

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 *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php

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

THE DATE OF CODEX BEZAE.

WHAT is the age of Codex Bezae? The answer is unanimous; all textual critics declare it to be of the sixth century. But when we go on to ask the reason for this date it is not so easy to gain enlightenment. Practically Codex Bezae is put down to the sixth century because Dr. Scrivener came to that conclusion. Moreover, much as has been written in late years about the genesis of the Greek and Latin texts of Codex Bezae, and about the later liturgical notes which are found in it, very little has been done to determine the actual date of the MS itself. There seems room, therefore, for something fresh on this inexhaustible subject.

Codex Bezae is not dated, and the direct study of the handwriting does not lead us very far. The hand is really unlike that of any other extant MS. The Greek is something between the hand of the Codex Alexandrinus (A) of the fifth century and the Vienna *Dioscorides* of the early sixth, but it is much lighter and neater than the *Dioscorides*. In fact, if we might assign D to the fifth century, no better pair of MSS than D and the *Dioscorides* could be found to illustrate Sir E. M. Thompson's dictum: 'Uncial writing of the sixth century shows an advance on the delicate style of the fifth century in the comparatively heavy forms of the letters' (Thompson's *Palaeography*, p. 152).

The Latin side, *d*, is still more peculiar than the Greek. Some of the peculiar effect, however, is due to the scribe's desire to give a general similarity to the Greek and Latin sides of his work. It seems to have been the usual custom, at least until early in the sixth century, for Latin uncials to be written with a *slanting* pen, while Greek uncials were written with a *straight* pen. If the top of the page be supposed to point North, in Greek writing a line drawn from N. to S. will generally be thick and from W. to E. fine, but in Latin the thickest will be from NW. to SE., and the

finest from SW. to NE. Thus the cross stroke of 'N' is rather fine in Greek writing but thick in Latin, and in the letter 'O' a typical Greek form is *o*, a typical Latin form is *O*. In Codex Bezae the Latin is written with a straight pen like Greek, and this gives it to the palaeographer an unfamiliar appearance, besides curiously modifying the shapes of several letters, such as F, P, and R.

The slanting pen of Latin scribes made the downstrokes end in a sort of bevel, and this was often prolonged by a hair line (e. g. *R*), beautiful examples of which may be seen in the Bobbio Gospels (*k*). The scribe of Codex Bezae was evidently accustomed to make such hair lines, but with his straight pen they become fine horizontal strokes at the bottom of the down-stroke. Thus we get the Bezan forms F, P, and R.

With regard to the question of the date of Codex Bezae, Scrivener sums up by declaring that we should 'assign to this manuscript full as high a date as to the Codex Alexandrinus, which was written early in the fifth century, were not our conclusions somewhat modified by other considerations, of which the debased dialect of the Latin version . . . is the most obvious and weighty: the palaeographical appearance of the Latin character is venerable enough' (p. xvi). In other words, the conventional date given to D depends on the assumed date of the Latin version. We have now to consider whether in the light of our present knowledge the character of this version really suggests so late a date as the sixth century.

It is certain that both the Greek and the Latin sides of Codex Bezae have each a character of their own. D is not simply a Greek rendering of *d*, nor is *d* simply a rendering of D. The microscopical investigations of modern scholars have detected some 2,000 discrepancies between the Latin and the Greek, so that we are led to conclude that, however much the Latin side may have influenced the Greek and *vice versa*, the two sides of the MS are in a sense texts of separate origin that have been fitted together. This of course might take place in many ways. The most obvious is that the immediate ancestor of Codex Bezae was a Greek MS (*β*), of which a Latin translation (*δ*) was made by some one who was familiar with one of the current Latin versions; on this hypothesis some renderings of *δ* were the result

of literal translation from the opposite side, others will differ from \mathfrak{D} and agree with the current ecclesiastical Latin. Under these circumstances \mathfrak{D} might be corrected here and there to agree verbally with the Latin on the opposite page. Our Codex Bezae (on this hypothesis) is a transcript of $\mathfrak{D}\mathfrak{D}$ so corrected: \mathfrak{D} therefore contains some readings which are a mere literal translation of a not absolutely literal Latin version, while most of the differences of d from the bulk of Latin MSS are instances where the scholar who produced the translation that I have called \mathfrak{D} deserted the ordinary Latin renderings to make his work agree more literally with the Greek on the opposite side. The proposition that at each transcription of a bilingual codex the Latin and the Greek will tend to be corrected into mutual conformity is one which will meet with but few gainsayers.

To make my meaning quite clear let me give one example of each of the processes imagined.

1. Difference of \mathfrak{D} and d .

Luc. xxii βι ἀπαρήση με] + ΜΗΕΙΔΕΝΑΙΜΕ D 71 *a b l*

d omits (= Gk. Lat. rell.).

Here d is free from an explanatory gloss found in \mathfrak{D}^{gr} . A similar instance may be noted in Acts iii 4. These therefore are cases where d retains the basal Latin rendering without having been brought into conformity with the Bezan Greek.

2. Agreement of d with \mathfrak{D} against other Latin texts.

Matt. xx 2 ἐκ θησαυρίου τὴν ἡμέραν D (= Gr. rell.).

[EX] DENARIO DIVRNO *a b c (e) f ff h (m) n q r vg*

(e omits 'ex,' m has *singulis denariis diurnis*).

But d has

EX DENARIO DIEM

i. e. a literal translation of each word of the Greek, resulting in a combination which is scarcely Latin¹.

3. Agreement of \mathfrak{D} with d against other Greek texts, under circumstances which suggest that the text of \mathfrak{D} is the result of retranslation from the Latin.

Matt. v 24 πρόσφερε] προσφερεῖς D, OFFERES d (in agreement with many MSS of the Vulg. and O. L.).

This example was brought forward by Mill in 1707 (Harris,

¹ The rendering of Luc. ii 14 in d is almost equally striking. It runs: *Gloria in altis Deo et super terra pax in hominibus consolationis*.

Codex Bezae, pp. 42, 94). *Offeres* and *offers* are forms used in late Latin for the classical imperative *offer*. But this was misunderstood by the scribe of D, who accordingly changed the Greek πρόσφερε into προσφέρεις to agree (as he thought) with the meaning of the Latin.

The main object of Dr. Rendel Harris' *Study of Codex Bezae* was to show how often cases like No. 3 occur, and whatever may be thought of some of the positions taken up by him in that book with regard to the genesis of the 'Western Text' generally, there can be little doubt that he has made out many cases of Latinization in the text of D^{ms} itself. But *d* as it stands is far more closely assimilated to the Greek than D is assimilated to the Latin, and, on the whole, little fault can be found with the general summing up of the problem by Scrivener: 'Single verses may readily be found which might serve to show either that *d* is completely independent of all other known translations and made exclusively from the Greek on the opposite page; or, on the contrary, that it is a mere modification of the Old Latin, differing no further from other copies of it than *e* (for example) does from *f*. The careful study of *d* in many long passages . . . leads us to believe that neither of these views presents us with the whole truth. The Latin of Cod. D was really constructed immediately from its Greek text, servilely following it (as we have just seen) to the violation of the simplest rules of Latin syntax, and thus contains much, both in respect to words and phrases, that is quite peculiar to itself: while on the other hand, inasmuch as it was the work of a Western scribe on whose memory the diction of his native version was firmly imprinted, like that of King James' Bible is on our own, the translator unconsciously and habitually imitated it, sometimes for whole verses together, even in places where the Greek original might have taught him to render otherwise' (Scrivener's *Bezae Codex*, p. xxxv).

Codex Bezae a Greek MS, accompanied by a Latin rendering.

Let us look at the question from a slightly different point of view. Let us try and find out what *Codex Bezae* *professed* to be. With what object was it written? Was it regarded by those for whom it was first prepared as a Greek MS accompanied by a Latin translation; as a Latin MS accompanied by a Greek

translation; or as a pair of MSS, one Greek and the other Latin, placed side by side? The answer to these questions might tell us something of its date and the locality of its birth-place.

I think there can be not much doubt that the first of these is the true representation of the facts. The correctors of the MS (with one notable exception) busy themselves with the Greek side, and in the rare cases where they do touch the Latin it is to accommodate the Latin to some change made by them in the Greek. All the liturgical notes are made for the Greek text; even the *Sortes Sanctorum* are put on the Greek side. There is no indication that Codex Bezae has ever been formally and publicly used except as a Greek book. That it was provided with a Latin version is an obvious indication that it was made for a community in which the vernacular speech was Latin; that the liturgical notes are in Greek proves that at the time they were inserted the Codex was used as a Greek service book. Scholars therefore are agreed that it belonged to some community in the West, where a Greek rite was regularly or occasionally performed. Accordingly most recent investigations have placed the home of Codex Bezae, at least during the ninth century when most of the liturgical notes were written, in Southern Italy, perhaps at Amalfi or Rossano¹.

The Latin Corrector (G).

The corrector called G by Scrivener has for us a peculiar importance. Out of more than a dozen scribes into whose hands Codex Bezae at various times has fallen, he is the only one that shows any interest in the Latin text. Several of the other correctors are proved by Dr. Harris to have been Latin-speaking individuals, but they seem not to have studied the Latin side.

It is now well known that Dr. Scrivener made a very serious

¹ Dr. Sanday has lately suggested that Codex Bezae may have come from Ravenna (*Harris*, p. 4). In favour of this may be alleged the cursive hand of the annotator or annotators called M by Scrivener. The cursive is evidently the natural hand of this scribe, and the queer appearance of his uncials in the *Sortes* is chiefly due to the circumstance that he is forming the letters in a cramped artificial manner. But his cursive writing (*Scrivener*, Facs. III, no. 15) is as much like the Ravenna hand of A. D. 756, figured in Thompson's *Palaeography*, p. 144, as a bad hand can be like a good one. See especially the formation of λ and Ν, and the combination λη (Codex Bezae, fol. 191 b).

mistake in assigning G to the eleventh century. It was Dr. Sanday who first pointed this out to me now seven or eight years ago, but it has since been generally recognised. Dr. Kenyon (*J. T. S.* i 293 ff) puts G down to the seventh century, but even this, I venture to think, is too late. My own opinion is that G is contemporary with Codex Bezae itself, and that it is the hand of a person in some position of authority for whom the Codex itself was made.

First let us look at the palaeographical evidence. Dr. Kenyon (p. 296) says: 'Why Scrivener should have thrust G down so low, it is impossible to imagine. The Latin hand is of a well-marked character, with well-known forms of the letters *g*, *r*, and *s*, which there is no reason to place later than the seventh century; while the Greek, though of a less familiar type (especially when Scrivener wrote), is in a hand to which there are many parallels in the papyri of the Byzantine period, in the sixth and seventh centuries.' But these seventh-century parallels—Dr. Kenyon is thinking of such hands as B. M. *Pap.* cxiii 13 (*a*) and cxiii 11 (*a*)—are after all not very close. There is a roughness and a stiffness about them which is foreign to the delicately formed characters of G, and I should be more inclined to compare G with B. M. *Pap.* cccxi and ccxl, both of about the year 346 A. D. Yet we can hardly expect to find a close resemblance between G and handwritings current in Egypt in the middle of the fourth century, for any corrector of Codex Bezae must be more than half a century later in time and widely removed in space. The fact is that there are very few extant papyri that can be certainly dated in the fifth or the sixth century, so that direct means of comparison fail us. For the Latin hand of G we may compare the writing of Victor—*Victor famulus Christi et eius gratia episcopus Capuae*, as he describes himself—the learned prelate for whom the Codex Fuldensis was transcribed and who read it through pen in hand in A. D. 546. But G's characters are just as much better formed than Victor's scrawl, as the hand of *d* is better than the comparatively clumsy uncials of the Codex Fuldensis. G also resembles the hand of the Arian annotator of the Paris MS lat. 8907 (*J. T. S.* ii 151), who wrote not later than the early part of the sixth century. Still more like G in many respects are the annotations to the Bembine *Terence* and

ερυντησαταινκατηρ

G. Latin Hand.
(when not cramped for space)

καιοκαλυχτηεπητηρτηρ

G. Greek Hand.

credimus
dicuntēiētiamdne

G substitutes credimus for d's etiam.

σπρδτηροσπτομυκτα
τωπμηδσησμοδση

Official Deed, AD. 233
(From Thompson's Palaeography, p. 141)

πεθεροσμετηνεα
ρομηνοιοκδθωσ

Manumission, AD. 365.
(From Thompson's Palaeography, p. 42)

harundineinquassatam

G. Latin Hand.
(When cramped for space)

to the cod. Weingartensis of the Prophets, but the dates of these marginalia are themselves a matter of conjecture. The same is unfortunately true of the fragment of a tract called *De Iudiciis*, edited by Mommsen in the *Monatsberichte* of the Berlin Academy for 1879, p. 503 ff. The letters in this vellum fragment are not unlike those of G in general style, but all that can certainly be said of its age is that it is older than the publication of Justinian's Code. The half-uncial hand of the Vatican *Hilary* (before 510 A. D.) has also some resemblance to that of G, but it is stiffer than G and several of the letters, notably *a* *df* and *g*, are nearer the later minuscule forms. Thus there is really nothing from the palaeographical side to prevent us from assigning G to any date from the fourth to the sixth centuries¹.

One of the first questions which will be asked about a corrector of a Biblical MS is the type of text with which he is familiar. Did he use the Vulgate or the Old Latin? The true answer is that he made use of neither text. Dr. Scrivener asserts indeed that in three places (Matt. xv 18, 20, xxv 25) G 'corrects the Latin of our manuscript from the Vulgate,' but examination proves how little can be founded on them. In Matt. xxv 25 *τὸ σὸν* was translated *quod tuum* in *d*; G has supplied the missing *est*, but this addition scarcely needed the authority of the Vulgate or any other version to commend it. Matt. xv 18, 20, are more interesting. In this chapter the verb *κοινοῦν* occurs five times (11 *bis*, 18, 20 *bis*) and is translated in *d* by the corresponding part of *communicare*. This was the original O. L. rendering², as is proved by its occurrence in *k* and even in the Vulgate of some of the parallel passages in St. Mark. But the scribe of D (or of \mathfrak{D}) misunderstood this, and changed *κοινοῦν* into the corresponding part of the verb *κοινωνεῖν*. The mistake was corrected by an early hand, the intrusive letters being washed out, a process which naturally makes the identification of the corrector more difficult than when something fresh is added. The corrector may have been G himself, who cancelled *communicant* on the Latin side in *vv.* 18 and 20*a*, writing *coinquinant* on the margin. 'Coinquinant' is the word used here in the Vulgate, and conceivably G took

¹ One of the nearest parallels I know to the Greek hand of G is the document of A. D. 355 figured in Thompson's *Palaeography*, p. 142, and here reproduced.

² Cf. Aug. *c. Faust.* xvi 31; *communicat*, i. e. *commune, profanum, ἀκάθαρτον* facit.

it from thence. But it also stands in *a c f f g r* (hiant *b k*), so that it cannot be used to show G's dependence upon or knowledge of the Vulgate. On the other hand, as Scrivener himself notes, in Acts ii 2 *et factum est repente caelo echo* (i. e. ἦχος) G puts *vox* in the margin for *echo*, although the Vulgate and the O. L. texts (including *h p g* and *e*) all have *sonus*.

This last instance is significant. G is not a textual critic comparing one Latin text with another, but a scholar reading over the text pen in hand and making quite freely on his own authority such changes as appear to him advisable. In Acts ii 2 he wished it to be clear that the Greek spoke of a 'voice' from heaven, not of a mere earthly 'echo.' That G was a scholar admits of little doubt from the way in which he corrects the betacisms of the scribe¹. Such monstrosities as *beruum uacuum* are turned by him into *uerbum uacuum*. But he cares nothing for the conventional Biblical Latin. For example, in Acts iv 9 the scribe of Codex Bezae (or its ancestor) forgot to cross a T, and so instead of St. Peter being asked *super benefacto hominis infirmi* we read

SVPER BENEFACIO HOMINEM INFIRMVM

i. e. *benefacto* was miswritten *benefacio* and then carelessly taken to be a verb. This is corrected by G into

SVPER BENEFICIO HOMINIS INFIRMI

Grammar and sense are brought back, but not by recourse to other Latin texts, for no Latin text here has *beneficium* instead of *benefactum*. Similarly G wishes to substitute the classical *mille passuum* in Matt. v 41 for the barbarous *miliun unum* of *d*. But the other Latin texts here have *mille passus* as the equivalent of *μλίων ἑν*.

Latin Equivalents for 'Yes.'

The clearest indication both of the point of view and culture of G, and at the same time of the methods which underlie the Latin of Codex Bezae itself, is to be found in the Latin renderings for *vai*, 'yes.' These are so interesting in themselves

¹ The only peculiar spelling I have found in G is in Matt. xxi 13, where he corrects 'spelucam' into *speluncham*. This odd form is characteristic of the corrector of Cod. Sangermanensis (*g*), and is found in Jo. xi 38 in Wordsworth's C and Z^o, one a Spanish MS and the other supposed to be Italian.

that I give them in tabular form. The renderings may be grouped under four heads: (1) *ita*, (2) *utique*, (3) *etiam*, and a miscellaneous class (4).

In the Gospels I have confined myself for the most part to the really ancient codices *a b e f k n* and the Vulgate, but any peculiar renderings, such as *intelleximus* in Matt. xiii 51 *corb*, are put down. In the Acts *h* is the Fleury Palimpsest, *g* the Gigas, *p* the Perpignan MS published by Berger.

	ITA	UTIQUE	ETIAM	Other renderings.
Matt. v 37			<i>d</i>	est <i>Latt. omn.</i> (<i>exc. d</i>) including G
ix 28	<i>h</i>	<i>a b q f v g</i>	<i>d</i>	credimus G
xi 9	<i>h</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>d b q v g</i>	
26	<i>h a b q f v g</i>		<i>d</i>	
xiii 51	<i>he</i>	<i>a b q f</i>	<i>d v g</i>	intelleximus G <i>corb</i>
xv 27	<i>he</i>	<i>a b q</i>	<i>d f v g</i>	
xvii 25	<i>e</i>	<i>a n (b)</i>	<i>d q f v g</i>	facit aut praes(tat) G utique non <i>b</i>
xxi 16		<i>b q f v g</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>om. e</i> [<i>hiat a</i>]
Mc. vii 28	<i>a n</i>	<i>f v g</i>	<i>q</i>	<i>om. d b c f f i</i>
<i>om. D φ 565</i>				
Luc. vii 26	<i>e</i>	<i>b c q v g</i>	<i>d a r f</i>	
x 21	<i>e a b etc. q f</i>		<i>d v g</i>	
xi 51	<i>e a b etc. q f v g</i>		<i>d</i>	
xii 5	<i>e i f v g</i>		<i>d b q m m</i>	<i>om. a c l r</i>
Jo. xi 27		<i>a b f v g (utique e)</i>	<i>d</i>	
xxi 15		<i>a b r (utique e)</i>	<i>d f f v g</i>	sed et Simoni sic dicit 'Diligis me?' respondit 'Diligo.' ait ei 'Pasce oues meas.' <i>Roman der- gy ap. Cypr. 486</i>
16	<i>c</i>	<i>a r (utique e)</i>	<i>d b f f v g</i>	
(17)			<i>b</i>	
Ac. v 8	<i>p</i>		<i>d v g</i>	tanti (<i>only</i>) <i>Lucif.</i> itaque (<i>only</i>) <i>g</i>
xxii 27			<i>v g</i>	[<i>hiat d</i>]
<i>εμ Dsr (= g)</i>				(<i>cius romanus sum</i> <i>Aug.</i>) <i>sum g</i>

A glance at the above table at once brings out the general distribution of the evidence. It is evident that *ita* is 'African,' *utique* and *etiam* 'European.' But *utique* belongs to an earlier strain of the text than *etiam*; for when *b* and its allies have *utique*, then *f* and the Vulgate sometimes have *etiam*, but *f* and the Vulgate never have *utique* except when *b* has it also.

Among this confusion of renderings the steadfastness of *d* is noteworthy. It has *etiam* every time, even in Matt. v 37, where

the whole company of Latin texts have *est, est*, for 'yea, yea.' Evidently *etiam* is no primitive feature of the Latin versions; if uniformity were in this instance a characteristic of the earliest text, the evidence points to *ita* not to *etiam* as the original. In the matter of rendering *val*, therefore, *d* is simply a slavish image of D, i.e. the Latin text has been influenced by the Greek, not the Greek by the Latin¹.

But the corrections of *d* by the contemporary hand called G are still more remarkable. Where he changes the 'etiam' of *d* it is neither into 'ita' nor 'utique.' He boldly leaves the Latin Bible and answers (like the sons of Zebedee²) with a verb. When the two blind men are asked in Matt. ix 28 whether they believe that Jesus can open their eyes, G makes them reply *Credimus* 'we believe,' in place of the *Etiam* of *d*. 'Have ye understood all these things?' says our Lord to the disciples in Matt. xiii 51; according to G they answer *Intelleximus* 'we have understood.' These corrections do not appear to rest on the authority of another Latin version but on a feeling for language, for in another instance G actually supplies an alternative. In Matt. xvii 24, 25, we read in *d*

MAGISTER VESTER NON PRAESTAT TRIBVTVM. ET DICIT
ETIAM

but in the margin G has written in substitution for *etiam* the words

FACIT AVT PRAES[TAT]

To the question 'Your master, does he not pay the tribute?' G's answer is 'He does,' or 'He pays.'

The only case where this idiom is found in a Latin MS of the Gospels is Matt. xiii 51 *corb*, a MS with a Vulgate base mixed with O. L. elements of various dates. But there does not seem to be any near link connecting *corb* with Codex Bezae or its correctors. It would be interesting if we could assume that St. Augustine had *Cinis Romanus sum* in his MS as the equivalent of *Nal* in Acts xxii 27. For *val*, D has *επιλ*, in which it is supported by *g* ('sum'), *d* being unfortunately missing. But

¹ A good parallel to the mechanical consistency of *d* in rendering *val* is to be found in his steady preference for *substantia* to render τὸ ὑπόκεινται, where other Latin texts have *res* or *facultates*, &c. (*O. L. Bibl. Texts*, ii 135).

² Matt. xx 22.

it is far from certain that St. Augustine is doing more than give the sense of St. Paul's reply¹.

Now who was this G? He was not a regular corrector of Codex Bezae, for his corrections do not go all through the volume. They are found throughout St. Matthew and in the early chapters of Acts. He seems to have begun at the beginning of a book and to have read through the Latin, pen in hand, until he was tired, correcting the spelling and making here and there more serious alterations, such as we have noticed. Let us put the points together.

(1) G's language was Latin.

(2) Yet he knew Greek, and where he adds a line of Greek (Matt. xviii 18) he writes it with an assured hand.

(3) He pays no attention to the traditional Latin Bible.

(4) His handwriting is that of a scholar, not of a professional scribe, and he makes corrections where he chances to have been reading.

The last consideration suggests a person in authority, examining the codex before he gives it his *imprimatur*, to use a convenient anachronism. I venture therefore to suggest that G is the handwriting of the Bishop of the church for which Codex Bezae was originally prepared; this church was a Latin-speaking community, but one in which the Gospels were read in Greek, either generally or on special occasions. In such a community the Greek side of Codex Bezae (D) was Holy Scripture; the Latin side (*d*) was merely a 'crib,' if one may be allowed the word.

In view of the freedom with which G treats the Latin renderings of the Gospels it is difficult to believe that the writer can have lived much later than the end of the fifth century. The case is quite different from the occurrence of Old Latin readings in a MS of the eighth or ninth century. Anything almost may be perpetuated by the conservatism of a scribe. But G is the autograph of a scholar making a fresh departure; and where shall we find a scholar in Western Europe after the beginning of the sixth century who would dare to have an opinion of his own as

¹ 'Non enim dicendo *Civis Romanus sum* non erat paratus hoc in se contemni quod pro minimo habebat ab eis qui in illo nomen tam pretiosum et salutare contempserat' (*De Serm. Dom.* i).

to what was the appropriate way to render the Greek of the Gospels into Latin? For G does not shelter his changes under an *alius* or an *aliter*, like the annotator of the Weingarten Codex of the Prophets, to name the most obvious parallel; his alterations are made boldly on his own authority.

Is there then any valid reason why we should not assign Codex Bezae itself to the fifth century, to the generation after the death of St. Augustine? The chief argument for bringing down the date of the book into the sixth century has been the rusticity of the Latin side, but if we think of this Latin text as a mere 'crib' there is less difficulty in giving it an earlier date. The unusual number of provincialisms and vulgarisms is what we should be prepared to expect in such a work; if the Latin text of Codex Bezae were neither regarded as Scripture nor designed for public reading in church it would have, so to speak, less dignity to keep up. At the same time the most pedantic efforts do not prevent the authors of such 'cribs' from retaining many a reminiscence of older versions¹.

To regard *d* in the way indicated above explains what we find in the Latin side of Codex Bezae. Naturally it does not explain the more important problems offered by the Greek text of Codex Bezae. But it does not exclude occasional conformations of the Greek to the Latin; under the circumstances a scribe in copying *Dd* from the hypothetical *DD* may have still further assimilated the two sides in all good faith. But the modifications of *D* and its ancestors seem to me to have been different in kind from the modifications of *d* and its ancestors. *D*, it is true, is an exile and no doubt has picked up foreign ways², but its companion *d* differs

¹ Reminiscences due to a knowledge of the current version are impossible to avoid. The most pedantically literal version of any part of the Bible in English is probably Cureton's translation of the Syriac Gospels called by his name. Thus for the first Beatitude he gives us 'Happy they, to the poor in their spirit, because theirs is the kingdom of heaven.' Yet a few verses further down (Matt. v 15) he brings in the 'candle' and the 'candlestick' of the Authorised Version, renderings that are appropriate enough as equivalents for the *λύχνος* and *λυχνίον* of the Greek, but which by no means reproduce the 'torch' (*sh'rágā*) and 'lamp-stand' (*m'nárlā*) of the Syriac. Similarly, Cureton translates both the *modiós* of Matt. v 15 and the *sa'thā* of Luc. xi 33 by the conventional 'bushel.' So strong indeed is the influence of the English version that in one place at least it has affected the Syriac text, for no doubt that is the reason why an 'and' has slipped in, both in Syriac and in English, before the last clause of Luc. iii 14.

yet more from its Latin compeers than D differs from other Greek MSS.

Strictly speaking, the date we assign to Codex Bezae does not greatly affect our estimate of its textual value. It is the internal characteristics of its text, not its assumed date, that have made it the most widely discussed of all Biblical MSS. At the same time I cannot help thinking that the historical interest of Codex Bezae is increased, if we are able to think of it as a product of the fifth century, of the times of Apollinaris Sidonius and of Leo the Great, an epoch when the Old Latin Versions were still current in the West. On the ordinary view, which puts Codex Bezae in the sixth century, we are obliged to regard the book almost as an historical accident of the Dark Ages.

F. C. BURKITT.