

of the spiritual world Jesus Himself could not break. Hardness is of the essence of Religion, like the iron band within the golden crown. Jesus was willing to undertake the culture of every man's soul, but He knew no other way than the Cross. If His disciples wished to sit on His throne, they must drink His cup and be baptised with His baptism (St. Matt. xx. 23). Jesus did not walk one way Himself and propose another for the disciples, but invited them to His experience if they desired His attainment. His method was not the materialistic cross of Munkácsy, it was the mystical cross of Perugino. Jesus nowhere commanded that one cling to His Cross, He everywhere commanded that one carry His Cross, and out of this daily crucifixion has been born the most beautiful sainthood from St. Paul to St. Francis, from A'Kempis to George Herbert. For "there is no salvation of the soul nor hope of everlasting life but in the Cross."

JOHN WATSON.

BREVIA.

The Reading of Codex Bezae in Acts I. 2.—I have to thank Dr. Marcus Dods for his kindly and appreciative notice of my book on *The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae* in the February number of THE EXPOSITOR.

I have lately noticed a significant piece of evidence as to an important reading of that Codex. I shall be grateful if I may call the attention of any readers of THE EXPOSITOR interested in the matter to it.

In Acts i. 2 Codex Bezae reads as follows :—

αχρι ης ημερας ανελημφθη εντειλαμενος τοις αποστολοις δια πνω αγιου ους εξελεξατο και εκελευσε κηρυσσειν το ευαγγελιον.

The "true" text has αχρι ης ημερας εντειλάμενος τοις αποστόλοις δια πνεύματος αγίου ους εξελέξατο ανέλημφθη.

It will be convenient if I state briefly that the theory as to Codex Bezae, which I have endeavoured to substantiate in my book, is that the Greek text of that Codex is the result of assimilation to an old Syriac text,¹ or, to put the theory in a more

¹ That an old Syriac text of the Acts existed is clear from the fact that

concrete form, that in that Greek text we have the Greek text of a Græco-Syriac bilingual MS., in which the Greek was conformed to its eccentric companion, an old Syriac text.

Turning to the Bezan text of Acts i. 2, we are struck by two points—a variation of order and an interpolation.

In regard to the variation of order, it must suffice to say that the Bezan text reproduces (except in one small point) the order of the words in the Peshitta (the Syriac Vulgate).

The interpolation is one of great interest. Among the Curetonian fragments of an Old Syriac Version¹ of the Gospels the last four verses (17–20) of [Mark] xvi. have a place. In v. 19 (ὁ μὲν οὖν Κύριος Ἰησοῦς μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς ἀνελήμφθη) we read in this old Syriac text, “But our Lord Jesus, after He had *commanded* (ܘܥܡܪ; ܕܥܘܠܘܢ) His disciples, was exalted to heaven.” In v. 15 we read in the Greek text, κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάση τῇ κτίσει. Here the Curetonian fragments (*i.e.* the old Syriac text) unfortunately fail us. There is, however, little room for variation in a Syriac rendering of this verse: the Peshitta has “Preachye *My-Gospel in-all-of-it* creation (ܘܥܡܪܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܘܢ).”

I maintain then in regard to Acts i. 2 that the Bezan interpolation is derived from an old Syriac text of the Acts. Why an interpolation should arise in a *Syriac* text at this point we can easily see. In Acts i. 2 the Peshitta renders ἐντελάμενος by the words “after He-had-commanded (ܘܥܡܪܘܢ ܕܥܘܠܘܢ).” Now as this rendering is a very natural translation in Syriac of the Greek participle, and as the Peshitta (the Syriac Vulgate), being a revision of the Old Syriac, often preserves (as we know from a comparison between it and the Curetonian fragments of the Gospels) an old Syriac reading, we may fairly assume that it does so here. But in the Old Syriac of [Mark] xvi. 19 the same phrase is used as the equivalent of μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι. Hence between the two passages [Mark] xvi. 15, 19, and Acts i. 2 there is a verbal connexion. As to substance, the two passages are most closely related; for both speak of our Lord’s charge to His Apostles just before His Ascension. The passage of the Gospel seemed to supply what was lacking in the text of the Acts; it suggested the substance of our Lord’s parting commands. Hence a phrase of

Aphraat (who used an old Syriac text of the Gospels) quotes four passages from a text of the Acts not identical with the Peshitta.

¹ Aphraat quotes an old Syriac text of [Mark] xvi. 16, 17, 18.

[Mc.] xvi. 19, was linked to the words of [Mc.] xvi. 15, and the gloss thus formed was inserted in the text of Acts. i. 2.

This theory as to the Bezan gloss receives, as I believe, complete confirmation from the following passage of the ancient Syriac document—*The Doctrine of Addai the Apostle* (ed. Phillips, p. 3, Eng. Trans., p. 9): “And Abgar commanded that they should deliver to Addai silver and gold. Addai said to him: ‘How are we able to receive anything which is not ours? for, behold, that which was ours we have forsaken, as we were commanded by our Lord to be without purses and without scrips, and carrying crosses upon our shoulders, *we were commanded to preach His Gospel to the whole creation.*’” The literal translation of the last clause is as follows: “We-were-commanded that-we-should-preach *His-Gospel* in-all-of-it creation (ܐܘܪܘܫܠܝܡ ܕܥܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܐ ܕܥܘܢܐ).”¹

Here then in an ancient Syriac document, which is known to incorporate old Syriac and Tatianic readings in passages of the Gospels, we find our gloss, its form indeed just so far changed (“we-were-commanded”) as to make it fit into its new context. Its occurrence here may, I think, be said to put it beyond doubt that the Bezan gloss in Acts i. 2 is a gloss from an old Syriac text. Further, the addition of the words “in-all-of-it creation” makes it certain that [Mark] xvi. 15, 19, is the source of the gloss.

In this case then I am able to appeal to something like documentary evidence, and this evidence confirms the conclusions to which a critical study of the Bezan text led me.

I may perhaps be allowed very briefly to call attention to two other Bezan readings. (i.) In Acts ii. 17, Codex Bezae reads *καὶ προφητευσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτῶν καὶ θυγατέρες αὐτῶν*. For *αὐτῶν* the “true” text has *ἑμῶν*. “The genesis” of this reading, I remarked (p. 18), “becomes obvious when we write side by side ܘܢܘܨܝܢ (your-sons), and ܘܢܘܨܝܢ (their-sons).” I have since noticed that we have an instance of the confusion between these two words in the Peshitta of 1 Cor. vii. 14: “and-if not, *their-children* (ܘܢܘܨܝܢ) unclean (were-)they,” where the “true” Greek text has *τὰ τέκνα ἑμῶν*. It may be noticed that this reading is found in the newly published Latin translation of the Armenian version of Ephrem’s commentary on the Pauline Epistles: “Sin autem

¹ “*His-Gospel*” will be noticed. It shows that the Peshitta in “*my-Gospel*” is preserving an Old Syriac text.

id, quod dixi, ita non esset, ergo *fili eorum* juxta mentes illorum immundi essent."

(ii.) In Acts ii. 47, Codex Bezae reads, *εχοντες χαριν προς ολον τον κοσμον*. Instead of *κόσμον* the "true" text has *λαόν*. I pointed out that the Bezan reading points to the substitution in a Syriac text of ܠܘܠܐ (the-world) for ܠܘܠܐ (the-people), and that we find instances of this substitution in the Curetonian text of Matt. i. 21 (He shall save *the-world*), and in the Peshitta of Lc. ii. 10 (great joy which shall be to all *the-world*). I would now add that the converse change is found in Jn. xviii. 20 (*ἐγὼ παρῥησίᾳ λελάληκα τῷ κόσμῳ*), where the Peshitta has "I openly (was) speaking with the-people (ܠܘܠܐ)." In these three passages of the Gospels there is, so far as I know, no authority for the variants except the Syriac texts. Further, in Jno. xii. 19 (*ὁ κόσμος ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ ἀπήλθεν*) the old Latin *Codex Corbeiensis* (ff²) has "unus [=universus] *populus*"—a striking illustration of the connexion which seems to exist between the old Latin and the Syriac texts.

F. H. CHASE.

THE PENALTY OF PRIVILEGE.

"You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities."—*Amos* iii. 2.

At first it seems a glaring *non sequitur*. There seems no logical connection between the fact stated and the conclusion drawn. It comes with the shock of surprise. It would have been natural to expect—You have I known, therefore you can rely on my favour; you have God on your side, and may do with impunity things forbidden to others; I will forgive all your iniquities.

This was evidently the reasoning which the Israelites pursued; for Amos devotes the first two chapters of his prophecy to establish the general truth of God's impartial justice. He illustrates the fact that judgment infallibly follows sin, by predictions against all the nations round about Israel. Judgment is never an isolated thing, but every sentence is pronounced on fixed principles. The doom of Israel is all the greater, by reason of that very favour upon which they were counting for lenient treatment.

Man naturally presumes upon favour. It is hard even yet to