ Only as Christianity in the West spread more widely or penetrated to the lowest strata of society would translations into Latin be required. (Yet if the 'Sator'² inscription at Pompeii is genuine, it shows that a Latin form of the Lord's Prayer was in use before A.D. 79!) The very character of the oldest Latin translations of biblical books known to us, careless and colloquial, shows that they can have been intended only for the uneducated. In the fourth century the attempt was made, particularly by Jerome, to polish these early translations.

The position of Greek in the Western half of the Empire begins to be insecure with the loosening of the bonds between East and West, which culminated in the creation of two empires in the first quarter of the fourth century, one Latin and the other Greek. When this separation had become complete, the knowledge of Greek in the West was confined to a highly educated class, and translations of Greek works became, for the first time since the age of the Republic, the order of the day.

An important exception to the general situation is to be found in the province called 'Africa', the territory of ancient Carthage, which was definitely annexed by Rome in 146 B.C. Latin was there the official language and the language of civilization; there translations would be an earlier necessity than elsewhere. The probability is that 'Africa' was originally evangelized direct from Rome

¹ Cf. Orr, *Some Neglected Factors in the Early History of Christianity*, 1899.

² Cf. D. Atkinson, *Journal of Eccl. History*, ii. (1951), pp. 1 ff.

itself, but of the beginnings of Christianity in Africa we know nothing for certain. The Semitic antecedents of the country may account for the rapid growth of Christianity there. The whole history, however, is dark till the end of the third quarter of the second century. Then, in the 'Acts' of the Scillitan¹ Martyrs, who met their death by decapitation in 180, light begins to dawn. The *libri et epistolae Pauli*, which they had, can hardly have been in any other language but Latin.² It is perfectly clear from references in Tertullian, who wrote at Carthage (mainly in Latin, but also in Greek) between A.D. 195 and 218, that Latin translations of at least some parts of Scripture existed in his time. Tertullian's regular practice was to use the Greek original and to translate for himself.³ But, in addition to his actual mention of existing Latin translations, it is clear that he sometimes used them himself. Did he also use a Marcionite translation or a Latin Diatessaron? A study of his quotations by Monceaux has shown that he must have possessed translations of Luke, John, Galatians, First Corinthians, Romans, and Ephesians.⁴

The existence of a (relatively) complete New Testament in Africa first comes into clear view in the writings of Cyprian († 258), who quotes a Latin Bible abundantly and accurately. The fact that on close study the translation used by him shows secondary characteristics⁵ confirms the conclusion that in Tertullian's time a Latin New Testament already existed in Africa, and suggests that it is the result of a long period of translation commenced not later than 150. There was, however, in Cyprian's time no one official version. For instance, a Bishop Nemesianus of Tubunas (on the confines of Numidia and Mauritania), who was present at the Rebaptism Council of Carthage in A.D. 256 with Cyprian himself, uses a Latin translation which differs from that employed by him, and is probably

¹ Scilli was in Numidia. The Acts are published in the appendix to Robinson's *The Passion of S. Perpetua (Texts and Studies, vol. i., No. 2, 1891)*.

² P. Monceaux, *Histoire Littéraire de l'Afrique chrétienne, etc.*, t. i. (1901), pp. 105 f. Chapter iii. pp. 97-173 is a valuable account of 'La Bible Latine en Afrique'.

³ An interesting case occurs in his quotation of Heb. vi. 5, where it is clear that his Greek copy had lost one short line. See p. 79.

⁴ Monceaux, *op. cit.*, pp. 110, 113-18.

⁵ E.g. in Luke xii. 47 Cyprian's *paruerit* is a corruption of the primitive *parauerit* (C. H. Turner in *Journal of Theological Studies, vol. ii., pp. 606 f.*); in 2'Tim. iv. 3 *κνηθόμενοι τὴν ἀκοήν* is rendered twice over.

earlier in origin.¹ The texts used in Africa down to about the end of the fourth century (and in some cases even later) are substantially identical with Cyprian's, though some have been subjected to revision in varying degrees.² In particular, the quotations of the Donatists show that they clung more closely to old-fashioned texts than the Catholics did. Details may be more fittingly reserved for Chapter VI.

In this department of our subject, as elsewhere, we start from the chronological and local basis provided by quotations in authors, and this method enabled Hort, Sanday, Burkitt, and Hans von Soden, each profiting by the work of his predecessors, to identify certain existing manuscripts as belonging to the 'African' family. We shall proceed to enumerate these.

'African' Gospel MSS.

k. The symbol *k* is applied to a MS. (with one column to the page), which now contains no more than Mark viii. 8-11, 14-16; viii. 19-xvi. 9, and Matt. i. 1-iii. 10; iv. 2-xiv. 17; xv. 20-36. The manuscript was written not later than A.D. 400 in Africa, and probably passed through Spain to the Irish monastery of Bobbio in North Italy, in the splendid library of which it was preserved for many centuries until it found a home in the public library at Turin, where it now is.³ The manuscript is very inaccurate, and was probably copied from a cursive original. It gives a text practically identical with the quotations of St. Cyprian.⁴ It is also notable for the fact that it contains (only) the shorter ending to St. Mark's Gospel. What is distinctive in the 'African' Old-Latin texts is the choice of renderings more than differences of underlying Greek text. A predilection, for instance, for *sermo* as a rendering for λόγος (rather than *verbum*), for *expello*,

¹ C. H. Turner in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. ii. pp. 602-6; cf. H. von Soden, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, iii. 3 (1909).

² *Old-Latin Bibl. Texts*, ii. pp. lxxxv ff. [Victorinus?] *De Physicis*, Optatus, *De Pascha Computus* (Burkitt, *Old Latin and the Itala*, p. 7).

³ It was scorched, but no more than scorched, by the disastrous fire of January 1904. A. Bakker's collation of it (1938) and her study (1933) are important.

⁴ Comparison between *k* and Cyprian in *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, ii. (Oxford, 1886), pp. xlii-lxvii (Sanday), and Hans von Soden, *op. cit.*, pp. 111-34.

excludo as renderings for ἐκβάλλω¹ (rather than *eicio*), for *felix* as a rendering for μακάριος (rather than *beatus*), and such like, marks off 'African' texts from those used outside.

e. This symbol is given to a MS. (with two columns to the page) which contains the following portions of the four Gospels: Matt. xii. 49–xiv. 11, xiv. 22–xxiv. 50, xxviii. 2–20; Mark i. 20–iv. 8, iv. 19–vi. 9, xii. 37–40, xiii. 2–3, 24–27, 33–36; Luke i. 1–viii. 30, viii. 48–xi. 4, xi. 24–xxiv. 53; John i. 1–xviii. 12, xviii. 25–xxi. 25. A copy of two further fragments, made in 1762, has been discovered in Rome (containing Matt. xiv. 11–22).² The MS. was written in the fifth century. It is one of the class of purple MSS., with silver and gold lettering, and very narrow columns. Native, no doubt, to Africa, it found its way to Trent, and, except for the one leaf at Dublin, is now at Vienna. It is only for 108 verses or parts of verses that both *k* and *e* have survived, and comparison between them is possible. The result of this comparison is to show that, while the underlying basis is in both cases the same, *e* has many differences from *k*, and should be regarded as a later partial revision of the *k* type, according to models current in the fourth century on the northern side of the Mediterranean.³ Augustine probably employed a Gospel text of this kind before 400.

Isolated African readings are also to be found in a late MS. *c* (*Codex Colbertinus*). For example, at the end of St. Luke (chaps. xxiii. and xxiv.) a comparison with *e* and Cyprian shows clear 'African' traces amidst general 'Europeanism'.⁴ And *c* is not quite alone in this: other Latin MSS. show occasional 'African' characteristics, not even excepting Irish or semi-Irish manuscripts of the eighth and ninth centuries, such as *gat*.⁵ Moreover, Dom de Bruyne has recovered African readings from chapter

¹ *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, ii. p. lxxxvi.

² Linke in *Sitz. Bay. Akad.*, 1893(2), 281–7; cf. H. J. Vogels' edition (1926).

³ Comparison between *k* and *e* in Sanday, *op. cit.*, pp. lxvii–lxxxv; Hans von Soden, *op. cit.*, 184–221.

⁴ Burkitt, *The Old Latin and the Itala (Texts and Studies, vol. iv. No. 3 [1896], pp. 35–40)*, with which compare my reconstruction from Augustine's citations in *Journal of Theological Studies*, xii. (1910–11), p. 155.

⁵ *I.e.* the *Evangelium Gatianum* (formerly of S. Gatiens of Tours, now at Paris) (ed. J. M. Heer, Freiburg, i. Br. 1910). Cf. Burkitt in *Journal of Theological Studies*, xi. (1909–10), p. 608.

headings in various MSS., whose connexion with Africa had never been suspected.¹

'African' MS. of Acts

h. This MS. (with one column to the page), known as the Fleury Palimpsest, is proved to contain an African text by the notable agreement between its readings and those of Cyprian, Augustine, and the Auctor *De Promissionibus*.² The manuscript contains chaps. iii. 2–iv. 18, v. 23–vii. 2; vii. 42–viii. 2; ix. 4–23; xiv. 5–23; xvii. 34–xviii. 19; xxiii. 8–24; xxvi. 20–xxvii. 13, besides portions of the Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse, which will be considered in their proper places. The MS., of which this is the original writing, was written in the fifth century, either in Africa, or elsewhere after an African model.³ The upper writing (saec. vii.) is Isidore *De Mundo*.

'African' MS. of Catholic Epistles

h. The same MS. contains the following fragments of the Catholic Epistles: First Peter iv. 17–Second Peter ii. 7, and First John i. 8–iii. 20. The presence of Second Peter, an epistle apparently unknown to Tertullian and Cyprian, suggests that *h* represents a rather late form of African text in this part, and internal evidence supports the view: for example, in First John iii. 17 the *agape* of Cyprian's Bible appears as *caritas*.⁴

'African' MS. of Pauline Epistles

r. A fragmentary MS. written in the fifth or sixth century, now preserved at Munich, containing portions of Romans, First and Second Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, First Timothy and Hebrews, is said to represent the type of text habitually used by St. Augustine

¹ *Revue Bénédictine* for 1910, pp. 273–324 and later. See also Rev. G. M. Youngman in *Amer. Journ. Theol.*, xiv. (1910), p. 625.

² Cf. Corssen, *Der Africanische Text der Acta Apostolorum* (1892); Monceaux, *op. cit.*, p. 152; Hans von Soden, *op. cit.*, pp. 221–42; J. H. Ropes, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Part i, vol. iii. (1926), pp. cvi–cviii, cccxiii–cccxv.

³ Traube, *Nomina Sacra*, pp. 191, 200–1.

⁴ Cf. Berger, *Le Palimpseste de Fleury*, p. 18; Burkitt, *Old Latin and the Itala*, p. 58; E. S. Buchanan, *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, v. (1907).

for this part of the Bible.¹ But contrast M.-J. Lagrange, *Critique textuelle*, pp. 491-8.

'African' MS. of the Apocalypse of John

h, the same MS. as above indicated, contains chaps. i. 1-ii. 1, viii. 7-ix. 12, xi. 16-xii. 14, xiv. 15-xvi. 5 only of the Apocalypse. Its African character is proved by what it shares with African writers, Cyprian, Tyconius, and, especially, Primasius. The last provides a complete African text of early type amid his commentary, a compilation of the sixth century.²

Of the early history of Latin texts on the northern side of the Mediterranean we know even less than of the African. Not a single certain quotation is found earlier than Novatian, the contemporary of Cyprian. It may be that the text, which for purposes of convenience we call 'African', really took its rise in Europe: we cannot say. The question, also, whether the texts we call African are of quite independent origin from those we call European is one that has been the subject of a good deal of dispute. On the one hand, Burkitt speaks of the European text as 'a continuous development, or rather *degeneration*, from the African standard', while on the other, Professor von Soden thinks that the two had a separate origin.³ The fundamental unity of European texts is shown by their agreement in rendering εἰ δὲ μῆ[γε] by *sin autem* in Luke x. 6 and xiii. 9 only, whereas in the other nine places they are almost unanimous for *alioquin*:⁴ there the Africans read *si quo minus*. Yet there is a notable unity in corruption in Mark ix. 15, where both African and European have *gaudentes* (προσχέροντες) (an error for προστρέχοντες); but Tatian had this reading: was it due in *b* and *k* to him? Lagrange (*Critique textuelle*, pp. 246-8) discusses other instances; cf. H. F. D. Sparks, *Ancient and English Versions of the Bible*, ed. W. Robinson (1940), pp. 106 f.

¹ 2 Cor. v. 1-12, 14-vi. 3 in *Revue Bénédictine*, xxviii. (1911), 221-7 (G. Morin). For the 'Fragments de Freising', see De Bruyne's edition (1921).

² *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Apokalypse-Ubersetzung*, H. J. Vogels (1920).

³ Cf. Burkitt in *Encycl. Bibl.* col. 4993; Hermann von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, i. pp. 1545-50.

⁴ Burkitt, *Old Latin and the Itala*, p. 41, who also gives other illustrations.

European Gospel MSS.

a. The premier European manuscript of the Gospels, fittingly if accidentally known by the first letter of the alphabet, is the *Codex Vercellensis*, preserved in a glass case at Vercelli in North Italy.¹ The writing is in double columns, as is usual in the older Latin MSS., with twenty-four lines to the column. It is an old tradition that the manuscript was written by the very hand of St. Eusebius, Bishop of Vercelli, who was martyred in 371, and there is nothing to disprove this tradition. As a sacred relic, it has suffered much from the kisses of worshippers throughout the centuries, and was recently removed to Rome for a time to be repaired. Next to *k*, it is the most important Old-Latin manuscript of the Gospels. Its age proves that its text cannot have been in any way contaminated with the Vulgate, as the latter was not issued till 383-4. The real antiquity of its type of text is proved by other arguments also. Novatian in the middle of the third century in Rome employed such a text as *a*, and in St. John's Gospel Lucifer of Cagliari (Sardinia), a friend of Eusebius, generally quotes a text agreeing with *a*.² Further, St. Jerome himself, at least for the Gospel of Luke, regularly cited a text practically identical with *a*, though he must have had many different types at his disposal.³ The fragmentary manuscript known as *n* (Chur, S. Gallen) (saec. iv.-v.) is, except in St. John,⁴ a sister MS. to *a*. We have thus traces of five different copies of this type.

The type contains more 'African' readings than any other European MS., and it probably represents an altogether earlier stage of the European Latin than *b* (and others). The manuscript *n* supplies lacunae in Mark xv.-xvi. and Luke xi. 11-29, where *a* is now defective. There is a very considerable difference between the *a n* type, and that which is provided by the remaining Old-Latin MSS.

b. The *Codex Veronensis*, known as *b*, is a purple-stained MS., with silver, and occasionally gold, writing, written in

¹ Ed. Gasquet, *Collectanea biblica Latina* (1914).

² *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, ii. p. 140; Burkitt, *op. cit.*, p. 15 f. Yet John vi. 26-27 *ap. Nouat. cib. Iud.* c. 5 (pp. 236, 9 ff.) is far from *a*.

³ See the present writer in the *British Congregationalist* for 9th June 1910, *Journal of Theological Studies* for July 1911, pp. 583-92, and H. C. Hoskier, *The Golden Latin Gospels*, etc. (New York, 1910), pp. xxvii-xxix, cxiv.

⁴ In St. John *n* is secondary as compared with *a*.

the fifth or sixth century, and preserved, probably continuously from that date to ours, at Verona.¹ It contains the Gospels in the usual order in Old-Latin MSS., Matthew, John, Luke, Mark,² save that the following parts are lacking : Matt. i. 1-11, xv. 12-22, xxiii. 18-27, John vii. 44-viii. 12, Luke xix. 26-xxi. 29, Mark xiv. 61-end. Thus a manuscript, which originally contained 418 leaves, now contains only 393, of which seven are illegible, because the ink has eaten away the written parts. The writing is in double columns of eighteen lines, each containing on an average ten or eleven letters. Two correctors of the MS. substituted Vulgate readings on occasion for the original readings of the MS., and did so with such neatness that the fact escaped notice, until E. S. Buchanan, the latest editor, discovered it. His edition (Clarendon Press, 1911), for this and other reasons, antiquates those of his predecessors.³ This discovery is of consequence in estimating the character of *b*, as Burkitt considers it to represent the type which Jerome used as the basis of the Vulgate. Whether this be so or not, *b* occupies a kind of central position amongst the European Old-Latin MSS., as the others all resemble *b* more closely than they resemble each other.⁴ The type of text present in *b* is found in Niceta of Remesiana (in Dacia), the author of the *Te Deum* (flor. 400),⁵ in the 'Ambrosiaster', resident at Rome about 375,⁶ and, so far as Luke is concerned, in Lucifer of Cagliari.⁷

d is the symbol for the Latin side of *D* (*Codex Bezae*), described in the last chapter.⁸ It does not in the same sense as the others represent an uniform Latin version, as it has been much corrected by its own Greek. It nevertheless in great part preserves a translation which is really old, as it has points of contact with readings of *k* and of *a*, where all other authorities differ : certain elements in *d*,

¹ It passed in the seventeenth century into the Chapter Library of the Cathedral, having been formerly in the possession of the Saibante family (Buchanan's edition of *b*, p. vii).

² The apostles being placed first.

³ See his introduction, pp. xiv-xx.

⁴ Prof. H. J. White, *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, iii. (1888), p. xxii.

⁵ Burkitt in Burn's edition of *Niceta* (1905), pp. cxlvi-cxlix.

⁶ Souter, *Study of Ambrosiaster* (1905), pp. 205 f. He had Luke xxiii. 34, which has now been found to be in the first hand of *b*. The wording does not exactly agree.

⁷ *Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, ii. p. 140.

⁸ Pp. 24 ff. For *d* in Acts, see J. H. Ropes, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

then, cannot be of later date than the first half of the third century, and may be earlier still.

*ff*₂ is the symbol for *Codex Corbeiensis* (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 17,225), of the fifth century, which has double columns of twenty-four lines each, and contains the Gospels except Matt. i. 1-xi. 16, John xvii. 15-xviii. 9, xx. 23-xxi. 8, Luke ix. 45-x. 20, xi. 45-xii. 6 (and some other parts lost through slighter mutilation) on its 192 surviving leaves.

q. *Codex latinus Monacensis* 6224, formerly of the abbey of Freising in Bavaria, was written by a scribe Valerianus in Italy¹ in the seventh century in a half-uncial hand, the characters of which are large and clumsy. It contains on 251 leaves, with double columns (containing twenty lines each), the four Gospels, with the exception of Matt. iii. 15-iv. 23, v. 25-vi. 4, vi. 28-vii. 8; John x. 11-xii. 38, xxi. 8-20; Luke xxiii. 23-35, xxiv. 11-39; Mark i. 7-21, xv. 5-36. When complete the manuscript must have contained 273 leaves. The special interest of *q* to the textual critic arises from the fact that, though it be an Old-Latin manuscript of the European class, it presupposes not infrequently a different Greek text from that which underlies the other Old-Latin manuscripts, whether 'African' or European. In its vocabulary *q* is close to the average type of European text, that which we find in *b*, but in its underlying text it frequently differs. The character of this MS. is, then, best explained by the theory that it is an European text (like *b*) which has been modified according to a Greek MS. with an up-to-date text.²

f. The MS. known as *f*, at Brescia, a MS. on purple-stained vellum with silver writing, may be mentioned here, though it is not an Old-Latin European MS. It was written in the sixth century, and contains all the Gospels except Mark xii. 5-xiii. 32, xiv. 70-xvi. 20. There can be no doubt that it represents the Latin side of a bilingual codex, which had Gothic in one column and Latin in the other, and it does not appear impossible that such a Gospel codex belonged to a recension made by St. Jerome's correspondents Sunnias and Fretelas³ early in the fifth

¹ Traube, *Nomina Sacra*, p. 190. It may have been written at Bobbio.

² In addition to White's edition (*Old-Latin Biblical Texts*, No. iii.); cf. De Bruyne in the *Revue Benedictine*, xxviii. (1911), pp. 75-80.

³ A long letter replying to textual questions touching the Psalms, addressed by these Goths, is Hier. *Epist.* cvi. (A.D. 403).

century. A fifth-century fragment of such a bilingual codex was found about 1911 near the ancient Antinoe in Egypt, and is now at Giessen, the Gothic occupying the place of honour on the left. The two authorities *f* and *giess* agree very closely. Such copies were in use in the Gothic kingdom in North Italy, and Brescia was a great city of this kingdom. The construction of this type of text appears to have been carried out on this wise. An Old-Latin MS. was taken and partly corrected to the Vulgate: it was then altered to suit the readings and renderings of the Gothic.¹ This is a much better way of accounting for the fact that the MS. *f* is for ninety per cent. of its text identical with the Vulgate, than to conclude with Wordsworth and White that *f* represents the type of text used by Jerome as the basis of the Vulgate in the Gospels.

European MSS. of Acts

d and *e* are the Latin sides of D (*Codex Bezae*) and E (*Codex Laudianus*), described in the last chapter.

gig. The manuscript styled *gigas* (from its great size) was written in Bohemia in the thirteenth century, but represents a fourth-century text, as is clear from the fact that this is exactly the type used by Lucifer of Cagliari (in Sardinia) († 370-1),² 'Ambrosiaster' (resident in Rome) (*flor.* 375),³ and Niceta of Remesiana (in Dacia) (*flor.* 400).⁴ Moreover, Jerome himself cites this type of text, on occasion, at least,⁵ though he certainly did not use it as the basis of the Vulgate,⁶ with which *gig*. has little in common.

p. A small manuscript of the New Testament (Paris, 321), written in North Spain or South France early in the thirteenth century, and formerly preserved at Perpignan, contains a text of Acts which is Old-Latin from i. 1-xiii. 5, and from xxviii. 16-31, while the rest of the book is Languedocian Vulgate.⁷ The Old-Latin part has points of con-

¹ Burkitt, *Journal of Theological Studies*, i. p. 131 and xi. 613. For the origin and character of the Gothic, see below, p. 63 f.

² *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi Latine* (ed. Wordsworth and White), ii. p. ix.

³ Souter, *A Study of Ambrosiaster*, p. 207.

⁴ Burkitt *ap.* Burn, *Niceta of Remesiana*, pp. cl-cliii.

⁵ Cf. *Epist.* xli. i. § 2 (p. 312 Hilberg). Vallarsi dates the letter 384.

⁶ Cf. Wordsworth-White, *loc. cit.*; cf. J. H. Ropes, *op. cit.*, pp. cix f.

⁷ With certain traces of Old-Latin here and there: cf. Buchanan's edition in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, xii. (1910-11), pp. 497-534; cf. Ropes, *op. cit.*, pp. cviii f.

tact with the quotations in the homilies of Gregory of Elvira (saec. iv.): the fact that Augustine's readings often agree with this and other 'Spanish' texts, where Augustine's special type *h* (see above) is not extant, suggests that the Spanish texts are a revision of the 'African', which is *a priori* probable.

European MSS. of the Pauline Epistles

d (otherwise *d*₂ or *d*^{paul}) represents the Latin side of the *Codex Claromontanus* (D), previously described. The Latin is not an exact translation of its accompanying Greek, but, except where it has been harmonized with the Vulgate in the longest epistles, represents exactly the text used by Lucifer of Cagliari (in Sardinia) († 371).¹

g is the Latin side of a bilingual related to D and known as G (*Codex Boernerianus*, of the end of the ninth century, at Dresden). It has many alternative interlinear readings, one of the two being Vulgate. The Old-Latin readings probably represent a fourth-century text, as they not infrequently agree with the text of the Pauline Epistles contained in the commentary by the 'Ambrosiaster', who flourished in Rome about 375.

European MSS. of the Catholic Epistles

ff. This MS. contains the Epistle of James alone of the Catholic Epistles. First in the extensive Benedictine library at Corbie, near Amiens, it was transferred with many other books to the sister house of St. Germain des Prés, Paris, and during the troublous times of the Revolution it was taken with a considerable selection of other St. Germain MSS. to Leningrad, where it now is. The MS. was written in the ninth or tenth century,² but it represents a much older text, possibly as old as the third century. It has some readings unique (almost freakish) in their character: for example, in chap. ii. 25 it has *exploratores ex XII tribus filiorum Israhel*, the last five words being found nowhere else. But on occasion it is in solitary

¹ Souter, *Journal of Theological Studies*, vi. (1904-5), pp. 240 ff., following Burkitt, *Ency. Bibl.*, iv. p. 4996.

² Traube dated it ninth, Holder (Karlsruhe) dates it tenth. Cf. also A. Staerk, *Les Manuscrits Latins de Saint-Petersbourg* (St. Petersburg, 1910), vol. ii. Plate LIX.

agreement with the Greek MS. B, and in such places there is a strong probability that the reading is right, as there is no general kinship between the two texts. The MS. has the remarkable colophon, 'Here ends the Epistle of James the son of Zebedee', whereas, of course, if the Epistle is apostolic at all, it can hardly belong to any other than James, the brother of the Lord (Gal. i. 19). One reading in this MS. is shared by a quotation in Chromatius of Aquileia († about 407), but this is too slender a basis on which to define the locality of its use. It would appear, like the following not unrelated MS., to represent a degenerate type of 'African' text, though we have not felt at liberty to class it definitely with the African texts.

m. This symbol is used, not to indicate a MS. of one particular book or group of books of Scripture, but to represent a work called 'Speculum' (mirror for conduct), wrongly attributed in manuscripts to St. Augustine.¹ This book consists of many verses of Scripture arranged topically, and it might have been introduced earlier, but for the fact that its text in the Catholic Epistles is more interesting than it is elsewhere: for there it agrees almost *ad litteram* with the quotations of Priscillian, the first person put to death by the Church († 385). For instance, James, chap. v. 1-3 (*m*) = Priscillian, ed. Schepss, p. 17, ll. 9-14. Before Schepss had discovered the tractates of Priscillian, Sanday had called this type of text degenerate African. We may now, therefore, conclude that Spain got some, at least, of its biblical texts from Africa.

European MS. of the Apocalypse

gig. The same MS. which is described above as containing an Old-Latin text of Acts, contains also an Old-Latin text of the Apocalypse. It is, however, extremely close to the Vulgate, and we must either conclude that Jerome's revision in the Apocalypse was the most perfunctory of all, or that the *gigas* MS. has here become seriously contaminated with the Vulgate, and has thus lost many of the original characteristics of its type. The former view is probably to be preferred. As to the locality where this type was in use, perhaps we can infer, from the fact that

¹ There is also a genuine *Spoculum*, prepared by Augustine and issued after his death, but in that work the quotations are in the Vulgate text.

the text gives the remarkable rendering *aeramento turino* (incense-copper) for *χαλκολιβάνω* in chap. ii. 18—shared with Priscillian of Spain and 'Ambrosiaster', who seems to have had Spanish connexions,¹ alone among ancient writers, so far as I know—that this kind of text was current in Spain. If it be the type used by Jerome in the Apocalypse, however, it was presumably known also in Italy.

This list may serve to give some idea of the character of the more important surviving documents of the Old-Latin versions of the New Testament books.

§ 2. LATIN ('VULGATE')

Chronologically the Vulgate,² so called since the early Middle Ages, should give place to some other versions, but it is convenient to consider it at this point. It was not a fresh translation from the Greek, but a revision of existing Latin texts (or perhaps of one text only for each book or group of books in the New Testament), in the way of correcting mistranslations, substituting occasionally as foundation better Greek MSS. than those at the back of the Old-Latin, and purifying the Latinity to a more cultured standard. It owes its origin to Damasus, Bishop of Rome from 366 to 384. This prelate, whose wide interests made his episcopate one of the most notable, was moved by the bewildering variety of texts existing over the Latin-speaking world to desire a revision, which should be superior in character to any existing Latin translation, and should eventually supersede them all. He therefore commissioned his secretary, Eusebius Sofronius Hieronymus, known to us as St. Jerome, to undertake this revision. Jerome probably undertook it against his will,³ but he was already ambitious to succeed Damasus, and no doubt considered it advisable to please his chief in all things.

It is only in the case of the Gospels that we learn anything of his work from himself. In a prefatory letter of

¹ See my edition of Pseudo-Augustini *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti* CXXVII. (Vindob. 1908), pp. xxii, xxiv.

² Jerome himself uses *vulgata*, etc., to indicate the most prevalent form of Latin text in his own time, in the case of any part of the Bible with which he happens at the time to be dealing.

³ He uses the word *cogis* of Damasus' commission to him.

surpassing interest, addressed to Damasus in the year 383, he tells us the circumstances of the publication. Damasus' chief purpose was that the Latin should be revised according to the 'true Greek text', the judge of what this true text was to be Jerome himself. Jerome, mindful of the strong opposition which his work was sure to arouse, made as little change as possible. He altered the Western order of the Gospels to that familiar to us, and regular in Greek MSS., and he removed mistakes occurring in the Latin copies by comparing them with 'old' Greek copies. But he confined the corrections to such as affected the sense, leaving the rest of the text as it was. At least so he says, but there can be no doubt that the able pupil of the great grammarian Donatus improved the style also here and there. He also equipped the Gospels with the Eusebian 'Canons', which he had found in Greek copies. These canons enabled one to see at a glance in how many Gospels a particular section was to be found. Sensible, also, of the harmonization which had taken place between different Gospels, especially in Western MSS., he endeavoured to correct this defect by restoring the *ipsissima verba* of each Evangelist.

The question what type of text he chose as the basis of his revision is answered in different ways by different critics. Hort, Wordsworth, and their collaborators were of opinion that the type chosen was that of *Codex Brixianus* (*f*) above described. This MS. is ninety per cent. the same as the Vulgate, and in the remaining ten per cent. of the Gospels the Vulgate represents a nearer approach to the readings of Greek MSS. like *κ* and *B*. But we prefer, with Burkitt, to explain the almost unique character of *f* as above, and to consider that the type of text used by St. Jerome was a real Old-Latin type, such a MS. as *b*, with the qualification that in Luke it may have been a MS. almost identical with *a*. (This last suggestion, which is my own, is due to the fact that St. Jerome is convicted of using a text practically identical with *a* in a very long quotation of Luke, chap. xv. 11-52, in a letter addressed to Damasus himself in the very year in which the Vulgate was issued.¹) In that case Jerome will have used Greek MSS. of the Syrian (Antiochian) type as well as of the Alexandrian. His work

¹ Epist. 21. See *Journal of Theological Studies*, xii. (1910-11), pp. 583-92, and above, p. 41.

would thus deserve the title *novum opus*. Or was the basis closer to *e*, *ff*², *b*, *i*, *q* (Vogels) ?

One or two examples of Jerome's method of working may be given, first in the matter of reading, the more important, and then in rendering. All the Old-Latin authorities (except *f* and *q*¹) omit *porro unum est necessarium* (ἐνὸς δὲ ἕστιν χρεία) in Luke x. 42, but Jerome has inserted them from a Greek MS. (or Greek MSS.) of his own time.² Again, in Luke xxiv. 36, the words 'Peace be unto you' (εἰρήνη ὑμῖν) are absent from all unrevised Old-Latin texts, but are found in the Vulgate: our oldest Greek authority for them is *κ*.³ In matters of rendering some words are really test words. *Caerimonia*, probably because of its pagan flavour, is absent from all Old-Latin texts, but it is freely employed in the Vulgate. *Porro* is never found in any Old-Latin text, but is used in the Vulgate not infrequently as a rendering of δέ, where the Old-Latin employed *autem*. *Fores* is very rare in Old-Latin biblical texts, which prefer *ostia* or *ianuae* as a rendering of θύραι.⁴ *Romphaea* has been left by Jerome once in the Apocalypse (ii. 12), but he has removed this Old-Latin rendering everywhere else in the Bible.

These instances are for the most part concerned with the Gospels. In the case of Acts Wordsworth and White have not been able to identify any Old-Latin text so close to the Vulgate as to deserve to be considered its basis, but they have shown that Jerome had a Greek MS. not unrelated to *κ* and *B* which he used in the course of his revision. In the Pauline Epistles he may have employed as the basis of his work the text which is used by 'Ambrosiaster' as the foundation of his commentary on the Epistles.⁵ In the Apocalypse there can be little doubt that MS. *gigas* represents the type employed, if it be really Old-Latin throughout. (See above, p. 43.)

The after-history of the Vulgate is interesting, and is parallel to the history of the reception of new English versions in modern times. No doubt it was adopted in

¹ Where the wording differs from the Vulgate (cf. Burkitt in *J.T.S.*, xi. [1909-10], p. 263).

² Our oldest Greek MSS. to show this reading are *p*⁴⁵, *A* and *C**.

³ For other examples see Burkitt in *J.T.S.*, xi. (1909-10), pp. 450 ff; cf. Lagrange, *Critique textuelle*, p. 286.

⁴ These three instances are borrowed from Burkitt, *op. cit.*, pp. 262, 454.

⁵ A. Souter, *A Study of Ambrosiaster*, pp. 212-57, especially p. 214.

the church at Rome from the first, but it was not to be expected that Damasus' successors would be so interested in it as to maintain it in a special position. As a matter of fact, we know that even in Pope Gregory's time (the second half of the sixth century) the Jerome revision and the Old-Latin were employed in the church at Rome indiscriminately. After about 398 Augustine employed the Gospel part in the church of Hippo Regius, of which he was bishop, and in all his works after that date long quotations are cited from the Vulgate.¹ About 409 Pelagius in Rome used the Vulgate text as the basis of his commentary on these Epistles.² But Old-Latin texts continued to be employed almost everywhere. For example, Augustine continued to use Old-Latin copies for the rest of the New Testament outside the Gospels. Primasius of Hadrumetum, in Africa, even in the sixth century employed a very old African type of text for his comments on the Apocalypse. His later contemporary, Cassiodorus, in South Italy, based his *Complexiones* on Old-Latin texts of Acts, Catholic Epistles, Pauline Epistles, and Apocalypse, though he had a complete Vulgate Bible in his possession. Such instances might be greatly multiplied. When we have critical texts of all the post-Vulgate Christian writers, it will be possible to write a very interesting book on the fortunes of Old-Latin and Vulgate texts in the early Middle Ages. In fact, the supremacy of the Vulgate was not assured till the ninth century, and it was not till the Council of Trent (1546) that the Vulgate became the standard for the Roman Catholic Church as a whole.

This situation is reflected in our MSS. The familiarity the scribes possessed with Old-Latin texts caused endless contamination in Vulgate MSS., and successive attempts were made to revise it into a state corresponding more or less to its primitive purity. The late Samuel Berger, a French Protestant, wrote learnedly and illuminatively on these.³ About the end of the eighth century Alcuin of York was commissioned by Charlemagne to make a revision for the use of his kingdom. This he completed in the first years of the ninth century by the help of good MSS. from

¹ Burkitt, *Old Latin and the Itala*, pp. 72 ff., etc., following and amplifying the conclusions of the eighteenth-century expert Dom Sabatier.

² A. Souter, *The Commentary of Pelagius*, etc. (London, 1907), pp. 17 f.

³ *Histoire de la Vulgate*, etc. (Paris, 1893).

Northumbria. His contemporary Theodulf of Orléans revised the text from Spanish MSS. The work done in the University of Paris in the thirteenth century resulted in a purification of the text, which became widely known through the earliest printed editions. It was in that century that Stephen Langton, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, divided the text into the chapters which we now use. The earliest important effort of the printing-press is the forty-two-line Bible (double columns) which Johannes Gutenberg printed at Mainz about 1450 to 1455. The editions most interesting to the Roman Catholic appeared—that of Pope Sixtus V in 1590, and that of Pope Clement VIII in 1592, which superseded the former. This last is the standard Roman Catholic text, which is not nearly in the state in which it left the hands of St. Jerome, but the differences are mostly of a trifling character, textual, and not seriously affecting dogma. Pope Pius X appointed a Commission of Benedictines in 1908 to undertake a fresh edition, under the presidency of Abbot Gasquet, Superior of the English Congregation. This work is proceeding on a vast scale and on thoroughly scientific principles.

The question of the identification of Vulgate MSS., and the other question of the estimation of their relative values, are both difficult to answer. The presence of Jerome's prefatory letter and the Eusebian Canons and Sections serves as a sufficient means of identification of Gospel MSS., but we have no such helps to the identification of manuscripts of the other parts of the New Testament. For these no Hieronymian prologues are extant, and indeed it is rather a curious fact that in Gospel MSS. of the Vulgate we generally find Priscillian's prologues, and in MSS. of the Pauline Epistles in the Vulgate we are provided with Marcionite prologues and chapter headings, while in some MSS. of the Vulgate Acts the prologues are Donatist. The occurrence of these extraneous growths on the Catholic work of Jerome is one of the oddest things in literary history. But their presence does not serve to stamp a MS. as Vulgate, as they are in all cases Old-Latin apparatus, which it was found convenient to transfer to Vulgate MSS. In the Gospels a MS. is Vulgate in proportion to its lack of readings which we know definitely to be Old-Latin, but in other parts of the New Testament we do not possess

the standards of comparison to the same extent. Can the 'Vulgate' text of Paul be attributed to Pelagius (De Bruyne)? Or all of Acts, Paul and Revelation to him (Cavallera)? Was Jerome's Old-Latin basis for Revelation influenced by κ (Vogels)?

What are esteemed to be the best MSS. of the Vulgate Gospels, containing the text as nearly as possible in the form in which Jerome issued it, are connected with South Italy and Northumbria. One, a complete manuscript of the New Testament, written about 545 for Bishop Victor of Capua, contains the Gospels in the Vulgate text, but arranged in the form of Tatian's Diatessaron. This manuscript was brought from Italy to the north of England either by Benedict Biscop, founder of the Abbey of St. Paul, Jarrow-on-Tyne (681 and 682), or by Ceolfrid, whom he appointed Abbot of the monastery. It was afterwards given to Boniface along with the 'Laudian' Acts, and contains some notes by his hand. He deposited it at Fulda in Germany, where it still is. The second manuscript was itself written either at Jarrow or Wearmouth to the order of Abbot Ceolfrid. It is one of three 'Pandects', that is, complete Bibles, which he ordered to be written. He designed two of them for these monasteries respectively. But the third was to be given to the Holy Father himself. In 715 Ceolfrid started with this manuscript, but died at Langres, France, on his way to Rome. The manuscript, however, was duly conveyed to Rome by Ceolfrid's companions, and presented to the Pope. It later found its way to the monastery of Monte Amiata (whence its name, *Amiatinus*), and thence to Florence, Laurentian Library, whose greatest treasure it is, being one of the largest MSS. in the world. The two copies made for Wearmouth and Jarrow have perished in whole or in part.¹

Clearly all three were made from an original which had been brought from Italy, and indeed 'Amiatinus' was written by an Italian scribe, probably out of compliment to a Pope, who would have found 'insular' script offensive and unreadable. The original of the three we know, too, to have been connected with no less a person than Cassiodorus, of Vivarium, South Italy, the retired Prime Minister of Theodoric, for the MS. contains prefatory matter which

¹ See C. H. Turner's *Iter Dunelmense in Journal of Theological Studies*, x. (1908-9), pp. 529-44.

is indisputably Cassiodorian. Other MSS. of English provenance preserve the same Gospel text entirely or partially.

The ground for the pre-eminence assigned to these MSS. in the Gospels—for elsewhere it would seem that their text may not be so good—is the absence of specifically Old-Latin readings. The text of Wordsworth and White is based principally on the consensus of these MSS., though they have collated many others. Improvement of their edition of the Gospels is only possible here and there, on the basis of collation of very early copies overlooked by them (notably of Sangallensis ¹), combined with quotations in critically edited writings of the two centuries succeeding the original issue of the Vulgate by St. Jerome. The publication early in 1912 of a tentative critical text of the entire Vulgate New Testament by Professor White, under the joint auspices of the Clarendon Press and the British and Foreign Bible Society, is a notable event.

SYRIAC VERSIONS

§ 1. TATIAN'S DIATESSARON

The early history of Syriac versions is a subject about which experts have differed considerably, and one who is no expert will refrain from any foolish attempt to point the right way. The view of Professor Burkitt will be adopted here, as that which seems to the outsider to be the more rational—namely, that the four Gospels were earlier known to the Assyrian Church as interwoven to form a connected narrative (*διὰ τεσσάρων*) than as four separate books. This is suggested by the title of the four separate Gospels when they first emerge in the history of the Church of the Assyrians, *Evangelion da-Mepharreshê*, 'The Gospel of the Separated Ones'. No one would be likely to speak of our four Gospels in that way who had not been earlier accustomed to use them in the combined form.

Tatian, an Assyrian Christian, face to face with the fact that the Synoptic Gospels contain so much that is represented twice and three times over, conceived the idea of

¹ A sixth-century MS. at St. Gall, edited by C. H. Turner, *The Oldest Manuscript of the Vulgate Gospels* (1931).

combining all that was contained in the four Gospels, without repeating any part common to two or more, into one connected narrative. He therefore took a Greek text of the Gospels of a type current c. A.D. 175 in Rome, where he was resident at the time, and rearranged it, as we should say, with scissors and paste. Whether the resulting compilation was ever translated into Latin direct we cannot say, though there are indications that it was.¹ Certainly Victor of Capua, as we have seen in the last section, arranged the Gospels in the Vulgate text 'diatessarically', but he may have done this direct from Tatian's Greek, and not through the medium of a Latin translation. This work of Victor has, in the circumstances, only got a value as to Tatian's arrangement, not at all as to his text.

Tatian himself, probably on his return to his native country, about 170, translated the resulting Greek compilation into Syriac, the language of the Euphrates valley, and this translation became the regular version in the use of the churches of Edessa and other places in that country. The Syriac language was akin to, but not identical with, the Aramaic spoken by our Lord. Tatian's Syriac Diatessaron remained in use till the end of the fourth century and even the early part of the fifth. It is regularly quoted by Syriac Fathers—for example, by the greatest of them all, St. Ephraem, who died in 373. It is, in fact, from the commentary which St. Ephraem wrote on the Diatessaron that we recover almost all the reliable part of the text of Tatian's work that has survived, for the original in its original form has perished. It was at some date in the fifth century or later brought into textual harmony with the Peshitta (see below), but even this form has perished. All that we have, apart from a small Greek fragment² from Dura-Europus, are two manuscripts of an Arabic translation, made by a monk in the eleventh century, of a MS. of this 'Peshittized' version. Here, again, the arrangement is preserved, as in Victor, but hardly any traces of the original text. The original Greek of Tatian's book is a more desirable possession for the textual critic of the Gospels than almost anything else yet undiscovered: the Syriac in its original form would be only less valuable.

¹ Cf. C. S. C. Williams, *Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (1951), pp. 19-24.

² Ed. by C. H. Kraeling, *Studies and Documents*, iii. (1935).

The type of text used as the basis of the Diatessaron was what we should call 'Western', but it is rather closer to the geographically Western, the 'Western' of *Codex Bezae* and the European Old-Latin, than it is to the text behind the Old-Syriac version, which falls to be considered next. For instance, the Diatessaron contained a reference to the great light at the baptism (Matt. iii. 16), also found in Justin and two European Old-Latin MSS., but not in the Old-Syriac. In some cases the Diatessaron stands alone: for example, in Matt. xvii. 26, it, along with Greek minuscule MS. 713 of the twelfth or thirteenth century, only has the interpolation after *ῥαί*: 'Simon said to him, "Yea!"' Jesus said to him, "Give thou also to him as a stranger." But there are readings (especially renderings) common to the Diatessaron and the Old-Syriac not all of equal significance. Both are 'Western' texts, and some relationship between the two is to be expected. In certain cases an influence of the one upon the other seems probable, and is just what one would anticipate.

Hermann von Soden has assigned too important a place to the Diatessaron. He argues that every departure from his supposed *I-H-K* text that is found at an earlier date than the constitution of that text, is due to the influence of the Diatessaron. That harmonizing, conscious or unconscious, played a great part in ancient as in modern citations, cannot be disputed. But it is impossible to prove so great an influence of the Diatessaron, seeing that its original form has disappeared. Also, if it had had such powerful influence as he says, it is hardly probable that it should not have left more traces in the Graeco-Roman world; ¹ the fact that the author was a heretic is not a sufficient reason for its disappearance. But recent research has found increasing traces of its influence even in the West.

§ 2. THE OLD-SYRIAC

But if the Assyrian Church regularly read the Gospels in a Diatessaron, there was nevertheless some interest in them in separate form as originally written, at least among scholars. Two manuscripts of a translation different from

¹ There is some affinity between the Diatessaron and the Old-Latin MS. *g* (Matthew).

any of the others have come down to us. There is by no means perfect agreement between their texts, but they are nevertheless manuscripts of one version, which is now known as the Old-Syriac, but was in the days when it was used known as the *Évangélion da-Mepharreshê*, 'The Gospel of the Separated Ones'—in other words, the separated Gospels. The older MS. is a palimpsest, of which the original writing, the text of the Gospels in Syriac, was written in the fourth century probably. The MS., preserved in the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, was there discovered in 1892 by Mrs. Lewis of Cambridge, England, who was then in the company of her sister, Mrs. Gibson. It is thus known as the 'Sinaitic' or the 'Lewis' Syriac. Since then it has been repeatedly photographed, transcribed, and examined (twice by the help of a reagent). All, or almost all, that is humanly possible has now been done to make its readings accessible to the world. The upper writing of the palimpsest belongs to A.D. 778, and the task of reading the original writing is one of excessive difficulty at times. The manuscript now contains Matt. i. 1-vi. 10, viii. 3-xvi. 15, xvii. 11-xx. 24, xxi. 20-xxviii. 7; Mark i. 12-44, ii. 21-iv. 17, iv. 41-v. 26; vi. 5-Luke i. 16, i. 38-v. 28, vi. 12-end; John i. 25-47, ii. 16-iv. 37, v. 6-25, v. 46-xviii. 31, xix. 40-xxi. 25.

The other manuscript, written later, probably in the first half of the fifth century, was discovered in the great library of the Convent of St. Mary the Mother of God in the Natron valley, west of Cairo. All but three leaves at Berlin is preserved in the British Museum, like so many other books from the same library, acquired in 1842 and 1847. In its original state the manuscript contained the Gospels in the unusual order Matthew, Mark, John, Luke: of these it now contains only Matt. i. 1-viii. 22, x. 32-xxiii. 25; Mark xvi. 17-20; John i. 1-42, iii. 5-viii. 19, xiv. 10-12, 15-19, 21-24, 26-29; Luke ii. 48-iii. 16, vii. 33-xvi. 12, xvii. 1-xxiv. 24. A comparison of the ground covered by each MS. shows that, even if we combine the two MSS., we do not possess the Gospels quite complete. Sometimes, also, only one MS. is available. Where the two are available, a comparative study is really helpful. We see, for instance, that the Sinaitic MS. must represent an earlier form of the version, at least for the most part, than the Curetonian does. The Sinaitic, for example, is,

like the oldest Greek uncials, without any ending to Mark, but the Curetonian exhibits the longer ending. Instances of the same kind might be multiplied, whereas instances of the contrary are rare (contrast Lagrange, *op. cit.*, pp. 213 ff.).

A theory is wanted both to explain the origin of this version and the differences between its two representatives. Burkitt conjectured that in its original form the version was the work of Palut, the third Bishop of Edessa, and that it was prepared under the auspices of Serapion, Bishop of Syrian Antioch, about the year 200. The Greek text from which the translation was made was, therefore, the text in use at Antioch at that date—a text otherwise practically unrepresented in our extant authorities, at least so far as we know. The translator was influenced both by the Peshitta Old Testament and by the Diatessaron in some of his renderings and readings. The Antioch text, therefore, 'Western' in character, if not Western geographically, has suffered in the process of translation some alterations which bring it on occasion into closer conformity with another, though kindred, type—namely, the geographically Western type. The differences between the Curetonian and Sinaitic types are easily explained. The Curetonian type represents a partial revision according to Greek MSS. of the later (fourth century) kind. Both MSS. seem also to have been at times altered to agreement with the Diatessaron by scribes accustomed to its language.

Examples of the phenomena just indicated are: in Matt. iv. 6 and Luke iv. 11 'arms' instead of 'hands' is due to the influence of the Peshitta Old Testament (Psalm xci. 12). The Old-Syriac and the Diatessaron agree in rendering οὐκ ἤθελεν in Luke xviii. 13 as 'was not daring', as they do in rendering σάρξ (John i. 14) by 'a body', and ἐν ἡμῖν (same verse) by 'in our nature'; both also have 'Lo' for οἶδα ὅτι in John iv. 25. Proof that the Sinaitic MS. contains the version in a more primitive form than the Curetonian is to be seen in the fact that the former omits the 'Father, forgive them' passage in Luke xxiii. 34 with the oldest Greek MSS., while the latter joins the multitude of Greek MSS. in inserting it at that place.¹ The state of the evidence in the Lord's Prayer points the same way, as does the text of Luke x. 41.

¹ Contrast C. S. C. Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

Hitherto nothing has been said of the Old-Syriac version of other parts of the New Testament. The older Assyrian Church possessed the Epistles of Paul (including the spurious Epistle to the Corinthians), and also the three Catholic Epistles, First John, First Peter, and James, but no more of the New Testament. We know hardly anything of the text of the Epistles of Paul, little more than we can get from Ephraim's Syriac commentary, which has survived in an Armenian translation, and a few citations from his contemporary Aphraates. There was certainly some kinship between the text used by Ephraem and that used by the heretic Marcion. This need not surprise us. Tatian and Marcion were in Rome about the same time. Just as Tatian used a Western text of the Gospels as the basis of his Diatessaron, so must Marcion also have used a Western text as the basis of his recension of St. Paul's Epistles. Doubtless Tatian brought the Epistles of Paul to Assyria, and may have translated an early Western text of them for the benefit of his compatriots. It may have been Marcion's edition which was translated in the first instance, and afterwards amplified, to judge from J. Molitor's reconstructed Greek text behind Ephraem, which often agrees with G. A pre-Peshitta text of Acts may also have been used by Ephraem, according to F. C. Conybeare.

§ 3. THE PESHITTA (SIMPLE, VULGATE) VERSION

The third of the Syriac versions, the Vulgate of the Assyrian Church, was, like the Latin Vulgate, a revision, not a fresh translation. Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa from 411 to 435, ordered that the Old-Syriac version should be revised in accordance with up-to-date Greek MSS. Thus the Old-Syriac was thoroughly revised textually¹ to bring it into accord with manuscripts which were two centuries later than those from which it had been made, and were quite different in type. Constantinople was now the centre of the Church in the East, and there an ecclesiastical text was in use which we find cited in the writings of the great patriarch St. Chrysostom, done to death in 407. Such an MS. as he might have used was carefully compared with the Old-Syriac version of the Gospels, and the latter was

¹ But old translations remain: ἀποστεῖλαι (Luke iv. 18) is still translated 'confirm (strengthen)'.

carefully altered, generally in the direction of expansion, to agree with the Greek MS. Thus it happens that the Peshitta Syriac often witnesses to something akin to what we find in the great bulk of Greek manuscripts. The version has remained the standard through all the later divisions of the Assyrian Church. It did not contain Second or Third John, Second Peter, Jude, or the Apocalypse.

This view, first expounded by Burkitt, is held now by many Syriac scholars, except A. Vööbus¹ and M. Black.² The older Syriac scholars considered the Peshitta to be a second-century production, and, as its close relationship to the bulk of Greek MSS. was evident, the defenders of the Constantinopolitan ecclesiastical text could point to this second-century version as evidence that the type of text they defended was as old as any known. The Peshitta was, in fact, 'the sheet-anchor', as Sanday happily put it, of the older hypothesis. Now that this anchor has been shown to be but decaying wood after all, and incapable of holding, the Peshitta can be left to perform a part hardly less interesting, if not so important, as used to be claimed for it.

§ 4. THE PHILOXENIAN VERSION

The Assyrian Church was slow to rest content with its achievements in the way of translation. Standard and official as the Peshitta always remained, further efforts were employed on the New Testament. In the year 506 Xenaia (Philoxenus), Bishop of Mabug (Hierapolis),³ superintended a more exactly literal translation of the New Testament made by his *χωρεπίσκοπος*, Polycarp. Of this translation in its original form only the books lacking in the Peshitta Canon, namely, Second and Third John, Second Peter, Jude, and the Apocalypse, survive. The Greek manuscripts from which the translation was made were of considerable textual purity. For instance, what is probably the correct reading in Jude, verses 22-23, namely, *καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζετε, διακρινομένους δὲ ἐλεᾶτε*, with *ἐν φόβῳ κ.τ.λ.* following as in other texts, is preserved

¹ *Contributions of the Baltic Society*, lix. (1947); lxiv., lxxv. (1948).

² *Bulletin of the John Ryland's Library*, xxxiii. (1951), pp. 203-10.

³ Now Menbidish on the Euphrates.

only in this version, and in Clement of Alexandria (date about 220) and Jerome (about 400).

§ 5. THE HARCLEAN REVISION

But, though this Philoxenian version has for the most part perished, it exists almost complete in a revision made by Thomas of Harkel (Heraclea) on the basis of two or three accurate Greek manuscripts, in the year 616-17, at Alexandria. The purpose of this revision was to make the accurate Philoxenian version more literal still. The result is such as to do violence to the Syriac language.

A new feature of the translation is that it was equipped with signs, and with marginal notes containing the readings of the manuscripts, Syriac and Greek, used by the translator. These notes show that manuscripts diverging from the normal in text were still to be found in Alexandria at the beginning of the seventh century. The Harclean revision is particularly interesting in the Book of Acts, where marginal variations from the text, both Syriac and Greek, are in remarkable agreement with the Graeco-Latin *Codex Bezae* (saec. v.-vi.) and three Greek cursives known as 383 (saec. xiii.), 614 (saec. xiii. perhaps), and 1518 (saec. xv.). In fact, very frequently some or all of these authorities stand together against all others in attesting particular readings: compare, for instance, my note on Acts xvi. 39. This type of text is what we call 'Western'. A fresh critical edition of the Harclean revision of Acts is much wanted. It will decide whether the Harclean is much the same as the Philoxenian version but with marginal readings giving variants or a totally new version. In other books its text is more commonplace—more, in fact, what we should expect a seventh-century product to be.

§ 6. THE PALESTINIAN VERSION

The Palestinian version is written in a dialect of Syriac (nearer to the Aramaic spoken by our Lord than are the other forms of Syriac) spoken near Syrian Antioch, as well as on Sinai and in Egypt. No book of the New Testament exists complete in this version. We are dependent, in fact, on various manuscripts of a lectionary containing select extracts from the Bible. The Greek

manuscripts at the basis of the version were by no means commonplace. The version, for example, surprises us by preserving what is probably the right reading in Matthew xxvii. 17, 'Jesus Barabbas':¹ this reading is attested by very few Greek MSS., including Θ fam.¹, but the Old-Syriac version also, the Armenian (no doubt through the Old-Syriac), Origen, and old MSS. known to Peter of (Syrian) Laodicea² (about 600) share it with the Palestinian Syriac.

Fragments of Acts and of the Pauline epistles in this version survive, but many questions about the version as a whole remain unsettled. Is it to be dated between A.D. 300 and 600 (Nöldeke)? In the sixth century (Burkitt)? Or the fifth (Lagrange)? Was it made from an Aramaic text and adapted to the structure of a Greek lectionary or was it composed in Aramaic from a Greek lectionary direct? Are its textual affinities with the Caesarean clan as close as S. New thought or with the minuscule 157 as Hoskier suggested? How far was it influenced by the Peshitta and was it known to Rabbula or to Thomas of Harkel? Has it been influenced by the Old-Syriac version? Did the Syriac translator of Eusebius know this version? How close is its language to that of the *Targums* and the Talmud? These are some of the questions that a future editor of the extant fragments will have to face.

¹ Cf. C. S. C. Williams, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-3.

² Perhaps Peter is here, as often elsewhere, simply copying Origen.

CHAPTER V

THE OLDER VERSIONS—*continued*

EGYPTIAN (COPTIC) VERSIONS, GOTHIC

Introductory

FROM the time of Alexander the Great, and perhaps from a still earlier date, cultivated persons in Egypt had been able to speak Greek. Alexandria almost from the first was destined to be a noted centre of Greek learning and books. The earlier Ptolemies were munificent patrons of Greek learning, and drew around them a succession of scholars and librarians distinguished enough, even though they failed to produce immortal works. The library or libraries of Alexandria were intended to contain the entire literature of Greece (in the widest sense) on papyrus rolls. In no part of the Greek world did Greek institutions of every sort take deeper root.

When Egypt became a Roman province after the battle of Actium (31 B.C.), it was treated by the Roman emperors in a different way from all the other provinces. Here alone did the emperor reign as king, as the successor of the Ptolemies. He sent a man of equestrian rank as *praefectus* to govern for him, and his jealousy was such that no senator was permitted to land in Egypt without special permission from the emperor. It was thus that the life of Egypt was for long lived apart from the rest of the empire. It was the greatest centre of the corn supply for Rome and Italy, and as such had to be guarded with especial care. Its peculiar position, separate from the rest of the empire, made it possible for conservative institutions of every sort to flourish there, while the rest of the empire was progressing.

It was in this country, thickly populated with Jews, that the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament was begun in the third century B.C. Here some at least of the Old Testament Apocrypha were written. Alexandria was

the scene of Philo the Jew's prolific literary activity. A good soil for Christianity had been prepared, and there can be no doubt that Christianity made rapid progress there. Our oldest Gospel papyrus fragment, p⁵², is dated before A.D. 150. Not that our records are reliable. The churches of Egypt were isolated from the other churches in the way we have indicated. This was favourable to special development, and indeed we know that in some matters of government the churches of Egypt were different from all others. The peculiar position of Egypt, joined to its scholarly traditions, was also favourable to the better preservation of the New Testament text, at a time when it was being freely handled in the West. As we have seen, our most accurate documents come from there.

In contrast to the wide cultivation of the classes in which Christianity was sure to spread most easily, were the original Egyptians themselves, whom the Romans considered to be the most degraded of all their subjects. For long no version of the New Testament books would be required in Egypt, because the entire reading public was Greek-speaking and reading. But when Christianity had worked its way down to the degraded strata of society, and had gradually lifted them higher and higher, eventually the stage was reached when versions in the native Egyptian dialects became necessary, especially for monks. (Had St. Antony been called by hearing Matt. xix. 21 in Coptic?)

Of these dialects there were a number. Here we are concerned only with three, one of which itself is really a group. There were the Bohairic dialect, that spoken in the delta of the Nile, the Sahidic dialect spoken in Upper Egypt nearer the source of the Nile, and the group of dialects known as Fayyumic (Basmuric), spoken in the district called the Fayyum. The special circumstances of each district would determine the date at which a translation would become necessary. In the northern part, where was Alexandria, the necessity did not arise till late, and Guidi, followed by Burkitt and Leipoldt, thinks that the Bohairic version, still the official version of the Coptic Church, was made in the sixth or seventh (or eighth) century. But a fifth-century MS. of John in sub-Achmimic points to an earlier date. The Sahidic version, made for a region where the knowledge of Greek was not so widespread, was probably much earlier, second, third, or fourth

century.¹ Each of those versions appears to have been subjected to at least one revision, as the manuscripts in particular passages are divided in their support, some supporting older Greek MSS., others later Greek MSS. Knowledge of the fragments of New Testament texts preserved in the Fayyumic dialects is as yet the property only of the experts, and of them not much can yet be said.

§ 1. THE SAHIDIC² VERSION

The Sahidic version of the New Testament must be restored from numerous fragments: hardly a single New Testament book exists complete in any MS.³ The Rev. George W. Horner published the Gospels in a critical recension, with apparatus, translation, and photographs, which far surpasses all previous efforts.⁴ He succeeded in presenting all the text of the Gospels except thirteen verses in Matthew, thirty-five in Mark, and three in Luke: of these fragmentary verses only fourteen are entirely absent. The text in each portion rarely depends on one fragment only, and seldom on less than three: in two verses of John ix. there are actually seventeen authorities.⁵ When one reflects that these fragments are seven hundred and fifty-one in number, and are the débris of about a dozen papyrus, and nearly a hundred and fifty parchment and paper books, the stupendous nature of Horner's labour will be realized. The fragments vary in date from the fourth century to the fourteenth, and they are not entirely homogeneous in textual character, though wonderfully so.

Nevertheless, the character of the Sahidic version, at least so far as the Gospels are concerned, is fairly clearly marked. Like its younger sister, the Bohairic, it is mainly Neutral in tendency—that is, it agrees habitually with the α B type of text. Yet at the same time it shows very

¹ Leipoldt, a brilliant Coptic scholar, dates the Sahidic version in the first half of the fourth century, and the Bohairic in the seventh or eighth century (*Geschichte des neutest. Kanons*, i. (1907), pp. 81 f.).

² Formerly called Thebaic.

³ This statement must be modified in the light of the discovery of complete MSS. of Matthew, Mark, John, fourteen Epistles of Paul, First and Second Peter, First, Second, and Third John, the property of J. Pierpont Morgan (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, xxxi. [1912], p. 55). There is also a British Museum fourth-century MS. of Acts, published by Dr. Budge (*Coptic Biblical Texts in the British Museum* [1911]).

⁴ Clarendon Press, 3 vols., 1911.

Horner's preface to vol. i. p. viii.

considerable agreement with D and the Old-Latin authorities, where these differ from \aleph and B. This latter agreement is less striking in Matthew and John than it is in Luke and Mark. The whole state of affairs could be explained by the supposition that the original Sahidic Gospels were translated from a manuscript Western in text and order of Gospels—such a manuscript, in fact, as Clement of Alexandria possessed.¹ This type could then have been carefully revised with the Neutral type in Matthew and John (the first and second Gospels in this set), and the third and fourth revised in a more perfunctory way.² A reviser's ardour often cools when he sees what a tedious work detailed revision is. Despite the frequent concurrences with D and the Old-Latin authorities, it is remarkable that there is hardly an instance where D and the Sahidic, or the Old-Latin and the Sahidic, stand together in making an addition to the text of all other authorities. Even the description of the stone at the tomb of Jesus in St. Luke appears in different words in each of the four Sahidic manuscripts available at that point, the wording in no case agreeing exactly with that of D or the Old-Latin MS. *c*, the only other authorities for the interpolation. An interesting Western reading, *κεκαλυμμένη* for *καιομένη* in Luke xxiv. 32, is unquestionably also the genuine Sahidic lection, as the testimony of six Sahidic MSS. extant at that point is unanimous. In Acts the text is more distinctively Western, but without the longer additions of D, to judge from Horner's edition and Sir Herbert Thompson's.³

The Sahidic version is of the utmost importance in any endeavour to sketch the earliest history of the New Testament text, for in itself it shows in special combination the 'Western' and 'Neutral' types. If the character of the Sahidic does not make the problem of the early history of the Greek text easier, it at least provides fresh material for the solution of that problem of a surpassingly interesting kind.

¹ It must be remembered that W, the Freer MS. from Egypt, despite late textual elements, still has the Gospels in the Western order.

² As a matter of fact, there is reason to suppose that John came before Matthew, and Mark before Luke, in the Sahidic 'Gospel'; but this does not affect our reasoning; cf. Lagrange, *op. cit.*, p. 321.

³ *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles* (1932).

§ 2. THE BOHAIRIC¹ VERSION

The whole New Testament is preserved in the Bohairic version, the official version of the Coptic Church. In textual character it is not unrelated to the Sahidic, and certain MSS. of the Bohairic appear to have been actually influenced by Sahidic MSS. But this version differs in two ways from the Sahidic. It is on the whole closer to the Greek MSS. κ and B, and rarely shows Western characteristics. Again, while it supports κ and B consistently, it not infrequently, or at least this is true of certain MSS., supports the later Alexandrian type of text, of which L is the best representative. This latter fact suggests (but does not prove) that the Bohairic translation is altogether a later production than the Sahidic. The MSS., also, are far from showing the consistency of the Sahidic MSS. It seems not improbable that the Bohairic version was subjected to a revision not very long after its original appearance. The oldest MS. of the Bohairic, a Gospel lectionary,² sometimes presents an older type of reading than any other extant Bohairic manuscript.

§ 3. THE MIDDLE-EGYPTIAN VERSIONS

Of the Middle-Egyptian versions fragments in at least three dialects are preserved, but they are practically inaccessible to non-experts, and as yet do not cover much of the ground of the New Testament, apart from Sir Herbert Thompson's edition of St. John. A complete study of them will doubtless be undertaken when more fragments have come to hand. The symbol 'basm' in Tischendorf (=Basmuric) and 'Fayumic' in Von Soden indicates a reading in one of the dialects of Middle Egypt. Some of these readings are striking enough, as, for example, in Heb. ix. 2, where there is an interesting agreement with B in a remarkable reading.

§ 4. GOTHIC VERSION

Some of the Goths on the northern frontier of the Roman Empire became Christian before they became Roman, and

¹ Sometimes called also Coptic, Memphitic.

² Perhaps Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan's defective *codex* is still older (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, xxxi. [1912], p. 55).

in consequence their second Bishop Ulfilas (Wulfila), whose life stretched throughout the greater part of the fourth century, translated the Bible into the Gothic language. This translation has great interest as the oldest Teutonic literary monument. The translation of the New Testament was made from Greek MSS. such as Chrysostom used, of the official Constantinopolitan type. The version no longer exists in completeness. The most noted manuscript of it, the *Codex Argenteus*, now at Upsala, is written in silver letters on purple-stained vellum, and the writing was probably executed in North Italy in the sixth century. How it found its way into the valuable library of the monastery of Werden in Germany, where it was in the sixteenth century, is not known, but in the middle of the seventeenth century it reached Sweden as part of the booty taken in the Thirty Years' War, having been in the interim at Prague. The manuscript in its present state contains fragments of the four Gospels. A bilingual Gothico-Latin fragment of another, probably fifth century, Gospel MS. has been mentioned in the last chapter. Fragments of the Pauline Epistles have also come down to us, belonging to other MSS., one at Wolfenbüttel being Latino-Gothic and containing about forty verses of Romans. It is possible that a critical edition of the Gothic Bible was produced by Ulfilas's pupils Sunnias and Fretelas in 405, though G. W. S. Friedrichsen¹ expresses doubts on this point.

This scholar who has written on both the Gospels and the Pauline epistles in the Gothic version has considered the interesting problem how far a Latin element appears in the extant Gothic manuscripts and what is likely to have been its origin. He has over-emphasised the relationship between some Old Latin texts and the Gothic material available, which probably originated in northern Italy, though he has rightly pointed to the possibility that the Gothic manuscripts may have influenced some later Latin texts of the Gospels while some of the Gothic revisers of the (Pauline) epistles seem to have used Latin commentaries, as well as codices, 'in particular the notorious Ambrosiaster'.²

¹ *The Gothic Version of the Gospels* (1926), pp. 196 ff.

² A. Souter, *Journal of Theological Studies*, 41 (1940), pp. 303-5.

CHAPTER VI

SECONDARY VERSIONS

UNDER this head are included not only versions which are of secondary importance to the textual critic, but more especially those which were not made directly from the Greek, but through some intervening version. Even in modern times we are familiar with such secondary versions. Wycliffe's and all the other English versions before William Tindale's were translations of the Latin, and not made from the original tongues, Hebrew and Greek. Similarly the Western Church had to read the Old Testament in a translation of the Septuagint, until Jerome translated it from the Hebrew. Several versions of the New Testament existed in the early centuries of the Church, which are translations of other versions, and these we now propose to enumerate.

§ 1. ARMENIAN VERSIONS

The Armenian Church was the result of evangelization by Syriac-speaking Christians from whom the Armenians got their first biblical writings. The no longer extant Armenian text (Arm.¹), the existence of which S. Lyonnet has proved from Armenian Fathers, had much in common with the citations of St. Ephraem and contained some Syriacisms that point to Arm.¹ having been based on a text akin to Tatian's Diatessaron. The later Armenian text (Arm.²), the printed edition of which is that of Zohrab which was based in 1789 on twenty unnamed MSS., was thought at one time to have been made from a Syriac text, too, but more recent researches have shown that it was from a Greek original, probably from MSS. of the 'Caesarean' clan, though inevitably some echoes from the Syriac basis of Arm.¹ survived especially where the translators had difficulty with the Greek. It is uncertain how far the Caesarean influence survived in Arm.²; Blake thought that it was revised away in favour of a Byzantine text but a

study of Mark i. in the oldest Armenian MS. at Oxford seemed to prove the influence still strong. The oldest Georgian MS. (see below) was probably based on an Armenian text midway between Arm.¹ and Arm.² as Lyonnet suggests. On this view, Arm.¹ was probably the work of St. Sahak c. A.D. 406 who according to Moses of Chorene translated from the Syriac: while Arm.² was produced under St. Mesrop after 433 from the Greek, as Koriun and Lazar of P'arp record. The Armenian version, like the Old-Syriac, lacked Philemon, but had the apocryphal Third Corinthians.

The manuscripts show many divergences from one another. For instance, several manuscripts of the Armenian, like the older form of the Old-Syriac, are without any ending to Mark, but other known MSS. have the longer ending,¹ one, E.229, attributing it to 'the presbyter Ariston'. This is sometimes considered to point to Aristion of Asia (*flor.* 110), a disciple of the Lord mentioned by Papias. There can, however, be no doubt that the original Armenian version was without the ending. Much valuable information on the Armenian readings, due to an independent study of the version in the original, will be found in the apparatus to Horner's edition of the Sahidic version. Lyonnet discussed the (Arm.²) text of the rest of the N.T. in Lagrange's *Critique textuelle*.

For the Apocalypse, we possess, thanks to the scholarly labours of Dr. F. C. Conybeare, an up-to-date edition of both forms in which it has come down to us. He has shown that the Apocalypse was first translated into Armenian in the fifth century. As this book does not appear to have been translated into Syriac till the century after, this translation cannot have come from Syriac. It would be natural, therefore, to infer that it was made direct from Greek. But some curious phenomena about it seem to suggest that it was made from Latin: the spelling *Zezabel* (ii. 20); the reading 'pains of a couch' (ii. 22) in one MS., compared with *luctum* of one Latin authority, confused with *lectum* (couch). In whatever way we explain such occurrences, the Old-Armenian is a valuable text, and in some cases it may alone preserve the original reading in the case of a book, the textual history of which is notoriously obscure and difficult: for example, it omits

¹ Cf. E. C. Colwell, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 56 (1937), pp. 369-86.

ὡς χιών in chap. i. verse 15. Its additions, however, such as 'with the daughters of the Gentiles' (chap. ii. 14) after πορνεῦσαι (cf. xiii. 5), may make one suspicious as to its omissions.

This Old-Armenian version of the Apocalypse was revised in the twelfth century, and in this later form it is officially recognized. The revision leaves a good many of the older characteristics untouched.

For Eznik's citations see G. Cuendet, *Revue des Études arméniennes*, 9 (1929), pp. 13-40.

§ 2. ETHIOPIC (ABYSSINIAN) VERSION

Scholars vary much in their opinions as to the date of origin of the Ethiopic version, some arguing for a date as early as the fifth century, while others attribute it to a date as late as the sixth or seventh. Gildemeister was of the latter opinion, and believed the version to have been translated from Syriac by Monophysite Assyrians who had converted the Abyssinians about A.D. 500. With this opinion Burkitt agrees, adding that it was the Old-Syriac, not the Peshitta, that was used. So does A. Vööbus.¹ Yet Hoskier could point to many agreements with p^{46} (Paul). The version was certainly influenced later by Coptic or Arabic texts. The oldest manuscript is perhaps of the thirteenth century. According to some, at least, of those who know the Ethiopic version well, it is valueless for purposes of New Testament textual criticism. Ἀντικρῦς in Acts xx. 15 is taken as a proper name. Certainly there are wide variations between the MSS., and in important places we generally find that some of them are ranged on each side.

§ 3. GEORGIAN (IBERIAN) VERSION

This version was probably made from the Greek before c. A.D. 450, but its characteristics, so far as they are known, rather suggest a close relationship with the Armenian, and point to considerable freedom in handling the sacred text. Conybeare and Burkitt were of opinion that it was made

¹ Cf. W. D. McHardy, *Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S. iv. pt. i., 1953, pp. 98 f.

originally from a manuscript of the Old-Syriac text almost identical with that which the first Armenian translators used. This might explain its likeness to the Armenian. They also think that this original form of the version was revised and corrected throughout from the Greek text, in the time of St. Euthymius, says Conybeare.¹ In certain select parts of the Gospels he exhibited points of contact between this version and D, the Sinaitic and Peshitta Syriac, and the Armenian. Other scholars now think that the Georgian was a child of the Armenian version. In Acts a manuscript of the twelfth or thirteenth century abounds in early Western readings, especially such as are found in D and E of the Greek.² R. P. Blake³ has published the text of Matthew, Mark, and John using the Adysh MS. as a basis (A.D. 897) and the Opiza and Tbet' MSS. in the *apparatus*. These, written in A.D. 913 and 995, point to a Greek text of the Caesarean clan.

Rev. was apparently not translated into Georgian before A.D. 978 by St. Euthymius (cf. S. Lyonnet in Lagrange's *Critique textuelle*, p. 625).

§ 4. ARABIC VERSIONS

These come partly direct from the Greek, partly through Syriac, and partly through Coptic. Muhammad himself knew the Gospel story only orally. The oldest MS. goes no farther back than the eighth century: a ninth-century MS. contains certain of the Pauline Epistles in a text, which appears to have been translated from the Peshitta Syriac. Interesting readings are occasionally to be found in Arabic; for example, the negative form of Matthew xviii. 20, a reading at least as old as the second century. Some Tatianisms and some Caesarean readings have been discovered in these versions. Two revisions of the Arabic are reported to have taken place at Alexandria in the thirteenth century.

¹ 'The Georgian Version of the N.T.' in *Zeitschrift für die neuest. Wissenschaft*, xi. (1910), 232-9, with photographs of pages of two MSS. (possibly of the twelfth and thirteenth century). Euthymius lived in the fifth century.

² The 'Old Georgian Version of Acts' in the same review, xii. (1911), 131-40, with three plates.

³ *Patrologia Orientalis*, xx. 3 (1929), pp. 435-574; xxiv. 1, 1933, pp. 1-168; xxvi. 4 (1950).

Such is a sketchy view of certain ancient versions. The meagreness of our knowledge with regard to certain of them is a call for workers in this field. It is most desirable that what Horner did so admirably for the Bohairic and Sahidic should be done for the Armenian, Georgian, and other versions. Meanwhile, the student may be referred to the admirable discussions of the evidence in Lagrange's *Critique textuelle* and in B. M. Metzger's *The Evidence of the Versions for the Text of the New Testament* in M. M. Parvis and A. Wikgren's *New Testament Manuscript Studies* (1950); cf. B. M. Metzger, *Exp. Times*, lxiii. (1952), pp. 309-11.

CHAPTER VII

PATRISTIC (AND OTHER EARLY) CITATIONS

§ 1. GREEK WRITERS

APOSTOLIC FATHERS.—The quotations from or allusions to the New Testament in the Epistle of Barnabas, Didache, First Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Shepherd of Hermas, and Second Clement were carefully collected and examined by a committee of the Oxford Society of Historical Theology. The results, which were published in 1905 in a volume entitled *The New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, have hardly any bearing on the choice between variants in passages of the New Testament. But, if one could be sure that First Clement i. 3 was an echo of the Epistle to Titus, chap. ii. verse 5, the *οἰκουργεῖν* of the former would be a powerful support to the *οἰκουργοῦς* of the better MSS. (as against the *οἰκουρούς* of the inferior) in the latter.

MARCION, a native of Sinope in Pontus, active in Rome (140 and later). When he parted from the Church of Rome, he issued an *Εὐαγγέλιον* of his own which was that of St. Luke with excisions made in the interests of his excessive Paulinism. The text he used as the basis of this edition was of course old, and old of the Western type.¹ We find him in company with Latin witnesses, especially the European Old-Latin MSS., but not infrequently also with the Old-Syriac. He is never on the side of the great Greek uncials against both these versions.²

Marcion's canon of the Pauline Epistles deserves special mention. It was without the Pastorals, and the remaining Epistles were arranged in the following order, the most Pauline at the head: Galatians, First Corinthians, Second Corinthians, Romans, First and Second Thessalonians, Laodiceans (= 'Ephesians'), Colossians, Philippians, Phil-

¹ Cf. Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century* (London, 1876), pp. 231 ff., 362 ff.; Zahn, *Gesch. des neutest. Kanons*, i. pp. 585-718; A. von Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, xlv. (1924).

² Cf. below, pp. 111, 124.

emon. The text was subjected to considerable mutilations, as we learn from critics of Marcion like Tertullian and Epiphanius. The absence of the last two chapters of Romans in Marcion's edition is probably the result of excision: it lacked mention of Rome in chap. i. verses 7 and 15, and wanted the last two chapters. Perhaps i-xv was originally sent to Rome (and Marcion omitted xv) while i-xvi was sent to Ephesus, cf. McNeile's *Introduction to the N.T.* (1953), pp. 157 f. The ἀποστολικόν of Marcion can be in great part reconstructed from the details provided by his critics, but as a separate work all of it has perished except the prologues to the Epistles and the chapter headings. These have survived in a Latin translation found in many MSS. of the Vulgate, etc.¹ It may be that Marcion himself is the originator of a number of petty variations which are characteristic of the Western text of the Epistles (preserved in D and other Greek MSS). The Old-Syriac version of the Epistles seems to have been like his in text.

JUSTIN MARTYR.—Justin, who lived and worked at Rome about 150, is a very loose quoter.² He appears to have made most use of the Matthaean Gospel, and in a text decidedly 'Western'; the company in which we find him is D, the Diatessaron, the Old-Latin, the Old-Syriac, the 'Clementine' Homilies. Interesting instances of readings in Justin are the Light at the Baptism (Matt. iii. 16), shared with the Diatessaron and the two Old-Latin MSS. *a* and *g*; 'Thou art' for 'This is' in Matt. iii. 17 (Luke iii. 22) with D, *a* of Old-Latin, Irenaeus, Hilary, and Augustine, etc.; ἐρῶ for ὁμολογήσω (or ὁμύσω) in Matt. vii. 23 with the oldest Old-Latin MSS., the Old-Syriac, the Diatessaron, Cyprian twice, and Augustine. But contrary to such authorities, or, rather, to some of them, he has Luke xxii. 19.

¹ The identification was made by Dom Donatien de Bruyne, O.S.B., of Maredsous, Belgium, in the *Revue Bénédictine*, xxiv. (1907), pp. 1-16, and (independently) by Dr. Peter Corssen, Berlin, in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentl. Wissenschaft*, x. (1909), pp. 1-45 (contrast Mundle, *ibid.* (1925), pp. 56-77). Harnack, Harris, Burkitt and others have accepted the identification without question; see, e.g. Burkitt's *The Gospel History and its Transmission* (ed. 3), (Edin. 1911). I have found the prologues and chapter headings in certain MSS. of the expansion of Pelagius's commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul, which passes under the name of Jerome: there they are obviously copied from a Vulgate MS.

² On the whole subject, see Sanday's chap. iv., especially pp. 113 ff., 133 ff., Bousset, *Die Evangelienzeit J.'s* (Gött. 1891), and H. von Soden, *op. cit.*, § 375; cf. Lagrange, *Critique textuelle*, pp. 169-71.

THE ACTS OF PAUL, composed by a presbyter of the province of Asia (possibly of Smyrna ¹), who was deposed from his office on confessing his guilt, dates from about 160. The work is based on the canonical Acts, and some points suggest that these were used in a Western text. For instance, in Acts xxi. 1, D has the insertion *καὶ Μύρα*, found also in p⁴¹: and this form appears to have been before the eyes of the presbyter.²

TATIAN.—All that we have found it necessary to say with regard to Tatian has already been said in the fourth chapter, in connexion with the Diatessaron. Reference must be made here, however, to the commentaries on the Gospels written by Isho'dad of Merv, Bishop of Hadatha about A.D. 850. This learned commentator compiled his work from earlier sources, the chief of which were Ephraem's commentary on the Diatessaron, and Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Gospels. The work was published in Syriac and English by Mrs. M. D. Gibson, with an introduction by Dr. J. Rendel Harris.³ Much of the Diatessaron is here preserved in a pure state, and Old-Syriac readings are to be found in considerable numbers.⁴ It is now known that the Commentary of Dionysius Bar Salibi, written in the twelfth century, which used to be regarded as of high value for the sake of the authorities used, is hardly anything but a compilation from the Nestorian Isho'dad and the Monophysite Moses Bar Kepha.⁵

IRENÆUS.—Irenæus, born about 140 in or near Smyrna, where he heard Bishop Polycarp, removed early in life to Rome, where he was a hearer of Justin Martyr, and apparently did not return to the East. As Bishop of Lyons he wrote his greatest work, probably about 185. The original Greek has perished, except for one fragment of papyrus MS., from Egypt (Oxyr. Pap. 405). We are dependent for the rest of what we have of the Greek on citations in

¹ An excellent suggestion of Carl Schmidt (*Acta Paula, Übersetzung, Untersuchungen und koptischer Text, herausg. v. C. S. 2te Ausg.* [Leipzig, 1905], p. 205 n. 1) to account for the large number of proper names shared by Smyrnaean inscriptions with the *Acta Pauli*.

² Schmidt, p. 212. The writer has also used the Epistles, including the Pastorals.

³ Cambridge University Press, 1911, vols. i. (English); vols. ii. and iii. (Syriac).

⁴ See vol. i. pp. xxxvii f. for an enumeration.

⁵ Harris in *op. cit.* pp. xxx f. Compare also his *Ephraem and the Gospel* (Cambridge, 1894).

later authors, who are under some suspicion of having altered the biblical quotations to a form more like that used by themselves. The greatest quoter is Epiphanius, of the second half of the fourth century.¹ Nevertheless, the tiny fragment from Oxyrhynchus strengthens emphatically the inference which we make from a study of the other materials at our disposal. It contains a quotation of Matt. iii. 16, 17, in which the following interesting readings occur: $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ for $\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ with D and Eusebius, $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ before $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\chi\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$ with D and the great mass of authorities, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\pi'$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$ with D and Eusebius, $\sigma\grave{\upsilon}$ $\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ for $\omicron\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ with D alone of Greek MSS.² A remarkable likeness to *Codex Bezae* is thus evident. But there are differences. D has $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ (for $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\nu$), and adds $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\omicron\upsilon$. After $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$, also, D has $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu$. But, despite these differences, we shall not err greatly in concluding that Irenaeus's copy of the Gospel was practically equivalent to an early ancestor of the Greek side of *Codex Bezae*, excelling the latter by greater freedom from corruption. Conybeare told me that the Armenian translation of Books iv. and v. of Irenaeus's work increases the closeness to the Bezan text.³ In Acts the case is the same exactly: e.g. Acts iv. 31, $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\acute{\omega}$ $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\nu\tau\iota$ $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\epsilon\iota\nu$, shared by both, and so with the negative golden rule (xv. 20) and the $\phi\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omega$ $\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ of xv. 29 (cf. below).

Our knowledge of this work, however, is mainly derived from a complete and careful Latin translation which has survived. This translation was probably made in Africa in the second half of the fourth century, though Sanday dated it c. 200.⁴ It often follows the Greek exactly, not an Old Latin version; for the Latin agrees with the

¹ Karl Holl, who had already published *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Epiphanius (Ancoratus und Panarion)* (1910), edited the *Ancoratus and Panarion*, G.C.S. 25, 31, 37 (1915-33).

² Contrast Lagrange, *Critique textuelle*, pp. 176 f.

³ *Irenaeus' gegen die Häretiker . . . in armen. Version entdeckt . . .* (Texte und Untersuchungen Band xxxv. (2), Leipzig, 1910). Cf. Conybeare's results published in Sanday's *Novum Testamentum S. Irenaei*, pp. 253 ff.

⁴ My own conclusion (based on a minute lexicographical and stylistic argument, now in print), independently reached by Hort as to date (Westcott and Hort's introduction, § 220, a masterly summary of a lengthy argument is published complete in *Novum Testamentum S. Irenaei*, by Dr. Sanday and collaborators), pp. lxx-cxi, and by Dr. H. Jordan as to date and locality (*Theologische Studien Theodor Zahn . . . zugebracht* [1908], pp. 133-92, also separately). Nor ought Dodwell (*Dissertationes in Irenaeum*, 1689) to be forgotten. See also O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*³ (1910), p. 97; Nestle, *Einführung*³, p. 162; Lagrange, *Critique textuelle*, pp. 174-177.

Greek fragments and the Armenian of Books iv and v.¹ When a long citation was made, it was convenient to look the passage out in the Latin Bible, and copy the translation thence. In general, where we cannot parallel the phraseology from the Latin Bible in any particular citation, we may conclude that at that point the translator is reproducing his Greek without referring to a Latin Bible. In the Gospels our translator had a text showing points of contact with *k*. The most glaring instance of this is a reference to Matt. v. 22, where the best MS. of Irenaeus lat. (Claromontanus of the ninth century, now at Berlin) shares with *k* the extraordinary corruption *pascitur* for *irascitur*: but there are a good many other cases of agreement. There are points of contact also with *d*. In Acts our translator shows agreements with *h*: but the most striking agreement is that with *d*, namely in Acts iii. 14, where D *d* have *ἐβαρύνετε*, *grauastis*, and the Latin Irenaeus *adgrauastis*, while all other authorities have *ἠρνήσασθε* (denied). There are, in fact, a number of agreements with D in Acts (cf. xvii. 26), and it looks as if here also D were a fifth or a sixth century representative of the roll of Acts used by Irenaeus himself. In the Epistles of St. Paul and in the Apocalypse the type of text used by the translator is late—fourth century, in fact. In the former case he is in close relationship with the text used by Augustine; in the latter he is not far removed from the Vulgate itself. In his text of the Catholic Epistles there are two interesting points. In First Peter ii. 23 he has the clause *τυπτόμενος οὐκ ἀντέτυπτεν*, elsewhere found in Greek only in the Apostolic Canons: in First John iv. 3 he is the oldest authority for the reading *ὁ λύει*, shared with Clement, Origen, etc.²

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA became head of the Catechetical School in Alexandria shortly before 200. He is not a very careful quoter of Scripture, but, thanks to the researches of P. M. Barnard, it is now known that in the Gospels he used a text closely related to *Codex Bezae*

¹ As the Latin translation shows undoubted traces of the Lucianic recension of the LXX in a long citation from Third Kingdoms (Rahlfs, *Septuaginta Studien*, iii. (Göttingen, 1911), pp. 116 ff., 138), it is clear that it cannot be earlier than the fourth century. Lucifer is the first Latin author of fixed date to show such traces (Rahlfs, pp. 143-54).

² In this investigation I profited by the work of Sanday, Turner, and collaborators.

(D).¹ Instances are: ἔξωθεν for ἐκτός in Matt. xxiii. 26, the omission of the second ὑμᾶς in Luke vi. 22, διάγοντες for ὑπάρχοντες in Luke vii. 25, the reversed order of clauses in Luke ix. 62, the shortest form of text in Luke x. 42, προμεριμνᾶτε in Luke xii. 11, τὸ ἐπτάκις in Luke xvii. 4, and so on. In Acts and the Epistles of Paul the relationship to the B type seems closer (cf. Acts xvii. 23, where ἱστορῶν in one of two citations is like D's διστορῶν, but ὄν and τοῦτον in both citations follow the other family: also Rom. x. 9, 15, xiii. 13, 14; Gal. ii. 11, iii. 24). Many readings in the scanty manuscripts of Clement's works are doubtless due to scribal harmonization with the late ecclesiastical text.

HIPPOLYTUS.—Of the voluminous works of this writer, who lived in or near Rome and in Sardinia († 236 or 237), but little survives in the original Greek. Yet enough remains to show that in the Gospels he used a good Western text. His citations of Matt. xiii. 43, xxiv. 48–9, and xxv. 41 suggest that he may also have used Tatian's Diatessaron on occasion. In the Epistles of Paul, also, he appears to have used a Western text: at least this is suggested by the text in which he quotes 1 Thess. iv. 13–17. In the Apocalypse his text is particularly important: there he is found to agree with the best authorities; for example, he reads βασιλείαν in chap. v. ver. 10, θελήσωσιν in xi. 6, ἠρπάσθη in xii. 5 (twice), δῶσιν in xiii. 16, εἶδα with A (only) in xvii. 3,² which certainly ought to be put in the text. The advent of the Jerusalem MS. (saec. x.) of the *De Antichristo* in G. N. Bonwetsch's edition (Leipzig, 1902) completely antiquates Tischendorf's reports of Hippolytus's readings, especially in chapters xvii. and xviii. of the Apocalypse.

ORIGEN.—Clement's successor Origen († 248), the greatest biblical scholar of the ancient world, had every then existing type of text at his disposal. It is therefore a matter of the greatest regret that, owing to dogmatic bias at the end of the fourth century and later, his works practically ceased to be copied; that in consequence we are confined to a few late (and bad) manuscripts of a few works or parts of works, and that those which were translated into Latin

¹ *The Biblical Text of Clement of Alexandria in the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles* (1899). This needs revision in the light of recent papyrological discoveries.

² For another agreement of A and Hipp. see Apoc. xviii. 2. Read ἔβαλον with C Hipp. in xviii. 19.

were rendered without due regard to the form of the biblical quotations.¹ Origen's practice was to dictate his works: sometimes he may have indicated the roll from which the amanuensis was to copy a passage of Scripture, sometimes he may have left it to the amanuensis himself. In him as in other ancient writers we occasionally find that the comments presuppose a different text from that which precedes them. E. Hautsch did good service in eliciting from comments of Origen's on the Gospels the text on which he must have been commenting.²

It is no longer possible to say with Streeter that when Origen left Alexandria in 231 for Caesarea he abandoned an Alexandrian text for a Caesarean. Later research has shown that he had used Caesarean texts available in Alexandria; and while his text of John in the *Contra Celsum* was akin to B \aleph , that of Matt. in the same work was nearer to I and 1582, as was his text of Matt. in the commentary on that gospel. Just as with Irenaeus and Clement, D most nearly represents his text sometimes, and perhaps the best way to describe the situation would be to say that Origen's favourite roll varied very seldom from the readings supported by B and D in common.

With regard to the Pauline Epistles, a fortunate discovery of Von der Goltz has put us in a much better position. In a MS. at the Laura monastery on Mount Athos,³ he found Origen's text of the Epistle to the Romans complete, which some biblical scholar in the tenth century had carefully copied out of a manuscript of Origen's commentary on that epistle in the original Greek, now lost. The MS. also contains considerable notes of what Origen read in particular places of other Epistles also, as well as the Catholic Epistles and Acts. With G and 1908^{ms} ⁴ Origen left out $\epsilon\nu$ $\rho\acute{\omega}\mu\eta$ in Rom. i. 7, but on the

¹ For instance, Bishop Westcott in his classical article 'Origen', in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, long ago showed that Rufinus, in translating Origen on *Romans* into Latin, had substituted for Origen's biblical text a Latin text current at Aquileia in North Italy about 400—no doubt with the best motives!

² *Die Evangelienzitate des Origenes* (Leipzig, 1909).

³ 1739^{ms} in Gregory's list (B 64 is the shelfmark in the Laura). Von der Goltz, *Eine textkritische Arbeit des 10 bezw. 6 Jhdts.* (Leipzig, 1899). Cf. K. Lake, J. de Zwaan, and M. S. Enslin, *Six Collations of New Testament Manuscripts* (1932).

⁴ 1908 is an eleventh-century MS. at Oxford, which has some considerable connexion with Origen (and with MS. 1739). The corrector of the eleventh-century Vienna MS. (known as 424**) is also related (cf. Gal. iii. 8).

whole it is the Neutral text to which he witnesses in this Epistle (cf. ii. 16 with κ B, $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ 'Ιησοῦ, etc.). In the Epistle to the Hebrews Origen's text is most nearly represented by M (or 0121), ninth-century fragments at London and Hamburg.

PAMPHILUS and EUSEBIUS.—The martyr Pamphilus († 309), already referred to, had been educated at Alexandria, and the main part of the theological library which he founded at Caesarea in Palestine consisted of the voluminous works of Origen on rolls. His pupil and protégé, Eusebius († 339–40), afterwards Bishop of Caesarea, had full use of this collection. We are not surprised, therefore, to find Eusebius ranged on the side of D or 'Caesarean' MSS. and Origen in the Gospels. He is, however, a most unsatisfactory quoter from our point of view, as he rarely indulges in a long citation.

ATHANASIUS († 373) and CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA († 444) both, according to Hermann von Soden, used for the most part what he calls the *H* text.¹ This text is practically identical with Westcott and Hort's Neutral. The study of Cyril's Gospel text has been seriously hindered by the method which the Oxford editor employed in publishing his Commentaries on St. John.² The discovery of further leaves of a papyrus of a work of Cyril confirms Von Soden's conclusion as to the sort of text employed by him in the Gospels.³

BASIL OF CAESAREA († 379), GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS († 389 or 390), and GREGORY OF NYSSA († 395 ?).—The three Cappadocian Fathers, as they are commonly called, all used, according to Von Soden, the same type of text, that found in the purple MSS. of the Gospels, already described.⁴ This text has ancient elements still present in it, but is in the main the same as the official ecclesiastical text associated with Constantinople and the regions under her influence.

CHRYSOSTOM († 407) was the first great writer to use the fully developed ecclesiastical text, and his influence as Metropolitan of Constantinople and a distinguished preacher and commentator no doubt greatly extended its

¹ *Die Schriften*, u.s.w., §§ 336 (correct his index, Bd. i. p. 2178), 397, 457, 492.

² Cf. Nestle's *Einführung*³, p. 159.

³ See p. 20 above.

⁴ See pp. 8, 27 f. above. Von Soden, *Die Schriften*, u.s.w., pp. 1466 ff.

use. In fact, Von Soden makes him the first reviser of his *K* (or *Kouνή*) type of text, which is roughly that of the great bulk of our manuscripts.¹ There are in him no traces of the Neutral text, but plenty of evidence that he was acquainted with 'Western' texts²: for example, like Jerome and Theodoret, he knew the reading *ἐπιψεύσεις τοῦ χριστοῦ* in Eph. v. 14. These readings Von Soden thinks he got from Origen. Chrysostom never quoted the lesser Catholic Epistles or the Apocalypse.

Later Greek Fathers, like Theodoret of Cyrus († *ca.* 458) and John of Damascus († *ca.* 750), used substantially the same text as Chrysostom.

COSMAS INDICOPLEUSTES, merchant of Alexandria († *ca.* 550?), used in the Gospels a late Alexandrian type of text, like *L*, but in Acts employed a text almost identical with *B*.³

§ 2. LATIN WRITERS

For the most part the evidence for the text of the Latin Fathers (including the biblical quotations cited by them) is much more abundant and in a much purer state than the Greek and Syriac evidence. Many of the Latin Fathers' works exist in copies almost coeval with the authors themselves. There is extant quite a respectable number of sixth-century MSS. preserving works written by fourth- or fifth-century authors, and quite a cluster of MSS. of the works of Gregory the Great († 604) and the Venerable Bede († 735), practically contemporary with the authors themselves. For the most part these precious MSS. lie unopened in the libraries of Europe, or are looked into only by the palæographer and the cataloguer. The printed editions of the Latin Fathers, with the exception of those in the *Vienna Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* and a few others, are unreliable in questions of New Testament textual criticism. The early editions were mostly printed from one MS. which happened to be accessible to the printer. If it were a fifteenth-century MS., so much the easier would the printer's task be, as he could not but

¹ *Die Schriften*, u.s.w., § 332.

² Dean Robinson's *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* (London, 1903, and later), p. 300.

³ This fact becomes for the first time clear in E. O. Winstedt's edition of *Cosmas* (Cambridge, 1909).

be familiar with a script practically contemporary with himself. Succeeding editors were often content to reprint without alteration, with slight improvement, or with alteration for the worse. But there is no longer any excuse for this, with the improved conditions of travel and the increased accessibility of MSS., and after the work of a century or so it will be possible to write a splendid account of the history of the Latin Bible, both Old-Latin and Vulgate. Meantime, only certain writers, whose texts are published (or accessible to the present writer) in primitive purity, can be alluded to here.

TERTULLIAN of Carthage († 222) wrote particularly in Latin, but also in Greek. He also sometimes used a Latin Bible, sometimes a Greek, probably oftener the former than the latter. It is improbable that his Greek Bible was very different in text from the Greek text underlying his Latin Bible. A curious defect in one or other of these occurred in Hebrews vi. 5, where in the archetype of one of these rolls the text read:

ΝΟΥΣΘΥΡΗΜΑΔΥΝ
ΑΜΕΙΣΤΕΜΕΛΛ
ΟΝΤΟΣΑΙΩΝΟΣΚΑΙ

The copyist, however, who wrote Tertullian's copy, omitted the second line, and thus he reads *δύνοντος*. The character of his text in general is, of course, 'Western'. Sanday long ago put the textual position in the Gospels thus: 'The hypothesis that Tertullian used a manuscript in the main resembling *b* of the Old-Latin satisfies most elements of the problem'.¹ I am informed that the Vienna edition, so far as it has appeared (see Selected Bibliography), does not exhibit the biblical quotations in an appreciably different form from that which they have in the edition of Oehler. The Greek MS. with which Tertullian is in most frequent agreement is D; among Greek Fathers he finds his chief allies in Clement and Origen. He is farthest removed from B among the Greek MSS.²

CYPRIAN.—In the Gospels, Cyprian of Carthage († 258),

¹ The best summary known to me of the Tertullianean evidence is in his *Gospels in the Second Century* (London, 1876), pp. 333-43. The quotation above is made from page 342.

² It must, however, be noted that in Matt. i. 16 he agrees with \aleph B and the bulk of MSS., just as he does in Luke i. 46, where he deserts his ally *b*.

a most accurate quoter, is practically identical with *k* in text. Sometimes one appears to be more primitive than the other, and the text has certainly some history behind it. In Acts and the Apocalypse Cyprian goes consistently with the fragmentary palimpsest known as *h*. I have suggested that his text of the Pauline Epistles is the earliest for that part of the New Testament,¹ but this suggestion perhaps ought to be retracted, as 2 Tim. iv. 3 bears secondary traces (a double rendering of *κηθόμενοι τὴν ἀκοήν*).²

NEMESIANUS OF TUBUNAS in Numidia, a contemporary of Cyprian, read the Epistles of Paul from a different translation.³ In some ways his form is nearer to Tertullian's, and it is more probable that the rustic would use an earlier form than the citizen of the great capital.

NOVATIAN (or Novatus) of Rome († 257?) used a text like *a* in St. John, and in the Epistles of Paul one related to *d* (see also Lucifer). See Baumstark, *Oriens Christianus* (1930), pp. 1-14 for influence of the Diatessaron on him.

HILARY OF POITIERS († 366) used in the Gospels a text having points of contact with *r* (the Irish-Latin *Codex Usserianus* of the sixth century). No doubt Great Britain and Ireland first got the Gospel from Gaul. This sort of text, therefore, is what we should expect.⁴

LUCIFER OF CAGLIARI in Sardinia († 370 or 371). In the Gospel of John his text is the same as that of *a*, in Acts practically the same as *gigas*, and in the Epistles of Paul the same as that of *d* (except in the longer Epistles where *d* has been harmonized with the Vulgate). See A. M. Coleman's editions of Lucifer's citations.

'AMBROSIASTER.'—This writer (*flor.* 375-85 at Rome and in Spain), whose works were issued anonymously, but are attributed in manuscripts to Hilary, Ambrose, and Augustine, is generally agreed now to have been Isaac, a converted Jew, the enemy of Pope Damasus. One of his works is a commentary on the Pauline Epistles (excluding Hebrews), at the basis of one of the editions of which lies

¹ *Study of Ambrosiaster* (Cambridge, 1905), pp. 213 f.

² Lactantius in Africa (saec. iv. early), Firmicus Maternus in Sicily († saec. iv. med.), Zeno of Verona († 373?), Commodian (saec. v.) in Gaul, found it convenient to use Cyprian's excerpts from Scripture in preference to Scripture itself.

³ See C. H. Turner in *Journal of Theological Studies*, ii. (1900-1), pp. 602 ff.

⁴ Bonnassieux, *Les Evangiles Synoptiques de S. Hilaire de P.* (1906).

