

SWEETGOSPELHARmony.com

PART II

CHAPTER IX.

GENERAL VIEW OF THE INTERACTION OF THE GREEK AND LATIN TEXTS.

1. CONFUSIONS due to betacism.

A very cursory glance at our MS. will show the prevalence of this feature of late Latin phonetics; the confusion between *b* and *v* is everywhere: and we have to see whether this has in any degree reacted upon the interpretation of the Latin text and so upon the Greek text from which it is made.

Turn to Luke i. 78,

ΕΝ ΟΙΣ ΕΠΕΣΚΕΨΑΤΟ ΗΜΑΣ
ΑΝΑΤΟΛΗ ΕΞ ΥΨΟΥΣ

IN QUIBUS VISITAVIT NOS
ORIENS EX ALTO.

Here the confusion between *visitavit* and *visitabit* is so natural, that if we adopt the Greek Text of Westcott and Hort and read ἐπισκέψεται, we must say that our Codex has Latinized: and if we do not adopt this reading, we must say that Codices ~~N~~BL have Latinized: the dilemma is a pretty one, because D is here supported by almost all other non-Latin authorities, the Latin authorities themselves not being counted one way or the other, on account of the prevalence of betacism in the early copies.

In Luke xv. 15, we should have

ET ADHESIT VNI CIVIVM,

but the scribe gives us

ET ADHESIT IBI VNI CIVIVM.

Possibly he wrote an anomalous *adhesibit* = *adhesiuit*; and the *ibi* of the Latin text has been taken from the verb, the confusion being very easy in the Latin capitals.

A pretty betacistic confusion will be found in Luke xiv. 5, where the Latin is

CVIVS EX VOBIS OVIS AVT BOVIS,

where *bovis* is a Vulgar Latin nominative; here it is clear that *ovis* is wrong, being either a repetition of *vobis* or a correction of *bovis*: if it is a dittograph we may replace some other word: some persons will imagine a confusion with *υῖός* which has the same letters; others will read the equivalent of *ὄνος*. Finally *ovis* has been taken over into the Greek and has produced the well-known reading

ΤΙΝΟΣ ΕΞ ΥΜΩΝ ΠΡΟΒΑΤΟΝ Η ΒΟΥΣ.

2. Cases where the corrector has troubled himself over the rendering of *δε* at the beginning of a sentence, and with the desire to keep the sequence of the words the same in Greek and Latin has carried back *δε* into the Greek under the form of *καί*.

Acts xiii. 49,

ΔΙΕΦΕΡΕΤΟ ΔΕ = ET PROVVLGABATUR,

and the Greek becomes

ΚΑΙ ΔΙΕΦΕΡΕΤΟ.

Matt. xvii. 24,

ΚΑΙ ΕΛΘΟΝΤΩΝ ΑΥΤΩΝ
ET VENIENTIBVS EIS:

where the original was

ΕΛΘΟΝΤΩΝ ΔΕ ΑΥΤΩΝ.

Mark iv. 36,

ΚΑΙ ΑΛΛΑ ΠΛΟΙΑ

was rendered

ALIAE AVTEM NAVES,

and then the two texts were adjusted,

ΚΑΙ ΑΛΛΑ ΔΕ ΠΛΟΙΑ
ET ALIAE AVTEM NAVES,

other corruptions creeping in afterwards, as a reference to the Codex will shew.

In Mark iv. 29,

ΟΤΑΝ ΔΕ ΠΑΡΑΔΟΙ

was rendered

ET CUM PRŌDVXERIT,

and the Greek changed to

ΚΑΙ ΟΤΑΝ ΠΑΡΑΔΟΙ.

In Mark vi. 21 the corrector's hand is seen in

ΚΑΙ ΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΗΣ ΔΕ ΗΜΕΡΑΣ

ET CUM DIES.....

where we should erase *καί*.

In Mark viii. 29 we should read

ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΣ ΕΠΗΡΩΤΑ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ,

but Codex Bezae has

ΑΥΤΟΣ ΔΕ.....

on account of the Latin

IPSE AVTEM INTERROGAVIT EOS.

In Luke xix. 39,

ΤΙΝΕΣ ΔΕ ΤΩΝ ΦΑΡΙΣΑΙΩΝ

QVIDEM AVTEM DE PHARISAEIS,

the original text seems to have been

ΚΑΙ ΤΙΝΕΣ.....

These are a few instances of a widespread confusion.

3. Cases where the artificial rendering of the article by *ille*, *iste* and *hic* has produced an addition of demonstrative pronouns in the Greek text.

In Matt. xv. 24,

ΕΙ ΜΗ ΕΙΣ ΤΑ ΠΡΟΒΑΤΑ

seems to have been rendered

NISI AD HAS OVES,

and then we get the harmonized bilingual text

ΕΙ ΜΗ ΕΙΣ ΤΑ ΠΡΟΒΑΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ

NISI AD OVES HAS.

Matt. xv. 32,

ΕΙΠΕΝ ΠΙΛΑΝΧΝΙΖΟΜΑΙ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΝ ΟΧΛΟΝ ΤΟΥΤΟΝ
DIXIT MISEREOR • SVPER TVRBAM HANC,

is another case of the same kind.

There are many other cases of similar textual amplification: and great confusion introduced into the texts thereby: we will give one striking specimen in order to shew how early this mode of rendering is in the history of the Latin text.

In the Gospel of John we frequently find *hic mundus* used as a translation of ὁ κόσμος.

Suppose then that we find in John xvii. 11

ΚΑΙ ΟΥΚΕΤΙ ΕΙΜΙ ΕΝ ΤΟΥΤΩ ΤΩ ΚΟΣΜΩ
ET IAM NON SVM IN HOC MVNDO,

we reasonably conclude that the *τούτῳ* came in to balance *hoc*. Let us then examine the whole passage:

ΚΑΙ ΟΥΚΕΤΙ ΕΙΜΙ ΕΝ ΤΟΥΤΩ ΤΩ ΚΟΣΜΩ
ΚΑΙ ΟΥΤΟΙ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΚΟΣΜΩ ΕΙΣΙΝ
ΚΑΓΩ ΠΡΟΣ ΣΕ ΕΡΧΟΜΑΙ ΟΥΚΕΤΙ ΕΙΜΙ ΕΝ ΤΩ
ΚΟΣΜΩ • ΚΑΙ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΚΟΣΜΩ ΕΙΜΙ,

for which the Latin is

ET IAM NON SVM IN HOC MVNDO
ET IPSI IN HOC MVNDO SVNT
ET EGO AD TE VENIO IAM NON SVM IN
MVNDO ET IN MVNDO SVM.

It is clear that we have here a conflate text of a similar character to that which we find in Codex Verecellensis (= *a*), which reads

et hi in hoc mundo sunt,
et ego ad te venio
et iam non sum in hoc mundo
et in hoc mundo sunt.

Moreover this Codex tells us that the Beza scribe has confounded *sunt* with *sum* at the end of the verse: and we see that the Greek text has not merely preserved the transferred demonstratives, but has followed the Latin in giving *εἰμί* at the end of the verse for *εἰσίν*. It is easy now to separate the two parts of the

conflated text and to reject the part which depends upon the false translation of the article. The two parts may be placed side by side:

et iam non sum in hoc mundo = iam non sum in mundo
 et ipsi in hoc mundo sunt = et in mundo sunt
 et ego ad te venio.

This example is very convincing: it tells us moreover that there is a close relation between the Latin texts Cod. *a* and Cod. *d*: this point must be noted for future use.

Other cases of *hic mundus* will be found in viii. 26,

HAEC LOQVOR IN HOC MVNDO.

xiv. 22,

OSTENDERE TE IPSVM ET NON HVIC MVNDO.

xiv. 30,

LOQVAR VOBISCVM VENIT ENIM HVIVS
 MVNDI PRINCEPS,

where the Greek is

ΛΑΛΗΣΩ ΜΕΘ ὙΜΩΝ ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ ΓΑΡ Ο ΤΟΥ
 ΚΟΣΜΟΥ ΑΡΧΩΝ.

xvi. 21,

HOMO IN HVNC MVNDVM,

but in none of these cases has the strong translation of the article affected the Greek. In all of them, however, the Latin agrees with Cod. *a*.

In John xvii. 14, 15, we have, however, a good case of confusion and reflex action.

ΚΑΙ Ο ΚΟΣΜΟΣ ΜΕΙΣΕΙ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ ΟΤΙ ΟΥΚ ΕΙΣΙΝ
 ΕΚ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΚΟΣΜΟΥ ΟΥΚ ΕΡΩΤΩ ΙΝΑ ΑΡΗΣ
 ΑΥΤΟΥΣ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΚΟΣΜΟΥ ΑΛΛ ΙΝΑ ΤΗΡΗΣΗ
 ΑΥΤΟΥΣ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΠΟΝΗΡΟΥ ΕΚ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΚΟΣΜΟΥ
 ΟΥΚ ΕΙΣΙΝ ΚΑΘΩΣ ΚΑΓΩ ΟΥΚ ΕΙΜΙ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΚΟΣΜΟΥ

the Latin being

ET MVNDVS ODIТ EOS QVONTIAM NON SVM
 DE HOC MVNDO NON ROGO VT TOLLAS
 EOS DE MVNDO SED VT SERVES
 EOS DE INIQVO DE HOC MVNDO
 NON SVNT SICVT ET EGO NON SVM DE MVNDO.

Here we notice first that the translator having used the form *odit* (instead of *odio habuit*) which has a present meaning, *μισεῖ* has replaced *ἐμίσησεν* in the Greek text. Next we see that the Latin scribe has again given *sum* as an equivalent for *sunt*: and this repeated error may indicate a dialectical equality of the two forms (cf. the Italian *sono* which is the equivalent of both *sum* and *sunt*). In this case, however, the Greek has not been harmonized with the Latin as it was in John xvii. 11. Third, we see that *hoc* [*mundo*] has crept back into the Greek at two separate points; and in both cases there is Latin support for *d*.

For further reflex actions see xvii. 18, where there are two in a single verse. But perhaps the thing reaches the height of absurdity in xvii. 25, where *ὁ κόσμος* has been translated as *mundus hic*, and the Greek text appears as

Ο ΚΟΣΜΟΣ ΤΟΥΤΟΣ.

It appears probable then that the primitive Latin translation of John had *hic mundus* everywhere, and Cod. *a* agrees very well with this idea.

Many other cases of the same confusion, arising from the translation of the article, may be found scattered through the Western text; as Mark viii. 2,

ΣΥΛΛΑΧΝΙΖΟΜΑΙ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥ ΟΧΛΟΥ ΤΟΥΤΟΥ
MISEREOR SUPER ISTAM TURBAM,

where *istam* = τοῦ, but has been turned back into Greek as τοῦτου.

Acts vi. 5,

ΚΑΙ ΗΡΕCΕΝ Ο ΛΟΓΟΣ ΟΥΤΟΣ ΕΝΩΠΙΟΝ ΠΑΝΤΟΣ
ET PLACUIT SERMO HIC IN CONSPECTU OMNI,

where *oûres* comes from the translation of *ὁ λόγος* by *hic sermo*.

We must not be surprised at this peculiar feature of the primitive Latin translation, for it can be paralleled in the English renderings of the New Testament, being found freely in the Genevan edition of 1576 (Tomson's New Testament). Of this Westcott says¹, "One peculiarity is characteristic of Tomson alone.

¹ *Hist. Eng. Bible*, p. 232 note.

In his anxiety to express the emphatic force of the Greek Article he constantly renders it by 'that' or 'this,' and in many cases the effect is almost grotesque. One example will suffice 'He that hath *that* Son hath *that* life; and he that hath not *that* Son of God hath not *that* life' (1 John v. 12)." If Tomson had only lived in the second century, what a splendid chance he would have had for propagating a New Testament with extra-canonical readings!

4. Ambiguities arising from the doubtful gender of such words as *eius illius*, etc.

In Matt. ix. 26, the original Western Greek was probably

ΚΑΙ ΕΞΗΛΘΕΝ Η ΦΗΜΗ ΑΥΤΗΣ,

and the Latin of Codex Bezae is

ET EXIIT FAMA EIVS.

But the revising scribe not unnaturally takes *eius* as masculine and therefore he corrects *αὐτῆς* to *αὐτοῦ*, as we have it in the Greek of our text.

I am inclined to believe that it is to the same cause that we must refer the confusion in Matt. xiv. 6. We start from a primitive text

ΩΡΧΗCΑΤΟ Η ΘΥΓΑΤΗΡ ΤΗΣ ΗΡΩΔΙΑΔΟΣ,

which was rendered

SALTAVIT FILIA EIVS HERODIADIS,

where *eius* is meant for a feminine and is the equivalent of the article.

Then we get the Greek altered to *αὐτοῦ* which necessitates a further correction, and finally we reach the impossible

ΩΡΧΗCΑΤΟ Η ΘΥΓΑΤΗΡ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΗΡΩΔΙΑC.

In Luke ii. 22, we have

ΚΑΙ ΟΤΕ ΕΠΛΗCΘΗCΑΝ ΑΙ ΗΜΕΡΑΙ

ΤΟΥ ΚΑΘΑΡΙCΜΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΝ ΝΟΜΟΝ

ET CVM CONSVMMATI SVNT DIES

PVRGATIONIS EIVS SECVNDVM LEGEM.

Does not *eius* here stand for *αὐτῆς* (the Blessed Virgin), and has it not been understood of our Lord: unless indeed it should turn out

that both readings *αὐτοῦ* and *αὐτῆς* are derived from a primitive *αὐτῶν*?

5. Curious case of confusion between *οὐ* and *οὐ*.

In Matt. xviii. 20 the translator began to render

ΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΕΙΜΙ • ΔΥΟ Η ΤΡΕΙΣ ΣΥΝΗΓΜΕΝΟΙ
NON ENIM SVNT DVO AVT TRES • COLLECTI,

and having rendered *οὐ* by the negative he was obliged to alter the line

ΕΚΕΙ ΕΙΜΙ ΕΝ ΜΕΣΩ ΑΥΤΩΝ

so that it read

ΑΥΤΟΙ ΟΥΟΝ ΕΝ ΜΕΣΩ ΕΩΝΟΝ.

Hence the Greek

ΟΥΚ ΕΙΣΙΝ ΓΑΡ ΔΥΟ Η ΤΡΕΙΣ ΣΥΝΗΓΜΕΝΟΙ
ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΕΜΟΝ ΟΝΟΜΑ
ΠΑΡ ΟΙΣ ΟΥΚ ΕΙΜΕΙ ΕΝ ΜΕΣΩ ΑΥΤΩΝ.

6. Confusion owing to the difference of genders in Greek and Latin.

Matt. iii. 16 we have the Latin

ET VIDIT SPIRITVM DEI
DESCENDENTEM DE CAELO.

All of the Greek that is preserved is the words

ΚΑΤΑΒΑΙΝΟΝΤΑ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΥ,

and it would seem that the change from *καταβαῖνον*, which should accompany *πνεῦμα*, was due to the Latin *descendentem*. This suggestion was made by Mill.

In Mark iv. 36 we have

ΚΑΙ ΑΛΛΑΙ ΔΕ
ΠΛΟΙΑΙ ΠΟΛΛΑΙ • ΗΣΑΝ ΜΕΤ ΑΥΤΟΥ
ET ALIAE AVTEM
NAVES MVLTAE • ERANT CVM ILLO,

where we should read *ἄλλα πλοῖα ἦν*.

In Mark ix. 36,

ΚΑΙ ΛΑΒΩΝ ΤΟ ΠΑΙΔΙΟΝ
ΕΣΤΗΣΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΕΝ ΜΕΣΩ ΑΥΤΩΝ
ET ACCIPIENS PVERVM
STATVIT ILLVM IN MEDIO EORVM.

Here *illum* has affected the Greek, and given us αὐτόν for αὐτό.

In Acts v. 32 we have a case like the one quoted above from Matt. iii. 16,

ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΠΝΑ ΤΟ ΔΓΙΟΝ ΟΝ ΕΔΩΚΕΝ Ο Θς
ET SP̄M̄ SANCTVM̄ QVEM DEDIT D̄S.

7. Instances where the corresponding verbs or prepositions govern different cases in Latin and Greek:

In Acts xi. 7,

ΚΑΙ ΗΚΟΥΣΑ ΦΩΝΗΝ ΛΕΓΟΥΣΑΝ ΜΟΙ
ET AUDIVI VOCEM DICENTEM MIHI.

The Latin accusative has been carried over and has replaced the Greek genitive.

Matt. v. 42,

ΚΑΙ ΤΩ ΘΕΛΟΝΤΙ ΔΑΝΙΣΑΣΘΑΙ ΜΗ ΑΠΟΟΤΡΑΦΗΣ
ET VOLENTI MUTUARI NE AVERTARIS.

The Greek has altered τὸν θέλοντα in order to agree more closely with *volenti*.

Matt. ix. 24,

ΚΑΙ ΚΑΤΕΓΕΛΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ
ET DERIDEBANT EVM,

where we should have αὐτοῦ in the Greek.

Matt. ix. 25,

ΕΚΡΑΤΗΣΕΝ
ΤΗΝ ΧΕΙΡΑ ΑΥΤΗΣ
TENVIT
MANVM̄ EIVS,

where we ought to read τῆς χειρός.

Matt. ix. 38 we have a similar case

ΔΕΗΘΗΤΕ ΟΥΝ ΤΟΝ ΚΝ̄ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΡΙΣΜΟΥ
ORATE ERGO DNM̄ MESSIA.

John x. 27,

ΤΑ ΠΡΟΒΑΤΑ ΤΑ ΕΜΕ
ΤΗΣ ΦΩΝΗΣ ΜΟΥ ΑΚΟΥΕΙ
OVES QVAE SVNT MEAE
VOCIS MEAE AUDIUNT.

Here the Latin has been made to agree with the Greek.

John xii. 47 is a similar case,

ET SI QVIS AUDIERIT MEORVM BERBORVM.

Mark v. 41,

ΚΑΙ ΚΡΑΤΗΣΑΣ ΤΗΝ ΧΕΙΡΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΙΔΙΟΥ
ET TENENS MANVM PVELLAE,

Mark viii. 23,

ΚΑΙ ΛΑΒΟΜΕΝΟΣ ΤΗΝ ΧΕΙΡΑ ΤΟΥ ΤΥΦΛΟΥ
ET ADPRAEHENDI[T] MANVM CAECI,

where we should read τῆς χειρός.

Mark x. 21,

ΕΝ ΟΙ ΥΓΓΕΡΕΙ

instead of

ΕΝ ΟΥ ΥΓΓΕΡΕΙ

because the Latin is

VNUM TIBI DEEST.

Luke xx. 26,

ΟΥΚ ΕΙΣΧΥΣΑΝ ΔΕ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΡΗΜΑ
ΕΠΙΛΑΒΕΘΑΙ
NON POTVERVNT AVTEM EIVS VERBVM
ADPRAEHENDERE,

where we should expect ῥήματος.

Acts iii. 25 also belongs to this class:

ΚΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗΣ ΗΝ Ο ΘΣ ΔΙΕΘΕΤΟ
ET EIVS DISPOSITIONIS QVAM DS DISVNTAVIT,

where ἦν is for ῥῆς under the influence of the Latin.

Acts v. 3 may perhaps be mentioned here: it should stand

ΕΙΠΕΝ ΔΕ ΠΕΤΡΟΣ ΑΝΑΝΙΑ

But *ἀνανία* has been taken as a dative and rendered

AD ANANIAN.

Then the Greek is reformed to

ΕΙΠΕΝ ΔΕ ΠΕΤΡΟΣ ΠΡΟΣ ΑΝΑΝΙΑΝ.

Acts vi. 2,

ΟΥΚ ΑΡΕΣΤΟΝ ΕΣΤΙΝ ΗΜΕΙΝ
ΚΑΤΑΛΕΙΨΑΝΤΑΣ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΥ
NON ENIM PLACET NOBIS
DERELICTO VERBO DI,

where *ἡμῶν* stands for *ἡμᾶς*.

8. Cases of confusion between the degrees of comparison of the adjectives; as, for example, where the scribe has, from a correct Semitic feeling, as it would seem, in harmony with Vulgar Latin usage, translated a positive adjective by a comparative or superlative.

Matt. x. 42,

ΚΑΙ ΟΣ ΑΝ ΠΟΤΕΙΧῃ * ΕΝΑ ΤΩΝ ΕΛΑΧΙΣΤΩΝ ΤΟΥΤΩΝ
ET QVICVMQVE POTAUERIT . VNVM DE MINIMIS HIS.

The Latin is a translation of *μικρῶν*, and would be a very good translation if the equivalent of *οἱ μικροί* had been given in Hebrew or Aramaic, but, in any case, is not a bad rendering. When the translation was thus made, I take it that the reviser wrote *ελαχίστων* in the Greek.

Probably the same reaction explains why in Matt. xiii. 48, the line

ΣΥΝΕΛΕΞΑΝ ΤΑ ΚΑΛΑ ΕΙΣ ΤΑ ΑΓΓΙΑ

has been turned into

ΣΥΝΕΛΕΞΑΝ ΤΑ ΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΑ...

There is good ground for believing that the Vulgar Latin superlative was often found, as in the Semitic languages, in the form of a repeated positive, so that we suspect that *τὰ κάλλιστα* of our text is the equivalent of a primitive Latin *bona bona*, which in Cod. Bezae's Latin has been replaced by *meliora*, but in Codd. *a b e k* appears as *optima*¹. Whether then *καλὰ* or *κάλλιστα* is the original reading, the change from one to the other is made through the mediation of the Latin.

¹ Cf. Sanday in *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, II. p. lxvi.

9. Translation of the Greek aorist by the Latin perfect or imperfect; and examination of the effect of such translations of one tense by another in the original Greek.

In Matt. xvii. 5 we find,

ΙΔΟΥ ΝΕΦΕΛΗ ΦΩΤΕΙΝΗ
ΕΠΕΣΚΙΑΖΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ

the Latin being

ECCE NVBS LVCIDA
OBVMBRABAT EOS,

for a primitive Greek ἐπεσκίασεν, the aorist having been rendered by the Latin imperfect.

Matt. xix. 27,

ΚΑΙ ΗΚΟΛΟΥΘΗΚΑΜΕΝ ΟΙ
ΕΤ ΒΕCΥΤΙ ΣΥΜΥΣ ΤΕ,

for a primitive ἡκολουθήσαμεν which was translated rightly by a Latin perfect.

In Mark i. 38,

ΕΙC ΤΟΥΤΟ ΓΑΡ ΕΞΕΛΗΛΥΘΑ

(where we should perhaps restore ἐζηλθον) because the Latin had rendered the aorist by

AD HOC ENIM VENI.

Mark v. 24,

ΚΑΙ ΑΠΗΛΘΕΝ ΜΕΤ ΑΥΤΟΥ

becomes

ΚΑΙ ΥΠΗΓΕΝ ΜΕΤ ΑΥΤΟΥ

because the Latin was

ET IBAT CVM ILLO.

Mark xv. 14,

ΟΙ ΔΕ ΕΚΠΕΡΙCΩC ΕΚΡΑΖΑΝ

becomes ἔκραζον under the influence of

AD ILLI MAGIS CLAMABANT.

Luke viii. 27,

ΟC ΕΙΜΑΤΙΟΝ ΟΥΚ ΕΝΕΛΥΔΙCΚΕΤΟ
ΟΥΙ ΤΥΝΙΚΑΜ ΝΟΝ ΙΝΔΥΕΒΑΤΥΡ,

where we should expect ἐνεδύσατο, if the most ancient texts are to be followed, and certainly the translation would be made by an imperfect tense.

Acts vii. 34,

ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΕΤΕΝΑΓΜΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΑΚΗΚΟΑ
ET GEMITVS EIVS AVDIVI,

where we should have *ἤκουσα*.

Mark x. 13 seems to have originally been read,

ΟΙ ΔΕ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ
ΕΠΕΤΙΜΗCΑΝ
DISCIPVLJ AVTEM EIVS
COMMINABANTVR,

and then *ἐπετίμησαν* had to be corrected to *ἐπετίμων*.

10. Translation of the Greek aorist by a pluperfect; and other mutations of tenses.

Matt. xi. 21,

ΟΤΙ ΕΙ ΕΝ ΤΥΡΩ ΚΑΙ ΣΙΔΩΝΕΙ • ΕΓΕΓΟΝΕΙCΑΝ
ΑΙ ΔΥΝΑΜΕΙC
QVIA EI IN TYRO ET SIDONA • FACTAE ESSENT
VIRTVTES.

Here *factae essent* stands for *ἐγένοντο*, rightly enough; and hence the correction of the Greek text.

Matt. xvi. 26, the translator rendered

ΤΙ ΓΑΡ ΩΦΕΛΗΣΕΤΑΙ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟC

by

QVID AVTEM PRODEST HOMINI,

and hence we get the Greek corrected to *ὠφελείται*.

John xvii. 14,

ΚΑΙ Ο ΚΟCΜΟC ΜΕΙCΕΙ ΑΥΤΟΥC,

because the Latin rendered the verb *ἐμίσησεν* by

ET MVNDVS ODIT EOS.

Mark vi. 39,

ΑΝΑΚΛΙΘΗΝΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΑC

has been rendered

VT DISCVMBERENT OMNES,

and the passive verb in the Greek has been corrected to

ΑΝΑΚΛΕΙΝΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΑC.

In Matt. iv. 8,

ΠΑΛΙΝ ΠΑΡΑΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΙ ΑΥΤΟΝ Ο ΔΙΑΒΟΛΟΣ
ΕΙΣ ΟΡΟΣ ΥΨΗΛΟΝ ΛΕΙΔΑΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΔΕΙΞΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ.

In the last line the Latin renders

IN MONTEM ALTVM NIMIS ET OSTENDIT EI :

ostendit is both a present and a perfect; but it looks as if some corrector of a Western MS. had taken it, in this case wrongly, for a perfect and had given us *ἔδειξεν* in place of the ordinary reading *δείκνυσιν*. This explanation was suggested by Middleton in his work on the Greek Article.

11. Rendering of the participle (especially the aorist participle) followed by the verb as two verbs with a conjunction; and consideration of the effect of the same.

Matt. iv. 3 should read

ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΕΛΘΩΝ [ΑΥΤΩ] Ο ΠΕΙΡΑΖΩΝ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ.

To render this into Latin we should say

ET ACCESSIT AD EVM TEMPTATOR ET DIXIT EI.

The translator, in fact, gives us this, only he renders *ὁ πειράζων* by *qui temptabat*.

Is it any wonder that the Greek in Codex Bezae should run

ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΧΛΘΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ Ο ΠΕΙΡΑΖΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ ?

Matt. ix. 28, we should expect a Greek text

ΕΛΘΟΝΤΙ ΔΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΟΙΚΙΑΝ
ΠΡΟΧΛΘΟΝ ΑΥΤΩ,

which would become in Latin, as in Cod. D,

ET VENIT IN DOMVM
ET ACCESSERVNT AD EVM,

which rendering reacts and produces

ΚΑΙ ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΟΙΚΙΑΝ
ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΧΛΘΟΝ ΑΥΤΩ.....

Matt. xiii. 4,

ΚΑΙ ΕΛΘΟΝΤΑ ΤΑ ΠΕΤΕΙΝΑ ΚΑΤΕΦΑΓΕΝ ΑΥΤΑ

has been made into

G ★

ΚΑΙ ΗΛΘΟΝ ΤΑ ΠΕΤΕΙΝΑ ΚΑΙ ΚΑΤΕΦΑΓΕΝ ΑΥΤΑ

under the influence of

ET VENERVNT VOLVCHES ET COMEDERVNT EA.

Matt. xvii. 7,

ΚΑΙ ΗΨΑΤΟ ΑΥΤΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΙΠΕΝ
ΕΤ ΤΕΤΙΓΙΤ ΕΟΣ ΕΤ ΔΙΧΙΤ,

where we should have read

ΚΑΙ ΑΨΑΜΕΝΟC ΑΥΤΩΝ ΕΙΠΕΝ.

Matt. xx. 30,

ΗΚΟΥCΑΝ ΟΤΙ ΙΗΣ ΠΑΡΑΓΕΙ
ΚΑΙ ΕΚΡΑΖΑΝ ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕC
ΑΥΔΙΕΡVNT QVOD ΙΗΣ ΤΡΑΝCΙΤ
ΕΤ CΛΑΜΑΥΕΡVNT ΔΙCΕΝΤΕC,

where the primitive Greek would seem to have been ἀκούσαντες...
(—καὶ).

Matt. xxi. 6,

ΕΠΟΙΗCΑΝ.....ΚΑΙ ΗΓΑΓΟΝ

for

ΠΟΙΗCΑΝΤΕC.....ΗΓΑΓΟΝ

because of the Latin

PECERVNT.....ET ADDVXERVNT.

Matt. xxvi. 51,

ΚΑΙ ΕΠΑΤΑΞΕΝ ΤΟΝ ΔΟΥΛΟΝ
ΤΟΥ ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΩC
ΚΑΙ ΑΦΕΙΛΕΝ.....

because of the Latin

ET PERCVSSIT SERVVM
PRINCIPES SACERDOTIS
ET ABSTVLIT.....

John vi. 11,

ΚΑΙ ΕΥΧΑΡΙCΤΗCΕΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΔΩΚΕΝ

for

ΕΥΧΑΡΙCΤΗCΑC ΔΙΕΔΩΚΕΝ.

Sometimes a reviser has taken pains to restore the participial construction in the Latin : e.g. in

John xii. 3,

ERGO MARIA ACCIPIENS LIBRAM PISTICI VNGVENTI
PRETIOSI ET VNXIT PEDES.

Here it is clear that he had at first *accipit* or *accepit* to correspond to the Greek *λαβοῦσα*; first, because he has left the *et* in the second line: and next, because *λαβοῦσα* has been changed to *λαμβάνει* in the Greek.

John xii. 36,

ΚΑΙ ΑΠΕΛΘΩΝ ΕΚΡΥΒΗ ΑΠ' ΑΥΤΩΝ

becomes

ΚΑΙ ΑΠΗΛΘΕΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΚΡΥΒΗ ΑΠ' ΑΥΤΩΝ

under the influence of the Latin

ET ABIIT ET ABSCONDIT SE AB EIS.

Acts xiv. 6,

ΚΥΝΙΔΟΝΤΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΚΑΤΕΦΥΓΟΝ

INTELLEXERVNT ET FUGERVNT,

where *καὶ* is from the Latin.

Luke v. 14,

ΑΠΕΛΘΕ ΔΕ

ΚΑΙ ΔΕΙΞΟΝ ΣΕΑΥΤΟΝ

VADE AVTEM

ET OSTENDE TEIPSVM.

Here the Greek should be *ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν δείξον*.

Luke xv. 23,

ΚΑΙ ΦΑΓΩΜΕΝ

ΚΑΙ ΕΥΦΡΑΝΘΩΜΕΝ

ET MANDUCEMVS

ET AEPVLEMVR,

where we should have *φαγόντες εὐφρανθῶμεν*.

In Mark iv. 36 for

ΚΑΙ ΑΦΕΝΤΕΣ ΤΟΝ ΟΧΛΟΝ ΠΑΡΑΛΑΜΒΑΝΟΥΣΙΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ

the translator has

ET DIMITTUNT TYRBAM * ET ACCEPERVNT EVM,

whence the Greek becomes

ΚΑΙ ΑΦΙΟΥΣΙΝ ΤΟΝ ΟΧΛΟΝ * ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΑΛΑΜΒΑΝΟΥΣΙΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ.

In Mark vii. 25,

ΕΛΘΟΥΣΑ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟCΕΠΕCΕΝ

stands against

INTRAVIT ET PROCEdit.

Obviously the *καὶ* is an intrusion from the Latin.

In Mark x. 16,

ΕΤΙΘΕΙ ΤΑΣ ΧΕΙΡΑΣ ΕΠΙ ΑΥΤΑ
ΚΑΙ ΕΥΛΟΓΕΙ ΑΥΤΑ

for *κατευλόγει τιθείς*, because the Latin was

IMPONEBAT MANVS SVPER ILLOS
ET BENEDICEBAT EOS.

In Mark x. 22,

Ο ΔΕ ΕΣΤΥΓΝΑCΕΝ
ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥΤΩ ΤΩ ΛΟΓΩ ΚΑΙ ΑΠΗΛΘΕΝ
AD ILLE CONTRISTATVS
IN HOC VERBO • ET ABIIT.

The Greek should be *στυγνάσας ἀπῆλθεν*: observe that *est* has been removed from the Latin after *contristatus* in the interests of equality.

In Mark xi. 2 again the change of the Greek is only partial; *καὶ* has been introduced, but the participle left:

ΛΥCΑΝΤΕC ΑΥΤΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΓΑΓΕΤΕ
SOLVITE ILLVM ET ADDVCITE.

So in Mark xiv. 63,

ΔΙΑΡΡΗΞΑC ΤΟΥC ΧΕΙΤΩΝΑC ΑΥΤΟΥ • ΚΑΙ ΛΕΓΕΙ
SCIDIT VESTIMENTA SVA ET AIT,

and Mark xvi. 14,

ΠΟΡΕΥΘΕΝΤΕC ΕΙC ΤΟΝ ΚΟΣΜΟΝ
ΚΑΙ ΚΗΡΥΖΑΤΕ ΤΟ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ.

12. Cases where the Latin has used two verbs to render a single Greek verb, and a corrector has either erased one of the Latin verbs, or has carried over an extra verb into the Greek.

In Mark v. 18

ΠΑΡΕΚΑΛΕΙ ΑΥΤΟΝ
Ο ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΘΕΙC

is translated line by line,

COEPIT DEPRAECARI ILLVM
QVI DEMONIO VEXABATVR,

the imperfect being given as an inchoative. The Greek has then been brought into harmony with it: and so we have in Cod. Bezae

ἤρξατο παρακαλεῖν αὐτόν.

Exactly the same corruption occurs in Mark viii. 25, where

καὶ διεβλεψεν

has been made into

καὶ ἤρξατο ἀναβλεψαί

because the Latin translation was

ET COEPIT VIDERE.

Probably the same thing occurs in Mark xiv. 72,

καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἐκλαίεν.

Whatever *ἐπιβαλὼν* may mean, the Latin is

ET COEPIT FLERE,

which translates *ἐκλαίεν*. Was *ἐπιβαλὼν* then displaced by *ἤρξατο*? For we find in Cod. Bezae

καὶ ἤρξατο κλαίειν.

In the Acts of the Apostles there are a number of cases where the simple *λέγει* and *λέγων* of Greek narration has been expanded in this way; or where *λέγει* has been added to a similar word.

Acts xvii. 6,

βοῶντες καὶ λεγόντες

CLAMANTES ET DICENTES,

where the proper Greek text is merely *βοῶντες*.

Acts xvii. 19,

ἠγάγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ ἀρίον παγὸν

πυρρῶς ἀνόμενοι καὶ λεγόντες

ADDUXERVNT AD ARIVM PAGVM

COGITANTES ET DICENTES.

In the last line *cogitantes* is an error for *rogitantes*; and this free double rendering of the Greek *λέγοντες* has led to the insertion of the words *πυρρῶς ἀνόμενοι καὶ* in the Greek.

In Acts xxi. 39

δαιόμε δε σογ εὐνηωρηται μοι

is rendered

ROGO OBSEURO AVTEM MIHI.

Here *δαιόμε* is by itacism for *δεομαι*, and *δεομαι δε σου* is rendered freely enough, but not unfairly, by *rogo obsecro*. The

reviser of the text, finding these two verbs instead of one, struck out by mistake the word which the translator had used to render *συνχωρῆσαι*.

What we have said of the double translation of verbs applies also to those cases where two words were necessary to render a noun.

Here is a striking instance: in Luke xxii. 12, the translator had to render the word *ἀνώγειον*; he employed a word, which was understood in the Vulgar Latin of the provinces, and especially, it would seem, in Africa, viz. *maenianum*, a word which means an overhanging balcony. The word does not, however, occur in its true form in any of the great Latin Codices, but in the Codex Vercellensis (*a*) it appears in the form *medianum*, both in Mark xiv. 15, and in Luke xxii. 12. This *medianum*, of course, caused trouble, and in the passage from Luke we find Cod. Veronensis (*b*) gives us *pede plano* (on the ground floor), which is a blundering correction of *medianum* as we have it in *a*. This necessitated the addition of an explanatory word to shew what it was that was to be found on the ground floor, and hence many Latin texts add *locum*, and then afterwards the scribes go back and correct the 'ground floor' to *in superioribus* = 'upstairs.'

Now let us turn to Codex Bezae, where we find a bold correction; *medianum* is replaced by *superiorem domum*. We have now two Latin words for one Greek word, so the scribe quietly inserts *οἶκον* after *ἀνώγειον*.

We have given this instance at length, on account of the peculiarly interesting ramification of the Latin texts over a hard word. The special case of the change in the Greek in Cod. D is very simple and easily betrays itself¹. We shall have many similar cases as we proceed.

13. Cases where the aorist participle or aorist imperative has been rendered by the Latin present participle or present imperative; and subsequent reflex action on the Greek.

¹ For *maenianum* cf. Linke, *Studien zur Itala*, Breslau, 1889, p. 28. The parallel passage Mark xiv. 15 is instructive in its various forms in the Old Latin. In particular Codex Bezae has here *ἀνάγειον οἶκον ἐστρωμένον μέγαν ἐταίμον* although both *medianum* and *superiorem locum* have disappeared from the Latin.

Acts xiv. 21,

ΕΓΑΓΓΕΛΙΖΟΜΕΝΟΙ ΔΕ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΠΟΛΕΙ

has been made out of

ΕΓΑΓΓΕΛΙΣΑΜΕΝΟΙ.....

because the Latin translator had, of necessity, unless he had resorted to the use of the finite verb, rendered by

EVANGELIZANTES AVTEM IN ILLA CIVITATE.

In Acts xvi. 29 I believe a similar error once occurred in Western copies:

ΦΩΤΑ ΔΕ ΕΤΗΣΑΣ ΕΙΣΕΠΗΛΗΣΕΝ,

the translator gives

LVMEN VERO PETENS ACCVVRIT.

If this *petens* had changed *αἰτήσας* of the Greek into *αἰτῶν*, it would easily have been read *ἄπτων*, which underlies the Syriac rendering; and in some respects seems to be a superior reading.

Matt. x. 27,

ΚΗΡΥΣΣΕΤΑΙ ΕΠΙ ΤΩΝ ΔΩΜΑΤΩΝ

PRAEDICATE IN TECTIS,

where we ought to have, not *κηρύσσετε* but *κηρύξατε*.

Matt. xiii. 22,

Ο ΔΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΑΣ ΑΚΑΝΘΑΣ ΣΤΕΙΡΟΜΕΝΟΣ

QVI AVTEM IN SPINIS SEMINATIVR,

the word *σπαρείς* in the first line having been replaced by one more exactly correspondent to the Latin.

In the same way in Matt. xiii. 24, *σπείραντι*, which was translated *seminanti*, has given way before the Latin, and we have

ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩ ΣΤΕΙΡΟΝΤΙ • ΚΑΛΟΝ ΣΠΕΡΜΑ

HOMINI SEMINANTI BONVM SEMEN.

Luke ii. 16,

ΣΤΕΥΛΟΝΤΕΣ ΚΑΙ ΕΥΡΟΝ ΤΗΝ ΜΑΡΙΑΝ

FESTINANTES ET INVENERVNT MARIAM.

Here *festinantes* stands for *σπεύσαντες* and the Greek has been assimilated to the translation.

Luke ii. 45,

ΚΑΙ ΜΗ ΕΥΡΙΣΚΟΝΤΕΣ ΥΠΕΣΤΡΕΨΑΝ
ET NON INVENIENTES REVERSI SVNT.

Here *εὐρίσκοντες* stands for *εὐρόντες*, which of necessity was represented by the present participle in the Latin.

In Luke xix. 27 we find a similar difficulty with the infinitive:

ΤΟΥΣ ΜΗ ΘΕΛΟΝΤΑΣ ΜΕ
ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΕΙΝ
QVI NOLVERVNT ME
REGNARE.

Here we should have expected *βασιλεύσαι*: but the reason for the change is not far to seek.

So again in Luke xx. 6, the Latin having given

SCIT ENIM
IOHANNEN PROPHETAM FVISSE,

where the Greek had *εἶναι*, the corrector has given us *γεγονέναι* as a more exact answer to *fuisse*.

Luke xxii. 9,

ΕΙΣΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΩΝ
ΥΜΩΝ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΠΟΛΙΝ

for *εἰσελθόντων*

because the Latin is

INTROEVNTIBVS
VOBIS IN CIVITATEM.

14. Confusion caused by the attempt to translate the articular infinitive in Greek.

We may take as an instance Mark xiv. 55,

ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΘΑΝΑΤΩΣΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΝ,

which was rightly rendered

VT MORTI TRADERENT EVM,

after which it goes back into Greek as

ΙΝΑ ΘΑΝΑΤΩΣΟΥΣΙΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ.

In Acts iii. 12 we have the following confusion

ΩΣ ΗΜΩΝ ΤΗ ΙΔΙΑ ΔΥΝΑΜΙ Η ΕΥΧΕΒΙΑ
ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΕΠΟΙΗΚΟΤΩΝ ΤΟΥ ΤΟ ΠΕΡΙΠΑΤΕΙΝ ΑΥΤῸ
QVASI NOS NOSTRA PROPRIA VIRTUTE AVT PIETATE
HOC FECERIMVS VT AMBVLET HIC.

In order to resolve the confusion, observe that in iii. 19 the articular infinitive is rendered by the equation $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o} = ad\ hoc\ ut$. Hence in the present case we have $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ rendered by *hoc ut ambulet*.

Then the words are displaced, and the Greek is corrected until we get the Bezan sentence.

Acts iii. 26,

ΕΝ Τ ΑΠΟC
ΤΡΕΦΕΙΝ ΕΚΑCΤΟC ΕΚ ΤΩΝ ΠΟΝΗΡΙΩΝ ΥΜΩΝ
IN EO CVM ABERTATUR VNVSQVISQVE A NEQVITIIS BVIS,

the Greek $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$ has been changed so as to match the Latin *unusquisque*.

With this error take the similar one, Acts xviii. 2,

ΔΙΔ ΤΟ ΤΕΤΑΧΕΝΑΙ ΚΛΑΥΔΙΟC
EO QVOD PRAECEPISSET CLAVDIVS.

15. Translation of the subjunctive after $\omicron\upsilon\ \mu\eta$.

This very strong form of denial is rendered in the Latin by a future indicative: hence we shall find the subjunctive in Greek replaced by an indicative: e.g.

Mark x. 15,

ΟΥ ΜΗ ΕΙC ΑΥΤΗΝ ΕΙCΕΛΕΥCΕΤΑΙ
NON INTRAVIT IN ILLVM.

16. Translation of a Greek infinitive by *ut* with the subjunctive: and converse case of a Latin infinitive for $\delta\tau\iota$ with the indicative.

Mark v. 17,

ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΕΚΑΛΟΥΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ
ΙΝΑ ΑΠΕΛΘΗ
ET ROGABANT EVM
VT DISCEDERET,

where we should read $\alpha\pi\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, if it were not for the Latin.

Mark vi. 49 the original text seems to be

ΕΔΟΞΑΝ ΟΤΙ ΦΑΝΤΑCΜΑ ΕCΤΙΝ,

and the Bezan Latin is

PVTAVERVNT FANTASMA ESSE.

Hence the Bezan Greek

ΕΔΟΞΑΝ ΦΑΝΤΑCΜΑ ΕΙΝΑΙ.

17. Changes of compound verbs to simple, and conversely, with a view to greater harmony between Greek and Latin.

Matt. ix. 25,

ΕΛΘΩΝ ΕΚΡΑΤΗΣΕΝ
VENIENS TENVIT.

There is reason to believe the true reading to be *εἰσελθών*, but the translator rendered it by *veniens*, and a reviser erased the Greek prefix.

Matt. x. 25,

ΒΕΛΖΕΒΟΥΛ ΚΑΛΟΥΣΙΝ
BELZEBVL VOCANT,

where we ought to read *ἐπεκάλεσαν*.

Matt. xvi. 23,

Ο ΔΕ ΕΠΙΣΤΡΑΦΕΙΣ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΤΩ ΠΕΤΡΩ,

where we should have *στραφεῖς*, the Latin being

QVI AVTEM CONVERSVS AIT PETRO.

John iv. 45,

ΕΞΕΔΕΞΑΝΤΟ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΟΙ ΓΑΛΙΛΑΙΟΙ
EXCEPERVNT EVM GALILAEI,

the simple form *ἐδέξαντο* being not close enough in appearance to its Latin rendering.

18. Confusion of the Vulgar Latin present with the future in the third person singular.

In John xii. 25 we should read

Ο ΦΙΛΩΝ ΤΗΝ ΨΥΧΗΝ ΑΠΟΛΛΥΕΙ ΑΥΤΗΝ

for which the Latin is

QVI AMAT ANIMAM SVAM PERDET EAM.

Here *perdet* is a late form of the present tense; but it has the form of the Latin future: so we get *ἀπολέσει* written in the Greek.

This confusion between the *e* and *i* vowels is very common both in the verb-endings and in the plurals of nouns, and has given rise to many variants in the Latin and by reflection from the Latin text to the Greek. For instance in John vi. 56

Ο ΤΡΩΓΩΝ ΜΟΥ ΤΗΝ ΣΑΡΚΑ • ΚΑΙ ΠΕΙΝΩΝ ΜΟΥ
 ΤΟ ΑΙΜΑ • ΕΝ ΕΜΟΙ ΜΕΝΕΙ
 QVI EDET MEAM CARNEM ET VIBET MEVM
 SANGVEM IN ME MANET

we have an apparent future in the Latin twice, and in Mark xiv. 21

Ο ΜΕΝ ΥΙΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ ΠΑΡΑΔΙΔΟΤΕ
 FILIVS QVIDEM HOMINIS TRADETUR.

But here there has been no reaction upon the Greek.

19. Confusion between the two meanings of *quam*.

The reviser of the MS. had a prejudice in favour of regarding *quam* as a feminine form. Hence we find, Matt. xi. 22,

ΑΝΕΚΤΟΤΕΡΟΝ ΕΣΤΕ • ΕΝ ΗΜΕΡΑ ΚΡΕΙΣΣΩΣ ΗΝ ΥΜΕΙ
 TOLERABILIVS ERIT • IN DIE IVDICII QVAM VOBIS,

where ἡ has been changed to ἦν in the Greek.

The same form occurs again in v. 24.

20. Confusion between *qui* and *quia*.

The scribe is constantly in peril of a confusion between these forms, especially when the word that follows begins with an *a*.

Acts ii. 6,

QVIAVDIEBANT VNVSQVISQVE.

Here it should be *quia*: but the Latin was misunderstood, and then the Greek, instead of

ΟΤΙ ΗΚΟΥΣΕΝ ΕΙΣ ΕΚΑΚΤΟC,

becomes

ΚΑΙ ΗΚΟΥΟΝ ΕΙC ΕΚΑΚΤΟC.

Notice at the same time the harmonization of the Greek and Latin verbs.

Acts vii. 39,

ΟΤΙ ΟΥΚ ΗΘΕΛΗCΑΝ ΥΠΗΚΟΟΙ ΓΕΝΕCΘΕ
 CVI NOLVERVNT OBOEDIENTES ESSE,

where *cui* has been read as *quia*, and the correct reading ϕ turned to ψ .

Sometimes the scribe himself is aware of the danger his text is in, and he places a distinguishing point in the text: e.g.

Acts xiv. 27,

ΚΑΙ ΟΤΙ ΗΝΥΞΕ
ET QVIA • APERVIT.

The object of this point is, not to divide the sentence but to secure the reader or transcriber from reading it as *qui aperuit*. If the point had not been placed there we should probably have had a Greek variant

ΚΑΙ ΟC ΗΝΥΞΕ.

21. Cases where a false translation has been carried back from the Latin into the Greek.

Matt. xv. 11,

ΑΚΟΥΕΤΑΙ ΚΑΙ CΥΝΪΕΤΕ • ΟΥ ΠΑΝ ΤΟ ΕΙCΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟ
ΕΙC ΤΟ CΤΟΜΑ • ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙ ΤΟΝ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΝ

is the equivalent of

AVDITE ET INTELLIGITE • NON OMNE QVOD INTRAT
IN OS COMMVNICAT HOMINEM.

Here two Greek words have evidently been confused, namely, *κοινῶ* and *κοινωνέω*; no doubt the true text is *κοινοῖ*, but whether because *coinquinat* (= *coincuinat*) has been read as *communicat*, or because *communicat* actually had acquired the supplementary meaning of pollution, the Greek text has been reformed so as to give the normal equivalent of *communicat*.

The same mistake will be found in *v.* 20.

In a similar manner when we find in Acts xxi. 28

ΚΑΙ ΕΚΟΙΝΩΝΗΣΕΝ ΤΟΝ ΑΓΙΟΝ ΤΟΠΟΝ ΤΟΥΤΟΝ

and

ET COMMVNICAVIT SANCTVM LOCVM HVNC,

we must substitute *κεκοίνωκεν*, or at all events the aorist *ἐκοίνωσεν*, for the text as given in the Beza Codex. The instance which we have been discussing was pointed out by Mill.

22. Cases where the corrector has substituted in the Greek a more exact equivalent of the Latin, although the Latin translator had really done his best to render the word.

Acts xix. 8,

ΕΙCΕΛΘΩΝ ΔΕ Ο ΠΑΥΛΟC ΕΙC ΤΗΝ CΥΝΑΓΩΓΗΝ
ΕΝ ΔΥΝΑΜΕΙ ΜΕΓΑΛΗ ΕΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑΖΕΤΟ.

Here the Latin text is conflate;

CVM INTROISSET AVTEM PAVLVS IN SYNAGOGA
CVM FIDV CIA MAGNA PALAM LOQVEBATVR.

A reference to Mark viii. 32 will shew that *palam loqui* is an attempt to render *παρρησιάζεσθαι*: but *cum fiducia magna loqui* is another attempt at the same thing, and apparently the first translation: it has given rise to *ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλη* in the Greek.

Another case where the conflation of two possible Latin renderings has produced a corresponding conflation in the Greek is Acts xx. 18.

It should run

ὥς δὲ παρεγενοντο πρὸς αὐτον
εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς,

the first line of which was rendered in two ways:

AD VBI VENERVNT AD EVM

and

SIMVLQVE CVM ESSET (=ESSENT),

and the Greek accordingly adds at the beginning of the second line

ὁμῶς ἐόντων αὐτῶν.

In Acts xxii. 23 the translator has had before him

καὶ κονιορτον βαλλόντων εἰς τὸν αἶρα

he rendered the last word *in caelum* as it was perfectly right to do, *caelum* being the regular equivalent; and the corrector carried back the word into the Greek in a more exact form, and substituted *οὐρανόν*. True, the Latin text is lost here, but the Greek tells its own tale.

The converse correction will be found in Matt. xvi. 3,

τυρραζει γὰρ στυγνάζων ὁ ἀηρ.

In Matt. xvii. 15, the words

καὶ κακῶς ἔχει

would seem to be rightly translated by

7

ET MALE PATITVR.

Must it not then be by reflex action that we find in Cod. D

καὶ κακῶς πασχει?

In Luke ii. 6 the text may be taken

ἐπληρώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι,

which the scribe rendered

CONSUMMATI SUNT DIES;

but *consummati sunt* would be more nearly the equivalent of ἐτελέσθησαν, which is placed in the Bezan text. A still stronger correction is made in verse 21, where we have συνετελέσθησαν.

In Luke iv. 5 the translator rendered

πᾶσας τὰς βασιλείας
τῆς οἰκουμένης

by

OMNIA REGNA
MUNDI,

and then because κόσμος, forsooth, is the proper word for *mundus*, we have the Greek

τοῦ κόσμου.

In Acts xvi. 34 the translator was obliged to use a periphrasis for πανοικί and so he gave, properly enough,

ET EXULTABAT CUM TOTA DOMU SUA,

and the Greek takes this up, and we have, instead of the original πανοικί,

καὶ ἠγαλλιάτο σὺν τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ.

In Mark iii. 5 the scribe had done his best to render πάρωσις by means of the verb *emorior*, which means not merely to die, but to become void of feeling (cf. Celsus v. 28. 14: *clavus...saepe emoritur*); but the reviser put the more exact equivalent νέκρωσις into the text: hence

ΕΠΙ Τῇ ΝΕΚΡΩΣΕΙ ΤΗΣ ΚΑΡΔΙΑΣ Αὐτῶν
SUPER EMORTVA CORDIS EORVM.

In the very next verse he rendered συμβούλιον ἐδίδουν by *consilium faciebant*, and again the Greek was corrected,

ΣΥΝΒΟΥΛΙΟΝ ΠΟΙΟΥΝΤΕΣ ΚΑΤ' Αὐτοῦ
CONSILIVM FACIEBANT ADVERSVS .EVM.

If in Mark iv. 21 the accepted reading is

ΜΗΤΙ ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙ Ο ΛΥΧΝΟΣ,

then we must say that, by some confusion between *accedo* and *accendo*, the text of Cod. D has become:

ΜΗΤΙ ΑΠΙΤΕΤΑΙ Ο ΛΥΧΝΟΣ
NVM QVID ACCENDITVR LVCCERNA,

where, however, we can hardly help feeling that the Beza text ought to be right. In any case the variants find their motive in the Latin.

In Mark viii. 2

ΠΡΟΣΜΕΝΟΥCΙΝ ΜΟΙ

has been freely paraphrased by

EX QVO HIC SVNT;

and word for word it goes back into the Greek

ΑΠΟ ΠΟΤΕ ΩΔΕ ΕΙCΙΝ.

In the very next verse, the translator gave

DE LONGE VENERVNT,

as translation of

ΑΠΟ ΜΑΚΡΟΘΕΝ ΕΙCΙΝ,

and then *εἰσίν* is displaced by *ἤκασιν*.

In Mark viii. 13 *ἐμβάς* is expanded for Latin readers to

ASCENDIT IN NAVEM,

and hence

ΕΝΒΑC ΕΙC ΤΟ ΠΛΟΙΟΝ.

In Mark vi. 36, we find

ΙΝΑ ΑΠΕΛΘΟΝΤΕC ΕΙC ΤΟΥC ΕΓΓΙCΤΑ ΑΓΡΟΥC
VT ΕΥΝΤΕC • ΙΝ ΠΡΟΧΙΜΑC VILLΑC.

The translator rendered *τοὺς κύκλῳ ἀγροὺς* by *in proximas villas*: but *proximas* did not seem a near enough equivalent to the Greek, so the reviser has given us *ἐγγιστα*.

In Mark vi. 39 the idiomatic *συνπόσια*, *συνπόσια* was translated *secundum contubernia*; and we have in the Bezan Greek

ΚΑΤΑ ΤΗΝ CΥΝΠΟCΙΑΝ.

Mark vi. 47 gives us

IN MEDIO MARE

as the translation of a primitive

EN ΜΕΣΩ ΤΗΣ ΘΑΛΑΣΣΗΣ.

Harmony is restored by reading, as in Cod. Bezae,

EN ΜΕΣΗ ΤΗ ΘΑΛΑΣΣΗ.

Mark vii. 4 reads

ΚΑΙ ΑΠ' ΑΓΟΡΑΣ ΟΤΑΝ ΕΛΘΩΣΙΝ

ET CUM VENERINT A FORO.

It would seem that the Latin is the free rendering of ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς, and that the two last words in Greek are an addition for the sake of equivalence. But perhaps the added words are a gloss of some later hand, and not of the translator; in the Arabic Tatian Harmony we have a different explanation, viz. *quod emptum est*; i.e. they wash what they buy from the market. It is clear that the abrupt ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς puzzled the translators.

In Mark xi. 32 the scribe translated

ΟΤΙ ΟΝΤΩΣ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ ΗΝ

by

QUIA VERE PROFETA ERAT,

but a more exact equivalent of *vere* was ἀληθῶς, which accordingly is put in the Greek.

Acts iv. 21, the passage to be translated was

ΜΗ ΕΥΡΙΣΚΟΝΤΕΣ ΤΟ ΠΩΣ ΚΟΛΑCΩΝΤΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΥC,

and the writer gave

NIHIL INVENIENTES CAUSAM QVA PVNIRENT EOS,

inserting *causam* just as the Coptic and Syriac versions do, in order to express the meaning more closely. Then αἰτίαν creeps into the Greek after εὐρίσκοντες.

23. Omission of such words as *ἡμέρα* in the Greek descriptions of time.

Acts xvi. 11,

ΚΑΙ ΤΗ ΕΠΙΘΥΓΗ ΕΙC ΝΕΑΠΟΛΙΝ,

the proper Latin of which is

ET SEQUENTI DIE NEAPOLIM;

and now *ἡμέρα* must be restored to the Greek, so that we have

καὶ τῇ ἐπιοῦσῃ ἡμέρᾳ εἰς νεαπολιν.

Acts iv. 5,

εἰγένετο δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν αὐρίον ἡμέραν,

where the word *ἡμέραν* has been brought in from the Latin

CONTIGIT AUTEM IN CRASTINUM DIEM.

Another way of removing the apparent inequality is to strike out *diem* in the Latin: we find in Acts iv. 3,

καὶ ἔθεντο εἰς τήρησιν εἰς τὴν ἐπαύριον
ET POSVERUNT IN ADERTIONEM IN CRASTINUM.

Matt. xxviii. 15

ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας

for

IN HOERNVM DIEM,

where *ἡμέρας* is borrowed from the Latin.

With these cases we may notice Mark vi. 2, where

καὶ γενομένου σαββάτου

has been rendered

ET DIE SABBATORVM,

and hence the Greek becomes

καὶ ἡμέρα σαββάτων.

With the foregoing we may take the cases of translation of *τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ* and similar expressions. We shall find that the Latin translator renders such a term as *τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ* by *post tres dies*, or *post tertium diem*. When, therefore, the reviser with his little Latin and less Greek goes over the text, he finds an apparent discord between the languages; although the translator meant by *post tertium diem* the third day after. And so he corrects the Greek.

Hence in Matt. xvi. 21 we have

καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται
ET POST TRES DIES RESVRGERE.

Matt. xvii. 23,

καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἐγερθῇσεται
ET POST TRES DIES RESVRGET.

Acts x. 40,

ΤΟΥΤΟΝ Ο ΘΣ ΗΓΕΙΡΕΝ ΜΕΤΑ ΤΗΝ ΤΡΙΤΗΝ ΗΜΕΡΑΝ
HVNΘ ΔΣ ΣΥΣCITAVIT POST TERTIVM DIEVM.

In all these cases the correct reading would seem to be established as τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

The argument is, however, complicated by the fact that in Mark viii. 31 we find

ΜΕΤΑ ΤΡΕΙΣ ΗΜΕΡΑΣ ΑΝΑCΤΗΝΑΙ
ET TERTIA DIE RESVRGERE.

Here codices *a k*, which may be suspected to contain our most archaic Latin text, read *post tertium diem*: so there has been, in all probability, a correction made on the Latin side. But the matter will require a closer enquiry, both in the Greek and Latin.

24. Further cases of elliptical expression in the Greek, where the Latin text has proved a reactionary influence.

In Acts xiii. 22 the text should run

ΕΥΡΟΝ ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΤΟΝ ΙΕCCAΙ,

which is rendered

INVENI DAVID FILIVM IESSAE,

the Latin language not favouring the omission of *filius*. Hence we have *υἱόν* carried over into the Greek

ΕΥΡΟΝ ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΤΟΝ ΥΙΟΝ ΙΕCCAΙ.

In John xxi. 2,

ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΤΟΥ ΖΕΒΕΔΑΙΟΥ

becomes

ET FILI ZEBEDAËI,

and so the Greek replaces τοῦ by υἱό.

25. Confusion between ἄλλα and ἀλλά.

If we turn to Matt. xx. 23 we shall see that the translator or reviser does not always feel sure about his Greek, where ἀλλά and ἄλλα could be confounded one with the other; for he renders

ΟΥΚ ΕCΤΙΝ ΕΜΟΝ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΔΟΥΝΑΙ
ΑΛΛΟΙC ΗΤΟΙΜΑCΤΑΙ

by

NON EST MEVM DARE
ALIIS PRAEPARATVM EST,

and we may very well ask whether there is any case of reflection upon the Greek text from such misunderstandings in the Latin. Let us look at John vi. 23; probably the original was

ἀλλὰ ἦλθεν πλοῖαρι,

but here ἀλλὰ was read as ἄλλα and rendered

ALIAE NAVICVLAE VENERVNT;

and then, to prevent any further mistake or misunderstanding in the Greek, the text is changed to

ἀλλῶν πλοιαρείων ἐλθόντων.

26. Translator's use of *tunc* for καί.

The translator has often avoided the monotony of the sentences connected by καί, by using *tunc* as a substitute, with the ultimate effect either of displacing καί by τότε, or, at all events, of pushing τότε into the Greek text:

e.g. Mark i. 36,

καὶ κατεδίωξαν αὐτον
τοτε CIMΩΝ καὶ οἱ μετ αὐτοῦ
ET CONSECVTI SVNT EVM
TVNC SIMON ET QVI CVM EO ERANT.

Here *tunc* has got into the Greek in the second line, and hence we have both readings in Greek and Latin.

Mark ix. 35,

τοτε καθίκαC ἐφώνηCεν τοῦC • IB •
TVNC CONSEDIT ET VOCAVIT • XII •,

where τότε stands for a primitive καί.

Mark xiv. 27 is a similar case,

τοτε λεγει αὐτοῖC ο̅ ιηC,

and the same thing occurs in Mark xiv. 34.

We shall now pass on to give a series of similar Latinizations which do not so readily admit of being grouped together.

CHAPTER X.

FURTHER CASES OF LATINIZATION.

THE previous chapter contains a spicilegium of the cases of Latinization which occur in the Codex Bezae. A few further instances are to be given which do not so readily admit of classification.

In Matt. v. 24 the Bezan reading is

ΚΑΙ ΤΟΤΕ ΕΛΘΩΝ
ΠΡΟΣΦΕΡΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΔΩΡΟΝ ΣΟΥ,

where *προσφέρεις* for *πρόσφερε* is due to the spelling of the Latin:

ET TVNC VENIENS
OFFERES MVNVS TVVM.

This case was pointed out by Wetstein.

Matt. v. 40,

ΚΑΙ Ο ΘΕΛΩΝ ΣΟΙ ΚΡΙΘΗΝΑΙ
ΚΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΧΕΙΤΩΝΑ ΣΟΥ ΛΑΒΕΙΝ
QVI VOLVERET IVDICIO CONGREDI
ET TVNICAM TVAM ACCIPERE :

upon which Middleton remarks (p. 481) "This has strongly the appearance of being a rendering from *qui uoluerit* (i.e. *ὁ θέλων* for *τῷ θέλοντι*) by some one who did not look forward to the end of the sentence."

In Matt. v. 46,

ΤΙΝΑ ΜΕΙΣΘΟΝ ΕΖΕΤΑΙ
QVAM MERCEDEM HABEBETIS.

Here *habetetis* is apparently a dittograph for *habetis*, but it has been read as a future; and the Greek altered to correspond. Of the change in the Greek there seems no doubt; there is, however,

some reason for believing that the Latin error is not palaeographical, but belongs to the dialect of the translator, who used a reduplicative form of the verb *habeo*. We shall return to this point later on.

A curious case which seems to be traceable to Latinization is Matt. ix. 20,

καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνὴ αἱμορροοῦσα δώδεκα ἔτη
ET ECCE MULIER FLUXVM SANGVINIS HABENS XII ANNIS.

Here *fluxum sanguinis habens* is the equivalent of αἱμορροοῦσα. Knowing what we do of the mode of structure and reformation of the Greek text, we feel sure that *habens* would in time be carried over as ἔχουσα. But if it were, it would certainly be attached to δώδεκα ἔτη, and then we should not be surprised at the reading which we find in Codex L,

δώδεκα ἔτη ἔχουσα ἐν τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ.

This reading is not in our MS, though Stephen refers it to β: he often confounds Codices D and L. But it seems to be an error of the same kind as those which we are studying.

Matt. x. 30,

ὧμων δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς,
SED ET CAPILLI CAPITIS VESTRI,

has been corrected by carrying ὧμων to the end of the sentence and translating *sed et* by ἀλλὰ καί.

Hence

ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ὧμων.

In Matt. xiii. 29 the correct text would seem to be

ἐκρίζωχτε ἀμὰ ἀγτοῖς τὸν σίτον,

which is very well rendered

ERADICETIS SIMVL ET TRITICVM CVM EIS.

This goes back to the Greek as

ἐκρίζωχτε ἀμὰ καὶ τὸν σίτον σὺν ἀγτοῖς.

In the same chapter the translator has twice to find a proper translation for ὅσα.

In Matt. xiii. 44 he renders ὅσα ἔχει very well by *omnia quae habet*; and the Greek takes up the added word and appears as

παντα οσα εχει.

In v. 46 he rendered ὅσα εἶχεν by

QVAE HABEBAT,

and this time the Greek is corrected to

ΑΠΕΛΘΩΝ ΕΠΩΛΗΣΕΝ Α ΕΙΧΕΝ.

In Matt. xiii. 48

ΗΝ ΟΤΕ ΕΠΛΗΡΩΘΗ • ΑΝΕΒΙΒΑΝΤΕΣ

has been rendered

CVM AVTEM INPLETA FVERIT • EDVCENT EAM,

and then the Greek changes to the Beza reading

ΟΤΕ ΔΕ ΕΠΛΗΡΩΘΗ • ΑΝΕΒΙΒΑΝ ΑΥΤΗΝ.

In Matt. xviii. 9 the translator, with pardonable freedom, has prefaced a new clause by the word *similiter*,

SIMILITER • ET SI OCVLVS TVVS • SCANDALIZAT TE,

and an attempt has been made to render the added word by the prefixing of τὸ αὐτὸ to the Greek

ΤΟ ΑΥΤΟ ΕΙ ΚΑΙ Ο ΟΦΘΑΛΜΟΣ ΣΟΥ ΣΚΑΝΔΑΛΙΖΕΙ ΣΕ.

In Matt. xviii. 22,

ΟΥ ΛΕΓΩ ΣΟΙ ΕΩΣ ΕΠΤΑΚΙΣ

ΑΛΛ ΕΩΣ ΕΒΔΟΜΗΚΟΝΤΑΚΙΣ ΕΠΤΑΚΙΣ

NON DICO TIBI SEPTIES

SED SEPTVAGIES SEPTIES.

Here the African Latin usage is perfectly correct; as we may see from Capella, VII. § 737, "sexies septuagesies dipondius facit quadringentos trigies dipondius." But the Greek text had ἑπτὰ for ἑπτάκις in the second line, the Latin usage being to say "seventy times seven times," and the Greek "seventy times seven." The reviser, then, seeing that *septies* in one line stood for ἑπτάκις and in the next for ἑπτά, has corrected the Greek text to the form in which we have given it above.

In Matt. xix. 28

ΚΑΘΙΣΕΘΕ ΚΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΙ

has been made into

ΚΑΘΙΣΕΘΕ ΚΑΙ ΥΜΕΙΣ

because the Latin, properly enough, had given

SEDEBITIS ET VOS.

In Matt. xx. 17 I suspect the true text to be

ΜΕΛΛΩΝ ΔΕ ΑΝΑΒΑΙΝΕΙΝ Ο ΙΗΣ.

To translate this exactly would have required a participial periphrasis; hence the Latin

ET ASCENDENS IHS HIEROSOLYMA,

from which the Greek

ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΒΑΙΝΩΝ Ο ΙΗΣ.

In Matt. ii. 9 it seems as if in rendering

ΕΙΤΑΝΩ ΟΥ ΗΝ ΤΟ ΠΑΙΔΙΟΝ

by

SVpra pvervm,

which it must be allowed is not a very close translation, the way had been made for the Greek corrector to write

ΕΙΤΑΝΩ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΙΔΙΟΥ

which is the Bezan reading.

A few verses on there is another instance where the scribe had to render the words τὸ παιδίον several times; he gave *puer* as the equivalent, but in these cases, Matt. ii. 13, 14, 20, the corrector substituted in the Greek the more exact equivalent τὸν παῖδα.

In Matt. xv. 9,

ΠΟΡΡΩ ΑΠΕΧΕΙ ΑΠ ΕΜΟΥ

was rendered

LONGE EST A ME,

with the result that ἐστίν displaces ἀπέχει in the Greek.

In Matt. xv. 27,

ΚΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΤΑ ΚΥΝΑΡΙΑ
ΕΧΘΙΟΥCΙΝ ΑΠΟ ΤΩΝ ΨΕΙΧΩΝ,

where the Latin is

ET CANIS ENIM
EDENT DE MICIS,

the plural verb in Greek has been produced by the parallel Latin verb in the corresponding line.

In Matt. x. 42 we have a case where the Latin translator

has translated ψυχρὸν by *aqua frigida*, with the effect of forcing back *aqua* on the Greek text¹.

ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΥΔΑΤΟΣ ΨΥΧΡΟΥ * ΕΙΣ ΟΝΟΜΑ ΜΑΘΗΤΟΥ
CALICEM AQUAE FRIGIDAE IN NOMINE DISCIPULI.

In Luke xiii. 35 the translator seems to have used a little freedom in rendering ἕως εἰπητε, by

DONEC VENIAT VT DICATIS,

and the Greek becomes

ΕΩΣ ΗΞΕΙ
ΟΤΕ ΕΙΠΗΤΕ.

In Luke xii. 51 he rendered δοῦναι εἰρήνην by *pacem facere*: and the Bezan Greek shews

ΔΟΚΕΙΤΕ ΟΤΙ ΕΙΡΗΝΗΝ ΠΑΡΕΓΕΝΟΜΗΝ
ΠΟΙΗΣΑΙ.

In Acts xii. 15 we have the passage

ΟΙ ΔΕ ΕΛΕΓΟΝ ΠΡΟΣ ΑΥΤΗΝ
Ο ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΣΤΙΝ

prettily translated by

QUI AVTEM DIXERVNT AD EAM
FORSITAM ANGELVS EIVS EST.

And *forsitan* goes back into the Greek as *τυχόν*.

Bearing in mind the equivalence between these two words in the translator's or reviser's mind, we can explain Luke xx. 13

ΤΥΧΟΝ ΤΟΥΤΟΝ
ΕΝΤΡΑΠΗΧΟΝΤΑΙ
FORSITAM HVNC
REVEREBVNTVR.

The Greek should read ἵσως, but the other was the reviser's word.

In Acts iii. 22,

ΕΚ ΤΩΝ ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ ΗΜΩΝ
ΩΣ ΕΜΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΑΚΟΥΣΕΘΑΙ
DE FRATRIBVS VESTRIS
TAMQVAM ME IPSVM AVDIETIS.

¹ Wetstein, *Proleg.* p. 32.

Here the Latin is perfectly correct, if we place a point between *me* and *ipsum*: but the reviser has run the two words together, and corrected the Greek from ὡς ἐμέ αὐτοῦ to ὡς ἐμοῦ αὐτοῦ; i.e. "you shall hear him as if it were myself."

It is instructive to notice that in c. vii. 37, where the same quotation occurs, the text has been fortified against misunderstanding by a point as well as by the line-division, and we have

DE FRATRIBVS VESTRIS TAMQVAM ME.
IPSVM AVDIETIS,

and no error in the Greek.

In Matt. xxv. 10, where the Greek

ἀπερχομένων δε αὐτῶν ἀγοράσαι

has been translated by

CVM VADUNT EMERE,

a corrector has concluded that a more exact equivalent of the Latin would be

ΕΩΣ ΥΠΑΓΟΥΣΙΝ ΑΓΟΡΑΣΑΙ.

In Matt. xxvii. 65 and 66,

φυλάκας and μετὰ τῶν φυλάκων

stand for

κοῦστῳδιαν and μετὰ τῆς κοῦστῳδιας

because the Latin is

CVSTODES and CVM CVSTODIBVS.

In Luke viii. 30 the text probably stood

πολλὰ γὰρ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς αὐτὸν δαίμονια,

which, no doubt, was rendered

MVLTA ENIM INIERANT DAEMONIA.

But *enim inierant* easily became *enim erant*, and then the Greek was corrected to

πολλὰ γὰρ ἦσαν δαίμονια.

In Luke xxiv. 44 the translator had nothing in Latin to answer to the Greek ὧν, and of course he paraphrased

ΕΤΙ ΩΝ CYN ΥΜΙΝ

into

CVM ESSEM VOBISCVM.

The Bezan Greek now stands

ΕΝ Ω ΗΜΗΝ ΣΥΝ ἸΜΕΙΝ.

In Matt. xxviii. 19,

ΜΑΘΗΤΕΥCΑΤΕ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑ ΕΘΝΗ
ΒΑΠΤΙCΑΝΤΕC ΑΥΤΟΥC
ΔΟCΕΤΕ ΟΜΝΕC ΓΕΝΤΕC
ΒΑΠΤΙΖΑΝΤΕC ΕΟC,

we might maintain that *βαπτίζαντες* was rightly translated by *baptizantes*: but it may be suggested on the other hand, in view of the occurrence of *βαπτίζοντες* in all other copies except the Vatican Codex, that the Greek reading (for the Latin is certainly right) is due to assonance.

In Mark i. 10 the scribe had to render

ΕΙΔΕΝ CΧΙΖΟΜΕΝΟΥC ΤΟΥC ΟΥΡΑΝΟΥC,

for which he gave

VIDIT APERTOS CAELOS.

Hence the Greek *ἡνυγμένους*.

In Mark i. 16,

ΑΜΦΙΒΑΛΛΟΝΤΑC ΕΝ ΤΗ ΘΑΛΑCCH

would naturally be rendered

MITTENTES RETE IN MARE.

The elliptical Greek is brought to order by inserting *τὰ δίκτυα* over against the Vulgar Latin *retias*. (Note that the Vulgar Latin turned the neuter plurals into feminine singulars; thus in the present case the word for 'a net' is not *rete* but *retia*. A good deal of confusion arises from this peculiarity.) This is not a case of assimilation to Matthew *βάλλονταc ἀμφίβληστρον*, but, even if it were, the Latinization remains, for *ἀμφίβληστρον* has been replaced by *τὰ δίκτυα*, which must be under the influence of the form *retia*.

In Mark v. 15 the translator rendered *τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον* by *illum qui a daemonio vexabatur*, and thence *αὐτὸν* has crept into the Greek:

ΚΑΙ ΘΕΩΡΟΥCΙΝ ΑΥΤὸ
ΤΟΝ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΖΟΜΕΝΟΝ
ET VIDENT ILLVM
QVI A DAEMONIO VEXABATVR.

The same mistake occurs in the next verse

ΑΥΤΩ ΤΩ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΖΟΜΕΝΩ
EI QVI DAEMONIO VEXAVATUR.

In Mark vii. 5 *ἐπερωτῶσιν αὐτὸν* was rendered by *interrogant eum...dicentes*. It is no wonder, then, that we find *λέγοντες* thrust into the Greek.

In Mark vii. 25, we find

ΑΚΟΥΣΑΝ ΠΕΡΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ
VT AUDIIT DE EO,

and so we have *ὥς* prefixed to the Greek as an equivalent for *ut*.

In Mark viii. 36,

ΤΙ ΓΑΡ ΩΦΕΛΗΣΕΙ ΤΟΝ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΝ
ΕΑΝ ΚΕΡΔΗΣΗ ΤΟΝ ΚΟΣΜΟΝ ΟΛΟΝ
QVID ENIM PRODERIT HOMINI
SI LUCRETUR VNIVERSVM ORBEM.

Here *κερδήσας* has been replaced by *ἐὰν κερδήσῃ* on account of the rendering *si lucretur*.

Mark ix. 34,

ΔΙΕΛΕΧΘΕΑΝ
ΤΙΣ ΜΙΖΩΝ ΓΕΝΗΤΑΙ ΑΥΤΩΝ
DISQUIREBANT
QVIS ESSE ILLORVM MAIOR,

where *esse* stands for *esset*. Then the words *γένηται αὐτῶν* are added to the Greek text.

Mark x. 10,

ΟΙ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ
ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΛΟΓΟΥ
ΕΠΗΡΩΤΗΣΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΝ
DISCIPVLI EIVS
DE EODEM SERMONEM
INTERROGAVERVNT EVM.

Here *de eodem sermone* is a free translation of *περὶ τούτου*, and the Greek text has been corrected.

Mark x. 12. The scribe paraphrased the participial construction

ΚΑΙ ΕΑΝ ΑΥΤΗ ΑΠΟΛΥΣΑΤΑ ΤΟΝ ΑΝΔΡΑ ΑΥΤΗΣ
ΑΛΛΟΝ ΓΑΜΗΣΗ * ΜΟΙΧΑΤΑΙ

and translated

ET SI MULIER EXIET A VIRO
ET ALIUM DVXERIT • MOECHATVR.

This is intelligible enough in Latin; can the same be said of the reformed Greek?

ΚΑΙ ΕΑΝ ΓΥΝΗ ΕΞΕΛΘΗ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΑΝΔΡΟΣ
ΚΑΙ ΑΛΛΟΝ ΓΑΜΗΣΗ • ΜΟΙΧΑΤΑΙ.

Mark x. 16,

ΚΑΙ ΕΝΑΓΚΑΛΙΣΑΜΕΝΟΣ ΑΥΤΑ

has been misunderstood: the scribe was not quite at home with the word; in Mark ix. 36 he had given it as *ἀνακλίσάμενος*: here he boldly assumes it to be a compound of *καλέω*, and renders it

ET CONVOCANS EOS:

then the Greek becomes

ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΚΑΛΕΣΑΜΕΝΟΣ ΑΥΤΑ.

Mark xiv. 1, the scribe found

ΗΝ ΔΕ ΤΟ ΠΑΣΧΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΑΖΥΜΑ.

The two words *πάσχα* and *ἄζυμα* were equivalent to him: if *ἄζυμα* had stood alone we can guess what he would have done by a reference to Luke xxii. 7, where he found

ΗΛΘΕΝ ΔΕ Η ΗΜΕΡΑ ΤΩΝ ΑΖΥΜΩΝ,

and rendered it

VENIT AUTEM DIES PASCHAE,

and the reviser went back and corrected the Greek text to

ΗΛΘΕΝ ΔΕ Η ΗΜΕΡΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΑΣΧΑ.

In Mark, then, he had no need to translate τὰ *ἄζυμα*, and discarded it; and it is erased accordingly from the Greek.

Mark xiv. 36,

ΟΥΧ Ο ΕΓΩ ΘΕΛΩ
ΑΛΛ Ο ΕΥ ΘΕΛΕΙΣ,

θέλεις has come from the Latin

NON SICVT EGO VOLO
SED SICVT TV BIS.

Mark xiv. 56,

πολλοι γαρ εψεγαδομαρτυρου
ελεγον κατ αὐτου
MULTI ENIM FALSVM TESTIMONIVM
DICEBANT ADVERSVS EVM.

Here *ελεγον* has merely come in to balance *dicebant* in the same line.

Traces of a similar error may be found in the following verse.

In Mark xvi. 11,

και οὐκ επιστευσαν αὐτω,

the Latin is missing: but it must have been

ET NON CREDIDERVNT EI,

where *ei* by the way is feminine, so that the Greek has been corrected: and there is no doubt the whole Latin sentence simply stands for the single Greek word

ΗΠΙΣΤΗCΑΝ.

The prefixed *καὶ* shews that *ἀκούσαντες* in the previous clause was rendered by *audierunt et*.

In Luke v. 8,

ο δε σιμων προσπεσεν αὐτου τοις ποσιν
SIMON AVTEM PROCIDIT AD PEDES EIVS.

Here the Greek should have *γόνασιν* for *ποσίν*, which is fairly translated by the Latin *ad pedes*. We see the Greek has been corrected.

Sometimes, as in Acts ii. 17, the reviser's correction can be seen to underlie an error of the text: we have

και οι πρεσβυτεροι ενυπνιασθησονται
ET SENIORES SOMNIA SOMNIABVNT.

Here the Greek had originally *ἐνυπνίοις ἐνυπνιασθήσονται*, which was rendered by *somnia somniabunt*; but the reviser corrected the dative case of the Greek into the accusative of the Latin; and the *ἐνύπνια* dropped out as a dittograph of *ἐνυπνιασθήσονται*.

In Acts ii. 47,

και εχοντες χαριν προς ολον τον λαον,

the translator gave

ET HABENTES GRATIAM APVT TOTVM MVNDV,

much in the same way as a Frenchman would say *tout le monde*; and the revising hand has replaced λαόν by κόσμον.

In Acts iii. 24,

ΚΑΙ ΤΩΝ ΚΑΤΕΞΗΣ Ο ΕΛΛΗΝΕΝ

is due to

ET EORVM QVI ORDINE FVERVNT QVODQVOD LOCVTI SVNT,

quotquot having been misspelt as is common throughout our text (*t = d*), and then read as *quod*; accordingly ὅσοι disappears, giving place to ὅ.

Acts v. 9,

Ο ΔΕ ΠΕΤΡΟΣ [ΠΡΟΣ] ΑΥΤΗΝ ΤΙ ΟΤΙ

ΣΥΝΕΦΩΝΗΘΗ ΥΜΕΙΝ

PETRVS VERO AD EAM QVID VTIQVE

CONVENIT VOBIS,

and συνεφωνησεν is substituted as a more exact equivalent of *conuenit*. This case was noticed by Mill.

Acts vii. 1,

ΕΙ ΤΑΥΤΑ ΟΥΤΩΣ ΕΧΕΙ

was rendered

SIC HAEC SIC HABENT.

We have explained in a previous place the Vulgar Latin use of *sic*: ἔχει seemed to demand a singular, so we have

ΕΙ ΑΡΑ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΟΥΤΩΣ ΕΧΕΙ.

Acts vii. 52,

ΚΑΙ ΑΠΕΚΤΕΙΝΑΝ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ

ΤΟΥΣ ΠΡΟΚΑΤΑΓΓΕΛΛΟΝΤΑΣ

ET OCCIDERVNT EOS

QVI PRAENVNTIAVERVNT,

where αὐτούς has been put in to balance *eos*.

Acts viii. 13,

ΚΑΙ ΒΑΠΤΙΣΘΕΙΣ ΗΝ

ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΣΚΑΡΤΕΡΩΝ

ET BAPTIZATVS EST

ET ADHEREBAT PHILIPPO,

where ἦν has been taken with βαπτισθείς and so καὶ became necessary in the second line.

Acts xiv. 4,

ἦν δὲ ἐκχρισμένον τῷ πλήθει
DIVISA AUTEM ERAT MULTITUDO

for ἐσχίσθη for the sake of parallelism.

Note in the same verse the effect of rendering οἱ μὲν, οἱ δὲ by *alii*.

καὶ οἱ μὲν ἥσαν σὺν τοῖς ἰουδαίοις
ἄλλοι δὲ σὺν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις
ET ALII QUIDEM ERANT CUM IUDÆIS
ALII VERO CUM APOSTOLIS.

Acts xv. 26,

βάρναβᾶ καὶ παύλῳ ἀνθρώποισιν
παράδωκεσιν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν
BARNABA ET PAVLO HOMINIBVS
QVI TRADIDERVNT ANIM SVAM.

The Latin shews the original to have been παραδεδωκόσιν which the reviser took to be the exact equivalent of *tradiderunt*, and made the necessary vocalic change.

Acts xvii. 23,

ἐν ᾧ ἡ γεγραμμένη

for

ἐν ᾧ ἐπεγεγραπτο,

the Latin being

IN QVA SCRIPTVM ERAT.

Acts xix. 19,

συνεγκάντες τὰς βιβλους

was rightly translated so as to bring out the force of σύν by

ADTVLERVNT ET LIBROS,

and καὶ is inserted against *et* in the Greek text.

Acts xix. 30,

οὐκ εἶπὼν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ

was changed to

ΟΙ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙ ΕΚΩΛΟΝ,

the Latin being, however,

DISCIPVLI NON SINEBANT.

The scribe had already translated the same verb in a different way: for in Acts xiv. 16 he had given *sanavit omnes gentes* as a rendering for *εἰλασεν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, as if the word came from *λάομαι*. Now he avoids the difficulty by changing the words.

Acts xx. 12,

ἤγαγεν τὸν νεανίσκον ζῶντα

for

ἤγαγεν τὸν παῖδα ζῶντα

because the word *παῖδα* had been rendered in the Latin, properly enough, as

ADDUXERVNT IVBENEM VIVENTEM.

Acts xx. 23,

κατὰ πόλιν

having been rendered by

PER SINGVLAS CIVITATES,

an additional word seemed necessary in Greek: hence we have

κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν.

A very complicated, but at the same time convincing case of reaction will be found in Acts xix. 29,

καὶ συνέχθη ὅλη ἡ πόλις ἀίσχυνσις

ET REPLETA EST TOTA CIVITAS CONFUSIONEM.

The Greek is impossible, and must be due to correction badly administered; and the question is, how did the impossible reading *αἰσχύνσις* arise? Evidently it has been put in to balance *confusionem*. Now that the words in question do correspond, from the point of view of our translation, may be seen from Luke xvi. 4, where *αἰσχύνομαι* is rendered *confundor*. Further, in Matt. xx. 28, in the long interpolated section we have *καὶ κατασχυυθήσῃ* as the equivalent of *et confondaris*. Moreover, in Luke xiv. 9, we have *μετ' αἰσχύνσις* rendered by *cum confusione*, and in Luke ix. 26, *ὃς γὰρ ἂν αἰσχυυθῇ* (for *ἐπαισχυυθῇ*) *με* = *qui enim confusus fuerit me*. There is therefore no doubt about the origin of *αἰσχύνσις*, and the Latinization of the passage is demonstrated.

The next question is whether *αἰσχύνσις* is a pure addition to the text, or whether it has displaced some other word? In favour of the latter hypothesis it may be urged that *αἰσχύνσις* is in the

genetive; this looks as if it had displaced some word in the same case. This could very well happen if the word *συγχύσεως* had stood in the text, its genetive case being dependent on a preceding *ἐπλήσθη*. The present Greek text may then be regarded as a mixture of two readings

ΚΑΙ ΣΥΝΕΧΥΘΗ ΟΛΗ Η ΠΟΛΙΣ

and

ΚΑΙ ΕΠΛΗΣΘΗ ΟΛΗ Η ΠΟΛΙΣ ΣΥΓΧΥΣΕΩΣ.

We should then have to decide in some way between the two readings in the matter of priority.

If, on the other hand, we hold *αἰσχύνης* to be a mere addition from the Latin, we must say that the genetive is due to the fact that *ἐπλήσθη* was also carried back, but subsequently displaced by the original reading *συνεχύθη*. The problem is a pretty one, especially in view of the early attestation of both the suggested primitive forms. Of one thing we may be certain, and that is that the Latin is all right as it stands, and needs no correction except the erasure of the final *m*. Moreover, we are certain of the Latin influence on the Greek as it now stands in the Bezan text. Concerning the other points at issue we prefer to reserve our opinion for the present.

We have now verified completely the hypothesis to which our investigations of the Beza text led us, viz. that the Greek text has been thoroughly and persistently Latinized. We do not think it will be doubted, in view of the many Latin readings which we detect in the Greek, that the case is completely proved. It will not any longer suffice, to say that we prove consent but not corruption. When the equivalents of obsolete Latin forms turn up in the Greek, there is corruption; when Latin verses appear in a Greek dress, there has been Latin interpolation: and so we have a clear and convincing demonstration of conspiracy as against the old-fashioned hypothesis of concurrence. Griesbach's hasty dismissal of the question must now be considered an unhappy blunder: and we must revise our critical methods accordingly. We have arrived at these results, without complicating the question by asking whether any important codices or any of our great editors were in the conspiracy: we need to be on our guard against the popular prejudices in favour of great names.

It is by this time clear that Dr Hort's opinion, that the Latin of Cod. Bezae has been forced into agreement with the Greek, must be rejected: the force is in the majority of cases exactly in the opposite direction. Starting from the demonstration of Latinism in the Beza Greek, we must now enquire what MSS. have absorbed similar errors, and see how far their corrupted texts can be restored. And this is no slight task, and for the criticism of the New Testament it is of infinite moment. For the present we will simply say that the new light we have obtained will often shine into very dark corners.

We shall presently return and study a little more closely the Vulgar Latin forms, from which we diverged in order to discuss the question of Latinization which those forms forced upon us.

CHAPTER XL

GENEALOGICAL RELATIONS DEDUCIBLE FROM THE PREVIOUSLY DEMONSTRATED LATINIZING ERRORS.

WE will now take a glance over the results already arrived at, to see how far they affect other New Testament texts. We do not, of course, assume that our judgment is final in regard to the development of error in each one of the passages quoted, but we simply say that our results have been tabulated as far as possible without prejudice, and with only an occasional reference to authorities other than D, whose character might be compromised by the investigation. But, if there be any truth in our demonstration of the process of Latinization which has gone on in the Codex Bezae, we cannot stop at this point; we want to know whether any errors that we have noted affect the whole Latin tradition, and whether they have spread beyond that tradition. Now, in the nature of the case many of the errors referred to are short-lived; they only remain for a few generations, and some of them may have only the lifetime of a single copy. At the same time there are others which shew a remarkable persistence. For instance, to recur to a case previously referred to from Matthew v. 22, where we find *qui pascitur* for *qui irascitur*; we are almost sure that this error arose in a bilingual Codex, for it is the error of a bilingual scribe and is caused by the equivalence of a Latin *p* and a Greek *ρ*. Now we have pointed out that this error is in the Codex Claromontanus of Irenaeus, so that it may be said with confidence that it belongs to the translator of Irenaeus; but no translator would have invented such an extraordinary reading; it must therefore have had its equivalent in the Greek text of Irenaeus or have been current in the Latin Gospels of his translator.

It should be remembered that Codex *k*, which is generally taken to be an African version, shews the same reading. The bilingual error must, therefore, have been widely diffused. And do not let us assume that this error was absent from the textual ancestry of D.

Next consider the reading which we previously discussed from John xxi. 22, 23. The concurrence in error here brings together the texts D *d a b c ff^a g* and the Vulgate with Ambrose and Jerome: the smaller group formed by D *d ff²* and the Vulgate being perhaps a little nearer together than the rest.

In Mark ix. 15, we have noted the concurrence of D *d b c ff² i k* with Tatian in the misreading and corresponding mistranslation of *προστρέχοντες* by *προσχέοντες*.

In Luke xxiii. 53, we find D *d c theb* appropriating a Latin hexameter verse.

In Mark v. 9¹, all the Latins seem to support the first *ἐστίν*, the second is added by the company

D *d B 69. 124. 238. 346 b c f g¹ g² i l q vg.*

In Mark vi. 3, *εἰσίν* is represented in

D *d a b c f ff² g¹ g² i l q vg.*

In Mark viii. 2², note the substantial concurrence of D *d a b c i* in the expression *ex quo hic sunt*.

In Mark ix. 34, the Latin *esset* has been carried back into the Greek of D and 2^{pe}; and in a different form by 13, 69, 346.

In Mark x. 27, the added *ἐστίν* is found in

D *al. pauc. a b c f ff^a k q vg.*

In Mark xiv. 36³, the addition of *ἐστίν* has Greek support in 13, 124, 346.

In Luke viii. 25, the addition of *ἐστίν* seems to be in all codices except B^NALX. 1, *al.*⁴. Is it the genuine reading?

In Luke i. 78⁴, either B^NBL have fallen under the influence of a Latin *visitabit*, or D and most of the other texts have made the converse error by retranslating *visitavit*. The Latin forms are to be regarded as equivalent and interchangeable.

¹ Cf. *sup.* p. 57.

² p. 58.

³ p. 61.

⁴ p. 62.

In Matt. xv. 32¹, the intrusive *hanc* is found in a number of Greek MSS.; also in the following authorities

[b] c f [ff¹] g² me Hilary and Ambrose.

In John xvii. 11, the eccentric conflation has influenced the copies D d a c e.

In John viii. 26³, the intrusive article is found in

D d a b f ff² l q.

In John xiv. 30, the article appears in

d a b c e f ff³ g l q vg and 1. 346. 2⁴ and others.

In John xvii. 14, notice the agreement between D a c f q in the insertion of the article.

In Mark viii. 2⁵, the addition of *τούτου* to the Greek finds a corresponding Latin in

a b c f ff² g¹ i q

and the Greek is followed by L. The same addition may be seen in the Memphitic and Peshito Syriac.

Matt. ix. 26⁶, the curious error of D is followed by

71. 435. g^{per} al.² and *theb*

while the error itself assumes an underlying Greek text, which is found in

NC 1. 33. 118. and *me*.

Matt. xviii. 20⁷ brings together for an astonishing reading

D d g¹.

Acts v. 32, D is followed by E⁸.

John xii. 47, d and e agree in reading *meorum berborum*¹.

Acts v. 3, D has the support of the Vulgate.

Matt. x. 42⁹, the Latin tradition is all for *minimis*. But note that Cod. 157 conflates the Greek *τῶν μικρῶν* with the translation from the Latin *τῶν ἐλαχίστων*.

Matt. xiii. 48, the same thing seems to be true for *κάλλιστα*.

These two instances are of peculiar importance, in that they intimate the occurrence in the Latin either of an irregular trans-

¹ Cf. p. 65.

² p. 66.

³ p. 67.

⁴ p. 68.

⁵ p. 69.

⁶ p. 70.

⁷ p. 71.

⁸ p. 72.

lation of an adjective in the positive degree, or of the duplicated positive.

The reader may confirm his faith in the existence of this duplicated form by comparing Matt. v. 39 in Cod. *k*, *non resistere adversus nequam nequam*; where *nequam nequam* represents *nequissimum*; and is conclusive in favour of the masculine interpretation of *malo*.

In Mark i. 38¹, we have again a difficulty in the fact that ἐξῆλθον is only supported by **NBCL** 33. But our method would shew it to be right: for the other reading is explained.

Mark xv. 14, ἐκραζον is supported by

ADGKMPH 1. 69. 346 and 25 others.

Assimilation to the text of Matthew may have contributed to this?

In Luke viii. 27, we are again confronted with a dilemma between **NBL** 1. 33. 151. 157 *me* reading ἐνεδύσατο and the other uncials and cursives supporting D and the Latin tradition. Again D would seem to be wrong.

Matt. xvi. 26², the choice lies between

NBL 1. 13. 22. 33. 61. 157. 346. *y^{scr} e f q me theb*

against the general Latin tradition and all the rest of the uncials &c.

Mark x. 13. The right reading ἐπετίμησαν must be sought in **NBCLΔ**.

John xvii. 14, the reading of D (μισεῖ) is followed by *a e q* and a group of cursives.

Mark vi. 39, the reading ἀνακλιθῆναι is supported by **NBCI** 1. 13. 28. 69. 2^m. al.^m; the rest of the company being with D.

Matt. ix. 28³, D is supported in καὶ ἔρχεται by *a b c g¹ h k*.

Matt. xiii. 4, Cod. B alone of the uncial texts with 13. 124 seems to have the original reading.

Matt. xvii. 7⁴, we find the uncorrupted texts to be **NB** 13. 124. 346.

Matt. xx. 30, we have again the consensus in error of D and the Latins.

¹ p. 73.

² p. 74.

³ p. 75.

⁴ p. 76.

Matt. xxi. 6, D and the Latins have some support from the Sahidic and Syriac; but was not this to be expected in such a construction as participle and verb?

Matt. xxvi. 51. Here again most of the Latins agree with D, and, as might have been expected, the Syriac versions.

John vi. 11¹, D is supported in its error by $\aleph a b e q$ and the Syriac versions, which last ought perhaps not to be counted.

John xii. 36², D and the Latins are again together in the resolution of the participle and verb into two verbs.

Luke v. 14, shews agreement again between D *a e*, other old Latins and the Vulgate.

Luke xv. 23, D finds no support outside the Latin company and some versions.

Mark iv. 36, the aberrant company is

D 13. 28. 69. 346. 2^{re} *b c e ff² i q.*

Mark vii. 25, the inserted *καὶ* is given by DΔ, from the Latins.

Mark x. 16³, D is accompanied by *b c ff² k q.*

Mark x. 22, we have D in error with *b c ff² q.*

Acts xiv. 21⁴, the Latinization has affected AEHP as well as D.

Matt. xiii. 22, for *σπειρόμενος* D has the company of *a c g¹ ff² k.*

Matt. xiii. 24, *σπειράντι* is the reading of \aleph BMXΔII 13. 33. 346 al²⁰. It is surely right; and D, with the later uncials, has Latinized.

Luke ii. 16, D is only supported, outside the Latins, by Cod. 61.

And so we might continue our examination, but the results are sufficiently patent: we may say that the hypothesis of Latinization is shewn conclusively to be the right one for the explanation of the text, since so many readings of D are unsupported in Greek, while almost all are followed by the Latin. Next we see that occasionally whole battalions of later uncials take up the Latinized reading, while a small company remains faithful, usually including B.

Amongst the codices which have occasionally Latinized will be found \aleph LD, &c.; whether B has been entrapped in any cases into error is a question which must not be prejudged, and it almost requires a special and extended investigation; but it looks as if B had escaped.

¹ p. 76.

² p. 77.

³ p. 78.

⁴ p. 81.

The majority of the Latin texts (perhaps all of them) are derivable from a common source, their concurrence in singular errors being inexplicable on any other hypothesis, but whether this source be European or African, Gallican or Roman, remains as yet uncertain. And this being the case, and the authority of D having, for the greater part, been reduced to that of *d*, the practical problem is, to restore the lost Western text in its primitive Vulgar Latin form, and to reason from the single form thus reached, as being the equivalent of a very early Greek MS.¹

So extensively has the Greek text of Codex Bezae been modified by the process of Latinization that we can no longer regard D as a distinct authority apart from *d*. In the first instance it may have been such; or, on the other hand, it may have been the original from which the first Latin translation was made. But it is probably safest to regard D + *d* as representing a single bilingual tradition. The process of Latinization is not a late one consequent on the *rapprochement* in a bilingual codex of two texts, an old Western Greek and an old Western Latin respectively; for this bilingual tradition goes back to the earliest times. It can be traced in Irenaeus, in the ancestry of NCL, and in the parentage of the Egyptian versions. Any residual divergences between D and *d* are due to unequal criticism of correcting hands.

¹ In Luke xvi. 26, *d* reads

chaus magnum confirmatus est,

where *chaus* came in through the loss of the repeated syllable in *chasma magnum*.

In this error it is supported by *b c f ff³ i l vulg.* Ambrose, Hilary and Augustine.

If this means anything, does it not mean a common Latin original for the Gospel of Luke in the authorities referred to?

CHAPTER XII.

SOME PHONETIC AND GRAMMATICAL PECULIARITIES OF THE BEZAN SCRIBE.

1. *On the local pronunciation of the initial letters JU.*

An examination of the Codex Bezae will shew the scribe's pronunciation of these letters. We may expect, if he is a French scribe, to find a transitional pronunciation of the same kind as that by which the French language derived such a word as *jusque* from *de usque* : i.e. we may expect that there was a predominance of the *d* sound over that of *j*.

Turn to Acts xx. 19, where

ΕΝ ΤΑΙΣ ΕΠΙΒΟΥΛΑΙΣ ΤΩΝ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΩΝ

is rendered by

EX INSIDIIS AD IYDAEIS.

Here *ad iudaeis* clearly stands for, and should be printed *a diudaeis*.

The scribe writes *diu* for what we represent by *ju*, so that there was a consonantal sound to the initial letter, something like what we should render by *dy*.

Next turn to Mark x. 21,

ΕΚ ΝΕΟΤΗΤΟΣ ΜΟΥ
ΑΔ ΙΥΒΕΝΤΥΤΕ ΜΕΑ.

Here again we should print

A DIVVENTYTE MEA¹.

¹ Notice how the Vulgar Latin has again conserved something in its pronunciation from the primitive form, if we may assume with Curtius, *Gr. Etym.* 230, that the root is the Sanskrit *dévāt*.

A similar case occurs in the Lyons Pentateuch where the scribe had to write the word *Jebusaeorum*; he actually wrote *Zebusaeorum*, and those who have noted the interchange in the Old Latin texts of the forms *zabulus* and *diabulus*, *baptizo* and *baptidio*, *exorcizo* and *exorcidio* in MSS. will see what the archaic pronunciation of the word in question was. It could not have been = *Yebusaeorum*.

We see the same thing in the Lyons Pentateuch in Lev. x. 7, where ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας τῆς σκηνῆς is translated

ad ianua tabernaculi.

Certainly the words should be divided so as to read a *dianua*.

Under the same heading probably belongs the Bezan reading of *zosum* for *deorsum* (sometimes written *diosum*) in Acts xx. 9, and Cod. k (Matt. i. 12) *dechomias* for *iechomias*.

2. On the pronunciation of the adjacent letters SR.

We find $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{SDR} \\ \text{STR} \end{array} \right\}$ for SR in proper names. For this change, which is what we should expect in a Latin MS., seeing that the Latins render *Ezra* by *Esdras*, and give *Hasdrubal* as the equivalent of Azrubaal (עֲזָרָא בַעַל), our text furnishes a frequent illustration in the spelling of *Israel*.

E.g. Matt. ix. 34, ἐν ἰσραῆλ = in *istrahel*, but in x. 6, οἴκου ἐισραῆλ = *domus israhel*. So in x. 23 (*israhel*).

John xii. 14, τοῦ ἰστραῆλ = *istrahel*.

In Luke xxiv. 21, we again find the spelling *israhel*, otherwise generally the spelling is *istrahel*¹, and in not a few cases the Greek imitates the Latin spelling.

The case is important (1) as indicating a real phonetic difficulty amongst certain Latin-speaking peoples; (2) because the influence of the Latin text on the Greek appears not only in the Codex Bezae, but also in the famous Codex Vaticanus, and the spelling carries with it an intimation of the probable existence of Western readings in that text.

¹ On p. xlviii Scrivener says: "ἰστραῆλ John xii. 13; Luke ii. 32, iv. 25; Mark xii. 29. ἰστραῆλται Acts xiii. 16, xxi. 28 (but in the Latin *istrahel* in 26 other places, *i-trahelitae* in 3 others." Compare p. xliii: "*istrahel* etc. always except in Luke xxiv. 21." There is some confusion here.

It is interesting to observe that this difficulty of pronouncing *sr*, and the insertion of *t* between the discordant sounds, can often be traced in the Romance languages: e.g. the French *ancêtre* is from *antecessor*, through *an[te]cessre*; *connaître*, from *cognoscere* through *conoistre*; *être* from *essere* by *estre*. It does not however seem that the modern Italians feel the difficulty so keenly as the ancient Latins and the French, for they give us a few such forms as *sradicare sregolamento*.

3. On the so-called impure *S*, and the prefixed vowel that often attaches to it.

The initial *s* in Italian when followed by a consonant is usually called 's impure.' It is so congenial a sound to the Italian language, that it has been extended by analogy to many words where it does not etymologically belong; but on the other hand I think we ought to recognize that, the further back we go in our study of the Italian language, the more likely are we to find that the forms with *s* impure are genuine forms derived from the archaic speech.

For example, let us see what Scrivener says of the Codex Bezae¹:

Such forms as *sconspectu* Acts vii. 46, and yet more *scoriscatio* Matt. xxiv. 27, *scoruscus* Luke xvii. 24, *scorusco*, xvii. 24 bis, xxiv. 4² (*ἀσρπαρή* and *ἀσρπάτω*, but *fulgur* Matt. xxviii. 3, Luke x. 18) savour more of the initial impure *s* of the Italian, which plainly sprung from the Latin *ex*, e.g. *sbarcare*, *scarnare*.

Now, leaving upon one side the question as to whether any cases of the Italian impure *s* can be conceivably traced to the Latin prefixes, let us ask whether it is not possible that after all the form *scoruscus*, which our MS. so decidedly affects, may not be archaic, and as good as the more usual *coruscus*. According to the authorities in philology, the word comes from an ancient reduplicated Sanskrit root, *skar*, which means to *oscillate rapidly backward and forward*, and hence to *gleam*, to *dazzle*: *skar-skar*, the reduplicated root, being easily worn to *scorsco* and *scorusco*, the middle *s* being thus a testimony to the ancient initial *s* which it duplicated³.

It appears then that the scribe who wrote the first copy of the Latin of Codex Bezae (for the peculiarity is evidently primitive,

¹ p. xlv.

² Query: add ix. 29.

³ Vanček, *Etym. Wörterbuch*, p. 1246 (from Brugmann).

and similar forms have probably been weeded out in many places) was brought up in the use of Latin which, whether provincial or not, was marked by archaisms of speech. It would clearly be unfair to call these forms early French or early Italian. We may perhaps class them as Vulgar Latin without depreciating their antiquity. But, having noted this peculiarity once, let us point out a similar feature in the Greek of the great Vatican Codex (Cod. B). Twice in the last chapter of Matthew we find the scribe of B writing the word *κουστωδία* in the form *σκουστωδία*. The peculiarity is not noted by Tischendorf, but this is probably due to the fact that he did not pay attention to what he took to be a mere scribe's blunder, if indeed he observed it at all. What shall we say of this word? it is clearly a Latin loan-word in the Greek text; its prefixed sibilant is certainly not a savour of an Italian impure *s*: it is at least doubtful whether the form is a reminiscence of a Latin Bible with which the scribe may have been familiar, although I can very well believe such a form would be hailed as a proof of the Western origin of Codex B. Obviously the real explanation is that *σκουστωδία* is an archaic form. It has been the fashion to refer *custos* and *custodia* to a root *kudh* = *κρύθ-ω*, but it may be conjectured that the root had a prefixed spirant and is rather to be referred to *sku*, to *cover*, to *hide*, especially since we find the form preserved in the Latin *scutum* for the long shield which covers the body.

Accordingly we have noted a second instance where the vulgar speech of the New Testament writers and their translators would seem to be archaic. I propose, therefore, to regard these spellings *scoruscus* and *scustodia* as belonging to the earliest current forms of the New Testament writers¹.

The other case quoted *sconspectu* is more difficult; we can scarcely assume that any such form as *scon* could have been current after Indo-germanic times: it must then be a vulgar form of speech; and not, I think, the form of the scribe of Codex Bezac, but of some earlier scribe; for we shall see presently

¹ It is important to register all such peculiarities; suppose, for example, there should be reason to suspect that a Latin document underlay the closing verses of St Matthew's Gospel, we should then read in xxvii. 65 not *habetis custodiam* but *habete scustodiam*.

that the Bezan scribe himself does not shew any fondness for the impure *s*.

The question of course is, as to whether the existence of such forms connotes a peculiar locality: a problem which is not by any means confined to our Manuscript, but turns up constantly in the Vulgate and Italic texts.

For example, in the very interesting discussion which occurred not long since in the pages of the *Academy* as to the origin of the Codex Amiatinus, it was stated by Dr Hamann that the scribe must either have been an Italian, or at any rate the text must have been taken from an Italian exemplar. For, said he, we are directed to Italy and to no other country by such forms as *senes* for *senex*, *senia* for *xenia*, *optimantum*, *gigans*, *ancxius*, *uncxit*, *sussaltastis*, *ammirata*, *quemnammodum*, *chuserunt*, *hostia*, *tophadius*, *agusto*, *ascultabant*, *elodum*, *adtractaverit*, *redemet*, *histriatarum*, *expendebat*, *scandescet*, *Spaniae*, *totum belli impetu*, *in tantum arrogantiae tumore*, *incidemus in manu Dei et non in manus hominum* etc.¹

Hamann's assertion was met by Professor Sanday, who in an Appendix to the second volume of the Oxford *Studia Biblica*² discussed the instances in detail, and pointed out how ill-supported were Hamann's rapid generalisations. Dr Sanday further appealed for some fresh light on the subject of the Codex Bezae. "The form *scandescet*... in Sap. v. 23 has many analogies in that remarkable MS. *Cod. Bezae*.... It were much to be wished that we knew where *Cod. Bezae* itself was written. The common view, as we have seen, assigns it to the South of France."

We have done our best in the earlier part of this book to prove that the Codex Bezae belongs to some place not far from the Rhône Valley, and we hope that we have either settled the question or have made it easy for some one else to settle it. For our part, we take that for a fixed point of departure. And it is clear that with this for our starting point we have only to discriminate the forms which actually belong to the Bezan scribe from those forms which may have been imported into his text by genealogical transmission from earlier copies.

¹ I quote from *Studia Biblica*, II. p. 286.

² pp. 309 sqq.

Now, bearing in mind that the natural tendency of the French language is to get rid of the impure *s* by prefixing a vowel (e.g. *Étienne, étable, espérer, école* etc.), we must expect to find in our text cases of such a prefixed vowel; and we should be very much surprised if they were wholly absent from a writer who follows the pronunciation so closely in his writing.

In Luke xviii. 32, we have

iniuriabitur et espuent in eum.

In Acts xvi. 19,

quoniam ispes et reditus eorum.

It appears from these instances that the scribe was averse to the initial combination of *sp*. How weak it was in French may be seen from the fact that in many cases the *s* wore away after the vowel had been prefixed, as, for instance, in *épée* from *spada*¹.

How then are we to explain the fact that a scribe who was averse to the combination of the letters *sp* was so tolerant of *sc*?

We have suggested that one way out of the difficulty would be to defend the genuineness of the form *scoruscus* which we find in our text. It is a curious thing, however, that the modern Italian, with its extravagant fondness for words beginning with *sc*, does not use this stem except in the form *coruscazione*. Yet it must have been a popular form, at least, if not a genuine one: and if so, why does it not turn up in Italian?

But even if it be a genuine form we have still to explain the other word *sconspectu*. So that if such a form be thought impossible in Southern France, we have another reason for believing that the Latin archetype of Cod. D was brought from the other side of the Alps.

Rönsch² draws attention to the fact that the Codex Vercellensis has a parallel instance in Luke xxii. 31, 'postulavit vos ut

¹ The prefixed *i* or *e* before *s* is not assumed to be confined to France. Rönsch, *Itala u. Vulgata*, p. 467, gives instances of it from the Codex Fuldensis, which is supposed to be by the hand of Victor of Capua; from the Veronese Psalter, from Isidore and the Codex Toletanus etc., and one instance from Tertullian. We note also in Cod. Vercellensis, Mark ix. 20 *ispumans*.

² *Itala u. Vulg.* p. 468.

scribraret tanquam triticum.' Here D reads *cerneret*, and the Cod. Veronensis is illegible for the doubtful word, but it looks as if it were *uentilet*. Possibly *scribraret* is here the original translation. Is it conceivable that the impure *s* which we are discussing is an Africanism?

Upon the whole, we cannot say that we have as yet come to a clear understanding upon this question: but it may be more intelligible as our investigation proceeds. The fact is we want to know something more definite about the relations of Codex Bezae and the Old-Latin codices.

We may compare with what has been said above as to the obscuring of the *s impurum* in French, what Le Blant says on the subject from the stand-point of epigraphy¹.

Des vocables *iscalā*, *ispiritus*, *Istephanus*, *ispes*, *ischola*, *istetit*, *ismaragdus*, *iscrīptit*, *istudium*, nous avons fait: *escalier*, *esprit*, *Étienne*, *espoir*, *école*, *été*, *émeraude*, *étude*.

Our results confirm his as to the form *ispes*, at any rate, which cannot be regarded as a copyist's blunder. Le Blant adds in a note to the following effect:

D'après les rapprochements que l'on vient de voir, les mots *étāble*, *étang*, *estrade*, *espèce*, *épine*, *époux*, *escabeau*, *escient*, *espace*, *épi*, *estomac*, *état*, *étrangler* etc. me semblent montrer qu'en latin le vulgaire a dû dire *istabulum*, *istagnum*, *ispecies*, *ispina*, *isponsus*, *iscabellum*, *iscire*, *ispatium*, *ispica*, *istomachus*, *istatum*, *istrangulare*.

4. On the interchange of final M and NT in the Codex Bezae.

We frequently find an equivalence between forms ending in *m* and those ending in *nt*: and though, at first sight, it seems as if we had to do with a merely palaeographic error (which certainly is likely enough in MSS. like Codex Bezae and the Lyons Pentateuch, which write final *nt* in a single letter, by crossing the last stroke of the *n*), yet a closer examination convinces us that the error is phonetic, and that the final nasal sounds are subject to confusion.

First let us look at some of the cases: then at the causes.

We have Acts xi. 22, *Barnabant* for *Barnabam*. Acts xii. 16, *eunt* for *eum*.

¹ *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule*, p. cxviii.

Perhaps a similar case occurs in Acts xiii. 47,

ut sint in salutem usque ad ultimum terrae,

where we propose to correct *sint* into *sim*.

Now turn to John xvii. 14, where we have

et mundus odit eos quoniam non sum,

where it is clear from the Greek that *sum* stands for *sunt*. We have already pointed out how this error has given rise to a remarkable conflation in John xvii. 11, where the Bezan text is supported wholly or in part by Codd. *a c e*.

Now this singular Latin error is explained at once by the dialectical forms of the Vulgar Latin, from which sprang the Italian *sono*, which is both first person singular and third person plural. Let us interrogate the Latin inscriptions and see where this tendency to equivalence shews itself. According to Sittl¹,

Auslautendes NT wird nur in Italien durch nasales M ersetzt: *fecerum* I. N. 2037 (Nola), 2775, 2824, 7197. Gruter, 686, 3 (Rom) Perret catac. de R. 5, 29, 68, Orelli-H. 7360 (Rom): *convenerum* Marini Atti t. 40, a 21 (A. 218); *comparaverum* Fabretti 5, 11; *emerum* Bold. 53 b 6; *posuerum* ib. 381, 1; *dedicarum* Orelli 3740 (bei Lanuvium); *comparabirum* und *commendaberum* Lupi p. 24 (Tibur J. 613).

From these instances collected by Sittl we see the direction in which to look for the origin of the peculiarities which we noted in our text. They are certainly more Italian than French; and if this be so, then we again suspect that the text of Codex Bezae came to Lyons from the other side of the Alps¹.

I have not found any instance of this error in the Lyons Pentateuch.

5. On the inflexional forms in the Codex Bezae.

Let us now see how it stands with the noun-inflexions in our Codex: how do they answer to the Vulgar Latin?

We know that in the Vulgar Latin the neuters disappear,

¹ Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten, p. 70.

² There are two cases of the kind in Cod. *k*, viz.

Matt. xiii. 54 *stuporem* for *stupere*.

xiv. 5 *habebam* for *habebant*.

It is conceivable, in view of the many transcriptural blunders in *k*, that these are scribe's errors; but on the other hand, they may merely be intimations that we are dealing with a real dialect, which was not French.

taking on masculine or feminine forms as the case may be: the neuter plurals in particular appearing as feminines of the first declension¹. We are not then surprised to find that our text writes regularly the form *retia*: e.g. John xxi. 6, *retiam*: v. 8, *retiam piscium*: v. 11, *non est scissa retia*, and so in many other places. After a while this singular form will develop its own plural as a feminine noun; though not necessarily the classical plural; for the study of the Romance languages shews us that the formation of a plural by the addition of *s* becomes soon a rule, as it must have been in the earliest times of Latin speech; what constitutes the motive for this apparent reversion to type is more difficult to see; it may be the influence of the oblique case; it is however certain that in the Provençal the plural of such a word as *corona* is *coronas*, while the Old French gives *corone corones*: thus we find an *s* established at a very early period indeed in French².

We shall expect then to find traces of neuter plurals which give rise to feminine plurals, and of feminine plurals which are made by the addition of *s*.

For instance, in John iii. 20, we have

ut non arguantur operas eius de luce.

Here we have *opera* turned to a feminine, and the new plural formed in Vulgar Latin fashion.

Again, in Acts ii. 17, we have

et prophetabant filii eorum
et filias eorum.

This *s* does not appear in modern Italian, but it is in the Spanish and the French. Probably we may say in our case that the form is South-Gallic. But it might just as well be Spanish; and indeed we need to know a great deal more about the variations of the Vulgar Latin before we speak with decision on such a point.

¹ Thus in the Lyons Pent. we have *castrae* (dat.) and *castra* (abl.); and for *crus* we find *crura*.

² Schwan, *Altfranzösische Gramm.* p. 90, refers this final *s* to the influence of analogy, "nach Analogie der Feminine der lat. iii. Decl. haben auch die Fem. der lat. i. Decl. in Nom. Plur. ein *s* erhalten."

Having shewn, then, that our MS. sometimes gives us the Vulgar Latin form of the feminine plural of nouns ending in *a*; let us ask whether there is any similar phenomenon with regard to masc. nouns with *o* stems. Here the early Latin form seems to have been for the plural to end in *oe* and *e*, which was probably a survival from *oes* and *es*: but all the words which occur in literature make the plural in *i*. Nor does it seem that in the Old French a plural form in *s* is developed; thus *livre* and not *livres* is the Old French for the Latin *libri*.

There is one case in our MS. which seems to involve such an *s* plural. In Acts xi. 21,

πολὺς τε ἀριθμὸς πιστεύσας
ἐπιστρέψεν ἐπὶ τὸν κν
MULTISQUE NUMERIS CVM CREDIDISSENT
REVERSI SVNT AD DNM.

Here the verbs shew that the singular number of the Greek has been replaced by a plural: we must then either say that *multis numeris* is a nominative plural, or that it is an unfortunate attempt to render the construction known as the ablative absolute, which was never completed on account of the difficulty with the verb; the latter would seem to be the correct explanation.

Now let us turn to the oblique cases; we find in the Vulgar Latin that the *accusative* and *ablative* very early exchange forms and functions; because, for example, as soon as the final *m* of an accusative singular ceases to be sounded, the forms of the two cases are usually phonetically equivalent.

Hence, for example, the form *dono dedit* is really only the phonetic weakening of *donum dedit*. May we say then that in our MS. in Acts xiii. 22 the rendering

ὦ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρησας
CVI ETIAM DIXIT TESTIMONIO,

conveys an accusative form under an ablative dress? If any one doubts the phonetic equivalence in our scribe's dialect of two such cases as *testimonium* and *testimonio*, let him look at Luke x. 4 where he will actually find *sacellum* written *sacellu*; Matt. xxvii. 51 *a susu usque deorsum*; and at Luke xvii. 24 where we have *sub caelu* for *sub caelum*; and let him notice the innumerable cases

where the accusative and ablative are interchanged, such as
Acts xvi. 25,

circa mediam uero nocte,

Acts v. 15,

ab omnem ualetudinem,

Acts v. 26,

eum uim,

etc. etc.¹

The Lyons Pentateuch shows the same weakness in the final letter: we have *dece dextru eu lignu noue qua regnu sempiternu signu suu*.

One consequence of this practical equivalence of the cases would seem to have been the free use of an accusative absolute, which some people consider to be an Africanism. The combination of the two cases makes the oblique case of the Old French, the genitive and dative being replaced gradually by the use of prepositions.

Before leaving the consideration of the accusative case, it may be proper to point out that the MS. occasionally shews traces of an accusative plural formed simply by the addition of an *s* to the singular, just as it must have been in the earliest period of the Latin language, when, for instance, the plural of *navem* was *navem + s = naues*.

I have noticed in Codex *k* in Matt. xii. 4 the curious case *panems propositionis*: and there are one or two things in the Codex Bezae that point to a similar recurrence of the ancient usage. For instance, in Acts xiv. 17,

benefaciens de caelo uobis
imbrens dans et tempora fructifera
implens ciuo et incunditate.

Here *imbrens* stands for an accusative plural. It may, however, be said that this is only a palaeographic assimilation to neighbouring words in the adjacent lines.

¹ The weakness of the final *m* may be seen by studying such a form as *decem* which shews no final consonant in Greek, nor in Vulgar Latin: e.g. John vi. 70 *nonne ego uos duodeci elegi*; Matt. xviii. 21 *dece milium denariorum*; Luke xiv. 31 *in dece milibus*; Luke xix. 16 *dece mnas*. In these last instances, however, the final letter was represented in the beginning of the next word. In Matt. xvi. 10 we have *septe panes* where *m* is lost in the closely related letter which follows.

But this explanation will not do for the following cases in the Bezan text.

John vii. 45,

nemo misit in illum *manum*.

Mark iii. 15,

et dedit illis potestatem
curandi *valetudinems*.

Leaving then the oblique case, let us come to the genitive case which is replaced in Vulgar Latin by the preposition *de*. We find a number of instances of this usage, and of the similar usage of *ex*, in our MS. of which the following are perhaps the most remarkable.

In Luke xi. 1,

ΕΙΠΕΝ ΤΙΣ ΤΩΝ ΜΑΘΗΤΩΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ
DIXIT QUIDAM DE DISCIPULIS EIVS.

Luke xiii. 10,

ΕΝ ΜΙΑ ΤΩΝ ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΩΝ
IN UNA DE SYNAGOGIS.

Acts x. 25,

ΕΙΣ ΤΩΝ ΔΟΥΛΩΝ
VNVS EX SERVIS.

Acts xxi. 39,

ΕΝ ΤΑΡΣΩ ΔΕ ΤΗΣ ΚΙΛΙΚΙΑΣ
TARSESIS EX CILICIAE,

and perhaps Acts ii. 30,

ΕΚ ΚΑΡΤΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΚΑΡΔΙΑΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ
DE FRUCTVM DE PRAECORDIA EIVS.

It is important that all these forms should be registered and classified, as they furnish new and valuable material for Romance philology, and add to the knowledge which has been derived from the study of inscriptions. I do not see anything in our results, however, that is in conflict with epigraphic conclusions. A reference to Le Blant, *Inscriptions chrétiennes de la Gaule* (p. cxvi) will shew the following summary :

Dès le vi^e siècle, le français peut se pressentir. Le trouble qu'apporte la confusion du cas fait apparaître, à cette époque, la préposition, l'article de notre langue sans flexions. Au lieu de *minister templi* on dit déjà *minester de tempulo*; pour *membra duorum fratrum* un marbre porte *membra ad duos*

fratres, forme qui subsiste dans notre parler vulgaire, pour indiquer le rapport de possession. Notre pronom *qui*, invariable aux deux genres, se montre, dès 431, sur l'épithaphe d'une religieuse.... D'*ispíritus*, que l'on entend encore aux offices de villages, viendra *esprít*. *Aiutare* offre la suppression qui nous donnera le verbe *aider*. Dès le v^e siècle *santa* prépare le mot *sainte*. Le *g* de *triginta* s'oblitére et nos pères disaient *trienta* comme, plus tard, nous écrirons *trente*. Déjà, pour eux *tanto*, comme pour nous le mot *tant*, indiqua un nombre indéterminé¹.

Just as the cases in Vulgar Latin disappear, or almost disappear, so we find the declensions of the nouns to simplify: the earliest step towards this is the resolution of the so-called fourth and fifth declensions into forms that can be classified with the others, from which indeed they must have been primitively evolved. Thus we may expect to find *dies* turn into *dieus*, as in Acts x. 40,

hunc *ds* suscitavit post tertium *dicum*.

And in the case of nouns from the so-called fourth declension, the transference to the second frequently causes a change of gender; e.g.

Luke ix. 4,

in quocumque domum.

Luke xxii. 21,

ecce manus qui tradet,

unless *qui tradet* should be the simple translation of *παπα-διδότρος*, or *qui* has ceased to be inflected.

Acts iii. 11,

in porticum qui vocatur Solomonis.

6. *Pronominal and adverbial enclisis in the Vulgar Latin.*

An examination of the Romance languages will shew many cases of the enclitic use of pronouns and adverbs; and it becomes a matter of interest to examine whether any of these occur in our text. Let us take for instance the adverb *ibi*: this becomes in French *if* and finally *y*: but in Italian it is used enclitically in the form *vi*. Suppose then we find in John xii. 2

et fecerunt ei cenam *bi*,

may we not regard the word as used enclitically, and far gone in the process of decline?

¹ Our ms. shews *tempula* (Acts xix. 24), *santi* (Acts iv. 30), etc.

And is not the same thing discernible in the following cases of suffixed pronouns?

Matt. ix. 19. *sequebatur um.*

Matt. xix. 21. *et ueni sequerem.*

Mark vi. 26. *noluit am contristare.*

Luke xi. 9. *dabite for dabit ei.*

Luke xiii. 7. *praeceideum.*

Luke xiv. 12. *et illi reinuitente.*

Luke xxiii. 39. *unus autem de malignis blasphemabat um.*

3 John 15. *salutante amici.*

7. *Phonetic Variations in the Verb-Forms.*

We must now say a few words about the confusion in the verb-forms: we have already pointed out that in the archetype of our copy there was a confusion between *sum* and *sunt* just as in modern Italian. It is probable then that we shall find some other cases of confusion between the nasal terminations.

One common case is the writing of the singular for the plural: e.g.

Acts vii. 57. *exclamasset for exclamassent.*

Acts xiii. 27. *habitabat for habitabant.*

Acts xx. 18. *esset for essent.*

Acts xxi. 21. *circumcidat for circumcidant.*

Perhaps we may add Acts xvi. 27,

NOMIZΩΝ ΕΚΤΕΦΕΥΓΕΝΑΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΔΕΣΜΙΟΥΣ
EXISTIMANS EFFUGISSET CVSTODIAS,

in which case *custodias* would be the nominative plural; but may it not rather be that *effugisset* is meant for the infinitive?

Remark also

Matt. xvii. 14. *uenisset for uenissent,*

where the variation has affected the Greek.

John xx. 25. *dicebat ergo illi alii discipuli,*

where *n* has been superscribed.

Mark vi. 1. *et sequebatur illum discipuli eius,*

where *n* has been superscribed.

There are a number of instances of this confusion in the text of the Lyons Pentateuch.

Another important change of which our MS. shews frequent traces is the substitution of the *e* vowel for *i*, especially in the

third person singular; and since we sometimes find the opposite error, we must assume the sounds to have been nearly equivalent. The MS. is full of such exchanges (e.g. Matt. iii. 9, *putetes* = *putetis*; iv. 5, *suscepit* = *suscipit*; v. 28, *omnes* = *omnis*; v. 34, *sedis* = *sedes*; xi. 13, *omnes* = *omnis*; xii. 24, *potestes* = *potestis* etc. etc.). In this respect it is very like the Lyons Pentateuch, which has scores of such confusions¹.

The result of these errors is apparent in the language and in the particular texts where they occur; in the language because there is produced an approximation between a number of present tenses to the future tenses, which assimilation ultimately makes way for the introduction of a new future, made with the auxiliary *habeo*; and in the particular texts, because there is a bilingual reaction from the modified Latin to the Greek.

For instance, in Luke xxii. 21,

ΤΟΥ ΠΑΡΑΔΙΔΟΝΤΟΣ ΜΕ
QVI TRADET ME,

where *tradet* is not meant for a future, but for a present; cf. Mark xiv. 20, 21 where *παράδιδοναι* is twice rendered *tradetur*.

Again, in John xii. 25,

qui amat animam suam perdet eam,

where either the future *perdet* has been taken as a present, or conversely; for the Greek MSS. fluctuate suspiciously between *ἀπολέσει* (D etc.) and *ἀπολλύει* (NBL).

M. Robert points out that this approximation between the present and future tenses holds also for those future forms which are more divergent from the present tense-forms: thus he cites as future tenses *abominamini inquinamini sanctificamini*. We have the same thing in Cod. Bezae: Luke vi. 21, *saturamini*: Acts i. 5, *baptizamini*, are certainly future tenses.

The participial formations shew great variation, the following being the most common changes.

NS to S.

Luke iv. 40. *impones* for *imponens*.

Luke xii. 16. *dices* for *dicens*.

¹ See Robert, pp. lxx, lxxi.

NS to N.

Acts xix. 16. *insilien* for *insiliens*.

NS to NT.

Luke v. 16. *orant* for *orans*.

Acts x. 20. *dubitant* for *dubitans*.

Cf. Luke xv. 1. *erat*ⁿ *autem adpropiant*,

where *adpropiant* would seem to be an adjective¹.

These confusions may be illustrated from others which occur in the verb-forms: e.g.

Acts xxi. 21. *docens* for *doces*?

Matt. xvii. 27. *inueniens* for *inuenies*.

Luke xiii. 25. *incipientis* for *incipietis*.

Matt. v. 11. *dixerin* for *dixerint*.

Luke xviii. 9. *confidens* for *confident*.

Perhaps Mark iii. 11. *cum uideret illum* (if the Greek is *θεωρῶν*).

Such forms are difficult of classification: in the Romance languages the participle present appears in French as *chantant*, in Provençal as *chantans*, and in Italian as *cantante*. The general fluctuation which we find in our text will hardly fall exclusively under any of these heads.

8. On the use of the Vulgar Latin future in the Codex Bezae.

On p. xlv of his introduction to the Codex Bæzae, Scrivener notes the peculiar employment of *habeo* as an auxiliary verb:

We find (he says) in the style of *d* distinct traces of the employment of *habeo* as an auxiliary verb, which is well known to be a notable characteristic of the modern languages of Western Europe (of the French as much as any) as distinguished from the Latin whence most of them sprung. In Mark xiv. 27 *σκανδαλίσασθαι* (-θε)³ is rendered *scandalizari habetis* by *d*, but *scandalum patiemini* by *ac*, *scandalizabimini* by *f* and the Vulgate. *Habeo* is used three times to render *μέλλω*, Luke x. 1: xix. 4: Acts i. 5, although the Greek word is translated by *incipio* 25 times (sometimes very awkwardly), 15 times by the future participle, three times in other ways.

Now there is something which all these examples have in common: they are all expressions or modifications of the future

¹ The scribe of the Lyons Pent. (p. 50, c. 17) wrote the word *aperiens* as *aperient*, but corrected his own mistake.

² The Lyons Pent. (p. 55, a. 21) writes *offerens* for *offeret*.

³ For *σκανδαλίσασθε*?

tense. A similar case will be found in the Athanasian Creed, as given, for example, in the Utrecht Psalter, in the sentence

ad cuius aduentum omnes
homines resurgere habent
cum corporibus suis,

where the Greek version would show either a future tense, or μέλλω with an infinitive. Scrivener's statement is therefore not quite complete as to the use of the auxiliary in French. It should be shewn that the French future can be analysed so as to show the form in Codex Bezae. That is, the parallel does not lie between the future with *habeo*, and the preterite with *avoir*, but between the future with *habeo*, and the French and Provençal future in *ai*, as *donnerai*, for example, separated into the elements *donner* + *ai*.

When these forms are placed side by side, we see in what sense the future of the Vulgar Latin is related to the future of the French and other Romance languages¹. And it can be shewn, I think, that in some Romance dialects the attached auxiliary verb of the French remained capable of separation from the infinitive to which it belonged.

We cannot be wrong in referring a peculiarity which we find in all the Romance languages right back into the Vulgar speech of the Empire².

¹ "Von den altlateinischen Temporibus sind in den romanischen Sprachen nur erhalten: das Präsens, das Imperfekt, das Perfekt und das Plusquamperfekt. Die beiden Futura werden durch Umschreibung mit *habere* und dem Infinitivo des Präsens gebildet, z. B. *cantare abeo* *cantare abea*." Schwan, *Altfr. Gram.* p. 12.

² It is curious that the later Greek language shows also a future formed with *έχω* and the infinitive; but there is no linguistic connexion between the Greek and Latin forms. The earliest trace that I know of this Greek future is its intrusion into Greek mss. from the fourteenth century onward: e.g. Cod. 418, S. Sabae of the Jerusalem Collection, a ms. of the Invention of the Cross, has

λιμοκτονήσω σε έχω εάν μη όμολογήσης,

where a comparison with other texts shews

λιμοκτονήσω σε κτέ:

this ms. is probably of the fourteenth cent., and another curious tract of nearly the same age in the same library, Cod. 66 S. Sep., containing an *Αντιλογία* between Christ and the Devil, has

οι γάρ άγγελοι μου φοβεροι ειναι· και εάν σε
υποδείξω αύτοις παράξεν σε έχουν.

Now let us turn to Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata*, p. 447, where we shall find a large collection of cases where *habeo* occurs with an infinitive, under the heading *Gräcismen des Infinitivs*.

At the end of the catalogue of cases (p. 449) Rönsch adds a note saying that there are three different uses of *habeo* in his list; (i) können, vermögen, im Stande sein; (ii) Nothwendigkeit; (iii) das Futurum; and under this last head he refers to the Romance Futures and their origin in the Vulgar Latin. ("Bemerkenswerth. ist, dass dieser Gebrauch von *habere* durchgehends der *romanischen Futuralbildung* zu Grunde liegt.") It would have been convenient if the three classes had been separated, for we clearly cannot assume that every writer who employs *habeo* in one of the three senses will necessarily employ it in the other two senses. Moreover it is important for us to know how far this Vulgar Latin future prevailed, which we find at the back of all the Romance languages. Does it occur, for example, in Africa? Or may we regard its occurrence as a proof that the copies in which it can be traced are European copies? Let us see what other cases there are of the translation of a future tense by the present tense *habeo*.

In John viii. 22 the Codex Vercellensis renders ἀποκτενεῖ αὐτόν by *occidere se habet*, where we see that the future really carries the force of μέλλει ἀποκτείνειν. We cannot then be quite sure whether the translator was working literally. Indeed the same objection may be urged with regard to the passage quoted from Cod. Bezae: Mark xiv. 27 σκανδαλίσασθαι looks very much as if μέλλεσθαι had stood at one time in the text and been removed.

The same thing is true of Tertullian, *Marc.* iv. 39: "quod et ipsae vires caelorum concuti habeant" is not an immediate quotation from the Gospel (Luke xxi. 26 σαλευθήσονται): Tertullian is quoting much in the same way as we should if we said "But that the powers of the heavens have to be shaken." And indeed almost all of the fifty or more cases of the use of *habeo* by Tertullian belong to the same category. They are not pure futures; their Greek equivalent involves δεῖ or μέλλει or ὀφείλει in almost all the cases quoted. On the other hand, the frequent occurrence of these *futures of necessity* in Tertullian may indicate the very ground out of which the later Vulgar Latin future tense was evolved.

In the Palatine version of the Shepherd of Hermas, we find a striking case of a genuine future :

Vis. iii. 9. 5,

θελήσετε ἀγαθοποιεῖν καὶ οὐχ ἔξετε τόπον

velle habetis benefacere et non habebitis locum.

Now Haussleiter¹ has brought forward very decided reasons for believing the Palatine version of Hermas to be an African translation. If this be so, then we can draw no conclusion as to locality from the occurrence of a Vulgar Latin future with *habeo*².

It may be of interest in connexion with the further investigation of the place and time of the Bezan translation to see how far this peculiarity of which we have been treating prevailed in the Latin of Irenaeus. We premise, then, for comparison, that the following are the Bezan instances of the future with *habeo*.

¹ *De versionibus Pastoris Hermæ Latinis*, Erlangen, 1884.

² It may be interesting to note how the two versions of Hermas, the Palatine and the Vulgate respectively, render μέλλω. Here are some cases which we have noted :

			PALAT.	VULG.
Vis.	i. 1. 6.	μέλλω λέγειν	incipio dicere	dictura sum
	i. 1. 8.	τῶν ἀγαθῶν τῶν μελλόντων	gloriam venturam	futura bona
	ii. 2. 3.	τῇ μελλούσῃ	quae incipit esse	quae futura est
	ii. 2. 8.	τοὺς νῦν μέλλοντας ἀρνεῖσθαι	qui nunc incipiunt	denegaturi sunt
	iii. 5. 5.	οἱ οὖν μέλλοντες μετανοεῖν	si ergo coeperint	acturi sunt
Mand.	iii. 8. 11.	ἃ σοι μέλλω λέγειν	incipio dicere	incipio dicere
	iv. 3. 3.	τοῖς μέλλουσι πιστεῦειν	qui credituri sunt	qui credituri sunt
	iv. 4. 4.	μέλλω λαλεῖν	dicturus sum	—
	xi. 7.	μέλλω λέγειν	—	dicturus sum
	xi. 18.	μέλλω λέγειν	dicturus sum	—
Sim.	i. 1.	μέλλετε κατοικεῖν	habitaturi estis	habitaturi estis
	i. 4.	τί μέλλεις ποιεῖν	quid facturus es	quid facies
	iv. 1.	οἱ μέλλοντες κατοικεῖν	qui habitaturi sunt	qui habitaturi sunt
	v. 3. 8.	ἐμελλες εἶναι	eras futurus	eras futurus
	v. 3. 7.	ἐμελλες ποιεῖν	erogaturus eras	facturus eras
	v. 5. 4.	ὃ μέλλω σε ἐπερωτᾶν	quod quaero	quod quaero
	viii. 6. 2.	μέλλουσιν καθαρὰν γενέσθαι	puras mentes futuras	puras mentes futuras

It will be seen that in the Vulgate version μέλλω is only once rendered by *incipio* : in the Palatine version, however, it is translated in the Visions five times out of six by *incipio* and *coepi*. I have found no case, in either version, of what is so common in the Bezan text, the rendering of μέλλω by *habeo* with the future.

Mark xiv. 27,

ΟΤΙ ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΥΜΕΙΣ ΣΚΑΝΔΑΛΙΖΑΘΑΙ
QVI OMNES VOS SCANDALIZARI HABETIS.

Luke x. 1,

ΟΥ ΕΜΕΛΛΕΝ ΕΡΧΕΘΑΙ
VBI HABEBAT VENIRE.

Luke xix. 4,

ΗΜΕΛΛΕΝ ΔΙΕΡΧΕΘΑΙ
HABEBAT TRANSIRE.

Acts i. 5,

ΚΑΙ Ο ΜΕΛΛΕΤΑΙ ΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΙΝ
ET EVM ACCIPERE HABETIS,

(where, as we shall shew by and by, the Latin is the original, and is probably due to an African hand).

In twenty-five other cases μέλλω = *incipio*, in fifteen cases we have a future participle and three other modes of translation; e.g. Mark xiii. 4, μέλλει συντελεῖσθαι = *consummabuntur*, a passage which cod. *b* renders by *incipiunt perfici*.

Notice also the curious textual changes in John xiv. 30, where, the expression ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔχει not being understood, a Latin interpreter assumed that *habet* was a sign of the future tense, and that a verb had dropped. Hence in *ad* we have *invenire* added: this goes back into D as εὐρεῖν, and in some late Greek texts and versions (KII, etc.) as εὐρήσει.

And now turn to Irenaeus and examine some of the similar phenomena which appear in the Latin text.

In ii. 296 = Mass. 285,

θεὸς γὰρ ὁ μέλλων ὁρᾶσθαι

is rendered

deus enim est qui habet videri.

Here we have the same Vulgar Latin usage: but more commonly μέλλω is rendered by *incipio* as in i. 118 = Mass. 62,

διαθερμανθῖσα τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὸ τῆς προσδοκίας
τοῦ μέλλειν αὐτὴν προφητεύειν

is rendered

concalefaciens animam a suspitione
quod incipiet prophetare,

the translation being almost as close and servile as in Codex Bezae.

In i. 151 = Mass. 78,

τοῦ μέλλοντος εἰς αὐτὸν κατέρχεσθαι Ἄνθρώπου

is rendered

eius qui incipit in eum descendere Hominis.

In ii. 48 = Mass. 191,

μόσχος ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀνευρέσεως τοῦ νεωτέρου παιδὸς μέλλον θύεσθαι
vitulus qui pro inventione minoris filii inciperet mactari,

and so in a number of other cases.

9. *Decline of the prepositions.*

The codex shews great decay in the forms of the prepositions; some of which are far gone on their way to French and Italian; while others are only slightly changed.

The weakness of the final *t* in *post* is seen when it comes before a word beginning with either *t* or *d*, as

Acts xx. 29,

pos diescessum meum.

Matt. xxiv. 29,

pos tribulationem.

Such assimilations between neighbouring words are however not uncommon in our text.

We notice one case of *pos* for *post* in the Lyons Pentateuch (*pos hoc*).

Sursum is a word which is more changed; and becomes almost French in its form.

In John iii. 31, *desusum*, and so in Luke i. 3; in Acts ii. 19 it is *susum*¹.

That the final letter was not sounded appears from *susu* in Matt. xxvii. 51. The Lyons Pentateuch shews two cases of *susum* and one of *desusum*.

Trans appears as *tras* in John vi. 15: cf. *trasire* in Luke xviii. 25. In Mark v. 21 we find *tranfretasset*, so that it has the same weaknesses as a participial formation.

¹ This is the form which appears in the Peregrinatio Sylviae (IVth cent.), p. 46: "ecce et commonetur episcopus et descendit et sedet susum."

Deorsum = *diosum* in Luke iv. 10; and this appears as *zosum* in Acts xx. 9. We note *deosum* in the Lyons Pentateuch once.

Per appears once as *sper*: Mark v. 13, *sper praeceps*. The scribe has separated *sper* from the previous word *grex* by a point: otherwise we should read *grexs per*. Note that the form has been traced provisionally to *ex per*; Diez notes that in Wallachian *per* becomes *pre* and then is strengthened to *spre*¹.

There is nothing in all this which is discordant with our previous location of the ms.: and we will now leave the study of the Latin forms in the ms.², and see whether we can get any further light from the Greek side. And first, a few preliminary remarks on the Graecisms in the Latin.

¹ Diez, *Gramm.* p. 756.

² Many of the forms discussed in this chapter may be paralleled from a remarkable seventh-century Vulgar Latin ms. of the Acts of Peter, preserved at Vercelli, and recently transcribed by Gundemann for Lipsius' *Acta Apocrypha*. For instance, *scoruscare* will be found on p. 68, *turbas* for *turbae* (p. 73), *componeretum* for *componeret cum* (p. 51); while the future with *habeo* appears in such expressions as *certare habent duo Iudaei* (p. 70), *quaecunque consumere habui* (p. 77).