

and for all at the final judgment. Historical evidence upon this point is rather conflicting and ambiguous. But certainly the impression left upon the mind by the Exposure sayings, applied either to the secrets of an individual life, or to the processes by which truth is to be manifested and propagated, is that the disclosure was to be a process, not a shock; the gradual result of action and experience rather than a paroxysm of unmasking. Even in the Matthæan form (10<sup>26</sup> f.), where v. 28 has an apocalyptic ring, the saying on "the housetop" implies not so much a crisis as a career. And to interpret the Logion in this light is neither to read back a fine modern idea into the gospel, nor to attribute proleptically to Jesus a phase of thought which was entirely alien to his experience and outlook.

JAMES MOFFATT.

TWO IMPORTANT GLOSSES IN THE  
CODEX BEZÆ.

I HAVE recently been reviewing with some care the text of the Codex Bezae and its allies (which pass comprehensively under the name of the Western Text of the New Testament), as well as a part of the multitudinous books and pamphlets which have essayed to explain the peculiarities of that text with a view either to justify or to condemn it. Amongst these peculiar variations from received or authorized forms, it is well known that the most conspicuous are to be found in the text of the Acts of the Apostles; so that the critic who meddles with the difficult problem of New Testament origins is sure to find himself, sooner or later, in the Slough of Despond which these readings furnish, where there is no sure foothold for the investigator, and which, like the original swamp in the *Pilgrim's Progress*, does not appear to have been made much better by the multitude of attempts that have been made to construct a causeway over it. Or, to use a more classical figure, the

Western text is a Serbonian bog, well suited to swallow up armies of patient scholars and erudite linguists.

After which description it might seem, perhaps, presumptuous on my part, in view of the fact that I am not reckoned to have been uniformly successful in my attempts at forcing a passage through the swamp, to begin again to elucidate the matters that are in dispute. But perhaps I may claim some forbearance if I state at once that the object of this note is merely to draw attention to a couple of microscopic matters, and that the conclusions which it furnishes are not such as tend to establish any previously published theories of my own.

Amongst the additional matter in the Western text of the Acts (which we call for simplicity the Bezan glosses, not because they are proved to be glosses, nor as being necessarily limited in their attestation to the Codex Bezaë) there are two expansions upon which I think a fresh ray of light can be cast, so as to make them, first, intelligible, and, second, appropriate to the situation in which they are found to occur. Of these two glosses, the first, as far as I know, has never yet been explained at all, although Dr. Blass came very near to it in a footnote in the larger edition of the Acts; the second has provoked explanations which have not, so far, commanded critical assent.

The two glosses in question are found respectively in Acts 4<sup>24</sup> and Acts 5<sup>39</sup>. We will take them in order.

In Acts 4<sup>24</sup> the text of Codex Bezaë is :

Οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες [καὶ ἐπιγινόντες τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνέργειαν] ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἤραν φωνὴν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ εἶπαν, Δέσποτα . . .

where the bracketed words constitute the gloss. Blass adds the words to his text of the Acts, and has the following justificatory note :

*ἐνέργεια* (Aristot.; 3 Macc. 4<sup>21</sup>) de deo (vel diabolo) saepius ap. Paulum Phil. 3<sup>21</sup> al. Et miraculum fecerat Deus et apostolos incolumes servaverat; hinc etiam de reliquis confidunt.

That is, Blass justifies the language by classical and Hel-

lenistic parallels, and the expression itself as being appropriate to the miraculous deliverance which had occurred. We are to understand the passage in the following sense :

When they heard what had taken place, and had recognised the interposition of Divine providence, they lifted up their voices with one accord, and said, etc.

If Blass had actually quoted the text of the Maccabees to which he refers, he would have made a much stronger case for his explanation and justification of the added words. The third book of the Maccabees is a story of the miraculous escapes of the Alexandrian Jews from a series of massacres which had been planned against them by King Ptolemy Philopator. In 3 Maccabees 4<sup>21</sup> we are told that the officials who were to make a list of the proscribed persons, proposed as victims of the massacre, broke down in their work because there was not a sufficient supply of paper and pens in the Alexandrian bazaars to meet the needs of the enumerators, concerning which the historian or novelist remarks :

*Τούτο δὲ ἦν ἐνέργεια τῆς τοῦ βοηθοῦντος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐξ οὐρανοῦ προνοίας ἀνικήτου.*

It was an interposition of Heaven, of the unconquerable providence of Him that watched over the Jews. This is the passage which Blass adduced, and it is singularly apposite, especially in view of the fact that the document from which it is taken is contemporary, or almost so, with the time of production of the Acts of the Apostles.<sup>1</sup>

On reading further in the romance of the Maccabeist we find another remarkable deliverance in 3 Maccabees 5<sup>12</sup>, where Ptolemy, who has arranged the time of the massacre, oversleeps himself, and the officials, being unwilling to begin without him, allow the Jews to escape. Upon which the writer remarks that the sleep was a Divine interposition :

*ἡδίστῳ καὶ βάθει [ῥπνφ] κατεσχέθη τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ τοῦ δεσπότου.*

<sup>1</sup> Assuming 3 Maccabees to have been written about A.D. 40.

Again, in 3 Maccabees 5<sup>28</sup>, when the massacre has been again planned, and apparently the Jews are finally abandoned to their fate, Ptolemy suddenly loses his memory and forgets the orders that he has given, so that the commands are unconfirmed, or withdrawn. Again the Jews escape, and the writer remarks :

τούτο δὲ ἦν ἐνέργεια τοῦ πάντα δεσποτεύοντος θεοῦ.

Here, then, are three cases of a story-teller's explanation of miraculous escapes, which are exactly similar to what we find in the Acts of the Apostles, and which, as we shall see, will throw a light upon the sequence of the narration in the Western text.

But before passing from the enumeration of these singular and striking parallels in 3 Maccabees, it should be noticed that the third book of the Maccabees is in general, and in this particular turn of speech, under the influence of the second book of Maccabees.

In 2 Maccabees 3<sup>29</sup> we have the account of the punishment which fell on Heliodorus when he tried to raid the treasury in the Temple at Jerusalem :

Heliodorus fell suddenly to the ground, and was compassed with great darkness ; but they that were with him took him up, and put him into a litter. Thus him, that lately came with a great train and with all his guard into the said treasury, they carried out, being unable to help himself with his weapons, and manifestly *they acknowledged the power of God: and he, through the divine activity (διὰ τὴν θείαν ἐνέργειαν)*, was cast down, and lay speechless without all hope of life.

Here again the language is singularly apt to elucidate the supposed Western gloss, for the parallels are not mere dictionary or concordance parallels. They are parallels in situation and in idea.

Returning now to the cases in the third book of Maccabees, it will be seen that in two of them the direct reference is made to God as *δεσπότης*. How apposite this is to the prayer of the Church which follows, which opens with the word *δέσποτα* ! Blass, who does not seem to have

noticed this sequence of thought, even though he edits the gloss as a part of his text, but who had a keen sense that there must be some special fitness in the use of the peculiar word, thought it was parallel to the *τοῖς δούλοις σου* which follows, his note being :

*δέσποτα* Lc. 2<sup>29</sup> ubi respondet τὸν δουλὸν σου, ut hic 29 τοῖς δούλοις σου (cf. 1 Tim. 6<sup>1</sup> al.).

It will, however, be clear from the references we have given that the real fitness of the word is to be sought in the *ἐνέργεια* which precedes.

Chrysostom, who, as I have shown in my *Four Lectures on the Western Text*, had an acquaintance with the Bezan glosses, as well as, in all probability, with a commentary upon a text that contained them, has the right feeling of the meaning of *δεσπότης*. He draws a parallel between the prayer of the Church in the fourth chapter and the prayer at the election of Matthias in the first chapter of the Acts. In the one case they wanted to know which of the candidates was worthy of the apostolate, so they prayed, "Thou, Lord, that knowest the hearts," etc.; in the other case, since their adversaries had to be reined in, they discourse of lordship, and begin with "Thou, Ruler," etc. (*ἐνταῦθα δὲ, ἐπειδὴ ἐπιστομισθῆναι τοὺς ἐναντίους ἔχρην, περὶ δεσποτείας διαλέγονται. δίο καὶ οὕτως ἤρξαντο, Δέσποτα*). According to Chrysostom, then, it is the restraining of their adversaries, and not their own subjection to God, that provokes the thought of His Lordship.

May we not then go so far as to say that the gloss (as it is called) is singularly apposite to the text in which it is found, and that, if it is not a part of the true text, it is as good an interpretation as the very best commentary ever made upon it, an admission which is perilously near to the confession that it is not a gloss at all.

And, further, let it be observed that we have not merely justified the thought of the supposed commentator; we have justified his language also. Retranslations out of

Latin or Syriac are not to be thought of in the explanation of such a genuinely Greek expression. The gloss must have arisen in Greek; the chances are infinitesimal that its peculiar turns of speech would have survived a pilgrimage through an adjacent language.

We shall, therefore, conclude provisionally that the supposed gloss is either a part of the primitive Greek text of the Acts or an extremely early Greek expansion, with a strong balance of probability in favour of the former. A Montanist explanation, as suggested in my *Study of Codex Beza*, is no longer to be thought of.

The next gloss to which I desire to draw attention is Acts 5<sup>39</sup>, where the text of the Codex Bezae is:

*εἰ δὲ ἐκ θεοῦ ἐστίν, [οὐ δυνήσεσθε καλύσαι (l. καταλύσαι) αὐτούς, οὔτε ὑμεῖς οὔτε βασιλεῖς οὔτε τύραννοι, ἀπέχεσθε οὖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτων,] μήποτε θεόμαχοι εὐρεθῆτε.*

Here again Blass justifies the peculiar Greek by a reference to Wisdom 12<sup>14</sup> (*Βασιλεὺς ἢ τύραννος*), the justification being necessary because *τύραννος* is not a New Testament word, and therefore makes the gloss suspect in which it occurs. But he does not notice that the passage which is quoted from Wisdom is dealing with the same problem as in the Acts, viz., the question *whether it is safe to oppose God*. Hence it is certain that the added words in Acts 5<sup>39</sup> are either the very words of Wisdom 12<sup>14</sup> or an adaptation of them. The passage is as follows:

*οὔτε γὰρ θεός ἐστίν πλὴν σου . . . οὔτε βασιλεὺς ἢ τύραννος ἀντοφθαλμησαὶ δυνήσεται σοι περὶ ὧν ἐκολάσας.*

It will, I think, be admitted that the supposed gloss, while not absolutely necessary<sup>1</sup> to the argument "lest haply ye be found fighting against God," is an excellent corroboration of the argument, and agrees admirably with the sequence of thought. The situation is, then, very much like that in the passage which we previously discussed: the added words may be a commentary—they are

<sup>1</sup> For we have the previous statement, "If this thing be of God," etc.

almost too apt to be a commentary. We must not resort to the explanation that the words were due to the fervour of some time of persecution, when kings and tyrants were provoking criticism; there is no more need to treat the text of the Acts this way than the text of Wisdom. No Montanist is needed, nor is any retranslator to be called for. In the latter case, indeed, we are secured by the peculiar word *τύραννος*, which justifies the Greek of the gloss, and would almost certainly have been lost if the passage had gone through translation and retranslation. It is a *bonâ fide* Greek expansion, and may be a part of the original text.

In this particular case it should be observed that Codex Bezae does not stand alone. It is supported by the Fleury palimpsest, and by the Heracleian Syriac; and its text, in a modified form ("neither ye nor your rulers"), has come down in the Codex Laudianus, the Gigas, and elsewhere. The excellence of the text of Codex Bezae is seen by the comparison with the Laudianus, from which the identification with the language of Wisdom has quite disappeared. Still more conspicuous is the excellence of the Fleury text, which, although in Latin, by a microscopic variation of *ac* for the third οὔτε, enables us to restore to the Codex Bezae the form

οὔτε ὑμεῖς οὔτε βασιλεῖς ἢ τύραννοι

in still closer agreement with Wisdom 12<sup>14</sup> (βασιλεὺς ἢ τύραννος).

We have now reviewed these two glosses and discussed their origin. It must be admitted that they strongly support Blass's theory of the genuineness of the Western accretions. At all events he might have made his case much stronger if he had discussed more at length the parallels which, working on independent lines, we have both of us discovered. If I do not express myself more positively, Dr. Blass will understand that it is because I am still engaged upon the great problem.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.