

Clauda or Cauda?

A STUDY IN ACTS XXVII. 16.

BY J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., LITT.D., LL.D., LATE FELLOW OF CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

It was my fortune on one of my Mediterranean voyages to pass to the north of an island, near the coast of Crete, along whose opposite shore that Alexandrian corn-ship ran, which had St. Paul on board, when the great gale broke upon them which tossed them about for so many days in Adria. And I remember how, on hearing from the captain the name of the island in its modern form, which is very near to the Italian Gozo, a name which recurs for another island to the south of Malta, I recalled the reading of the famous Codex Vaticanus in Ac 27¹⁶, according to which the island was called Cauda (Καῦδα) and not Clauda (Κλαῦδα), as the most of the New Testament authorities had it, and the Authorized English Bible. It seemed to be just one of those instances where the appeal to geography had settled the reading definitely and finally in favour of the text of Codex B. One is not, therefore, much surprised to find Clauda in such disfavour that it is not even honoured by an entry or cross-reference in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*.¹

And the student who is beginning Textual Criticism would, I suppose, have very little difficulty in settling the matter: if he knows that B with some slight additional attestation reads Καῦδα, but that \aleph (the Sinaitic MS.) and practically all the rest of the Greek authorities read Κλαῦδα, he will probably say that one of these readings arises easily out of the other by transcriptional error, and since the modern Greek name is Γαυδοῖσι (the island of Gaudos), and the modern Italian name Gozzo, there can be no doubt that the form Κλαῦδα must be abandoned. The judgment would be the same as that of Sir William Ramsay in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, that, 'amid the varying forms of the name the preference must be given to the forms in which the letter L is omitted, as is proved beyond dispute by the modern forms Gaudho in Greek and Gozzo in Italian.' The confidence of the underlined words exactly expresses my own feeling as we ran along the northern shore of the

island; I remember explaining the matter with the air of an instructed scribe to the captain of the ship!

It is assumed in this statement of the case as one in which the true reading is recovered without dispute, that one of the readings is true, and the other false: that the island did not have two names: that the name which it really had can be selected from the complete forms by the assistance of the modern geography. The alternative that both forms may be correct appears to be excluded. If that is so, then B must be right, and the others wrong.

It should, however, have awakened our suspicions to find the condemned reading so well attested outside of Biblical and Theological writings: Ramsay has pointed out that the form Καῦδα is supported by Καῦδῶ in Suidas; by Καῦδος in *Notitia Episcopatum*, viii. 240; by *Gaudus* in Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* iv. 12 (61); and by *Pomponius Meta.* ii. 114. But then, on the other hand, the form Clauda is attested in the form Κλαῦδος by Hierocles, *Synecdemus*, 651, 2, by Ptolemy, iii. 15, 8, and by the *Notitia Episcopatum*, ix. 149; while the form Κλαῦδία is found in the *Stadiasmus Maris Magni*, § 328. It is clear that all these writers cannot be harmonized into a consentient form by the hypothesis of a transcriptional error; nor are they under the influence of a variation, this way or that way, in the text of the New Testament. We are therefore driven to the hypothesis that both forms are lawful, and that the idea that the form Cauda can be 'justified beyond dispute' is no longer tenable, without further investigation. Indeed it seems, at first estimate of the new situation, as if the form Καῦδα, which is the modern survival, might be younger than the other in regard to origin, in which case there would certainly be a reopening of the question in favour of editing Clauda. But this is the very point where we want further information: it seems clear that the two forms co-exist in the time of the Acts of the Apostles, and what we have to do is to dig a little deeper into their history, for we are now definitely detached from the paleo-

¹ In Cheyne's *Encyclopædia* the name is discussed under *Clauda*, with a cross-reference from *Cauda*.

graphical explanation of the variant, and in search of the meaning of the names and the cause of their interchange.

The first suggestion would naturally be that the name was Phœnician,¹ for we have a second island of the same name, or what seems to be the same name, in the neighbourhood of Malta; and as Malta is probably Phœnician (𐤆𐤋𐤍 = 'escape,' and cf. Ac 28¹, 'when we were *escaped*, we knew that the island was called *Scape*'), it seems natural to ascribe a similar origin to the Maltese Gozo. Phœnician inscriptions encourage the belief. If this were correct, the case against an original Κλαῦδα would be established, for Κλαῦδα cannot be a Semitic form.

But the matter is not so easily settled, there is the further alternative that the name might be Cretan.

August Fick, in his *Vorgriechische Ortsnamen*, discusses the occurrence in Cretan place-names of forms coincident with or closely related to place-names in Asia Minor, especially in Caria and Lydia. In the course of the study of these coincidences which connect one stage of the Cretan civilization with Asia Minor and outlying parts of Greece, he comes to a treaty made between the people of Gortyna and the inhabitants of Kauda: (Γορτυνίοις καὶ τοῖς ἐν Καυοσί Φουκίονσι), upon which he remarks that 'the island is called both Γαυδός and Κλαῦδος. The form with L seems to be quite Carian. We find on Attic tribute lists the Carian Κλαυδῆς.' Fick goes on to explain the relation between the forms Κλαῦδος and Κλαῦνδος, but this we need not discuss. If he is right in his parallel, and it is one case out of many which he brings forward, the origin of Cauda is not in Crete, nor in Phœnicia, but in Caria. And the curious thing is, that Fick brings up from the depths of antiquity the very same forms which we find contending with one another in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the contemporary literature. So we conclude that the names are Cretan, and of the highest antiquity, with a possible Carian ancestry behind the Cretan.

Both forms are, therefore, substantially genuine, and for our purposes equally ancient. Cauda has outlasted Claudia, but they must have started very near together. Unfortunately our ignorance of the Carian language and history prevents us from saying what the meaning of the name is.

¹ See Schröder, *Phœn. Spr.* 105.

Returning to the criticism of the New Testament, we find that the problem is much changed from what we started with. The received text has Κλαῦδην, which shows an editorial hand correcting the grammar to an accusative (cf. καλούμενον Καλοῦς Λιμένας in 27⁸), but betrays also that the form the editors were correcting was in all probability Claudia, and not Cauda. And apparently every Greek hand has Claudia, except Codex B and the seventh-century (Cesarean) corrector of the Sinaiticus. On the other hand, amongst the versions, B (which appears to be without its usual Egyptian support) has the backing of the Peshito and the Vulgate. What are we to say in such a division of authorities?

It is certain that, at some point, very early in the transmission of the text, there has been a deliberate alteration of the reading: it has either been changed from Cauda to Claudia, or conversely. Let us try the two hypotheses.

1. Claudia was the original reading, and was changed to Cauda by some one who knew the Mediterranean navigation and geography. This would very naturally be the work of an Alexandrian scribe, perpetuated in Codex B.

Objection: this leaves out of account the reading of the Peshito, which can hardly be under Alexandrian influence. Moreover, it is conceded that if Luke wrote Claudia, he got the name from Alexandrian sailors with whom he was travelling; in that case, why should an Alexandrian hand have corrected it?

2. Cauda was the original reading, and was changed to Claudia: the change might very well have been made in Antioch: the Antioch text of the first period would be reflected on the Peshito and therefore should have exhibited Cauda; while the Byzantine (Antiochene) tradition of a later date shows clearly the reading Claudia.

Objection: this does not explain how the Coptic text gets Claudia; for it is difficult to put this text under Antioch influence. The Antioch revision appears to have changed the grammatical form (but not the spelling of the name?).

The two series of objections land us in a dilemma: we cannot explain the Peshito reading on the hypothesis of a primitive Claudia, nor the Coptic reading on that of a primitive Cauda.

If one of these readings has been wrongly edited, it is almost certainly the Coptic.

We throw out the suggestion, therefore, that the Coptic originally read *Cauda* with Codex B. In that case the scale is turned. We have an original reading *Cauda*, attested by Antiochene and Alexandrian antiquity. This has been changed at Caesarea by some critical hand. The Antioch revision has taken up the Caesarean reading and perpetuated it. We conclude, therefore, to edit *Cauda*, with Westcott and Hort, and against Tischendorf. The result is, as so often happens in this kind of work, not exactly what we expected when we came across the proofs of the extreme antiquity of both readings. It looked as if a later and popular form *Cauda* had displaced an archaic *Clauda*. But this appears not to be the case. It

is true that *Clauda* is, historically, the dying form: but it is a correct form, and its introduction into the N.T. may, after all, be only a piece of pedantry.

We have shown conclusively that paleographical considerations have to be ruled out of the argument, whose balance seems now to be in favour of the reading of Codex B. But it is a balance that might easily be turned by a fragment of fresh evidence.

Incidentally we have arrived at two curious results: first, there is a clear proof that the paleographer is sometimes not the final authority for readings; second, there is a suspicion that some early hand has revised the place-names in the New Testament.

Studies in Pauline Vocabulary.

BY THE REV. R. MARTIN POPE, M.A., OXFORD.

I. Of the Triumph-joy.

THERE is a remarkable richness and suggestiveness in the language of this doxology. The word *θριαμβέοντι* (*leadeth in triumph*) awakens in the mind a host of subtle associations, which carry us back, on the one hand, to the beginnings of Greek tragedy in the *θρίαμβος*,¹ a hymn sung in honour of Dionysus; on the other hand, to the colour and movement of a Roman *triumphus*.

In his *Religious Teachers of Greece* the late Dr. Adam has dwelt on the significance of that extraordinary drama, the *Bacchae* of Euripides. The play stands alone among the creations of a mind which for the most part shows itself in revolt from the national faith. Euripides is in effect the new theologian of Athens in the fifth century before Christ: but in the *Bacchae* he strikes into a vein of religious feeling or emotion, as if he were deliberately endeavouring to do justice to the inwardness and power of the mystery-element in

τῷ δὲ Θεῷ χάρις τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβέοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ τὴν δόξην τῆς γνώσεως αὐτοῦ φανεροῦντι δι' ἡμῶν ἐν παντί τόπῳ (2 Co 2¹⁴).

the old Greek religion. Though the *Bacchae* may not amount to a recantation of a previous rationalism, it is at least the tacit acknowledgment of the potency of enthusiasm in the experiences of the soul. Nothing can be more sympathetic than his spiritualization of Dionysus-worship. The *motif* of the drama is 'The world's Wise are not wise.'² Dionysus is introduced to the conventional life of Thrace as 'a god of the wild northern mountains, a god of intoxication, of inspiration, a giver of super-human and immortal life.'³ His cult is intimately connected with certain forms of tree-worship, more particularly the vine. He is the wine-god, banisher of care and giver of peace.

It is well known that Orphism, which was really a revival of religion on mystic and emotional lines, and originated in the sixth century B.C., laid hold of the Dionysus-cult and transformed it. But in his portraiture of the Dionysus-worship Euripides appears to go back to the primitive pre-Orphic

¹ The more familiar word is *διθύραμβος*. Cf. the word *ἐπιχορηγία* for another link between St. Paul's language and Greek drama.

² See *Bacchae*, 395: τὸ σοφὸν δ' οὐ σοφία.

³ See Intro. Note, G. Murray's translation of the play.