

Henry Barber, and Sir William Hewitt in the sixteenth century.

Of *Physicians*, Thomas Lynacre, physician to Henry VIII., 1524; Dr. Baronsdale, president of the college, 1608; Sir Simon Baskerville, M.D., 1641.

Of *Stationers*, William, John and Bonham Norton, 1593-1635; John Cawood, 1572; Richard and Simon Waterson, 1563-1634; and Francis Coldock, 1602.

. The authorities for this paper are Dugdale's "History of S. Paul's"; Payne Fisher's "The Tombs, Monuments, etc., in S. Paul's"; Dean Milman's "Annals of S. Paul's"; with other books of less importance.

WILLIAM SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D.

ART. IV.—THE ROMANCE OF CODEX BEZÆ, WITH
SOME COLLATERAL REFLECTIONS.¹

PART I.

IN 1874 the Mathematical Tripos list contained the name of J. Rendel Harris, who came out as Third Wrangler, and was subsequently elected a Fellow of Clare. He had not, so those who knew him best say, while at college shown any classical leanings. After awhile he went to America, and, after holding a position in the famous Johns Hopkins University, he was appointed Professor of Biblical Languages and Literature in Haverford College, Pennsylvania, where he continued till last year, when Cambridge recalled him to fill the newly-founded lectureship in Palæography. He is married to a Quaker lady, and is himself, we believe, a member of the Society of Friends. But since the year 1883, as was well shown in the *Guardian* of May 18, 1892, he has been prominently before the critical world, and has displayed an amount of industry and scholarly insight that compares most favourably with any of his contemporaries; and it is gratifying to know that an English Cambridge graduate has so well maintained the best traditions of English

¹ Authorities: "Studies in Codex Bezae," by J. Rendel Harris, 1892; "Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis," Scrivener, 1864; Westcott and Hort's "New Testament," vol. ii., 1881; Scrivener's "Introduction to the New Testament," 1874; McClellan's "New Testament," vol. i., 1875; Weymouth's "Resultant Greek Testament," 1892; *Expository Times*—note by Rev. G. Farmer, January, 1892; *Critical Review*, April, 1892—Professor Warfield, pp. 130-138; *Guardian*, May 18th and 25th, 1892; *Academy*, June 4th, 1892.

scholarship and plodding hard work among our brethren on the western shores of the Atlantic. The mere record of his publications is phenomenal and worth quoting; as indicating the scope and depth of his learning and critical power.

He began with two essays on "Stichometry," in the *American Journal of Philology*, in 1883, and an article on "New Testament Autographs." In 1884 (I am quoting the *Guardian*) "Mr. Harris put out a sharp-sighted observation, which, with a comment of Dr. Hort's, has had an important bearing on the history of the Greek Versions of the Old Testament, and has given a different direction to the treatment of Old Testament quotations for purposes of criticism" (*Johns Hopkins University Circular*, April 1, December, 1884). To the same period (1887) belong an account of Cod. 69 (the Leicester MS. of the Gospels), and some newly-recovered fragments of Philo Judæus. Would that he would give us some day an edition of Philo, distinguishing critically the genuine from the spurious works!

About this time Professor Harris undertook a journey to the East and explored the library of the Convent of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, an account of which he published, as well as a "Collection of Biblical Fragments from Mount Sinai." And it is interesting to observe that in the majority of instances his writings have been published by the Cambridge Press, evidencing that his American position did not blind him to the value of his earlier home. He has looked "unto the rock whence he was hewn." As part of the spoils of this journey he brought back a Greek version of "The Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas," which is the basis of one of his most recent works!

In 1890 came an important contribution to the rapidly growing and intensely interesting literature arising out of the newly-recovered "Diatessaron" of Tatian, which, though consisting of only sixty-eight pages, contained much that was new and valuable, and is interesting historically as giving the first hint, so far as I know, of the thesis maintained in the book which is my subject in this paper, although the opinion Professor Harris now holds is the opposite of that put forward in the preliminary study of the "Diatessaron."

Passing over some minor works such as a collation of Cod. 892, Gregory, and Codex Sangallensis (Δ), the latter of which, however, has a close relation to D, we come to Professor Rendel Harris's two most recent contributions to our knowledge. The *Guardian* reviewer has curiously omitted the first of these, a fact the more remarkable as he has ferreted out much smaller productions.

The past few years have witnessed a very striking change in

the methods of critical work at our universities; the change being mainly due, according to Professor Sanday, to the influence and example of the late Dr. Edwin Hatch, too soon removed, of the fruits of whose critical labours the world has just received another very profound illustration in the publication of the first part of his posthumous Concordance to the LXX. and other Greek versions of the Old Testament. The first fruits of this new movement, which may be described briefly and roughly as the investigation in minute detail of every scrap of evidence, however small and apparently insignificant, in preference to, and antecedent to, any large and sweeping generalizations, was the publication of the series known as "Studia Biblica" emanating from Oxford, under the editorship of the Bishop of Salisbury, Professor Sanday and others. The "Studia Biblica" are very learned, very important, but rather dull, and they have not had, I believe, a very wide circulation even for literature of the kind. The price was high to begin with, and the separate contributions could not be got in detached form. Cambridge was not long in following the example of the elder University, and the "Cambridge Texts and Studies"—Contributions to Biblical and Patristic literature—under the able editorship of the Rev. J. Armitage Robinson, B.D., Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge, are now well under way, and seem destined to sail with auspicious wind to a fair haven. They are published in parts, and the first four parts form the first volume. The prices of the parts are moderate, and the style in which they are written is graphic, while the scholarship displayed is quite on a level with that of the "Studia Biblica." The first volume contains Professor Rendel Harris's "Apology of Aristides," the Editor's "Passion of St. Perpetua," Mr. Chase's valuable monograph of "The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church," and Mr. A. E. Brooke's "Fragments of Heracleon." Of the second volume only two parts are at present issued: Harris's "Study of Codex Bezae," and Mr. M. R. James's monograph on "The Testament of Abraham," with translations from the Arabic of the Testaments of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, by Mr. W. E. Barnes.

Of Professor Rendel Harris's recovery and edition of the long lost "Apology of Aristides," I have not now time to speak, save only to say that it will well repay study; while for the indolent or busy there is a smaller edition in English, recently published, edited by Mrs. Rendel Harris, and expurgated for popular use. Its importance may be gathered from the single fact that it is earlier than the "Apology" (for it seems probable, or at least possible, that the second "Apology" is part of the first) of Justin Martyr. And it is to be hoped that Professor Harris, or some other diligent and expert scholar, may come across the

still missing "Apology of Quadratus." The *Guardian* review curiously omits all reference to this most important part of Rendel Harris's scholarly work.

I have dwelt thus long upon the previous work of Professor Rendel Harris in order to show how competent he is from his training and acquirements to deal with the questions he raises in his last book. And also because it is always interesting to trace the development of a man's progress from small beginnings to greatness. He has now placed himself in the very front rank of English scholarship, and the stages of his advancement, though rapid, are orderly and natural. The interest of his other works, great as it is, especially in the case of "Didache," in Schaff's edition, and the "Apology of Aristides," pales beside that of his "Study in Codex Bezae," which, at one stroke, has reopened many questions that some, at least, thought had been set at rest for many years. It has made several books almost useless, except as marking progress in the history of criticism, and has, at any rate, I think, made the acceptance of the Revised Version of the Gospels and Acts as a final version impossible. I am not blind to the splendid character of the Revised Version, and I still think that it is the best we have. But that it is the best we can have no one who has read Professor Harris's book can any longer hold. And this far more from the method he has employed than from any actual results obtained. Some of his results are open to criticism and have been criticized, but the main positions at present hold their own.

Codex Bezae has long been one of the great puzzles of New Testament criticism. It was presented by Theodore Beza to the University of Cambridge (of the Public Library of which it is still the greatest treasure) in 1581. Beza's own account of it, given in the letter which accompanied the MS., was that he had gotten it from the Monastery of St. Irenæus at Lyons, probably as part of the plunder in the sacking of Lyons in 1562. It appears never to have been out of France, with the exception that it was taken to the Council of Trent by a French bishop, William à Prato, in 1546, a piece of information first furnished by Wetstein, that accounts for the otherwise strange fact mentioned by Scrivener, "that about the year 1546, when Robert Stephens was collecting materials for his critical editions of the New Testament, numerous extracts from a document (by him called B), which we shall soon prove to have been none other than Codex Bezae, were sent to him from Italy by some friend who had collated it in his behalf" (Scriv. Bez. Cod. Cantab., Introd. viii.).

We know that at the Council of Trent a MS. was used in order to show the existence of the reading *εαν αὐτὸν θέλω*.

μένειν οὕτως in St. John xxi. 22, which is found in D alone at present. And Professor Rendel Harris shrewdly conjectures that the reason why this MS. was brought in was in support of the doctrine of celibacy—μένειν οὕτως, “to remain as he was,” *i.e.*, unmarried, it being taken as proof of the perpetual virginity of St. John the Divine.

It was used thus by Stephens in the third edition of his New Testament in 1550. Beza himself employed it in the three editions of his Greek Testament, 1582, 1589, and 1598. It has been collated since by Patrick Young, by Archbishop Ussher (very badly according to Scrivener), by Mill, by J. J. Wetstein in 1716, and by Bentley. The two editions of it that are best known and deserving of note are those of Dr. Thomas Kipling, which preserves, though with many inaccuracies, the uncial letters, their various sizes, and the relative spaces between them; and the last collation, that of Scrivener, published by Deighton and Bell in 1864, and judging by the difficulty I had in getting hold of a copy, that is not nearly so well known as it should be. The London Library, even, did not contain one—an omission which should be remedied. Scrivener's edition contains the Greek and Latin texts printed in ordinary lower-case type, but preserving the colometry of the original MS., which in some cases is of great importance. Scrivener's "Introduction," too, is still of great value, though needing, of course, to be constantly checked by Professor Harris's later work, while serving oftentimes as a countercheck; and the *Guardian* reviewer is right in lamenting the sparsity of Harris's references to, and the admission of his obligations to, Scrivener. The MS. contains not only the text, Greek and Latin, of the Gospels and Acts, but some other curious things in addition. It once contained, according to Scrivener, the Catholic Epistles as well, but these are lost, except twelve lines of the Third Epistle of St. John; so that practically it is only available for the Gospels (which occur in their usual *Western* order—Sts. Matthew, John, Luke, Mark) and the Acts. And there are lacunæ either in the Latin or in the Greek, or in both, in these. St. Luke's Gospel is the only book that is complete.

Among the things it contains in addition to the text are the Ammonian sections (not the Eusebian Canons), and various supplemental leaves by later hands. Scrivener enumerates nine or ten correctors in the text, and many more (including Bentley himself) in the margin. There are, however, 321 notes in the margin of St. Mark, a list of which Scrivener appended to his edition of the text (pp. 451-52), but of the meaning and use of which he could make nothing; and it is one of the most interesting chapters in Rendel Harris that

deals with these scrawls. Scrivener said (p. 27): "Those found in St. Mark consist of moral apothegms, some of them silly enough; the rest are τίτλοι, or summaries of the contents of the page," written by a tenth-century hand in Greek. Professor Harris has, however, shown that they form a *sortes sanctorum*, and do not by any means stand alone, similar ones being found (by M. Samuel Berger) in the Codex Sangarmanensis, in Codex Sangallensis, and others, and the relation between those in Codex Bezae and the St. Germain Codex is still under investigation. This is of itself a brilliant discovery, and one which will doubtless lead to further research and light upon early Church history and practice.

The common opinion about Codex Bezae is that it is a storehouse of blunders, that its text both as to matter and form is about as corrupt as a text well can be, that its interpolations are wilful, its spellings arbitrary, its critical value practically nothing. There were exceptions to this general chorus of condemnation of Codex D, but even these were very vague and uncertain as to details, and therefore of little critical use. A sample or two may suffice. Mr. McClellan in his invaluable edition of the Gospels, by no means yet appreciated at anything like its full worth, and of whom it may be hoped that he will yet, notwithstanding the want of success that has attended his first volume, finish the New Testament in the same way as that in which he has begun it, says of Cod. D: "Very corrupt, distinguished by extensive interpolations, but very valuable." And Bishop Westcott and Dr. Hort, in the second volume of their Greek Testament, one of the most learned books ever penned by man, and needing already to be considerably modified if Rendel Harris's view of D is correct, said, pp. 148-49: "Though the MS. was written in century VI. the text gives no clear signs of having undergone recent degeneracy; it is, to the best of our belief, substantially a Western text of century II., with occasional readings probably due to century IV. Much more numerous are readings belonging to a very early stage of the Western text, free as yet from corruptions early enough to be found in the European or even in the African form of the Old Latin Version, and, indeed, elsewhere. In spite of the *prodigious amount of error* which D contains, these readings, in which it sustains and is sustained by other documents derived from very ancient texts of other types, render it often invaluable for the secure recovery of the true text. And apart from this direct applicability, no single source of evidence, except the quotations of Origen, surpasses it in value on the equally important ground of historical or indirect instruction. To what extent its unique readings are due to the license of the scribe, rather than to faithful reproduction of an

antecedent text now otherwise lost, it is impossible to say; but it is remarkable how frequently the discovery of fresh evidence, especially Old Latin evidence, supplies a second authority for readings in which D had hitherto stood alone. At all events, when every allowance has been made for possible individual license, the text of D presents a truer image of the form in which the Gospels and Acts were most widely read in the third, and probably a great part of the second, century than any other extant Greek MS." And yet, curiously enough, judging from the "Notes on Select Readings" in the same volume, apparently, and from the Revisers' Text certainly, Codex Bezae was seldom or ever taken against the single or united authority of Codices Aleph and B.

Now what are the corruptions of Codex Bezae? They may be roughly divided into two classes—*phonetic* and *material*—*phonetic* affecting the form of individual words, *material* affecting the insertion or omission of words or phrases (in most cases in D, insertion).

Professor Rendel Harris has dealt with both those classes of variations, though the division I have used it is but fair to say is not his but mine, and I have no right to weight him with it.

I. Now, first, as to merely phonetic variations. As is well-known Codex D is a bi-lingual codex, written in parallel Greek and Latin columns. The old theory was that of these the Greek was the original and the earlier, and the Latin an imperfect, faulty, misspelt, and altogether bad *translation*, of little or no value, and not to be taken into account in weighing the critical merit of the Codex. In fact, the very use of the single title "D" shows this. No one thought of employing a double nomenclature "D" to represent the Greek, and "d" to indicate the Latin reading. All this is changed by Professor Harris. Reserving for the moment the question of the priority and relations of the two columns, the mere linguistic problems attaching to the Latin have now received a new and satisfactory solution, and that by the use of a more rational and scientific method. Just as the Homeric forms were once explained by the simple but erroneous supposition that they were mere metrical devices to overcome difficulties of scansion and the like, but are now known to be differences due to dialect and to age, so the Bezan Latin is not misspelt nor wilfully corrupt, but represents a stage in the development of language, the classical Latin passing into the vulgar or rustic Latin, and so on into early French. The Codex thus becomes a storehouse for transitional forms, a treasure yet to be fully explored, and destined, doubtless, to prove of service in other fields of inquiry. The same is true, though not to the same extent, of the phonetic problems belonging to the Greek of the

Codex. The transitional forms, moreover, are those which point distinctly to a Gallican and not to an Italian origin, as when we find

Et dicit illi amīe—St. Luke xi. 5,

and

Ad quod venisti amē—St. Matt. xxvi. 50 ;

where "amīe" and "amē" are clearly transitional forms of "amice," on the road to the French "ami." If it had been Italian we should have had "amico." There are numerous other illustrations of this kind of change pointed out by Professor Harris, but the interest of this part of the inquiry is secondary, though extremely absorbing, to the philological student. Let me say in passing that I have not been able to make out whether the learned Professor has worked at all at the original MS., or has been content with Dr. Scrivener's unique edition. The point is not without its value, because Scrivener himself distinctly says (Cod. Bez., p. xxii.) that in his edition "the text as it came from the original scribe is represented *only so far as seen by the editor himself*," and as the MS. appears to have been less legible in 1864 than when seen by Kipling in 1793, it might be worth while again to check Scrivener's collation ere it be too late. It seems, however, probable that Mr. Harris used only Scrivener's edition, especially as there is some doubt about the punctuation of St. John i. 3 in the Cambridge MS., while the author of the work now before us expresses none whatever, thus following Scrivener.

The result, then, so far, of the researches of Professor Harris is that Codex Bezae is Gallican, and belongs to some place not far from the Rhone Valley, and he expresses the hope (p. 119) that he has either settled the question of Gallican as against Italian origin, or made it easy for some one else to settle it. How much farther back he traces it I shall have to note later on in my paper.

II. Now let us turn to what I have called the "material" variations found in the Codex. These are much better known than the former, but a brief recapitulation may not be out of place, especially as I have found Scrivener's edition so little known. Scrivener says (p. xlix.): "The most striking feature of Cod. D is its perpetual tendency to *interpolation*, by which term we understand the practice of adding to the received text passages (often of some length) which, whether genuine or spurious, are found in this document either alone or in company with a very few others." Dean Alford says (in Proleg., ch. vii., § 1): "It appears to have been written in France, and by a *Latin transcriber ignorant of Greek*, from many curious

mistakes which occur in the text and version attached. . . . Its peculiarities are so great that in many passages, while the sense remains for the most part unaltered, hardly three words together are the same as in the commonly received text. And that these variations often arise from capricious alteration, is evident from the way in which the Gospels, in parallel passages, have been more than commonly interpolated from one another in this MS. . . . In critical weight it ranks the lowest of the leading MSS.

The following, then, are a very few of the chief interpolations in D :

i. In St. Matt. i. 16, in the Latin (the Greek being lost) inserts "Virgo" before "Maria." Found also elsewhere.

ii. After St. Matt. xx. 28 is found a long passage of twelve lines, evidently foreign to the style of St. Matthew, but found also in Cureton's Syriac, many of the Old Latin versions, one MS. of the Peshito, etc. It is chiefly composed of a variant form of our Lord's words about sitting down in the lowest room, but opens, with words that are unique : "But you, seek ye that from little things ye may become great, and not from great things may become little."

iii. After St. Luke vi. 4, in D only, are the words, "On the same day he beheld a certain man working on the Sabbath, and said unto him, Man, blessed art thou if thou knowest what thou dost; but if thou knowest not, thou art cursed and a transgressor of the law."

iv. St. Luke xxiii. 53. The words are added :

Et posito eo impositus
In monumento lapidem quem vix viginti
Moverant.

With corresponding Greek.

Now, what light does the new study of Codex D throw upon the mass of interpolations of which these quoted are only a fragment ?

Professor Rendel Harris has attempted to prove—and it is a question that will bear a good deal of discussion whether he has really proved—that so far from the Greek being the original and the Latin a translation made by a scribe ignorant of Greek, the reverse is the case. According to Rendel Harris the Latin is earlier than the Greek of D. He says, "The whole of the Greek text of Cod. Bezae from the beginning of Matthew to the end of Acts is a re-adjustment of an earlier text to the Latin version." In this he goes back to the view of the earlier critics, Mill, Wetstein, Middleton and others, with the addition, of course, of the enormous amount of knowledge gained since their day. Substantially, his view is that

the two texts have acted and re-acted one upon the other, but that the stronger element in the re-action has been the Latin.

The way in which this is shown is very long and complex, involving the quotation of a number of parallel passages, with which I do not propose now to deal. But a sample may be given, bearing also upon an entirely new point in New Testament criticism.

Take the passage last quoted, the words added to St. Luke xxiii. 53. Dr. Scrivener had always pointed out that "to this verse D makes a strange addition, conceived somewhat in the Homeric spirit"; but Rendel Harris has gone further, and thinks he has tracked it to Homer. He says, "Fixing our attention on the added words in the Latin, we see that the words 'posito eo' and 'in monumento' are a repetition from the preceding words, 'posuit eum in monumento.' And if we erase them we have left what is certainly meant for a hexameter verse,"

Imposuit lapidem quem via viginti movebant.

It is clear, then, that the scribe of D, or, if we prefer it, an ancestor of his, *has deliberately incorporated into his text a verse of Latin poetry*, which he has then turned into Greek, following closely the order of the Latin verse. . . . The origin of the gloss is Homeric, and the stone which covered the entrance to the Lord's tomb has been compared to the great stone which Polyphemus rolls to "the mouth of his cave," so great that two and twenty waggons would not be able to stir it. Whether this be so, or no, I cannot say, but on the following page Harris whets one's appetite in the most tantalising manner. He goes on to say that "the leading facts of the Gospel History were, at a very early period (far earlier than most people suppose), transferred into poetry by using the language of Homer, and translating into this speech the record of the Miracles and Passion of our Lord. These curious patchworks of verses and half-verses of Homer were known by the name of 'Homeric Centones' It is not generally known that these collections have exercised a very great influence over the primitive Christian literature. But such is the case, as I hope at some future time to demonstrate. When the Homeric Centonists went to work to write the story of our Lord's burial in Greek hexameters, they made the very same connection with Polyphemus that Codex Bezae does." Then follows the quotation. And the conclusion is "the intermediate link was either some Latin form of the 'Odyssey,' or it was a version of the Gospels made by a Latin Centonist."

This, however, is not all that can be got out of the Homeric gloss. The same gloss is found in the other Latin MS. (c.

Codex Colbertinus), which seems to be a re-translation of the Western Greek, and also in the Sahidic or Thebaic version, "which ultimately leans on a Latin base," and is usually referred to the third century, at least. Hence the metrical gloss must be very ancient also, and Harris sums up by stating that instead of regarding D as a fourth century product, he regards it "in the main, including the glosses, as two hundred years earlier than this," *i.e.*, second century.

He has, by thus dealing with the relation of the Greek to the Latin text, added much to our knowledge of the Old Latin version, which forms so large an element in the work done in "Studia Biblica." In addition to the now increased probability that the Old Latin and all Latin texts go back originally to one version, and that a product of *North Africa*, he shows us that the original Old Latin version was the first line-for-line translation of the Greek text, and regards the Latin of *d* as its best and most unaltered extant representative.

FREDERIC RELTON.

(To be continued.)



ART. V.—BENEVOLENCE.

I WONDER which of us really knows by his own intimate personal experience what is the meaning of being in distress. I do not use the word "poverty." Poverty is a very relative expression. It may mean totally different states in the mouths of different people. A man might even say that he was poor because he was reduced from some high standard of expenditure, though he might be still able to lay out many thousands a year. "Poverty," said an acute writer—William Cobbett—"is (except where there is an actual want of food and raiment) a thing much more imaginary than real. The shame of poverty, the shame of being thought poor, is a great and fatal weakness, though arising in this country from the fashion of the times themselves." I shall therefore avoid the word "poverty." It is not about anything so liable to be misunderstood that I wish to write. I am writing about a very real and terrible fact. I shall use the word "distress." And I ask my readers whether they have any experience of the bitter meaning of being in distress.

It means that all earthly hopes have failed you. You do not know where to look for the next bit of bread. Your strength, which is to you of the last and greatest value, has slowly ebbed away through weeks or months of insufficient