

TWO QUESTIONS OF TEXT AND TRANSLATION.

I

Acts xii 25 ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν **N B** :
 ἐξ **A** : ἀπὸ **D**.

Dr Hort thought ἐξ Alexandrian, ἀπὸ the Western reading. The εἰς of **N B** 'cannot possibly be right if taken with ὑπέστρεψαν', he said, and suggested as the original τὴν εἰς Ἱ. πληρώσαντες διακονίαν. Mr Valentine Richards, in *Camb. Biblical Essays* xv p. 532, considers this one of the passages that 'serve to shew that the text of **N B** cannot always be followed even when it has further attestation', and doubts whether Hort's is 'an easier explanation than the more obvious one that εἰς is a blunder of an earlier copyist'.

Is it not possible that Hort's explanation was wrong, and yet **N B** were, in this place, right? In xi 28 we read of a wide-spread famine. In v. 29 of the disciples at Antioch resolving to send alms τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀδελφοῖς. In v. 30 of their sending these alms by Barnabas and Saul to the Elders. The Elders, no doubt, were the Elders at Jerusalem, but the Brethren dwelling in Judaea were likely to be scattered in many villages as well as in Jerusalem. The narrative is interrupted at this point by the account of the imprisonment and deliverance of St Peter. When it is resumed at xii 25 we are told in the briefest manner that 'Paul and Barnabas returned to Jerusalem having fulfilled their ministry'. The easiest inference seems to be that after all ὑπέστρεψαν should be construed with εἰς; that the Elders charged Paul and Barnabas with the distribution of their alms in the country districts; and that, when they had finished this distribution, they returned to Jerusalem. The addition of συναρραβόντες Ἰωάνην τὸν ἐπικληθέντα Μάρκον should not be urged against this reading of the passage. We are told indeed in xii 12 that St Peter went to the house of Mary the mother of Ἰωάνου τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου Μάρκου, and her house was of course in Jerusalem. But we are not told that John Mark was then in the house, or that he dwelt in it habitually. Moreover, the repetition of the name with note of surname so soon after suggests that the author made an extract from some document, or from some other set of notes of his own, which led him to cut short the story he was telling about Paul and Barnabas; and this makes it only more probable that Paul and Barnabas did something more than he has found it worth while to record. Then, in resuming, he followed his rough notes more closely than his shortened summary, if it was to be perfectly clear, demanded; hence the repeated note about the surname, and the phrase with εἰς which puzzles us.

The Epistles of St Paul had so long thrust the Gospels into the back-

ground that the impulse of return, begun in the Oxford Movement and fashionable now, has but imperfectly changed our habits of thought. In imagining the Apostolic world we still circle in the *ἀναστροφῇ* of the citizen, and forget (what Dr Hatch has taught us) that the *πορεύεσθαι* of the villagers was the 'Way' of the primitive disciple. A mission to Judaea need not mean a mission to Jerusalem, any more than the address 'to Hebrews' need mark a letter to the Church at Jerusalem. And, further, Dr Hort himself helps us to this interpretation of the passage. In 'Prolegomena to Romans', p. 40, he wrote: 'It would have been easy, as it must have been at times most tempting, to sever sharply the hampering links which bound St. Paul to the Churches of Judaea, and to form the new Gentile Churches into a great separate organization. But this was just what he was most anxious to prevent. . . . This was doubtless the primary motive . . . which made him visit Jerusalem before each of his great missionary journeys.' So then NB witness to an act of courtesy which prepared for this loyal habit of later life.

II¹

Heb. ix 11 is another passage where the reading of B, supported here by D*, is rejected by editors on account of its difficulty, and where again the difficulty disappears if what is surely the natural construction be allowed.

Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν γενομένων ἀγαθῶν διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειότερας σκηνῆς οὐ χειροποιήτου, τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος εἰσῆλθεν κτλ.

It is certainly bold to translate τῶν γενομένων ἀγαθῶν 'the good things that are come'. *Γενομένων* expects words to complete it. But it gets those words if we construe it with διὰ τῆς μείζονος κτλ., as we easily may if we remember that οὐδέ is a particle of emphasis rather than of addition. It does not connect δι' αἵματος with διὰ τῆς μείζονος but carries to a further stage the idea of παραγενόμενος. So Euthymius Zigabenus's comment: ἐνταῦθα ἡ ἀπόδοσις τῆς συντάξεως. ἔστι γὰρ οὕτως· Χριστὸς δὲ παραγενόμενος Ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς, ἐφάπαξ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὰ Ἄγια. With the reading γενομένων, the plan of the sentence is:—

Christ having appeared as High-priest of the good things which came by the greater tabernacle—not by blood of goats and calves either, but by His own blood entered.

As for the repetition of διὰ in a new connexion, it is almost a man-

¹ Since this Note was in type I find that Dr Wickham in his recently published commentary makes the same suggestion as to the construction of διὰ, though he connects it with μελλόντων; and that Dr Rendall in 1883 explained μελλόντων as a correction made by some one who failed to see the true construction of γενομένων with διὰ.

nerism of the author to repeat a word which he has used once, even though the sense or application be changed; e. g. i 5, 6 *πάλιν*, iv 12, 13 *λόγος*; with addition to mark the change iv 8, 14 *Ἰησοῦς*—*Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ*, xi 35 *ἀναστάσεως*—*κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως*. He is apt to repeat even parts of words, as he does with *παραγενόμενος*—*γενομένων* here; e. g. v 1-3 *ὑπὲρ-πρὸς-προσφέρῃ-ὑπὲρ-περίκειται-περὶ-περὶ-περὶ*, vii 23-25 *παραμένειν-μένειν-ἀπαράβατον-παντελὲς-πάντοτε*, xi 7 *κατεσκευάσεν-κατέκρινεν-τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνης*, xiii 1 *φιλαδελφία-φιλοξενίας*, 22 *παρακαλῶ-παρακλήσεως*.

A. NAIRNE.

AN UNRECORDED REFERENCE TO THE RULES OF TYCONIUS.

IN the introduction to Professor Burkitt's edition of the *Rules* of Tyconius, the following words occur, summarizing the early history of the book: 'The sole reference to Tyconius's book independent of the review in the *de Doctrina Christiana* [of Augustine] is that by the author of the *de Promissionibus*. He was an African, and perhaps for that reason familiar with the book which his countryman had written less than a century before. But Cassian and John the Deacon quote the Book of Rules only to illustrate a passage where Tyconius's explanation had been already noticed by St Augustine; Cassiodorus names Tyconius only in the sentence in which he recommends the study of the *de Doctrina Christiana*; St Isidore follows St Augustine's remarks more than the original Seven Rules.'¹

I am happy to be able to supplement two of the above statements. There is a quotation taken apparently direct from the *Rules*, and not through St Augustine, in the commentary on the Epistles of St Paul hitherto printed under the name of Primasius, but which, following a felicitous conjecture of Mr C. H. Turner,² I have successfully claimed for Cassiodorus and his pupils.³ The quotation occurs in a comment on 2 Thessalonians chapter ii, verses 4-5 (ed. Paris [1543] p. 160 v = Migne *P. L.* lxxviii 648 C, D), and reads thus:—

'*Quod dicitur deus ecclesia est: quod autem colitur deus summus est. Ut in templo dei sedeat ostendens se quod ipse sit deus, id est, quod ipse sit ecclesia: quale est, si diceret: in templum dei sedeat ostendens se quod ipse sit dei templum, aut in deum sedeat ostendens quod ipse sit deus. Istud de Ticonii Regulis.*'

¹ Page xxiv.

² See this JOURNAL vol. iv (1902-3) pp. 140-141.

³ *Proceedings of the British Academy* vol. ii p. 428.