SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE CODEX BEZÆ.

"The internal character of Codex Bezæ is a most difficult and indeed an almost inexhaustible theme." Thus wrote Dr. Scrivener in a passage of his Introduction, which, as the new editor tells us (vol. i., p. 130), was penned before the publication of the highly ingenious treatise by Mr. Rendel Harris, entitled A Study of the Codex Bezæ (1891). After Harris, Mr. Chase took quite a different look at it, pointing to the Syriac element in Codex Bezæ, and now the question has taken quite a new start, or will do so, by the theory put forward by Prof. Blass, of Halle, that, as far as the Acts are concerned, this Codex has preserved us quite a different recension or edition of that book, flowing, as it seems to him, from the first draught or rough copy of Luke's text, while the other MSS. go back on the altered copy forwarded to Theophilus. Compare the Prolegomena of Acta Apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum Liber alter: editio philologica apparatu critico, commentario perpetuo, indice verborum illustrata auctore Friderico Blass, Göttingen, 1895.

It is not my intention to enter upon this theme at large—I have not even the necessary books for doing so—but I believe I have made two observations, one as to the text and the other as to the origin of the Codex, which may turn out very important, if they be proved. If any one has already started them before me, I most willingly concede the priority, and beg to excuse my ignorance by my distance from all centres of learning.

1. My first observation is that the Greek text of the first chapters of Acts as contained in Codex Bezæ shows clear traces of an underlying Semitic original, namely, Acts ii. 47. All our Greek manuscripts and other sources read: ἐχοντες χάριν πρὸς δὸν τὸν λαὸν; Codex Bezæ alone πρὸς δὸν τὸν κόσμον, αρπὸν totum mundum. As Prof. Blass
remarks, κόσμος may be used here in a similar way to John vii. 4, xii. 19 in the sense which the word has in modern Greek = le monde = les hommes. But to a reader more versed in Hebrew and Syriac another thought might occur.

Ἀαός is = ὡς, ἱκ and κόσμος is = ἐκκόσμις, ἱκ. How easily these two words have been confounded, a few examples will suffice to show. First, one from the New Testament.

2 Peter ii. 1, εν τῷ λαῷ: Tischendorf quotes as variant, Syr. Bodl., in mundo. Now, it has long since been shown (1886) by I. H. Hall, in his edition of the William Manuscript, that the latter has correctly ἱκ (people), and that ἐκκόσμις (world) in the Bodleian copy is a mere clerical error of the Syrian copyist. This variant has to disappear from the critical apparatus.

Another example from the Old Testament. In 1 Esdr. iv. 40 we have the doxology: καὶ αὐτῆ—thus must be read, instead of αὐτῆ—ἡ ἱσχῦς καὶ τὸ βασιλείων καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία καὶ ἡ μεγαλειώτης τῶν πάντων αἰώνων: of all ages. Ball, in his Variorum Apocrypha, quotes for the last word as variant: “peoples, Syr.” But it is clear, Syriac ἱκόσι (peoples) is again a mere misspelling for ἱκόσι (ages).

On three witnesses a cause stands; therefore one more example from an ecclesiastical text. Within the last year, by a strange coincidence, the Vita Antonii was published twice, printed in the same printing house, the whole text by P. Bedjan in the fifth volume of his Acta Martyrum, the first part only by Friedr. Schulthess, of Zurich, in a dissertation of the University of Strassburg. Schulthess used three MSS. of the British Museum, Bedjan also three, one of them being identical with one used by Schulthess. Now, where Bedjan reads ἱκόσι, and the people slept (p. 19 l. 8), Schulthess has ἱκόσι (p. 14 l. 1.) and the world slept. Neither gives any variant in his critical apparatus;
from this argumentum ex silentio we would have to conclude that all three MSS. of Bedjan have אֶלֶכֶת, and the three copies of Schulthess עַלְכֶת. This cannot be true, as one identical MS. was used by both; but it is perhaps the best proof how easily אֶלֶכֶת and עַלְכֶת are confounded. The possibility at least seems, therefore, settled, that λαός and κόσμος may go back to an identical Semitic text, in which at one time אלהי עַלְכֶת, and at another אלהי עַלְכֶת, was believed to stand.

We have, by the bye, in the New Testament, perhaps, a further example of this confusion: Luke ii. 10, where we hear of the great joy which shall be to all the people (R.V.) παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, the Syriac version, at least in the printed editions at my disposal, has: to all the world, עַלְכֶת; and it is a new example of the insufficient representation of this Queen of the Versions in our critical editions that Tischendorf does not mention this at all. The newly discovered Lewis-Codex has also עַלְכֶת, world, likewise the Arabic Tatian, while Philoxenus and the Hierosolymitan render λαῷ. I should not wonder if a Syriac MS. of the Peshito be found reading עַלְכֶת.

But I must haste to another passage, which, to my understanding at least, makes the supposition of a Semitic original not only possible or likely, but even necessary.

Acts iii. 14 we read: ὑμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἄγιον καὶ δίκαιον ἡρνήσασθε; Tischendorf notes: D, εἴσαρνατε, item Int agravastis (d. grabastis), Aug., pecc. mer. 28, inhonorastis et negastis. Beside the remark that the palimpsest of Fleury, which in other places agrees with D, has here negastis, Prof. Blass has added nothing to the critical apparatus. In the commentary he merely says: D plane mire εἴσαρνατε. I am not aware that any one has tried to explain this apparently strange εἴσαρνατε. To me it seems pretty clear αἴρεσθαι is = עַכֶת (עַלְכֶת); compare the Syriac, and בָּרְפָּס, בָּרְפָּנַא—a look into Hatch-Redpath will suffice—is = עָלְכָּה.
(Job xv. 10, xxxv. 16). Can we escape the conclusion, that he who wrote εβαρυνατε, translated a Semitic text, in which he believed he read בָּבְרִית, while another, or the same afterwards in revising his translation, read נַפְרֵיס = ηρυψασθε?

Prof. Blass has asked for the first eight chapters of Acts: "num ex ore narrantium omnia exeperit Lucas, an etiam commentarios quosdam adhibuerit ab hoc vell illo—he thinks of Mark and Barnabas—perscriptos." On internal grounds he has quite decided for the latter supposition, not only as to the speeches of Peter and Stephen, but also as to the narrative parts, in which these speeches are imbedded: "putandum erit, satis amplos eos commentarios fuisse, pertinentes fortasse a primis originibus ecclesiae Hierosolymitanae usque ad mortem Herodis Antipæ.

I believe it to be proved, by this observation on the text of Codex Bezæ, that Luke used for the first chapter of Acts a written source, and that this account was a Semitic one; whether Hebrew or Aramaic, I cannot discuss at present; εβαρυνατε favours the supposition of a Hebrew one.

2. My second observation touches the origin and home of Codex Bezæ. The planum mira lectio εβαρυνατε is to be found already with Irenæus. There is another passage where a mere clerical error of D is also already attested to by that father.

Acts v. 31: the first hand of D has τη δοξη, instead of τη δεξια. A corrector, whom Scrivener calls B, changed it into δεξια. By a strange coincidence, also, the Latin text of D has here a clerical error, caritatem, instead of claritatem. That δοξη is nothing but a misspelling may be proved by the fact that the same kind of error occurs elsewhere. 2 Chron. xxx. 8 all our Greek MSS. read: δοτε δοξαν κυριω, the Hebrew 'י showing that it must be δεξιων. Isaiah lxii. 8, we read ωμοσευν κυrios kata της δοξης αυτου; but not only have Ximenes, Aldus, Grabe printed δεξιως, but the corrector of the Codex Vaticanus Ba changed this
δόξης into δεξιας, just like the corrector of D. Now this very δόξης is again testified by Irenaeus: gloria. Indeed, a respectable age of this misspelling, but we wonder less at it, if the supposition of Blass be true, that D goes back on a rough copy, a first draught, which probably was written not very calligraphically. Be this as it may, the point that I am now concerned with is this: Beza himself testifies, in the letter by which he presented his treasure to the University of Cambridge, that he got it “ex Irenæi cœnobio Lugdunensi.” I do not see that those who lately discussed the origin of the Codex took any notice of this very curious coincidence. I have not time or means of taking up the question at length, but I may express my belief that Codex D was written in the very place from whence it got into the possession of Beza, in the town of Irenæus, perhaps from his own copy, and that in Acts at least it preserved us a text of the utmost importance, a text which leads us back not only to the Greek of Luke, but to the Semitic originals which Luke made use of.

3. On Luke xi. 2 Tischendorf remarks:—

Praeterea D add (: : e Mt.) μη βαπτολογεῖτε ὡς (d sicut et) οἱ λοιποὶ δοκοῦσιν γάρ τινες, etc.

If D takes from our Greek Matthew, why does he not write ὡς οἱ εὐνικοὶ, as we read Mt. vi. 7, or οἱ ὑποκριταὶ as given by B syr.cur. Neither is τινες found in any MS. of the first Gospel.

The natural supposition is, that εὐνικοὶ and λοιποὶ go back to a common Semitic, Hebrew or Aramaic, original. If I consult the new Oxford Concordance of Hatch-Redpath under λοιποὶ, it is true that I find there nothing to help me; but, strange to say, the old Thesaurus of Biel—Trommianus is not at my disposal—is here better.

Dan. 7, 20 we read, with Theodotion, ἥ δρασις αὐτοῦ μειξον τῶν λοιπῶν; with the Chisianus: ἥ πρόσοψις αὐτοῦ ὑπερ. εφέρε τὰ ἄλλα, exactly corresponding to the Aramaic
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The Hebrew שֵׁם, fem. שֵׁם, being the commonest Aramaic word for *alius*, *socius*, *ērēs*, *ētārēs*, *λοιπός*, and I cannot understand why Hatch-Redpath marked the passage with the Obelus, which implies that the identification between Greek and Hebrew (Aramaic) "is doubtful, or at least that a student should examine the passage for himself." *Sub ἀλλος*, col. 56, שֵׁם is duly given at the head of the article (better, however שֵׁם, with נ to recognise it at once as Aramaic).

Now, if we resort to the root שֵׁם in a Hebrew Concordance, for instance that of Kircher, to look there for its Greek equivalents, what do we find? Just beside the passage quoted from Daniel for λοιπός another Greek rendering

**ΕΘΝΟC**

Job xli. 25 (30) ἐνοικοῦνται δὲ αὐτῶν ἔθνη: שֵׁם. Is this coincidence accidental? Or does λοιποί of D and ἔθνικοι of our Matthew go back to a common שֵׁם? There can be no doubt: Jesus speaks, Mt. vi. 5ff., of the Pharisees and their practice of prayer: שֵׁם denotes, as is well known, the communities of the Pharisees (Schürer, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 2, 319, 333). In the connexion there is nothing to make us think of heathen praxis in prayer: Jesus used שֵׁם in this Jewish sense here as well as in Mt. v. 47, xviii. 17.

Eberhard Nestle.