

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

a propaganda that has a powerful financial backing.

What is the explanation of this sudden and widespread movement? The writer in the *New Statesman* analyzes the situation with obvious local knowledge of American conditions. He gives two reasons. One is a post-war fear of revolutionary influences. The real force of war feeling is only now being felt and to it every radical of every kind is a Bolshevik. This is as true in the religious sphere as in others.

The other reason is to be found in the conditions of Church life in America. 'Fundamentalism,' as the conservative movement is called, has little hold in the big cities. But the great mass of American Church members, the writer says, are to be found in outlying farms and holdings away from the centres of culture. These people know nothing of the modern critical attitude, or indeed of modernism in religion of any kind. They are acquainted only with the old ways and the old creed and will have nothing to do with any other.

Professor B. W. BACON, of Yale, himself a 'higher critic' but also a warm evangelical, goes deeper in a recent lecture delivered to American students. He thinks 'Fundamentalism' is at its root a protest against the barren 'liberalism' which has no gospel and no positive word to say about Christ, the kind of liberalism which has been associated with the name of Germany. As such,

'Fundamentalism' at heart arises from loyalty to the gospel, and for that reason Professor BACON has a deep sympathy with it.

His contention is that those who have absorbed the newer knowledge and the critical standpoint ought to show that these are not inconsistent with warm evangelical zeal and positive faith in a supernatural Christ. That, he thinks, is the task of the evangelical critics in the near future. What the Church needs is education, and education in the truer view of Scripture by men who believe in it and also believe heartily in the Gospel of Grace revealed in the New Testament. There can be no going back from truth, but the urgent necessity of the hour is to show beyond any reasonable doubt that the truth gained by criticism is not a menace to faith but a help and a buttress to it.

The Church awaits revival and needs nothing so much. It is true, revived life will only come from the preaching of a living Saviour. But it will not come until the mass of church-going people have their belief in the Bible restored to them. Great numbers who know little of the results of criticism know at least that it has discredited the old view of inspiration. And this vague impression means loss of confidence in the Word. The old view will never be given back to these people, because it is not true. What they need is a positive view of Scripture as the Word of God that has a sound basis in truth. When that faith is built up by the Church in its members revival will come.

The Origin of a Famous Lucan Gloss.

BY RENDEL HARRIS, LITT.D., LL.D., D.D., MANCHESTER.

WHEN Cureton published in 1858, from a Nitrian MS. of the fifth century, what he described as the *Remains of a very ancient recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac, hitherto unknown in Europe*, it was soon recognized that a text of the Gospels had been recovered, which was of an earlier type than

that which was current in the much admired and venerated Syriac Vulgate. The more its superior antiquity was established, the more important was the duty laid on New Testament critics of analysing the variations of the new text from the popular Syriac tradition, and of determining, where possible,

the causes which underlay the variation of the texts. This was imperative in the cases where the new text differed by notable excesses or defects from the old, and the problems thus presented are, for the most part, still with us; the omissions not all justified, the insertions not all explained. Amongst the insertions, or glosses (we use the word without prejudice), one of the most striking was an expansion in Lk 23⁴⁸, which runs as follows in Cureton's text:

'And all those which were assembled there, and saw that which was done, were smiting upon their breast, and saying, *Woe to us, What is this! Woe to us from our sins.*'

The question before us is the determination of the origin of the words which have here been substituted for the conventional ending, 'returned.' May we restore the passage, or should we delete it? The first thing to remark is that Cureton has mistranslated the Syriac; he should have said, 'Woe to us! What has befallen us?' but he did not recognize that the verb 'to be' in the sense which we have here given, 'what has happened,' can be read with an accusative in Syriac. The correction will be seen, presently, to be of importance in the judgment of the text.

We may take the next stage in the study of the gloss from the eighth edition of Tischendorf's NT, in which the Cureton readings were inserted, Tischendorf himself advising us in the preface that the new text was of the middle of the second century, and its rival, whom it was to displace, of the end of the second century. We know, now, that this was two hundred years too soon for the publication of the Peshitta, and that it was probably some decades too soon for the Curetonian text. That is a matter of slight importance; but the case is different when Tischendorf quotes the gloss in the form (omitting *ὑπέστρεφον*): 'et dicentes: *Vae nobis, quae facta sunt; vae nobis propter peccata nostra,*' where he should have said, 'quod factum est nobis.' Tischendorf then makes the important reference to the Latin Codex of St. Germain (which he denotes by the sign *g*¹), as containing the Syriac gloss in a longer form, thus: 'dicentes: *Vae nobis, quae facta sunt hodie propter peccata nostra; appropinquavit desolatio Hierusalem*'; the MS. reads *uobis* and *hodiae*, but that is unimportant: the thing to notice is the expanded form in which the gloss occurs.

The evidence now accumulates from various un-

expected quarters for one form or another of the gloss. When I wrote in 1890 my little tract on the *Diatessaron of Tatian* I was able to point to two documents, of Syriac origin, which showed traces of the gloss before us. Both of them were dependent upon the lost *Diatessaron*, and it was, therefore, highly probable that the gloss itself was a part of the text of Tatian. The first document in question is the *Doctrine of Addai*, where we read as follows:

'Unless those who crucified Him had known that He was the Son of God, they would not have had to proclaim the desolation of their city, nor would they have brought down Woe! upon themselves' (*Addai*, c. 27).

The passage is a harmonistic rendering, in that it has the Matthæan 'Son of God' instead of the Lucan 'righteous man'; and we should also observe that the persons who cry out 'Woe' are not the crowds who had gathered to the sight, but in a special sense, the Crucifiers. Moreover, in the *Diatessaron*, as known to the author of *Addai*, there stood a reference to the desolation of Jerusalem, as we observed in the St. Germain MS.

The other authority is the now well-known Commentary of Ephrem on the *Diatessaron*, preserved in an Armenian translation: the following passages are significant:

P. 245. 'Their mind began, little by little, to be illuminated. "Woe was it, Woe was it to us; this was the Son of God."'

P. 246. 'When, however, the natural sun had failed them, then by the very darkness it became clear to them that *the destruction of their city had arrived*. "The judgments," it says, "of the ruin of Jerusalem have come." And so because this city did not receive Him who had builded it, it remained for it, that it should *see its own ruin*. Here we notice again a certain parallelism with the gloss as it occurs in the St. Germain MS. There is the triple reference to the ruin of the city. We notice also that there must have been in the text of Ephrem some reference to seeing or not seeing what was occurring; for he plays on the effect of the miraculous darkness on the eyes of the spectators, and says that they did not see and yet saw.

We may also find a further slight allusion on Ephrem's part: on p. 248, 'The first utterance in their mouth was one of mockery . . . the second was Woe in their mouth, accompanied by beating on their breasts.'

We claimed, then, the Cureton gloss, in an expanded form, for the *Diatessaron*; and we may admit (*horresco referens*) that we followed Cureton in his mistranslation.

At this point we might have added (if we had known it) a passage from a very early discourse attributed to Marutha of Maiferkat in the fourth century, which runs as follows:

‘Woe to us! what happened to us! Our eyes saw the slaughter of the saints, but (yet) they did not see it, because of our insolence’ (Bedjan, *Acta Sanctorum*, ii. p. 58). Here we have again a trace of the Cureton gloss, together with a suggestion of misfortunes seen and yet not seen.

The next accretion to the evidence is from the Greek quarter. In 1892 a fragment of the lost Gospel of Peter was found in a tomb at Akhmim in Upper Egypt; it contained a large part of the story of the Passion, and in particular it reported that ‘the Jews and the elders and the priests, recognizing what ill they had done to themselves, began to wail and to say, Woe to our sins; the judgment and the end of Jerusalem hath drawn nigh!’

The importance of this new text was evident: on the one hand, it agreed closely with the St. Germain Latin in its reference to the approach of the judgment of Jerusalem; on the other hand, this is very nearly what we had in the text of Ephrem about the ‘arrival of the judgments of the ruin of Jerusalem.’ So we were now face to face with Greek evidence for our gloss, which could hardly be dated later than the second century.

Last of all we have Mrs. Lewis’ Syriac Gospel from Mt. Sinai, a text certainly older than that of Cureton, but in exact agreement with it as far as the gloss is concerned. We come now to the question as to the origin of this widely attested gloss, and as to the meaning of this common matter in the *Gospel of Peter* and in the *Diatessaron of Tatian*. Dr. Swete attacked the problem in his edition of the *Gospel of Peter* with much confidence. ‘The genesis of the passage,’ says he, ‘can hardly be doubtful! The people wailed; wailing expresses itself in cries of Woe. The next step would be to add the words ἡγγισεν ἡ κρίσις or ἡ ἐρήμωσις or τὸ τέλος Ἱερουσαλήμ, or some combination of them founded on Dn 2²⁶ or on Lk 21²⁰.’ The criticism, though confident, can hardly be called convincing.

Professor Burkitt was more cautious: in his note on the passage in Luke, he corrects the mistransla-

tions, draws attention to the parallelism between *St. Peter* and the *Diatessaron*, and says that ‘this sentence (from *Peter*) and the form of text found in the *Diatessaron* obviously have a common origin: possibly the Gospel of Peter is the original source of the reading!’ This would add a fifth Gospel to the structure of the *Diatessaron*. Burkitt was also quite clear that ‘some reference to the “judgment” or “desolation” of Jerusalem stood in the *Diatessaron* as well as the cry, “Woe to us! what hath befallen us?”’

Dr. Swete had expressed himself in favour of the opposite opinion, that the *Gospel of Peter* was dependent on the *Diatessaron*. He found traces of harmonization in Peter, relatively to the canonical Gospels, and expressed himself as follows (*Introd.* xxv.):

‘We may perhaps claim to have established a strong presumption that the Petrine writer employed a harmony which in its general selection of extracts, and in some of its minuter arrangements, very nearly resembled the *Harmony of Tatian*. . . . The relation of the Petrine writer to Tatian remains for the present an open question; but enough has been said to render such a relation probable if further inquiries should lead us to place the *Gospel of Peter* after the publication of the *Diatessaron*.’ We may take it that Dr. Swete’s suggestion of further inquiries will include a further research into the actual origin of the gloss which we are discussing. Suppose that we turn once more to the Syriac literature in search of illumination.

Among the earliest deposits of that literature will be found the account of the martyrdoms which took place in Persia under Sapor. The MS. accounts of this great persecution go back to the fifth century, the persecution itself to the middle of the fourth century. The principal figure among the Christian sufferers was Simeon bar Sabba’e, and his tale will be found in the second volume of the *Patrologia Syriaca*. The author of these *Acts of Martyrdom* begins by historical parallels with the sufferings of the Maccabees, and in the course of his reminiscence he relates as follows:

‘Mattathias sighed and said: *Woe to us! what has befallen us! to look upon the misery of our people, and upon the ruin of the holy city and His temple which is given into the hands of the aliens: and behold! our glory and our beauty is devastated. Why do we yet live?*’

It will be admitted that we have here a striking parallel to our evangelical gloss: so we must examine the passage a little closer. The writer is quoting from the second chapter of the First Book of Maccabees. That is certain; but it is also clear that in that case we have a fragment of the earliest Syriac text of Maccabees that is known to us. It is an earlier text than the printed Vulgate Syriac, and somewhat earlier than the great Milan text of the sixth century: the latter runs as follows:

'And he saw the blasphemies that were done in Judah and Jerusalem, and he said: Woe to me! why has it befallen me to look upon the misery of my people, and upon the ruin of the holy city? and they sat there, while it was delivered into the hand of the enemies and into the hand of the aliens . . . and behold! our sanctuary and our beauty and our glory is devastated.'

We have, then, in the *Martyrdom of Simeon bar Sabba'e*, an extract from a very early Syriac text of 1 Mac., and this extract supplies us with so many coincidences with what we have in the gloss on Luke, that we may conclude the latter to be dependent on the former. Here is the 'Woe' in its archaic form, and here the references to the devastation of Jerusalem. Here also is the clue to the references in Ephrem and in Marutha to the seeing what was being done or to be done to the Holy City and the Holy Place. The glossator has drawn upon this passage in the Maccabees, and has expanded it by a reference to the sins of the people, 'Woe to us for our sins!'

The next thing that is clear is that the gloss cannot have come from the Greek text of 1 Mac. It is the Syriac text that is being quoted in the *Martyrdom*, and it is with this Syriac text that the authors quoted show coincidence. The Greek text begins οἱμοι, ἵνα τί τοῦτο ἐγενήθη, which will not furnish the requisite matter either to the *Peter Gospel* or to the *Diatessaron*.

It will also be regarded as fairly certain that, in spite of the antiquity of its attestation, the gloss can hardly be allowed as a part of the primitive text. The evidence that we have brought forward shows that it was imported into the *Diatessaron* from a Syriac text. It seems probable, also, that the *Gospel of Peter* is—as Swete suggested, under the influence of the *Diatessaron*, and that the St. Germain MS. is in the same condemnation. We now apply to all the Biblical texts that are involved in the inquiry the rule that 'when the cause of a variant is known, the variant itself disappears.' We began our inquiry with an historical sequence of related texts that had come to light, beginning with the reading of the Cureton text. It has, however, come out in the course of that inquiry, that the involved reading of the *Diatessaron* must have been a good deal longer than that in the Old Syriac Gospel. There was more of Maccabees in it. The play which Ephrem makes over the 'seeing' the destruction of Jerusalem, takes us back to the passage in Maccabees, which in the existing Greek speaks of 'seeing the devastations of my people and the devastation of the holy city.' It is interesting to note that Ephrem keeps up the play on this for paragraph after paragraph. 'The city was to see its own ruin. But in future the Jews would not be able to see it.' In fact they are now prohibited from seeing it: or they 'could only see it widowed and destroyed.' The recurrences show that, as we pointed out, Ephrem's *Diatessaron* had more in it (from the Maccabees) than the old Syriac can now show.

Enough has now been said by way of clearing the text of the NT (or at least its critical apparatus) of one more encumbrance. In this direction every simplification is a distinct gain. It is also an advantage to know that the text of the First Book of Maccabees was probably extant in Syriac at a very early period.

Literature.

THE CENTURY BIBLE.

PROFESSOR A. C. BRADLEY once remarked that the period during which an English Dictionary is authoritative is about ten years. The late Principal Adeney apparently estimated the duration

of the validity of a Commentary on the Gospels at twenty years. At least that is about the time that has elapsed since the Gospels were first published in *The Century Bible*, and we now have a new edition, to which we accord a hearty welcome.

The Century Bible, revised edition: *Matthew*, ed.