The Journal
of
Theological Studies

OCTOBER, 1909

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

IV. THE LANGUAGES OF THE EARLY CHURCH: (A) GREEK AND THE GREEK BIBLE.

THE whole history and developement of the Canon of the New Testament, as we have so far seen it unroll itself before our eyes moves within the confines of a single language. From the 'traditions' handed on by St Paul to his converts down to the Gospel and Apostolicon of Marcion everything is Greek. But before we pass beyond the rough chronological limit which has bounded our horizon in the preceding chapters, and follow the Gospel in its process of transference into the vernacular of the Latin-speaking and Syriac-speaking peoples, we must once more, in the present chapter, travel over the same century and a half of the Christian *origines* and study them anew from the linguistic standpoint. We must satisfy ourselves to what extent the dominance of the Greek tongue in the Christian society goes back to the very beginning, to the Jewish surroundings which cradled the infant Church: and we shall find that the experiences of the journey will not have been without direct profit to our equipment as textual critics of the New Testament.

Three languages shared the field and divided the interests of the Judaism of the first century: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek. Hebrew was the ancestral language of the Jews. Aramaic was now, and had long been, the vernacular of the Jews in Palestine, acquired gradually by them from their neighbours round about. Greek, at the time of the Christian era, was the only language familiar to most Jews outside the Holy Land, and as the common medium of intercourse between the peoples of the Eastern

Mediterranean was known to many even of the Aramaic-speaking Jews of Palestine.

HEBREW had wholly ceased to be a spoken language: the Ἑβραϊστί of the title on the Cross, the Ἑβραΐς διάλεκτος of St Paul's speech on the steps of the *Parembole*, mean Aramaic, not Hebrew[1]: but it was the language of the sacred books which counted for so much in the life of Judaism, and in view both of the high standard of education among the Jews and of the near affinity of the Hebrew and Aramaic tongues, it is probable that there were still many Jews who could understand it. In the synagogues of Palestine the Scriptures were always read in the Hebrew original: no translation into Aramaic was ever made, but the time came when for the benefit of Aramaic-speaking congregations a Targum or running paraphrase in Aramaic of the Hebrew text was allowed a subordinate position in the synagogue services, much in the same way as after the official Latin Gospel in the Mass a rendering into the vernacular often follows in French churches to-day. The earliest of these Targums that are extant, the Targum of Onkelos on the Pentateuch and the Targum of Jonathan on the Prophets, may go back in substance to the first and second centuries A.D.: and no doubt the beginnings of the system are to be sought for earlier still.

ARAMAIC—a name which, though properly speaking it is interchangeable with Syriac and applies equally to all its dialects, is now used conventionally by historians of Christianity to distinguish the dialect of Palestine or southern Syria from the related but not identical dialect of northern Syria or Edessa—was doubtless the familiar language of our Lord and His apostles. All the fragments of His speech which our Greek Gospels have preserved untranslated are in the Aramaic idiom[2]: and there have been few

[1] It is a curious point of contact between the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse that in both books the writer is fond of introducing names, in the Gospel Aramaic, in Apoc. Hebrew, under the title Ἑβραιστί (the word does not occur in any other New Testament book)—Jo. v 2 Βηθζαθά or Βηθσαϊδά or Βηθεσδά, xix 13 Γαββαθά, xix 17 Γολγοθά (and cf. xx 16 Ῥαββουνεί): Apoc. ix 11 Ἀβαδδών, xvi 16 Ἀρ Μαγεδών. The Greek and Gentile Luke apologizes for the vernacular Ἀκελδαμάχ, with perhaps a touch of polite disdain, τῇ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν, Acts i 19.

[2] Marc. v 41 Ταλειθά κούμ, vii 11 Κορβάν, vii 34 Ἐφφαθά, xv 34 Ἐλωί ἐλωί λαμὰ σαβαχθανεί, and cf. iii 17 Βοανηργές. In all these cases translations are given side by side with the original. That our Lord would be expected to speak in Aramaic is further clear from Acts xxvi 14 ἤκουσα φωνὴν λέγουσαν πρός με τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ. [Compare too the words Ῥαββεί, Ῥαββουνεί, Ὡσαννά.]

more interesting contributions within our own generation to the better understanding of the Gospels than the attempt to get behind the Greek form in which our Lord's teaching, as it has come down to us, is clothed, and to penetrate, in the case at least of the simpler ideas and expressions, to the underlying Aramaic kernel. It is possible too that the local church of Jerusalem, and its lineal representative after the flight of the Christians at the time of the great siege, the church of Pella, were bilingual and still understood, perhaps still employed for worship, the language used by Christ. Even outside Palestine some few of the first disciples found their missionary field among Semitic-speaking peoples. Early tradition connected St Bartholomew with the church of Ethiopia, St Thomas and St Thaddaeus with the church of Edessa. And though all the books of the New Testament, as we have them, are in Greek, the possibility must not be excluded that our Greek books may in some cases be reproductions of an Aramaic original or at least expansions of an Aramaic nucleus.

Yet examination of the evidence does not, save in a single instance, lend any real colour to such suppositions. Jerome explained the difference between the styles of 1 and 2 Peter by suggesting that the apostle employed different interpreters in the composition of the Greek of the two epistles[1]: but Jerome probably underrated the extent to which Greek must have become a familiar language even to an apostle who had started life as a fisherman in Galilee, and we must look on other lines for the solution of the problem of the *secunda Petri*. Papias, too, long before Jerome, had called Mark the interpreter of Peter, and Irenaeus had followed Papias[2]: but if it were certain that they meant by ἑρμηνευτής an interpreter from one language into another, would it not be more likely that the interpretation was from Greek into Latin for Latin-speaking hearers at Rome, rather than from Aramaic into Greek? Clement of Alexandria accounts for the difference of Greek style between the epistle to the Hebrews and the (other) Pauline epistles by the conjecture that St Paul wrote to the Hebrews in Hebrew, and that the Greek text is a rendering

Ep. ad Hedibiam 120 *Quaest.* xi (Vallarsi, i 838) 'Denique et duae epistulae quae feruntur Petri stilo inter se et charactere discrepant structuraque verborum. ex quo intellegimus, pro necessitate rerum diversis eum usum interpretibus'.

Eus. *H. E.* iii 39: Iren. *adv. Haer.* III i 1 (Greek in Eus. v 8): and cf. Jerome in the passage just quoted, 'Habebat . . . interpretem . . . beatus Petrus Marcum, cuius evangelium Petro narrante et illo scribente compositum est'.

by St Luke.[1] Modern critics have suggested the addition of the epistle of St James to the list of books with Aramaic originals[2]: but their reasons are as purely *a priori* as are Jerome's for the epistles of St Peter.

In fact, there is one and only one tangible piece of evidence for an Aramaic original of any New Testament book: and that is of course Papias's categorical statement that 'Matthew composed the *Logia* in the Hebraic dialect, and every one interpreted them as best he could'. Scholars are agreed in accepting on this testimony St Matthew's authorship of Aramaic *Logia*, but they differ widely as to what these *Logia* were. Prof. Burkitt suggests that they were a collection of Old Testament prophecies[3]: and nothing would in itself be more probable than that at some very early date *Testimonia* were brought together out of the Old Testament for the purposes of the controversy with Judaism. But what need in that case of individual and separate effort at translation, when the Greek Bible was in all hands to supply an authorized rendering? And why should Eusebius, whose interest was concentrated on the genesis of the canonical Gospels, have inserted unexplained this quotation from Papias, if the *Logia* had nothing more to do with the Gospel as Eusebius knew it than the provision of its references to the Old Testament? Even if we may not, with Lightfoot, translate *Logia* by 'Gospel' pure and simple, it is impossible to account for the ancient and unanimous ascription of our First Gospel to St Matthew's authorship, if there does not lie very near behind it some document at least of 'Sayings' for which the apostle was directly and immediately responsible.[4] It is interesting to note that Jerome, at the end of the fourth century, found in use among the Nazarene sect in Palestine a Hebrew—that is, an Aramaic—'Gospel according to the Hebrews', which the sectaries themselves appear to have claimed as the original of the Greek Gospel of St Matthew. While it kept on the whole fairly close to the canonical Gospel, its variations, omissions and additions were yet considerable enough to induce Jerome to translate it for the benefit of his contemporaries into both Greek and

[1] ap. Eus. *H. E.* vi 14.

[2] See Mayor's edition, pp. ccv sqq.: Mayor himself rejects the view.

[3] *Gospel History* pp. 126-128.

[4] See above, *J. T. S.* Jan. 1909, pp. 171, 172.

Latin.[1] Not a fragment has survived either of these translations or of the text from which they were made: our knowledge of this 'Hebrew' Gospel is confined to some dozen citations made from it in other writings of St Jerome.[2]

But the real Gospel 'according to the Hebrews', just like the Epistle 'to the Hebrews', was written not in Hebrew or Aramaic, but in Greek. So too, as we have just seen, were the Epistle which James the Lord's brother, the head of the Christian community at Jerusalem, addressed 'to the Twelve Tribes that are in the Dispersion', and also the Epistle of St Peter to the 'sojourners of the Dispersion' in Asia Minor. The *Didache* is a Jewish-Christian document and modelled on Jewish exemplars: but the *Didache* again is in Greek. The literature of the Christian controversy with Judaism, the Dialogue of Jason with Papiscus, and the Dialogue of Justin Martyr with Trypho, was embodied from the first in the same language.

That GREEK was the language of the primitive Church is thus a general statement which needs only very slight reservations. And early Christianity was Greek, because contemporary Judaism was in the main Greek also.

The Jewish Dispersion was one of the most marked results of the great movement of Hellenic expansion which accompanied and followed the conquests of Alexander the Great. Cities were the distinctive feature of Greek as opposed to 'barbarian' life: and the planting of new cities was the principal expedient by which Alexander and the successors who partitioned his dominions after him set themselves to Hellenize the Eastern world. But the native Greek population must have soon proved insuf-

[1] *Vir. Ill.* § 2 'Evangelium quoque quod appellatur **secundum Hebraeos** et a me nuper in Graecum Latinumque sermonem translatum est, quo et Origenes saepe utitur': *in Matt.* xii 13 'in evangelio quo utuntur Nazaraei et Ebionitae, quod nuper in Graecum de Hebraeo sermone transtulimus, et quod vocatur a plerisque Matthaei authenticum': *adv. Pelag.* iii 2 'in evangelio **iuxta Hebraeos** quod Chaldaico quidem Syroque sermone sed Hebraicis litteris scriptum est; quo utuntur usque hodie Nazaraei **secundum Apostolos** sive, ut plerique autumant, **iuxta Matthaeum**; quod et in Caesariensi habetur bibliotheca': *in Mic.* vii 6 'evangelio, quod **secundum Hebraeos** editum nuper transtulimus' (Vallarsi, ii 817; vii 77; ii 768; vi 520).

[2] Collected in Westcott *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* Appendix D: but no. 12 of the list there given should perhaps be omitted, for in that passage (*Comm. in Matt.* ii 5) the words 'in ipso Hebraico' may mean 'in the original Hebrew [of the Old Testament]'.

ficient for the huge drain on their numbers which this policy implied: and accident or statesmanship discovered in the Jewish race an effective supplement. For centuries past the Jews had been struggling, now with more and now with less success, against absorption by the surrounding peoples, and they were animated therefore by no inconvenient loyalties to the dispossessed governments: a prolific population was willing enough to discharge its surplus into colonies, and genius for trade achieved its fitting outlet in the new city-foundations of the Macedonian conquerors. Asia Minor and the Aegean, Syria, Mesopotamia, but above all Alexandria, were soon full of Jewish emigrants, who lived in their own quarter of each city, under their own laws and their own magistrates, and in the free exercise of their own religion. The one necessary concession which the Jew made to his neighbours was in the matter of language. Greek was now the universal medium, not only of literature and education and polite society, but of trade and business, throughout the whole Levant: and just as the Jews of Palestine had learnt to talk Aramaic instead of their ancestral Hebrew, so the Jews of the Dispersion (as the new colonies were collectively called) learnt to talk Greek and forgot their native Aramaic. In especial, under the fostering protection of the Ptolemies, the Greek Jews of Egypt and Alexandria acquired something almost like a distinctive nationality of their own.

Meanwhile, even the Jews of Palestine, at any rate those of the towns, had perforce to employ Greek for the purpose of communication with their Gentile rulers, and of intercourse with the Gentile settlers whom their native princes had encouraged to come and live among them. Caesarea Stratonis, for instance, the favourite foundation of Herod the Great and afterwards the civil capital of the Roman province of Judaea, was from the first a Greek-speaking city. Thus when the Jews of the Dispersion gathered in Jerusalem for the annual feasts, the common ground between visitors and residents was not Aramaic, but Greek: and it necessarily followed that the preaching of the Christ to the 'strangers and proselytes' must almost from the first have been carried on by the apostles, not in a native Aramaic, but in an acquired Greek, or at least through Greek-speaking interpreters.

If such was the case at Jerusalem, much more was the same thing true of the preaching in the Dispersion. St Paul, as we

learn from the Acts and the Roman epistle, had in the course of his three missionary journeys preached the Gospel 'from Jerusalem right round as far as Illyricum'[1] through Syria, Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece. Everywhere he kept to the towns, everywhere he started work in the synagogue: everywhere, as far as we can tell, he preached and was understood in the Greek tongue. If the people of Lystra fell back, in a moment of excitement, on their native language—the historian records the fact just because it was so exceptional[2]—we need not doubt that their ordinary intercourse with the apostle was conducted in Greek on both sides. Nor is there any reason to think that it was otherwise at Rome. The epistle to that Church had been addressed to it in Greek: and from the distinctively Greek character of the Roman Church throughout the succeeding century we can safely argue back to its *origines*, and assume that the first generation of Roman Christians were evangelized, were instructed, and worshipped, through the medium of the same language.[3]

St Peter's missionary labours are not known to us in the same detail as St Paul's. The canonical Acts do not follow him outside Palestine, unless we read some such hidden meaning into Acts xii 17 'he departed to another place'. From the Galatian epistle we learn of his presence at Antioch; and tradition, which there is at least *prima facie* reason to respect, makes him the founder of the Antiochene line of bishops. His own epistle is addressed to the Christians of the five provinces which made up at that time the Asia Minor of Roman rule, though he nowhere expressly implies in it that he had preached to them in person. It is dated from Babylon: but there is every reason to suppose that Babylon is not the literal Babylon of the Euphrates, but the mystic Babylon of the Seven Hills. An unambiguous allusion appears to be made in the Fourth Gospel to St Peter's martyrdom as a familiar fact: and no rival tradition claims for it any other scene than Rome. St Peter, like St Paul, lived and died a missionary to Greek-speaking peoples.

[1] Rom. xv 19 ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ κύκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ. On 'Illyricum' see appended note at the end of this article.

[2] Acts xiv 11 ἐπῆραν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτῶν Λυκαονιστί. Cf. Ramsay *Church in the Roman Empire* p. 58.

[3] Of St Paul's preaching in Spain more will be said in a later chapter in connexion with Latin Christianity.

What Rome was as a focus of apostolic traditions in the West, that the East possessed in Ephesus and in the province of Proconsular Asia, of which Ephesus was the capital. Here were gathered, as it would seem, about the time of the Jewish War and the destruction of Jerusalem, most of the survivors of the original disciples, and especially those who had hitherto remained in closest contact with Palestine. The Fourth Gospel gives special prominence (apart from Peter and John) to Andrew, Philip, and Thomas: and the two former of these are further connected with Asia Minor by independent traditions recorded in documents of the end of the second century.[1] Papias of Hierapolis had conversed with those who had listened to Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, and Matthew[2]: and though we are not to conclude that all the apostles named had themselves preached in the neighbourhood, we may not unreasonably see, in the prominence of the most purely Hellenic district of Asia Minor as a centre of Christian memories, yet another proof of the almost exclusive hold of the Greek language over the apostolic and sub-apostolic Church.

But if the language of the early Church was Greek, its Bible was Greek too. We moderns are so accustomed to think of the Hebrew Old Testament and the Greek New Testament as two sharply contrasted wholes, that we forget that no idea of any linguistic barrier between the two Testaments was for a moment present to the mind of any Greek-speaking Christian. If the New Testament of the Church was in Greek, the Old Testament was in Greek also: and it was in Greek, not because the Church had provided a new vernacular rendering of the unfamiliar Hebrew, but because she inherited an existing one from the Jewish Dispersion. The Septuagint was already the Bible of the vast majority of Jews. They had no need to change their old Scriptures for new ones, when they accepted the teaching of Jesus as Messiah.

About the actual conditions under which the Hebrew Scriptures were rendered into Greek by the Seventy translators, legend was busy at a very remote period. The story of the miraculous accompaniments which guaranteed the divine inspiration of the new

[1] 'Eadem nocte revelatum Andreae ex apostolis ut recognoscentibus cunctis Iohannes suo nomine cuncta describeret', Canon Muratorianus: *Φίλιππον τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων, ὃς κεκοίμηται ἐν Ἱεραπόλει*, Polycrates ap. Eus. *H. E.* iii 31, v 24.

[2] ap. Eus. *H. E.* iii 39.

version may be read in Epiphanius.[1] Even the belief, general among early Christian writers, that the translation of the whole Hebrew Canon was carried through at Alexandria at one and the same time has been disproved by the researches of criticism: it is now clear that the translations of different books or groups of books were made at different times, possibly even in different places. But whatever breaches may have been made in the outworks of tradition, the inner kernel remains: the books of the Law were translated at Alexandria 250 years or more before Christ, and the whole Hebrew Canon was represented in a more or less official Greek form in time for the Christian Church to adopt and assimilate it before its final separation from Judaism.

But the complete Greek Bible of the Dispersion differed in one very obvious way from the Hebrew Bible of Palestine. Its contents were not the same as the contents of the Hebrew Bible, for it included in addition those books which we call 'deutero-canonical' or 'apocrypha'. It was this larger Canon which, outside Palestine and outside the influence of the few scholars who knew the Hebrew language and the Hebrew Canon, was the recognized Bible or Old Testament of the Christian Church: Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus were accepted on the same level as Proverbs, Tobit as Esther, and the books of the Maccabees enjoyed equal authority with the books of Chronicles. The witness of the Western Church before Jerome is practically unanimous in this sense. The great Greek Bibles of the fourth or fifth century, ℵ A B C, if they differ from one another in the exact contents of their Old Testament, as we have seen that they do in regard to their New Testament, yet agree on a Greek as against a Hebrew Canon.[2] If Melito of

[1] *de mens. et pond.* §§ 3, 6. Epiphanius appears to be alone in the statement that the 72 translators worked in pairs, ζυγῇ ζυγῇ κατὰ οἰκίσκον, each pair taking a single book; 'thus, for instance, Genesis was allotted to one pair, Exodus to the next pair, Leviticus to the next, and so on all through.' This story so far presents a remarkable parallel to the latest researches of Septuagint scholars, who have called attention to the existence of minute differences in the style of the first and second halves respectively of all the longer books: see Mr Thackeray's proofs in *J. T. S.* iv 245, 398, ix 88.

[2] Cod. C has no more than 64 O.T. leaves, but these contain parts of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus: of the others ℵ has Tobit, Judith, 1 and 4 Maccabees, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus: A has Baruch, Tobit, Judith, 1, 2, 3, 4 Maccabees, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus: B has Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Judith, Tobit, Baruch. The order too differs in all three: but all agree in sandwiching the deutero-canonical in among the rest without any distinction.

Sardis in the second century gives the 'number and order of the ancient books' as he found it recognized in Palestine, the Hebrew colour of the list explains itself: and the same Palestinian influence will account for the arguments of Africanus in the third century, and for the Canon of Cyril of Jerusalem in the fourth. Origen's list is introduced in so many words as the 'twenty-two books according to the Hebrews' κατὰ Ἑβραίους: his own usage is based on the fuller canon, but his list had an independent influence, and the only truncated list in the West before Jerome is copied direct from it—that, namely, of St Hilary of Poitiers.[1] When Jerome set himself to oust the Septuagint text from its position in the Latin Church and replace it by a new translation from the Hebrew, he naturally adopted the Hebrew Canon with the Hebrew text: the additional books of the Alexandrine Canon form no true part of the Vulgate Bible. If the Sixth of the Thirty-nine Articles cites St Jerome as saying that these 'other books the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine',[2] we must make it quite clear to ourselves that this distinction between canonical and deutero-canonical books was in the main a new one of Jerome's own making, and does not represent the inherited tradition of the Church of earlier days. Something like it had been employed by Eusebius in the classification of the books of the New Testament[3]; but the principal additions which mark off the Septuagint Canon from the Hebrew, the books, say, of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and Tobit, had (outside the local and non-Christian influences already named) a wider circulation and a firmer footing in the first four centuries of the Church than the Catholic Epistles or the Hebrews or the Apocalypse. In any case the attempt to reckon degrees of canonicity implies a work

[1] Melito ap. Eus. *H. E.* iv 26: Origen ap. Eus. *H. E.* vi 25: Cyril Hier. *Catech.* iv 35: Hilary *Prol. in librum Psalmorum* § 15.

[2] *Praef. in libros Salomonis* (Vallarsi, ix 1295) 'sicut ergo Iudith et Tobi et Macchabaeorum libros legit quidem ecclesia, sed inter canonicas scripturas non recipit: sic et haec duo volumina' [sc. Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus] 'legat ad aedificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam. si cui sane LXX interpretum magis editio placet, habet eam a nobis olim emendatam. neque enim sic nova cudimus ut vetera destruamus.'

[3] Eus. *H. E.* iii 25. Athanasius's thirty-ninth Festal Epistle, A.D. 367, offers the nearest parallel; it distinguishes the Canonical Books as the Scriptures of the baptized Christian from the Apocrypha as the Scriptures of the catechumen.

of investigation and reflexion: it is, as regards the Old Testament, a device employed by scholars or theologians to bring under one formula older and contradictory conceptions. And of these warring conceptions one is characteristic of the Hebrews and the Hebrew-Christian Church of Palestine, the other of the Jewish Dispersion and of the Christian Churches among the Gentiles.

As with the number of the books, so with their text. The Septuagint translation—if we put aside the difficult question of the versions of the book of Daniel—was current in the Churches, and in a relatively unadulterated form, till its purity first, and next its supremacy, were disturbed by the labours of the two great scholars whose Hebrew acquirements so profoundly affected the future history of the Old Testament texts in the Greek and Latin Churches respectively. Between the work of Origen and the work of Jerome there was indeed a difference of scope and method, which corresponded to a difference in the characters of the two men. Origen accepted *ex animo* the enlarged Greek Canon of the Old Testament as one of the characteristic marks which distinguished the Christian Church: but in the case of the books translated from the Hebrew he found many serious divergences between the Greek of the LXX and the Hebrew text of his day, and his great critical undertaking, the Hexapla, aimed at facilitating the correction of the LXX to the standard of the Hebrew by the aid of the later Greek versions of Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. The transpositions and additions—these latter were supplied from the version of Theodotion—which this procedure rendered necessary were, in Origen's own edition, marked off from the LXX proper by an elaborate mechanical apparatus of asterisks, obeli, and so forth. But while the text thus doctored soon ousted its genuine rival and became the ordinary Old Testament text of the Greek Church,[1] the signs by which the verity of the original LXX had in the Hexapla been safeguarded proved too complicated for the majority of copyists, and were silently

[1] Compare Jerome's ironical remarks, addressed to St Augustine as an adherent of the LXX (ep. cxii 19: Vallarsi, i 746) 'miror quomodo Septuaginta interpretum libros legas, non puros ut ab eis editi sunt, sed ab Origene emendatos sive corruptos per obelos et asteriscos... vis amator esse verus Septuaginta interpretum? non legas ea quae sub asteriscis sunt, immo rade de voluminibus, ut veterum te fautorem probes. quod si feceris, omnes ecclesiarum bibliothecas damnare cogeris: vix enim unus aut alter invenietur liber qui ista non habeat'.

dropped. Not even the oldest of our uncial MSS lacks the large increments from Theodotion which bring the Greek Job of the LXX up to the proportions of the Hebrew text; yet neither ℵ, for instance, nor B reveals by any sort of indication that their LXX text has borrowed numerous passages which are simply Theodotion, and not really LXX at all.

In Origen's system the LXX at least provided the groundwork: Jerome was a better Hebrew scholar than Origen, and was little trammelled either by self-distrust or by respect for ecclesiastical custom. The Vulgate Old Testament was not produced by revision of the Old Latin, but was undertaken in direct and exclusive dependence on the Hebrew.

For the true text of the LXX, then, we have to appeal in the first place to Greek evidence unaffected by the work of Origen, and to Latin evidence unaffected by the work of Jerome: and criticism has made it quite clear that the true text of the LXX is far from being a *quantité négligeable*. The LXX would always indeed have had an imperishable claim on our interest as the Old Testament of the primitive Church: but we know now as well that it is an indispensable aid to the restoration of the Hebrew original, seeing that the tradition of the Massoretic text is as certainly posterior to the Christian era as the LXX is certainly prior. Just as for the New Testament the versions have hitherto been unduly neglected in comparison with the extant Greek evidence, so for the Old Testament the LXX has a value in comparison to any available Hebrew evidence enormously greater than either Origen or Jerome or the scholars of the Protestant Reformation suspected to be the case. On this ground alone we should be rightly proud of the prescience with which Oxford led the way in the eighteenth century by the edition of J. E. Grabe (1707–1720), and followed up Grabe's work with that splendid monument of zeal and erudition, the LXX of Holmes and Parsons (1789–1827): nor shall we be less proud of the determination of Cambridge, under the guidance of Dr Hort and Dr Swete, to supersede the edition of Holmes and Parsons by a still better and completer one.[1]

[1] Of the larger Cambridge edition, edited with admirable care by Mr Brooke and Mr McLean, only Genesis (1906) and Exodus–Leviticus (1909) have as yet appeared: but for the purposes of most of us the beautiful manual edition by Dr Swete, with the same writer's *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, will be amply sufficient.

In emphasizing the fact that the Greek translation of the Seventy was the Bible alike of the Jewish Dispersion and of the early Church, we are bringing it into near relation with our own immediate purpose. When the Christian Church first came to possess the complete Bible of the two Testaments, it was by grafting the collection of Greek scriptures of the New Testament on to the existing collection of Greek scriptures of the Old Testament. On this existing collection of 'sacred' and 'inspired' books, 'profitable for teaching, for convicting and convincing, for instruction in righteousness,'[1] most of the writers of the New Testament had been nurtured whether as Jews or proselytes or converts to the Christ: they were steeped in its thoughts, they expressed themselves in its language. Books like the Apocalypse and the Epistle to the Hebrews are full of such reminiscences from end to end, and even where the character of the book as a whole does not lend itself to the same usage a particular chapter may occur, as the speech of St Stephen in the Acts, where the necessary conditions hold good: nor is it the least of the merits of Westcott and Hort's edition that by its use of uncial type it keeps this feature prominently before the eyes of every reader.[2] Perhaps critics have not always borne sufficiently in mind the assistance which constant reference to the LXX may supply to the student of the New Testament even in his textual difficulties.[3] Our first and most natural presumption will be that, given the familiarity of the sacred writers with the LXX, that one of two various readings is most likely to be correct which agrees with the LXX text. But then we have to remember, on the other hand, that the scribes who copied out our New Testament books were also familiar with the LXX,

[1] 2 Tim. iii 15, 16: I think that the contrasted words ἐλεγμὸς ἐπανόρθωσις at least include the idea of the refutation of the Jewish, and building up of the Christian, interpretation of the Messianic Scriptures.

[2] The caution must, however, be added that the editors have rightly included in their uncial type all words or phrases which correspond in sense to any passage of the Old Testament books, whether or no they echo the actual language of the LXX.

[3] I should like in this connexion to name (though they were not intended for textual purposes) the nearly forgotten books of the Rev. E. W. Grinfield, *Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Hellenistica* (2 vols., Pickering, London, 1843) and *Scholia Hellenistica in Novum Testamentum* (2 vols. 1848). Mr Grinfield is probably best known now as founder of the Septuagint lecture at Oxford—a lecture which is only rarely devoted to its proper and primary purpose.

nay, during the first Christian generations—and we must never lose sight of the truth that it was during those first generations that the most serious variations of text came into being—were often more familiar with the Old Testament, the Bible of their childhood, than with the New. We ourselves find it impossible to escape from similar processes of unconscious assimilation, only with us it is the language of the Old Testament, as the less familiar, which would be in danger of accommodation to the language of the New: with ancient scribes the temptation was strong to assimilate all derived language to its source, to raise the standard of exactness all round, to make a reminiscence into a quotation, and a loose quotation into a precise one.

We must first admit that there are cases where it is the New Testament writer who follows the LXX text and the New Testament scribes (or some of them) who diverge from it. Such cases are rare, and probably occur only where the phrase echoed from the Old Testament is not well enough known to be familiar and at the same time unusual enough to encourage alteration. A good illustration will be Luc. iv 26, where the reading Σάρεπτα τῆς Σιδωνίας 'Sarepta of the Sidonian country' is given by ℵ A B C D 1, the Ferrar group, and both Old Latin and Vulgate, in exact accordance with 3 Reg. xvii 9: while the later Greek MSS and the Syriac versions substitute for the unusual adjective Σιδωνίας the well-known place-name Σιδωνος. The external evidence is decisive: and we deduce from it that the chance that an unexpected phrase will be turned into an ordinary one may be greater than that the scribes would in so small a matter have either known or verified the exact wording of the LXX.

But far more numerous are the passages where scribes have, consciously or unconsciously, brought the text of the New Testament writers into closer agreement with their source or supposed source in the Old Testament.[1] Of the various forms

[1] Attention may be called in passing to an instance where, as Prof. Burkitt points out (*Gospel History and its Transmission* p. 49), independent reminiscence of a LXX phrase by St Matthew and St Luke will account for one of the rare agreements between them in Marcan matter against St Mark. In both Matt. xvii 17 and Luc. ix 41 the reading ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη appears to be certain (although Marcion's Gospel text, and therefore perhaps his copy of St Luke, did

which their misguided energy took in this direction, the simplest is that where a definite quotation is expanded to the full measure of the LXX, without any actual alteration of what evangelist or apostle had written. Thus the quotation in Luc. iv 18, 19 is introduced by reference to the 'roll of the prophet Isaiah', and is in fact found in Is. lxi 1, 2. But whereas in the original the central words ran *ἀπέσταλκέν με ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν* (or *τῇ καρδίᾳ*), *κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν* κτλ., St Luke's text, according to the witness of ℵ B D L Ξ 33, the Ferrar group, the Latin versions, the Old Syriac, Origen, Eusebius, and Athanasius, gave an abbreviated version *ἀπέσταλκέν με κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν* κτλ. Now when we find A and the later Greek MSS, the Peshitta, and Irenaeus, inserting the omitted words, we do not for a moment doubt that they have been supplied to the text of St Luke from the text of Isaiah.

Or again, in Matt. ii 18 we have a quotation from Jer. xxxi [xxxviii] 15 introduced 'as that which was spoken through Jeremy the prophet', and most of our authorities give the second clause *θρῆνος καὶ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὀδυρμὸς πολύς* in accordance with the Old Testament text, *θρήνου καὶ κλαυθμοῦ καὶ ὀδυρμοῦ*. But ℵ B Z 1 22 and the Latin and Egyptian versions omit *θρῆνος καί*: and the words are to be regarded here too as a scribal assimilation to the LXX.

In these two Gospel passages it has been easy to come to the same conclusion as the critical editors of the New Testament. The problems of the book of Acts are less simple to resolve: but it may be doubted whether, for instance, the canon that agreement with the LXX text is, in the case of *variae lectiones*, a ground for suspicion should not modify the texts of our editions of Acts ii 17–20. In the opening clause of this quotation from Joel, St Peter is made to use the phrase *ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις*, whereas the LXX has *μετὰ ταῦτα*, and B follows the LXX. Here all editors, including Westcott and Hort, desert B: but if we

omit the word): but in Marc. ix 19, their common source, it is no less certain that the true reading is *ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος* without addition. A solution of the difficulty may be found in the LXX of Deut. xxxii 5—in so familiar a chapter as the Song of Moses—*γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη*. But I should like to add here that I am now somewhat tempted to think that an explanation of this and similar passages may be found in the use of the First Gospel—no doubt as quite a subordinate authority—by St Luke.

rightly read *ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις* in verse 17, it is tempting to omit *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις*, with D and the *de Rebaptismate* (a tract contemporary with St Cyprian), in verse 18. Still more suggestive is the agreement of ℵ D (followed by Tischendorf) in omitting Joel's *καὶ ἐπιφανῆ* after *ἡμέραν Κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην* in verse 20.

But the influence of familiar LXX phrases will be felt even where the words are not expressly introduced as a quotation. Thus in Acts vii 30, ℵ A B C and the Vulgate present the text *ὤφθη αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τοῦ ὄρους Σινὰ ἄγγελος ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς βάτου*. But in the LXX of Exod. iii 2 we read *ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος Κυρίου ἐν πυρὶ φλογὸς* (*v. l. ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς*) *ἐκ τοῦ βάτου*: and consequently Codex Bezae and Codex Laudianus, with the mass of MSS and the Peshitta, write *ἄγγελος Κυρίου* instead of *ἄγγελος* in the text of Acts. A more complicated variation on the same lines is Luc. xvii 29. *ἔβρεξεν πῦρ καὶ θεῖον ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ* is the reading of ℵ B L, the mass of Greek MSS with the Sinai Syriac and the Vulgate, followed by the editors: *ἔβρεξεν θεῖον καὶ πῦρ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ*, A D and a few others: *ἔβρεξεν πῦρ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ*, the Old Latin MSS (*a b e ff i l q*), the Curetonian Syriac, Irenaeus and Eusebius. Of these three readings the second corresponds with the LXX of Gen. xix 24, and may be rejected at once on that ground. But the first also is a familiar Old Testament tag, as familiar as is 'fire and brimstone' to ourselves: compare Ps. x (xi) 6, Ezech. xxxviii 22, and so the Apocalypse *passim*. Against the Greek evidence and the editors, we will therefore conclude without much hesitation for the originality of the last of the three alternatives, *ἔβρεξεν πῦρ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ*.

Somewhat similar, at least in the sense that the scribal change is by way of addition only, and has left the genuine words unaltered, are the cases where an allusion is worked up into a direct historical reference, and the i's are dotted and the t's crossed for the benefit of the careless reader. So in Luc. ix 54 James and John ask the Lord *Κύριε, θέλεις εἴπωμεν πῦρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀναλῶσαι αὐτούς*; The allusion to 4 Reg. i 10, 12 is unmistakeable: and it was perhaps first only as a marginal gloss that the words *ὡς καὶ Ἠλείας ἐποίησεν* made their appearance in the Gospel. But they now find place in the text of A C D and the mass of Greek MSS, in most MSS of

the Old Latin, in the Peshitta, and in numerous Fathers from the fourth century onwards. The true reading is preserved in ℵ B L Ξ and two cursives, in two of the best Old Latin MSS *e l*, in the Old Syriac, and in St Cyril.

In all these instances it is the shorter of two readings which is right: and except in the case of omissions by *homoeoteleuton* or other definitely assignable cause, it may be taken as a sound general rule that a shorter reading is so far more likely to be right than a longer one. 'Colligite quae superaverunt fragmenta ne pereant' was not only a natural but a sound instinct of scribes, and especially of biblical scribes: as between a shorter and a longer text, the responsibility of omitting for good what might be genuine was obviously more serious than that of retaining for the time what might be spurious.

There remain the cases where, under the influence of the Old Testament, the very words of the New Testament writers have been modified, and brought into closer agreement with their sources. It might have been expected that reluctance would have been felt in thus altering the actual language of the sacred record: yet so strong was the impulse, that even the last words of the Lord from the Cross were not exempt from the harmonizing process. Luc. xxiii 46 appears in all the early uncials, in the Latin and Syriac versions, and in many Fathers, in the form Πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου: but because Ps. xxx (xxxi) 6 runs εἰς χεῖράς σου παραθήσομαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου, the future is substituted for the present in the Gospel by L and some of the later uncials with the great mass of cursives.

Corrections like this last almost look like the result of a definite and not very early recension of which assimilation to the LXX text was one of the guiding principles: and of course wherever the variation appears to be only a relatively late one, external evidence alone would make the decision easy. But there are other and more difficult cases in which variation clearly commenced at a much remoter period, and there we welcome the help of the test of probability arising out of agreement or disagreement with the Septuagint. Reference was made in an earlier chapter[1] to Luc. xii 14, where ℵ B L 1 and the editors give τίς με κατέστησεν κριτὴν ἢ μεριστὴν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς; For

[1] *J. T. S.* (Jan. 1909) p. 180.

κριτὴν ἢ μεριστὴν A and the mass of MSS have δικαστὴν ἢ μεριστήν: while Marcion-Tert D 33, the Old Syriac, and one good MS of the Old Latin *c*, give a single noun only, which on the authority of the two Greek MSS, D 33, we shall without difficulty identify as κριτήν. In this verse Westcott and Hort do not print anything in uncial type: but at least it cannot be questioned that the form of the saying suggested to scribes a parallel in Exod. ii 14 (cited in Acts vii 27, 35 and in Clem. Rom. 4) τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν ἐφ' ἡμῶν; That parallel will account for the appearance of δικαστήν in A and the *Textus Receptus*, and we are left to decide between the two variants κριτήν and κριτὴν ἢ μεριστήν. Individual critics will estimate differently the weight of the probabilities: some may think that *homoeoteleuton* will account for the loss of the two words ἢ μεριστήν: for myself I suspect that the shorter reading is once more right, and that the influence of the double noun in the Exodus passage suggested a double noun in the Gospel. κριτὴν ἢ δικαστήν, which is found in Clement of Rome, is mere tautology, due to the influence of the Lucan κριτήν on the text of Exodus: the happier effort of κριτὴν ἢ μεριστήν would have been, on this hypothesis, suggested by the μερίσασθαι of verse 13. A prudent editor might perhaps print the verse in the shape τίς με κατέστησεν κριτὴν [ἢ μεριστὴν] ἐφ' ὑμῶν;

The last and most complicated series of various readings which concern us in this chapter are those where an Old Testament source and its citation elsewhere in the New Testament may both have influenced the tradition of the text. Sometimes indeed the complication is so far simplified that the source and the parallel give the same reading. A simple case, where the sense is not affected, would be Acts iv 11, where 'the stone that has been set at nought ὑφ' ὑμῶν τῶν οἰκοδόμων' is the reading of ℵ A B D, Origen and Didymus. But the Psalm (cxvii [cxviii] 22), and its citations in the Gospel, have ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, and the *Textus Receptus*, representing the mass of MSS, puts τῶν οἰκοδομούντων into the Acts in place of τῶν οἰκοδόμων. Again, in Luc. xxiii 34 ἔβαλον κλῆρον 'they cast the lot', which Westcott and Hort adopt with ℵ B C D L and the mass of MSS, is the reading both of the parallels in the other two Synoptists and of the common source in Ps. xxi (xxii) 19:

ἔβαλον κλήρους, the reading of Tischendorf with A 1 33, some of the Old Latin MSS (*a e ff* against *b c*), the Vulgate, and St Augustine,[1] has all the appearance of being a stylistic correction by St Luke himself, which scribes have attempted to harmonize away into agreement with the other biblical documents. So in another echo of the same Psalm in the Passion, according to St Matthew and according to all printed texts of St Mark the Aramaic verb σαβαχθανεί (Matt. xxvii 46, Marc. xv 34) is interpreted, in accordance with the LXX of Ps. xxi 2, by the Greek ἐγκατέλιπες. But D in St Mark reads ὠνείδισας, and two Old Latin MSS, *c* and *i*, give respectively 'exprobrasti' and 'in opprobrium dedisti': and not only so, but *k*, our best Old Latin MS, which had been reported as having 'dereliquisti' over an erasure, has been shewn by Prof. Burkitt to have originally given 'maledixisti'.[2] It is hardly conceivable that this reading is a wanton freak of scribes: and, in view of the overpowering temptation to harmonize with the dual authority of St Matthew and the Psalter, I should be prepared to accept the testimony of D and its three Old Latin allies.

The summary of the Commandments (Marc. x 19 = Matt. xix 18, 19 = Luc. xviii 20: cf. Exod. xx 12–16) presents curious difficulties in the text of St Mark. St Matthew and St Luke follow Exodus closely, diverging from one another only in the order of the Commandments. St Mark agrees with them according to a few, but those some of our best, authorities—B* 1 (the Ferrar group??) and the Old Syriac. All other authorities add the command μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς, and, in view of the impossibility of otherwise accounting for it, the addition must be considered genuine: B and the Old Syriac are therefore, it seems, not above the temptation to harmonize.[3] But further, an important group D Γ *k* substitute μὴ πορνεύσῃς for μὴ φονεύσῃς,

[1] The Old Syriac appears to have the plural in all three Gospels, and cannot therefore be cited.

[2] *J. T. S.* i 278. No less than six of our Old Latin Gospel MSS are, as Prof. Burkitt points out, defective at this part: the reason of course is that St Mark comes last of the four Gospels in the ordinary Western order, and the first and last pages of a book are always the most liable to loss.

[3] The Latin for μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς is in *k* 'ne abnegaveris', in *a c* 'non abnegabis'. Have we not then in this passage of St Mark the key to the summary of the Christian *sacramentum* given in Pliny's letter to Trajan 'ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent'?

c has both, and 1 omits both. It is possible that accident may account for this variation: if *φονεύσῃς* were miswritten *πονεύσῃς*, the neighbourhood of *μοιχεύσῃς* would do the rest. But the combined testimony of D *k* can never be quite lightly treated.[1]

As a final example of a textual problem, difficult and at first sight insoluble on account of the action and interaction of the different Gospel and Old Testament sources, let us look at Ps. cxvii (cxviii) 26, *εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου*, and its apparent echoes in the Gospels. As used by our Lord in the lament over Jerusalem, there is no variation to record: St Luke (xiii 35), equally with St Matthew (xxiii 39), gives it in strict agreement with the Psalter. But as employed by the crowd in the triumphal entry each one of the four evangelists gives a different turn to the phrase, and in St Mark, St Luke, and St John it is not easy to arrive at the true reading. I begin by setting out Westcott and Hort's text in each case:—

Matt. xxi 9 *Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυείδ· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου· ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.*

Marc. xi 9, 10 *Ὡσαννά· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου· εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυείδ· ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις.*

Luc. xix 38 *Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ βασιλεύς,*[2] *ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου· ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις.*

Jo. xii 13 *Ὡσαννά· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου, καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.*

(1) In St Matthew the text is without variation, and the LXX of Ps. cxvii is strictly followed. The other evangelists diverge in more or less degree from the Psalm, and in proportion as they do so variations multiply. (2) Of these in St Mark there is none that need be cited, save that *k* gives the abbreviated form 'benedictus qui venit in regnum patris nostri David'. It is true that accidental omission of the words *ὀνόματι . . . ἐρχομένη* at any point in the ancestry, Latin or Greek, of *k* would account for this reading: but it gives such an admirable sense, *εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαυείδ*, and the ordinary

[1] It is worth noting, as a contribution to the criticism of the Codex Bezae, that in the two variations last discussed, Marc. xv 34 and x 19, it is the Greek only of D which goes with *k*: the Latin has the ordinary reading.

[2] With marginal alternatives *ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλεύς* or simply *ὁ βασιλεύς*.

reading could so easily have grown out of it, once the inevitable addition of ὀνόματι Κυρίου was made after ἐν,[1] that the more I study it the more I gain impression of its superior originality. (3) In St Luke there are no less than five variant readings:—

(*a*) εὐλογημένος ὁ βασιλεύς — *e l**

(*b*) εὐλογημένος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου — ℵ* H 69 Origen

(*c*) εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλεὺς ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου — ℵ^{c} A L most Greek MSS

(*d*) εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ βασιλεύς, ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου — B

(*e*) εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου, εὐλογημένος ὁ βασιλεύς — D most Old Latin MSS

The Vulgate and Syriac versions support (*c*) or (*d*): Tischendorf adopts (*b*), Westcott and Hort (*d*). I confess to a suspicion that once more the shortest reading is not improbably also the most original. *e* is, where *k* fails us, the best representative of the African Latin: *l* is a MS which comes from the same neighbourhood as *e*—*e* was found at Trent, *l* is connected with Aquileia—but it is more unequal than *e*, its value being almost entirely confined to the third and fourth Gospels.[2] If we assume (*a*) as the original reading, the rest can all be deduced from it as different combinations with the text of the Psalm.[3] (4) In St John the variations are less serious, but a new complication is caused by the fact that the two Old Latin authorities whose text approved itself in St Luke again shew omissions but differ from one another in the words which they omit: *e* omits ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου, *l* omits ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. Besides this the καί is omitted by the Latin and Syriac witnesses and most of the Greek. Again the claims of a shorter reading seem preferable, and I would suggest tentatively εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος [ὁ] βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

The readings here recommended are, it will be noted, the

[1] The reader must be reminded that the iota adscript or subscript does not appear in early MSS: βασιλεία and βασιλείᾳ would not be distinguished from one another.

[2] My knowledge of both the value and the limitations of *l* I owe to Prof. Burkitt: but I cannot lay my hand upon the reference.

[3] The concluding words of St Luke as given in the editions, ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις, hardly give a tolerable sense.

readings of the 'African' Latin—of *k* in St Mark, of *e l* in St Luke, of *e* in St John—unsupported by any other authorities: and if they are right, no more eloquent testimony could be rendered to the value of this version. But are they right? I should like to submit two considerations which seem to me to reinforce the textual evidence on which in the preceding paragraph the hypothesis of their correctness has been based.

In the first place the circumstances of the Triumphal Entry must almost inevitably have brought to recollection the prophecy of Zechariah (ix 9: quoted in Matt. and Jo.) *ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεταί σοι δίκαιος καὶ σώζων, αὐτὸς πραΰς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον καὶ πῶλον νέον.* And the presence of the title *ὁ βασιλεύς* in three out of the four reports of the scene—and though St Matthew has not got the word, he has replaced it by an equivalent reference to the Davidic Sonship—seems at least to imply that Psalm cxvii cannot account for the whole of the thought that was in the minds of the spectators.[1] In the second place these revised and abbreviated readings, by concentrating the cry of the multitude, as represented in the last three evangelists, upon the kingship, give us surely a much more intelligible background to the charge brought against our Lord by the chief priests at the judgement-seat of Pilate: all four accounts (Matt. xxvii 11=Marc. xv 2=Luc. xxiii 3=Jo. xviii 33) reproduce Pilate's opening interrogatory in identical words *Σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων;*

The dominating note of our treatment of these parallel passages has been the assumption that comparison of a well-known verse in the Psalms and in St Matthew would exercise upon early scribes of the other Gospels an irresistible force in the direction of harmonizing uniformity. The result may appear, at first sight, startling: but if the assumption has in any way justified itself, the moral of the importance of the LXX to the student of the text of the New Testament needs no further words to point it.

[1] The seventeenth of the Psalms of Solomon is well worth comparing here.

NOTE ON ROMANS XV 19 *μέχρι τοῦ Ἰλλυρικοῦ.*

THE following note has been put together out of the materials collected in Marquardt *Römische Staatsverwaltung* iv 141 sqq. (in the French translation ix 171 sqq.), and Mommsen *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum* III i pp. 279, 280. It may be found useful in supplementing the information given in the commentaries on St Paul *ad loc.*

Illyricum was a general name for the districts inhabited by Illyrians or people of Illyrian race; even when the first skeleton organization was given to it by the Romans in 167 B.C., it is called Illyricum, not Illyria (Liv. xlvi 26). Whether or no it originally covered as wide a ground, at any rate by the time of the Christian era the term was applicable to the whole country from the Alps eastwards to the mouth of the Danube and southwards to the Adriatic.

Augustus divided Illyricum, which had hitherto formed one unit of government, into three separate provinces (and this triple division remained unaltered thoughout the first century):—

(1) The eastern and south-eastern parts were made into the province Moesia not later than A.D. 6.

(2) Northern or Lower Illyricum became the province Pannonia in A.D. 10.

(3) The original nucleus which was now all that was left of the old Illyricum was technically 'Upper Illyricum', *superior provincia Illyricum.* But the awkwardness of this name, and the liability to confusion with the larger sense of Illyricum, soon brought about in practice the use of a separate name—parallel to Moesia and Pannonia—namely Dalmatia. Tacitus and Josephus use Dalmatia: Dio Cassius uses Illyria down to the time of Augustus, Dalmatia after Augustus. St Paul uses the same name, and doubtless in the same sense for the province of Upper Illyricum, in the Pastoral Epistles: 2 Tim. iv 10 *Τίτος εἰς Δαλματίαν.*

But though these three names of Moesia, Pannonia, Dalmatia, now stood for separately organized provinces, there remained more than one link which bound them still officially together: and between the dates when the single province of Illyricum was divided up by Augustus, and the date when Diocletian or his successors grouped various provinces into the diocese of Illyricum and various dioceses into the Prefecture of Illyricum, the phrase had a continuous political history as applied to the three provinces as a whole. Tacitus writes that news came 'ex Illyrico iurasse Dalmatiae ac Pannoniae et Moesiae legiones' (*Hist.* i 76), and even employs the phrases 'Illyrici exercitus', 'Illyrici legiones'. Similarly in inscriptions we find 'in Illyrico' used in a sense that covers any one of the three provinces. In finance especially the union of the

provinces was a close one: the 'vectigal Illyricum', τὸ Ἰλλυρικὸν τέλος, had its own organization and officers, whose sphere extended over Dalmatia, Pannonia, Moesia, and after Trajan's time Dacia as well.

If we assume St Paul to be keeping close, here as elsewhere, to the political sense of geographical terms, he will mean by τὸ Ἰλλυρικόν the whole extent of the three provinces: and there will then be no reason at all why we should not bring his own language 'to the confines of Illyricum' into harmony with the record of his European preaching as contained in the Acts. From Philippi or Thessalonica to the Moesian border was no great distance: the apostle may even have made, on one or other of his journeys along the coast, brief excursions inland.

I do not think, therefore, that St Paul, during the whole period of his activity as recorded in the Acts, ever found himself outside the range of currency of the Greek language.

C. H. TURNER.