the negation of thought, or in voiceless contemplation. On the contrary, nothing seems to him so profitable as tireless study and discursive thought. For by these he hopes to taste, here and now, the sweetness of the Logos.

W. TELFER.

ON LUKE xxii 17–20

THE 'various readings' in St Luke's description of the Last Supper are of more than ordinary importance, because the clauses omitted by some ancient authorities include the only injunction to repeat the ceremony found outside St Paul's account. It is obvious that in this matter, as in the somewhat similar case of the text of the Lord's Prayer, ordinary canons of textual criticism should not be applied without scrutiny: in the rest of the Gospels we may assume some measure of ignorance on the part of scribes and therefore of dependence upon the exemplar before them, but in the case of the Lord's Prayer and the 'Words of Institution' the text must have been too familiar for merely careless mistakes to be perpetuated and transmitted by whole groups of MSS. To take the simplest instance, some Churches inserted a Doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer in St Matthew, some omitted it. I can conceive an Ecclesiastical authority becoming convinced that the Doxology should be omitted, or *vice versa*, but I should be surprised if a scribe left it out by mere carelessness in copying. The Canon of the greater probability of a longer (or shorter) reading simply does not apply.

All the more therefore in these passages is it probable that we ought to adopt the unconventional reading—perhaps it would be better to say the unliturgical reading. All our MSS, without exception, were penned by Christians,[1] many of them (I should suppose) by clergymen, and the various readings actually found in these passages in ancient groups of MSS must, I think, be explained by efforts to produce something which seemed to be more edifying and nearer the *consensus fidelium* than the rival reading.

An obvious instance is afforded by the Peshitta text of Lk. xxii: no one supposes that it was the result of mere accidents of transcription. It is a nice question what text exactly may be supposed to have stood before the editor, but whatever it was it must have been a text describing a ritual which it was difficult to reconcile with that in Mark and Matthew on the one hand or the still more familiar words of

[1] Cod. Bobiensis (*k*) is a possible exception, for the scribe seems not to have known his *Paternoster*.

1 Corinthians on the other. The remedy applied was to assimilate the whole to 1 Corinthians by leaving out altogether the mention of the first Cup, peculiar to the Lucan narrative.[1]

No one defends the Peshitta text here: I only mention it, because every one properly condemns it on the ground that its rivals are each in their way more unconventional, more unliturgical. St Luke's first Cup cannot have arisen out of a transcriber's blunder; whatever our interpretation of it, the clause that mentions it must be a genuine part of the text.

Our decision, of course, has to be between the text of B and the text of D: the former is what is printed in Westcott and Hort, the latter is obtained by leaving out Westcott and Hort's double brackets, i. e. *vv.* 19^{b} and 20. It is this latter text that is defended in Dr Hort's Note.

The attestation for the shorter text is in Greek, Codex Bezae (D); in Latin, *aff i* and *l*, while *b* and *e* put *vv.* 17 and 18 after *hoc est corpus meum*; in Syriac, syr. *C* has the same transposition as *b* and *e*, but adds 19^{b} as well, while syr. *S* incorporates the two halves of *ver.* 20 also, producing a narrative which mentions only one Cup, almost exactly as is done in the Arabic Diatessaron. The facts are not in dispute and are well set out in Hort's Note and in Tischendorf, except for syr. *S*: what should be noticed is that no genuine Old-Latin MS, and neither Cureton's MS nor the Sinai Palimpsest, has a text of Lk. xxii that speaks of two Cups.[2]

There are many variants in which D stands on one side and all the rest of our Greek MSS on the other. But when in such variants none of the ante-Nicene versions (i. e. the various forms of the Old-Latin and the Old Syriac) supports the mass of Greek MSS, and these versions do more or less support D, then external authority can say no more. It is a division of the witnesses in which the original authentic reading is found sometimes on one side, sometimes on the other, and only internal probabilities can guide us.

The rival texts can be tested in two ways, (1) Intrinsic Probability, and (2) correspondence or otherwise with St Luke's ascertained methods of composition. On (1) it may suffice to give a quotation from Dr Hort: 'the extreme improbability that the most familiar form of

[1] It may be remarked that the wording of Lk. xxii 19–20 and of 1 Cor. xi 23–25 is not identical in the Syriac, which seems to indicate that the harmonistic recension now represented by the Peshitta was not a Syriac manufacture. I do not suggest that it follows the wording of some early Syriac liturgy, for the Words of Institution very probably formed no part of the Syriac Liturgy till later.

[2] It is to be noted that throughout Lk. xxii and xxiii *e* deserts the 'African' text and agrees generally with *b*. The archetype of *e* had evidently here lost a quire.

the Words of Institution, agreeing with St Paul's record, should be selected for omission; while the vaguer, less sacred, and less familiar words, in great part peculiar to Luke, were retained.' As for (2), if the Longer Reading be regarded as St Luke's work, then the whole text is a conflation of Mark, of St Luke's special source (which supplied *vv.* 17 and 18), and of 1 Corinthians. In particular the clause τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου comes from τοῦτο τ. ποτ. ἡ καινὴ διαθ. ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι in 1 Cor. xi 25. Now Prof. Cadbury in his exhaustive work on the Style and Method of Luke, p. 149, gives nine passages where Luke has added a copula, or similar verb, to complete the grammatical sense of his source, and adds 'The omission of the copula in Lk. xxii 20 is therefore difficult to understand as all the parallels have it'. It is of course difficult to understand on the assumption that it *is* Luke's work. But by a really Providential slip Prof. Cadbury had forgotten that the passage was omitted by D *a ff i l* and Dr Hort, so that he cannot be accused of having formulated this rule of Lucan style in order to favour the shorter reading! The natural inference is that the evidence of style shews that the Longer Reading does *not* come from Luke's pen.[1]

It may perhaps not be out of place to add here a conjecture as to the date and origin of the Longer Reading. *Habent sua fata libelli*, and in the fated career of what we call 'St Luke's Gospel' the most critical event was clearly when it was separated from its own Second Volume to form a partnership with Matthew, Mark, and John. It is only likely that this double process of amputation and new association should have left some mark on the text. And that is indeed what we find, just in the place where we might expect to find it, *viz.* in the last chapter of Luke, now no longer the middle of a longer work. I refer, of course, to the series of readings generally known in England by the clumsy title of 'the Western Non-Interpolations'. These are a set of eight or nine passages in Lk. xxiv, where D and the Old-Latin MSS, generally but not uniformly supported by the Old-Syriac, omit clauses found in all other authorities. Internal evidence shews that the passages are not likely to be original, i. e. Lucan, but their addition becomes more comprehensible if we regard them as editorial touches inserted to adapt 'Lucas *ad Theophilum*, Vol. I' to its new company. Thus 'He is not here, but is risen' (xxiv 6ª) links the narrative with Mk. xvi 6, while the words about Peter running to the empty Tomb (xxiv 11) and the additions to xxiv 36 and 40 link it similarly with John xx 4–6 and 26 ff. The final parting of our Lord and the Apostles had been reserved by St Luke for the opening section of his

[1] See *J. T. S.* xxiii 303.

Second Volume, but this was now separated from its predecessor, so a short allusion to the Ascension was inserted in Lk xxiv 51, 52.

We see then that these editorial changes are marked by a desire to complete the narrative by simple verbal additions, without any attempt at historical criticism, very much in the manner that the Diatessaron itself was compiled. It seems to me that the same hand added xxii 19ᵃ–20 (*τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν—ἐκχυννόμενον*). The genuine Lucan account of the Last Supper might well seem glaringly defective: it contained no express reference to the Blood of Christ, no mention of a new Covenant. What more natural than that the editor who had touched up the last chapter of the Gospel to fit it for public reading in Christian assemblies along with 'Matthew' and 'John' should supplement Luke's meagre narrative with the apostolic words of St Paul?

On this view, then, the shorter text, both in Lk. xxii 17–20 and in Lk. xxiv, preserves the true Lucan wording, while the longer text dates from the formation of the Church's official Canon of Four Gospels.

F. C. BURKITT.

Τὰ στοιχεῖα IN PAUL AND BARDAIṢĀN.

MANY modern scholars think that by *τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου* in Gal. iv 3, 9 and Col. ii 8, 20 Paul means personal powers or elemental spirits. Elsewhere he refers to similar beings as *οἱ ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*[1] and as *ἀρχαί* and *ἐξουσίαι*.[2] The world is the sphere in which they have authority and operate. *Στοιχεῖα* in 2 Pet. iii 10, 12 is also interpreted in this way by a few scholars.

In the Syriac work entitled *The Book of the Laws of the Countries* there are four passages in which ܣܛܘܟܝܐ, the Syriac equivalent of *στοιχεῖα*, is used of personal cosmic powers. They are not completely free, but they enjoy a certain measure of freedom. These passages seem to have been overlooked by New Testament scholars, and it is the purpose of the present writer to call attention to them. They are as follows: (1) 'On this account, let it be manifest to you, that the goodness of God has been great towards man, and that there has been given to him free-will more than to all these Elements of which we have been speaking'—i. e. the sun, the moon, the stars, the sea, the hills, the winds, and the earth (p. ۹ ll. 8 ff = p. 4).[3] (2) 'I say to him (i. e.

[1] 1 Cor. ii 6, 8. [2] Col. i 16.

[3] The Syriac letters refer to the pages of the Syriac text in Cureton's *Spicilegium Syriacum*. The second Arabic numeral designates the page of Dr Cureton's English translation. I have followed this translation in the main, making only a few unimportant changes in it.