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ABSTRACT

Considering the amount of material written on Codex Bezae down through the centuries a detailed history of research into the codex has long been overdue. Such a history is important not only to give future researchers an understanding of what has gone on before, but also to facilitate an understanding of the development of ideas and their outcome. As Codex Bezae is the principal witness of the so-called Western text, much of what has been written centres upon its text. Nevertheless from the end of the last century there has been a growing awareness among scholars of the need to give the other details contained within the codex far more attention than hitherto.

Inasmuch as the D text is the main rival to the Alexandrian text as the best representative of the original exemplar, it is of no surprise that Codex Bezae and its text have been of interest to the textual critics. Over the last century and a half there have always been those advocating the supremacy of the D text, and such claims have attracted much attention. For this reason, Codex Bezae has never been far from the focus of scholarly debate. This debate would be greatly helped if Codex Bezae could be accurately located historically, for this, briefly, is the nub of the problem - where and when was it written? Any avenue of inquiry ever pursued, any investigation ever embarked upon, has the answer to this question as its prime objective. Hence the importance of this history, for we need to know how the debate has progressed if we are to avoid repeating previous fruitless enterprises and if we wish to build upon previous fruitful endeavours.

Having established the history of research on Codex Bezae it was opportune to assess the claims and counterclaims, to sift the data, and to
separate the more factual evidence from the many hypotheses, in order to establish a solid base from which to launch future inquiries.

Consequently this thesis provides:

1. a detailed history of the research on Codex Bezae;
2. an analysis of the existing evidence;
3. a detailed catalogue of scholars who have contributed to the debate;
4. details of my own investigations into the historical use of unusually spelled words in the Bezan text; and
5. suggested avenues for future research.
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PART I

The History of Research on Codex Bezae since 1582
PART I

THE HISTORY OF RESEARCH ON CODEX BEZÆ
FROM 1582

Introduction

Although Beza’s covering letter is dated 6 December 1581 it is probable that the manuscript did not reach Cambridge until 1582. Its arrival there brought an immediate change of status, for instead of being ignored it became the object of study. In March 1583, after it had been in Cambridge for some fourteen months, Archbishop John Whitgift (c.1530-1604), made a transcription of it. After this a number of people made transcriptions and collations of it with varying degrees of success. The more notable of these will be referred to during this history.

1 The exact date of arrival is unknown. The Vice-Chancellor and Senate’s letter of gratitude is dated 18 May 1582. (Scrivener, Bezae, p. vii). Kipling (p. xxii) records that according to a letter written by Beza to Walter Travers, the codex did not reach Cambridge until the beginning of spring of 1582.

2 Codex Bezae’s history prior to 1582 is covered in appendix A. Since the basis to this thesis is the history of research on Codex Bezae, which has its beginning with its arrival in Cambridge, this part of its history will be dealt with first.

3 Whitgift’s transcript, which is considered to be poor, was placed in Trinity College in 1604. (Scrivener, Bezae, pp. x, xiv).

4 For a list of these scholars the reader is referred to Marsh, p. 241, but particularly to Scrivener (Bezae, pp. x-xiv) who gives a brief but comprehensive account of the people who worked with the codex. He also gives his opinion of the merits of their respective efforts.
1657 - Archbishop James Ussher (1581-1656)\(^1\)

Archbishop Ussher made a comprehensive collation of Codex Bezae against the Greek text for Brian Walton’s *London Polyglot Bible* (Vol. 6, No. 16, 1657).\(^2\) However the collation is of such a poor standard that Scrivener was to say:

> I am grieved that truth compels me to state that I never examined a performance more inaccurate than this. Besides numberless omissions, manifest typographical errors, a looseness and carelessness of citation which is really remarkable, and almost complete inability to distinguish the first from the later hands, its actual misstatements are so many, that I have accumulated a catalogue of 228, with which it is needless to trouble the reader.\(^3\)

1686 - Jean Leclerc (1657-1736)

As early as 1686, when textual criticism of the New Testament was in its infancy, the Swiss theologian and scholar, Jean Leclerc (*Lat. Johannes Clericus*),\(^4\) first expressed the possibility that the author of Acts produced two editions of his work, one of which led to the Bezan text. This became known as

---


the bifurcation theory.¹

Although Leclerc made the suggestion of a double edition he nevertheless dismissed the idea as improbable and argued instead that the variants were paraphrastic interpolations of a critic:

I cannot conceive of any reason for such striking variants other than the temerity of the copyist, unless one of these alternatives be true, which are not equally plausible. First there may have been a double edition of the Acts produced by Luke himself, one of them being purer and more correct than the other. The same, however, would have to be said of the four Gospels, in which there are similar variants in this codex [Bezae]: to me this seems highly improbable. Secondly, this codex contains not the simple text, but rather a paraphrase. Certainly the early Christians sometimes produced paraphrases of various works, in which they retain in general the words of the text with some transpositions and amplifications: we have an instance of this in the paraphrase of the Enchiridion of Epictetus, first edited by Meric Casaubon. This also seems implausible, although I would sooner believe this than that there was a double edition of these books made by the apostles themselves.²

¹ Strange (p. 205, n. 2) states that Leclerc first expressed his belief of a double edition by Luke in a letter to Richard Simon some eighteen months before his 1686 publication.

² *Nullam possum comminisci rationem tantae varietatis praeter Exsaptorsis temeritatem, nisi forte alterutrum horum verum sit, quae tamen non aequè verisimilia videntur. Nimimum potuit esse duplex Editio Actorum ab ipso Luca procurata, quarum una altera fuit emendantor & purior. At idem dicendum foret de quatuor Evangelis, ubi similes occurrunt in eo Codice varietates, quod mihi nullo modo vero consentaneum videtur. Vel, hoc Codice non propriè continetur simplex textus, sed*
Consciously or not Leclerc's rejection of the variants in Codex Bezae appears to be based upon two basic canons of textual criticism: *lectio brevior potior* and *lectio difficilior potior*. Nevertheless, the seed of a double edition had been planted; others were to consider the idea favourably, particularly Blass, who over two hundred years later was to develop it fully.

1689 - Richard Simon (1638-1712);

The French theologian, Richard Simon, agreed with Leclerc's final decision. The basis to Simon's argument rested on the well known fact that, for some people in the early period of the Church, changing the text was a common practice:


I am indebted to Professor Willis for obtaining for me a copy of Leclerc's work from the Cambridge University Library.

Clark's quote of Clericus, which is effectively the same as the above, contains a number of differences, namely: (1) macrons are not included; (2) in place of & he has et; (3) Capitals are omitted from: *Editio, Codice, and Librorum Editionem*; (4) the comma after *Evangelii* is omitted; (5) *quattuor* is spelt *quattuor*; (6) *verisimile* is given as two words, *viz veri simile*. 
One sees nothing similar in the Cambridge exemplar, which was altered by the orthodox according to the customs of those early times, where someone took the liberty to insert in a Gospel, in the form of a supplement, that which was believed to be lacking.¹

Such editing, however, did not arise through malicious intent or through any desire to change the sense of the text; it was rather the consequence of attempting to make the text more intelligible.² Nevertheless, not all additions were for this purpose, for he considered some, such as that contained within Luke 6:5, as records of genuine events.³

Simon rejected Beza’s belief that the barbarous notes in Greek, contained here

¹ ‘On ne voit rien de semblable dans l’Exemplaire de Cambridge, qui a été alteré par des Orthodoxes selon la coûtime de ces premiers temps-là, où l’on prenoit la liberté d’insérer dans un Evangile par forme de supplément ce qu’on croyoit y manquer, ….’ (Simon, p. 369).

² ‘que tout ce changement ne vient que de la liberté qu’on prenoit en ces temps-là de rendre les Livres du Nouveau Testament plus intelligibles, sans se mettre beaucoup en peine de garder les mots de l’Original, pourvû qu’on n’alterât rien dans le sens.’ (Ibid., p. 374).

‘Neanmoins quelque changement qu’ayent reçu ces Livres dans ces anciens temps, où l’on n’étoit pas exact à garder les propres mots des Evangelistes & des Apôtres, on ne trouvera point que le sens en ait été alteré. On s’appliquoit seulement à les rendre plus intelligibles au peuple; & il fut nécessaire pour cela de les refondre, étant remplis d’Ebraîsmes & de phrases trop concises, qu’il fallut selon cette methode mettre dans un plus grand jour … C’est pourquoi ceux qui ont osé retoucher en tant d’endroits les premiers Exemplaires du Noveau Testament dans la seule vûe de les rendre intelligibles à tout le monde.’ (Ibid., p. 376).

³ ‘… parce que ce sont de veritables faits qui ont été ajoutés.’ (Ibid., p. 376).
and there within the Codex Bezae, proved that it came from Greece\(^1\) (Beza states that these notes were written by a Calogeros, apparently simply because the script is Greek).\(^2\) Instead Simon argues that the Latins had a knowledge of Greek.\(^3\) In fact, he argues that Codex Bezae, along with manuscripts of the same type, were written from the same hand and that 'the Greek approaches more the ancient uncial letters of the Latins, than that of the Greeks. The former are more square, instead of which the Greek capital letters are longer and thinner.'\(^4\) Indeed, he considered Codex Bezae to be a document written by Latins and one that had been derived from similar exemplars to those read before the time of

---

1 Vide: part II.

2 Beza gives no reason for this statement.


At the foot of the page on which Scrivener (Beza, p. vi) reproduces Beza's letter there is a footnote giving the following quotation from Ducange: "'Calogeri: a monk, especially one venerable for his old age (καλόγηρος).'" Ducange Glossar. ad Script. Med. Latin.

3 'Il se trompe donc manifestement, lors qu'il assure que ce Manuscrit a été apporté de Grece, parce qu'il y voyoit des remarques ecrites en Grec. Il [Beza] n'a pas scû que les Latins qui avoient quelque connoissance de la langue Grecque, joignoient le Grec à la Version Latine dans leurs Exemplaires du Nouveau Testament, & même des Pseaumes.' (Simon., p. 360).

4 '... que le Grec & le Latin de ces sortes de Manuscrits sont écrites d'une même main, & que le Grec approche plus des anciennes lettres unciales des Latins, que de celles des Grecs. Ces premières sont plus quarrées, au lieu que les grandes lettres des Grecs sont plus longues & plus maigres.' (Ibid., pp. 360f.).

Marsh (p. 703) was to reject Simon's argument, by saying: 'Here Simon seems to have been ignorant, that the long and narrow shape of the Greek uncial letters was not introduced before the eighth century, (Montfaucon Pelæographia, p. 230) and that the square form, which is observable in the Codex Bezae, is found in the most ancient Greek inscriptions.'
Jerome’s revision of the Old Latin text at the end of the fourth century.\(^1\) He also believed that the Latin and the Greek were written by the same hand.\(^2\)

**1707 - Mill (1645 -1707)**

Dr John Mill, a textual critic, became Principal of St Edmund’s, Oxford, in 1685. He made a collation, albeit a poor one, of Codex Bezae in preparation for his *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, Oxford, which was published a fortnight after his death in 1707.\(^3\) Mill’s critical appraisal of the Greek text in Codex Bezae was in conformity with his contemporaries and earlier scholars.\(^4\) Where scholars had

---

\(^1\) ‘L’Exemplaire Grec & Latin de Beze, qui se conserve presentement à Cambridge, ...., ayant été écrit par des Copistes Latins sur de semblables Exemplaires qu’on lisoit avant la reformation de Saint Jerôme.’ (Ibid., pp. 359f.).

A. Arnaud, of like opinion, also suggested that Codex Bezae had suffered at the hands of a sixth-century falsifier. A. Arnaud (Arnaldus), *Dissertation critique touchant les exemplaires grecs sur lesquels M. Simon prétend que l’ancienne Vulgate a esté faite, et sur le jugement que l’on doit faire du fameux manuscrit de Bèze*, Cologne, 1691. (Strange, p. 205, n. 4).

Middleton (p. 471) simply states: ‘Arnauld pronounced it to be a forgery of the sixth century.’ (Note the different spelling of Arnaud).

\(^2\) ‘Le Grec & le Latin sont écrits d’une même main ...’. (Simon, p. 361).

\(^3\) Scrivener, *Beza*, p. xi.

\(^4\) Ropes (pp. lxxvif.) was to later state that Mill’s view of the Bezan Greek text was more moderate than that of previous scholars, but this is manifestly wrong, for as the reader will see in the coming quotation that after referring to the assessment of previous and contemporary scholars he concludes by saying: ‘This was the opinion expressed by Erasmus, Lucas Brugensis, Estius, Grotius, and others; and it is not surprising that we have adopted their
long held the opinion that the Greek text of Codex Bezae, and for that matter of any Greek-Latin diglot, was either wholly translated from Latin or at least edited and emended in its various parts against a Latin version to the degree that it was worthless as an original source, Mill argued that the Bezan Greek text had come originally from a Greek text similar to that from which the Latin text had been derived, but later changed to conform to the Latin. His assessment of it follows:

We have seen the character of the Greek and of the Latin in this manuscript. Concerning the Greek the question is raised whether it was modified against a Latin original. That was the express opinion of a number of learned men of our age and the generation before concerning books of this kind, for since the Greek text agreed remarkably with the Latin against the testimony of other Greek books including the good ones, they were easily persuaded that the Greek text either was not of Greek origin at all, but that the whole thing was translated from Latin, or at least that it had been edited and emended in its various parts against a Latin version. This was the opinion expressed by Erasmus, Lucas Brugensis, Estius, Grotius, and others; and it is not surprising that we have adopted their opinion in this edition.

The situation seems to be this. Among the Latins there were various Greek texts taken from copies of books on which the Old Latin version, the Itala, was based, and through the ignorance of scribes and the busybody exertions of certain more learned people among the Latins these were gravely injured and interpolated (they took care to insert scholia borrowed from the Greek books and apocryphal fragments into the manuscripts that were copied from theirs). A Latin version was then speedily adapted to these interpolated versions by certain men.¹

¹ Vidimus jam qualia fuerint Graeca, qualia item Latina hujusce codicis. De
Mill argues that the process of changing the Greek text of Codex Bezae to suit the form of the Latin is to be seen in such words as Ἠρώδους, Ἰωάννους, Σαμαριτάνων. Moreover, he says, it is also evident in such passages as:

Matthew 5:24, when the Latin was offeres, the copyist altered πρόσφερε into πρόσφερετι. In his eyes, that was the second person, future tense. καταβαίνου, is turned into καταβαίνοντα because of the Latin descendentem in 3:16. In Chapter 11:22, 24, where the Latin has quam vobis and the Greek, ἡ ψῆφον [sic.], they altered quae vobis (for that is what they thought they saw) into ἡ ψῆφον to make it correspond to the Latin. Thus in the same chapter, verse 28, it was turned into πάντες οἱ κοπιῶντες καὶ πεφορτισμένοι ἐστὶ because of the Latin omnes qui laboratis et onerati estis. Chapter 15:18, 20, because of the

Graecis unum illud ultra quaeeritur; an aliqua ex parte castigata fuerint ad Latinum exemplar? ea enim erat de libris hujus genus eruditorum quorundam nostrae et superioris actatis diserta sententia. Nempe cum mirifice consenserint ista cum Latinis, contra quam reliqui Graeciae libri, iique optimi, facile ipsis persuasum est, ea vel non omnino fuisse Graeciae originis, sed tota, quanta quanta, traducta de Latinis, vel saltam recensita et emendata fuisse variis sui partibus, ad Latinam Versionem. Sic de ipsis pronuntiant Erasmus, Lucas Brugensis, Estius, Grotius, alii; quorum sententiam nil mirum si in hac editione nostram fecerimus.


1 The Bezan text actually has ἡν ψῆφον, i.e. ψῆφον and ἡν ψῆφον, respectively.
obsolete (but genuine Latin of the Vulgate interpreter), *communicat*
*communicant*, *i.e.* pollut and polluant, instead of *κοινωι* and *κοινωνια* he
absurdly wrote *κοινωνι* and *κοινωνια*. As in Acts 21:28 *ἐκοινωνησε* τὸν
ἄγιον τόπον τούτον because of the *communicavit sanctum locum hunc.*
Thus in Matthew 18:22, *ἐβδομηκοντάκις ἐπτάκις* because of the Latin *septies.*
Acts 5:9, *Συνεφώνησεν* (instead of *συνεφώνηθη*) ιμῖν because of the Latin
*convenit vobis.* I spare further examples.¹

It can be seen, of the last seven examples, five are the result of mistaken
 endings. That Mill should brand the codex as Latinized on such flimsy evidence
is surprising, particularly when one considers the trouble he went to in
discussing twenty-four readings in which he believed the Greek was correct.²

**Richard Bentley (1662-1742)**

Richard Bentley, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge from 1700 to
1742,³ and a noted classical scholar, took a keen interest in textual criticism as
early as 1691. His interest in Biblical writings led him to study the text of Codex
Bezae and to make comment on the Latinization hypothesis. Referring to Luke
15:28, Bentley noticed what he believed was the deliberate dropping of a Greek
word to balance the Greek text with the Latin. He remarked: ‘τὸ παρακαλεῖν

Harris, *Bezae*, p. 42.


³ Webster’s, p. 99. Scrivener (Introduction, p. 451) gives his date of appointment as
1699.
has been dropped from the Greek to balance in the Latin the same order of words; as is his custom [the copyist's]'\(^1\). However, after studying the discrepant Greek and Latin readings of Acts 6:14 he came to the conclusion that the Greek had not been corrected to the Latin:

\[
\text{καταλύσει τὸν τόπον τούτον καὶ ἀλλάξει τὰ ἔθη}
\]

\[\text{destruct locum istum et mutavit iterum}\]

Where *mutavit* stands for *mutabit*. Bentley says 'he took ἔθη as the same thing as ἔτι. Note well! not to have corrected the Greek to the Latin.'\(^2\)

As to the Latin text, Bentley observes:

The Cambridge manuscript exhibits an old Latin translation in parallel columns, rendered word for word from the Greek, which is well worthy to be rescued from darkness and oblivion and brought at last into the light.\(^3\)

---


It should be noted, however, that although Bentley states that the Latin text of Codex Bezae came from a Greek text he does not say that it is that of Codex Bezae, nor does Kipling address this point.

1716 - Johann Jakob Wetstein\(^1\) (1693-1754)

Wetstein's interest in biblical studies became apparent as early as the age of twenty and continued to his death. His pursuit of manuscripts led him to England three times and it was on his first visit in 1716 that he made what is considered by Scrivener to be a good transcription of Codex Bezae. However, he apparently never referred to it again,\(^2\) the possible reason being that he, like Mill, believed the codex to be Latinized. He also mentions that a Lucas Brugensis\(^3\) was also of the same conviction:

To these words of Mill's in his Prol. 1274, with which I fully agree, I add

---

\(^1\) Wetstein is often spelt: Wettstein, e.g., Metzger, 1992; Aland, 1987; Parker, 1992, which is apparently an acceptable alternative; however, as the face sheet of his Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΑΙΩΝΙΚΗ, NOVUM TESTAMENTUM GRAECUM, Amsterdam, 1751, gives his name as JOANNIS JACOBI WETSTENII a single t will be used throughout this dissertation. Those who spell his name with the single t are: Matthaei, 1786; Marsh, 1794; Kipling, 1793; Scholz, 1830; Credner, 1832; Scrivener, 1883; J. Rendel Harris, 1901; Kenyon, 1901; Quentin, 1906, Ropes, 1926. On prima facie evidence it would appear that the additional t is a modern phenomenon.

\(^2\) Scrivener, Bezae, p. xi.

\(^3\) François Luc de Bruges, dean of St Omer, and Hebraist; 1549-1619.

Scrivener (Introduction, p. 105) records that Lucas Brugensis 'published his Notationes in S. Biblia in 1580, and his Commentary on the Four Gospels ... in 1606.'
that there are many omissions and changes, particularly where an ill-judged patcher thought that the original reading was at variance with the truth of history or with the glory of Christ or with other passages of Scripture; but he erred much more often when he made Greek out of the Latin version or 'Itala', so that the violent distortion of words and phrases is obvious to anyone. This was noted, for example, by Lucas Brugensis, who at the end of the Lord's Prayer wrote, 'I greatly suspect from this passage and from many others that this has been corrected to agree with the Latin.'

Wetstein goes on to note that Beza had also noticed and been surprised by the agreement of his codex with the Vulgate at Luke 8:54. Wetstein argues that it was these apparent links with the Latin texts that led Peter Morinus to judge that the Latin version could derive confirmation from such Greek codices as Codex Bezae. After citing a number of the examples used by Morinus to prove his case, Wetstein takes him to task for making such a suggestion and accuses him of being ignorant of Greek. Indeed, Wetstein leaves the reader in no doubt

---

1. ... quibus Millii Prol. 1274. verbis, quae nostra fecimus, addimus & omissiones quamplurimas & mutationes occurrere, praecipue ubi authenticam lectionem repugnare existimabat vel historiae veritati, vel gloriae Christi, vel aliis Scripturae locis, exigui admodum judicii Consarcinator: sed multo saepius deflectit idem, quoties ex Latinis sive Versione Itala fecit Graeca, ita ut Vocabulorum & Phrasium violenta detorsio cuvis appareat; quod etiam observavit Lucas Brugensis ad Coronidem orationis Dominicae ita scribens": Ad Latina castigagatum [sic.] vehemens mihi suspicio est, cum ex hoc loco, tum ex aliis pluribus; ....". (Wetstein, p. 32).

2. Hinc patet quam perverso Morinus, praecente ex parte Beza & sequenter Siminio ex talibus Codicibus Graecis Versionem Latinam confirmari posse judicaverit, .... (Ibid.).
as to what he thinks of the Greek text of Codex Bezae, for he states:

I call upon all men of sound judgment and knowledge of Greek to decide which reading be the more sincere - that which our manuscripts have, or that which Morinus took from the Graeco-Latin codex of Beza. All these readings of Morinus' so smell of interpolation by an ignorant Latin that they cannot be welcomed as Greek except by one quite unacquainted with the language.¹

As for Codex Bezae itself, Wetstein states that it 'bears every mark of antiquity and is perhaps the oldest of all now extant, ....'² It should be remembered that this statement was made when the existence of Codex Vaticanus was well known, but how well known to Wetstein is debatable. Scrivener writes that it was only through extracts that Wetstein knew of the codex, which means he never sighted the actual manuscript.³

Believing that Thomas of Harkel had used Codex Bezae in Alexandria at the time that he undertook his revision of the Philoxenian version (615)⁴.

¹ Obtestor hic omnes sano judicio praeditos, ac literarum Graecarum peritos, judicent utra Lectio sit sincerior, illane quam nostri Codices exhibent, an quam Morinus ex Codice Bezae Graeco-Latino protulit? ita omnes istae Morinianae interpolationem indocti Latini sapiunt, ut non nisi literarum Graecarum omnino rudi cuipiam pro Graecis arridere possint. (Ibid.).

² Caeterum cum sit omnibus Indiciis vetustatis insignis hic Codex, & fortassis omnium, qui nunc supersunt, antiquissimus; .... (Ibid., p. 34).

³ Scrivener, Introduction, pp. 105f.

⁴ Wetstein's date of 615 as the year of Harkel's revision (pp. 11, 28) is an error because it is well known that this revision took place in 616. (Marsh, p. 240; Metzger, Versions,
Wetstein argues for its presence in Egypt during this period.\(^1\)

From Egypt, Wetstein holds, Codex Bezae returned to Gaul or went there for the first time. The basis for this conjecture was the writings of Christian Druthmar, a native of Aquitaine and afterwards a monk at Corbie, who lived about 840. Druthmar in his exposition on Matthew states:

> I have seen a manuscript of the gospel written in Greek, which was said to have belonged to St Hilary, in which the Gospels of Matthew and John came first, the other two afterwards. I asked the Greek monk Euphemius why this was, and he said to me, 'He acted like a good farmer, who yokes his strongest oxen first'.\(^2\)

From this evidence Wetstein concluded: ‘... if I do not greatly err, he saw this very Cambridge codex, which is the only one of all the Greek codices to preserve this order of the gospels.’\(^3\)

---

1. Hoc Codice usum fuisse existimo Thomam Charkel sive Heraclensem, cum AO. 615 Alexandriæ Versionem Syriacam alteram, auspiciis Philoxeni adornatam, cum Codicibus Graecis conferret. .... (Ibid., p. 28).

2. Christian Druthmar, Expositio, Chap. 1 Matthew.

3. Wetstein, p. 28.

Kipling (p. xvii) as did other scholars was to reject Wetstein's argument on two counts: firstly, because Codex Bezae consists of the Gospels and Acts, which are written in Greek and Latin whereas Druthmar only writes of the Greek Gospels, [this does not, however, preclude the possibility that Acts was in the manuscript referred to by Druthmar, nor that a Latin translation accompanied the Greek]; secondly, because the order of the Gospels mentioned above is not
Arguably, Wetstein’s greatest contribution to textual criticism was his institution of a system of manuscript-notations, the basic principles of which continue to this day. He used capital letters to identify the uncialss, the Arabic numbers 1 to 112 for the minuscules; 1 to 24 for the lectionaries. Each group of New Testament writings was assigned a new number series, as follows: the Gospels, A to O (uncials), 1 to 112 (minuscules); Acts and the Catholic letters, A to H (uncials), 1 to 58 (minuscules); the Pauline Epistles, A to H (uncials), 1 to 60 (minuscules), 1 to 3 (lectionaries); the Apocalypse, A to C (uncials), 1 to 28 (minuscules). As a consequence of this innovation Codex Bezae was given the symbol D and was to be known henceforth as Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D).

peculiar to Codex Bezae.


1 The present day system of manuscript notations is that of Caspar René Gregory, who in 1908 further developed Wetstein’s system.

2 Since only the Gospels and Acts are contained within Codex Bezae it is more precisely designated D$^{ea}$. Likewise Codex Claromontanus, which contains only the text of the Pauline Epistles is designated D$p$. Although both codices have the common sigla D they are distinct manuscripts and conclusions regarding their common ancestry ought not be deduced from their common designation.

A further modification of the system by Caspar René Gregory (1846-1917) designated the uncialss by numerals with an initial 0 (zero) so that Codex Bezae became 05 and Codex Claromontanus 06. Vide: Aland, Text, pp. 71-75.

Thus Codex Bezae, given all its various designations, would read: D$^{ea}$ 05 Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis.
1732 or 1733 - John Dickinson

An unpublished, yet accurate collation worthy of note was made of Codex Bezae, in either 1732 or 1733, by John Dickinson1 of Saint John’s College, for John Jackson of Leicester. Scrivener considered it to be ‘the best collation by far’.2

1763 - Johann Albrecht Bengel (1687-1752)

Possibly the most fantastic suggestion for Codex Bezae’s place of origin was that proffered by the German scholar Bengel, Abbot of Alpirspach and Superintendent of the Evangelical church of Württemberg, who theorised that the codex had its beginning in Britain with an Anglo-Saxon version as its exemplar. The basis for this conclusion was what he considered to be the remarkable agreement between Codex Bezae and the Anglo-Saxon version of the four Gospels.3 The qualities of the latter were believed to be imitated by Codex

1 Scrivener (Bezae, p. xii) informs the reader that Dickinson’s collation is now stored in the Library of Jesus College, Cambridge (O 82).


Scrivener (ibid., n. 2) also records that John Dickinson of Sheffield, B.A. 1728-9, M.A. 1732, became Assistant Minister of Sheffield 1752-66, and that ‘This humble and forgotten man must have been a good and early scholar.’

2 Scrivener, Introduction, p. 123.

3 Kipling (p. v) was to later point out that this proved nothing since, ‘critics are well aware that the text of the codex Bezae agrees not only with the Anglo-Saxon version, but with
Bezae. In this regard Bengel is a solitary voice, for no other person is known to have expressed such a view. Unfortunately the basis to his belief is not given, not even one proof, thus one is unable to deduce how Bengel may have arrived at what is now considered to be a most remarkable hypothesis. Bengel recognised the implications of his conclusions by stating that such an opinion detracted considerably from the opinion of Codex Bezae’s antiquity.¹

Bengel also argued that ‘the codex Bezae constantly Latinizes,’² i.e. it is almost everywhere corrupted to agree with the Old Latin version (or Itala).

the Syriac - indeed more closely with the latter.' *Cæterum probe jam norunt critici Bezae codicis textum non versioni modo Anglosaxonicae, verum etiam, idque arctius quidem, Syriace convenire.*


It should be noted that this 1763, enlarged, edition of the *apparatus criticus* was published after Bengel’s death by his son-in-law, Philip David Burk. (Metzger, *Text*, p. 113).

Kipling (p. ivf.) was to also quote part of the above, but with slight differences - these are highlighted as follows: *Patria corum est Britannia. Certe codicem Cantabrigiensem, illic esse conscriptum, singularis convenientia ejus cum versione Anglo-saxonica quatuor Evangeliorum demonstrat. Et quidem, ubi versio Anglo-saxonica ex idiotismo suo concisis loqui solet, Cantabrigiensis eam sæpe imitatur: Quo ipso simul antiquitatis suæ opinioni haud parum detrahirat.*

² *Græca Bezae codicis passim latinizare.* (Bengel, *op. cit.*, § 1, p. 50).
A notable first in textual criticism was Bengel’s idea of reducing extant witnesses to the text by allocating them to companies, families, tribes and nations.\(^1\) By this he divided his manuscripts, versions, and ecclesiastical writings into two *nations*, designating them ‘African’ and ‘Asiatic’. Although he recognized the value and importance of Codex A (the only great uncial then much known),\(^2\) and the Latin versions, he did not accord the codices D\(^{ea}\), D\(^{p}\), E\(^{a}\), F\(^{p}\), G\(^{p}\) the same respect because of their constant and deliberate interpolations. Indeed, he stated ‘they should be considered not as books but as confusions of words’\(^3\).

1764 - Johann Salomo Semler (1725-1791)

Johann Semler, professor at Halle (1753-91), was a pioneer in scientific biblical textual criticism. Although he originally accepted the theory of Latinization\(^4\) he was later to challenge this long held view by saying: … *istae accusationes omnes vanae sunt jam et temerariae*.\(^5\)

Thomas Edwards refers to both Semler and Marsh as scholars who link Codex Bezae, or at least its exemplar, with Egypt, for he states:

Should the hypothesis that the Codex Bezae was written in Egypt seem to be


\(^3\) *non pro codicibus sed pro rhapsodiis, haberi debeant.* (*Ibid.*).


Parker (*Beza*, p. 185) has: *istae accusationes omnes vacuae sunt et temerariae.*
countenanced by its orthography or pseudography and many of its readings, we may suppose with Semler that the original, from which its Greek text was copied, was written in Egypt; or with Mr. Marsh that the writer of it used a manuscript of the Alexandrine edition.¹

Semler also made a significant contribution to textual criticism by further classifying the ancient authorities. Whereas Wetstein had rejected Bengel’s classification, Semler embraced them. Initially he accepted them as they were - with the following exceptions: Bengel’s ‘Asiatic’ became Semler’s ‘Eastern’, which he considered to be the work of Lucian of Antioch;² and the ‘African’, ‘Western’ or ‘Egypto-Palestinian’, which he believed was a product of Origen. In 1767 he modified these to a threefold division: (1) an ‘Alexandrian’ derived from Origen, and found in the Syriac, Coptic, and Ethiopic versions; (2) an ‘Eastern’ recension that contained forms of the text derived from Antioch and Constantinople; (3) a ‘Western’ recension embracing the Latin versions and Fathers, and Codex D.³ Johann Jakob Griesbach, Semler’s student, adopted this classification and finally extended it.


² Semler is credited by Bruce M. Metzger (Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism, Grand Rapids 3, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1963, p. 15) with being ‘the first scholar to use the term recensions in referring to groups of New Testament manuscripts, as well as the first to identify one of these recensions with the work of Lucian of Antioch, .... ’.

1767\textsuperscript{1} - Johann David Michaelis (1717-1791)

Johann D. Michaelis, professor at Göttingen (1746-91), and a noted German critic of his day\textsuperscript{2}, also rejected the argument that Codex Bezae had been Latinized, by saying: 'It cannot be denied that some of the examples, which have been alleged in support of the accusation, are very extraordinary; ...'\textsuperscript{3} Furthermore, contrary to the theory of Latinization are those occasions where the Greek text varies sometimes even from the accompanying Latin version, and where the Latin text appears to have been altered from the Greek. Of greater significance to him is the agreement between the Greek text of Codex Bezae and several ancient versions, and in particular the Syriac version. In regards to the latter Michaelis states:

\begin{quote}
Notwithstanding the chasms in the Acts of the Apostles, it agrees with the Syriac versions in seventy-seven readings, that are found in no other manuscript,\textsuperscript{4} ... and in the short Gospel of St. Mark I have likewise observed twenty-nine passages of this kind,\textsuperscript{5} .... If therefore, as some critics have affirmed, the Cod. Cant. had been altered, throughout the whole, from a version, it would be most reasonable to suspect the Syriac.\textsuperscript{6}
\end{quote}

---

\textsuperscript{1} Not having been able to obtain the original of Michaelis's work or seen the facsimile of Marsh's translation I am unable to determine the accuracy of this date of publication.

\textsuperscript{2} Scrivener, \textit{Introduction}, p. 462.

\textsuperscript{3} Marsh, p. 229

\textsuperscript{4} For these passages Michaelis refers to his \textit{Curae in Actus Apostolorum Syriacos}, p. 82. (\textit{Ibid.}, p. 231).

\textsuperscript{5} These are 3:11, 13, 17; 4:15, 28; 5:21, 23, 26, 28; 6:25, 28, 31, 38, 53; 7:21 (2x); 8:1; 9:3; 10:6; 12:2, 14, 40; 13:19; 14:12, 30, 65, 67, 69; 15:19. (\textit{Ibid.}).

\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Ibid.}
Michaelis concludes that a Greek-Latin manuscript written in the West of Europe, where Latin alone was spoken, could hardly have been altered from the Syriac, therefore, 'the natural inference to be deduced is, that its readings are for the most part genuine, and of course preferable to those of modern manuscripts.'  

Nevertheless he acknowledges that several of the readings appear to be faulty, 'being either scholia, or a substitution of an easy for a difficult reading, or the result of an alteration made to remove some unfavourable doctrine.' 2 After producing three pages of evidence to prove his claims, Michaelis, concludes:

The result of the preceding remarks is, that the manuscript in question [Codex Bezae] cannot possibly have been altered from the Latin, according to the


Despite the evidence presented by Harris, Max Wilcox was to write over seventy years later: 'Unfortunately for Chase's theory, so far we have no tangible evidence for the existence of such an Old Syriac text of Acts.' Op. cit., p. 116.

1 Marsh, p. 232.

2 Ibid.

The supposed theological thrust of the variations in Codex Bezae was to become a major issue.
charge which has been usually laid to it. The transcriber appears to have acted like
a critic, to have corrected the text from the best help which he could procure, ....
But till we are fully informed what readings are to be ascribed to the text itself and
what to subsequent corrections, it is impossible to decide on this subject with any
certainty; ....1

Since Michaelis could find 'no reason to suppose that to Egyptian
manuscripts of the Greek Testament, would be added a Latin translation.',2 he
rejected Wetstein's claim that Thomas of Harkel used Codex Bezae in his
revision of the Philoxenian version in 616.

1787 - Johann Jakob Griesbach (1745-1812)3

Griesbach, who was professor at Jena from 1775 until his death, was the
first to coin the term synoptic and propose the theory that Mark was derived from
Matthew and Luke. He also opposed the theory of Latinization and in so doing
was a decisive voice against the hypothesis.4 As to the evidence put forward by

1 Marsh, p. 235.

At the end of this statement Michaelis brings to the attention of the reader one of the
intrinsic problems faced by the textual critic working on the text of Codex Bezae, namely,
differentiating between what is the so-called Western text and what is not.

2 He adds as a footnote: 'A more probable argument, as well as the answer to it may be


4 J. J. Griesbach, Symbolae criticae, vol. I., 1787, p. cxi. (Harris, Bezae, p. 43, n. 2).
those who believed in the phenomenon, he argued that, 'they show nothing more than the agreement of those [Greek readings offered as proof of the theory] with this [the Bezan Latin text], but certainly not that those were corrupted out of this.'¹ Like Michaelis before him, he believed that the Latin had been assimilated to the Greek. Nevertheless while he rejected the notion of a systematic adaptation of the Greek to the Latin he was willing to accept that some Latin glosses or readings of a minor nature had crept into the Greek text, but these were considered to be rare - he even intimated that a few such readings may be found in Codex Alexandrinus. Regardless, he argued, the presence of one or two such readings was no reason for rejecting the rest of the manuscript. Indeed, Griesbach was of the conviction that the Greek text itself was of Greek origin, derived from a very ancient stage of the text of the Gospels and Acts.² He recognized that the manuscript contained a number of readings worthy of

Kenyon (Handbook, p. 77) was to write later that Griesbach’s opinion ‘had been generally held down to the present day.’ (Cf. Harris, Bezae, p. 43) Yet Marsh’s later comments and his formulation of a canon to determine whether a text had been Latinized or not, suggests otherwise. (Vide infra: p. 43) Indeed, Matthaei, Middleton, and Tischendorf (Klijn, Survey, p. 10) quotes Tischendorf’s as follows: a Latinis quidem quantopere pependerit, formae leprvsou (leprosi) ... (etc.) ... similesque satis probant. L. F. K. von Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Grece, Leipzig, 1859, p. ciii), agreed that the text of Codex Bezae had been Latinized. Even as late as 1881 (twenty years before Kenyon made this statement), Westcott and Hort (p. 120) were to write of the Latinization theory, that the Western Text and therefore its main witness, Codex Bezae, had been rejected partly owing to ‘the persistent influence of a whimsical theory of the last century’. Cast in this light one has to ask how influential was Griesbach’s opinion on this matter.

¹ nil prae ter illorum cum hac consensum ostendunt, neutiquam vero istos ex hac corruptos esse. (Symbola critica, vol. 1., 1787, p. cx). (Harris, Bezae, p. 43).

² Ibid., pp. cx-cxvii. (Ropes, p. lxxvii, n. 4).
From the frequent agreement of $D$ with our $L$ and with Origen it is obvious that the manuscript $D$ contains a large number of old and good readings which one looks for in vain in the common manuscripts.\footnote{E frequenti codicis $D$ ... consentione cum nostro $L$, cumque Origene, patet, tum ingentem antiquissimarum et bonarum lectionum copiam inesse codici $D$. quas in vulgaribus libris frustra quæras, tum .... (Ibid., p. cxviiff.; Kipling, p. vii.5).}

Griesbach, in agreement with Bengel and Semler, also believed that the manuscripts, versions, and ecclesiastical writers divide themselves into families or recensions. At first he considered dividing all his material into five or six different classes, but in the end settled for three, viz\footnote{Because as H. W. Fowler (A Dictionary of Modern English Usage, Hertfordshire: Omega Books Ltd, 1984, p. 696) states: the ‘z is not the letter, but the old symbol of contraction for the -et of videlicet, this and all subsequent viz will not be followed by a period.} the Alexandrian, Western, and Constantinopolitan families. The first two of these three were encompassed by Bengel’s African, and the third by his Asiatic. Although Griesbach virtually repeated Semler’s division his contribution to this area was the greater precision he gave in assigning the principal authorities.

1786 - Christian Frederick Matthaei\footnote{Christian Frederick Matthæi, Professor of Classical Literature at Moscow, is referred to by David Schulz as “the most vigorous adversary of the so-called ‘western recension’ and of this Cambridge manuscript, ...”} (1744-1811)

Christian Frederick Matthæi, Professor of Classical Literature at Moscow, is referred to by David Schulz as “the most vigorous adversary of the so-called ‘western recension’ and of this Cambridge manuscript, ....” Matthæi who had
produced a twelve volume *Novum Testamentum Græce et Latine*, Riga 1782-1788 was scathing in his remarks on Codex Bezae, referring to it in his preface to the Acts (p. xi) as: ‘that Cambridge manuscript which seems to have been deliberately corrupted by the most impudent of scoundrels.’ Also in his smaller edition of the N.T., vol. 2, p. 1, note, he wrote: ‘But the corruptions in the Syriac version, in Bede, and in the manuscript D exceed all bounds: indeed they have been devised to make sport with readers and with Holy Writ.’

Matthæi was also of the opinion that the scribe of Codex Bezae possibly made use of an Egyptian exemplar, but that the additional information in Codex Bezae, which he referred to as corruptions, was from the hand of a Latin monk who had only a mediocre education in Greek. This monk had added to the margin of his Greek New Testament a mixture of passages from the Greek and Latin Fathers, noted differences between some Greek and Latin manuscripts, and had added parallel passages of Scripture. From this farrago the monk, or someone else, made up a text of his liking; whether from stupidity or deceit he is uncertain.

---

3 Also spelt Matthai. Middleton, p. 471.

4 *Unum addimus, vel ipsum Chr. Frid. Matthæi, longe vehementissimum quum Occidentalis dictae recensionis, tum huiusce Cantabrigiensis codicis adversarium, ....* (Schulz, p. 8).

1 *Cantabrigiensis ille... qui ab homine omnium mortalium audacissimo data opera corruptus esse videtur.* (Schulz, pp. 8f.).

2 *Sed corruptiones versionum Syrarum, Bedae et scribae codicis D omnem modum excedunt. Etenim ad ludibrium et lectorum et litterarum sacrarum excogitatae sunt.* (Ibid., p. 9).

3 *fieri sibi credibile, Aegyptiacum exemplar ad manus fuisse scribae.* (Ibid).

4 *De Codice Wetsstein* D. ita suspicor. *Monachus quidam Latinus, Græcè*
1793 - Thomas Kipling (1755-1822)

Thomas Kipling, who according to Scrivener was Senior Wrangler in 1768 and afterwards Dean of Peterborough until his death, was commissioned by the University of Cambridge to provide an inexpensive copy of Codex Bezae for students. The complete transcription of the manuscript, which took Kipling five years to prepare, was finally published in 1793 in two folio volumes. The print of the text was unique in that the movable type used in printing this edition was made to resemble, as nearly as possible, the written characters of the codex itself, in shape, size, and spacing.¹

In the preface to this work, Kipling speaks of the manuscript itself, beginning with the age of the manuscript and finishing with its history. In recognition of its great age he states: ‘That the Cambridge manuscript bears every mark of the greatest antiquity is certainly true, and it seems to me believable that it was written before the fifth century and exceeds in age the Alexandrine codex.’² The

mediocr iter doctus, Graeco Novo Testamento suo adscripterat marginibus loca Patrum, cum Graecorun tum Latinorum. quae locos singulos N. Testamenti spectare videbantur. Notaverat enim discrimina Codicum* aliquot Graecorum et Latinorum N. Testamenti. Adjecerat etiam loca literarum* sacrarum parallela. Ex hâc farragine deinde vel ipse, vel alius, confecit textum sibi probabilem. Id utrum per stultitiam, an per fraudem fecerit, incertum est. Ex hujusmodi exemplari autem, abhorrenti ab reliquis omnibus, ductus est Codex Cantabrigiensis seu Wetsteinii [sic.]* D. Middleton, p. 471f.)

¹ Horne (p. 172, n. 2) cites the same passage but with the words marked with an asterisk shown as: Wetst.; condicum; litterarum; Wetst., respectively.

² Codicem Cantabrigiensem omnia præ se ferre maximaæ antiquitatis indicia,
basis to this assumed antiquity is the absence of the doxology from the Lord’s Prayer. Kipling argues that it is unlikely that a person who amplified his text with so many *spurious elements* would knowingly and willingly omit the doxology. ‘Is it not therefore more probable that the Codex Bezae was written at a time when that clausula was known to none or to very few?’\(^1\) He refers to Jerome, Origen, and Cyprian who say nothing of it, even though Origen and Cyprian write of the Lord’s Prayer in great detail. He also mentions that the doxology begins to appear only in writers of the fifth century.

Kipling reasons that the Codex Bezae is older than Codex Alexandrinus on the grounds that the Ammonian sections are found by themselves in the former while in the latter they are accompanied by the canons of Eusebius, as is also the case with Codex Ephraeimi. He concludes that since Ammonius\(^2\) flourished in

\[
\text{sane verissimum est: et credibile mihi videtur cum, tum ante quintum exaratum fuisse sæculum, tum codicem etiam Alexandrinum ætate superare: .... (Kipling, p. iii.)}
\]

\(^1\) Dixi mihi quidem credibile videri, codicem Cantabrigiensem sæculo quinto antiquiorem esse. Quæ mea conjectura hoc nititur fundamento, scilicet, doxologiam illam, quæ solet in plerisque libris Orationem claudere Dominam, ab exemplari nostro absesse. Notissimum est enim Bezae codicis textum non modo scholiis hic illic fædari, verum etiam spuriis quibusdam amplificari pericopis. Num vero idem ille, qui tot intexuit adulterina, clausulam modo dictam sciens volens omississet? Nonne verisimilium est tunc scriptum esse Bezae codicem, cum clausula illa aut nemini, aut perpaucis tantum innotuerit? (Ibid.).


The Alands (*Text*, p. 175.) also state that he was Bishop of Thmuis.
the third century and Eusebius in the fourth it is possible that:

the man who marked the Ammonian sections in our codex lived either at the end of the third century or at the beginning of the fourth. Since those sections are not marked by the first hand nor at about the time when the codex was written, but a good many years later, so far as I can judge, there is no reason why Whiston’s conjecture may not be true, viz that the Cambridge manuscript was written in the second century.¹

Mill had previously proposed that the omission of the Eusebian canons had come about through the writer of the Ammonian sections in Codex Bezæ not having red ink at the time of his writing; he therefore left space for their later inclusion, but had subsequently forgotten them. Kipling rejects this argument because there are instances in which the numerals indicating the Ammonian sections are too close to allow the insertion of the Eusebian markings. He gives


Præterea, claruit Ammonius tertio, Eusebius subsequente sæculo. Non est incredible igitur vixisse illum, qui Ammonianas sectiones in codice nostro notaverit, vel sæculo excuncte tertio, vel ineunte quarto. Quoniam autem sectiones illæ, nec a prima manu notatae sunt, nec eo circiter tempore, quo scriptus est ipse codex, sed multos, me judice, post annos, nihil videtur obstare, quo minus vera sit Whistoni conjectura, codicem scilicet Cantabrigiensem secundo descriptumuisse post Christum natum sæculo. (Ibid.).

Horne (p. 171, n. 1) quotes Whiston as follows: ‘Beza’s double copy, which is far more ancient than any of the rest, and I think written at the latest within thirty years of the death of John the Apostle.’ He gives the reference as: ‘Of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, according to Beza’s double Copy of the Four Gospels, and Acts of the Apostles’.
as examples: pp. 472, 504, 518.¹

The theory of Latinization is also rejected by Kipling. In agreement with Michaelis,² he reasons that:

... the Cambridge manuscript, within a few years of its writing, was serving in some Christian church as an evangelistary, and that bishops formerly took the greatest care that nothing spurious should creep into the church’s books.³

He holds that the frequent agreement with the Latin is no more an argument for Latinization than its more frequent agreement with the Syriac is an argument for it being Syriacized. Kipling goes on to point out that the same reasoning

¹ Conject quidem Millius ‘Sectiones Ammonianas solas hic incedere et absque comitatu canonis Eusebiani, ea nimirum de causa, quod scriba, cum jam haud adeset ei minium, quo canonem characteribus rubris exprimeret, ad mentem Eusebii, scriptionem ejus in aliud tempus distulerit, ac postea ex oblivione, aliave aliqua causa impeditus fuerit, quo minus ipsum ex instituto describeret.’ (Mill, Prolegomena to the N.T. Rotterdam, 1710, § 1271) Sed subtiliter hæc magis quam vere. Nam sæpissime fit, ut literæ numerales, quibus Ammonianæ notantur sectiones in Bezae exemplari, aliæ aliis multo sint propiores, quam ut possint interponi notæ ab Eusebio inventæ. Cujus rei exempla praebent, cum aliæ complures, tum paginæ 472, 504, 518, crebritate sectionum canones excludente. (Kipling, p. iv).

² Ibid., p. vi, n. c.

³ ..., codicem Cantabrigiensem, paucis postquam exscriptus est annis, in ecclesia aliqua Christiana vicem suppliesse Evangelistarii, ab Episcopisque porro olim diligenter cautum esse, ne quid adulterinum in ecclesiænum libros irreperet. (Ibid., p. vi).
could be extended to the Jerusalem, Sahidic, and Coptic versions with which Codex Bezae also shows remarkable agreement. Moreover, he observes that the frequent use of the particle καί ‘occurs in the LXX and in the Codex Bezae more often than in any other manuscript’ that he had read. He gives as corroborating evidence six readings taken from Matt. 26:66, 27:33f; John 12:36; Luke 15:23; Mark 16:15; and Acts 16:34, as given in Codex Bezae, the LXX, and what he calls the printed texts. From this he concludes that:

... if the Evangelists (as many critics think) wrote their narratives not in Attic Greek, but in a style resembling that Hebrew manner in which the LXX was written, what stronger argument could be adduced to prove that the Greek text of our codex was not constantly corrupted into agreement with the Latin, or indeed with any other version of the N.T., ....

As for the Latin text of Codex Bezae, Kipling disagrees with those scholars who argue that the Latin of the Codex Bezae is derived not from the Greek of the same manuscript, but from another manuscript. To prove his argument he lists a

1 There is little doubt that Kipling is referring here to the Jerusalem Syriac version, which has now come to be known as the Palestinian Syriac, for this version demonstrates unique links with D. (Metzger, Versions, pp. 75, 82).

2 ... multo crebrius occurrit et in versione ista veneranda et in exemplari Bezae MStO vocula καί, quam in ullo alio, quod legerim, volumine. (Kipling, p. viii).

3 Quod si Evangelistae, ut plerisque videtur criticis, historias suas stylo scripsereint, non Attico quidem, sed simillimo Hebraici illius, quo scripta fuit versio LXX viralis, quodnam potest afferri majus argumentum, Graeca nostri codicis nec passim ad latinam depravata fuisse, nec ad ullam aliam versionem novi Testamenti ... (Ibid., p. ix).
number of parallel Latin and Greek readings, and these, he declares, are but a few of the many that could be cited. The discrepancies that exist between the two texts, he argues, 'should be ascribed by everyone either to the carelessness of the translator himself or to the inattention of the copyists, or to the excessive passion for correcting among the early Christians.'

He agrees with those critics who label the Bezan Latin as barbarous, faulty, and constantly at variance with a pure Latinity. However, he claims that these factors only point to it being more genuine and closer to the Greek, and therefore the more useful for restoring the Greek text to its pristine integrity:

Therefore, the more greatly any ancient Latin version of the N.T. diverges from Latin idiom, and the more closely it approaches to Greek idiom, the more closely does it follow the Greek from which it was derived, and the more valuable it should be to the N.T. critic.

He lists seven readings where he thinks the Latin of Codex Bezae follows the Greek text with painful fidelity.

---


2 *Atqui discrepantiae illæ originem, credo, debuerunt omnes, vel interpretis ipsius incuriae, vel descriptantium oscitantium, vel denique nimio apud primævos Christianos corrigendi studio. (Ibid., p. x).*

3 *Quo magis igitur recedat versus quæpiam pervetum novi Testamenti latina a latini sermonis idiomate, quo propior autem simul accedat ad graecæ linguae consuetudinem, eo pressius Graeca sequitur, unde habuerit ortum, atque adeo sacro cuique acceptior critico. (Ibid., p. xi).*

4 1. 1, pp. 34f.; l. 32, pp. 126f.; l. 23, pp. 192f.; l. 9, pp. 526f.; l. 23, pp. 526f.; l. 5,
Because there are instances in Acts where the Latin renderings of Greek words vary from those of the Gospels, Kipling claims that the translator of Acts was not one of those who translated the Gospels. He gives three examples, of which the first will suffice to illustrate his argument:

In the Gospel of Matthew [12:7] the word **ἈΝΑΙΤΙΟΥϹ** [sic] is rendered by the Latin *innocentes*, but the pious Latin translator of the Acts [16:37], whoever he was, not knowing the word *innocentes*, or the sense of **ἈΝΑΙΤΙΟΥϹ**, wrote in Latin *anetios*.1

He ascribes the orthographical errors in Codex Bezae to the use of dictation for copying the manuscript.2 Kipling points out, however, that errors in spelling are not restricted to the Bezan text alone, for the copyist of Codex Bezae ‘had the same spelling habits as those scribes who wrote the Alexandrinus, the Guelferbytanus A and B, and others of great antiquity.’3 He therefore puts forward the

---

1 Codex Bezae actually has *ανετιος*.

2 *In Matthæi Evangelio verbum αναίτιους latine redditur per innocentes. Sed homo quisquis fuit ille pius, qui Acta aggressus est in linguam transferre latinam, nesciens aut TO innocentes, aut vim verbi αναίτιους, latine scripsit anetios.* (Ibid., p. xii).

The others are: *αδυνατος* which is rendered by *impossibilis*; the translator of Acts turns **ΔΥΝΑΤΟϹ** into *adunatus*; and **ΔΟΧΑΖΩ** in Acts becomes *clarifico* instead of *glorifico* or *honorifico* as in the Gospels.

3 This belief was to be strongly refuted by Parker. *Vide infra: § 1982 - David C. Parker, (1) ‘A “Dictation Theory” of Codex Bezae’*

4 *... de codicis Cantabrigiensis orthographia, vel, si forte mavis.*
hypothesis that the errors in the Greek came about because the man who dictated the text was not a Greek, but a barbarian, and that the scribe was not well versed in Greek. As proof, he cites a list of around fifty words in which a letter or letters are confused with another letter or other letters, consonants are wrongly added, and vowels wrongly omitted.

Kipling also mentions that Wetstein, Antonius Georgius, and Woide considered these aberrations from customary Greek orthography to be related to Egyptian pronunciation and that they occur in almost all manuscripts brought from Egypt. For these reasons Wetstein, Woide, and Spohn had argued that the Codex Alexandrinus, which has these aberrations in common with the Codex Bezae, was written in Egypt. For the same reason also, F. A. Knittel, Archdeacon of Wolfenbüttel, ascribed Codices Guelferbytianus A and B, to scribes living in Egypt. Kipling goes on to say that the Greek text of Codex Bezae is not only written in an Egyptian manner, but ‘abounds with readings that

\[\textit{pseudographia, notari velim, quod librario cadem fuit scribendi ratio, quae illis libraribus, qui codices Alexandrinum. Guelpherytanum A. Guelpherytanum B. nonnullosque alios summæ antiquitatis exscripscriunt}. (Kipling, p. xiii).\]

\[\textit{Cujus tam anomalæ scribendi rationis quanam excogitari possit alia origo, præter peregrinam quandam dictantis pronuntiationem, scribæque imperitiam? (Ibid., p. xiv).}\]

1 Antonius Georgius is understood by Kipling (p. xv) to have argued that the scribe of Codex Bezae was an Egyptian.


are attested in certain Egyptian manuscripts, but not in any others.\(^1\) By these arguments and by the authority of great scholars I am led to believe that Egypt was the native land of the Codex Bezæ.\(^2\)

Nevertheless, Kipling, like Michaelis before him, rejects Wetstein’s suggestion that Thomas of Harkel had referred to Codex Bezæ in his revision of the Philoxian version, and also like Michaelis refers to Ridley’s dissertation and his discoveries regarding Thomas’s marginalia as follows:

Our compatriot Ridley thinks otherwise: ‘Of the additions’, says he, ‘which are unknown to the Greek editions the Cambridge codex has some which the Heraclean codex has not - e.g. Acts 16:39 and many others. Now this could not be so if the Bishop of Mabugum\(^3\) had collated that manuscript. The Heraclean manuscript has some readings in the margin unknown to the Cambridge codex, which could not be of Harkel. In the sentences that they have in common not every word agrees; of those that agree some are found in the pure text, some in the text but marked spurious with an obelus, some in the margin of the Heraclean codex. Hence it is apparent that Thomas had a manuscript that was not the Cambridge one, but not greatly differing from it.’\(^4\) Thus Ridley, with whom I

---


2 *Quod Graeca nostri codicis non tantum Aegyptiaco scripta sunt more, sed lectionibus præterea scant, quas in Aegyptiacis quibusdam, nec in ulla aliis libris, compertas habemus. Quibus argumentis, quibusque gravissimis auctoribus, ad credendum tandem adduco. Aegyptum esse Bezae exemplaris patriam.* (Kipling, p. xv).

3 Mabugum is a Latinized form of (Mabbug) the modern Turkish name for Hierapolis in Syria, of which Thomas of Harkel was bishop. (Metzger, *Versions*, pp. 63f.).

4 Kipling (pp. xvii, n. a) cites: ‘De Syriac. N. Foed, Versionibus Dissertatio Glocestrii,
agree; for in the margin of his codex, Thomas noted (Luke 20:34): ‘In an ancient manuscript is *gignunt et gignuntur*; but it is not in the Greek.’ Now since in the Codex Bezae we read *γεννωνται καὶ γεννώσαυ*, it is quite certain that Harkel did not compare the Philoxenian version with the Greek of our codex, and that here, at all events, Wetstein is in error.¹

Kipling traces the history of Codex Bezae by looking at the corrections and marginalia, etc. By this he laid the foundation of dating the different hands in the manuscript; a task that was undertaken later in much greater detail by Scrivener, and subsequent scholars, right down to David Parker.

In Kipling’s opinion the scribe of Codex Bezae having completed the manuscript, went through and corrected many of the mistakes he had made both in the Gospels and the Acts, in both the Greek and Latin texts.²

The liturgical notes: *αυναγνωσμα περι τον σαββατου, αυναγνωσμα περι του κυριακη, αρχη, τελος, etc.*, which are written in the margin are considered by Kipling to have been added before the seventh century by a second

Ridley, pp. 62, 63, London 1761.’ He also adds: ‘For the use of this very rare book, as of several others, I am indebted to Mr Richard Farmer, Master of Emmanuel College, a credit and ornament to the world of letters.’

¹ Kipling, pp. xvif.

² *Qui codicem descripsit Cantabrigiensem, ut creberrime erravit, ita plurima correxit idem; idque cum in Evangeliiis, tum in Actis etiam Apostolorum, nec in graeco solum textu, sed in versione quoque latina. Constat ergo librarium, confecto opere, tum ipsum recensuisse.* (Ibid.).
hand.¹ He concludes that the codex ‘was in use, a century or so after it was written, serving the turn of a lectionary in some church or other.’²

Kipling found further proof of Codex Bezæ’s Egyptian provenance in the frequent interchange of η and ι, which according to his sources was a practice common to Egyptian scribes.³ He gives as an example the phrases: πέρι τι σαβατο, εἰς τίν παρασκυγην, τι ποιουσιν, which he claims are often found written in the margins.⁴ Proof again is to be found in the liturgical marginalia of Codex Bezæ, which has readings for both Saturday and Sunday. This practice, he claims, was common to the Egyptians who were wont to come together for worship not only on Sunday, but also on Saturday.⁵ The final evidence offered by Kipling is that:

... the Egyptian readers, when the annual flood of the Nile was at hand, used to read on Saturday to the congregation the story told by St John the Evangelist about the woman of Samaria, and on Sunday the passage from the same gospel about Christ walking on the water. In the Codex Bezæ you will find both

---

¹ Scrivener (Bezae, pp. xxviif.) was to call this annotator ‘Hand L’.

² *ex quibus omnibus orta est opinio codicem hunc Mstum, ut supra jam monuimus, uno alterove postquam descriptus est sæculo, lectionarii vices in ecclesia aliqua supplevisse.* (Kipling, p. xv).


⁴ The first of these phrases is, as Kipling (p. xwi) states, often found in the liturgical marginalia, however, the spelling as given here is unusual. As for the second phrase, it is to be found only once in the list of liturgical notes given by Scrivener (pp. 448-450), and the third not at all.

⁵ Kipling (p. xvi, n. b) cites as his source: Cassian, *Inst.,* vol. 3, chaps. 2 and 9.
these sections marked with the word αὐγνωσμα. It is reasonable then to suppose that the Codex Bezae was written in Egypt and remained in that country for some time.¹

Although Kipling rejects the argument put forward by Wetstein that the statement by Christian Druthmar locates Codex Bezae in Gaul in the seventh century,² he proffers other considerations, which, he suggests, ultimately affirm Wetstein’s claim. This evidence rests upon the lacuna in the Latin of Matthew (2:20 to 3:8), which had been supplied by a hand, which Kipling suggests is of the tenth or perhaps the ninth century. He points out that this supplement agrees entirely with the text of a Latin manuscript that was written before the tenth century and preserved for many years in the ancient monastery of Corbie.³ The final piece of evidence comes from the knowledge that in about the middle of the ninth century Druthmar retired into the Corbie monastery.

¹ Denique, anagnostae solemant Aegyptiaci, instante annua Nili exundatione, Sabbatis apud populum legere, quæ Joannes tradidit Evangelista de muliere Samaritana, diebusque simul Dominicis, quæ scriptis idem mandavit de Jesu Christo supra mare ambulante. Reperies autem in nostro codice, cum hanc, tum illam sectionem, verbo annagnosma insignitam. Verisimile est igitur codicem Cantabrigiensem, in Aegypto descriptum, aliquot etiam annos in eadem regione mansisse. (Ibid., p. xvi).

² Vide supra: § 1716 - Johann Jakob Wetstein (1693-1754).

³ This manuscript, ffl, Codex Corbeiensis, was printed first by D. J. Martianay (1695), then by J. Blanchinus (Belsheim) in 1881. (Kipling, p. xviii, n. a; Kenyon. Handbook, p. 172).

Scrivener (BEZA, p. xxx, n. 1) makes the following comment on Kipling’s statement: ‘... this Latin page is taken word for word from the more recent Vulgate, but assimilates less completely with ff.’
Even if one were to reject the above evidence, Kipling still maintained there was no doubt that by the ninth or tenth century Codex Bezae was in the West, simply because the writer of the above mentioned lacuna was definitely a Latin, as was the hand that made amendments in the tenth or eleventh century. In addition another Latin hand of the tenth or twelfth century1 inserted the following Greek supplements: Matt. 3:8-16, John 18:13 - 20:13, and Mark 16:15.

He then argues that evidently after the twelfth century, Codex Bezae fell into the hands of a Greek priest, who marked more liturgical annotations in the margin, some in the Gospels, but the greater part in the Acts. Thus Kipling concludes:

Hence it seems likely that the Cambridge manuscript, having been previously used as an evangelistary, later (possibly in the thirteenth century) served again the purpose of a lectionary both in the Gospels and in the Acts.2

Kipling’s remaining survey of the evidence that has a bearing upon the provenance of Codex Bezae, covers the details regarding its possible presence at the Council of Trent in 1546, its use by Robert Estienne for his Editio Regia of 1550, its discovery in 1562 at the monastery of St Irenaeus in Lyons, its

1 Wetstein (p. 31), considers the hand to be of the tenth century, while Griesbach (Symbolæ criticæ, 1787, p. lvii) with whom Kipling (p. xviii, n. e) agrees, argued for the twelfth.

2 Quapropter verisimile est, exemplar Cantabrigiense, quod antea, ut videtur, pro evangelistario usurpatum fuerat, ævo quodam inferiori, decimo terto fortasse sæculo, lectionarii iterum supplevisse vices, cum evangelici, tum etiam præ- apostolici. (Kipling, p. xviii).
possession by Theodore Beza, and its subsequent transfer to the University of Cambridge in 1582.

Kipling’s transcription of Codex Bezae, which was the first publication of the codex, was criticised by David Schulz, for he was to say: ‘it has seemed several times very dubious to me whether he [Kipling] read the words of the manuscript correctly or not and also made good its smaller lacunas.’

Nevertheless Scrivener redressed this negative view of the publication by saying: ‘I have found the text of my predecessor less inaccurate than some have suspected … perfect correctness is quite unattainable’. Even so, Scrivener’s favourable assessment of Kipling’s collation did not extend to Kipling’s opinion on matters of palaeography, for Scrivener considered them to ‘carry little weight’.

Indeed, Scrivener was to argue that the errors in orthography and grammar, which Kipling believed indicated a non-native Greek scribe, could be used ‘to demonstrate the same thing concerning every other manuscript of the N. T.’. T. H. Darlow, and H. F. Moule, the compilers of the Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of The British and Foreign Bible Society, have a point of view akin to Scrivener, for they say of Kipling’s transcript: ‘The transcript is fairly correct, but the preface and notes possess little value.’

---

1 mihi aliquoties valde dubium visum esse, utrum recte necne codices verba legerit ac minores eius lacunas explavit. (Parker, Bezae, p. 187).

2 Scrivener, Bezae, p. xii.

3 Ibid., p. xxvii.

4 Ibid., pp. xlvi.

1795 - Herbert Marsh (1757-1839)

Bishop Marsh’s translation of the fourth edition of J. D. Michaelis’s *Einleitung in die göttlichen Schriften des neuen Bundes*, is provided with copious additional notes. It is in these that we find Marsh’s opinions of Codex Bezae. In agreement with Michaelis, Marsh rejects the hypothesis of Latinization and in so doing centres his attack upon Wetstein’s main argument by pointing out that although there are many readings in Codex Bezae that agree with the Latin versions against the Greek manuscripts, it does not necessarily follow that the Greek text was altered to conform to the Latin. He goes on to say: ‘It is at least as possible that they might have had their origin in the Greek as in the Latin, and this very possibility is sufficient to defeat the whole of Wetstein’s hypothesis.’

He goes on to say: ‘It is surely more reasonable to suppose, that a translation would be altered from an original, than an original from a translation.’ To substantiate his argument Marsh refers to Jerome, as one scholar who referred to Greek manuscripts in his revision of the Latin version. He also draws attention to the fact that Codex Bezae ‘has additions, omissions, and transpositions, which are found neither in the Vulgate, nor any other Latin version now extant.’ As further evidence Marsh cites the early witnesses to Codex Bezae readings, *viz* the Syriac, Coptic, Sahidic versions; the marginalia of the Harklensis, the Versio Syra Hierosolymitana, and the quotations of Origen, all of which must have been corrupted if the charge of Latinization is to stand.

---

1 Marsh, pp. 677f.
3 *Ibid*.
4 There is considerable debate as to whether Thomas produced a complete revision of the Philoxenian New Testament or he simply added marginal notes. For greater detail see, Metzger (*Versions*, pp. 63f.).
Marsh argues in favour of Wetstein’s argument that Codex Bezae had been used by Thomas of Harkel in his revision of the Philoxenian version. In so doing he points to Adler’s collation of the marginalia in the Harklenis\(^1\) version of the four Gospels, and the nineteen readings peculiar to Codex Bezae found there.\(^2\) From his own investigations of Acts Marsh was to find a ‘great number’ of equally unique readings, \textit{e.g.} Acts 6:11, of which he says: ‘the Codex Bezae has a passage consisting of fourteen words contained in no other manuscript at present known, …’\(^3\) As further examples with the same unique status he cites 14:4, 10; 15:7.

Finally Marsh formulates a canon for determining whether a reading had been Latinized, \textit{viz}:

There is no reason whatsoever for ascribing any reading of a Greek manuscript to the influence of the Latin, unless it can be proved that it could not have taken its rise in the Greek, and that it might easily have originated in the Latin.\(^4\)

---

1 Marsh has ‘Philoxenian’, because at that time the \textit{Harklenis} was not considered to be a revision in its own right. Indeed the matter of whether Harkel’s work was a revision or simply one of adding marginalia to the \textit{Philoxenian} version has been debated for centuries. (Metzger, \textit{Versions}, pp. 63-65). The Alands (\textit{Text}, p. 197) are in no doubt that it was a revision, for they say: ‘it is now clear that Thomas undertook a thorough revision.’

2 Marsh (p. 701) gives the following reference to Adler’s work: \textit{Versiones Syriacæ}, p. 130, n. 97.

3 \textit{Ibid.}, p. 702.

4 \textit{Ibid.}, p. 680. Parker (\textit{Bezae}, p. 186) erroneously has the reference as p. 683.
This canon, however, only restates what Griesbach had previously set down in his *Symbolae criticae*, of 1787.\textsuperscript{1}

Apart from believing that Codex Bezae was written in the West by a man more accustomed to writing Greek than Latin, he has no firm view regarding its country of origin. He accedes, however, to the opinion of Griesbach when he acknowledges that:

> Codex Bezae might still have been written in Italy, or in some other part of the West of Europe where Latin was spoken, since it is highly probable that Greek scribes were employed in Italy for copying Greek books.\textsuperscript{2}

\section*{1808 - Johann Leonhard Hug (1765-1846)}

J. L. Hug's publication, *Einleitung in die Schriften des N. T.*, 1808, focuses on textual issues. He does, however, express an opinion on a number of matters that have direct bearing upon the history of Codex Bezae. Firstly, it must be noted that although he recognized that the Codex Bezae did not contain a uniform text, he still thought highly of it, referring to it as *das wichtige Denkmal*.\textsuperscript{3} His appreciation of the close relationship between the text of Codex Bezae and the scriptural references of the earliest Church Fathers, *viz* Clement of Alexandria and Origen, and the references to a D type text in the apparatus of sy\textsuperscript{h}, influenced him in this regard.\textsuperscript{4} Another influencing factor was his belief that

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} J. J. Griesbach, *Symbolae criticae*, 1787, p. cxi. (Harris, *Beza*, p. 43).
\item \textsuperscript{2} Marsh, p. 704.
\item \textsuperscript{3} Hug, p. 160.
\item \textsuperscript{4} *Fänden wir nun irgend unter unserm litterarischen Vorrath ein altes Manuscript.*
\end{itemize}
Codex Bezae was one of the manuscripts that contains readings of the earliest text, which he designated, κοινὴ ἐκδοσιᾶ.¹

Hug had no doubt that Clement, Origen and Thomas of Harkel, all Alexandrians, used a D type text, thus he concluded that Codex Bezae’s text originated in Alexandria or in Egypt.² Using an argument similar to Marsh, he

welches sich ungebunden vom Texte der spätern Zeiten entfernte, und jene Lesearten darstellte, die wir so eben aus Clemens ausgehoben haben; welches nicht allein diese und mehrere andere, die sonst noch in den Schriften dieses Lehrers vorkommen, sondern durchaus die Abweichungen und Eigenheiten der ältesten Kirchenväter bis ins dritte Jahrhundert herab, oder doch einen beträchtlichen Theil derselben in sich faßte; was würden wir Andres von ihm sagen können, als daß es den Text der Periode, welche den kritischen Bearbeitungen vorangeht, daß es die κοινὴ ἐκδοσιᾶ ausdrücke?

Wir sind im Besitze eines solchen Manuscriptes; es ist die berühmte Cambridger Handschrift, welche die vorhin angeführten Sonderbarkeiten des Clemens enthält. Sie ist es auch, welche uns meistentheils ausschließlich die Abweichungen der ältesten Kirchenlehrer in ihrem Texte wieder gibt. In der Kritik trägt sie bekanntlich das Zeichen D, unter dem sie also auch hier erscheint.’ (Ibid., I, pp. 145f.).

‘Sie enthält zwar Lesearten von mehreren Kirchenvätern des zweiten und dritten Jahrhunderts, wie wir ausführlich dargethan haben: aber durchaus und im Verlaufe durch den ganzen Text, in der gleichmäßigen Beharrlichkeit kleinerer Lesearten, die zwar weniger auffallen, aber durch ihre Gleichförmigkeit schärfer charakterisiren, kommt sie jenen Exemplaren am nächsten, welche der Alexandrinische Clemens bei seinen Ausarbeitungen gebrauchte, und dann jenen, welchen Origenes in solchen Schriften folgte. …’ (Ibid., I, p. 160).


² ‘Man kann auch zur Bestätigung eines jener Manusciphte in Anschlag bringen, aus welchem Thomas von Charkel im Kloster der Antonianer zu Alexandrien Lesearten an den
also rejected any notion that the Bezan Greek text had been Latinized, arguing that, since the Latin text would not have had sufficient time to gain the authority required to influence the exemplar of Codex Bezae and the other manuscripts that flowed from it, the Latinists would have had to change all the other manuscripts that have readings corresponding to the text of Codex Bezae. In fact, he


Further on he says: ‘Uebrigens verstand der Schönschreiber wenig griechisch; und eben so wenig latein: in beiden Sprachen unwissend fertigte er sein Buch lediglich in der Eigenschaft eines Handwerkers. Er war ein Aegyptier oder Alexandrier.’ (Ibid., I, p. 287).

From this last statement it can be seen that like Credner later (p. 152) Hug did not recognize Thomas of Harkel’s work on the Philoxeniana as a complete revision worthy of being called a version of the NT in its own right.

1 ‘Wie konnte es auch anders sein, da noch keine der Recensionen vorhanden war, die nahe am Schlusse des dritten Jahrhunderts entstanden? Die Uebereinstimmung dieser Uebersetzungen mit D ist unläugbar und auffallend, und es bedarf weiter nicht eines Wortes, um begreiflich zu machen, daß sie aus ähnlichen griechischen Exemplaren geflossen sind.

So einfach und geschichtlich wahr dieser Aufschluß über die beiderseitige Uebereinstimmung ist, so sehr er in der Nähe liegt, so warf man doch lieber den Blick in die Ferne, und vermutete Ursachen, die weder schön erfunden, noch natürlich sind. Man beschuldigte die Lateiner, aus ihren Uebersetzungen den griechischen Text geändert, und nach jenen umgebildet zu haben. Aber haben sie denn auch das Exemplar Justins des Märtyrers, das Exemplar des Clemens von Alexandrien aus ihren Uebersetzungen interpolirt? Hatten sie auch in Syrien ihre Emissare, um da den griechischen Text oder die Exemplare der Peschito zu verfälschen? Haben sie auch die syrischen Handschriften der Nestorianer verfälscht? Und wie
considered the theory of Latinization to be 'an idea learned people might find plausible in an instant when they forget their learning. Indeed it was a idea, which had, up until then, been the greatest obstacle to the development of the history of the text'.

1808 - Thomas Fanshaw Middleton (1769-1822)

Also published in 1808 was Middleton’s *Doctrine of the Greek Article.* In this publication Middleton comes down in support of the theory of Latinization of Codex Bezae. Where Marsh and Hug had emphasised the other Greek witnesses that bear testimony to Codex Bezae’s readings as a reason for rejecting the theory of Latinization, Middleton rests his case on the Old Latin versions that support the Latin readings in Codex Bezae.

Middleton also gives an insight into how his contemporaries considered Codex Bezae when he states: ‘At the present day, no critic of eminence, so far as

---


2 As the original edition was unobtainable the 1833, posthumous, edition will be referred to.
I know, believes the Codex Bezae to be enormously corrupt, except *Matthaei ...*.\(^1\)

Middleton made a stilted collation of Codex Bezae against the Received Text, using readings from six chapters of Matthew (5, 6, 9-12). He took into account synonyms, transpositions, compound for simple, and simple for compound, verbs, wrong moods and tenses, alterations in the sense, questionable Greek, Latinisms, and the uses of the article. However, only chapter five was analysed in depth. By collating all variants, apart from those that arise from the peculiar spelling of the codex, he exposed a total of 46 variations. The remaining five chapters are dealt with less extensively, only the more remarkable deviations being noted - a total of 47 in all.\(^2\) From this study he was led to conclude that the Greek text suffered from a balder and more clumsy phraseology in a great number of its readings. Many of these, such as the constant use of two verbs coupled with καὶ in place of the participle and verb (*e.g* Matt. 4:3); the addition of the participle of existence (*e.g* Matt. 4:12, Mark 5:40); and the very frequent use of ὅταν before the indicative (*e.g* Matt. 5:11; 10:19, 23), are, in Middleton’s opinion, examples of very acceptable Greek. Nevertheless, it is a Greek inferior to that found in the other manuscripts.\(^3\) He also found that the Bezan text broke the neuter plural rule\(^4\) (*e.g* Matt. 15:27; 13:40). He concluded:

All these are improbable readings, considered as having originated in the Greek: but as re-translations, they are discrepancies of precisely the same sort which are observable in the exercises of school-boys, (and for the most part of ill-

---

\(^1\) Middleton, p. 471.


\(^4\) That, **neuter plural subjects are followed by singular verbs**.
taught or half-taught boys,) who re-translate into Greek what they have translated from the Latin.¹

Although Middleton did not rule out entirely the possibility that in some instances the Latin was derived from the Greek, he considers it improbable that many deviations would have come from that source. In agreement with Mill, he considered the reading of Matt. 3:16: τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαίνοντα to be a Latinism arising from the masculine spiritum. To corroborate his opinion he pointed to the words that follow: καταβαίνοντα ἐκ τοῦ ωρανοῦ ὦς, which are preserved solely in Latin authorities.² Thus, by this example and the following statement Middleton provides the grounds for his conviction that the D text has suffered from Latinization:

If the Codex Bezæ, in almost every page, presents us with variations from all existing MSS., and yet in Latin authorities, and most commonly in them alone, we find passages which, being closely rendered, give us the Greek of the Codex in such cases, even if that Greek be not absolutely intolerable, we may still, I think, safely infer in what quarter the variation originated.³

Those passages that may be taken as Latinized are defined as:

passages which, varying from all the MSS., Greek Fathers, and Oriental Versions, and being wholly inexplicable as the usual errors of copyists, are yet

---

¹ Middleton, p. 480.
² Nestle - Aland²⁷ cites the following witnesses: D pc it vgmiss (syh). The witness of the Harklean version invalidates this argument.
³ Middleton, p. 481.
easily accounted for as translations from the Latin; especially if any thing of the Greek idiom be lost, and something of the Latin be introduced into its place.\(^1\)

 Middleton believes that examples of Latinization can be found in: Matt. 5:40, where, ὁ θέλων is believed to have come from; *qui voluerit*, ‘by some one who did not look forward to the end of the sentence’\(^2\); in v.42, where, τῷ θέλοντι is used to express *volenti* of the Vulgate; in Mark 4:31, where, ἄ εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is derived from the *qua sunt in terrâ*; in Mark 6:2, ‘*for γενομένου σαββάτου* D. reads ἡμέρα σαββάτων: this, in form, little resembles the Greek of the manuscripts, but perfectly well expresses the meaning of two Old Latin Versions, *die sabbatorum*\(^3\); and in Mark 8:2, where ὅτι ἡδη ἡμέρα τρεῖς εἰσίν, ἀπὸ πότε οὐδὲ εἰσίν is believed to have come from *triduum est, ex quo hic sunt*, which is found in five Old Latin versions.\(^4\)

In conclusion he states:

I conclude with subscribing to the opinion of Matthäi, somewhat modified.

I believe that no fraud was intended; but only that the critical possessor of the basis filled its margin with glosses and readings chiefly from the Latin, being a Christian of the Western Church; and that the whole collection of Latin passages was translated into Greek, and substituted in the text by some one who had a high

\(^1\) Ibid.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. 481.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 482.

Neither in this or his later references does Middleton specify the old Latin versions to which he refers.

\(^4\) Ibid.
opinion of the their value, and who was, as Wetstein describes him,

“καλλιγραφίας quae vel Graecae vel Latinæ linguae peritior.”1

1820 - Johannes Martinus Augustinus Scholz (1794-1852), (1) Curæ Criticæ

Although a number of scholars had named the West as the place of origin of Codex Bezæ (e.g., Du Pin, Mill, Pfaff, Whiston), Scholz appears to be the first to name Southern Gaul explicitly. In his publication on the history of the text of the Gospels he states: ‘there is much dispute among critics as to the provenance of the Cambridge manuscript. But after giving due weight to all arguments it appears that, like Regius 375 [Gregory-Aland l.60], it was written in the south of France.’2 It was a claim he was to repeat ten years later in the Prolegomena of his two volume Greek New Testament.3 It would also seem that J. F. Eichhorn was the first to support this theory, followed later by such notable scholars as Scrivener, Harris, Nestlé, Kenyon, Chapman and Sneyders de Vogels.4

1 Ibid., p. 485.

2 Multum est dissensionis inter criticos, quae sit codicis Cantabrigiensis patria. Sed omnibus rationibus rite perpennis nihil obstat, quo minus opinemur, cum ut Regius 375. in Gallia meridionali fuisse scriptum. (J. M. A. Scholz, Curæ Criticæ in historiam textús Evangeliorum, Heidelberg, 1820, p. 37f.).

3 Published in Leipzig.


However, since the subscription in l.60 states that it was copied in AD 1022,4 for the monastery of St. Denys it is hard, as Scrivener (Bezæ, p. 31) was to state, ‘to conceive that there can be any striking likeness between codices which differ in age by full 500 years.’
1827 - David Schulz (1779-1854)

While other scholars had considered Codex Bezae in their writings, the first edition worthy of being called a ‘monograph’\(^1\) on Codex Bezae was that of David Schulz, published 1827.\(^2\)

---

Brightman (p. 453) was also to emphasise that Evst 60 (l 60) did not belong to Southern Gaul, but proposed instead that the scribe, whose name was Elias, may have belonged to ‘the foundation of his great namesake, St Elias the Speliote, one of the heroes of Basilian Monasticism in Calabria.’ He goes on to suggest that the manuscript was copied by Elias and given to the monks of St. Denys.

\(^1\) W. A. Strange (p. 205, n. 3) is of the opinion that Richard Simon probably produced the first monograph to give extensive attention to Codex D.

\(^2\) The following references to Schulz’s work are at odds, not only in title but also in location of publication. The key to two of the differences in the place of publication is in the use of the Latinized form of Breslau, which is Vratislavia. I am indebted to Professor Willis for this information. The various references are:


Klijn: Disputatio de codice Cantabrigiensi. Breslau, 1727. (Survey, p. 5). In this instance the date given for the publication is wrong, as is also the place of publication. Presumably the incorrect date is why Klijn was unable to obtain a copy, for he states after his reference ‘not available’. The incorrect date is not a typing error, for he states after his reference ‘not available’. The incorrect date is not a typing error, for he misplaces Schultz chronologically by having him coupled with Michaelis (1717-1791) and coming before Griesbach (1745-1812), Kipling and Hug (1765-1846). It also places in error the statement contained in his text which goes as follows: ‘We may say that the investigation of the groups to which D was supposed to belong was started by D. Schulz and J. D. Michælis …’. (Ibid.).

Parker (Bezae p. xx.): De Codice D Cantabrigiensi, Warsaw, 1827. Yet in the text (Ibid., p. 186) he has: De Codice D Cantabrigiensi disputavit D.

At the outset of his article Schultz confirms what Middleton had reported some nineteen years earlier, by saying: ‘it is the almost unanimous opinion of theologians that it is noteworthy beyond all the others, but it has problems of its own’.¹

Where Kipling had unequivocally opted for an Egyptian origin for Codex Bezae² Schulz was initially more circumspect, preferring simply to state: ‘For my part I think that I have detected signs of an Alexandrian origin in all those good and ancient manuscripts [B C L D A]’³. After studying the manuscript in detail, however, he upheld Kipling’s opinion, believing it to be closer to the truth than any other suggestion. His exact words are: ‘Unless I am very much mistaken, a


In fact the full title is as follows:


¹ theologorum unaniimi fere sententia prae ceteris notabilem, sed nihilominus in suo genere occultum, ut diversissima interpretum tum de originis loco, tempore et ratione, tum de internae bonitatis ac pretii modulo iudicia experiri potuerit atque expertus sit. (Schulz, p. 5f.).

² Kipling (p. xvi) is correctly cited by Schulz (p. 8), but erroneously cited by Scrivener (Bezae, p. xxix), for he refers the reader to ‘Kipling, Praef. p. xii’.

³ Ad me quod attinet, Alexandrinæ originis vestigia in omnibus illis vetustissimis optimisque libris [B C L D A] reperisse mihi videor. (Schulz, p. 5). This is part of a quote taken from the preface to the first volume of Griesbach’s New Testament which Schulz says he edited.
truer opinion than all these was espoused by the editor of the codex, Thomas Kipling, who thought it likely that it was written in Egypt.¹

The scribe of Codex Bezae, Schulz argues, was wholly ignorant of Latin and not well trained in Greek, since he frequently violated Greek usage and grammatical laws; he suggests that the manuscript came into existence neither among Romans nor among Greeks, particularly since in many of its striking readings it is at variance equally with both Latin and Greek authorities.²

Schulz cites forty-seven verses from Acts in which the Latin has suffered from such grammatical blunders as prepositions used with the wrong case, incorrect forms of verbs, intransitive verbs used transitively, accusative as subject of a sentence, and so forth. He concludes: ‘Who would believe it possible that in any part of the world where Latin was spoken, anyone even of the lowest orders would have written thus?’³ Following these are a number of examples that demonstrate errors in the Greek text.

Rejecting categorically the idea that the Greek text of Codex Bezae had

¹ Quibus omnibus veriorem, ni omnia nos fallunt, sententiam protulit ipse codicis editor, Thomas Kiplingius, qui in Aegypto exaratum eum esse verisimile habuit. (Ibid., p. 8).

² Latinae linguae omnino rudem fuisse codicis D librarium, quaelibet eius pagina manifestum reddit. Sed ne Graeci quidem idiomatis accuratiore scientia praeditum cognoscimus, siquidem permulta caque foedissima admisit in Graecae linguae usum et grammaticae leges vitia; ita quidem, ut haud magis inter Graecos quam Latinos prognatum esse librum coniicias, praeertim quum in tot suis lectionibus admodum singnlaribus [sic] a Graecis pariter abhorreat testibus atque Latinis. (Ibid., p. 9).

³ Quis vero credit fieri potuisse, ut ualla in parte terrarum, quibus Latina lingua in usu erat, quempiam vel infimi ordinis tali sermone loquutum esse? (Ibid., p. 10).
been Latinized, Schulz argues that there is not a single instance in which it is clearly made out that the Greek is derived from the Latin. In fact, he takes the contrary opinion, pointing to the scribe’s preparedness to violate every law of Latin idiom rather than deviate one jot from the Greek original.¹

Schulz goes on to cite over forty instances where the Latin appears to be modelled closely on the Greek.² This list was never meant to be exhaustive, for he states at the outset that the examples are simply ‘a few grains, as it were, out of a whole sack’.³

Although there are innumerable passages that bear testimony to Schulz’s claim that the Latin was based on the Greek, there are also many passages in which the Latin differs from the Greek, to such a degree that he found it doubtful whether the Latin text of Codex Bezae was derived from its present Greek text.⁴

¹ Ut enim innumeris locis manifestum sit, Latina Cantabrigiensis conformata esse ad Graeci textus typum ac normam, ita ut librarius, quisquis fuerit et qualiscunque, Latini idiomatis maluerit leges pervertere universas, quam a Graeco fonte aliquantulum declinare, e contrario ne unum, quidem exemplum, opinor, invenias, ex quo vere ac perspicue appareat, Graecum a Latino pependisse. (Ibid., p. 11).

² Ibid., pp. 11-13.

³ .... velim, sequentia ex ingente acervo quasi grana quaedam selecta, .... (Ibid., p. 11).

From this and the general comments made in the article one is led to believe that Schulz conducted quite an extensive analysis of the text even though he provides only selected examples.

⁴ Nam iuxta innumerabiles illos locos aequales ac propemodum consonantes obviam feruntur etiam satis multi, ubi Latinum a Graeco tantopere deflectere
Schulz corroborates his argument by citing over thirty examples. Further proof is provided by the Latin doublets not found in the Greek, which must be regarded as having arisen from variant readings in the Latin, e.g. Acts 11:29 *sicut prout* (καθως), 19:32 *autem vero*; 21:29 *rogo obsecro* (δέομαι),¹ In conclusion he conjectures that the Latin text of *D* was not made from the Greek text of *D*, but was copied from another manuscript, and that a Latin one.²

As to the origin of the Greek text of Codex Bezæ, Schulz, although somewhat hesitant in expressing an opinion, agrees with Storr and Michaelis, for he states: ‘I think that the Greek text of *D* was ultimately derived from an oriental, probably Syrian, translation, or that such a translation was consulted in the writing of this manuscript.’³ As proof of his claim he cites what he calls fifty

animadvertis, ut illius hunc fuisse archetypum omnino nequeas admittere. (Ibid., p. 13).

¹ Ibid., p. 15.

² His igitur rebus et aliis, quas nunc non attingimus, probable fit, Latinam versionem, etsi nusquam non admota Graeco fonti compareat, ex ipso tamen codicis *D* textu Graeco non factam, sed ex alio coque Latino exemplo esse transscriptam. (Ibid., pp. 15ff.).

³ Etiam Graecum codicis *D* sermonem ab interpretatione aliqua eaque Orientali (forsan Syra) primitus pependisse, aut eiusmodi versionem in exarando hocce libro iis saltem in locis, quos adeo multos ab omnium codicem Graecorum textu abhorrentes habet, una cum Graeco quodam antigrapho adhibitam fuisse existimo. ... sed quibus integros versus ac sententias additos, interdum etiam omissos videmus, quorum in reliquis archetypi libris universis ne vestigium quidem cernitur, sed quae plurimam partem cum antiquissimis Orientalium præsertim Syrorum et Aegyptiorum versionibus mirum in modum conveniunt, effluxisse dixeris? (Ibid., p. 16. Q.v., p. 21).
‘striking’ examples from Acts and the Gospels.\(^1\) To these he adds as further proof: the use of the simple καὶ to connect sentences after the fashion of the orientals and the LXX (cf. Matt. 26:66; 27:33f.; Mark 16:15; Luke 15:23; John 12:36; Acts 16:34). Furthermore, the quotes from the O. T. are written after the fashion of the Easterners, for in both the Greek and Latin text they are divided into separate lines and are not written continuously as in the rest of the book, e.g. Acts 13:33:

\[ \text{Ἰᾶσος μου ἐὰν σὺ,} \\
\text{ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκά σε.}^2 \]

Later Chase was to develop fully the suggestion of a Syrian influence upon Codex Bezæ, even to the point where he argued that the Bezan Acts arose through an assimilation of a Greek text to a Syriac text that antedated the Peshitta version.\(^3\)

---

1. Ibid., pp. 17-20.

2. Schulz, p. 20.

3. Chase, passim, but specifically stated: pp. 1; 134-136; 144, n.1.

Bibliographical details of Chase’s publication vary, as follows:


1830 - J. M. A. Scholz, (2) Novum Testamentum Graece

In the Prolegomena of his New Testament, Johannes Scholz not only reiterated what he had said ten years earlier in his Curæ Criticæ, namely, that he believed Codex Bezae had its genesis in Southern Gaul, he also expressed the view that the scribe was a Latin speaker. He argued that a Greek would hardly have added a Latin translation to a manuscript written in his native language. In support of his argument he refers to the Greek words formed after the manner of Latin words, e.g. Σαμαριτάνων, Δανιήλου, Πέτρους, φλαγελλώσας; also the errors, which he believes were committed by a scribe who was ignorant of Greek, e.g. τελωνῶν for θελόντων [Mark 12:38], ἀμαρτανοῦσαι for αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι [John 5:39], ἐργαζόμενοι for ὄργαζόμενοι, ἔτι ἀρα for ἐπάρας [Luke 6:20] etc.; also the confusion of Latin characters with Greek, e.g. in τύβλοι, ἀπέσταλκεν; furthermore, the unusual orthography, e.g. θενσαυροῦς, thensauros, ἐνγίσαντες, ἐνπροσθεν, ἐνμανουήλ, enmanuel; and finally the order of the Gospels preserved in this manuscript.¹

Further proof of a Southern Gaul origin is provided by the Latin orthography, e.g. temptatio, quotiens, thensauro, anticus, locuntur, inicus, secuntur, for these fit this region better than any other. Also the words soniis (French soins) (μερίμναις), refectio (κατάλυμα), sideratos (κυλλοῦς), involeit (κλέψῃ), demorari (διαστρίβειν), natatoria piscina (κολυμβήθρα), taediari (κηδεμονεὶν), applontat (ῥήσει), certabatur

¹ Scholz does not give references and ἐργαζόμενοι cannot be located in Codex Bezae. Possibly he has an error and means ὄργαζόμενος for ὄργαζόμενος [Matt. 5:22].

² Codex Bezae actually has ἄρας.

³ Scholz, Novum Testamentum Graece, Textum ad fidem testium criticorum. Leipzig, 1830, p. xxxix.
(δισχύριζετο), sestertia ducenta (ἀργυρίου μυρίαδας πέντε), and the sigla, ἅ (Ϲηνάριον) do not agree with any other region, for these are French words. He goes on to say:

This opinion is supported by the similarity that is found between the handwriting of this manuscript and that of the Paris codex Regius 375 [Gregory-Aland l 60] or Evanglist 50, which we learn from the subscription was written there, particularly the equality of the written characters both Greek and Latin which are quite different from those of others which I have seen.¹

In conclusion Scholz makes a statement, which not only ignores the very evidence of the annotators, but appears to be unsupported by any other scholar, for he states: ‘It does not seem to have been used for ecclesiastical purposes, for pericopes are rarely indicated’.²

1832 - Karl August Credner (1797-1857)

Credner’s investigation of Codex Bezae was quite comprehensive, and although he centres his study upon textual matters he does make a number of

¹ Favet etiam huic sententiae similitudo, quae intercedit inter scripturam huius codicis et codicis regii paris. 375 vel evanglist. 50, quem ibi scriptum esse subscriptio docet, atque maxime aequalitas characterum quorundam graecorum et latinorum ab illis reliquorum. quos vidi, plane diversorum. (Ibid., pp. xxxixf.).

² Usui ecclesiastico inservisse non videtur: pericopae enim raro indicantur. (Ibid., p. xl).
statements regarding the history of Codex Bezae itself.¹ Some of these are quite
novel and deserve attention.

In agreement with Schulz, Credner rejected any notion of deliberate
Latinization, but acknowledged that Latinisms have crept into the Greek text.²
He argued instead that the Latin was a scrupulous, almost word for word, copy
of a Greek text, but not the Bezan Greek text, because it does not reflect the
many distortions contained in that text.³ As proof of his argument Credner refers
to the many examples provided by Kipling and Schulz, and adds Matthew
26:59f., because of its obscure construction. He also provides a similar
illustration from Luke 22:26-28 where he believes the text incorporated glosses
from the margin. Further examples, which are thought to contain errors in the
Greek that have not been carried into the Latin, are: Matthew 10:35, 11:3, 15:27;
this evidence Credner argues that the document lying at the foundation of Codex
Bezae was similar to, but grammatically purer than, the existing manuscript. This

¹ K. A. Credner, Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften, Halle, 1832.
² ‘Die Latinismen, welche sich in den Griechischen Text eingeschlichen haben.’ (Ibid.,
p. 515).
³ ‘Die daneben stehende Lateinische Uebersetzung verräth eine ängstliche, fast
wörtliche, Nachbildung des Griechischen Textes. Dieselbe ist nicht nur, gleich dem
Griechischen Texte, stichometrisch abgetheilt, sondern sie theilt auch viele Fehler des letzteren.
Gleichwohl kann die Uebersetzung nicht unmittelbar nach dem ihr zur Seite stehenden
Griechischen Texte gemacht sein, denn sie hält sich frei von vielen den Sinn gänzlich
entstellenden Fehlern des Griechischen Textes unserer Handschrift.’ (Ibid., p. 460).

Cf: ‘Die Lateinische Uebersetzung verräth, wie schon aus den vorliegenden Beispielen
erhellt, ein ängstliches Streben nach wörtlicher Uebereinstimmung mit dem Griechischen
Texte.’ (Ibid., p. 462).
manuscript, which he calls C, was a conglomerate of one or more freely handled, glossed, texts of earlier origin. Credner was undecided whether manuscript C also contained a Latin version, but was inclined to assume that the Latin text of Codex Bezae was a translation from the Greek text of manuscript C. He, like

1 ‘Aus diesen Erscheinungen, welche unsere Handschrift darbietet, geht nun schon hervor, daß derselben eine Handschrift zu Grunde liegt, welche denselben Text, wie die unsrige, enthielt, nur in sprachlich reinerer Gestalt. Der Text dieser älteren Handschrift, - wir wollen dieselbe C. nennen, - war aber zusammengetragen aus einer oder mehreren glossirten Handschriften noch älteren Ursprungs.’ (Ibid., pp. 464 f.).

2 ‘Ob aber die Handschrift C. auch eine Lateinische Uebersetzung zur Seite gehabt hat, muß dahingestellt bleiben; denn die Erscheinungen, welche die Lateinische Uebersetzung unserer Handschrift D. darbietet, lassen sich schon erklären, wenn man annimmt, daß diese Uebersetzung nach dem Griechischen Texte der Handschrift C. gemacht ist. … und von dieser ist unsere Handschrift D. eine genaue, aber sehr fehlerhaft geschriebene Abschrift.’ (Ibid., p. 465).

Harris in giving a synopsis of Credner’s history of the Bezan text (Lectures, p. 3), which he appears to have taken from Alfred Resch, states that the Latin text was possibly added to the Greek text prior to C.E. 480. Later (p. 5) he is more definite and says: ‘that in the history of the origin of the bilingual text we must allow that the Latin text was added to the Greek as early as 500.’ Klijn (Survey, p. 9) who appears to refer to either Resch’s or Harris’s account of Credner’s history of the Bezan text, repeats the error. However, it can be seen from the above quote from Credner that although he states that the Latin text was derived from manuscript C he does not give a date. Later when addressing the history of Codex Bezae he states that the Latin was added during the time that Codex Bezae came into being - not earlier that the seventh century. Credner (p. 517) begins its history by saying: ‘Im siebenten Jahrhunderte wurde ein Glied dieser Gemeinde nach dem südlichen Gallien verschlagen.’ He goes on to explain how the person who was responsible for the creation of Codex Bezae returns to his homeland from Southern Gaul and while there has a copy of the exemplar of the Bezan Greek text (manuscript
Kipling before him, believed that Codex Bezae had been written from dictation.  

Credner also argued that the texts themselves provide further clear evidence of the time difference in composition of the Latin and Greek texts of Codex Bezae. Whereas the Greek text demonstrates an unrestricted freedom - even arbitrariness - in its treatment, the Latin is one of scrupulous exactness. Thus, he reasoned, the Greek text came from that period of early church history when the text of the New Testament, being yet uncanonised, was handled with considerable freedom. The Latin text, on the other hand, with its demonstrated exactitude, suggests a later period when the copyist perceived his task as one of preserving divine Scripture. As the period of free handling of the Scriptures

C) made. It is at this time that the Latin text is added. His exact words are: 'Nach der gewöhnlichen Weise dictirte er selbst den stichometrischen Text einem im Schönschreiben geübten Schreiber, und fügte zugleich eine Lateinische Uebersetzung hinzu, da die Lateinische Sprache mit seiner neuen Heimath seine Landessprache geworden war.' Thus the Latin text could not, in Credner's reckoning, have come into being before the seventh century.

1 'Der Text unserer Handschrift D. ist Abschrift einer älteren Handschrift C., und zwar ließ sich der Schreiber den Text vorsagen oder dictiren. ... und von dieser [C] ist unsere handschrift D. eine genaue, aber sehr fehlerhaft geschriebene Abschrift.' (Ibid.).

'So oft der Griechische Text fehlerhafte Lesarten aufweist, welche der Schreiber in Folge falscher Auffassung durch das Gehör in den Text gebracht hat, ...' (Ibid., p. 463).


2 'Eine solche scharfe Sonderung zwischen dem Alter der Abfassung unserer Handschrift
ended around the middle of the second century Credner contended that the Greek
text that was the basis to Codex Bezae had its origin sometime in the second
century.¹

Credner also contended that the manuscripts that made up Codex Bezae
came from the East out of the hands of Judaeo-Christians who were closely
associated with the Catholic Church. Indeed, he believed that the contents of
Codex Bezae became their canon. He also believed that these Judaeo-Christians
considered Paul’s epistles to be directed toward Christians from paganism and,
although they recognized them as very good and useful, deemed them to be of no
use to themselves and therefore excluded them from their canon. Because the

und dem Alter des Textes, welchen sie enthält, ergiebt sich auch nothwendig, wenn die
Grundsätze aufgesucht werden, nach welchen der Griechische Text unserer Handschrift und die
Lateinische Uebersetzung derselben behandelt sind. Im Griechischen Texte zeigt sich eine
unbeschränkte Freiheit, ja Willkür der Behandlung; in der Lateinischen Uebersetzung die
ängstlichste Genauigkeit. Beides kän nicht einerlei Zeit angehören. Die Entstehung des
Griechischen Textes unserer Handschrift führt uns in eine frühere Zeit und unter Menschen,
welche Willkürliehkeiten jeder Art, Aenderungen und vermeintliche Verbesserungen bei der
Behandlung der neutestamentlichen Schriften noch für erlaubt hielten. Die Entstehung der
Lateinischen Uebersetzung verrath die eifrigste Sorge für unveränderte Erhaltung göttlicher
Schriften.’ (Ibid., pp. 465f.).

¹ ‘Veränderungen wie diese konnten in der katholischen Kirche nur bis um die Mitte des
zweiten Jahrhunderts mit dem Texte der Evangelien vorgenommen werden; denn nach dieser
Zeit hat die Behauptung eines göttlichen Ursprunges der neutestamentlichen Schriften in
derselben allgemeine Anerkennung gefunden. Dieses Dogma läßt keine solche
Behandlungsweise des Textes mehr zu, wie dieselbe mit dem Texte unserer Handschrift
vorgenommen ist. Dann würde unserer Handschrift ein Text aus dem zweiten Jahrhunderte
zum Grunde liegen.’ (Ibid., p. 491).
book of Revelation was long rejected by the Eastern Church, its absence from Codex Bezae was also seen as further proof of the codex’s eastern origin.¹

The marginalia were not written by the scribe of the text, but were added much later;² they were, he argues, in existence before Codex Bezae was written.³ That all these readings are in Greek, and associated solely with the Greek text, convinced Credner that the selections and the marginalia came into being in regions in which the Greek language and Greek liturgy dominated. However the barbarous style and expression of the Greek preclude a region where Greek was the vernacular. He suggested a region in which Greek was the language of the church, but not the mother tongue. Indeed, the guttural characteristics of the Greek and the liturgical quality of the marginalia suggest a Jewish origin.⁴

¹ ‘Wir sind folglich berechtigt die Schriften, welche unsere Cambridger Handschrift zu einem Ganzen verbunden hat, in den Händen von Judenchristen zu suchen. Nicht gerade bei den Judenchristen aller Orten, sondern vorzugsweise bei solchen, welche der katholischen Kirche sich näher angeschlossen und darum dem Canon derselben mehr genähert hatten. Solchen Judenchristen konnten die Paulinischen Briefe recht gut und verdienstlich erscheinen, ohne daß sie von ihrer Seite derselben zu bedürfen meinten. Sie meinten, Paulus, der Heidenapostel, habe seine Sendschreiben für Christen aus dem Heidenthume geschrieben, folglich betreff der Inhalt derselben nur diese, nicht aber die Christen aus dem Judenthume. …

Was endlich die Offenbarung des Johannes anbetrifft, welche in unserer Sammlung ebenfalls mangelt: so erklärt sich dieß theils daraus, daß der Aufnahme derselben in den Kanon von der morgenländischen Kirche lange widerstrebt wurde …’ (Ibid., pp. 496f.).


³ Ibid., p. 517.

⁴ ‘Da sämtliche liturgische Bemerkungen nur in Griechischer Sprache abgefaßt und nur zur Seite des Griechischen Textes enthalten sind; da ferner sowohl die bemerkten Lesestücke,
Credner goes on to say that even the Sabbath, Easter, and Whit festivals and the church consecration, which are referred to, are of Jewish origin. Moreover, there is a distinction between the Sabbath and Sunday in the marginalia - a distinction, he claims, which also points to Jewish writings, for only in these is


the Sabbath recorded as being celebrated apart from the Sunday. ¹ To corroborate this claim Credner quotes Eusebius of Caesarea: τὸ μὲν σάββατον καὶ τὴν ἀλλήν ² Ἰουδαϊκὴν ἀγωγὴν ὁμοίως ἐκείνοις παρεφύλαττον, ταῖς δὲ αὐ κυριακαῖς ἡμέραις ἦμιν τὰ παραπλήσια εἰς μνήμην τῆς σωτηρίου ἀναστάσεως ἐπετέλουν. ³ Of this he says: 'Jewish writings of this type, as were named by Eusebius, were well known to the author or authors of the marginalia in our manuscript.' ⁴ Credner also argues that marginal note: ΕΡΙΑΝΑΠΑΤΑΥ ΑΜΕΝΟΣ, which is written in the margin next to John 5:18, is a garbled reference to a Sabbath holiday. He argues that it ought to read Περὶ ἀναπαυσαμένους in accordance with a Sabbath Jewish holiday, entitled ἀνάπαυσις. He provides a number of references to prove his claim. ⁵ After going into some detail over the link between the festivals referred to in the marginalia and the Jewish festivals, Credner states:

---

¹ 'Lange zwar ist der Sabbath in der Griechischen Kirche neben dem Sonntage gefeiert worden. Aber als Ruhetag, nach altjudischer Weise, wurde der Sabbath nur von den Judenchristen neben dem Sonntage gefeiert.' (Ibid.).

² Credner (ibid.) has this word following 'Ιουδαϊκήν.


⁴ 'Judenschriften solcher Art, wie sie Eusebius bezeichnet hat, waren dem Urheber, oder den Urhebern, der Randbemerkungen in unserer Handschrift wohl bekannt.' (Ibid., p. 506).

⁵ 'S. 202. der Handschrift liest man nämlich neben den Worten Joh. 5, 18.: Οὐ μόνον έλυε τὸ σάββατον, Folgendes bemerkt:

ΕΡΙΑΝΑΠΑΤΑΥ

ΑΜΕΝΟΣ

Thus the inner as well as the outer phenomena, which our manuscript presents, i.e. the text, the style of writing, and the concise liturgical notes in the margin, lead us to conclude, therefore, that our manuscript owes its arrangement to the Judaeo-Christians, and certainly Judaeo-Christians who already had moved very close to the Catholic Church.¹

Thus the marginalia on Sabbath-breaking are seen to belong to a period when the Christian Church was breaking away from its half-Jewish state into one more Christian.

Credner’s assessment of the age of Codex Bezae was in complete contrast to Kipling’s possible second century origin,² for he believed that the codex was a product of the seventh century. He reasoned that as Euthalius was the one who introduced the stichometric structure to Acts and the Epistles (c. 480)³ Codex Bezae must have been produced later than this.⁴ However, since the Latin translation in Codex Bezae is a copy of an older manuscript that had already been divided stichometrically, Codex Bezae must have been produced at some time considerably later than Euthalius. Hence, he suggested that the lack of any

¹ ‘So führen die innern sowohl als die äußern Erscheinungen, welche unsere Handschrift darbietet, der Text, die Schreibart, die liturgischen Randbemerkungen, kurz, Alles darauf hin, daß unsere Handschrift ihre Gestaltung Judenchristen zu verdanken hat, und zwar Judenchristen, welche sich der Katholischen Kirche bereits sehr genähert hatten.’ (Ibid., pp. 507. Q.v., p. 496).
⁴ For an understanding of Euthalius’s use of στίχοι the reader is directed to Kirsopp Lake, Text, pp. 55ff.
accents, aspirants, word division, and missing punctuation marks, which were introduced into Scripture towards the end of the seventh century at the latest, places the codex earlier than these innovations. Credner cites Eichhorn as one who believed the handwriting of the codex to have a close similarity with the handwritings of the sixth century.

Unlike Kipling, Credner considered the possibility that the underlying text of Codex Bezae may have come from an area vastly separated from that in which

---

1 Credner (p. 508, n. 4) cites as his source: ‘Montfaucon: palaeogr. gr. I, 4; - III, 1,5.’


the manuscript itself was written,¹ and proceeded to address them as two distinct issues. Firstly he assessed the evidence for the original home of the text. The known links between the text of Codex Bezae and that of the Syriac Peshitta, and the manuscripts used by Thomas of Harkel in the year 615,² and manuscripts B and L, and the Eastern versions whose texts have their origin in the East, led Credner to state: ‘The text of our manuscript comes to us from those regions where the Eastern Church ruled’.³ He suggests that the liturgical marginalia indicate an association with the Greek Church. Also, the frequent agreement of the marginalia with the manuscripts K⁴ and M⁵ point to links with the East - particularly since the first originated in Cyprus and the second stands very close to it textually.⁶ The overall evidence led Credner to believe that the text of Codex Bezae arose among Jewish Christians, either in Egypt or in that general vicinity, specifically, Palestine or Cyprus.⁷

Credner rejects Kipling’s arguments that Codex Bezae had an Egyptian

---


² The date of composition of the Harklensis is known to be 616. (Metzger, Versions, pp. 63f.).

³ ‘Der Text unserer Handschrift führt uns in solche Gegenden, in welchen die morgenländische Kirche herrschte.’. (Credner, p. 512).

⁴ K⁰ 017, Codex Cyrius of the ninth century, Byzantine text of the Gospels.

⁵ M 021, Codex Cambrianus of the ninth century, Byzantine text of the Gospels.

⁶ Credner, pp. 512f.

⁷ ‘Diesen Bemerkungen zufolge muß der Text unserer Handschrift seine Gestaltung unter Judenchristen entweder in Aegypten oder in dessen Nachbarschaft erhalten haben. Im letzteren Falle werden wir auf Palästina oder auf Kypern verwiesen.’. (Ibid., p. 513).
origin. Firstly, he points out that it ‘was the custom, not only in Egypt, but in all churches in the East to celebrate the Sabbath simultaneously with Sunday as a day of festivity.’ Secondly, he reveals how selective Kipling was in the evidence presented regarding the passages in John that were to be read during the flooding of the Nile. Thirdly, Kipling’s argument that the orthographical errors in the Greek point to an Alexandrian origin is dismissed on the grounds that such errors were to be found coming from many places in which New Testament manuscripts had been written, and quite often the errors introduced by these other places were far greater than those from Alexandria. Furthermore, Credner cites a number of examples of Greek texts from writings and inscriptions, which have similar errors to those in the Codex Bezae, and which would be deemed by critics as Alexandrian, and yet come from locations well outside Egypt - such as Rome and Germany.

---


2 Ibid., p. 510.


4 Ibid., pp. 511f.
Credner’s main reason for choosing Palestine and Cyprus is the references in the margins to the festivals of Saint Dionysius the Areopagite and of Saint George. He states the former was held in high repute in the Christian East and the latter was entirely at home in Palestine and is the protecting patron of that land. Multiple inscriptions, one as early as 410, testify to the early worship of Saint George in that region. Recognising that the veneration of Saint George could well have spread to the adjoining Cyprus from Palestine, the selection finally came down to what must be considered as substantially a subjective choice, for Credner concludes: ‘however, on the grounds of this observation, the simple and more natural [conclusion] would be that the land of origin of our manuscript is to be sought in Palestine or its vicinity.’

The internal evidence led Credner to draw a number of conclusions. Firstly, he had no doubt that several divergent readings of Codex Bezae’s text are indisputably genuine and old. Secondly, the Latinisms that have crept into the Greek text suggested that the scribe, whom he considered skilled, understood more Latin than Greek. Thirdly, the coarse errors in the Greek pointed to a scribe from outside Italy; the use of several words in the Latin translation suggested a Gallican translator. Fourthly, the translation of σεβόμενοι as

---

1 ‘Zwar konnte sich die Verehrung des heil. Georg frühzeitig auch von Palästina nach dem benachbarten Kypren verbreiten; allein das Einfachere und Natürlichere möchte es doch sein, das Vaterland unserer Handschrift auf den Grund dieser Wahrnehmung in Palästina oder dessen Umgebung zu suchen.’ (Ibid., pp. 514f.).
2 ‘Manche von unserem Texte abweichende Lesarten sind unstreitig ächt und alt.’ (Ibid., p. 490).
3 e.g. Ἡρώδου, Ἡρώννου, Ἡρώννει, Σαμαριτάνων. Ibid., p. 515, n. 3.
4 e.g. κατάλυμα relectio, κυλλούς sideratos, κλέψῃ involet, διατρίβειν demorari, κολύμβηθαρα natatoria piscina, κηθεμονεῖν taediari, ἥσσει applontat, δισχυρίζετο
coelicolaë in Acts and κυλλοῖ as siderati in Matthew 15:30, and other such examples, also suggested to Credner that the translator was not entirely foreign to Judaism.¹

Credner presents two scenarios on how Codex Bezae itself came into being. In the first, he suggests that in the seventh century some person, probably a trader, left the community in which the Greek text of Codex Bezae’s exemplar existed and went to Southern Gaul. During a return visit by this person to his homeland he obtained a copy of the community’s Greek text (by then in stichometric form), while at the same time adding a Latin version. He took this version, which is now known as Codex Bezae, back with him to Southern Gaul. The second scenario has the exemplar of Codex Bezae being taken to Southern Gaul as a result of the advancing Islamic forces. While there, it is copied and a Latin text added.²

1864 - Frederick Henry Ambrose Scrivener (1813-1891)

In 1864 Scrivener published a complete copy of Codex Bezae with critical introduction, annotations, and facsimiles, entitled: Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis, Being an Exact Copy, in Ordinary Type, of the Celebrated Uncial Graeco-Latin Manuscript of the Four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, Written Early in the Sixth Century, and Presented to the University of Cambridge by Theodore Bezae, AD 1581. In the first chapter of this major work he details the manuscript’s recent history. In the second he (1) sets out his palaeographical analysis of the

certabatur. (Ibid., p. 515, n. 5).

¹ Ibid., p. 518.

² Ibid., pp. 517f.
text; (2) provides a more precise classification of the various secondary hands of
the codex than Kipling had; (3) addresses the phenomenon of the stichometry in
the Greek text, which he argues reflects that of its exemplar.1 The third and
fourth chapters contain Scrivener's analysis of the Latin and Greek texts re-
spectively. At the beginning of each of these last two chapters he declares his
objectives for each. In the third chapter he states that he seeks to prove (1) that
the Latin text is '... an independent translation made either directly from the
Greek on the opposite page; or from a text almost identical with it';2 (2) that the
scribe of the Latin text was influenced by the Old Latin version and Jerome's
revised Vulgate; (3) that the Latin text and therefore the codex itself was written
in a remote province, probably 'in Gaul about the close of the fifth century'.3
Earlier he had not only declared Gaul to be the native country of the codex, but
had also added 'nor is there any valid reason for thinking that it ever left that
country till it was carried into Italy in 1546'.4 In the fourth chapter he argues
'...that the [Greek] text of Codex Bezae, as it stands at present, is in the main
identical with one that was current both in the East and West as early as the
second century ...the third century at the latest'.5

The difference in the manner in which the text is arranged in Codex Bezae
and Scrivener's edition is simply in the supplemental leaves of the codex.
Where these are now bound in their correct places within the manuscript,
Scrivener has relegated them to an appendix (pp. 417-428).

---

1 Ibid., p. lxiv.
2 Ibid., p. xxxi.
3 Ibid., pp. xxxi, xl, lxiv.
4 Ibid., p. xxxi.
5 Ibid., pp. xiv, lxiv.
Scrivener's study of Codex Bezae led him to conclude that it originally consisted of the Four Gospels, the Catholic Epistles, and the Acts of the Apostles.\(^1\) He also analysed each of the secondary hands and although in some instances his conclusions proved seriously flawed and came under instant criticism, his work did stimulate further research. He rejected the notion that the Greek text had been Latinized, stating: 'so far from the Greek text being dependent on or derived from it, the Latin version is little better than a close and often servile rendering of the actually existing Greek'.\(^2\) Having made his stand he acknowledges that the major weakness in his argument is the 1919 occasions where the Latin is at variance with the Greek, and this is without taking account of the clerical errors in the Latin. He concludes, however, that 'the vast majority of these 1919 divergencies relate to matters so insignificant that they would be utterly overlooked except by a reader who was narrowly watching for them.'\(^3\)

The three reasons offered by Scrivener for believing that the Latin was derived directly from the adjacent Greek are: (1) 'the frequent insertion into the Latin of purely Greek words which no other known version ever employed, and for which there are adequate equivalents in Latin'\(^4\); (2) the gross and palpable violation of the rules of Latin syntax which are unique to the codex;\(^5\); (3) those

---


\(^5\) *e.g.* The Greek construction of a genitive absolute is restricted to Luke, 'and not elsewhere; as if the inexperienced translator had been trying an experiment which he saw cause to discontinue; just as οὐ εἰς κ.τ.λ. is rendered *qui autem &c.* in Matth. ii. 14 and in 53 other passages in that Gospel, but afterwards only in Acts xii. 15; *ad* (i.e. *at*) *ille, ille vero, ipse*...
many instances where the Latin has a false reading that is clearly derived from an error in some other Greek manuscript or 'some false reading of the existing Greek which could not have sprung up in the Latin, or else from a mere misapprehension of the sense of the Greek'.

Not only did Scrivener believe that the Latin text of Codex Bezae was derived from the Greek, he also considered the Greek text to be independent of the Latin text, 'at least of the Latin which stands on the opposite page in Codex Bezae'. He based his argument on the variations in the present Latin, which are not found in the Greek, and which he believes could have arisen only in the Latin.

Scrivener also argues that the very nature of the manuscript, namely, Greek Scriptures furnished with a Latin version, suggests that it 'would most likely be written among a people with whom Latin was vernacular'. This, coupled with the order of the Gospels, which is peculiar to the West, Latin letters in the Greek text, and, as he states, 'those unmistakable [sic] Latin forms and

\textit{vero (Acts xii. 16) being used instead.'} (\textit{Ibid.}).

\footnote{\textit{e.g. 'Matth. xxii. 40 νομος νερβυμ (the scribe misread λογος); ibid. xxvi. 6 του την γενομενου ihu facto ...'. (Ibid., p. xxxiii).}}

\footnote{Examples of this kind might be adduced from \textit{d} without limit, but a few of real moment are as good as a thousand. Such are John xii. 43 ηγαπησαν \textit{dixerunt} (i.e. \textit{dilexerunt}, cf. xiii. 23; 34); \textit{ibid.} xiv. 26 οποιμησει \textit{commouebit} (i.e. \textit{commonebit}) ...'. (\textit{Ibid.}, p. xxxiv).}

\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}, pp. xxx.}

\footnote{\textit{Ibid.}}

Parker (\textit{Bezae}, pp. 116ff.) gives a comprehensive list of Greek and versional manuscripts and a few writers who bear testimony to the order of the Gospels in Codex Bezae.
terminations brought into the text by the analogy of the Latin; such as θηνσαυρος Matth. ii. 11; xiii. 44 ....'¹

Scrivener considered it quite plausible to have Eastern type lectionary notes in what is regarded as a Western document. He believed them to be a carry-over from the intercourse between Gaul and Asia, which was started by Pothinus and his missionaries about 170 CE. He even argues that the liturgical notes themselves point to a Western origin:

the very orthography of these notices savours of a Celtic origin ...; and the only three Saints' Days whose proper lessons are marked are just such as would be specially regarded in the West at their respective dates, viz. the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin (Aug. 15) by a hand of the tenth century (M₂, Fol. 229 b), the Festivals of S. George and S. Dionysius the Areopagite, the patron saints of England and France, inserted as late as the twelfth (by O, Foll. 462 b; 488 b). Thus all outward appearances point to Gaul as the native country of Codex Bezae.²

Scrivener refutes Kipling's argument for an Egyptian origin for Codex Bezae and found it difficult to believe that 'an excellent scholar like David Schulz should have so lightly acquiesced in Kipling's belief that Cod. Bezae was written in Egypt'.³ In the main Scrivener uses Credner's argument, but also mentions that when Cassian refers to the keeping of Saturday he describes the activity as quite general, thus it cannot be seen as peculiar to Egypt. Instead of

---

¹ Scrivener, Bezae, p. xxx.
² Ibid., p. xxxi.
³ Ibid., p. xxix.
Egypt Scrivener opts for a Western origin, suggesting Gaul.\(^1\)

As to the exemplar of Codex Bezae, Scrivener's analysis of the 234 erasures in the text led him to conclude:

Codex Bezae, as well the Latin as the Greek pages, was copied from an older model similarly divided in respect to the lines or verses. ... [and ] that the pages in Codex Bezae and its exemplar could not have been identical.\(^2\)

Unlike Kipling, Scrivener believed that all the supplementary leaves were written in the tenth century by the same Latin hand.\(^3\) He also compared Codex Bezae with Codex Sinaiticus (♀ 01), and came to the conclusion that the itacisms in Codex Bezae were fewer than in Codex Sinaiticus and a few other manuscripts, and that 'the errors of transcription, especially in the Greek, are not by any means so numerous'.\(^4\)

Credner's argument for a seventh century origin, on the grounds that Euthalius was the one who began the practice of writing the Scriptures in sense-lines,\(^5\) is completely negated by Scrivener who pointed out that this division had been applied to the Scriptures long before Euthalius, as testified in the writings of Athanasius (†373), Gregory of Nyssa (†394)\(^6\), Epiphanius (†403), and

---

\(^1\) Ibid., p xxxf., xi, lxiv.

\(^2\) Ibid., p. xxiii, xviif.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. xxi.

\(^4\) Ibid., p. xlvi.

\(^5\) Credner, p. 516.

\(^6\) Scrivener (Bezae, p. xvii) actually has 396. The Nestle-Aland\(^27\) (p. 75) has 394. The
Chrysostom (†407), all of whom refer to Psalms as being divided into sense-lines (στίχοι), while Jerome (†c. 420) bears witness to the same for the book of Isaiah.¹

Scrivener’s edition of Codex Bezae, being much more accurate than Kipling’s, is a high point in the history of the codex. Even today, it is a standard work for anyone studying the text. Although the information contained in the Introduction is dated and suffers for want of an index, tabulation of data, and a bibliography, it contains a mine of information, which, if nothing else, has benefited and will continue to benefit, anyone researching the codex and its text.²

1868 - Thomas Hartwell Horne (1780-1862)

The Rev. Horne’s publication, An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament; with Analyses, etc., of the Respective Books, and a Bibliographical List of Editions of the Scriptures in the Original Texts and the

Webster’s New Biographical Dictionary has c. 394.

¹ Scrivener, Bezae, p. xvii.

² It is interesting to note that of all the authors to whom Parker refers (Bezae, pp. 347ff.) Scrivener is mentioned the most, viz Scrivener is referred to on 56 pages; Lowe, 42; Harris, 22; Tischendorf 20; and Clark, 17, etc. Nevertheless working from Scrivener’s introductory notes is most difficult and must be a source of frustration for any scholar who needs to know the material in depth. F. E. Brightman (p. 446) was one who was to comment later upon this aspect of Scrivener’s notes by saying in reference to his material on lectionaries: ‘Dr. Scrivener scarcely does justice to his position in the form in which he has put his notes. If he had tabulated them clearly, it would have been more obvious that the lessons indicated are the Byzantine series ....’.
Ancient Version, was, according to the face sheet, a revised work, for this states: The Critical part Re-written and the Remainder Revised and Edited by Samuel Prideaux Tregelles (1813-1875).

In this publication the theory of Latinization of the Bezan text is rejected. Indeed the Latin text is recognized as having been altered, in part, to agree with the Greek, Horne’s exact words being:

... the charge of its [the Greek text] being adapted to the accompanying Latin is one which cannot be substantiated to any general degree, even if there be points of difficulty uncleared up; for the Latin text is as peculiar as the Greek, and very frequently the Latin text has been made to suit the Greek without any regard for Grammar or perspicuity.¹

Horne² rejected Kipling’s argument for a second century genesis for Codex Bezae, but because he considered the current data on the codex insufficient to make a reliable conclusion he adopted instead the generally accepted sixth century origin. He also argued that the scribe was not the originator of the text, but that:

... the interpolations had probably been introduced into some still older copy from the margin, in which they had been previously written. There they may have been subjoined by some who wished to add whatever they could obtain, to

¹ Horne, p. 170.
² Assuming Tregelles would have maintained Horne’s opinions in his re-write, the opinions expressed here will be considered to be that of Horne.
make the narrative more full and complete.¹

That these interpolations had their origin as marginalia was first suggested by Matthaei and supported by Middleton.² However, where Matthaei and Middleton had argued for a single event Horne, on the basis of their presence in the margin of other documents, e.g. the margin of the Harkensis, reasoned that their ‘accretion must have been more gradual’.³

1881 - B. F. Westcott (1825-1901) and F. J. A. Hort (1828-1892)⁴

In 1881, Westcott and Hort published their New Testament in the Original Greek. Although written by Hort, no doubt the Introduction expresses the opinion of both scholars. It was their opinion that the scholarly world had rejected the Western Text and therefore its main witness, Codex Bezae, owing partly to the theory of Latinization. In Hort’s own words:

This all but universal rejection is doubtless partly owing to the persistent influence of a whimsical theory of the last century, which ignoring all Non-Latin Western documentary evidence except the handful of extant bilingual uncialis, maintained that the Western Greek text owed its peculiarities to translation from the Latin; partly to an imperfect apprehension of the antiquity and extension of the Western text as revealed by patristic quotations and by versions.⁵

¹ Ibid., pp. 172f.
² Vide supra: pp. 50f.
³ Ibid.
⁴ Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort.
⁵ Westcott and Hort, p. 120.
Hort held tenaciously to this opinion throughout his life. Even after studying Harris’s work on the subject, which was published a year before his death, the most he was willing to concede to the theory was its existence in such cases as the Latinized forms *leprosus* and *Samaritanus*.¹

Not only was the theory of Latinization of the Western text rejected by Westcott and Hort, but they also held that the Latin text had been ‘altered throughout into verbal conformity with the Greek text by the side of which it was intended to stand’.² They acknowledged that the Western text was the most widely distributed text and at least dominant in most churches of both East and West of Ante-Nicene times and that the earliest readings then known belonged to it.³ They also suggested that the Western text had come into existence either in North-western Syria or Asia Minor.⁴ As for Codex Bezæ itself, they state:

> Though the MS was written in Cent. VI, the text gives no clear signs of having undergone recent degeneracy: it is, to the best of our belief, substantially a Western text of Cent. II, with occasional readings probably due to Cent. IV. Much more numerous are readings belonging to a very early stage of the Western text, free as yet from corruptions ...⁵

Yet despite these acknowledged attributes of the Western text and Codex Bezæ...

---

¹ J. Rendel Harris, *BBC* 3 (1926) 1-9, 4. This insight is a quote by Harris from Hort’s Biography.

² Westcott and Hort, p. 82.


Bezae, they still rejected Western readings on the grounds of internal evidence, which in truth was anything but an objective choice.\(^1\) They argued that the Western text, having been subjected to free handling, was ‘a corruption of the apostolic texts’. These corruptions came in the form of paraphrase, alterations, additions, and errors introduced, deliberately and unintentionally, by scribes in the process of copying.\(^2\) Nevertheless their adherence to the canon *brevior lectio potior*\(^3\) encouraged them to accept a number of passages contained in D and its allies against the vast majority of witnesses, including their much esteemed B and 8. These readings were valued because of their omissions or as Westcott and Hort called them ‘Western non-interpolations’, all of which, apart from Matthew 27:49, are contained at the end of Luke’s Gospel, *viz* Luke 22:19b-20; 24:3, 6, 12, 36, 40, 51, and 52.\(^4\) Accepting the omissions in the Western text as genuine left them no alternative but to conclude that the Non-Western texts had suffered interpolation in these passages.

Westcott and Hort’s branding of the Western text as secondary to Griesbach’s Alexandrian text perpetuated its non-acceptance as an original text.

1891 - James Rendel Harris (1852-1941), (1) *Codex Bezae*

J. Rendel Harris’s philological study of Codex Bezae brought the theory of

---

1. Despite an elaborate methodology in sorting texts etc., the final choice as to which of the texts was the better ultimately came down to a very subjective choice.


Latinization to a climax. Although his study of the Bezan text was bold in its
endeavours, detailed in its execution, and stimulating by its existence, it
unfortunately was flawed in its conclusions. From the outset Harris doomed his
enterprise to failure by singling out only those passages that gave credibility to
his argument. The study itself was centred upon the Bezan text and was
primarily aimed at resolving the mysteries of the Western text of which Codex
Bezae was the main representative. As Harris explains in his introductory notes:

The object of this tract is to supply the workers with some fresh suggestions
as to the handling of the central problem of the criticism of the New Testament,
viz. the origin and meaning of the so-called Western text.¹

Nevertheless, his arguments are fundamental to his belief that Codex Bezae
had its origin in Southern Gaul. He also makes a number of observations that
have a bearing on the early history of the manuscript.

Harris joined the ranks of a number of previous scholars of note, namely,
Erasmus², Mill, Bengel, Wetstein, Matthaei, Middleton, and Tischendorf, all of

¹ Harris, Bezae, p. 2.
² Wetstein (p. 33) refers to a letter written by J. G. Sepulvedas to Erasmus in which he
reveals Erasmus’s views on this matter, for he states: ‘As for the Pontifical MS. (he means the
Codex Vaticanus, which we discussed before) , we should have no doubt at all, as you yourself
write, that the Greek codices of the New Testament have been corrupted by the malice or
incompetence of certain Greeks, because, when the Greeks returned to their senses and reached
an agreement with the Roman church, it was laid down that the Greek manuscripts were to be
emended to agree with the Roman reading.’ Quod pertinet, inquit, ad librum Pontificium,
(Codicer Vaticanum intelligit, de quo egimus supra p. 23.) Graecos codices Novi
whom had also argued that the Bezan Greek text had been Latinized. Indeed, as far as he was concerned, 'the whole of the Greek text of Codex Bezae from the beginning of Matthew to the end of Acts is a re-adjustment of an earlier text to the Latin version.'

Indeed, Codex Bezae is to be considered not as a collection of blunders, but rather as 'a valuable storehouse of transitional forms in the language at a time when many changes were going on.' To avoid taking up space on a hypothesis that has been thoroughly discredited, his arguments will not be discussed here. He did look, however, at the theological tendencies, and the word order of the Greek and Latin texts of Codex Bezae, and its place of origin. These investigations in turn stimulated further research in these areas.

---

Testamenti, Graecorum quorundam vel malitiae vel levitatis, fuisse depravatos, id ipsum, quod scribis, fides esse debet indubitata, quod Graecorum ad sanitatem redeuntium fœderea inquit Ecclesia Romana cautum suerit, ut Graeci Codices ad Romanam Lectionem emendarentur.

1 Harris, Bezae, p. 41.

Harris (Bezae, pp. 62-93) argued that Latinization had taken place in a number of ways, e.g. 1.) the inclusion of Latin verse into the Latin text which was then incorporated into the Greek, (pp. 47-52). 2.) The Greek column, had been adjusted to the Latin in order to maintain 'numerical verbal equality' (pp. 53-61, 63-65). 3.) Confusion due to: betacism (confusion between b and v); sunt and sum, which has lead to the use of ειμί instead of εστίν; the differences in gender; and numerous other similar errors.

Only three years after this publication Harris (BBC, VIII (1930) 4-7, 5.) was to write '... my critics were probably right in saying that I had exaggerated the sphere of Latin influence, '. However thirty-six years after saying this he was to speak of a revival of the theory: 'it [the Latinization theory] raised a hailstorm about my head when I first ventured to revive the ancient heresy of Latinization, but there are not many hailstones left in that corner of the world'.

2 Harris, Bezae, p. 21.
Harris agreed with what appears to be the widely held view of his day, *viz* that Codex Bezae had been written in Gaul, by a Gallic scribe\(^1\) of the sixth century,\(^2\) not far from Lyons or Clermont.\(^3\) His acceptance of this view was based, among other things, upon the French and late Vulgate forms found in the Bezan text.\(^4\) He also suggested that the correlation of a series of *Sortes Sanctorum*, written in short sentences, in Greek, in a tenth-century hand, and found in the lower margins of the Gospel of Mark in Codex Bezae, with that of the Latin system in the Saint Germain Latin Codex Sangermanensis (g\(^1\)) of the ninth century,\(^5\) indicates that the codex was still in France in the tenth century.\(^6\) He also contended that the liturgical notes, which he believed refer to the old Gallican lesson for Palm-Sunday, and which were from hands of the ninth century (designated by Scrivener, as Hands L and J), point to its presence in France at this time.\(^7\) Harris also put forward the view that the Bezan text was of the second century, having its origin in the Latin text, as could be witnessed in the writings of the translator of Irenaeus.\(^8\) This was in stark contrast to Scrivener, who had suggested that the Latin text was of the fifth century,\(^9\)

Although Harris rejected the idea that Codex Bezae was an Italian

---


\(^4\) *Ibid.*, chapters IV and V.

\(^5\) A French manuscript of the ninth century.

\(^6\) Harris, *Bezae*, pp. 7-11.


\(^8\) Harris, *Bezae*, pp. 51, 162, 164, 191, 225.

production,\(^1\) he believed that the interchange in a final \(m\) and \(nt\) in some Latin words\(^2\) suggested that the *text* had been in Italy before arriving in France.\(^3\)

As for the history of the Bezan text, Harris describes it as ‘a Carthaginian text which has been glossed by (mainly) Carthaginian hands’.\(^4\) This modified text was used in Rome where it was corrupted by the addition of glosses by a Latin Montanist sometime in the period CE. 160-170.\(^5\) Finally, in the bilingual manuscript the text of the Greek was freely corrected to conform to the Latin.

In rejecting the concept of Syriacization, Harris states:

> the hypothesis of Latinization is shewn conclusively to be the right one for the explanation of the text, since so many readings of \(D\) are unsupported in Greek, while almost all are followed by the Latin.\(^6\)

In agreement with Scrivener,\(^7\) Harris argues that a primitive colometry underlies that of Codex Bezae and by taking a random sample (in this case Mark

---

2. *e.g.* *Barnabam* for *Barnabam* (Acts 11:22), *eu\(n\)t* for *eu\(m\)n* (Acts 12:16), and possibly *s\(i\)nt* for *s\(i\)m* (Acts 13:47).
10:35-38) from both codices Bezae and Bobiensis¹ (κ) he demonstrates the close correlation between the two. In comparing the two he states: ‘Notice that the interpunction of κ not only agrees closely with the D lines, but that where κ has dropped portions of the text, it is whole lines of D that are missing.’² He also ‘strongly’ suspected that the same colometry underlies the Curetonian Syriac,³ and that the abbreviations used in the Codex Bezae are of a very ancient form.⁴

Harris’s claims for Latinization of the Greek text of Codex Bezae came under immediate and severe criticism and in the end were totally discredited. Even Harris was to admit later that his thesis was fundamentally flawed, causing him to shift his attention to Italy for the genesis of Codex Bezae. Nevertheless, his labours were not totally unproductive, for they stimulated a great deal of research. Indeed, the next decade was to see an increased interest in Codex Bezae.

1894 - Sir William Mitchell Ramsay (1851-1939)

Ramsay’s years of first hand experience of Anatolia and its archaeological sites enabled him to provide some valuable insights into the Bezan text of Acts. The detail of events contained in the additional material regarding Asia Minor, suggested to Ramsay that some of these may give the original text. He argues that they at least indicate that their author was intimate with his subject.⁵

¹ Spelled ‘Bobiensis’ by Parker (Bezae, pp. 13, 262, 322) and Metzger (Text, p. 73).
² Harris, Bezae, p. 243.
³ Ibid.
⁴ Ibid., p. 250.
⁵ Ramsay, Church, pp. 151-156.
Conversely, the incorrect information in the additional material regarding Europe demonstrates an ignorance of that region.\(^1\) He reasoned, therefore, that Codex Bezae was founded on a revision made in Asia Minor.

Two years on, in a later publication, he was no more decided than before as to the originality of the Bezan text. He was, however, far more specific as to the home of the revision, for he states:

\[
\text{I believe that the Bezan Reviser made many skilful changes in passages relating to Asia Minor and some foolish changes in European passages. In some}
\]

Although Ramsay (p. 167, n) came to this conclusion independently he acknowledges Bishop Lightfoot (Joseph Barber Lightfoot, 1828-1889) as the person who first made this observation.

The verses he refers to in this instance are Acts 16:9f.; 18:24; 19:9, 14, 28, 35; 20:4-6, 15; 21:1.

With regard to 16:9f., Ramsay (p. 151) says of the Bezan text: 'The scene is described with a vividness and completeness of detail that almost incline us to think that Codex Bezae gives here the original text. But perhaps the reading of this Codex may be best explained as an alteration founded on a tradition still surviving in the churches of Asia, ....

\(^1\) Ramsay, Church, pp. 156-162.

The most striking example is that of Acts 16:12 of which he states (p. 156): 'according to the received text, Philippi is the "first (i.e. leading) city of its division of Macedonia, a colonia"; but in Codex Bezae it is "the head of Macedonia, a city, a colonia," (ἡτὶς ἐστὶν κεφαλὴ τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλις, κολωνία) ... The term "first" was commonly assumed by towns which were, or claimed to be, chief of a district or a province; and Philippi either boasted, or was believed by the reviser to boast, of this distinction; but he is wrong in assigning to it the pre-eminence over the whole of Macedonia. Philippi was merely first in one of the districts into which Roman Macedonia was divided, but not of the whole province.'
of these cases, the view remains open that the Bezan reading is the original; but evidence is as yet not sufficient to give certainty. The home of the Revision is along the line of intercourse between Syrian Antioch and Ephesus, for the life of the early Church lay in intercommunication, but the Reviser was connected with Antioch, for he inserts we in XI 28.1

Ramsay reasoned that since the first century forms and facts were changed to conform to second century details, the reviser was of the second century. He also concluded that since the text had been handled so freely the reviser was a person of some position and authority.2 He also suggested that some of the changes arose through a gradual process and not through the action of an individual reviser.3

1894 - Friedrich Blass (1843-1907)

The idea of a bifurcation of Luke's work, suggested over two hundred years earlier by Jean Leclerc, was fully developed by the eminent German Professor of Classical Literature, Friedrich Blass. However, where Leclerc finally rejected the hypothesis, Michælis, who had initially suggested that the Bezan text came about through Syriacization, finally abandoned the idea in favour of the bifurcation theory.4 Blass reintroduced it, but this time with renewed vigour,

---

1 Ramsay, *Paul*, p. 27.
2 Ramsay, *Church*, pp. 161, 163f.
3 Ramsay, *Church*, pp. 162f.

Harris (*Lectures*, p. 15) states that the bifurcation theory had been the accepted theory since
developing it in far greater detail than any of his predecessors.

Blass not only rejected Bornemann’s theory that Codex Bezae was Luke’s sole creation,¹ he also rejected the hypothesis that Codex Bezae had been derived from what is generally accepted as Luke’s sole work, the common text.² Basing his argument on the belief that it was the custom of people who rewrote their work to produce a shortened version, Blass argued that Luke’s original and longer work, which he designated β, was rewritten to produce a second and shorter work (α).³ Blass accepted Corssen’s argument that the Bezan text was not the original β text in its purity, but rather a text that has suffered from Michaelis’s day.

Semler is said by Blass (Philology, p. 99) to have referred to Hemsterhusius as another who was of a similar opinion. J. D. Lightfoot (On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament, London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1871, p. 29) is another who gave approval to the idea.


² ‘Es war auch in der That gänzlich aussichtslos und unmöglich, mit Bornemann den gewöhnlichen Text aus Entstellung des in D überliefernten erklären zu wollen; freilich auch das Umgekehrte ist meines Bedenkens unmöglich, wenn es auch den meisten anders scheint. Denn das ist jetzt die übliche Meinung,. . . .’ (Blass, Textüberlieferung, p. 87; Philology, pp. 105f.).

³ ‘Nicht nur weil in der Welt kein denkbares Motiv für irgend jemanden war, ohne materielle Änderung lediglich einen völlig klaren Ausdruck zu verbreitern, sondern auch weil umgekehrt ein Motiv für die Abkürzung bei einer unwichtigen Begebenheit vollkommen denkbar und sehr naheliegend ist .... Das aber wissen wir alle, daß, wenn jemand sein Eigenes abschreibt, er dies nicht ohne Änderungen und namentlich auch nicht ohne Abkürzungen thut.’ (Blass, Textüberlieferung, p. 89).
frequent mixture and conflation with the common text, \( \alpha \). In a later publication he states: ‘In many instances the actual reading in \( D \) is an impossible mixture of two texts, the correction having been but partly made, or partly transcribed.’

---


‘... in den erhaltenen Teilen D nicht alle Zusätze von \( \beta \) hat, sondern zuweilen der Fassung \( \alpha \) folgt.’ Then, in a footnote reference, Blass states: ‘Dies wird bereits nachgewiesen in dem sehr schätzbaren Programm von P. Corssen, Der Cyprianische Text ....’ (Blass, *Textüberlieferung*, p. 90; Philology, pp. 107ff.).


In another publication Blass (Acts, pp. xixf.) says of Codex Bezae: *Et graeca (D) et latina pars (d) στιχηθῶν scriptae sunt, non tamen ut accurate ea divisio semper sensus divisionibus respondeat. Neque graeca et latina semper inter se consentiunt: quod minus mirum crit, si reputaveris codicem a multis manibus (quas diligenter distinxit editor optime meritus Frid. Scrivener) esse correctum, verisimileque esse, eandem faciem etiam archetypi unde descriptus situisse. Correctores autem recentiores - nam antiquissimi aliquatenus fide digni videntur - id fere egerunt, ut passim lectionibus formae \( \beta \) alteras substituerent, verum non ratione aliqua constanti usi, sed hic illic, sicut fors ferebat, unde magna pars illarum lectionum omnino intacta evasit. Simili ratione si archetypum codicis vel archetypa correcta fuisse putabimus, habebimus rationem cur in \( D \) tantum contaminationis inter utramque formam reperiatur, saepe ut ne sensus quidem ullus constet. Neque enim aliter se res habet in multis codicibus versionis latinae, estque ibi dudum observata et notata. Itaque talibus locis ceteri testes adhibendi sunt, unde saepe et lectio \( \beta \) integra et ratio confusionis eius quae in \( D \) est luculenter apparat. [The Greek \( D \) part and the Latin part \( d \) are written in στιχηθῶν, but the division does not always correspond carefully to the division of the sense, nor the Greek and Latin texts always agree between themselves, which will be less remarkable if you consider that the manuscript has been corrected by many hands, which the
Nevertheless, he believed that the Western expansions in Acts could not be considered as the act of an interpolator, or without information that adds to the reader's knowledge. He expresses agreement with Ramsay, who saw the additional information contained within the codex as examples of the writer's intimate knowledge of his subject, but goes beyond Ramsay when he argues that this is testimony to their originality. He gives as examples such passages as Acts 10:24, προσεγγίζοντος δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου εἰς τὴν Καισαρίαν προδραμών εἰς τῶν δούλων διεσάφησαν παραγεγονότα, αὐτῶν; 12:10, κατέβησαν τοὺς ζ βαθμοὺς; 19:9, τινὸς ἀπὸ ἀρχαῖς ἐ ε ἑκάτης; and the additional we passage, viz 11:27, συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 119-137.}

Blass, or his student Ernst Lippelt, appears to be the first to suggest that the present order of the Gospels in Codex Bezae was not that of its exemplar. Blass first presented Lippelt’s data in his edition of Luke’s Gospel (p. viff.), but raised excellent editor Frederick Scrivener has carefully distinguished and that it is probable that the archetype from which it was copied presented a similar appearance. The more recent correctors (for the ancient ones seem to some degree worthy of trust) have principally achieved this, that they have substituted other readings for readings of the form β, but they have not done this on any consistent scheme, but only here and there as chance dictated and consequently a great part of those readings has remained intact. If we think that the archetype or the archetypes of the codex were corrected in a similar manner we shall have a reason why in capital D so much contamination between the two forms is found so that some times no sense can be got out of the text. We find a similar situation in many manuscripts of the Latin version and this has long since been observed and noted. So the other witnesses are to be consulted in such places from which often the true reading of β and the cause of the confusion which we find in D is plainly visible.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 119-137.}

the matter again in his *Philology of the Gospels*. The basis of the argument is that, in the great majority of cases, in Matthew, John, and Mark, by far the preferred spelling is ܐܘܚܢܢ; whereas in Luke and Acts ܠܘܚܢܢ is preferred. From this evidence, Blass made two suggestions: (1) that the order of the Gospels in Codex Bezae’s archetype was different to Codex Bezae itself in that it placed Luke’s Gospel after the other three; (2) his second and preferred suggestion was that Luke and Acts were copied from an archetype different from that of the other gospels. This matter was to be investigated more closely by J. Chapman in 1905 and later again by Parker who was to repeat Chapman’s work.

By analysing Acts, its variants, its words, language, and style, Blass was able to demonstrate a strong correlation between these and the writings of Luke. Although Bernhard Weiss was to criticise Blass’s work severely, the differences in opinion were mainly due to subjective interpretation, consequently Blass was

---

1 Blass, *Philology*, pp. 76f.


Parker (*Bezae*, p. 109) was to say of this second suggestion: ‘The final suggestion is scarcely tenable. Had Blass gone on to compare the practice of the Greek and Latin columns, he would not have made it. ... The idea that the bilingual Luke-Acts is derived from a single scribe is not acceptable, since Acts has a peculiarity not shared by Luke. Whereas in Luke the single v/n form is found in both columns, in Acts the Greek has the single and the Latin the double liquid.’


4 Although the salient points of his argument are discussed in the two works cited, for greater detail the reader is referred to his: *Acta Apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter. Editio Philologica*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupr., 1895.

5 Bernhard Weiss, *Der Codex D in der Apostelgeschichte. Textkritische Untersuchung*, TU 17.1, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897.
not moved to change his stand.\(^1\) One of the few points on which Blass and Weiss agreed was the belief that the exemplar of Codex Bezae had several superscript readings. Blass refers to Acts 18:19 to illustrate his argument that superscript notes resulted in confused readings, since they were not understood, or not attended to, by those who subsequently copied the manuscript out.\(^2\)

Initially Blass had limited his bifurcation hypothesis strictly to Acts, but later he included the Gospel of Luke as well. Because Blass’s theory continues to find support, the more detailed version of his theory, which comes from a later publication, is given in full, as follows:

So there is nothing too modern attributed to the evangelist, but only a thing common in all ages in which writing has been practised, and literary works produced. One copy of the Gospel was that sent to Theophilus [who was considered to have lived in the East]; but when Luke afterwards came to Rome, he would of course be requested by the Roman Christians, who heard of his having written a Gospel, to give them, too, a copy of it, and he would write out that copy in the course of perhaps a month and give it them. That fresh copy would not exactly agree with the former, for the writer was entirely at liberty to shorten where he liked, or to insert what he thought suitable for these new readers, or to make improvements in style, or what else he chose to do; and he would naturally desire to do something of that kind, as we usually do, when we write the same essay a second time. Likewise the Acts, which were written in Rome, would be given to the

\(^1\) Blass, *Philology*, pp. 121ff.

\(^2\) ... *notis fortasse additis, quae a descriptibus vel non intellectae vel non curatae sunt; inde utrumque lectionem contaminaverunt*. (Blass, *Acts*, p. 26).

Romans first in one copy, and afterwards sent or brought to Theophilus in another different copy.¹

Although the bifurcation theory gained the support of a number of prominent scholars, post Blass, such as Eberhard Nestle, Theodor Zahn, James M. Wilson, A. J. Wensinck, M. Wilcox, M. -É. Boismard, and A. Lamouille, and É. Delebecque,² there were equally eminent scholars who opposed it: B. F.

¹ Ibid., pp. 100f.


Boismard’s and Lamouille’s publication is the most significant work to offer a
systematic interpretation of the textual history of Acts since Albert C. Clark's, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1933. Their approach to studying the text was novel in that they undertook a stylistic analysis of the Western text in the whole of Acts, which resulted in a renewal of support for Blass's bifurcation theory, but with slight modification, as follows: 'Luc aurait écrit une première rédaction des Actes dont nous trouvons un écho dans le texte Occidental; il aurait, un certain nombre d'années plus tard, profondément remanié son œuvre primitive, non seulement du point de vue stylistique, comme le voulait Blass, mais encore du point de vue du contenu. Ces deux rédactions auraient été ensuite fusionnées en une seule pour donner le texte actuel des Actes, plus exactement le texte Alexandrin (sous une forme plus pure que celle que nous avons maintenant).’ - [Luke wrote a first redaction of Acts, of which we find an echo in the Western text; a certain number of years later he would have radically altered his initial work, not only from the stylistic point of view, as Blass had it, but also from the point of view of its content; that these two redactions were fused into one to give the present text of Acts, or more precisely, the Alexandrian text (in a purer form than that which we now have]. (M.-É. Boismard, & A. Lamouille, *op. cit.*, p. 9).

The original Western text ('texte Occidental' = TO), suffered bifurcation to produce a relatively pure stream of tradition (TO₁) and a degraded form (TO₂). They argue that Dₑᵃ, syrᵇmg, and cop¹⁶⁷ are part of the TO₂ family, and that the Greek text of E₈ (0₈, Codex Laudianus), and the text of the Old Latin manuscript h had as their foundation TO₁. (*Ibid.*, pp. 111-118).

Barbara Aland ('Entstehung, Charakter und Herkunft des sog. westlichen Textes untersucht an der Apostelgeschichte', *ETL* 62 (1986) 5-65, 6f. 22ff., 31-36) attacked Boismard's and Lamouille's methodology and their conclusions. She argues for a continuation of the *status quo*, *i.e.* that the Western text had a post-Lucan origin. The groupings of readings are believed to disclose a Western *Hauptredaktion* from which *D* type texts have arisen.
Knox, James Hardy Ropes, Albert C. Clark, D. Plooj, A. M. Coleman, Frederic Kenyon, C. S. C. Williams, Ernst Haenchen.¹

1894 - J. Rendel Harris, (2) Four Lectures

In 1894 J. Rendel Harris published four lectures, which he had previously delivered at the Divinity School of Cambridge over the years 1892 -1894. These lectures focus upon what he refers to as the ‘problem of problems, the

¹ Westcott & Hort, 1881, p. 177.
Corssen, Acta, 1896, p. 426. This article by Corssen is devoted wholly to refuting Blass’s hypothesis.
Page concentrates his attack upon two verses which Blass had put forward as leading proofs that Luke was the author of the Western text, viz 1:5 and 21:16.
Ropes, pp. ccxxvii-ccxxxi, ccxlvii; BBC 8 (1930) 15.
A. M. Coleman, ‘A Note by Mr. Coleman’, BBC 9 (1931) 11.
interpretation of the Western text of the New Testament.\textsuperscript{1} Although the subject is outside the range of this thesis, the statements made regarding Codex Bezae are noteworthy.

In his transcript of the lecture of 19 November 1892\textsuperscript{2} Harris challenges Credner’s belief that the Judaeo-Christian liturgical marginalia point to a Judaeo-Christian origin. He argues that these, in fact, have nothing to do with Jews and rejects Credner’s interpretation of them. The early date ascribed by Credner to the liturgical notes is also rejected by Harris.\textsuperscript{3} To prove his claim Harris appeals to the palaeographical evidence and refers to Scrivener’s study, to demonstrate that: ‘None of these annotations are as early as the ninth century, and some of them are as late as the twelfth.’\textsuperscript{4} For these reasons Harris contends that Credner’s case for a very early Judaeo-Christian existence before its transfer to

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} Harris, \textit{Lectures}, p. vii.
\item \textsuperscript{2} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 1.
\item Harris (\textit{ibid.}, pp. 6f.) believes that the early date given to the lectionary notes arose through Credner using Kipling’s edition, which has the liturgical notes contained within the margin in the same type as the text itself. He also argues that the error was further compounded when Credner missed Kipling’s statement that the liturgical notes were not contemporary with the text. However, Credner (p. 497) clearly states: ‘Die Hand, welche dieselben hinzusetzte [liturgischen Randbemerkungen], ist verschieden von der, welche den eigentlichen Text schrieb.’ [The hand that added these [liturgical notes] is different from that which wrote the actual text].
\item \textsuperscript{4} Harris, \textit{Lectures}, p. 8.
\item Scrivener, \textit{Bezae}, p. xxvii.
\end{itemize}
Gaul is effectively undermined because of the later date of the liturgical notes.¹

Harris also rejects Credner’s argument that the sense-lines were incorporated into the text around 500 CE. He points out that there is no proof that Codex Bezae contains Euthalius’s system and that as far as the Gospels are concerned, the line divisions go back long before Euthalius, possibly into the second century.²

Credner’s dictation theory was also analysed by Harris and proved wanting. He looked at four of the ten readings, which Credner had proffered as proof that the document was copied by a scribe writing from dictation, and found that these errors were not so much from an aberration of the ear but were copyist errors, such as parablepsis and assimilation to the context, which normally occur when reading from the text itself.³ The only reading Harris was willing to accept as possibly arising from dictation was that of John 14:21 where ἡμφανίσω had been read as ἐνφανίσω, but even this may be explained as resulting from confusion in the mind.

¹ Harris, Lectures, p. 7.

² Ibid., p. 11.

³ Harris (Lectures, p. 11) goes on to say: ‘The only instance which Credner gives that has any verisimilitude is John xiv. 21, where ἡμφανίσω has been read as ἐνφανίσω. But the human mind is quite capable of such confusions, without the introduction of a dictator.’ Ibid., pp. 11f.

There is an error in Harris’s references to Credner, for he has Luke xvi. 26 when it should read Luke xiv. 26; Acts vi. 5, 4, should read Acts v. 4.
1894 - A. S. Wilkins (1843-1905)

Also published in 1894 was A. S. Wilkin’s critique of Harris’s *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis*. In his survey of the historical data Wilkins looked at Scrivener’s argument regarding the origin of the Bezan texts and their supposed influence of one upon the other, and concluded that Scrivener does not prove that the Latin text was derived from the Greek text of the codex.¹ He states ‘there is nothing to show that the misreading of the Greek was a result of translating from D rather than at any earlier stage.’² He then argues to the contrary by citing Matt. 11:3 and Luke 2:14 (and later, Acts 19:29 - p. 414), as examples of where, the Latin text has the correct reading against the Greek. This he claims, proves ‘to a certainty’ that the Latin text was not derived from the Greek of the Codex. Wilkins concludes his assessment of Scrivener’s argument by expressing his own thoughts on the matter:

... there has been no systematic attempt to assimilate either Δ [D] or D [d] to the other; there are in both corruptions which must have been subsequent to any such attempt, if it was ever made.³

---

¹ In defence of Scrivener it must be brought to the reader’s attention that Scrivener (*Bezae*, p. xxxi) clearly states that it is not only possible that the Latin text was derived from the Greek text on the opposite page, but also ‘from a text almost identical with it.’.

Secondly one cannot but question any statement which talks about *proved to a certainty* when the only certainty is that we do not have any autographs to know for certain what was originally written.

² Wilkins, p. 391.

From this point on Wilkins addresses Harris’s claims regarding the Latinization of the Bezan text. After a detailed assessment of his arguments, Wilkins makes a number of astute observations regarding the Bezan text that are worthy of note, while at the same time effectively rendering Harris’s claims baseless, \textit{viz:}

Of the numerous instances where $\Delta$ [the Greek text of Codex Bezae] has the Latin idiom of two finite verbs and a copula instead of a participle and a finite verb, many may fairly be ascribed to Latinizing. But the question may arise here, as in similar cases, whether the Latinizing was not due quite as much to the fact that the copyist was familiar with Latin idioms, as to the influence of the attached version.\footnote{Ibid., p. 399f.}

In the second part of this article Wilkins concludes his analysis of the evidence presented by Harris in chapter 10, entitled: ‘Further Cases of Latinization’, with the statement: ‘I do not think it safe to say more than that $\Delta$ and D [the Latin text in Codex Bezae] agree in a looseness of expression, which may have originated with either.’\footnote{Ibid., p. 413.} Further on he states:

The general impression left on my own mind ... is that Mr Harris has made out his case, so far as to prove the existence of this Latinizing influence in the case of $\Delta$, or, to be more exact, in the case of a text from which $\Delta$ has descended, but that many of his cases are doubtful, some highly improbable, and that among the improbable ones must be accounted all those which implicate A C (and \textit{a fortiori} B) in the same charge of Latinizing. Further, the agreement of the great
majority of the Latin texts in some of the most significant errors seems to show that we may look for some common source; and thus the problem becomes that of reconstructing a primitive Latin rendering, which will be the representative of a very early Greek MS.¹

... the agreement of Δ and D may be taken just as well as evidence of their original source as of harmonizing; and other considerations must be brought in to decide in each individual case.²

Although Wilkins rejected Harris’s claims for complete or systematic Latinization, he readily acknowledged that evidence exists which suggests ‘that at some stage in the history of the tradition, the Greek text was here and there adapted to the Latin.’³ It was his contention also that the phonetic peculiarities of the Greek text do not afford any evidence to support the theory that the codex was written in Gaul. Harris’s argument, that the heightened awareness of the work of the Holy Spirit, as found in the interpolations and glosses was the result of Montanist influences, is also shown to hold little credibility and requires further examination.⁴ Even Harris’s dependence upon the Latin translation of Irenæus as further proof of Latinization is shown to be very weak.⁵ Indeed, after looking at all of Harris’s arguments, none are left unscathed, thereby rendering the theory of Latinization again unsubstantiated, indeed, untenable.

1895 - Eberhard Nestlé (1851-1913)

In his article: ‘Some Observations on the Codex Bezae’, of 1895, Eberhard Nestlé makes two observations regarding the text of Codex Bezae. In the first, he suggests ‘an underlying Semitic original’.1 This idea had originally been proffered by Resch, who in 1892 postulated an original Hebrew edition of Acts.2 Blass also considered Luke’s diction to have a Hebrew colour.3 Nestlé, however, goes beyond simple suggestion and argues by examples that ‘the Greek text of the first chapters of Acts as contained in Codex Bezae demonstrates clear traces of an underlying Semitic original.’4 The second observation is that Codex Bezae

1 Nestlé, p. 235.
2 A. Resch, Ausserkanonische Paralleltexte, Leipzig, 1892. (Wilcox, p. 2).
4 Nestlé, p. 235.


In brief, the main contention of the theory is the claim that the greater degree of Semitisms in the Western text proves the priority of that text. Black, Op. cit., p. 277. However Black’s argument and indeed the pro arguments of other scholars have proven to be of little
had its origin closely linked to Irenæus and was, therefore, written in Lyons, France.

Nestlé suggests that confusion between the Hebrew and Semitic forms of the words λαός and κόσμος (Latin mundus) led to the use of the latter word in Codex Bezae (Acts 2:47). As corroborating evidence he refers to the phrase ἐν τῷ λαῷ in II Peter 2:1 and Tischendorf's quoted variant in mundo in Syr. Bodl., which, he claims, is a recognized error of the Syrian copyist. He also cites other examples where there has been confusion between the Syrian form of the words peoples and ages, e.g. I Esdr. 4:40. Thus he concludes: 'The possibility at

substance. Klijn (Survey II. p. 171, n. 3) was to say of Black's study: 'In this work the supposed aramaic influence on the text of Acts is only dealt with superficially.' (Ernst Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles. A Commentary. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971, 1985, p. 54) who apart from demonstrating that these so-called Aramaisms can be accounted for by scribal errors, 'to which scriptio continua is highly conducive', he also argues that, 'When we consider what pains Luke took to improve the Greek, when recapitulating Mark, then it is as a matter of course improbable that in Acts he tolerated such Aramaisms, impossible in the Greek of his time.' Haenchen's last remark, however, rests on a presupposition with which not all scholars of the Synoptic question would agree. After studying the Semitic phenomena in various texts J. D. Yoder ('Semitisms in Codex Bezae', JBL. 78 (1959) 317-321, 317) was to say: '1) when one takes into account not only the instances of Semitic phenomena in Codex Bezae, but also the Bezan variants which abandon Semitisms found in other Mss, the net increase of Semitisms is sometimes inconsequential, while in other respects this Ms actually reveals fewer Semitisms than found in the B Aleph text; and 2) oftentimes the data are concentrated in limited areas of the text ...'. Thus he concludes '...one is justified in speaking of Codex Bezae as more Semitic than B and Aleph only when one defines explicitly both the Semitic features as well as the pericopes or sections of the individual books which display these features.' (Ibid., p. 321).
least seems, therefore, settled, that λαός and κόσμος may go back to an identical Semitic text.1 As further possible proof of his claim he cites Luke 2:10 in the Syriac2 and the Lewis-Codex3, both of which have the Syriac form of the word world where the Greek has λαῷ. His final example is found in Acts 3:14 where a presumed confusion between the Hebrew forms of ἡρψάσασθε and D’s ἐβαρύνατε led to the difference in the two texts. In conclusion he says:

I believe it to be proved, by this observation on the text of Codex Bezae, that

_Luke used for the first chapter of Acts a written source, and that this account was a Semitic one_; whether Hebrew or Aramaic, I cannot discuss at present; ἐβαρύνατε favours the supposition of a Hebrew one.4

To prove his second point, _viz_ that Codex Bezae had its origin closely linked to Irenæus, Nestlé points to ἐβαρύνατε in Acts 3:14, which, he argues, is unique to Codex Bezae and Irenæus. Another piece of evidence put forward by Nestlé is _D_’s use of τῇ δόξῃ in Acts 5:31, which Corrector B changed to δεξιᾷ, instead of τῇ δεξιᾷ. He argues that δόξῃ is a misspelling, and cites the same type of error in II Chron. 30:8. He goes on to say:

_ Isaiah lxii. 8, we read ωμοσεν κυριος κατα της δοξης αυτου; but not_
only have Ximenes, Aldus, Grabe printed δὲξὶς, but the corrector of the Codex
Vaticanus Ba changed this δὲξὶς into δὲξὶς, just like the corrector of D. Now
this very δὲξὶς is again testified by Irenæus: gloria. Indeed, a respectable age of
this misspelling .... ¹

Nestlé’s final piece of evidence is that provided by Beza himself. In his
covering letter Beza states that he received it from the monastery of St Irenæus
in Lyons. Nestlé concludes:

Codex D was written in the very place from whence it got into the posses-
sion of Beza, in the town of Irenæus [Lyons], perhaps from his own copy, and that
in Acts at least it preserved us a text of the utmost importance, a text which leads
us back not only to the Greek of Luke, but to the Semitic originals which Luke
made use of. ²

1900 - Sir Frederick George Kenyon (1863-1952)

In an article of 1900, Kenyon provides a number of important conclusions
he had reached from a study of the photographic reproduction of Codex Bezae. ³

Firstly, Kenyon states that the palaeographers generally agree that the
codex belongs to the sixth century, ⁴ but then goes on to sound a note of caution

¹ Ibid., pp. 238f.
² Ibid., p. 239.
³ Kenyon was one of the leading scholars of ancient manuscripts in his time.
⁴ This is contrary to what Ian M. Ellis (‘Codex Bezae and Recent Enquiry’, IBS 4 (1982)
and to highlight some very interesting points regarding the palaeographical detail of this codex, viz:

The only remark that need be made on this is that, for want of materials, the precise dating of early uncial hands must still be regarded as somewhat precarious, and that the question is complicated in the case of Codex Bezae by the fact that neither its Greek nor its Latin hand is wholly natural. Written, as its bilingual character shows, in a country of mixed languages, and probably remote from the great literary centres, its writing shows an unevenness, and even an awkwardness, which places it a little outside the normal course of palaeographic development. Roughness and irregularity of writing are generally taken as signs of degeneration from an earlier and better form; but they may also be due to inexperience in a scribe contemporary with the better style but at a distance from the centres in which it is practised. This may reasonably be the case with Codex Bezae; and if evidence were to come to light which pushed it into the fifth century, palaeographers could accept it without difficulty. Provisionally, however, a date in the sixth century must be regarded as more probable.

Kenyon’s conclusions regarding the roughness of the Greek hand confirm

82-100, 82) attributes to Kenyon, for he states that Kenyon and Lowe suggest the fifth century. As he gives no references it is hard to confirm his statement. A year later, Kenyon (Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. London: Macmillan, 1901, p. 75) was still to claim a sixth-century origin.

1 Kenyon (Handbook, p. 75.) was to say later that ‘the Greek has the appearance of having been written by a scribe whose native tongue was Latin.’. This could imply of course that although the scribe spoke Latin well his writing of it was poor. However this would surely be an unlikely situation for one whom might be considered a professional scribe. (Stone, p. 38).

2 Kenyon, Bezae, p. 295.
what Credner had observed sixty-eight years earlier.¹ However, where Kenyon saw the Latin hand as not ‘wholly natural’ Credner considered the Latin to have an ängstlichste Genauigkeit.²

Kenyon’s dating of two of the correctors is not in accord with Scrivener’s. Whereas Scrivener placed Hand F within the period from the eighth to the eleventh century, with the seventh century as a possibility, and Hand G in the eleventh century.³ Kenyon argues that Hand F ‘... may very well have belonged to the seventh’⁴, and Hand G, ‘... of about the seventh century.’⁵ He goes on to say:

... since G is the most active corrector of the Latin text; it would appear also that G must be earlier than F, since no notice is taken by him, in his corrections of the Latin, of the additions made by F to the Greek text. .... 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, ...., is in a hand to which there are many parallels in the papyri of the Byzantine period, in the sixth and seventh centuries.⁶

¹ Vide supra: § 1832 - Karl August Credner (1797-1857).
² Credner, p. 466.
³ Scrivener, Bezae, p. xxvi.
⁴ Kenyon, Bezae, p. 296.
⁵ Ibid., p. 296.
⁶ Kenyon, Bezae, p. 296.

Although Kenyon is the first to publish the noted error in Scrivener’s date for Hand G, he may not have been the first to suggest it, for later on Burkitt (p. 506) was to say that Sanday had pointed the error out to him seven to eight years earlier, which means he would have been told some six to seven years before this article by Kenyon.
Kenyon suggests that since the Codex Bezae contains both a Latin and a Greek text it is reasonable to assume that it was written in a community in which Latin was the vernacular; had it been otherwise, and Greek the vernacular, there would have been no reason to provide the text in another tongue. He continues by saying:

The addition of a translation almost necessarily implies that the language into which the translation is made is the vernacular of the country in which it is produced,\(^1\) though the original tongue is sufficiently well known to make the retention of it useful. Under such conditions one would expect subsequent alterations and additions to be rather in the language of the country than in the foreign tongue of the original; but with the Codex Bezae the contrary is the case.\(^2\)

Kenyon is more specific than Scrivener when dating the writer of the majority of the liturgical notes and the Ammonian sections, Hand L, for where Scrivener had suggested the ‘ninth century at the earliest’, Kenyon believes it to be of the tenth.\(^3\) He continues by providing further insight into the quality of Hands J and L and what it implies:

Their Greek is rough and bad enough to prove, if any further proof were wanting, that they do not proceed from a country where Greek was habitually written; but they show that the Greek New Testament was still read in the services of the church in which this copy was used.\(^4\)

---

1. Scrivener (p. xxx) had stated the same earlier.
Where Kipling, Schulz, and Scrivener recognized Alexandrian forms in the Greek text of Codex Bezae, Kenyon could find no evidence of Egyptian characteristics in the Greek text of Codex Bezae at all, and thus categorically rejected the notion that it had an Egyptian origin:

Egypt, which was at one time suggested as the original home of Codex Bezae, is out of the question; of all the oldest MSS of the Greek Bible this is the one in which it is least possible to detect Egyptian characteristics....\textsuperscript{1}

Kenyon also rejects Southern Italy, because it does not fit the criteria established by the palaeographical details. He argues that the Greek language was so much at home in Southern Italy that one would expect a more polished Greek instead of the ‘rough and peculiar characters, strangely similar to the Latin on the opposite page.’\textsuperscript{2} He goes on to say that such poor Greek ‘can hardly have been written in a region where trained Greek scribes were at home.’\textsuperscript{3}

Having eliminated the two most accepted homes for Codex Bezae, Kenyon discloses his preference for Southern Gaul as the most likely place. The reasons for his choice are essentially a repetition of what Scholz and Scrivener had said earlier. However, he does point out a major difficulty with the theory:

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid.

The answer to the seeming contradiction lies in Scrivener’s statement: ‘... the long list of Alexandrian forms, if we may term them ....’. (Scrivener, Bezae, p. xxix). Although Kipling, Schulz, and Scrivener were willing to consider them as Alexandrian, Kenyon wasn’t.

\textsuperscript{2} Kenyon, Bezae, p. 297.

\textsuperscript{3} Ibid.
... the church of the Greek missionaries Pothinus and Irenaeus, the church in which Greek liturgical uses continued far into the Middle Ages, and for which at least one Greek lectionary is known to have been written as late as the year 1022 (Evst. 60)\(^1\). ... The principal difficulty connected with this theory is the uncertainty as to the extent to which the Greek language and liturgy continued in use so late as the tenth century; and in this point additional evidence is much to be desired.\(^2\)

This particular point was to be addressed later by F. E. Brightman.

**1900 - Kirsopp Lake (1872-1946)**

The first person to suggest publicly an Italian genesis for Codex Bezae was Kirsopp Lake.\(^3\) His argument centred upon the unique correlation between the texts of Codex 1071\(^4\) and Codex Bezae in their recording of the *Pericope Adulterae*. To demonstrate the agreement between these two documents, Lake lists: (1) eight variants where they find mutual agreement against all other documents, (2) four variants that are unique to 1071, and (3) one that disagrees with Codex Bezae.

Lake’s argument for 1071’s Italian origin rests solely upon two factors: (1)

\(^1\) Gregory-Aland I 60.


\(^4\) Athos Lavra A 104, which is a twelfth-century parchment of the Gospels containing the Jerusalem colophon.
Gregory’s suspicion that the handwriting of the codex was of Western origin, and, (2) that of a picture of St. John, contained within the codex, showing the apostle holding a book on which is written, *In principio erat verbum*. Lake concludes: ‘this seems to render an Italian origin almost certain, and ... suggests that it was brought to Mt. Athos from Amalfi.’

As the Morfinon monastery of Athos was founded in the twelfth century by colonists from Amalfi, Lake surmised that the codex accompanied the founding fathers. The demise of Morfinon led to the transfer of its library and a part of its lands to the Lavra; Codex 1071 is thought to have been among the books transferred.

For Lake’s argument to hold true both Codex Bezae and Codex 1071 had to be present at or near Amalfi, at the same time during the twelfth century, for, he claims, it was during this period that the Bezan *Pericope Adulterae* was incorporated into Codex 1071. It was Lake’s conviction, therefore, that Codex Bezae had been in Italy during the eleventh or twelfth century and remained there until taken to France from the Council of Trent in 1547.

Lake observes ‘that the *Pericope Adulterae* in the form given by 1071 is an

---

1 Amalfi is located in the Salerno province on the Golfo di Salerno.

2 Lake, *Origin*, p. 444.


It is upon just this point that Lake’s argument breaks down, for the evidence would suggest that Codex Bezae had been in or near Lyons from at least the ninth century until received by Beza in 1562; that is, apart from the months that it was in Italy at the Council of Trent, 1546/47. For greater detail the reader is directed to appendix A of this dissertation.
insertion marking a late stage in the history of the text of that MS.'

He also draws attention to the fact that the Jerusalem colophon, which is also contained in this codex, is common to a number of manuscripts. However, only 1071 has the *Pericope Adulterae* that correlates with Codex Bezae, he concludes, therefore, that the text of the *Pericope Adulterae* `cannot go far back, if at all, behind 1071 itself.'

The Jerusalem colophon, which reads: Ἐυαγγέλιον κατὰ Μαθαῖον ἔγραφη καὶ ἀντεβλή ἐκ τῶ ἐν Ἰεροσολύμωις παλαιῶν ἀντιγράφων τῶ ἐν τῷ Ἡγίῳ "Ὀρεί ἀποκειμένων," links the manuscripts that contain this subscription to an archetype stored on Mount Sinai. Apparently manuscripts from Jerusalem were used to correct the archetype. The consequence of this piece of evidence is the possibility that Codex Bezae was one of the manuscripts from Jerusalem, a point not lost to Birdsall some eighty-six years later.

---

1 Lake, *Origin*, p. 444.

2 Other manuscripts containing the Jerusalem colophon are listed by Aland (*Text*, p. 129) as '20, 157, 164, 215, 262, 300, 376, 428, 565, 686, 718, 1071, etc., and in Δ 039.'

Lake also lists the minuscule 829.


5 Lake (*ibid.*, p. 445, n. 1) gives sound reasons for believing that τὸ ἡγίον ὅρος refers to Mount Sinai, but as they have no direct bearing on the history of Codex Bezae they will not be given here, the reader is referred instead to Lake's article.
1900 - Frank Edward Brightman (1856-1932)

Published jointly with Lake’s previous article was Brightman’s essay entitled ‘The Marginal Notes of Lections’. In this, Brightman addresses the lectionary notes and the references to three Saints contained within Codex Bezae and the arguments for a Gallican origin, as put forward by Scrivener, Harris, and Kenyon.

Firstly, Brightman centres his attention upon the marginalia written by the Hands L and J. Harris had suggested that the those written by J were ‘the old Gallican lessons for Palm Sunday, as found in the seventh-century lectionary of Luxeul,’¹ and those of Hand L were lessons marked in from an ‘order like the Lectiones Dominicales in the Bobbio Sacramentary.’² On the other hand, Brightman, similar to Scrivener who had said that ‘All these liturgical notices doubtless refer to the established ritual of the Eastern Church,’³ recognized them more specifically as the Byzantine series, as he states: ‘...the lessons indicated are the Byzantine series, incomplete certainly, and in some cases more or less divergent from the present lectionary, but quite unmistakable.’⁴ He goes on to say: ‘Out of some eighty lessons noted by the scribe L, only about half a dozen cannot be satisfactorily identified.’⁵

Brightman also rejects Harris’s claims for a close connection between the

---

¹ Harris, *Codex*, p. 13.
⁴ Brightman, p. 446.
Greek and Gallican rituals, for in his opinion:

There certainly are such affinities; only I should be inclined perhaps to find closer affinities, at any rate in the matter of lectionaries, in other Gallican areas, like Spain and Milan, than in Gaul itself. But such fundamental connexions are quite inadequate to account for the developed system of Bezan lessons, and the matter is really not worth discussion.

In response to Scrivener’s claim for a Gallican origin by reason of the days associated with the three saints, the Blessed Virgin Mary, Saint George, and Saint Denys, Brightman argues that, ‘an emphasis on the Blessed Virgin Mary would prima facie suggest Byzantium and the East rather than a Latin atmosphere.’ He also raises the same objection to the argument as Credner had before him by pointing out that each of the other saints was celebrated in the East, particularly Saint George, who was the protector of the Byzantine Empire long before he was acknowledged in the West. Saint Denys, on the other hand, although associated more with Gaul, ‘was not forgotten in his own eastern world.’

Brightman also dismisses Kenyon’s and for that matter Scrivener’s argu-

---

1 Harris (Bezae, p. 14) had said: ‘No doubt there is a close connexion between the Greek and Gallican rituals, ….’

2 Brightman, p. 447.

3 Ibid., p. 452.

4 Vide supra: p. 71.

Harris (Annotations, p. 76) later was to agree with this.

5 Brightman, p. 452.
ment that the Greek tradition dating from Pothinus and Irenaeus continued for such a long period. He makes the astute observation that:

... this no more proves that the Gallic Church continued to be Greek or half Greek than that the Greek beginnings of the Roman Church continued to interfere with its thoroughly Latin character. If a continuous and influential Greek tradition can be shown on other grounds to have existed, the Greek origins would account for it; but the Greek origins cannot prove the existence of the tradition.¹

He conducts a similar argument to discredit the suggestion by Harris and Kenyon, that the few references to Greek elements in the tradition in Gaul proved a Greek tradition. His argument is that if such elements prove a Greek tradition in Gaul why don’t they also prove the same for English centres such as Canterbury and Winchester, where Greek elements are also to be found.²

Kenyon had argued that the Greek lectionary, l. 60, which he believed was written in France in 1022,³ suggested a continued Greek influence within the churches of Gaul. However Brightman, referring to the colophon contained within the manuscript, suggested otherwise. This colophon states that it was written by one Elias at castrum de Colonia, which according to Montfaucon, was

¹ Brightman, p. 452.

This may have been true in the early church but by the tenth century Mary had been venerated in the West from late in the fourth century. (Williston Walker, A History of the Christian Church, Edinburgh: T & T Clark, ¹1919, ²1968, ³1976, 1980, p. 156).

² Brightman, p. 452f.

somewhere near Le Mans, North-Western France. This, of course, does not detract from the argument for a Gallican origin, but the name, Elias, provides another clue, for Brightman contents that the name Elias suggests a Calabrian, ‘belonging to the foundation of his great namesake, St. Elias the Speliote, one of the heroes of Basilian monasticism in Calabria in the beginning of the tenth century.’ Brightman, therefore suggests that ‘the scribe was a visitor, who copied his Εὐσαγγελιον for the monks of St. Denys to satisfy their philological interest in their supposed patron.’

Having rejected the arguments for a Gallican origin, Brightman suggests instead that Southern Italy is the area most likely to have been inhabited by people who would use a Byzantine Lectionary. Such conditions, he argues, arose through the large influx of Greeks to Calabria and Apulia, due to the Moslem conquests in the Levant from the seventh century onward. An integral part of this eastern influence was the extension of Byzantine power, so that Apulia and Basilicata came under the authority of the Patriarchate of Constantinople. He continues by saying:

---

1 Brightman (p. 453) does not give a reference here but just before this statement he cites material which has a footnote reference, as follows: 'Montfaucon Palaeog. graeca p. 292.'

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.

4 Also called Puglia.

Margaret Deanesly (A History of the Medieval Church 590-1500, London/New York: Methuen, 1925, 1969, 1981, p. 79) states that Apulia had a Latin church, but this does not change the general thrust of Brightman's argument.

5 The period of time referred to here was from the time of Leo the Isaurian (717-740) down to the middle of the eleventh century. Ibid.
Its ecclesiology and its rite were Byzantine; and the interior of the toe and heel of Italy at this moment continues to be Greek in rite as in speech. And outside of these, as far at least as Monte Cassino,\textsuperscript{1} Greek elements existed, incorporated in the Latin rite. \textellipsis The monastery of Grotta Ferrata, in the Alban Hills, with its Byzantine rite, is a direct descendant of the Basilian monasticism of Calabria, and represents the history of the Greek population after the schism of East and West; for they became 'Uniates,' remaining in the Roman communion, while retaining their Greek rite. We have here, therefore, the conditions to which the Bezant lectionary might have real relations - a mixed Greek and Latin population, in which the Greek element was of the Byzantine rite.\textsuperscript{2}

\textbf{1901 - J. Rendel Harris, (3) Annotators}

In his continued quest to solve the mysteries of Codex Bezae's history, Harris conducted a study of the annotators of the codex, the results of which were published in 1901. This, his last major contribution to the debate, was prompted by Brightman's remarks regarding the correctors and annotators, and as before, his essay is punctuated with astute observations and detailed remarks. Building on from what Scrivener had previously done it is arguably the most comprehensive study of the subject down to that time and even possibly up to the present.

In this publication Harris first focuses his attention upon the criticism directed at his 1891 essay on Codex Beza. He acknowledges Brightman's valuable contribution to the research and admits that Brightman corrects his work in

\begin{footnotes}
\item[1] Ancient Casinum, in the Latium region.
\item[2] Brightman, p. 454.
\end{footnotes}
certain important points. Harris admits faulty judgement led him to claim a Gallican origin on the evidence of the liturgical annotations. He also acknowledges the ever increasing number of voices against a Gallican origin and refers to a comment made to him by William Sanday, who had suggested that the codex may have come from Ravenna, Italy.

For the rest of the essay Harris addresses the evidence provided by the annotators and attempts to find a location that matches the evidence. Firstly, concerning the annotators and correctors of Codex Bezae, he provides a very useful tabulation of Scrivener’s conclusions, something that Scrivener failed to do. He also includes Kenyon’s corrections and other suggested changes. By tabulating the data in this way the significant changes are readily seen. According to Harris these are: (1) that in the first half of its history (i.e. down to and including Hand L), systematic corrections were chiefly on the Greek text; (2) during the whole of the period that these corrections took place there is no trace whatsoever of the codex having ever been used for lectionary purposes; (3) that despite the many liturgical annotators there is not a single Latin lesson marked - an observation previously made by Kenyon. Harris suggests that this indicates that ‘the Latin lectionary was already the Vulgate, when Codex Bezae

---

1 Harris, Annotators. p. 5. Later Harris (ibid. p. 26) admits, among other things, that ‘the system of lections is undoubtedly the Byzantine.’


3 Harris, Annotators. p. 4.

4 Appendix B or Harris, Annotators, p. 6.

5 Harris, Annotators. p. 6.

6 Which Scrivener considered to be of the ‘ninth century at the earliest’ and Kipling the seventh century, (Harris, Annotators, p. 9), but Kenyon had argued for the tenth century.
began to be used as an official Greek lectionary, and that Old Latin copies were at that time of day superannuated; (4) no attempt has been made to translate into Latin either the τίτλοι of M₁ (Matthew) and M₂ (John, Luke), or the sortes in Mark by M₃. Because of this Harris is prompted to ask a number of pertinent questions, namely:

How does it come about that there were no persons who wanted their fortunes told in Latin? And the case would be the more surprising if (as has been suspected) the sortes were themselves a translation from a similar series in Latin. If that should turn out to be the case, we shall have to ask the question, why the Latin sentences were not also inserted: had councils of the Church fulminated against divination in Latin to tolerate it in Greek? And if not, what did the Latins mean by not coming to the Holy Gospels to have their fortunes told? ²

Harris observes that a note by J had been written over by L, providing ample proof that J preceded L. Although this piece of evidence was missed by Scrivener, he had deduced from other evidence that J was older than L.³ Harris also observed that a τίτλος in John of Hand M₂ had been written over by L, therefore it he concluded that the hand of M₂ proceeded that of L.⁴

A common copyist error in Codex Bezae is the insertion of Latin letters into

---

¹ Harris, *Annotators*, p. 8.

² Ibid., p. 8.


the Greek text, *e.g.* αRX1 in the correction of Acts 5:27. Such errors by Hand E led Scrivener to believe that this corrector was a Latin.¹ Harris in agreement points out that although errors of this type are to be expected in the transcription of a bilingual text no matter what the native tongue of the scribe, 'in the case of a straightforward emendation or expansion [which is the case here], the scribe is not likely to mix his alphabets, except by reverting to that alphabet which is his normal mode of expression.'² Harris, therefore, has no hesitation is saying that E was a Latin.³

He notes the habit of Hand G who constantly corrects the misspelt Latin. The same scribe also demonstrates an awareness of the Latin Vulgate. These are observations that Scrivener had made earlier;⁴ but unlike Scrivener, Harris is willing to say with some certainty that Corrector G's native tongue was Latin.⁵ He considered L to be a Latin,⁶ but of the tenth century and not of the ninth, at the earliest, as Scrivener had previously suggested.⁷ L and M are thought to be bilingual.⁸ The insertion of the letter γ, for phonetic reasons, by Hands L and M2, led Harris to believe that both annotators came under the same phonetic influence and therefore the same Greek School, and that they were writing from dictation and not transcription.⁹ He also believed that M3 could be shown to be a

¹ Scrivener, *Bezae*, p. xxv.

² Harris, *Annotators*, p. 10.


⁵ Harris, *Annotators*, pp. 10, 13.


⁸ Harris, *Annotators*, pp. 12f., 74, n. 2.

History of Codex Bezae

Latin. Harris believed that none of the annotators, Hands I, J, M, M1, etc. through to O2, apart possibly from J, were Greek scholars. Harris concludes his brief survey by saying that: 'The remaining scribes and annotators either do not furnish any criteria for their native place or tongue, or the discrimination can only be made after much microscopic work.'

Harris then examines more fully the phonetic intrusion of the letter γ. It was apparently used to provide a semi-consonant sound, probably of the nature of a y, e.g. Δαυγιφ is for Δαυιδ, thus changing David to Davy. He refers to the works of the philologists Foy and Krumbacher, both of whom had investigated the phenomenon of the additional γ. They had found it in writings from Egypt (second century BCE.), and Patmos (beginning of the ninth century CE.). From the twelfth century the use of the additional γ grows in use until it is quite common in the modern era.

Harris (ibid., p. 14) is not the first to observe this peculiarity, for he refers to Hickes, Wetstein (p. 31), and Scrivener (Scrivener, Bezae, p. xxvii and n.1) as scholars who have also addressed this phenomenon.

1 Ibid., p. 12.
2 Ibid., p. 74, n. 3.
3 Harris, Annotators, p. 12.
4 e.g. δαυγιφ, which is part of a τίτλοι written by Hand М2 (Scrivener, p. xxvii), at the head of Fol. 205b; λευγιτον, Fol. 204b; παραγμας (παραγμα), Foll. 301b, 302a.

Parker (Bezae, pp. 313, 318) ascribes the annotation at the head of Fol. 205b which is in Luke, to М1. This is in conflict with an earlier statement (ibid., p. 43) in which he ascribes the τίτλοι in Luke to М2.

5 Foy, Lautsystem der griechischen Vulgärsprache. (Harris, Annotations, p. 18).
The geographical distribution of the inserted γ was found to be as follows:

- Mainland after vowels (κλαίγω, ἀκούγω).
- Sporades (with Cyprus) after spirants (δουλεύγω, κόβγω).
- Cyclades after both

This would give παρασκευγή in the islands.¹

By this evidence Harris is led to suggest that "We thus arrive at the conclusion that the Codex Bezae is under the influence of annotators who speak Modern Greek and write it as they speak it."² Regardless of the validity of this statement by Harris, the evidence of Krumbacher and Foy effectively negates the suggestion that the insertion of the γ gives proof of a Celtic, Frankish, or Western origin,³ and although Harris provides evidence of the phenomena in writings from Southern Italy, there is no evidence of its presence in areas more to the north and west of Calabria.⁴

It is Harris’s conviction that the corrections made by L to J’s lectionary notes suggest that J used an earlier system, and not the same Byzantium lectionary system, as proposed by Brightman.⁵

¹ Ibid., p. 21.
² Ibid., p. 18.
³ Harris (ibid., pp. 12f.) states that Hickes believed that the inclusion of the γ pointed to a Moeso-Gothic alphabet. Wetstein (p. 31) argued that it suggested Frankish hands. Scrivener (Bezae, p. xxvii, n. 1) on the other hand said it 'points to a Western and Celtic origin ....'
⁴ Harris, Annotators, pp. 23-25.
⁵ Ibid., pp. 34-38, 75.

Brightman, p. 447.
Harris also undertook an investigation of the lection system used by the annotators I and J, and concluded: 'If then the scribe I has been rightly dated, the Codex is under Byzantine influence from its first annotator.' As for the remainder, M, M₁, M₂, M₃, M₄, Harris suggests that Scrivener subdivided these more than was necessary, and that some might be identical. From the evidence of the annotators Harris made a list of salient points that require serious consideration when attempting to locate the provenance of the codex. These are as follows:

(1) A Greek lection for Palm Sunday and the preceding Saturday; the name of Palm Sunday being replaced by Sunday of the Pro-photisms.

(2) A Greek lection for the Transfiguration.

(3) A long series of Byzantine lessons, with some peculiarities in the names of the special lessons, such as περὶ ἀναταξομενέων, &c .... .

(4) A number of peculiarities in the Greek dialect of the notes, both in the lessons, and in the inserted chapter-headings and elsewhere.

(5) A special cult of St George, St Denys, and, for at least one festival, of the Virgin.

It must be noted that although Brightman (ibid.) appears to believe that Hands J and L wrote in the same time frame of development of the lectionary system, he does point out that it was in a state of growth down to the thirteenth century. From this one could expect a difference, but is the difference due to different lectionary systems, different scribes from different periods of time, or both?

1 Harris, Annotators, p. 38.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid., p. 82.

Harris (ibid., pp. 82f.) goes on to say: 'Now of these points, the series of peculiarities under No. 4 has been shown, in our investigation, to be exactly paralleled in the Greek of
Harris argues that the Latin of those annotators who can be shown to be bilingual, viz L and M, is in certain cases Romance Latin. In general, however, the Greek of the annotators is barbarous and phonetic, and 'in a number of cases paralleled, if not identified with, some dialect of Modern Greek.' Thus, Harris concludes that the annotators of Codex Bezae, who span four centuries, beginning from about the ninth century, came from 'some Greco-Latin centre where both languages were spoken, and not from a Latin centre where Greek was merely read and written.' Harris also believes J's annotations reflect an ecclesiastical revival of a Greek element in a public baptism ritual.

The suggestion arises that perhaps we are amongst a Greek community where the revival of Greek is due to a reinforcement of the Greek element already existing or still surviving in the community. Such a reinforcement might be due (a) to literary interest, (b) to popular interest, arising from migratory additions to the Greek population; or both causes might be combined.

He also agrees that J's annotations regarding the persistent or revived Greek rite of adult baptism possibly suggests a church and not a monastic environment. He also mentions that without some commemoration of the

---

1 As an example Harris (ibid., p. 75, n. 1) refers to, '... the Sortes of M, who translates causa in its Romance sense and appears to use an early vulgar Latin future for his verb.'

2 Ibid., p. 74.

3 Ibid., p. 75.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid., p. 76.
patron saints Irenaeus and Pothinus it was difficult to believe that the codex could have been in the monastery of St Irenæus at Lyons for the period stated by Beza. This he felt was particularly so since both the Saints, George and Dionysius/Denys, who are honoured in the annotations, are twelfth century migrations from the East. Harris then looked at the evidence from various locations in Italy to see if they match those provided by Codex Bezae. The cities investigated were those where Greek culture and populations were to be found far into the middle ages, e.g. Naples, Amalfi, Ravenna, and Brindisi. Harris points out that Hellenization was at its height in Italy during the ninth century, the century when the annotators were believed to have started their work on Codex Bezae.

After a detailed discussion of the evidence from his investigations Harris finally opted for a Calabrian or at least a Southern Italian home, where, he believes, it stayed right down to at least the time of annotators M and O of the twelfth century. However, he recognizes a weakness in his argument, in that his perusal of a number of manuscripts from Calabria furnish no matching Greek hands that are palaeographically like the annotating hands of Codex Bezae.

Harris noted from his investigation of the supplementary leaves that there are no lections marked, nor are there any τίτλαι. Eight of these leaves are of the Gospel of John and nowhere in the remainder of this Gospel are there eight successive leaves without lections. He suggests, therefore, that the supplementary

---

1 Harris, *Annotators*, p. 106.

2 There is at least one other major weakness in Harris's argument, and it is the same as the one raised by Kenyon when he argued against Southern Italy, *i.e.* the barbarous nature of the Greek hand in a situation where Hellenism was so well established. This is despite the fact that Harris (*ibid.*, p. 74) had acknowledged the poor nature of the Greek earlier in his analyses.
leaves came after the Hand L.¹

In John 18:26 (supplementary pages) δουλων is spelt δολων, which Harris argues is the same phonetic error which occurred in the τίτλος: ... μετα τον δολον αυτου (Fol. 60b),² which is ascribes to Hand M₁. Harris, therefore, suggests that M₁ is possibly the restorer of the supplementary leaves also. From his analysis Harris presents the following chronological sequence to some of the Hands: J, M₂, L, and groups together M₁ and the hand of the restorer (R).³

As for the scribe who wrote the supplementary pages, Harris is in agreement with Scrivener when he declares that he was a Latin, for Harris, like Scrivener, believed that a Greek would not have committed such gross errors as those found in the Greek text, e.g. the perpetual substitution of P for Π and p for π and vice versa.⁴ As for nationality the lack of palaeographical support rules out Calabria, but leaves open the possibility that he was an Italian.

Such is Harris’s last major publication on the study of Codex Bezae. It is one that contains a wealth of information about the annotators of Codex Bezae and the supplementary pages. It was not, however, his last contribution towards the study of the Western text. Indeed, his abiding interest in the text led him to become the major driving force behind the fraternity of international scholars called the Bezan Club. This group of exceptionally talented men, who were associated with textual matters, sought answers to the issues arising from the

¹ Ibid., p. 107.
² Harris (ibid., p. 108) is in error when he states that this τίτλος is on Fol. 69b and that it reads: μετα τον δολον αυτου.
³ Ibid., pp. 108f.
⁴ Ibid., p. 107 - 109.
Bezan text. They promulgated their writings in what was generally an annual publication entitled: *The Bulletin of the Bezan Club*. This club, which had its beginning in the mid twenties, printed its last publication in 1937 and coincident with its activities were the major publications of two of its members, namely: James Hardy Ropes and Albert C. Clark.

**1901/2 - Francis Crawford Burkitt (1864-1935)**

Francis Burkitt’s study of the palaeography of Codex Bezae was undertaken with the object of determining the date of origin of the Codex Bezae. He begins his article by stating that Codex Bezae was generally thought of as a sixth century manuscript primarily because Scrivener had come to that conclusion from the palaeographical appearance of the Latin text. He then draws attention to the fact that its text is unlike any other extant manuscript and it is this uniqueness that makes it difficult to locate in time and place. The Greek, he states, lies somewhere between Codex Alexandrinus (A 02), of the fifth century, and the Vienna Dioscorides of the early sixth century. On the other hand he believes the peculiarity of the Latin hand is the result of the scribe deliberately attempting to produce a uniformity of style, by holding his pen straight when writing both texts. He points out that:

... it seems to have been the usual custom, at least until early in the sixth century, for Latin uncialis to be written with a *slanting* pen, while Greek uncialis were written with a *straight* pen. If the top of the page be supposed to point

---


In actual fact Scrivener (*Bezae*, p. xxxi) assigns the close of the fifth century as the date of origin of the codex; while in his *Introduction*, pp. 120-127, he does not proffer a date at all.
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.¹

Burkitt is adamant that the Latin and Greek texts of Codex Bezae are independent of each other. His opinion rests upon the ‘microscopic investigations of modern scholars’² who detected some 2 000 discrepancies between the two texts.³

He argues that since all the corrections, are made to the Greek text (apart from some rare cases where the Latin is changed to conform to the Greek) and since all liturgical notes and the Sortes Sanctorum are only added to the Greek text, and as there is no other indication that the codex was ever used formally and publicly except as a Greek book, he concludes that the provision of a Latin version obviously indicates the need of a community in which the vernacular speech was Latin.⁴ He concludes, thus:

¹ Burkitt, p. 501.
² Ibid., p. 502.
³ Burkitt is obviously referring to Scrivener’s Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis, for Scrivener (Bezae, p. xxxix.) had also referred to these differences, indeed it was he who had discovered that they were 1919 in number. He had come to this figure by means of ‘a minute examination of the whole manuscript’. Yet, despite these differences Scrivener (ibid.) still maintained that d ‘was made directly from its Greek or from a text almost coinciding with it,’ simply because ‘the vast majority of these 1919 divergencies relate to matters so insignificant that they would be utterly overlooked except by a reader who was narrowly watching for them.’
⁴ Burkitt, p. 505.

This is the same conclusion that Kenyon (Bezae, p. 296) had come to, but from different
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 Rossano.¹

Burkitt then concentrates his attention upon Hand G, the only corrector
who shows an overwhelming interest in the Latin text. He accepts Harris’s
conclusion that a number of the other correctors were Latin-speaking and notes
Kenyon’s seventh century dating, for Hand G, but disagrees with it. He argues
instead for a date from the fourth to the sixth century.² On the basis of G’s
corrections to Matt. 15:18, 20; 25:25, Scrivener had claimed that he had used
either a Vulgate or an Old Latin text,³ but after analysing the evidence Burkitt
rejects this argument claiming instead that 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. ... That G was a scholar admits of little


¹ Burkitt, p. 505.

² Ibid., p. 507.

Burkitt states (ibid., n. 1) that ‘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 ...’. Similarly,
Burkitt (p. 506) also claims that the Latin text has its closest parallels with B. M. Pap. cccxi and
ccxl, both of about the year 346 CE.

³ Scrivener, Bezae, p. xxxix.

Burkitt, p. 507f.
doubt from the way in which he corrects the betacisms of the scribe. Such monstrosities as *beruum uacum* are turned by him into *uerbum uacuum*. But he cares nothing for the conventional Biblical Latin.\(^1\)

Burkitt's following footnote is also important:

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 correctors of Cod. Sangermanensis (g), and is found in Jo. xi 38 in Wordsworth's C and Z*, one a Spanish MS and the other supposed to be Italian.\(^2\)

Burkitt analysed the use of the various Latin renderings of the Greek word ναί, *e.g.* *ita*, *utique*, and *etiam*, in a number of very ancient Latin codices. He concludes from his tabulation of the evidence that, *ita* is 'African', *utique* and *etiam* 'European'. He mentions that *d* always uses *etiam*, even in Matt. 5:37, contrary to all the Latin texts that have *est*, *est*, for 'yes, yes'. Thus he concludes: 'In the matter of rendering ναί, 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 Latin.'\(^3\) When the Corrector G changes the *etiam* of *d* it is neither into *ita* nor *utique*, but abandons the Latin Bible completely and selects rather a verb that reflects a feeling for language, *e.g.* Matt. ix 28, *Credimus* (we believe); Matt. 13:51, *Intelleximus* (we have understood) Matt. 17:24f, *facit aut prae[tat]*


('he does' or 'he pays').

In summary Burkitt states:

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*, .... I venture therefore to suggest that G is the handwriting of a 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.

Because of the free handling of the text by G, Burkitt suggests that G could not have lived much later than the end of the fifth century, for what scholar in Western Europe after the beginning of the sixth century 'would dare to have an opinion of his own as to what was the appropriate way to render the Greek of the Gospels into Latin?' Because of this he suggests a fifth-century origin for

Codex Bezae. He argues that the present sixth century date rests chiefly upon the rusticity of the Latin text, but suggests that if we think of it in its correct setting an earlier date is possible:

... 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 versions.¹

Burkitt makes an interesting observation in his concluding statement:

... 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.²

¹ Ibid., p. 512.
² Ibid., p. 513.
1905 - Dom John Chapman


Scrivener had suggested that the missing leaves from between the Gospel of Mark and Acts contained the Catholic Epistles, but admitted these would have required only fifty leaves, at most, of the sixty-six. Having rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Apocalypse, and 'any other book at all likely to occur in such a position', as the occupant of these sixteen leaves, Scrivener had suggested that the original penman miscounted his quires by two at some place in the portion that is lost; as was done in Codex Sinaiticus (8 01). Chapman, however, came to a different conclusion.

By examining the texts of the Church Fathers he came to the conclusion that the Codex Bezae was unlikely to have contained all of the Catholic epistles

---

1 The only biographical information this writer could find regarding a John Chapman that meets this time frame and occupation is that of Henry John Chapman (1865-1933) who was Abbot of Downside. This information is given with the warning that it requires confirmation.

2 Scrivener (*Bezae*, p. xiv) calculates these to consist of eight quires and three leaves. He also states that these are all the sheets 'after the fifth leaf of the forty-fourth to the end of the fifty-second quire.'.

3 Scrivener neither explains what books these might have been nor does he explain why Hebrews or the Apocalypse are not acceptable.

and suggested that James, II Peter, and possibly Jude were omitted. Chapman then assumes that the only Catholic epistles in Codex Bezae were I, II, and III John.  

Chapman approaches the problem of determining what else would be contained by the missing leaves by averaging the number of syllables per page for the four Gospels and for each of three sections of the book of Acts. These, he calculated, range from 329.4 syllables per page (the average for the first eight pages of Acts), to 396.6 for the Gospel of Luke. Given the number of syllables for each book and assuming an average number of syllables per page he then determined the number of pages required for each of the three Epistles of John. He calculated that it would take 16 pages, i.e. Foll. 399b - 414b, to accommodate all three epistles, with I John taking eleven and a half leaves, thus leaving fifty pages to be accounted for. Chapman, assuming 386.1 syllables per page (the same as in Mark, which is the book that precedes the gap), calculated that these fifty pages would be expected to contain 19 188 syllables and as the

---

1 It is not clear why Chapman chose the three Epistles of John to be the only Catholic epistles in Codex Bezae. It would appear that the reason is based upon the fact that the last five verses of III John are still contained in the Codex Bezae and because, as he states: 'we find that St. Irenaeus only seems to know 1, 2, (and 3?) John and 1 Peter; that St. Cyprian knows only the same; that Tertullian knows St. Jude also; that the old Latin apparently originally agreed with Tertullian; and that the Muratorian Canon also agrees with all the rest in omitting James and 2 Peter. Codex Bezae represents a very early text, and there is no reason at all for supposing that it ever contained James or 2 Peter, and some reason for supposing that it did not contain Jude.' (Chapman, *Contents*, pp. 47f). One has to ask on what basis was 1 Peter rejected? Also, on the same evidence 3 John appears doubtful.

2 In these calculations the words *pages* and *leaves* are interchangeable since each leaf contained a page of Greek on the recto with its Latin equivalent, verso.
Apocalypse in Westcott and Hort contains 19,408 syllables, he concludes that these fifty missing pages would have contained the Apocalypse.

Chapman also suggests that the loss of such a bulk of leaves was the result of the loosening of the binding after long liturgical use.\(^1\)

In his second article Chapman takes up the idea that the order of the Gospels would have been different in its archetype (or one of the archetypes). This had originally been proposed by Blass after one of his students, E. Lippelt, had noted the various ways that John’s name is spelled throughout the Gospels and had even suggested that Luke’s Gospel should be last.\(^2\)

Chapman’s study of the single point (which is used in the manuscript for punctuation), the stichometry, and the spelling of John (Ἰωάννης or Ἰωάννης), led him to conclude that the sequence of the Gospels in the parent of Codex Bezae was: Matthew, Mark, John, Luke,\(^3\) and that this had been changed to the present ‘Old Latin’ order: Matthew, John, Luke, and Mark.\(^4\)

---

1 Chapman, *Contents*, p. 53.
3 Later, Parker (*Beze*, p. 113) was to conduct the same study and although his figures for the different spellings of John are slightly different to those given by Chapman his conclusions are the same. Parker states that he did not know of Chapman’s study until after completing his own investigations.

Parker (*ibid.*, p. 111) also conducted a similar study of the spelling of Abraham and the use of the numerals twelve and seven, but found the results inconclusive.

4 This is more commonly known as the *Western* order. (Metzger, *Versions*, p. 313; Scrivener, *Beze*, p. xiv).
From his investigations, Chapman found that the points of punctuation are to be found regularly throughout Matthew and Mark, but only down to and including chapter nine of the Gospel of John. After that they virtually disappear, being practically non-existent in Luke, and for the five surviving verses of III John they are non-existent, as they are in Acts. Chapman concludes, therefore, that in the parent document Mark was in a different order, suggesting instead that the order was Matthew, Mark, John, Luke through to Acts, thereby giving a manuscript with continuous points of punctuation to the first half of John petering out after that to none at all in III John and Acts.

Chapman also points out that the above suggested order of the Gospels is the same as that of Mommsen's list (a catalogue of the Western Collection), and the Curetonian manuscript of the Old Syriac version, which is an almost purely Western text. Chapman concludes that the 'order - Mt Mc Jo Lc - seems therefore to be the original Western order.' Changing the order of the Gospels in Codex Bezae is, therefore, another instance of Latinization.

Using Scrivener's analysis of the colometry of Codex Bezae, Chapman draws attention to the fact that the final dissolution of the sense-lines precedes just a little the omission of punctuating with a dot. The original στίχοι, which are somewhat irregularly balanced within Matthew, become markedly worse at the beginning of John, and continue getting worse, so that by Luke viii, Scrivener was to remark: 'dissolution seems adopted almost in preference.' After this the situation begins to improve. Because the irregularities in Mark are greater than Matthew, Chapman argues that Mark would be better placed

---

between Matthew and John, thereby providing 'a gradual crescendo up to Luke viii, with a decrescendo, less marked, down to Acts.' The reason he gives for this irregularity of ςτίξοι was the scribe's desire to

... secure uniformity of length by avoiding very short lines, thus obtaining economy of parchment. In Matthew and Mark the scribe economizes but little. In John he becomes aware (as we have seen) that he need not even record the primitive stichometry by punctuation. The punctuation dwindles, and ceases about John ix. Dr. Scrivener tells us that about John vi. 32 the dissolution becomes complete, "though only one line (i. 16) ends with the article before ch. vi. 32, yet such irregularity occurs no less than 48 times from that place to the end of the Gospel." So that the final neglect of the stichometry just a little precedes the final omission even to draw attention to this neglect by punctuation. We can hardly hesitate to ascribe both forms of neglect to the same scribe, - not the scribe of Codex Bezae, but the scribe of its parent, which had the order Mt Mc Jo Lc. ²

His tabulation of the average number of syllables in a column for each book amply demonstrates a gradual increase from Matthew through Mark and John to Luke: Mt 372, Mc 386, Jo 394, Lc 396; Acts (beginning) 329 1/2, (later) 356 1/2, (end) 360. The diminution between Luke and Acts is put down to the copyist, who on discovering plenty of vellum to spare, 'reduced the lines roughly to the stichometry of his copy.'³

His analysis of the various ways in which ἐνώπιον and ἑνώπιον are used within the Gospels adds further weight to his argument. The dominant use of

1 Chapman, Gospels, p. 341.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid., p. 342.
'λόγωνς in Matthew, Mark, and John up to chapter five is in stark contrast to the use of 'λόγωνς in the remainder of John, as well as Luke and Acts.¹ The Latin demonstrates exactly the same phenomenon, the only exception is Acts, where Iohannes is used 22 times against Iohanes only once. He suggests therefore, that a corrector earlier than the present Codex Bezae made the changes, possibly the work of a Latin owner who was not sufficiently interested in the Greek to make the same changes to that text.²

On the basis that the demarcation for the changes in the spelling of John is near the middle of the Gospel of John, Chapman rejects Blass's hypothesis that Luke and Acts were copied from an archetype different from that of the other books, arguing that it is improbable that there existed 'two MSS of the Western text of quite similar character, one of which, nevertheless, had a different system of spelling from the other.'³

From his analysis, Chapman makes a number of suggestions: (1) The neglected stichometry both in the line-division and in the substituted punctuation suggests private ownership. (2) The parent-codex was probably written for a Latin's private use. (3) The changes in the order of the Gospels to that of the Old Latin, thought to have taken place during the writing of Codex Bezae, suggests that it was written in a Latin country where an Old Latin order was considered a matter of course. (4) Such changes must have taken place before the Greek order introduced by Jerome had become well known. Bearing these factors in mind Chapman suggests a date of origin for Codex Bezae, as follows:

¹ Blass (Philology, p. 76, n. 1) refers to his student, Ernst Lippelt, as the one who brought the difference to his attention.

² Chapman, Gospels, p. 344f.

³ Ibid., p. 344.
Such conditions are most unlikely in South Italy, Sardinia or Gaul after c. 450, one might probably say after 420. The beginning of the fifth century seems the most probable date, and this harmonizes with the result obtained on other grounds by Mr. Burkitt [vide supra].

1906 - Dom Henri Quentin

Dom Quentin, who had some association with Chapman, presented an article in 1906 that corroborates Beza’s statement that Codex Bezae had been in Lyons a long time before it was removed from there and placed in his hands in 1562. Quentin’s study is based on the references and citations found in the Martyrology of Ado and the notes of Marianus Victorius, many of which are peculiar to Codex Bezae.

Quentin compared all the New Testament readings cited in Ado’s Martyrology with a host of other witnesses. However before examining the

---

1 Ibid., p. 346.
2 Marianus Vittorius (Mariano Vittori), was Bishop of Amelia and later of Rieti (Lazio region of central Italy) from June 2 until his death on June 29, 1572.
3 Quentin (p. 3) used the following Old Latin versions: Veronensis (b) according to the edition of Bianchini, and the Colbertinus (c) according to Dom Sabatier, for the gospels; for the epistles of Saint Paul, the Claromontanus (d) and the Sangermanensis (e) as well as the opinion of Sabatier. For the Acts of the Apostles he used the majority of the witnesses, thereby reviewing: the texts of Codex Bezae (d), of Laudianus (e), the fragment of Ambrosienne (g²), the manuscript of Perpignan (p), the Liber combatus (i), and the citations of the anonymous tract, De prophetis et prophetis (Codex Sangallensis 133), the respective editions of Scrivener,
New Testament citations in Ado’s *Martyrology*, Quentin addressed the all important question of Ado’s location at the time of composing this work. This question was particularly relevant then - and for that matter, now - since some scholars argued for a composition in Vienne. They had based their argument on the list of Viennese bishops given in the *Martyrology* and the several notes concerning the Saints of that city.¹ In rejecting a Viennese composition, Quentin cites the work of Gospellier² who had stated that even in his time it was an already recognized fact that the better manuscripts of the *Martyrology* ignored completely the Bishops of Vienne. Quentin’s own investigations also affirmed that the same could be said of the mention of Pope Nicolas the first and the translation of Saint Cyprian. He recognized, however, that while some of the Saints of Vienne are in the body of the *Martyrology* they are not from Ado, but rather inserts, for they were already represented in the work of Florus, Bishop of Lyons († c. 860).³ which Ado had acknowledged using. He argues, therefore, that the evidence is against a Vienne composition, but points rather to a Lyons composition. The evidence for a Lyons composition comes in the form of the

---

¹ Ceriani, Samuel Berger, dom Morin and Harnack; of all the rest: Gegas (gig), fragments of Fleury (h), fragments of Bobbio (s) etc., ... and the edition of Acts by Wordsworth and White.


³ Sometime known as Florus diaconus other times, Florus magister. (Tafel, p. 40).
notes, which he says, appartiennent véritablement à Adon.\(^1\) These describe the martyrs of Lyons and their particular holidays. The eulogies of Saint Helypidius and Saint Antiochus of Lyons are also furnished as further proof.\(^2\)

Of the 65 quotations by Ado considered by Quentin, the majority (49) are from Acts. Although these quotations appear to be taken from Codex Gigas there are seven that suggest the influence of Codex Bezae. The first three of these, Acts 11:27\(^3\), 18:2, and 19:1,\(^4\) lack Codex Gigas readings, but provide readings witnessed either solely by Codex Bezae or also by either \(\text{h}\) or the marginalia in the Bible de Rosas. Of the remaining four quotations, Acts 6:9 (2x), 12; 18:2f., two contain readings that are a combination from \(\text{d}\), gig and the Vulgate; another contains readings that are a combination of gig and either \(\text{d}\) or the Vulgate; the last gives the exact reading of \(\text{d}\).\(^5\) This farrago of witnesses suggested to Quentin that the book of Acts used by Ado contained a critical apparatus.\(^6\)

---

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 2.

\(^2\) Quentin, p. 2.

\(^3\) Although shown as verse 27 in fact the words under discussion belong to verse 28.

\(^4\) Act. XI, 27. (Id. Febr.): Conversantibus autem nobis, haud dubium quin Antiochiae, surgens unus ex prophetis nomine Agabus ....


\(^5\) Ibid., pp. 21f.

\(^6\) ‘Que l’exemple du livre des Actes utilisé par Adon ait été muni d’un appareatus critique, c’est d’ailleurs ce qui est mis hors de doute par les quatre passages qui nous restent à étudier.’. (Ibid., p. 20).
The first of two quotations that have citations from Acts 6:9, reads: *et qui a Cilicia et Asia, cum eo DISPUTANTIBUS [vg e t p] et CONQUIRIENDIBUS [gig g\textsuperscript{2} p] atque ALTERCANTIBUS [d], nec resistere valentibus ...*.\textsuperscript{1} Note, Codex Bezae is alone in giving *altercantes*.\textsuperscript{2}

The second citation from Acts 6:9 (*a quibusdam qui erant de synagoga quae dicitur libertinorum*) is witnessed by Codices Gigas and Bezae. However the reading is virtually that of Codex Bezae and considering the close correlation between the quotations and *Gigas*, Quentin was moved to suggest that the exemplar used by Ado had therefore been subjected to an amendment intended to restore agreement with the adjacent reading in the Greek of *τὴν λεγομένησ*.\textsuperscript{3} He concludes therefore that in this passage, as in the other six, it appears to be the result of a corrector using Codex Bezae as his source.\textsuperscript{4}

Quentin reasons that Ado certainly composed his *Martyrology* in Lyons around 850-860.\textsuperscript{5}

\textsuperscript{1} *Ibid.*, p. 21.

\textsuperscript{2} ‘Le Codex Bezae est seul à donner *ALTERCANTES*. ... La présence de cette dernière [the reading of Codex Bezae] est d’autant plus remarquable qu’on ne l’a pas, jusqu’ici, trouvée ailleurs que dans le célèbre manuscrit de Cambridge.’. (*Ibid.*, p. 21).

\textsuperscript{3} ‘L’exemplaire utilisé par Adon avait donc subi une correction destinée à ramener la concordance avec la leçon τὴν λεγομένησ.’. (*Ibid.*, p. 22).

\textsuperscript{4} ‘le Codex Bezae apparaît comme la source probable de notre correcteur. ... Mais les sept passages que nous venons d’étudier sont, il ne faut pas l’oublier, d’une nature toute spéciale. Chacun d’eux révèle la main d’un correcteur, et d’un correcteur ayant sous les yeux un texte semblable à celui du Codex Bezae.’. (*Ibid.*, pp. 22f.).

\textsuperscript{5} Although Quentin does not specifically provide the reason for these dates they are no doubt based upon the time when Ado was associated with Lyons as a monk. Prior to 850 he
Believing that the basis to Ado’s *Martyrology* was a *Gigas*-recension containing marginalia drawn from Codex Bezae,¹ Quentin raised the question whether Ado or Florus may have performed the critical work. He does not rule out the possibility that Ado did this, but considers it fairly improbable.² Florus, on the other hand, was the more likely person because of his interest in ‘authentic’ books, as demonstrated by his considerable library.³ Florus also demonstrated an interest in revising and correcting books, for he performed such

had spent a few years in Ravenna. (Parker, *Beza*. p. 173) After his time at Lyons he became the Archbishop of Vienne (859-60) as stated above.

Parker (*Beza*. p. 174) suggests that since only the first edition of Ado’s work was produced in Lyons a check should be made to ensure that this edition contains the readings which show agreement with Codex Bezae, an exercise that might be useful in laying any doubts to rest - if any exist. However it should be noted that Quentin (p. 2) recognized there were differences between the editions for he states: ‘Mais c’est un fait déjà reconnu que les meilleurs manuscrits du martyrologe ignorent complètement les évêques de Vienne …’, and as the whole thrust of his argument was to prove the existence of Codex Bezae or at least a text like it in Lyons during the time that Ado was there, the importance of using the edition produced at Lyons must be considered fundamental to the exercise. To neglect to do this would demonstrate a standard of scholarship contrary to what one finds in the work of Dom Quentin.


² ‘Et maintenant, à supposer que les citations d’Adon soient considérées comme probantes au point de vue qui nous occupe, on se demandera peut-être si cet auteur a exécuté lui-même sur le livre des Actes le travail critique dont son martyrologe porte des traces si remarquables. En soi la chose n’est pas impossible; néanmoins je la crois assez peu probable.’ (*Ibid.*, p. 23).

³ A measure of Florus’s library may be obtained from his own writings as cited by Tafel (pp. 40-42).
a service for Eldrad, Abbot of Novalèse, by revising and correcting his Psalter.\(^1\) Furthermore, his direct links with Italy may have led to D’s transfer from Italy to Lyons. A passage in Florus’s treatise *Adversus Iohannem Scotum* shews that he had a knowledge of the Greek text of Acts.\(^2\) From this evidence Quentin hypothesized that the critical work on Acts could well be the work of Florus. However he acknowledges that this would place annotators M and O in the second third of the ninth century, a date in direct conflict with Scrivener’s suggested twelfth century. The alternative hypothesis is, as he says, more difficult because it would require a Greek environment in Lyons throughout the whole of the Middle Ages.\(^3\)

Following his article on Ado’s *Martyrology* is an addendum in which Quentin refers to three citations contained in the notes of Marianus Victorius (Mariano Vittori). These notes, which had been placed by Victorius at the end of his edition of Saint Jerome, demonstrate a close link with the Bezan text. The first is the reading contained in John 21:22, ἐὰν σὺτὸν θέλω μένειν σὺτως, which is unique to Codex Bezae. The second refers to Matt 1:23, and the use of the word καλέσεις. Codex Bezae is the only Greek manuscript with this reading, the remainder have καλέσουσιν. Also included in this note is the name of the source: ... *Et ita etiam scriptum est in antiquissimo codice Lugdunensi* .... The third refers to Matt. 9:13 and the exclusion by B and D of the words εἰς μετάνοιαν.\(^4\) The source in this case, however, is referred to as

---

\(^1\) *Ibid.*, pp. 42-44.

\(^2\) Quentin, pp. 23f.


\(^4\) These words are missing from a number of the Greek witnesses, thus, the reader is referred to Nestle-Aland\(^27\) for more details on the witnesses for this and the previous readings.
Claromontensis.¹ In response to the confusion that arises from the different locations Quentin states:

    The testimony of the editor of Saint Jerome remarkably confirms, therefore, the statement of Beza on the provenance of the manuscript, and henceforth, the doubts expressed on this provenance will have to be definitely dismissed.²

1913 - Elias Avery Lowe³ (1880-1969), (1) ‘The Codex Bezae’

    Lowe’s palaeographical investigations of Codex Bezae resulted in a number of suggestions that were, as he states: ‘in several respects at variance with accepted opinions.’⁴ He summarized his main conclusions as follows:

Since they have no bearing upon Quentin’s argument they are not given here.

¹ It is generally accepted that the codex from Clermont and the one from Lyons are the same document.

    Lowe (Lyons, p. 272) makes the statement that this ‘last reference betrays a confusion arising from the circumstance that the manuscript had been used on a public occasion by a bishop of Clermont [apparently referring to the Council of Trent]. The “Codex Lugdunensis” quite naturally became a “Codex Claremontanensis”’.

² ‘Le témoignage de l’éditeur de S. Jerôme confirme donc remarquablement les déclarations de Bèze sur la provenance du manuscrit et, désormais, les doutes émis sur cette provenance devront être définitivement écartés.’ (Quentin, p. 25).

³ Formerly Loew.

    It is of interest that this article by Lowe is not included in Palaeographical Papers 1907-1965 - apparently this is one of the articles omitted by the editor believing that its omission ‘would meet with the author’s approval.’ Pal. Papers I, p. xvii.

⁴ Lowe, Beza, p. 385.
1. The Codex Bezae is a provincial product, *i.e.* it originated in a non-Italian centre.

2. The scribe of the MS, as well as the early correctors, follows the traditions of a Greek scriptorium.

3. The scribe copied from an interlinear.

4. From the time of its execution to about CE. 800 the MS lay in a centre (or centres) where Greek was the literary and ecclesiastical language.

5. From about CE. 800 onward the MS lay in some Western or Latin-writing centre.¹

The basis for the first of the above statements lies in the style of the Latin which, although in uncials, used the minuscule letters *b* and *d*. This style of *b-d* uncial, Lowe claims, is ‘foreign to Italian literary MSS and is never employed as a book-hand by Western scribes ... it is invariably used in marginalia, additions, insertions or at the end of lines to save space.’² Only in the provinces was such a style used as a principal script, as witnessed by literary and epigraphical monuments from Egypt, North Africa, Asia, and Greece. He concludes therefore that remoteness from Italian centres led to ignorance of correct Latin calligraphy. Lowe suggests that this *b-d* type of uncial was probably modelled on the Roman law books that were disseminated to the provinces from the one centre in the fifth and sixth century. He cites the Formula Fabiana of Vienna and the Oxford and Berlin vellum fragments from Egypt as samples of known legal documents, which bear testimony to this unique style. Of nearly 400 uncial manuscripts known to him only two, Codices Cantabrigiensis and Claromontanus, have this


Rejecting Burkitt's argument that the peculiarities of the Latin letters result from the scribe striving for uniformity, Lowe argues instead that they portray a scribe who was accustomed to writing Greek rather than Latin. He observes that in Graeco-Latin manuscripts written in the West the Greek letters invariably conform to the Latin letters, and not vice versa.

Lowe also argues that other factors which corroborate his argument are: (1) the signing of the quires using Greek numerals is contrary to the Latin custom of using Roman numerals; (2) the several transposed verses on the Latin side that have their correct order indicated by Greek letters; (3) the occasional placing of the points of dieresis over Latin words is thought to be natural for a Greek scribe, but contrary to a Latin; (4) the spelling of magika for magica (Acts 8:9) and qem for quem (John 5:38) reflects a person accustomed to writing Greek; (5) the use of the apostrophe by an early corrector to separate two words; (6) the Corrector G, whom he considered contemporary with the scribe, or nearly so, indicates omissions with an arrow-head in the text and margin, in conformity with Greek custom; and the same corrector also indicates variant readings by the sinuous line in the text and margin, as also found in Codex Sinaiticus.

---

1 Lowe (Ibid., p. 386, n. 2) states in a footnote that 'the Codex Laudianus of the Acts, which is also a Graeco-Latin diglot, partially shares the palaeographical feature, for it has the b minuscule in an otherwise uncial alphabet.'

2 Burkitt, p. 501.

3 Lowe, Bezae, pp. 386f.

4 No examples given.

5 Lowe, Bezae, pp. 387.
Rejecting both Scrivener's and Harris's argument that the occasional substitution of Latin letters in the Greek text indicates a Latin scribe, Lowe instead points out that the reverse is also apparent. In fact, entire Greek words are admitted into the Latin side. As an example he cites Mark 7:3 where the scribe, dropped into Greek after the word _laverint_ and on the next line wrote τας¹ χειρ, but realizing his mistake, before finishing the word, wrote _manus_ over the deleted Greek letters.² Nevertheless, he recognizes these as errors that naturally arise when bilingual texts are copied.³

Lowe also maintains that like a number of other verses Mark 7:3 also provides proof that the scribe used an interlinear exemplar. The intrusion of Greek words into the Latin text at the beginning of a line, which are also corrected to conform to the Latin, suggests that the copyist's eyes neglected to skip the Greek line of text when writing out the Latin side of Codex Bezae.

Lowe observes that all the annotations are on the Greek side of the manuscript - the exception being Corrector G; that the Ammonian sections are only on the Greek side; and the liturgical lection marks, the τίτλοι, and the _Sortes Sanctorum_ are all in Greek. From this he concludes: 'This fact is in itself important, for it seems to indicate that our MS was used in a locality where Greek was the liturgical and literary language.'⁴ This observation is in agreement with what Harris had said earlier.⁵

---

¹ Lowe (Bezae, p. 387, n. 2) draws the reader's attention to the Latin _s_ and states: 'again a most natural confusion.'

² Ibid., p. 387.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid., p. 388.

⁵ Harris, _Annotations_, p. 75.
As for the annotators, Professor A. S. Hunt, an expert in Greek palaeography, whom Lowe had consulted regarding these, considered none of them later than the eighth century. Furthermore, since: (1) the added pages in Matthew, John, and Mark are written in an imitation uncial of the eighth or early ninth century; (2) the Greek and Latin of these pages are also unmistakably Western; (3) the only annotations posterior to the year 800 are in Latin, Lowe concluded ‘that sometime in the eighth century the Codex Bezae changed its home and found itself, probably for the first time, in a truly Western or Latin-writing centre.’

1914 - G. Mercati

In the very next issue of the *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Mgr Mercati challenged Lowe’s findings, citing evidence that suggested a Latin beginning for Codex Bezae. Mercati does not address every point raised by Lowe, but concentrates his attention upon Lowe’s second point, and in doing so provides sufficient proof to refute Lowe’s conclusion that Codex Bezae had its origin in a Greek scriptorium. His evidence is as follows:

1. The ornamentation at the end of each Gospel in the Codex Bezae and the arrangement of the *explicit*, *incipit*, are a reflection of the most ancient Latin manuscripts and not the Greek.

---

1 Lowe, *Bezae*, p. 388.

2 ‘The scribe of the MS, as well as the early correctors, follows the traditions of a Greek scriptorium.’ (*Ibid.*, p. 385).
2. The terms of the subscriptions: ευαγγελιον κατα ... ετελεσθη, αρχεται ευαγγελιον (without the article) κατα ... are much the same as the usual Latin explicit, incipit. In Greek manuscripts use the simple title by itself. The placing of the incipit, at the foot of the page before the first page of a book or text with the subscription of the preceding book or text is a Latin custom.

3. The abbreviation of titles e.g. κατ μαθη., etc is very common in the head-lines of Latin manuscripts.

Mercati concludes, therefore: 'Hence the Greek head-lines in the Codex Bezae, no less than the subscriptions and ornamentation, seem to me to shew that the copyist was not a Greek but a Latin.' He continues:

1. Only the very ancient Latin manuscripts number the quires at the inner corner at the foot of the last page, and add an ornament, e.g. ΛΒ (Fol. 256b) and ΝΗ (Fol. 462b), as found in Codex Bezae. More to the point of Lowe's argument regarding the numbering of quires in Greek, Mercati states that the Latin palimpsest manuscript, Bobbio, Vatican. lat. 5755, has its quires also numbered in Greek, and on that basis states: 'surely no one will on that ground be bold enough to suggest that this MS was copied in a Greek scriptorium.'

---

1 Mercati, p. 449.
2 Ibid.
3 Surface script: Augustinus de Trinitate, a minuscule originating at Bobbio, Italy, origin. There are two lower scripts: (1) Epistulae Pauli, an uncial and cursive minuscule of the seventh century, of Italian origin (2) Lucanus, Pharsalia, an uncial of uncertain origin, also of the seventh century. (Lowe, Pal. Papers II, p. 513).
4 Mercati, p. 449.

The use of Greek numerals to mark the quires is explained by Parker (Bezae, p. 9) as
2. Mercati agrees with Lowe in holding that the Latin script of Codex \textit{Bezae} is less than \textit{elegant and pure}, but argues that the Greek script is \textit{much more unsteady} even to the point of being barbarous. He draws particular attention to the letters X, U, C, and B, which have a form that is found only in Latin manuscripts, and thus belies a Greek source, for he says: 'for, down to the seventh century and even later, handwriting among the Byzantines did not degenerate and become so uncultivated as it did among the Westerns.'

3. Misspellings, like \textit{magika}, and \textit{qem} do not, as Lowe believed, suggest a non-Latin copyist, since such errors, and worse, are to be found in the most famous manuscripts of Virgil, and \textit{k} of the Gospels, and others. Also Codex \textit{Bezae} has in Mark 14:5, both in the Greek text (Fol. 336\textit{b}) and the Latin text (Fol. 337\textit{a}), in place of \textit{δηοψων} and its Latin equivalent, the siglum, \textit{κ}. This sign, he states, is known to exist in only one Greek manuscript, \textit{viz} Codex \textit{Bezae}.

Because of this evidence Mercati found he could not bring himself to believe that:

\begin{quote}
... the \textit{Codex Bezae} came from a Greek \textit{scriptorium} or from a hand more accustomed to writing Greek than Latin, I have no hesitation in accepting the view that subsequently it found its way to some 'centre (or centres) where Greek was the literary and ecclesiastical language', perhaps some Greek convent in Italy or
\end{quote}

follows: 'The scribe of D is following Latin practice, but using Greek numerals because all the left-hand pages are given over to the Greek text.'

\textsuperscript{1} Mercati, p. 450.

\textsuperscript{2} Mercati (p. 451) cites as his source: Gardthausen, \textit{Griechische Palæographie} ii, 1913, p. 372.
elsewhere.¹

He does, however, accept that the Ammonian sections and some of the liturgical notes ‘are more Greek in character, and are due certainly, I believe, to a Greek hand.’²

Finally, Mercati rejects Lowe’s argument for an interlinear exemplar. He contends that instead of the scribe writing a complete page of Greek and then Latin, as required by Lowe’s reasoning, the scribe was copying a line of Greek and then of Latin and after a distraction began the Greek line in the Latin column. He also suggests that the mistake may have arisen through ‘some tiresome reminiscence of the Greek, copied a moment ago, in an instant of slackened attention.’³

1924 - E. A. Lowe, (2) ‘The Codex Bezae and Lyons’

It was another ten years before Lowe was to acknowledge publicly the validity of Mercati’s argument. In doing so he states: ‘the objections raised by Mgr Mercati against the theory that the MS originated in a Greek-writing centre are so weighty and convincing as to render that hypothesis untenable.’⁴ The ornamentation, the wording of the colophons, the abbreviation of the running titles, and the position of the quire-marks, are acknowledged by Lowe to reflect a Latin scribal tradition.⁵ He argues, however, that to imply from this that the codex

¹ Ibid.
² Ibid.
³ Ibid., p. 451.
originated in a Latin centre is to ignore all the non-Latin features of the manuscript. Since, however, his article was written to address primarily the question of Codex Bezae’s later history, Lowe makes no further comment on matters of origin.

In addressing the question of Codex Bezae’s long attachment to Lyons, Lowe points to Beza’s statement that it was discovered there in the monastery of Saint Irenaeus in 1562\(^1\) and Quentin’s arguments, which, because of the evidence provided by Marianus Victorius and Ado, locate it there at least two decades before its discovery, and probably as early as the middle of the ninth century.\(^2\) The additional evidence furnished by Lowe himself centres upon the

---

\(^4\) Lowe, Lyons, p. 271.

\(^5\) Lowe (Pal. Papers I, p. 271) was to also acknowledge that the use of the bracket (\(\sqrt{\)}), which encloses each quire-mark, is a Latin custom.

Parker, (Bezae, p. 10) attributes to Bischoff (p. 26) the view that ‘The square format [which Codex Bezae is considered to be] was popular with Latin scribes of the oldest period’. From this he concludes: ‘and there is every likelihood that its shape is another indication that D was produced in a Latin scriptorium.’ Parker, however, appears to be reading too much into Bischoff, because such a statement cannot be found. The closest statement to this that can be found, reads: ‘In Classical and early Christian parchment codices two principal types were current; a square format and a tall, narrow rectangular one. The former is relatively frequent amongst early codices (and not only in de luxe manuscripts).’ (Bischoff, p. 26). I have underlined the two words from which Parker seems to have extrapolated the word *popular*. Even if one was to accept Parker’s assessment of Bischoff’s statement can one justifiably make the quantum leap of linking such productions with Latin Scriptoria. Certainly there is nothing in Bischoff’s statement which allows one to do so.

\(^1\) *Vide:* appendix A.

\(^2\) *Vide supra:* § 1906 - Dom Henri Quentin.
supplementary leaves of the codex and the peculiar three-shaped form of the question-mark found in them, and the blue ink used in the colophon at the end of St Mark on the Greek side of the text, Fol. 348b.

The use of blue ink in Latin manuscripts, Lowe notes, is extremely rare. He knew of only three other manuscripts that contain entries in blue ink; all are French and two of these are of Lyons: 484 (414) and 600 (517). Part of the latter is now at Paris (Nouv. Acq. lat. 446). The third, Rom. Vatic. Regin. 317, is considered to be a Luxeuil product. Lowe reports that L. Delisle considered the Lyons manuscript: 484 (414) to be Florus’s autograph. Tafel, however, refutes this, by saying:

But we can clearly distinguish two scribes (1. foll. 1-63f 105V-253; 2. foll. 63V-105f): the first is Manno, the Praepositus of St Oyan … and the second is not Florus. Still it has some corrections which may be by Florus.

Lowe found the second piece of palaeographical evidence, the question-mark, in only five manuscripts outside the supplementary leaves of Codex Bezae. Again, all of these manuscripts are French with all but one belonging to Lyons,

---

1 Tafel, p. 48.
2 Lowe, Lyons, pp. 272f.
4 The half-uncial, Berlin 83 (Phill. 1745), was used by Tafel (p. 44) to identify Florus’s handwriting, for he argues that this manuscript ‘gives us knowledge of Florus’s handwriting and of the marks used by Florus in his excerption and correction of MSS.’
5 Ibid., pp. 44f.
viz Lyons: 484 (414), 478 (408), 604 (521), and 431 (357).\(^1\) However the fifth, Paris 9550,\(^2\) is also linked to Lyons since it contains the work of a Lyons bishop, and contains annotations from the hand of a Lyons scholar. The same annotator had also worked over Lyons 484 (414), 478 (408), and 604 (521).\(^3\) Therefore Lyons 484 (414) contains both the blue ink for rubrics and the peculiar question-mark.\(^4\) Lowe concludes:

In view of this palaeographical evidence, it seems highly probable that the Codex Bezae was in Lyons when the added pages were written (perhaps by Florus himself, who may very easily have brought the book with him from afar).\(^5\) Taken in connexion with the literary evidence given above, this seems to make probability touch certainty.\(^6\)

---

\(^1\) Lowe (Lyons, p. 274, n. 1) adds the following important note when referring to the documents found with this peculiar question mark: ‘Of course this sign may exist in several other 9th-century Lyons MSS unexamined by me, but it is only its presence in MSS unconnected with Lyons that would weaken the force of the argument.

\(^2\) Tafel (pp. 44f., 48) provides considerable detail on all but 431, which he simply lists.

\(^3\) Tafel (pp. 44f.) has no hesitation in referring specifically to Florus as the one who worked on each of these manuscripts.

\(^4\) It should be noted that the manuscript Lyons: 484 (414) is a minuscule. A Latin uncial written by Florus is yet to be found.

\(^5\) Later Lowe (A Note, p. 14) was to say of Florus, that, ‘he was a scholar who had travelled much.’

J. Neville Birdsall (p. 104) disagrees with this statement for he states: ‘He [Florus] worked entirely in Lyons.’

\(^6\) Lowe, Lyons, p. 274.
1926 - James Hardy Ropes (1866-1933)

James Hardy Ropes’s detailed and comprehensive study of the book of Acts did not destroy the bifurcation theory, but it did severely weaken it,\(^1\) while at the same time providing a plausible alternative explanation of how the Western Text came into existence. Ropes rejected Blass’s theory\(^2\) and the primacy of the Western text, arguing instead for the affirmation of the Alexandrian text (Hort’s Neutral), as the true representative of the original text. Although Ropes centred his study on the text of the New Testament in its entirety, Codex Bezae (as the prime representative of the Western text) received considerable attention.

Although Ropes rejected the theory that the Western text was a Lucan product, he did not dismiss the text as totally worthless. Firstly he believed that the Western text was not just an accumulation of miscellaneous variants, but rather a definite recension derived from what he refers to as the original *Old Uncials*.\(^3\) It was his contention that the Western text consists of two elements ‘an ancient base, which would be of the greatest possible value if it could be recovered, and the paraphrastic rewriting of a second-century Christian.’\(^4\) Because of the early witnesses to the text he concludes that ‘the “Western” text was made before, and perhaps long before, the year 150, by a Greek-speaking Christian who knew something of Hebrew, in the East, perhaps in Syria

\(^1\) Even after this study the bifurcation theory was to still find support from such scholars as Wilson, Wensinck, and more recently Wilcox, Boismard, and Lamouille. For greater detail refer to: p. 96, n. 2.

\(^2\) Ropes, pp. viii, ccxxviif., ccxlvi.

\(^3\) *Ibid.*, pp. viii; lxxvi, n. 3; ccxi; ccxxiii, ccxxvii.

[particularly Antioch] or Palestine.'

As for Codex Bezae itself, Ropes devotes a considerable amount of space to discussing its history and characteristics. However, he is mostly concerned with reviewing the work of other scholars, adding little that is new. Similar to earlier scholars, he finds a sixth-century assignation possibly too late and sees no good reason for refusing it a place in the fifth. Recognising Mercati's contribution to the study of the manuscript, he agrees that the 'ornamentation, subscriptions, titles, the numbering of the quires, and the form of the letters betray the training of the scribe in Latin methods.' However, he also recognizes Lowe's contribution and acknowledges that it could not have had its origin in a centre where the scribes were skilled in Latin.

Ropes's rejection of Southern Gaul as the home of Codex Bezae centres upon its Greek annotations and lectionary system. Although he acknowledges the existence of Greek Christians living in Lyons and the Rhône valley during the second century, he considers it 'wholly improbable that Greek was the common language of this population or of these churches in the fifth, still less in the sixth, century.' He also echoes Brightman's words when he states: 'and fatal to the whole theory of Southern France is the insertion of the Byzantine

1 United States. pp. ccxliv, Q.v., ix, ccxix, ccxi, ccxiv.
2 Ibid., p. lvii.
3 Ibid., p. lviii.
4 Ibid., p. lxiii. Ropes cites Brightman as his source; and C. P. Caspari, Ungebruckte, unbeachtete und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbol und der Glaubensregel iii, Christiania, 1875, pp. 228-231.
5 Vide supra: § 1900 - F. E. Brightman (1856-1932).
lesson-system, which was not used in Gaul.'¹ Southern Italy is also rejected on the ground that by the fifth century the earlier Greeks had disappeared because of the barbarian invasions. He goes on to say that the linguistic evidence would suggest that by the fifth and sixth century the Latin ecclesiastic system and monasteries ‘supplied substantially all there was of higher intellectual and moral forces.’² It was not until the seventh century that people from the East, fleeing before the invading forces of the Persians and then of the Moslems, began to settle again in Southern Italy. By the eleventh century a Greek civilisation again flourished in that region. However this was well after Codex Bezae was written. In conclusion he argues that Southern Italy does not appear to provide ‘the background of church life implied by the extraordinary numerous correctors and annotators.’³ In the end Ropes chose Sicily as the probable place of origin. He argues that although Sicily under the Emperors consisted of landowners who were of the Roman aristocracy and the official language was Latin, Greek remained the language of the people. By the end of the sixth century the clergy were largely Latin, but there were Greeks among them. From the beginning of the seventh century, however, there was a steady influx of people from the East bringing with them their Greek language and culture. By the middle of the seventh century Greek was predominant among the Sicilian clergy, and its influence continued to grow so that by the eighth century the clergy were firmly attached to the Eastern tradition. Early in the ninth century the country was rocked by Arab invasions. He concludes:

All this would well account for the origin of Codex Bezae and for its use for centuries in a locality or localities where the Greek language and Greek customs

¹ Ropes, p. lxiv.
² Ibid., p. lxv.
³ Ibid., p. lxvi.
were continuously in vogue, but where Latin was also known. The disturbed condition of the country early in the ninth century would likewise explain the acquisition of the manuscript by scholars of Lyons at about that date.¹

Although he recognizes that the same history could be applied to Calabria, Ropes contends that the place of origin not only of Codex Bezae but also of Codex Claromontanus (DP 06) was Sicily and that the early correctors and annotators were also Sicilian. However if the codex had been taken to Calabria before going to Lyons around the year 800 some of these annotations and corrections could well have been added there. He points out that the history of Codex Bezae is very similar to that of Codex Laudianus (E³ 08), a Sardinian, Greek-Latin diglot, of the 6/7th century,² which arrived in England in the seventh century ‘doubtless’ by way of Italy.³

Ropes’s analysis of the text led him to conclude that the blunders in the Greek text are either the result of the scribe himself or his failure to correct them, which suggests that the copyist understood Greek imperfectly. However he hastens to add: ‘Nevertheless his ignorance of Latin is also extraordinary.’⁴ The following is a summary of Ropes’s conclusions:

1. Codex Bezae appears to be the work of one scribe.⁵

---

¹ Ibid., p. lxvii.
² Aland cites it as a sixth-century manuscript. Text, p. 110.
³ Ropes, p. lxviii.
⁴ Ibid., lxx, lxxx.
⁵ Ibid., lxix.
2. Both the Greek and Latin texts have influenced each other. The Greek text in particular "has been conformed to the parallel Latin in details on a large scale."\(^1\)

3. The Syrian text does not appear to have influenced the text of Codex Bezae.\(^2\)

4. The archetype of \(d\) was derived from a Greek Western text.\(^3\)

5. Traces of Semitism in the Greek text are detected by the use of Hebrew in place of Aramaic \(e.g.\) the words from the cross Matt. xxvii. 46, Mark xv. 34, \(ηλὲι \ ηλὲι \ λαμὲ \ ζσφθανει\) indicate that the scribe is transliterating the Hebrew of Psalm 22:1, not the Aramaic equivalent as seen in the accepted text.\(^4\)

6. He rejects the idea of a Montanist influence,\(^5\) or the promotion of any particular point of view, theological or other.\(^6\)

---

\(^1\) Ibid., pp. lxxxii, lxxii-1xxxii, cxi.

\(^2\) Ibid., pp. lxxivf., ccxxxivf.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. lxxx.

\(^4\) Further examples are: 'the readings \(απο καρυχτον\) John xii. 4, xiii. 2, 26, xiv. 22 (also in \(8\) John vi. 71), \(σαμφοιρειν\) for \(εφραιμ\), John xi. 54, and perhaps \(ουλαμμασιν\) for \(εμμασιν\), Luke xxiv. 13. Also the otiose \(αυτοι\) Acts xiv. 2 might be Semitic; \(μετα των\) \(ψυχων αυτων\) Acts xiv. 27 sounds more Semitic than Greek." (Ibid., pp. lxxv, cccxliii-iv).

\(^5\) Ibid., p. ccxxxiv.

\(^6\) Ibid., pp. ccxxiii.
Ropes's rejection of Gaul as Codex Bezae's place of origin provoked an immediate response from Sneyders de Vogel, who, by means of philological arguments, attempted to bolster the case for a Gallican origin. His article is the last known endeavour to claim Gaul as the home of Codex Bezae.¹

The grounds for Sneyders de Vogel's argument are the orthographical errors found in the Latin text of Codex Bezae. These, he argues, could only have come from an inhabitant of the south-east of France, in an area where people spoke Provençal or Franco-Provençal dialects, that is to say from the ancient dioceses of Lyons and Vienne.² Because of the dropping of the final vowel in words such as dix for dixit (Luke 9:3), and mis for misit (Mark 6:27), he also concluded that Codex Bezae could not have come into existence before the final vowel had been silenced, which was the seventh century at the earliest. He recognizes that this last point is the greatest weakness in his argument, for he concludes: 'if other considerations force us to attribute our manuscript to an earlier time, our reasoning which has been based on these writings loses any value, ....'³


² Just to give one example, Vogel's first: In Matt. 25 we come across, twelve times *talantum* and three times *talentum*. Italian only retains *talentum*, which gives *talea*; only in France are both forms known *talant* and *talent* in French, *talan* and *talen* in Provençal. (*Ibid.*, p. 11).

³ 'Si d'autres considérations nous obligent à attribuer notre manuscrit à une époque antérieure, notre raisonnement basé sur ces graphies perd toute sa valeur, ....' (*Ibid.*, p. 13).
1927 - E. A. Lowe, (3) ‘A Note on the Codex Bezae’

Lowe’s article ‘A Note on the Codex Bezae’ (1927) was a direct response to the previous article by Vogels. In this he not only refutes Vogels’ claim for a Gallican origin, but also mentions the weakness in Ropes’s argument for a Sicilian origin, namely:

Now given the total absence of ancient Sicilian manuscripts which might serve as a basis for comparison, a palaeographer would be rash indeed if he ventured either to endorse or reject an hypothesis built up exclusively on historical and ecclesiastical considerations.¹

There was, however, no lack of such evidence when it came to assessing Vogel’s philological arguments. Lowe attacked Vogel’s argument at its most vulnerable point, viz that the codex could be assigned to no earlier period than the seventh century. In so doing he points out a very important fact regarding extant biblical manuscripts:

If someone attempted to assign a MS. to the third or fourth century a sceptic might justifiably question the existence of adequate grounds for the ascription, since not a single definitely dated third- or fourth-century MS. has come down to us. But when we approach the sixth and still more the seventh century we find terra firma under foot: we have reached a period for which dated manuscripts and charters exist in sufficient number to furnish us with clear, objective criteria for judging both cursive and calligraphic writing of those two centuries.²

¹ Lowe, A Note, p. 9.
² Ibid., p. 10.
By comparing Codex Bezae with the three firmly dated French manuscripts of the seventh century,\(^1\) Lowe proved it to be ‘utterly different’ and much older than any of these. He states that this is quite contrary to what one would expect had the codex been written in France during the seventh century, for there would have been at least some similarity with these other manuscripts. He goes on to say:

But not only is the Codex Bezae manifestly older than the above-named seventh-century manuscripts, it has every appearance of being considerably more ancient than the famous Codex Fuldensis of the Gospel Harmony written in Italy, read and annotated by Victor, Bishop of Capua, in the year 546. In fact, the Codex Bezae must be pushed back to a still remoter antiquity, for a comparison with the Basilican Hilary in the Chapter-Library of St. Peter’s written at Cagliari, partly in half-uncial, partly in uncial, before the year 509-10, shows that the Bezan Codex possesses the older characteristics. Thus tested by the criteria which extant dated Mss. furnish, the Codex Bezae seems to belong to a period anterior to the year 500.\(^2\)

Concerning Codex Bezae’s recognized antiquity, Lowe refers to Burkitt’s date of the fifth century, Chapman’s claim for the early part of the same century,

\(^1\) These are ‘the Toulouse Ms. of Canons written at Albi between 600 and 666, the MS. of the Homilies of St. Augustine written in 669 at Luxeuil, and the MS. of St. Jerome’s Chronicle written probably at Fleury before 699.’ (Ibid., p. 10).

\(^2\) Ibid., pp. 10f.

Bonifatius Fischer (p. 41, n. 133) reports that Lowe and Berhard Bischoff stated in a personal conversation with him that they could not exclude the fourth century.
and Dom Wilmart’s\(^1\) possible fourth century, and concludes: ‘such is the powerful impression of antiquity made by the Codex Bezae upon those who have worked upon it and lived with it.’\(^2\)

He also rejects the argument that, since the scribe was consciously imitating an older manuscript, he has imparted to the codex the appearance of antiquity. Lowe points out that the Utrecht Psalter is an example of such a process, however, ‘such experiments are never so perfect as to deceive utterly.’\(^3\) Codex Bezae, on the other hand is palpably genuine.

The insertion of two omitted lines in cursive at the bottom of folios 59b and 60a (Matt. 18:18), which are attributed to Scrivener’s Corrector G, provide another clue to the age of Codex Bezae. Lowe considers the hand of this Latin addition to be of an age equivalent to the papyrus letter from Egypt preserved at Strasbourg,\(^4\) which is generally ascribed to the fourth century.\(^5\) Lowe also states that the hand of the Greek addition, at the bottom of folio 59b, is dated by Hunt as possibly of the fifth century and by Seymour de Ricci as possibly fourth.

---

\(^1\) Although Lowe does not give references, Fischer (ibid.) in reference to A. Wilmart (\textit{RB} 31 (1922) 201, n. 2) says: ‘… er schlug sogar eher das 3. Jh. vor und nannte das 4. die äußerste Grenze des Möglichen.’

\(^2\) Lowe, \textit{A Note}, p. 11.

\(^3\) \textit{Ibid.}

\(^4\) The unique form of the \textit{u} and \textit{g} have their equivalent only in this manuscript.

The papyrus to which Lowe (\textit{The Date}, p. 33, n. 2; \textit{Pal. Papers}, p. 5, n. 2) refers is Pap. lat. Argent. I. He refers the reader to F. Steffens, \textit{Lateinische Palaeographie}\(^2\), pl. 13.

\(^5\) Because of the evidence of this Latin edition Lowe (\textit{The Date}, p. 32f., 33) was to later ‘assign hand G, roughly, to a period between 500 and 550.’
Both these scholars were noted papyrologists.¹

Apart from the evidence provided by the script of Hand G, Lowe looked to the abbreviations in the Latin text to confirm the antiquity of Codex Bezae. His examination of these abbreviations suggested that the exemplar was not all of a piece or of one period. The basis for this statement is as follows:

For the abbreviation-symbols designating dominus used by the Bezan scribe in Acts - they are of the dns-dni type - represent a later stage in the development of the abbreviated forms of the Nomina Sacra than the symbols dms-dmi, etc. found in the four Gospels. Whereas in John, Luke and Mark we find only the dms-type, in Matthew the more recent dns-type is also admitted.²

The oldest Vulgate manuscripts, viz the Fuldensis written before 546 and the Sangallensis, which Lowe ascribes to the fifth century, are ignorant of the dms-type, but consistently use the dns-type, as found in Codex Bezae’s Acts and Matthew. Moreover the oldest manuscripts of the Old-Latin version³ are consistent in their use of the older dms-type. Of the two, only the dms-type is found in John, Luke, and Mark. Also the writing of deus and dei in full and designating them as Nomen Sacrum by means of a horizontal line above them is found 69 times in Luke, but only twice in Acts.⁴ This coupled with the

¹ Lowe, A Note, pp. 11f.
² Ibid., p. 13.
³ Lowe (ibid.) lists the following: Vercellensis, Veronensis, Corbiensis, the Fulda Weingarten fragments, and the Sangallensis.
⁴ These figures are somewhat different to those shown in Parker’s later tabulation (Table 14), where according to his calculations DEUS is never used with a line above it - and even
distinctive use of the *dms*-type and *dns*-type abbreviations led him to suggest that Codex Bezae was written in the period when the *dms*-type of abbreviation was giving way to the *dns*-type, which, going on the cited manuscripts, was sometime before the sixth century.¹

Thus the lack of correlation between Codex Bezae and any of the extant French manuscripts, including the oldest extant Lyonnese manuscripts, plus its date of origin (which is very much earlier than the seventh century) makes Vogel’s argument for a Provençal or Franco-Provençal product untenable.

As to the home of Codex Bezae, Lowe, apart from arguing against Lyons, continued to see it as a ‘fascinating problem’. The only definite opinion he was prepared to give was that ‘Codex Bezae belonged to a mixed community in which Greek was the liturgical language, and Latin was also used.’²

At the end of this article Lowe draws the reader’s attention to the palimpsest in the Palatine collection of the Vatican (Ms. Lat. 24), which has buried under its early-eighth-century text of the Old Testament, seven ancient texts. One of these, a work of Seneca’s, is written in a type of b-d uncial, which

without the line it is never used in Luke or Acts - and DEI with the line above it is not found in Acts, but is found 66 times in Luke. (Parker, *Bezae*, p. 101).

¹ In a later article Lowe (*Classical Quarterly*, xxii (1928) 43-62, 59 = *Pal. Papers* I, p. 270) was to point out that ‘the use of a different type of script for the running title from that used in the text is first noticeable in manuscripts of the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century.’. This is important in that Codex Bezae’s running titles are in the same script as the text though in a smaller character.

is the same as Codex Bezae. Further to this, Lowe states: ‘Perhaps if we knew more about this palimpsest, which rightly deserves a special monograph, some light might be shed on the origin of the Codex Bezae.’

1933 - Albert Curtis Clark (1859-1937)

Albert Clark’s study of Acts came seven years after Ropes’s great work. It must be ranked along with Blass’s and Ropes’s treatises in importance, not only because it was equal in scholarship, but because it provided the scholarly world with a plausibly argued third theory on how the Western text came into existence.

Clark, Corpus professor of Latin at Oxford, found from his extensive studies of Cicero, that the shorter version of this Roman statesman’s work arose through the omission of lines of about 21 letters in length. Applying the same principles he had used in the study of Cicero to an investigation of the Gospels and Acts convinced him that the same phenomena had occurred to the Scriptures and therefore the longer Western text was the superior. Clark rejected both Blass’s bifurcation theory and Ropes’s argument that the Western text was derived from the accepted text. He hypothesized instead that the text arising out of the four uncialfs $ABC$ (which he designated $\Gamma$) had been derived from the Western text ($Z$). In his original study Clark had argued that as far as the Gospel and Acts were concerned the textual criticism maxim: *brevior lectio potior*, should be abandoned, because, as he says: ‘the process has been one of

---


contraction, not of expansion.' Clark, Text, p. vi.

2 Credner (pp. 460, 508, 517) used the term stichometrisch when referring to the lines in Codex Bezae. Clark (Acts, p. lxii) refers to the terms used in referring to sense-lines as κώματα, κῶλα, or στίχοι, and although he uses the term στίχοι throughout his work he recognizes that its use was liable to cause confusion (ibid., p. 178). Kirsopp and Silva Lake ('The Acts of the Apostles', JBL. 53 (1934) 34-45, 36) later published an article in which they point out that 'The more usual use of the word [στίχοι] in connexion with manuscripts is a line of a definite number of syllables (or letters) on the basis of which the scribe was paid. Originally it was especially a line of poetry, either in hexameter or an iambic trimeter, and was then transferred to prose writers, meaning a line equal in length to an hexameter or an iambic trimeter.' Their suggested reading for this matter is in a footnote in which they say: 'There is a large literature on this subject, especially in the works of Graux, in the Revue de Philologie 1878, and Diels in Hermes XVII, but for all except those, who are technical experts the clearest source of information is Rendel Harris' Stitchometry, reprinted from the American Journal of Philology, vol. IV.

Four years after the above article Kenyon ('The Western Text in the Gospels and Acts', Proceedings of the British Academy XXIV, (Communicated 6th December, 1938), London: Humphrey Milford Amen House, n.d., p. 23) was to stress the same point, and argued for the use of the term κῶλα when referring to these lines.

Later again Robert Devreesse (Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs, Paris, 1954, p. 63), argued for the use of the adverb στιχηδόν when referring to the lines in Codex Bezae. Parker (Bezae, pp. 74f.) was to come down in favour of στιχηδόν. Nevertheless the proposal was not new, for Blass (Acts, p. xix) had used this term long before when referring to the sense-lines.

3 F. A. Bornemann (Acta Apostolorum ab sancto Luca conscripta ad Codicis
witness to the existence of the Western text as early as the year 300, is also used by Clark to support his argument.\footnote{Clark's book stimulated a good deal of debate. B. H. Streeter ('The Primitive Text of the Acts', \textit{JTHS} 34 (1933) 232-41, 241) was quick to respond with an article that addressed Clark's work, and although he did not agree with every aspect of Clark's argument he believed that in the main he had 'proved his case'. Kirsopp and Silva Lake ('The Acts of the Apostles', \textit{JBL} 53 (1934) 34-45, 35) on the other hand rejected both Ropes's and Clark's theories, favouring instead the idea that both major texts were derived 'from a common lost ancestor'.}

Although Clark's study is centred upon the Western text, Codex Bezae (its principal witness) receives substantial attention, for he addresses extensively both its history and its characteristics.

Clark argues that the sense-lines of Codex Bezae were those of its exemplar. Indeed, as early as his first study he was to say:

\textit{Cantabrugiensis}, Grossenhain (Saxony) and London, 1848, pp. x-xv) appears to be the first to suggest that the shorter Alexandrian text came from the longer text of Codex Bezae through homoioteleuton.

This theory of accidental scribal omissions was criticized on several accounts by such eminent textual scholars as Sanday, Souter, and Kenyon. B. H. Streeter (\textit{The Four Gospels}, London: Macmillan & Company, Ltd., 1927, pp. 132f.) looked favourably upon Clark's study, but felt that it should include intentional omissions. Clark's later study (\textit{Acts}, pp. xxxixf.) led him to agree that the omissions were mainly not by accident, but rather the work of an 'abbreviator'. Kenyon (\textit{op. cit.}, p. 25) was to say later that Clark was 'on much stronger ground,' in changing his stand from accidental to deliberate excisions.

\footnote{Henry A. Sanders, 'A Papyrus Fragment of Acts in the Michigan Collection', \textit{HTR}, XX (1927) 1-19.}

\footnote{Clark's study is centred upon the Western text, Codex Bezae (its principal witness) receives substantial attention, for he addresses extensively both its history and its characteristics.}
... all our MSS., including D, are descended from an ancestor written not in lines of equal length, as in the case of the Gospels, but in cola and commata, i.e. sense-lines of varying length, such as those found in D.¹

It was Clark’s contention that the original ancestor or archetype of the four Gospels, which would have been in book-form, could not have been later than the middle of the second century.² Clark’s conclusions are in accord with Scrivener’s, when he writes: ‘My own analysis has convinced me that both D and Λd have behind them a series of ancestors written in similar formation.’³

Clark almost repeats Scrivener’s words when he refers to the Latin text of Codex Bezae, for, in conformity with Scrivener, he believes that:

Λd is of little value. In basis it is a servile translation of D and adds nothing to its authority. Where it differs from D, it has been brought into conformity with Γ, cett. In all probability the great majority of such alterations are due to the use of a Latin MS. resembling Λg [Gigas (g)] and the version employed by Lucifer.⁴

---

¹ Clark, Text, p. vii, 90.

² Kenyon (op. cit.) points out a number of major weaknesses in Clark’s methodology. That which is relevant to the above claim is the error in transposing his analysis of medieval Latin manuscripts onto papyri manuscripts of the first and second century. Clark’s so-called archetype, which he argued consisted of 16 lines to a column and 10-12 letters per line, does not always accord with the earlier extant manuscripts, which can be considerably different.

³ Clark, Acts, pp. xxvif.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 219f., xliv. Q.v., pp. 192-220.
Despite this, Clark does acknowledge that occasionally D has been interpolated from d, but this is rare. He also argues that the differences in the nomina sacra, the vocabulary, and the methods of translating Greek idioms within the texts themselves, prove that the Acts and the Gospels were derived from different hands.¹

Clark spends considerable space (ten pages) on the provenance of Codex Bezae. Firstly, he reviews the opinion of previous scholars, addressing particularly Scrivener’s preference for Gaul and is most scathing of his arguments, considering them to be ‘chiefly founded upon the “debased Latin” of Ρ¹ and show singular ignorance of late and vulgar Latin as well as conspicuous want of logic.’² He then goes on to address the conclusions Lowe had come to in his article ‘The Codex Bezae’, particularly his first, third, and fourth points.³ Clark observes that Lowe’s remarks contained in the first point regarding the b-d uncials still stood unchallenged. As to points three and four, Clark had asked Prof. Hunt to re-examine the marginalia to confirm his previous dates, and being reassured, pronounced these two points ‘incontrovertible’.⁴

Clark questions the view that Codex Bezae had its origin in a scriptorium, which would have had fixed traditions and rules, particularly if D was produced in a region where neither Latin or Greek was the indigenous language, which, he argues, was the case.⁵

---

¹ Ibid., pp. xliiiif.
² Ibid., p. lv.
⁴ Clark, Acts, p. lvii.
⁵ It was Hunt to whom Lowe had referred previously on this matter. Vide supra: p. 150.
⁶ Ibid.
Clark had always held the opinion that Codex Bezae had its origin in the East, mainly because of the Graecisms found in parts of d. It would require a locality where the Greek language was more common than Latin. However, he also argues that the errors in D could not have been made by a genuine Greek. He concludes from his analyses of the texts that ‘The presumption, therefore, is that the translator was neither a Latin nor a Greek, but some one whose Greek was not perfect and whose Latin was much worse.’ He suggests, therefore, that Codex Bezae had its origin in a country that was to a certain extent trilingual, viz Greek, Latin, and the local language; with emphasis upon the Greek. North Africa, though trilingual, with Greek, Latin, and Punic, was considered unacceptable since Latin was the dominant language. He points out, however, that Egypt and Palestine, were countries in which Greek, as well as the indigenous language was widely spoken, with Latin as a subsidiary language.

Clark cites a number of scholars whose works provide inscriptionsal, papyrological and literary evidence of the diffusion of the Greek and Latin languages in the East, and therefore, the existence of trilingual communities.

---

1 In particular, Lowe (Ibid., p lvi) says, ‘in Lk. and Acts. Nothing parallel to these is to be found in any other old-Latin MS. of the N.T., or in any other translation from the Greek with which I am acquainted.’.

2 Ibid.

It is interesting to observe that Mercati (p, 450) had said the exact opposite regarding the two texts.

As a result of his own investigations Stone (p. 38) was to agree with Clark.

3 Clark (Acts, p. lxii) particularly favours Jerusalem when a Palestinian habitat is considered.

4 Clark, Acts, pp. lviiiff.

5 Heer, Oriens Christianus, ix (1912), Neue Serie, vol ii.
An example of the early official use of trilingual inscriptions in Egypt is the proclamation of Gallus, issued in 13/12 BCE. (C.I.L. iii, suppl. 141475), and in Palestine the trilingual inscription on the Cross (Lk. 23:38, Jn. 19:20). He goes on to cite a number of references that bear testimony to the use of three languages in Palestine. He also points to the wide use of Latin in Egypt, which is verified by the extant official documents and papyri fragments. Clark argues that as Greek was the ecclesiastical language of the early church the use of interpreters during services to translate the lessons for those who were not familiar with that language was not uncommon. He quotes the fourth-century Palestinian, Epiphanius, as one who speaks expressly of lessons being interpreted to a non-Greek audience, for he had said: ἐρμηνεύται ἀπὸ γλώσσης εἰς γλώσσαν ἣ ἐν ταῖς ἀναγνώσεσιν ἣ ἐν ταῖς προσομολήσεωι.

The second witness to such a practice is that of Aetheria’s account of the services at Jerusalem during a period at the end of the fourth century when it was subjected to crowds of pilgrims. She tells how the liturgy was given first in Greek and then translated orally into Latin and Syriac for the benefit of the

Schubart, Klio, xiii (1913), pp. 27.
Sir Herbert Thompson, Gospel of St. John, according to earliest Coptic MS. (1924).
Sanders, New Test. MSS. in Freer Collection (1918).
Bludau, Studien zur Geschichte u. Kultur des Altertums, xv (1927), 1-2 Heft.
_Ibid._, p. lviii, nn. 2-8.


2 Clark gives no other reference than ch. xlvii. 3-4. _Acts_, p. lxi. The following reference is that cited by Parker (Bezae, p. 261); Aetheria, _Ethérie, Journal de voyage_ (Sources Chrétienes 21), ed. H. Pétré, Paris, 1957.
visiting pilgrims. Clark states, 'When I first read the passage, several years ago, it seemed to me to indicate the use of bilingual or trilingual MSS., and I am still of this opinion.' Nevertheless, in the end, he chooses Egypt ahead of Palestine as the home of Codex Bezæ.

His preference for Egypt rests on the large number of extant Egyptian bilingual manuscripts and the use of στιχοι, which according to Heer, had its origin in Egypt. To corroborate his claim he also refers to Codex Claromontanus as the 'companion MS.' to Codex Bezæ since it is also a Greek-Latin bilingual with a b-d type of uncial written in 'sense-lines', and because it exhibits the same type of faulty Latin as found in Codex Bezæ. Clark refers to Tischendorf as the source of this information. He says that Tischendorf had argued that Codex Claromontanus had an Alexandrian origin because the Greek is Alexandrian and because the thin parchment used was characteristic of Egypt. Clark admits, however, that the first of these two arguments is weak. In the end his chief reason for choosing Egypt rests upon Ψ38 and the Harkensis (CE. 616), both of which are Egyptian documents. He concludes:

It is therefore very tempting to suppose that D was written in Egypt in cent. v, though, in view of the wide diffusion of this text at an early period throughout

---

1 Clark, Acts, pp. lxif.
2 Ibid., p. lxii.
3 Clark (ibid.) cites Heer as saying, 'the principle of colometry or arrangement in στιχοι was in the Gospels an ancient inheritance from Egypt, which in later times was imported into the West.' Although Clark does not give a reference in this instance, in an earlier reference to Heer he gives: 'Orients Christianus, ix (1912), Neue Serie, vol. ii.' (Ibid., p. lxi, n. 2).
4 Ibid., p. lxiv.
5 Ibid., pp. lxiiif.
the Roman world, other explanations are possible.¹

He provides further support for the early presence of a Western text in Egypt by referring to Oxy. 1597 and 405 (both iii/iv cent), the Sahidic translation, and the Greek uncial Codex Freerianus (W 032) of the fourth century. He says that the latter manuscript, which has characteristics similar to Codex Bezae - in that its Gospels have the same order as Codex Bezae - is positively known to be Egyptian’.² Furthermore, both the Sahidic and the Bohairic versions, along with Codex Bezae, position the Catholic Epistles before Acts. Clark also mentions that the abbreviations ΘΗC and ΧΡC, which are used as nomina sacra in Codex Bezae, and which were previously considered to be Latinized forms of the Greek TC and XC, are to be found in early Egyptian manuscripts, e.g. Ψ8, W, &B, and the Sahidic and Bohairic versions, though its use is sporadic in some cases.³ In view of this evidence Clark concludes: ‘I venture to think that all this

¹ Ibid., p. liii.
² Ibid., p. lxiv.
³ A. H. R. E. Paap (Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri of the First Five Centuries A.D. The Sources and some deductions, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959, pp. 107-110) clearly demonstrates that ΘΗC and ΧΡC were early forms of the nomina sacra that were to slowly lose their place over the centuries to the shorter forms, TC and XC.

In conclusion Paap (ibid., p. 120) makes the following statement: ‘The material collected shows that originally not all of the 15 nomina sacra were written as contractions. Only gradually such writings penetrated. The conservative manuscripts B and D have a small and coherent number of contractions in common, i.e. those for θεός, κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, and Χριστὸς, the writing of all 4 being based upon the same principle, viz. only the first and last letters. ΤΗC and ΧΡC in D, and occasionally in B and &B, indicate that at an early date contractions with 3 letters found their way into the text. Probably, analogous forms for πατήρ and πνεῦμα
cumulative evidence points to Egypt as the birthplace of *D.*

Although Clark’s work did not change the position of primacy held by the Alexandrian text, it did stimulate further studies into Codex Bezae itself.

1946 - Robert C. Stone

Stone’s careful and comprehensive study of the linguistic characteristics of the Latin text was undertaken with the aim of discovering ‘the precise character of the language, and to see if any light can thus be shed on the problem of provenience.’ His valuable study of the Latin text encompasses phonology, morphology, syntax, and contains an exhaustive lexicon of the Bezan Latin.

The claim by Harris for a Gallic origin because of phonetic peculiarities in the text is dismissed by Stone on three counts: (1) the numerous errors, which Harris ascribes to the weakening of intervocalic consonants could just as easily have arisen from haplography, particularly in a manuscript such as Codex Bezae which contains numerous errors of this type; (2) the types of phonetic peculiarities referred to by Harris are not confined to Gaul, but are considered common to the whole Empire; (3) nor are the cited instances of sufficient number to come to a definite conclusion regarding location.

are also old. We may assume that the 4 contractions first mentioned (ধস, খস, উস, খস) date back to the original text.


2 Stone, p. 16.

3 Harris, *Bezae*, chaps iv, xii.

4 Stone, pp. 23, 66.
He rejects Kenyon’s argument that ‘the Greek has the appearance of having been written by a scribe whose native tongue was Latin’\(^1\) and sides with Clark who considers the translator to have been ‘neither a Latin nor a Greek.’\(^2\) In considering the evidence, Stone, responding to Kenyon’s remark, states: ‘That any scribe whose native tongue was Latin, unless he were very poorly trained indeed, could have made so many and such barbarous errors, is almost incredible.’\(^3\)

Stone provides comprehensive details of the numerous types of morphological and syntactical errors in the Latin text and in his overall conclusions provides information regarding the manuscript as a whole. These are as follows:

1. ‘The language of the Latin Text of Codex Bezae does not vary materially in character from that of other literary remains from the same approximate period (iv-vii cent.).’\(^4\)

2. There are a few general differences between \(d\) and the other works referred to in the study.

3. There are unmistakable signs that \(d\) was written by a careless and ignorant scribe.

4. The Biblical Latin, e.g. \textit{et factum est} (‘and it came to pass’), demonstrates peculiar syntactical phenomena resulting from the influence of Hebrew and Greek.

5. The irregularities in the phonology of the manuscript are few, but

\(^1\) Kenyon. \textit{Handbook}, p. 75.

It should be noted that Kenyon is the only person to have suggested this.

\(^2\) Stone, p. 38; Clark, \textit{Text}, p. Iviii; Schulz (p. 9) was the first to suggest this.

\(^3\) Stone, p. 38.

\(^4\) \textit{Ibid}., p. 65.
unique.¹

6. Some of the outstanding Hebraisms in the manuscript can be ac-
counted for.²

7. The Greek has influenced the language of d considerably.

8. Clark's observation that the translator of Acts was perhaps a different
person to the one who translated Luke is further substantiated by the exclusive
use in Acts of ipse as an article, and 'the peculiar and sometimes awkward
replacement of the correlative participle by a cum clause.'³

Stone was unable to come to a clear decision regarding the provenance of
Codex Bezae, all that he was able to achieve was either to substantiate, or to
detract from, existing theories. Adding to the already substantial evidence that
weighs heavily against a Gallican origin, Stone points out that

The confusion between the vowels i and e, and o and u, is especially fre-
quent in writings from Gaul (pp. 17,18), but neither of these features is

¹ Stone (ibid.) lists these as follows: 'The change i>e (p. 18) is rare in Late Latin; d>p
(p. 20) may be palaeographical, since it is attested in no other place; and for m>p (p. 21) there
seems to be no ready explanation. Another strange phonological feature is the insertion of a t
between s and r in the word Istrahel, which appears regularly in this form throughout the text,
Istrahel being found but ten times (p.22).'.

² These result from: 'the confusion of the neuter plural with the feminine singular (p. 27)
[Footnote: Yet something of the same sort appears also in the Greek.], the use of abstract nouns
in the plural with concrete force (p. 32), the employment of in with the ablative to show means
or instrument (p. 48), the use of in with the accusative in a factitive sense (p. 48), the practice of
using cardinal numerals for ordinals (p. 61), and finally the use of the phrase et factum est to
introduce new paragraphs (p. 62).'. (Ibid.)

³ Ibid., pp. 57, 65f.
outstanding in Codex Bezae. The phonological difficulty with final *m* and *nt* (p. 64) is not Gallic but rather Italian.¹

One of the main stays to Scrivener’s argument for a Gallican origin is the use of *de* in the Latin text as a substitute for the genitive. However, Stone calls attention to the fact that its use in this manner was common throughout the Empire.²

The one piece of evidence that gives support for a Gallican origin is that verbs of the third conjugation tend to go into the second,³ a tendency that is contrary to that found in other texts apart from the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, which is known to be a product of Gaul.⁴

Shifting his attention to Ropes’s argument for a Sicilian origin, Stone agrees with Clark’s statement that the scribe of the manuscript knew little Greek

---


Harris (*Bezae*, p. 122) had also stated that the interchange of final *m* and *nt* ‘are certainly more Italian than French.’

² Stone’s (p. 66.) actual statement reads: ‘Scrivener’s contention that certain constructions in Codex Bezae “look more like French than Latin” has been shown to be ill taken, for the same constructions are found elsewhere throughout the Empire ....’

³ J. Neville Birdsall (p. 110) refers to thirty-one, but this writer can only find thirty. Nevertheless Birdsall states that ‘only twelve prove to be, in fact, peculiar to *d*.’

⁴ Stone, pp. 29, 66.

Birdsall (p. 110) points out that because of the inadequacy of research into late Latin ‘local differentiations cannot be made’, therefore the claim that the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* is is a product of Gaul remains unproven.
and Latin;¹ an improbable situation for a location such as Sicily where one could expect the scribe to know well at least one of these languages. As noted above, Stone’s study led him to conclude that the scribe knew little Latin. This, he argues, is evident not only from the great number of errors and their character, but also from ‘the great number of Grecisms [sic], and the evident difficulty which the scribe had in turning the Greek into idiomatic Latin ....’² He views Clark’s suggested trilingual community favourably and in consideration of the historical evidence opts for Jerusalem.³ Worthy of note is Stone’s observation that as this unique manuscript has survived the vicissitudes of time it would indicate the care of people who had a great reverence for it, despite its egregious faults.⁴

1963 - J. Mizzi

Down to this time little had been done to establish the source of the supplemental pages of Codex Bezæ. Apart from Scrivener and Lowe⁵ previous comments were made in passing. Scrivener had said: ‘All these Latin pages are

² Stone, p. 67.
³ The evidence proffered by Stone (pp. 67f.) being: the exile of the Jews by Hadrian and the establishment of a colony, which remained for years; it became a Christian centre, though not an outstanding one; between 408 and 450 a series of churches was established there by Eudoxia, wife of Theodosius II; in 638 the Muslims took over the city, which in turn may have initiated its westward journey.
⁴ However, what we see as errors may not have been so regarded by the community that cherished it.
⁵ Lowe, Lyons, 1924, pp. 272f.
transcribed from copies of the Vulgate which resembled the Clementine printed edition more closely than do Cod. Amiatinus and the best manuscripts.'¹ This statement, which stood unchallenged until this article by Mizzi, now stands refuted, for not only does Mizzi disagree with Scrivener, but argues to the contrary and provides the evidence to substantiate his case. I quote:

... we venture to think, beyond the shadow of doubt, that they [the Latin supplemental leaves] are more often in agreement with Cod. Amiatinus and the best Mss. than with the Clementine printed edition.²

Mizzi's analysis proves conclusively the invalidity of Scrivener's claim. Indeed, Mizzi demonstrates that Scrivener loaded his argument by choosing those verses that prove his case. When, however, an analysis is conducted of all the Latin supplemental verses Mizzi found that: '... whereas $d^{\text{supp.}}$ differs from Clem[entine. Ed. HETZENAUER. Oeniponte, 1906] in not less than ninety-eight instances, it differs from A [Codex Amiatinus] in eighty and from W-W [Wordsworth and White's version of the Vulgate] in only sixty-nine.'³

Mizzi found that 'When differing from A W-W and Clem. the text of $d^{\text{supp.}}$ shows some affinity with W, the Irish group of MSS. DELR, the Alcuinian codices KV, the manuscripts EpO ....'⁴ He mentions that these twenty-two

¹ Scrivener, Beze, p. xx.

Scrivener provides the following examples: John 18:12, 16, 19, 31, 36 (3x); 19:6, 16, 24, 28, 36.

² Mizzi, pp. 150, 163.

³ Ibid.

variations are chiefly orthographical. Thus, he argues, the supplemental verses have an ‘Irish streak’.\(^1\) However these particular variants demonstrate only a slight correlation with the Old Latin.

Although Mizzi’s analysis clearly disproves Scrivener’s claim and illustrates that \(d^{\text{supp.}}\) has a propensity towards Codex Amiatinus and the best manuscripts, the question as to the actual source of these supplemental leaves remains substantially unanswered.

1972 - G. Zuntz

Zuntz’s investigations, although centred upon the Western text, also focuses upon Codex Bezae’s provenance. His novel approach casts the Western text and the history of Codex Bezae in a new light, and at the same time revives Chase’s hypothesis that the Greek had the Syriac text as its base.\(^2\) In conclusion he states that Codex Bezae had a Syrian origin and names Edessa as the specific location. Not that a Syrian home for Codex Bezae is new in itself, for Sanday and Chase had previously suggested Antioch.\(^3\) What is novel, however, is the bases to his conclusion. Its regrettable that this article, the results of his investigations, although delivered as a paper to a group of Oxford theological lecturers in 1939, was not published until 1972.\(^4\)

---

\(^1\) Ibid., pp. 159f.

\(^2\) Zuntz, pp. 207-12.

\(^3\) Sanday, The Guardian, 18 and 25 May 1892. (Chase, pp. 143ff.).

Chase, pp. 115-131, 136, 142f., 147-149.

Ramsay, Paul, p. 27.

\(^4\) Zuntz, p. 189, n.1.
Similar to Corssen\(^1\) and Ropes,\(^2\) before him, Zuntz believed the Western text consisted of two elements. For him these were: the \textit{Old Western} (Wi), which he believed was remnants of the original text or at least one very near to it,\(^3\) and the \textit{secondary Western} (Wii),\(^4\) which arose through 'a re-translation, from the Syriac, of an ecclesiastical adaptation, namely, the lectionary-text of the oldest Church of Edessa.'\(^5\)

Basing his argument on the belief that Wii readings came into being at a time when early Christianity was centred in the communities and 'edification by the Holy Scriptures meant listening, in the Church, to the lector, the anagnostes,'\(^6\) he argued that the Wii text was used in the \textit{lectio solemnis}. To prove his claim Zuntz looked for and found lectionary opening and closing phrases in the Western witnesses that belong to readings identified by Burkitt to have been


\(^2\) Ropes, 1926, p. ccxl.

\(^3\) Zuntz (pp. 190-193) argues that both $\$45$ and Clement of Alexandria are witnesses to this original text.

\(^4\) This new material, Zuntz (\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 192ff.) argues, was added in order to promote an ecclesiastical point of view, \textit{e.g.} 15:29, 34; 13:8, 43; 14:7; 18:2, 27.

\(^5\) \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 189f.

\(^6\) \textit{Ibid.}, p. 201.

Zuntz (\textit{Ibid.}, p. 202) makes a significant point when he states: 'It is of course difficult to say if any, and which, of the many Western additions stood at the beginning or at the end of a lesson. For we do not know any details regarding the systems of pericopes in a time as early as that when the re-writing took place. Anyhow, one of the earliest facts known is that the whole of Acts was read, after Easter, at Carthage in the time of St Augustine, and at Antioch in the Age of St John Chrysostom. And, indeed, the \textit{lectio continua} is generally supposed to have been the earliest form of the \textit{lectio solemnis}.'
used at Edessa.¹

The additional Wii words, ‘in those days’ or ‘in that time’ are frequently used at the beginning of a lesson, while ‘The Lord’ and ‘God Almighty’ marked the end of a lesson, which in turn provoked the expected response, ‘Amen’. Specific to Codex Bezae are the additional words in 14:7: ὁ δὲ Παῦλος καὶ Βαρναβᾶς διέτριβον ἐν Λύστροις. D h w vg⁵ (mae), which are part of a lesson found only in the Mozarabic and lessons of the Syrian church.² The additional words in 13:43, ἐγένετο δὲ καθ’ ὅλης τῆς πόλεως διελθεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, D (syhmg) are also to be found only in a lesson of Edessa. The additions of κύριος (5:42) and φερόμενοι ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ (15:29), are used to mark the ends of Edessene lessons. With evidence such as this, Zuntz could well ask, with some measure of confidence: ‘... how could these additions - essential and characteristic parts of the secondary Western text - tally so well with the use of Edessa unless they were originally intended for it?’³

Having established his argument for the Western text thus far, Zuntz shifted his attention to its best representative, Codex Bezae. Rejecting an Egyptian provenance on palaeographical grounds, and Palestine because of the form of its text and its lack of any correlation with the Jerusalem lessons, Zuntz looked to Antioch. However Antioch is rejected because he believes a text from there would be expected to reflect a Lucianic form. Codex Bezae’s strong links with the Syrian witnesses, particularly the Peshitta, directed him farther East, nearer to the centre of genuine Syriac traditions, namely, Edessa.

¹ Ibid., pp. 204f.
² Zuntz (ibid., p. 204) states: ‘by the Nestorians on SS. Peter and Paul’s Day, and at Edessa on the Sunday after Pentecost.’
³ Ibid., p. 205.
His 'decisive argument', as Zuntz calls it, is that of the lectionary marks recorded in the margin of Codex Bezæ. Where Brightman had considered these to be of the Byzantine Mass-lessons Zuntz argues that:

This is true, but it is not the whole truth. There are deviations in these marks from the Byzantine system; deviations so far-reaching that they would have made this manuscript unservicable [*sic*] for use in a Byzantine church. Now it can be shown, by a fairly tedious inquiry, that these special lessons are remnants of the Syrian system, preceding, in the sector of Antioch, the reception of the Constantinopolitan system. It would seem, then, that codex Bezæ was in use in that region, whence, from general considerations, we suspected it to have originated, and these convergent facts thus seem to suggest that this paramount witness to the Western text comes from some place near that ecclesiastical centre to which we intend to trace the origin of Wii.¹

Thus Zuntz is somewhat circumspect when it comes to giving Codex Bezæ a home, but not so when naming the source and the place of origin of the Wii text, for he states unequivocally: 'the re-writing was carried out in Syriac at Edessa.'²

1980 - R. Sheldon MacKenzie

The available evidence would suggest that Kipling was the first to put

forward the idea that Codex Bezae was written from dictation.\(^1\) Credner supported the dictation theory,\(^2\) as did Alfred von Resch.\(^3\) Furthermore, Hermann von Soden, in referring to Codex Bezae and its many orthographical irregularities also states: ‘... the writer of the text, mostly dictated letter for letter, has been very careless with his eye.’\(^4\) Robert Stone, on the other hand, pointed to errors that appear ‘to be due to phonology; the scribe would repeat the phrase to himself as he wrote, and write as it sounded. Cf. Mt 23.17, aut templum = aut templum; J 16.30, hoc credimus = hoc credimus; L 4.7, eruntua = eruntua; and others.’\(^5\) It should be noted, however, that Stone does not indicate whether he considered these errors to be due to dictation or direct copying. A phonological error may arise from either of these two activities.

MacKenzie’s study of all the phonological errors in the Bezan text of Acts known to him was aimed at highlighting ‘those features of the errors in spelling that seem to suggest dictation.’\(^6\)

MacKenzie argued that since the aspirate \(h\) was muted in Vulgar Latin from

---

1 Kipling, pp. xiiif.
2 Credner, p. 465.
3 Alfred von Resch, Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien: textkritische und quellencritische Gründlegungen, Leipzig, 1892. (Harris, Lectures, pp. 1-3).
6 MacKenzie, p. 60.
around the first century BCE and had disappeared from common parlance by the time Codex Bezae was copied, it would have been a source of error when copying from dictation because of the scribe’s confusion over its inclusion or omission.¹

Another phonetic problem cited by MacKenzie is the final *m* and *nt*, which he considered to be more of a problem of misspelling than of incorrectly reading the word.² He goes on to state: ‘As early as the third century B.C.E. the final *m* was no longer pronounced and final *t* disappeared from Vulgar Latin.’³ Further to this, the omission of the letter *m* in words containing a *p*, *e.g.* 5:9, *teptare* should read *temptare*; 17:5, *adsuptis* for *adsumptis* - similar again in 12:25 and 20:14; and 13:19, *septe* for *septem*. Also the letter *p* is substituted for *m* in 5:17, *aepulationem* for *aemulationem*; and again in 13:34, *portuis* instead of *mortuis*. There is one instance were *f* has been substituted for *p* in 7:46 *referit* instead of *reperit*.⁴

Such is the type of argument presented by MacKenzie. Detailed also is the


MacKenzie (*ibid.*, pp. 61f.) gives seven verses in which such an error occurs, *e.g.* 4:15, *habire d* instead of *abire B* 8; the *hopus* in 5:38, although he admits this error could arise through copying two words having the same vowel; he says the same of *horabit* in 10:9 which has on the same line *hora;* etc. The other four are 10:43, 11:23, 21:20, and 2:15.

² Harris (*Bezae*, pp. 121f.) saw this phonological difficulty as Italian in origin.


confusion between the letters $d$ and $t$, $g$ and $d$, $b$ and $v$, $i$ and $e$, $e$ and $u$, $u$ and $o$. As well as the errors that arise through the incorrect use of the letters $r$ and $i$, and the use of $n$ before the letters $s$, $c$, or $d$.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 64-71.} Concerning the additional $a$ before the letter $e$, he states: 'the addition of $a$ before $e$ seems explicable on the basis of writing down what he thought was the correct spelling of what was heard rather than of copying down what was seen.'\footnote{Ibid., pp. 71f.} MacKenzie's conclusions are as follows:

In the first instance, the argument in favour of the text having originated in a center where the scribe wrote under the direction of a dictator is a fairly convincing one. ... 

The Latin text in which the phonological errors occur appears to be older than the Latin text of which the fuller readings are a part. With two exceptions, there are no phonological errors known to me in the fuller readings in the Latin text.\footnote{MacKenzie (ibid., p. 74, n. 43) gives as exceptions 15:29 and 17:19.} This must mean that when the Latin text became a part of the bilingual codex, the fuller readings were imported into it from the Greek column.\footnote{Ibid., p. 74.}

**1982 - David C. Parker, (1) 'A "Dictation Theory" of Codex Bezae'**

Harris had long before rejected Credner's arguments in favour of the hypothesis that Codex Bezae had been written from dictation. The only other person to refute the theory was David Parker, who in response to Mackenzie's study analysed Mackenzie's every argument and
demonstrated, as Harris had, that the errors arise from a copyist reading the book for himself.  

Parker breaks down the sixty-nine errors put forward by Mackenzie into the following five groups: (1) Errors that do not exist (2 in all). (2) Errors of such frequency in Latin manuscripts that they prove nothing (14). (3) Errors of parablepsis and assimilation to the context (27). (4) The writing of one word for another, or at least the form of one word has influenced that of another. This is a trick of the mind resulting from having previously heard or read this influencing word (12). (5) Errors that cannot be explained by any of these four (14). Regarding these last fourteen, Parker refers to Stone as having shown that ten of them are common to late Latin, and the remaining four are dismissed on the basis that ‘these cannot be used to prove any theory. They serve only to remind us that scribes periodically made silly and unreasonable mistakes.’

From his examination of the evidence Parker concluded that the examples

---

1 Parker, Dictation.

2 e.g. 5:9, teptare should read temptare; 13:19, septe for septem. (Ibid., pp. 98-100).

3 e.g. 4:15, habire d instead of abire B 8, where habebant in the previous line is the reason for the mistake; the hopus in 5:38 - the following word is hoc and there is hominibus in the following line; horabit for orabit in 10:9 arises from hora in the same line; aepulationem for aemulationem in 5:17 arises from the inpleti sunt before it and/or ejplhvsqhsan in the Greek. (Ibid., pp. 100-104).

4 e.g. 7:46, referit instead of reperit. (Ibid., pp. 100-104).

5 e.g. adsuptis for adsumptis. (Ibid., pp. 105f.).

6 e.g. 13:34, portuis instead of mortuis. (Ibid., p. 105).

7 Ibid., p. 106.
given by Mackenzie give no proof of dictation at any stage in the tradition behind Codex Bezæ. On the basis that it could be expected that such errors would be corrected by following copyists, as Corrector G did for many of those cited by Mackenzie, Parker argues that these errors, in the main, must have come from the hand of the scribe of the codex itself, or by an immediate predecessor. He goes on to say:

The only singular errors which are demonstrably older than the existing Ms, it may be laid down as a general rule, are those in which the corruption can be shown to have more than one stage, and those in which one column has influenced the other; those errors which make sense of some kind can be of any age.1

Having presented his argument against the dictation theory, Parker looks at the evidence for a visual copying of Codex Bezæ. Firstly he cites C. H. Roberts’s claim that the use of dictation in the earliest church in the copying of manuscripts was improbable,2 ‘first because in Judaism the practice was forbidden, second because the variety of hands in the earliest Christian papyri indicates that there were no central scriptoria.’3 Parker argues that although specialized

---

1 Ibid., p. 107.


3 Parker, Dictation, p. 108.

To quote Roberts (p. 49): ‘The strictest rules governed the handling, the reading and the copying of the Law. Multiplication of copies by dictation was not allowed; each scroll had to be copied directly from another scroll;’. Further on (p. 65) he states: ‘In the early second century the variety in the types of hands and the documentary influence visible in some of them
book production in the Church had its beginning with Origen (185-253/4) and the Catechetical School in Alexandria, it was possibly not until Constantine that scriptoria became widely used. 'Even then, there is no reason for believing the use of dictation to have been widespread.'\(^1\) More to the point, however, are the unique qualities of Codex Bezae to which Parker refers: 'Codex Bezae, with its "provincial look",\(^2\) and with no regular diorthotes, is more likely to have been produced to meet the need of a local congregation than as a commercial production.'\(^3\) Parker admits, however, that the use of dictation for the writing of unique books cannot be ruled out as impossible. Nevertheless, he concludes that:

The circumstances surrounding the creation of Codex Bezae, then, are also favourable to the belief that it was copied visually. ...

Until evidence can be produced that shows unambiguously that a dictator was used, it must be allowed that Codex Bezae was copied visually.\(^4\)

The other conclusion drawn by MacKenzie, namely, that the longer readings in the Bezan text are free from the errors he found in the remainder of the Latin text and therefore later in origin, is proven by Parker to be without foundation. By an examination of the longer readings in chapters 1-6, Parker is

tell against the hypothesis of central scriptoria.'.

\(^1\) Parker, *Dictation*, p. 108.


\(^3\) Parker, *Dictation*, p. 108.

able to provide nine examples of such errors, thereby proving that the longer readings are prone to error like the rest of the text, so that Mackenzie’s claim on this matter is without foundation. In conclusion Parker rejects Mackenzie’s theories, but makes three further statements, namely:

1. Assimilation to the context is an important habit of the scribe of Codex Bezae.

2. Many errors in spelling are so widespread that the relevance of phonetical theories for the study of Codex Bezae is far less than has been suggested. To write of a reading in d without referring at the very least to Wordsworth and White is pointless and almost certainly misleading. It is a pity that Jülicher’s Itala contains hardly any information on the spelling adopted in the various Mss.

3. It is to be concluded, as far as is possible from a study of the Latin text in isolation from the Greek, that the scribe of Codex Bezae copied from the exemplar visually, without the help of a dictator.

1986 - G. J. C. Jordaan

Although Jordaan’s novel and ‘preliminary’ study of the word-order differences between the Greek and Latin texts in Codex Bezae was centred upon the Gospel of Luke, it will be included in this history because its conclusions bear upon the manuscript as a whole. Harris had previously looked at the word

---

1 Fischer, p. 41, n. 131.
2 Parker, Dictation, p. 111.
3 The disconcerting aspect of Jordaan’s study is that all too often the references given in the text are either not given in, or do not accord with, the bibliography. The following examples are from the first page alone: Black, 1946; Von Soden, 1902; and Harris, 1891. The
order of the Bezan text and argued that the Greek had been consistently made to conform to the Latin.\(^1\) Jordaan refers to James D. Yoder who also conducted a similar study, but he had centred his investigations upon those readings where the word-order of the Greek text agrees with that of the Latin against all Latin or all Latin and Greek witnesses.\(^2\) Jordaan, therefore, centred his study upon those readings in which there are differences between the Greek and Latin text of Codex Bezae. Furthermore he based it upon the claim of Schwyzer and Rosén,\(^3\) which he states as being:

> ... the linguistic background of non-Greek authors or translators who wrote in Greek or translated into Greek can often be seen in the word-order of their work. Such a non-Greek writer would in moments of inattentiveness employ the word-order usual to his native language and thus betray his linguistic background.\(^4\)

Jordaan points out the importance of determining the background of the Bezan scribe, for such a discovery would render the peculiarities of the Greek and Latin text less of a problem, in that it would help answer questions such as:

---

bibliography has: Black, 1954; Von Soden is not listed; and Harris, 1893.

\(^1\) Harris, *Bezae*, pp. 53-61 (chapter, VII).

\(^2\) Jordaan’s references to Yoder, on p. 102, in this instance: (1958:90) and (1958:351), bears no resemblance to his references to Yoder in the Bibliography.


Were D and d each copied from its own archetype, or is the one a translation from the other? If assimilated, in which direction had the assimilation in Bezae been done: from D to d, or from d to D? Where did codex Bezae originate: in the East or in the West, or somewhere else?¹

His study of the word-order differences in the Bezan text of Luke concerned three aspects, viz:

- the order of the verb and adverbial phrases.
- the order of the noun and its adjective or adjectival phrase; and
- the position of the verb in the sentence.²

Since Yoder had discovered that no conclusions could be drawn, one way or the other, from readings in which both the Greek and Latin texts have either the usual word-order or both have an unusual word-order, Jordaan focused his attention upon those readings in which either the Greek or the Latin texts have an unusual word-order against the normal order of the other.

Concerning the order of the verb and adverbial phrase only one reading could be found that met this criterion, namely, Luke 18:27:

\[ \text{tā ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δύνατα παρὰ θεῷ ἐστὶν}. \]

*quae impossibilii³ sunt in hominibus apud dīm possibilia sunt*

³ The Bezan text actually has *impossibilia.*
In this reading, the word-order of the Greek agrees with most Greek witnesses. However, the word-order of the Latin is found in no other witness. After assessing a number of possibilities on how this difference might have come about, Jordaan opted for the possibility that: (1) the Greek text was copied before the Latin, from a Greek archetype; (2) that the Latin was copied from a Latin archetype; (3) that the copyist as a rule assimilated the word-order of the Latin to that of the Greek; (4) and that the copyist was Latin-speaking.

He cites thirty-five readings in which the Greek and the Latin texts differ regarding the order of the noun and the adjective. In all these readings the word-order of the Greek text is in accord with most Greek witnesses. This led Jordaan to conclude that:

..., it is probable that the Greek archetype which the Bezan scribe consulted, had the same word-order as that of D. Likewise it is probable that the Latin archetype which the scribe consulted, had the same word-order as that of d. Because of an unintentional oversight the scribe failed to assimilate. Whether it had been his intention to assimilate to the Greek or to the Latin is impossible to determine from these passages.¹

Despite not being able to determine from which text the other was assimilated, Jordaan argues that these results do have a bearing upon the question whether the Greek text was derived from the Latin. The evidence rests upon the seven passages in which the demonstrative adjective is transposed, so that the Greek text has the demonstrative after the noun, while the Latin has it before the

¹ Ibid., p. 107.
noun. In both cases the word-order is not unusual. He therefore concludes:

If indeed D should be regarded as a translation from d, these instances of word-order difference between D and d have to be explained as unintentional errors in translation. If this had been the case, no reasonable explanation can be given why the translator would have transposed the demonstrative from a position before the noun to postposition, because the translator could easily have retained the demonstrative before the noun, since Greek word-order equally allows for preposition and post-position of the demonstrative .... Therefore these passages supply evidence against the theory that D is a translation from d.

He draws similar conclusions from readings that involve the position of the verb. In these cases also 'there are only a few instances where the verb is found in an unusual position in both D and d,' The solitary verse given as an example by Jordaan is Luke 16:11:

\[ \text{τὸ ἄληθινὸν τίς ὑμῖν} \text{ quis crederis} \]
\[ quod uterum est quis creder uobis. \]

The position of the verb differs in the two texts. However, the Greek reading is in accord with the other Greek witnesses, just as the Latin reading is in accord with other Latin witnesses. Jordaan therefore concludes that both the Greek and the Latin texts were copied from archetypes of the same language and

---

2 Jordaan, pp. 107f.
3 Ibid., p. 109.
4 The Bezan text actually has ὑμεῖν.
that the Bezan scribe was a Latin. Had the scribe been Greek the verb at the end of the Greek sentence is likely to have attracted his attention, since it is removed from its usual position, either at the beginning or close to the beginning, of the sentence. On the other hand a Latin scribe would see nothing wrong with the verb in the last or second last position, since both positions are normal for Latin.

At the end of his article Jordaan lists his conclusions, thus:

1. The scribe of Bezae copied D from a Greek archetype and d from a Latin archetype.
2. The Greek was copied first, then the Latin, and while writing down the text of d, the scribe assimilated it to D.
3. The scribe was Latin-speaking, and therefore
   - he sometimes made an unintentional copying error by writing a word or phrase in a typical Latin position, thus creating a singular word-order reading;
   - sometimes, where the word-order patterns of the Greek and that of the Latin archetypes were in disagreement, but neither was unusual to Latin word-order, the scribe did not notice the disagreement and failed to assimilate the word-order of D and d.
4. From the Latin background of the scribe follows
   - that codex Bezae has probably been copied in the West;
   - that Latinisms in D should not necessarily be regarded as evidence of translation from a Latin text. It is much more probable that such Latinisms were the result of unintentional errors on the part of a Latin-speaking scribe.¹

¹ Ibid., p. 110.
1992 - David C. Parker, (2) Codex Bezae

David Parker’s study of Codex Bezae is arguably the most detailed undertaken since Scrivener’s production of almost one hundred and thirty years before. His investigations encompass a number of issues discussed by previous scholars, but in many instances, these were researched far more thoroughly than ever before. His study of the internal evidence, viz the character of the hands and the correctors, and the nature of the text, etc., enabled him to establish a stemma for the Codex Bezae tradition and to suggest a place of origin and early history. The five parts to the book are an indication in themselves of the scope of his investigations:

1. The palaeography
2. The scribe and the tradition
3. The correctors
4. The bilingual tradition
5. Text and codex

Parker argues that the scribe of Codex Bezae had a Latin background, as follows: under the part entitled, ‘1. The palaeography’ Parker repeats what Mercati1 had previously stated, i.e. that Codex Bezae’s colophons are in accord with Latin customs, but unlike Mercati, provides the proof. His investigation of all the manuscripts apart from 017 and 022, proved that the use of the words έτελεσθη and αρχηται in a colophon is unique to Codex Bezae.2 He, therefore, agrees with Mercati in believing that they are simply translations into Greek of

1 Vide supra: § 1914 - G. Mercati
2 Foll. 103b, 181b, 284b.
the Latin forms, *explicit* and *incipit*. Parker also agrees with Mercati when he says: ‘The writing of subscription and title together as a single formula in the character of a colophon is also not a Greek practice.’ He states, however, that the colophon found in D is not entirely without some similarity to the Greek forms, and the closest Greek parallel is that of Ø. There are also normal Greek forms to be found in Codex Bezae, *e.g.* on the first page of Luke: ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΗ ΚΑΤ ΑΟΥΚΑΝ - in this instance the Latin imitates the Greek by having, EUANG SEC LUCAN - as it does in Mark and Acts. Unlike the others, however, the opening title of Acts is not restricted to the first page. In all cases the Latin forms imitate the Greek. He also mentions that: ‘the absence of such a formula as *incipit* is as rare in Latin as it is standard in Greek manuscripts.’ On this basis he concludes that the ‘Greek form in Codex Bezae is likely to be the remnant of a practice that was standard further back in the tradition’, but he admits that the manuscript evidence is too scanty to allow any firm decision.

Parker’s tabulation of running titles in Greek and Latin New Testament manuscripts prior to 500 clearly demonstrates that ‘the Greek running titles of D are modelled on Latin forms, particularly in the use of abbreviations.’ Of the

1 Parker, *Bezae*, pp. 11f.
3 *Ibid*.
4 *Ibid*.

The tabulation of Greek manuscripts is listed in Table 2, pp. 17-19. The tabulation of Latin manuscripts is listed in Table 3, p. 20.

This had been pointed out earlier by Mercati (*Vide supra*: § 1914 - G. Mercati), and later acknowledged by Lowe (*Vide supra*: § 1924 - E. A. Lowe, (2) *The Codex Bezae and
sixty-seven Greek manuscripts with at least some top margin, only 8, B, and Dea have running titles whereas they are present in all the Old Latin New Testament manuscripts and almost in all the remaining ancient Latin manuscripts.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 16-20.} This data led him to state:

The conclusion that in using running titles, the scribe of D was doing what as a Latin scribe he considered normal, seems to be inescapable. The use of abbreviations also indicate this: sec is a common enough Latin practice, but κατ is unique, as are the shortened names of the evangelists. \ldots

There is no evidence to suggest that he [the scribe] could have been trained in a Greek scriptorium, while there is plenty to prove his Latin habits. The belief that he shows a mixture of skills cannot be sustained in the face of this study. We are dealing with the work of a Latin copyist.\footnote{Ibid.}

Burkitt’s claim that the pen of the scribe was cut to write Greek\footnote{Vide supra: § 1901/2 - Francis Crawford Burkitt (1864-1935).}, later repeated by Lowe,\footnote{Vide supra: § 1927 - E. A. Lowe, (2) ‘A Note on the Codex Bezae’.} is shown by Parker to be too simplistic. Parker’s investigations highlight the point that there is more than the cut of the pen to be taken into account when considering the factors governing the writing of script. Such things as cut of pen, angle of writing material, angle of holding the pen, the weight of the pen stroke in relation to the height of the letter, and a number of

\textit{Lyons\footnote{Vide supra: § 1927 - E. A. Lowe, (2) ‘A Note on the Codex Bezae’}.}
other factors, all influence the outcome.\textsuperscript{1} Parker points out that another fatal objection to Burkitt’s argument lies in the knowledge ‘that examples of each type of script are to be found in both languages.’\textsuperscript{2} He concludes that:

The two ways of writing are not confined the one to Greek, the other to Latin scripts. With this fact, the claim that the scribe of D cut his pen as would a Greek scribe falls to the ground. Even more than that, the view that all Greek scribes cut their pens differently from all Latin scribes is shown to be without foundation.\textsuperscript{3}

As to the view that there is a Greek influence upon the Latin script, Parker mentions that if specific Greek influences on the Latin forms of D are to be found, ‘we will need to look for un-Latin details. It is also becoming clear that everything which can be explained as a Latin form should be taken for one.’\textsuperscript{4}

Parker places great emphasis upon Bischoff’s opinion regarding the older eastern half-uncial in the Latin hand, in which Codex Bezae is written. Bischoff states that this type of script ‘is represented by a number of examples almost exclusively of Egyptian provenance (though not by any means necessarily of Egyptian origin), they date from the third to the fifth century.’\textsuperscript{5} Further on he states:


\textsuperscript{2} Ibid., p. 26.

\textsuperscript{3} Ibid., p. 27.

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{5} Bischoff, p. 72.
That a Greek writing norm (that is, the writing angle) has been taken over in this script, and that the slanting type probably imitates a Greek script, seems to me (together with the Greek element in the texts) to be of decisive importance for the question of the origin of this first minuscule script, which I would suppose to be in the East. Given the very considerable component of legal texts transmitted in this kind of writing, the Latin law school of Berytos (Beirut) probably played a rôle, if not already in its formation then certainly in its use from the third to the fifth century.\(^1\)

He concludes that the Latin column of Codex Bezae ‘is written in a form of half-uncial developed in the East, used most frequently in the production of legal texts, and possibly associated with Berytos.’\(^2\) This information was not new for Lowe had made the same observation long before.\(^3\) Bischoff’s statement, however, was to become the basis for Parker’s choice of Berytos as Codex Bezae’s place of origin.\(^4\)

According to Parker the Greek script, ‘is an example of the most common way of writing biblical manuscripts’,\(^5\) but one that betrays a Latin scribe.\(^6\) Upsilon (U) is given as a prime example, the oblique strokes of which have the

---

1. Ibid., p. 74.

2. Parker, Bezae, p. 28.

3. Lowe, Bezae, p. 386.

4. Parker, Bezae, p. 269.

5. Ibid., p. 29.

6. Parker (ibid.) also suggests that the variable pen angle, noted in the Greek script of Codex Bezae by Cavallo,\(^6\) ‘may be due to the influence of Latin cursive on early half-uncial, carried across into the formation of the Greek characters.’.
same angle to the vertical, rendering it as a Latin Y. Parker also sees the hand of a Latin scribe in the *nomina sacra,* and the orthography.

Parker’s investigation of the secondary hands resulted in a revised dating of each of the hands, particularly Scrivener’s Hand G, which he had placed in the eleventh century, and which had been dated by Kenyon as sixth or seventh century. Its date was pushed back further again by Burkitt who argued that it was

---

1 Parker (*ibid.*) argues that, ‘The classical biblical maiuscule form has the first oblique stroke at a less steep angle than the second. The form in D is, in fact, a Latin Y.’

2 Latin data show a developing form of the *nomina sacra* while the Greek data revealed a *static and archaic* form. From this Parker (*ibid.,* p. 106) concluded: ‘Clearly, we have to do with a scribe whose work has made him aware of the customs of other Latin scribes, but who is not influenced by contemporary Greek practice. This provides another indication as to the circumstances out of which the codex was made.’

3 In his conclusions regarding the orthography of Codex Bezae, Parker (*ibid.,* p. 107) refers to Scrivener’s study of the Greek text in Codex Bezae and Stone’s study of the Latin text. In reference to Stone’s work Parker says: ‘The simple fact is that the Latin column is full of spellings typical of Late Latin’. Stone (p. 65) also states that ‘The language of the Latin Text of Codex Bezae does not vary materially in character from that of other literary remains from the same approximate period (saec. iv -vii).’ Further to his previous statement, Parker (*Bezae,* p. 108) makes the following observations: ‘The fact that the Latin spelling is far more obviously influenced by contemporary pronunciation than the Greek, is a further demonstration of two facts. First, the scribe was a Latin speaker [an observation contrary to Stone (p. 38)] - he wrote the Latin as he would hear it, but the Greek as he saw it. Second, the manuscript was copied by eye, and not to dictation. If the latter, then the Greek would show far more signs of the speech of the day if the reader knew Greek well, and far more impossible combinations of sounds if he did not. The premise of these observations is that the orthography of the manuscript is the product of the scribe.’
contemporary with Codex Bezae itself. Parker agrees with Burkitt and cites as further evidence the omission signs used by G, thereby dating the hand, c. 400.¹ He also states that ‘The hand [G] is not calligraphic. It is fluent in both Greek and Latin, whilst being more Latin than Greek in character.’² Similar to Burkitt, Parker thinks that Corrector G was a person of standing, who was contemporary with the scribe of Codex Bezae. Parker also believes that Corrector G was a member of the community for which the codex was produced³ and ascribes 286 corrections to him, of which all but two are made to the Latin text.⁴ Furthermore Parker believes that Corrector G ‘was the last handler of the D tradition to consider consistency between the columns desirable. The bilingual tradition virtually comes to an end with him.’⁵

¹ Parker (Bezae, p. 37) in reference to omission signs refers to Lowe (‘The Oldest Omission Signs in Latin Manuscripts, Their Origin and Significance’, in Miscellanea Mercati, VI (Città del Vaticano, 1946), 36-79 = Lowe, Pal. Papers, pp. 349-384), who states that ‘Greek manuscripts were the models for the earliest Latin usage. Early Graeco-Latin manuscripts show the Greek method.’ (Pal. Papers, p. 380). The omission signs anchorae superiores and inferiores (similar in appearance to arrows) are of Greek origin. Of the eleven Greek manuscripts cited by Lowe (ibid., pp. 356-358) that use this symbol, only one is of the fifth century the remainder date from the 1 BCE. to CE. 4. The five manuscripts, including Codex Bezae, that contain a Latin text that use these omission signs date from the fourth to the sixth century.

² Ibid.

Much of Parker’s argument is in agreement with Burkitt, thus only his additional conclusions will be added here. Vide supra: § 1901/2 - Francis Crawford Burkitt (1864-1935).

³ Parker, Bezae, p. 175.

⁴ Two corrections are made to both the Greek and Latin texts. (Ibid., p. 125).

⁵ Ibid., p. 175.
Parker also pushed back considerably the date for Hand L. Where Kenyon and Harris had suggested the tenth century, and Scrivener the ninth, Parker argues for 550-600.¹

The changes to the remaining hands are less dramatic, but all differ from Scrivener's assessment.² The date of each hand is assessed as follows: 400-440, A;³ 400-450, B, C; 450, D;⁴ 450-500, E, F, H, J₁;⁵ 550-600, J, M₁, M₂, L; 550-

¹ The absence of either Ammonian Sections or liturgical notes by Hand L. in the supplementary leaves led Parker (ibid., p. 42) to argue that Hand L. must predate the supplementary leaves, because, as he states: 'It seems inconceivable that he could have ignored them if they were part of the manuscript in his time.'

² Parker (ibid., pp. 42f.) dates L by manuscripts with a similar script. Although 016, which is of the sixth century and is believed to have come from the Nitrian Desert, has a script close to that of L, the manuscripts of this period with the closest script are of Syrian-Antiochene origin, viz Φ, 043, N, 022, O, 023, Σ, 042, Cod. Guelferby. Helmst. 75a. The last of these has a script that is most similar. Because of this Parker places Hand L at the end of the sixth century. He goes on to say: 'Apart from the palaeographical and historical impossibilities involved in the later date, the earlier one makes it easy to account for the irregularities of the lectionary system compared to later standards: this is an earlier form.'

³ Vide: appendix C for the dates given by Scrivener, Kenyon, and Harris.

⁴ Parker (Bezae, p. 37) believes that the ascribing of Hand A and Hand B to the fifth century 'uncontroversial. A can be seen to be close in time to the first hand. His letters are simple, and straightforwardly Greek. The same is true of B.'

⁵ According to Parker (ibid., p. 38), Hand D is clearly a Greek writer who is not a professional scribe, but a scholar making his own annotations.

⁶ Kenyon had ascribed Hand F to the seventh century, however Parker (ibid., p. 39) states that 'this type of sloping pointed majuscule is rather too simple for such a late date.'
650, I, M, M₄, N, O, O₂;¹ 830-850, supplemental leaves. Parker suggests the following sequence for the correctors and annotators: G A C B D E H F J₁ J M₁/M₂ L.²

Parker presents a profile for each of the hands. The more significant of these is Corrector B, who is placed by Parker after C. Because B’s sources exhibit a text similar to ¹C, as well as a text similar to Codex Bezae, Parker suggests that the status of the Bezan text had been downgraded by this time.³ Because the corrections of Hand C ‘reflect a Byzantine text, with a number of quite distinctive readings’,⁴ Parker concludes that C was not far removed from the original Latin context of the manuscript. Hand D is thought to have been a scholar who knew a good New Testament text, which was closest among known witnesses to ¹B.⁵ Corrector E is considered to have been fluent in Greek and one who consulted a text which ‘is further along the Byzantine road.’⁶ By the

¹ Parker’s later statement (ibid., p. 282): ‘What we know is that the Codex Bezae was left untouched after the middle of the sixth century …’, is in conflict with the work of these series of hands that extend into the middle of the seventh century. It would appear that Parker meant to say that the manuscript remained untouched after the middle of the seventh century.

² Ibid., p. 49.

Parker (Ibid., p. 43) makes the statement: ‘I wonder whether the minuscule M² and the maiuscular M¹ are not two scripts from a single pen.’ From this point on he treats them as coeval.

³ Parker (Ibid., p. 177) states: ‘It is unlikely that the manuscript can have moved far from its birthplace by this stage. But either its original community has ceased to use Latin, or the codex has been moved to another place.’

⁴ Ibid., p. 139.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 155, 177.

⁶ Ibid., p. 177.
time of Hand F the move towards the standard Byzantine text was completed. Parker suggests that the period involving Hands, E, H, F, and J₁ is distinctive, because it was a time when Codex Bezae came under the influence of ‘the episcopate of the powerful Eustathius [451-58]’.¹ However, he admits that Corrector H does not ‘fit easily into the schema’² because ‘His origins and peculiarities are closer to the manuscript’s original setting, closer in text though not in time than Hands A and B.’³ The supplementary leaves on the other hand reflect a re-emergence of concern for the bilingual tradition and the original character of the text.

In chapter four Parker endeavours to discover a pattern in the tradition of copying bilingual manuscripts. He does this by citing and analysing the details of the physical characteristics and textual layout of a number of biblical and non-biblical diglots. If a tradition could be found one might possibly hope to place Codex Bezae somewhere within it. Such was the intention, but unfortunately, nothing of great moment was gained from the material presented. Indeed, Parker was to conclude: ‘Only in the use of sense-lines are the oldest New Testament Graeco-Latin bilinguals consistent.’⁴ Nevertheless, Parker does establish a tradition for Codex Bezae, but one derived from the internal evidence of the manuscript. This is set out in Part II of his book and begins with a study of the sense-lines.

Following on from Scrivener and Chapman, Parker also analysed the sense-

---

² Ibid., p. 282.
³ Ibid., p. 159.
⁴ Ibid., p. 69.
lines and their breakdown within Codex Bezae.  

1 The results of his analysis led him to conclude that the Gospels in the exemplar of Dea had consisted of short sense lines2 with two columns to the page: Greek on the left and Latin on the right.3 He believes, however, that the exemplar of Acts consisted of longer

---

1 To prove the difference between the lines of Codex Bezae and its exemplar, Parker (pp. 76-91) looked at a number of areas under the following headings: Separation of article and noun; Preposition, article and noun; Separation of preposition and noun (no article); the Evidence of the Punctuation; the Differences Between the Columns in Line Division; Repetitions; Transpositions; Omissions.

2 Clark had said the same thing earlier. He had based his belief upon 'the large number of short omissions in various MSS.' Text, pp. 21, 50-56.

3 Parker (ibid., p. 95) states that short sense lines in bilingual manuscripts are to be found particularly in Virgil and in the biblical manuscript, Laudianus, Acts. He argues, therefore, that 'This primitive form of bilingual text is the source of format for the Gospel exemplar of Codex Bezae, and no doubt also for that of its predecessors as far back as the formation of the bilingual tradition.'

Parker (Bezae, p. 76) cites the passage at Fol.89b, ll.32f. as conclusive proof that the line-division of the Gospels in Codex Bezae was different to those in its exemplar. At this point in the text the scribe found that he had omitted material. He therefore washed out the two lines he had just written:

ΠΡΟC ΤΟYC ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΙC ΚΑΙ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΟIC

ΤΙ ΘΕΛΕΤΑΙ ΜΟI ΔΟΥΝΑΙ

and, rewrote it as:

ΠΡΟC ΤΟYC ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΙC

ΚΑΙ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΟIC · ΤΙ ΘΕΛΕΤΕ МΟI ΔΟΥΝΑΙ

Parker concludes, therefore, that the exemplar was written:

προς τους άρχιερεις

κατ ειπεν αυτοις
sense-lines\textsuperscript{1} and therefore one column to the page.\textsuperscript{2} He rejects Chapman’s suggestion that the dissolution of the sense-lines in John and particularly in Luke was the result of trying to conserve writing space.\textsuperscript{3} He also observes:

The places where the line endings in the columns are not the same indicate a slightly greater concern with the Latin text than with the Greek. Along with this, the creation of longer lines is an important stage in the emancipation of the Latin version from the Greek text. It no longer exists as little more than an aid to understanding the Greek, or as a translation to be read after it. It is becoming authoritative in its own right.\textsuperscript{4}

He also concludes that the scribe in following a particularly specialized s absal tradition ‘was far more careful than has sometimes been supposed.’\textsuperscript{5} He argues, therefore, ‘It is not permissible to regard the text of D as coterminous with the Codex Bezae, nor to confuse the functions of redactor and copyist.’\textsuperscript{6}

Τί θέλετέ μοι δούναι.

Parker (\textit{ibid.}, p. 127f.) also uses the correction to Matthew 18:18 by Hand G to prove the same point.

\textsuperscript{1} Clark (\textit{Text}, pp. 80f.) had come originally to the same conclusion.

\textsuperscript{2} Further on Parker (\textit{ibid.}, p. 96) says: ‘The text of Acts also once existed in very short sense-lines but, from its state in the exemplar, we have evidence that the Bezan text is an amalgam of disparate elements. The evidence separates Acts from the Gospels, and Matthew and Mark from John and Luke.’.

\textsuperscript{3} Chapman, \textit{Gospels}, pp. 341f.; Parker, p. 114.

\textsuperscript{4} Parker, p. 95.

\textsuperscript{5} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 96.

\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Ibid.}
From his study of the abbreviations in Codex Bezae Parker provides a wealth of well-tabulated information.\(^1\) However, nothing of great significance was gleaned from the data. Nevertheless, he found that the abbreviations are not confined to those places where the text refers to the sacred, where they can be rightly called the *nomina sacra*, but they are used just as much as a shorthand. The sudden change in Mark 9, of the shortened forms of *Deus*, namely, \(\text{DEI}\) to the later form \(\text{DI}\), suggested to Parker either the work of two scribes, or the end of an aborted revision in the earlier history of the text.\(^2\) This is deemed to have occurred very early in the tradition, before the Latin texts of the Gospels, which Parker suggests existed independently apart from possibly Matthew and Mark, had been added to the Greek texts.\(^3\) He suggests that in a later part of the tradition, after the individual Greek and Latin books of the Gospels had been incorporated into a single bilingual volume, with a Mt - Mk - Jn - Lk order, this manuscript had been copied by two scribes, the change in scribes taking place about the second quarter of John.\(^4\)

\(^1\) Scrivener (Bezae, pp. xviii, xliii) provides the same information, but it is not tabulated. Clark (pp. 205f.) had conducted a similar analysis, but did not provide the same detail as Parker.

\(^2\) Parker, Bezae, p. 115.

\(^3\) Ibid., p. 118.

In an earlier study, Parker (‘The Translation of OYN in the Old Latin Gospels’, *NTS* 31 (1985), 252-76, p. 268.) had argued that ‘the consistency of translation technique in this respect is proof of the unity of origin of the Bezan Latin Gospels.’.

\(^4\) A study by J. A. Findlay (‘On Variations in the Text of d and D’. *BBC*, IX (1931), 10f.) of the differences between the Latin and Greek texts led him to suggest that, with the books of Codex Bezae in their present order, ‘Possibly a corrector has been at work assimilating Greek to Latin in the Gospels, but has tired of his work by the time he reached Mark-Acts.’

Parker (*Bezae*, pp. 250-278) proved Findlay’s conclusions to be incorrect.
History of Codex Bezae

Parker argues for a transcription by two scribes upon the following grounds: (1) the change in spelling of John from Ἰωάννης to Ἰωάνης; (2) the change from medial points to spaces in the punctuation; (3) the marked disintegration of the sense-lines; (4) the exclusive use of ĐMН as the accusative of dominus in Matthew and Mark while John and Luke use ĐOМ exclusively. However apart from the differences in the use of ĐMН and ĐOМ Parker adds nothing of significance to Chapman's earlier argument.¹

According to Parker the next stage in the tradition was the addition of Acts to the manuscript, which by that time consisted of the four Gospels. The late addition of Acts is based on three factors: (1) Turner and Lowe's statement that two columns per page, which Parker believes was the structure of the Gospels at that time, is a mark of antiquity²; (2) coupled with his belief that the exemplar of Acts alone consisted of a single column; (3) the exclusive use in Acts of the later abbreviation, ĐNS as the accusative of dominus.³ On this basis Parker surmises that 'the tradition of the Acts text is less ancient'⁴ and thus Acts was added to the Gospels sometime after they had been copied by the two scribes.⁵

A study of the differences between the columns led Parker to conclude that the exemplar of the present Latin text of Acts was itself Latin, but one 'derived from a shorter version of the present D text.'⁶ This, plus the tendency to recast

¹ Vide supra: § 1905 - Dom John Chapman.
³ Scrivener (Bezae, p. xlv) made this observation much earlier.
⁴ Parker, Bezae, p. 118.
⁵ Ibid., p. 116.
⁶ Ibid., p. 249.
the text in a more vernacular mould, the lack of uniformity in the form of the Gospels, the lack of distinction between the Gospels, because of harmonisations and additions from other sources; and - many other alterations - not least those arising from the influence of the context suggests to Parker that Codex Bezae has suffered badly from negligence and freedom of transmission. For this reason he argues, that it is impossible to attain a pure $D$ text; ‘The kind of text presented in $D$ will, by its nature, never have existed in a controlled and definable form. Such a text contains many hybrids, but no species.’

Having assessed the internal evidence Parker turns to the external evidence addressing the question of Codex Bezae’s place of origin. He dismisses Britain, Southern Gaul, North Africa, Sicily, Sardinia, Southern Italy, Dacia, Egypt, Antioch, and Jerusalem, for various reasons, leaving the field bare and open to suggestion. Before suggesting a site he identifies the following criteria, already established from his internal investigations:

1. The manuscript, which originated in the East, was written by a Latin-trained scribe who was accustomed to copying legal documents and who had a working knowledge of Greek.

2. The specific details of the various correctors must be considered.

3. The place of origin must be a location where Latin Scripture was

---


Later Parker (*ibid.*, p. 284) states: ‘The Bezan text is not a defined text. Its main characteristic, we have suggested, is its lack of definition, its freedom of transmission. It will have been too subject to change and to outside influence to have had a strong influence on other texts. Thus, the apparent confederacy of what was once described as the “Western text” is a similarity not in detail, but in character. We have not a text, but a genre. That is why the representatives of this free genre are district from all other types, puzzlingly unlike each other.'
needed, but where the reading of Greek was still possible. In his opinion this point had been previously overlooked.¹

Bischoff’s statement that the style of writing found in Codex Bezae has links with legal texts and possible links with Berytus encouraged Parker to look more closely at its history. The conclusion drawn from the evidence was that it met the above criteria for the period that Codex Bezae was written, i.e. c.400.

Parker argues his case from the belief that ‘by 400 Latin scribes and native Latin speakers were a rarity in the Eastern empire.’² Nevertheless, Berytus was the main Latin centre of the East because of its law school (founded c. CE. 200), and because it was a centre for the depositing and publishing of laws. It was also an important port that lay on the major road that ran along the coast, with a road running inland to Heliopolis.³ The teaching language used at the law school, which Parker claims was ‘the best in the world,’⁴ was Latin until it changed to Greek some time between the early 380s and 410. The names of past students


⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 272. The basis to this claim is not given and is somewhat bewildering when earlier Parker (*ibid.*, p. 268) quoted A. H. M. Jones (*The Later Roman Empire, Oxford*, 1964, vol. 2, p. 990) as having said, ‘a full Latin education in both grammar and rhetoric was always available at the imperial capital.’.
suggests that the school was primarily for bilingual Easterners with Greek as their first tongue.

Parker sees in the history of the law school an explanation of the history of Codex Bezae. Thus he gives the history of the codex as follows:

Copied in about or shortly before the year 400 and immediately corrected by G, the manuscript was produced in the final years of the strongly Latin tradition of the law school, for the benefit of Latin-speaking Christians drawn there by the needs and prestige of the school. The eclipse of Latin led to the Latin column falling into disuse, so that no further major corrections were made to it. The growing power of the Greek church of Berytus, where the manuscript remained, is reflected in the earliest Greek correctors. In the activity of Corrector B we see the growing influence of the church, and a corresponding susceptibility to outside influences, with the correction against a text of a Caesarean type, perhaps during the episcopate of Eustathius. With the destruction of the city in 551, the manuscript was taken elsewhere, beginning the travels that were in course of time to bring it to Lyons. In another home it found a new use. It was provided with a lectionary system and corrected against a standard form of text. ...

The selection of Berytus has implications for our understanding of the yet earlier history of the text. If we suppose that this bilingual tradition was formed for the sake of Latin speakers at Berytus, then we are provided with a terminus a quo for its formation: the creation of the law school towards the end of the second century. If we allow a little time for the institution and the archive to gather momentum, we are left with a date from about 200 onwards. Given that Codex Bezae is copied from exemplars themselves bilingual, we may suggest that the tradition
will have been formed in the early part of the third century.¹

Parker admits, however, there is no evidence that Berytus was a centre for the production of biblical texts, nor has the kind of Greek style of the people who had studies at Berytus much in common with the popularising revision of Codex Bezae.

Parker devotes the final chapter of his Codex Bezae to fleshing out the brief history given in the previous quote and by adding events following the destruction of Berytus in 551 by natural forces.² From Berytus the law school was transferred south to Sidon, to an environment in which it enjoyed a renewed use - as reflected in Hand L’s lectionary annotations and the Ammonian Sections. The fall of Berytus in 635 to the Arabs brought another change to the region that resulted in a decline in Christianity and a need for its manuscripts. Nothing is known of the manuscript until somewhere between 830 - 850, when some of the missing leaves are replaced. This last activity is believed to have taken place in Lyons, however, not by Florus.

In the eighth century Lyons was a centre for the preservation of Latin law in the West. Parker surmises, therefore, that Codex Bezae could have been part of the material rescued from the law libraries of Berytus. Parker adds nothing new to the events surrounding the manuscript while in Lyons, or to its transfer to Beza, or to its subsequent transfer to Cambridge.

¹ Ibid., pp. 277f.

² Parker does not say what these were, but he does say that a tidal wave accompanied one of a series of earthquakes.
It is fitting that this history of Codex Bezae should end with this most impressive study, which must rank among the most thorough to date.
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PART II

Analysis of the Evidence
PART II

ANALYSIS OF THE EVIDENCE

Introduction

It can be seen from the previous history of research on Codex Bezae that over the centuries an enormous amount of time and effort has gone into trying to unravel the mysteries of this manuscript, and one could well ask whether we are any closer to the truth. For every hypothesis that promises some hope for a solution there are a number of counter-arguments that leave the field once more bare and without a contender. The plethora of theories and ideas bring in their wake a bewildering amount of information, and yet, contained within all this data must be the threads of truth that will enable the astute craftsman to weave the true tapestry of its history, or at least provide a picture, although not complete, sufficient to allow one to appreciate the overall picture and to give a lead as to what thread to look for next.

The main and overriding problem faced by the scholarly world with regard to Codex Bezae must surely be: When was it written, where, and by whom? The second major concern is the course of its travels, from the time of its origin to its acquisition by Beza in 1562. The external evidence is such that we can conclude, with only minor reservation, that the codex was in France by the middle of the ninth century, and if really bold we might even suggest that it was in France a century earlier. However, apart from the fact that it had a brief sojourn in Italy during the Council of Trent in 1546, little is known of it in the period after the middle of the ninth century, and a good deal less in the period before.
Most of the evidence associated with Codex Bezae is circumstantial and added to this difficulty is the simple fact that its present nomenclature does not go back before Beza, nor does it appear to have had a previous title. Thus it is only through its readings that it can be located in time. However, such evidence raises its own inherent questions, e.g. are these readings from Codex Bezae or from some long lost sister manuscript? However, to ignore such evidence is to leave our tapestry devoid of any pictorial form. Until such a manuscript is discovered we must, therefore, work on the premise that Codex Bezae is unique.

Any attempt to reconstruct the history of Codex Bezae depends in great measure upon correctly dating the hand of the scribe of Codex Bezae, and the hands of the various correctors and annotators. By necessity such inquiries must primarily rest upon the palaeographical details and therefore the evidence of experts in this particular field. Often in the past the waters have been muddied by the opinion of textual critics who may be experts in textual matters, but are wanting in expertise when it comes to matters of palaeography. No doubt there are textual critics whose detailed study of manuscripts gives them the ability to date them with a great deal of confidence, but whether such expertise is equal to that of the palaeographer must surely be doubted. This writer rests his case on the opinion of Prof. James Willis, a textual critic of Latin manuscripts, who says of the textual critic:

To be able to read and collate a manuscript accurately is enough for his needs; for its date and provenance, if he is prudent and modest, he will seek the expert advice of a Mynors or a Bischoff.¹

For this reason when conclusions have to be drawn from palaeographical details the greatest emphasis will be placed upon the opinion of those who are recognised experts in this field. Nevertheless, so that a complete picture of any specific topic might be given the opinion of others also will be expressed.

There are many other details associated with the manuscript which by themselves do not prove anything specific about the main issues, but they do provide a clue or clues, which, when placed together with other evidence, may create a composite picture that opens a window on the codex’s past, or may simply add weight to the palaeographical evidence. The details referred to in this instance are: the abbreviations used in the text, the Ammonian Sections, the use of the anchora superior and inferior as a means of identifying the point of insertion of script written in the margin, the quire marks, and the running titles, etc., all of which may possibly add something to the evidence and therefore should not be ignored.

At the outset it must be emphasized that where the previous history of the research on the codex encompassed matters pertaining to the Western text, in the following a sharp distinction between the two is made, and where possible only those matters connected with Codex Bezae will be reviewed. Each topic is listed alphabetically to facilitate ready access. Appendix B contains a complete list of the topics and references.

**Ammonian sections**

The details of the Ammonian sections are indisputable: (1) they are associated only with the Greek text and as we will discover later they were
added sometime during the eighth century;¹ (2) they are without the Eusebian canons;² (3) the beginning of each section is indicated by double points (:) placed before or over the first letter, and sometimes both are given, e.g. John 15:23f. Similar dots are placed in the margin after the Ammonian numerals; (4) some of the sections in Codex Bezae vary in place and number to those commonly found in manuscripts and editions.³ A catalogue of all manuscripts containing Ammonian sections, with and without Eusebian canons, might prove useful in locating the time and location of the practice. The method of indicating the start of a section should be taken into account, as also the differences in place and number of some of the Ammonian sections in Codex Bezae - they may not be unique.

**Anchora superior/inferior**

The two lines accidentally omitted through homoioteleuton in the Greek text, Fol. 59b, l. 28, and the Latin text, Fol. 60, l. 28 - which in itself suggests that one text was copied from the other - have been inserted by Corrector G at the bottom of each page. The point in the text where the omission takes place is indicated by an up-pointing arrow (anchora superior). A down-turned arrow (anchora inferior) follows the insertion in the lower margin.

---

¹ *Vide infra:* § Annotators.

² Kipling (p. iv) had erroneously used this evidence to date the codex.

³ Scrivener (*Bezae*, p. 453) provides a list of these sections.
Lowe points out that in the oldest manuscripts the normal Latin method of indicating omissions is by the use of the abbreviations **hd** and **hs** etc.,\(^1\) whereas, "the old Greek manuscripts show a distinct preference for using an arrow - or anchor - like symbol in the text ..."\(^2\) Of the eleven Greek manuscripts cited by Lowe that contain these symbols, all are Egyptian papyri except Η and Β, but even these last two are believed to be linked to Egypt.\(^3\)

**Annotations and corrections**

Ropes saw a parallel in the sequence of the annotators and correctors of Codex Bezae with that of Codex Marchalianus (Q).\(^4\) No one else appears to have looked at this manuscript to assess the value of his claim. However it must be borne in mind that the sequence of the hands is critical for such a comparison, *e.g.* Ropes appears to base his judgement upon Scrivener’s sequence of correctors and annotators, which begins with corrections primarily to the Greek and does not change until Hand G who made major corrections to the Latin text. Burkitt and Parker, on the other hand, place Corrector G contemporaneous with the scribe of Codex Bezae thereby reversing the sequence so that it starts with corrections to the Latin and then moves to corrections to the Greek. However, there may be parallels in the sequence of the other hands apart from Hand G, thus a detailed investigation could prove

---


fruitful. Indeed a parallel in the sequence of only some of the hands would suggest a change in location involving at least either $D$ or $Q$.

**Annotators**

The greatest difference in opinion on the matter of the annotators is the dating of the hands. Scrivener, and for that matter Harris, has them starting with Hand I in the ninth century and extending through to the twelfth-century, Hands M and O. They also consider Hand $O_2$, the writer of a single liturgical note, to be modern. Parker, contrariwise, compresses them all within a century, ranging from 550 - 650.\(^1\) He does so in spite of admitting that the dating of the Hands I, N, O, $O_2$ was not a matter on which he felt fully competent.\(^2\) Nevertheless Parker has the support, in some measure, of Professor A. S. Hunt, a recognised expert in the field. Lowe had consulted Hunt earlier on just this matter and was advised that none were later than 800. Over two decades later Clark asked Hunt for a re-assessment of the annotators, and found that he was still of the same opinion. Even though this assessment leaves Scrivener’s dates in disarray, there is still a marked difference between Hunt’s pre-800 and ‘Parker’s pre-650 for all the annotators.

Parker dates Hand $M_4$, who provided a τέλος to his lections, not only prior to the restoration of the leaf Fol. 348, but also before its loss. He made his decision on the basis that the ἀρχή,\(^3\) would not have been provided had the annotator known that the following folio, which would have contained the τέλος, was missing. For, as he states: ‘... why should anybody want to provide

---

1. Parker, *Beza*, p. 49.
an αρχη for a half-missing lection?" He also cites Fol. 446b as another which has an ἀρχη written by Hand M4 without a τέλος. The same is to be found on Fol. 6b, by Hand M. Parker, however, is sceptical about the validity of the latter. Nevertheless, Parker's assessment of the details only provides one of at least three plausible explanations for such an event. It would not be unreasonable to expect the same thing to occur through a systematic entry of the lectionary notes, i.e. a scribe mechanically going through the codex writing down the lectionary notes could easily have written in the ἀρχη not realising the following leaf was missing. There again the scribe, for reasons quite irrelevant to Parker's argument, may have written them in simply to indicate where the lections began, despite the fact the following folios were missing.

Harris had noted earlier that Hand L had written over a τίτλος previously written by M2 and over a note by J, thus placing both J and M2 chronologically before L. However he also noted similarities in the scripts of L and M2, which led him to suggest that they had come from the same school. Parker places L at the end of the sixth century, by virtue of its close palaeographical links with Syrian-Antiochene manuscripts, dating from the sixth century. Kipling had similarly dated Hand L before the seventh century, but had made his assessment on the basis that the annotations by Hand L are 'without word-division, the letters are uncial, and accents and breathings are lacking.' Nevertheless, this early date for Hand L must be questioned. Kipling's argument can no longer be

1 Ibid., p. 44.

2 Harris, Annotators, p. 10.

Harris states the same on page 107, but mistakenly has M3 instead of M2.

3 Ibid., pp. 10, 12ff.

sustained because accents were not regularly used until the beginning of the tenth century,\(^1\) uncial were still in use up to the eleventh century,\(^2\) and as a general rule, the lack of word separation and uncial went together.\(^3\) Parker’s palaeographical assessment must also be questioned, in light of the following statement by the Alands:

But it is striking that of all the lectionaries which can actually be dated before the eighth century (and not all have been accurately dated!), there is not one exhibiting a system of pericopes that agrees in the least with that of the normal Greek lectionary. Furthermore, the earliest of the $\alpha\rho\chi\eta/\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ notes comes from the eighth century: there is no trace of this pattern from any earlier period.\(^4\)

Since the Codex Bezae lectionary notes are of the $\alpha\rho\chi\eta/\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ type and since F. E. Brightman could clearly identify the system as Byzantine with minor variations one must, from the manuscript evidence (the basis for the Alands’ statement), not only reject Parker’s assessment of Hand L but also his assessment of all the hands involved in the lectionary system. It also severely questions Parker’s palaeographical assessments, which he used so extensively to date all the hands. More will be said of this under the section ‘Correctors’.

Harris had also noted that Hand L, who had consistently supplied lectionary notes throughout the manuscript, added neither lections nor τίτλοι to the supplementary leaves. He thereby concluded that Hand L was at work

\(^1\) Reynolds & Wilson, p. 9.
\(^2\) Aland, Text, p. 81.
\(^3\) Vaganay, p. 8.
\(^4\) Aland, Text, p. 167.
before the supplementary leaves were added, at some time during the ninth century.¹ Scrivener had suggested that \( M_2 \) and \( M_3 \) may actually be the same hand.² From this we can reasonably conclude that the chronological order is: \( J \), \( M_2/M_3 \) and \( L \), followed by the supplementary leaves of the ninth century. From the evidence of the manuscripts, the hands of the lectionary notes must come after the eighth century and, according to Hunt, no later than 800, therefore they must all belong to the eighth century.

The above firm conclusions are all that can be reasonably deduced from the available evidence. To deduce more would run the risk of engaging in conjecture. Nevertheless, despite doubts about his ability to date accurately the annotators and despite documentary evidence to the contrary Parker still presents the following rather concise dating: ‘I suggest that it is safe to say that they all fit into the period 550-650.’³

¹ Harris, *Annotators*, p. 107.


It should be noted however that Scrivener has an error in that he ascribes a *sors* at the foot of Fol. 302b to \( M_1 \), when in fact he states over the page that the *Sortes* were by \( M_3 \). Because of the similarity in the cursive scrawl in which the τίτλος at the head of Fol. 205b was written and the *Sortes* at the foot of Fol. 302b, Scrivener suggested they may be from the same hand. Parker (*Beza*, p. 43) reports Scrivener correctly when he states that Scrivener ‘... thinks that \( M^2 \) may be the same as the hand of the *Sortes*, \( M^3 \).’ However, Parker (*Beza*, pp. 313, Plate 21) incorrectly ascribes to \( M^1 \) the τίτλος at the head of Fol. 205b (Luke’s Gospel), when previously (*ibid.*, p. 43) he had accepted Scrivener’s assessment that \( M^2 \) had written the τίτλοι in John and Luke. This is unlikely to be a typing error because it is repeated on p. 318.

³ Parker, *Beza*, p. 44.
Apart from the above chronological details, there are other factors that should be taken into account when considering the annotators. To this writer’s knowledge the following points by Harris have not been disputed: (1) none of the annotators were scholars with the possible exception of J;¹ (2) The annotations took place in a Græco-Latin centre where both languages were spoken, and not a Latin centre where Greek was merely read and written.’² (3) The annotators spoke the Greek of their day and wrote it as they spoke it.³

Colophons and headings

Mercati was the first to state that the Greek subscriptions in Codex Bezae with their unique use of ἐπελεσθη and αἰσχροται ‘are more or less like the usual Latin explicit, incipit. The oldest Greek MSS have nothing like this: they use the simple title by itself.’⁴ The joining of incipit … to the subscription of the preceding book or text is also a Latin custom.⁵ Lowe was to accede to Mercati’s claims,⁶ and Parker’s investigations also corroborate them.⁷ Nevertheless despite the many Latin forms found in the colophons the headings are not, as Parker says, without some similarity to the Greek forms. He refers to ἢ as the closest Greek parallel to that found in Codex Bezae. Others examples are: on the first page of Luke: ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛ. ΚΑΤ ΛΟΥΚΑΝ - in this instance the Latin imitates the Greek by having, EUANG SEC LUCAN - as it does in Mark

¹ Harris, Annotators, p. 74.
² Ibid., p. 75.
³ Ibid., p. 18.
⁴ Mercati, p. 449.
⁵ Ibid.
⁶ Lowe, Lyons, p. 271.
⁷ Parker, Bezae, pp. 10-12.
and Acts. These, however are considered by him to be 'the remnant of a practice that was standard further back in the tradition.'

In addressing the particular style and characteristics of Codex Bezae's colophon, Lowe provides two lists, totalling one hundred and fifty Latin manuscripts, primarily Christian, which range from the fourth to the eighth century. From these it can readily be seen that the use of alternate red lines in the colophon of Latin manuscripts (as found in the colophons of Matthew and John in Codex Bezae) extends across the whole period, thus the practice goes back to at least the fourth century. The use of explicit and incipit is found only in the later manuscripts and in a number of the earlier ones finit is used in place of explicit. Bischoff makes the same observation, saying: "...the word 'FINIT' or the ungrammatical 'EXPLICIT' opens a subscription; 'FINIT' is the older of the two and was seemingly preferred by Insular scribes." It was a peculiarity that Lowe felt might throw some light on the history of the text. This was rejected by Parker on the grounds that 'the value of this evidence may be regarded as questionable.' In fact, as far as the colophons are concerned Parker felt that they were of little value for dating Codex Bezae. Certainly as the evidence now stands one would have to agree with this statement, but the fact that explicit is used instead of the earlier, finit, indeed, that such terms are used at all at such an early period would suggest that Codex Bezae may even

---

1 Ibid., p. 12.
2 Ibid.
4 Q.v., Parker, Bezae, p. 13.
5 Bischoff, p. 44.

This is contrary to Parker (Bezae, p. 11) who states: 'The use of explicit (i.e. explicitum) and incipit is standard in Latin books.'

6 Parker, Bezae, p. 13.
have had its genesis in or near a centre where the use of such terms originated. A great deal more information of the manuscripts that contain these forms of colophons needs to be gathered and collated.

Correctors

Burkitt, Lowe, Wilmart,¹ and Parker argue that Corrector G was contemporary with the scribe of Codex Bezae. Scrivener’s argument that Corrector G was of the eleventh century has been unanimously rejected, leaving a range in time from possibly the fourth century (Seymour de Ricci²), up to the sixth or seventh (Kenyon³). Precluding Scrivener, Kenyon is the only one who does not place G in the same period as the scribe of Codex Bezae. Although Lowe does not say that de Ricci and Hunt considered G contemporaneous with the scribe, their early dates for G must align them with this opinion.

¹ Although A. Wilmart (‘Un Ancien Texte Latin’, RB 31 (1922) 182 - 202, 201, n. 2.) does not mention Corrector G when he states: ‘J’ai l’impression, je l’avoue sans hésiter, que l’écriture de ‘d’ mérite la première place, s’il s’agit d’antiquité; et la précieuse note, en caractères minuscules, ajoutée par une main contemporaine au bas du fol. 60,’. [‘I unhesitatingly confess, that I have the impression that the writing of d deserves the foremost place if we are considering antiquity and the invaluable note, in minuscule characters, added by a contemporary hand at the foot of folio 60,’], the corrections referred to at the bottom of Foll. 59b and 60a., are that of Hand G.

² Cited by Lowe, A Note, pp. 11f.

³ Kenyon, Bezae, p. 296.
Both Burkitt and Plooij argued that Corrector G was a scholar, but Parker had some doubts about the validity of this claim. Where Parker had suggested that this corrector had consulted the exemplar of Codex Bezae, Plooij makes the interesting observation that corrector G 'was dependent on Syriac texts.' Burkitt was of the opinion that G had not consulted 'the traditional Latin Bible while making his corrections. Parker also rejects both Scrivener's and Harris's belief that Corrector G consulted the Vulgate, on the grounds that "it is certain that there was no 'traditional' Latin Bible in 400, certainly not of Acts."

The dates for the origin of Codex Bezae will be discussed later, but for the moment the two most important findings relating to Corrector G, which have

1 Burkitt, p. 508; D. Plooij, BBC 5 (1928) 29f., 29.
2 Parker, Bezae, p. 129.
3 D. Plooij, BBC 5 (1928) 29f., 30.
4 Burkitt, p. 511.
5 It should be kept in mind that Scrivener made the suggestion in the belief that Corrector G was of the eleventh century - a date not disputed by Harris.
6 Parker, Bezae, p. 129.

A number of scholars, namely: Hort (pp. 82f.), Ropes (pp. lxxx, cxi), and Metzger (Text, p. 74) expressed the opinion that the Latin text of Codex Bezae is an ancient form of the Old Latin text. Fischer (p. 42), however, rejected the idea.
widespread acceptance, are: (1) he was the only corrector to show any interest in the Latin text, with around 280 corrections to the Latin text and very few to the Greek;\(^1\) (2) he was contemporary with or very close in time to the scribe of Codex Bezae. Worthy of consideration is Burkitt’s argument that the bold corrections by G would suggest a person of authority who considered the Greek text as Holy Scripture while the Latin was merely a crib.\(^2\) Also noteworthy is Parker’s observation that Corrector G made no corrections to the peculiarities of Codex Bezae because ‘he knew the text it came from, and accepted its authority.’\(^3\) There is also the possibility that there was no rival to the Bezan text in the community and therefore no reason to change the Greek text. If this last suggestion is true no major centre can be anticipated, but rather a smaller community away from the main stream of the Empire’s activities. That G made corrections mainly to Matthew and the first four chapters of Acts, would suggest that Matthew and at least the first four chapters of Acts were of major importance to the holders of the codex. The few corrections made by G to John are in the first half of the book and these are sporadic.\(^4\) If we take from

\(^1\) The exact figures vary between Scrivener and Parker, but they are not significant and neither would dispute the fact that Corrector G for all practical purposes concentrated solely upon the Latin text.

Parker (Bezae, pp. 291f.) lists in his Appendix 2 the differences between him and Scrivener.

\(^2\) Burkitt, p. 511. Parker, Bezae, pp. 129, 175.

\(^3\) Parker, Bezae, p. 130.

\(^4\) Scrivener (Bezae, p. 433) lists only four corrections G: Fol. 116a, ll. 1, 3; Fol. 118a, l. 5; Fol. 126a, l. 17.

Parker (Bezae, p. 125) on the other hand lists seven: Fol. 116, 118, 135, 140, and 148. Obviously, some have more than one correction. The difference is due mainly to Parker ascribing certain corrections to G that Scrivener had left without nominating a
both Scrivener and Parker those corrections that do not have mutual support there are only three corrections in John by Corrector G and all within the first four chapters of the book, viz Fol. 116, ll. 1, 3; Fol. 118, l. 5. Just three corrections at the beginning of the book gives the distinct impression that after correcting Matthew Corrector G started in a desultory manner to amend John but finally decided that the Gospel of John was of not sufficient importance to warrant the effort. That he then jumped to Acts and carried out extensive corrections to the first few chapters (up to and including chapter four, verse twelve) points to the importance of that book, or of at least the importance of the first three chapters and the first twelve verses of chapter four. These opening chapters in Acts may have been more important to the early church because of its detail of the ascension, Pentecost, and the resulting power from the indwelling Holy Spirit, ending at verse twelve with one of the most profound statements in the Bible, namely: καὶ οὐκ ἦστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενί ἡ σωτηρία, οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομα ἦστιν ἑτερον ὑπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸ δεδομένον ἐν ἁνθρώποις ἐν ὧδείς σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς. The details of the apostolic churches appear not to have been of great interest to the institute in which Corrector G worked. Also, it could well be that to a church that existed in a Christian world the missionary details which follow were not considered of importance. If this were so, it can be readily seen why Corrector G may have stopped at chapter four verse twelve. It adds weight to the supposition that the corrector amended only those parts of Scripture that were of greatest importance to him. If he was a bishop, as Burkitt suggests, it seems probable that he corrected only those parts of Scripture that were to be used by him in church services.

corrector; the correction on Foll. 126, is the exception, for in this instance Parker ascribes the correction to a secondary hand. Therefore if we remove those corrections which do not have mutual support, the three corrections by G occur only on Foll. 116, 118.
From the above evidence we might reasonably conclude that the church community in which Codex Bezae had its origin was a community that saw the Greek text as sacred, but required the Latin for the benefit of those in the congregation who were speakers of Latin. It is pushing the available evidence too hard to claim that it was located within a Latin community. The importance of Matthew and the first few chapters of Acts to this Church should not be overlooked, because such an emphasis might be found in other documents of the same period, thus possibly providing a vital lead to a particular church or region.

Corrector A is the next in chronological order. The palaeographical evidence would suggest that he also was close in time to the original scribe. Scrivener also points out that the ink used by A ‘differs little from that of the original scribes.’\(^1\) Parker demonstrates that Corrector A makes a break from the Bezan tradition. Since, however, A was not particularly concerned with textual matters, but more with grammar,\(^2\) this does not mean that the Bezan text had fallen out of favour. Nevertheless, the break with the Bezan text can be clearly seen with Corrector B, as Parker’s analysis of B’s alterations demonstrates. However, it is not a complete break for on occasion his corrections reflect a longer text not dissimilar to D* or d.\(^3\) Hand B’s corrections could suggest that Codex Bezae underwent a change of location to a place where its text was compared with another similar to it and changed accordingly. That the Greek has been changed in places without similar corrections to the Latin, to the degree that it is no longer in agreement with the Latin, adds weight to this suggestion and also suggests that this new location did not require the use of a Latin text.

---

1 Scrivener, Bezae, p. xxiv.
2 Parker, Bezae, pp. 130, 133.
3 Ibid., pp. 148f.
Parker parts company with Scrivener in almost every aspect of the remaining correctors, not only concerning their chronological order but also regarding the time of writing. Parker's sequence for the various correctors is G A C B D E H F J1. Where Scrivener has the influence of these correctors spread over three centuries, viz from the sixth to the ninth, Parker compresses them into one century, from 400 to 500.

Parker argues that since the corrections by Hand B demonstrate a shift towards a text closest to 8C and that the text used by Corrector D is closest to 8 B, these two hands should stand together. This suggestion appears logical. However, it has the Bezan tradition influencing Corrector B, but not the earlier Corrector C whom Parker suggests consulted a Byzantine text.

It is well known that the D text was the most widely distributed text up to and including the fourth century, after which it lost favour. One should expect to detect its decline from this time on. It is suggested therefore that the acceptance of the D text began its decline in the fourth century while at the same time the Byzantine text was gaining favour. The further a community was from the main stream of Church life and from the centres where these changes were initiated, the slower such changes could be expected to be instituted. There could well have been a time of uncertainty as to the correct text in many of these remote communities, until the Byzantine text gained universal favour. Both Correctors B and D appear to fall within this period. One can see the

---

1 Ibid., p. 49.
2 Ibid., pp. 139, 149, 154.
3 Ibid., pp. 139, 176.
4 Westcott & Hort, pp. 149, 178.
Aland, pp. 50f.
decline in the acceptance of the Bezan text in B and the beginning of the shift towards the Byzantine text in Corrector C. A still greater shift towards the Byzantine text can be seen in the amendments of Corrector H, reaching finality in F.\(^1\) The amendments by Corrector E do not allow the ready identification of any particular text.\(^2\) It is proposed, therefore, that the order of the correctors was G A B D C E H F.

Of course the above order conflicts with the argument that D corrected B,\(^3\) however it is suggested that as this claim is based on only one reading (Fol. 498b, l. 10), a close inspection of this correction by an expert in palaeography is warranted.\(^4\) After all, even Kenyon, when referring to the various hands found in Codex Bezae, cautioned that:

---

1. Parker, Bezae, pp. 159, 162.
2. Ibid., p. 156.
3. Scrivener (Bezae, p. 446) has for the correction of Fol. 498b, l. 10. ‘σ supra lineam post έκκλησια B: cf. vers. Latin. Pro τω νομώ D postea scripsit τη ενομω.’ These details are correct, as confirmed by a personal scrutiny of the text itself. Parker, (Bezae, p. 143) therefore, is incorrect when he ascribes ‘... τω εννομω ...’ to D\(^{D}\).
4. Unfortunately the reproduction from the microfilm facsimile of Codex Bezae is not of sufficient quality to allow any personal assessment. Even if this were not a problem, however, this writer would never presume the ability to distinguish between any of the earlier hands at any time leave alone when faced with distinguishing a hand on the basis of three characters. An appreciation of the difficulty of distinguishing between the hands can be readily obtained by an inspection of the plates 9-14, provided by Parker (Bezae, pp. 307 - 309). Even Kenyon (Bezae, pp. 295f.), who also only had access to photographic facsimiles, was to remark: ‘Scrivener distinguishes nine hands as employed in correcting the text, besides four or five who are responsible for the liturgical annotations in the margin. With regard to the first five of these (Scrivener’s A to E) it cannot be said that the facsimile is of much assistance. The work of all these correctors is confined to alterations of the
An editor may easily be too precise in his discernment of different hands in such small alterations as these, through not allowing for the fluctuations to which the handwriting of the same individual is liable; ....

The other likely objections to the above suggested order are the two corrections made by H at John 8:40 ἩΚΟΥϹΕΝ D* H d; ακουσα DΑ, and John 8:41 ουκ εγευνηθημεν D* H d; ου γεγευνημεθα DΒ, which Parker states reverses the move away from the Bezan text. These readings may accord with the Bezan text, but it does not mean that the corrector was consulting a manuscript of the Bezan text or that he intended to revert intentionally to the Bezan text, because εγευνηθημεν, at least, is also attested by B.

The evidence from the remaining correctors sheds little light on the history of the codex. In this writer’s opinion the dating of the hands still requires further investigation. Parker’s judgment on this matter varies so greatly from such scholars as Scrivener, Harris, and Kenyon one is apt to be sceptical, particularly when Parker looks little beyond the palaeographical evidence. There are many occasions when Parker disputes Scrivener’s discernment of the smallest kind, consisting of the insertion or superposition of one or two letters of a size so small that their individualities are difficult to determine. In cases such as these, so much depends upon the appearance of the ink that it is impossible to speak with any confidence except after a prolonged examination of the original; so far as the facsimile goes, the corrections of A and B are often quite indistinguishable, and the same is the case, as even Scrivener is inclined to admit, with C and E.’

1 Kenyon, Bezae, p. 296.
2 Ibid., p. 159
various hands. A case in point is the correction at Fol. 433b, l. 13 where $\alpha R\chi\iota$ is set over the letters O IE of O IEPEYC. Scrivener ascribes the amendment to Corrector E and argues for a Latin hand, ‘the Latin R betraying his nation.’\(^1\) It was an observation with which Harris was to agree.\(^2\) Even Parker accepts that this correction was from the hand of a Latin, for he states: ‘The R and the clumsy $\chi i$ betray that it is inserted by a Latin pen.’\(^3\) However, for reasons not clear to this writer, he considers Corrector E to have been a Greek and therefore does not consider this correction to be made by E.\(^4\) Admittedly Parker has the benefit of a far greater range of manuscripts to work from, but when there is so little to distinguish one hand from the other palaeographically, any conclusions made on these grounds alone must be treated with caution. It is worth noting, again, Kenyon’s observation that distinguishing between the Correctors A to E is so difficult that it is impossible using a facsimile and very difficult even with the manuscript itself, even for a scholar of the standing of Scrivener. It is so difficult in fact that one is forced to rely on the differences in the type of ink - something that Scrivener constantly refers to when describing the hands - and something which Parker does not take into consideration. The dating of the hands by Parker also oversteps the bounds of what is possible from palaeographical evidence, for within a period of fifty years he makes a chronological distinction of five hands, $\text{viz} \ G \ A \ B \ C \ D$, and in the following two periods of fifty years another four in each, $E \ F \ H \ J_1$ and $J \ M_1/M_2 \ L$.\(^5\) It is true that in determining the chronological order of B and C and some other hands Parker refers to other factors, but, in general, when determining the chronological order of the various hands his emphasis is upon the

---

1 Scrivener, *Beze*, p. xxv.
3 Parker, *Beze*, p. 38, n.
palaeographical evidence. The smallest difference in the script is attributed to some stylised change that can be chronologically placed. Such scrupulous detail ignores Kenyon's previously cited warning and the testimony of experts who generally talk in half centuries when a hand cannot be dated precisely. Because of this and because of Parker's demonstrated lack of ability to date satisfactorily the hands of the lectionaries\textsuperscript{1} one must consider his dating of the correctors with a good deal of scepticism.

**Date of origin**

Why William Whiston believed Codex Bezae was 'written at the latest within thirty years of the death of John the Apostle'\textsuperscript{2} is unknown to this writer. Whatever the reason, however, a second-century origin for Codex Bezae gained the guarded support of Kipling\textsuperscript{3} on the basis that since the Ammonian sections are given in Codex Bezae, but not the Eusebian canons, they must have been added between the time of Ammonius and Eusebius, \textit{i.e.} at some time between the third and fourth century.\textsuperscript{4} Also, since the Ammonian sections were added a good many years after the codex was written, a second-century origin appeared to be a reasonable deduction. Nevertheless, Kipling's deductions are flawed

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} Vide supra: pp. 226ff.
\item \textsuperscript{2} William Whiston, \textit{The Sacred History &c.}, vol. 5, London, 1745, p. 305. Cited by Horne (p. 171, n. 1) and Kipling (p. iv, n. b).
\item \textsuperscript{3} Kipling (p. iv) actually says: '... so far as I can judge, there is no reason why Whiston's conjecture may not be true, \textit{viz.} that the Cambridge manuscript was written in the second century.' He had written earlier: 'That the Cambridge manuscript bears every mark of the greatest antiquity is certainly true, and it seems to me believable that it was written before the fifth century and exceeds in age the Alexandrian codex.' (\textit{Ibid.}, p. iii).
\item \textsuperscript{4} \textit{Ibid.}
\end{itemize}
simply because Ammonius was not the author of the sections that bear his name, for they too were a product of Eusebius. The calling of Eusebius's section divisions 'Ammonian sections', arose through a misunderstanding of the words of gratitude written by Eusebius to Ammonius, after he had used Ammonius's *Harmony of the Gospels* as the basis to his section divisions.¹ This writer knows of no other scholar who agrees with a second-century origin,² and all who condemn the suggestion give no reason for doing so.

That Codex Bezae had a seventh-century origin was proposed by K. Sneyders de Vogel³ and K. A. Credner,⁴ but this need not detain us here, because an integral part of their erroneous arguments is the belief that Codex Bezae had its origin in France - a belief that is universally rejected today.

Burkitt is in error when he states that Scrivener's choice of a sixth-century origin for Codex Bezae is the reason for the widespread popularity of this date;⁵ firstly, because a sixth-century origin held wide acceptance from the earliest time, and indeed long before Scrivener; and secondly, because Scrivener actually argued for a date of the late fifth century. Scrivener states:

> All these circumstances (not the less important by reason of their delicacy and minuteness), when taken together, would lead us to assign to this manuscript [Codex Bezae] full as high a date as to the Codex Alexandrinus,

---


² To this writer's knowledge, all scholars who refer to a second century origin, apart from Horne and Kipling himself, ascribe the suggestion to Kipling.

³ Vogel ('Le Codex Bezae est-il d'origine sicilienne?', *BBC* 3 (1926) 10-13, 13) suggests, in fact, the seventh century at the earliest.

⁴ Credner, p. 517.

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 (on which we shall dwell in Chap. III) is the most obvious and weighty: the palaeographical appearance of the Latin character is venerable enough.¹

In chapter three he goes on to say: 'In the present chapter an attempt will be made to prove ... (3) that he [the translator] probably executed his work in Gaul about the close of the fifth century.'² Therefore, Scrivener did not choose a sixth-century origin as stated by Burkitt. It should also be noted that his rejection of an early fifth-century genesis rests squarely upon his assessment of the Latin text and the scribe's use of an Old Latin version and Jerome's revised Vulgate.³

Arnaud Antonius [Arnaldus] is the first person known to ascribe the codex to the sixth century and this date found support down through the centuries.⁴ It is only since the turn of this century that there has been a steady but gradual shift to an earlier date. Kenyon for one, had opted for a sixth-century origin, but admitted that the lack of early uncialis made the dating of Codex Bezae difficult. The task was made more difficult by the fact that neither its Greek nor

---

¹ Scrivener, Bezae, p. xvi.
² Ibid., p. xxxi.
³ loc. cit.
⁴ Arnaud Antonius [Arnaldus], Dissertation critique touchant les exemplaires grecs sur lesquels M. Simon prétend que l'ancienne Vulgate a esté faite, et sur le jugement que l'on doit faire du fameux manuscrit de Bèze, Cologne, 1691. Cited by Kipling (p. ii, n. c) and Strange (p. 205, n. 4). Strange, however, has an error in that he spells jugement as judgement.
its Latin hand is wholly natural. Burkitt also made a similar statement: '... the direct study of the handwriting does not lead us very far. The hand is really unlike that of any other extant MS.'

Thus, Kenyon and Burkitt state the dilemma faced by palaeographers in dating Codex Bezae. The difficulties are only slightly eased today by the availability of a greater number of uncial manuscripts. Nevertheless, the numbers are not great: of fourth-century uncial there are only fourteen, and only eight fourth- or fifth-century uncial.3 Yet only two years after Kenyon's article was published Burkitt promoted a fifth-century origin, not from the evidence of the hand of the original scribe, but from the hand of Corrector G. Indeed he argues that the delicately formed characters of Corrector G have a similarity with the script of B. M. Pap. cccxi and ccxl, both of about the year 346 CE.4 This would, of course, place Codex Bezae in Egypt at least in the middle of the fourth century - something Burkitt was not prepared to accept. A fifth-century genesis found acceptance from such scholars as Ropes, Harris, Pack, Hænchen, the Alands and Metzger.5 Whereas Scrivener and Epp propose

---

1 Kenyon, Beza, p. 295.
2 Burkitt, p. 501.
3 The Alands (Text, pp. 103 - 107) provide an overview of the available uncial of the Greek New Testament.
4 Burkitt, p. 506.
a late fifth-century origin. Chapman and Cavallo argue for before 450. Bonifatius Fischer rejected even the early fifth century and pushed the date back further into the fourth century. He cites the corroborating opinion of such scholars as: (1) Wilmart who, on the palaeographical evidence of the text and the correction provided by Hand G at the bottom of Fol. 60, concluded that: 'A fourth century date appears to me the lowest date to which one can bring the composition of this volume, and I would think it more accurate to place it in the third century.' (2) Lowe and Bischoff, who in a personal conversation with Fischer felt that the fourth century was a possibility; and (3) J. Mallon, who opted for the fourth century. H. J. Frede, who bases his argument upon the similarity between the hand of Codex Bezae and those of manuscripts of the third, fourth, and fifth century, also has no doubt that it is a

---


2 Chapman, Gospels, p. 346.

3 G. Cavallo, 'Ricerche sulla maiuscola biblica', in Studie testi di papirologia 2, Florence, p. 75.

4 Fischer (p. 41) states: 'Die Entstehungszeit ist eher in das 4. Jh. als in das beginnende 5. zu setzen.'

5 'Le ive siècle me paraît la date la plus basse à laquelle on puisse ramener la composition du volume; et c'est dire que je croirais plus juste de la placer au iiie siècle.' (A. Wilmart, 'Un Ancien Texte Latin', RB 31 (1922) 182 - 202; 201, n. 2).

6 Fischer, p. 41, n. 133.

manuscript of the fourth century.\(^1\) Parker in his customary \textit{too precise} manner, suggests: in about the year 400 or shortly before it.\(^2\)

When assessing the evidence for the genesis of Codex Bezae one must also consider the date of the contemporaneous Corrector G. The conclusions of Lowe, who must rank as one of this century’s leading lights in palaeography,\(^3\) are of considerable importance to this matter, and will, therefore, be stated in full here:

Thus tested by the criteria which extant dated Mss furnish, the Codex Bezae seems to belong to a period anterior to the year 500. ... But it may be objected by those who find it hard to accept so early a date that the Bezant scribe was consciously imitating a much older exemplar, and thus imparted to his copy an air of greater antiquity than it really possesses. Such things have

\(^1\) The manuscripts referred to are: (1) The Seneca palimpsest, Vatican Palat. Lat. 24 (foll. 10, 15, 39-40, 43-44), which is a \textit{bd-uncial}, of unknown origin, of the 3-4 century = Lowe’s CIX 187. \textit{Vide}: Lowe, \textit{Pal. Papers}, II, p. 514; (2) the papyrus fragment of Livy, Bodleianus lat. Class. f. 5 (P) of the fourth or fifth century. Frede (p. 18, n. 4) states that both of these manuscripts, but particularly the Livy fragment with its characteristic form of the S, are closely linked calligraphically with the third- or fourth-century epitome of Livy (Brit. Mus. Papyrus 1532). He also describes this manuscript as a \textit{halbunzial} (half-uncial) document since the letters \textit{bdr} and \textit{m} are clearly not in uncial.

\(^2\) Parker, \textit{Bezae}, pp. 30, 277, 281.

\(^3\) The editor of \textit{Palaeographical Papers}, which contains a great number of Lowe’s articles, states in the introduction (p. xvii): ‘Dr. Lowe did more to extend our knowledge, to broaden and deepen our understanding of early Western script, than any other scholar of his generation. ... Dr. Lowe’s scholarship was a very individual synthesis of acute observation and intuition, combined with breadth of mind, sureness of touch, and - last but not least - an inimitable charm which lightens the most technical of details.’
been done. There are archaistic manuscripts as there are archaistic statues. The Utrecht Psalter is a case in point. But such experiments are never so perfect as to deceive utterly. At one point or another the imitative character is betrayed. The opposite, however, is true of the Codex Bezae: its genuineness grows on one the more one examines it, and its great antiquity is strikingly confirmed by the added lines at the foot of ff. 59*-60, which supply an accidental omission due to homoioiteleuton. These lines, on both the Greek and Latin sides, are written not in a stiff, formal book-script, but in an easy-going semi-cursive. There can be no question of imitation here. The script of the added lines was as unpremeditated as was their omission. They were not written by the scribe but by a later reader or corrector (Scrivener's G). A comparison with the cursive lines entered in the Basilican Hilary in the year 509-10 leaves not a shadow of doubt as to the older character of the Bezan cursive. For [an] equally ancient Latin cursive one would have to go [to] the Strassburg papyrus letter of recommendation commonly ascribed to the fourth century. The two lines of Greek cursive are as cleverly written as the Latin. They make an impression of great antiquity upon those best qualified to judge, papyrologists like Prof. Hunt and M. Seymour DE Ricci, the former considering the fifth century possible, the latter finding even the fourth admissible.¹

¹ Lowe, A Note, pp. 10ff.
When one considers the opinion of scholars of the standing of Bischoff, Chapman, de Ricci, Hunt, Lowe, Wilmart, and Frede a date of the early fifth century is assured, with a strong possibility that the origin of Codex Bezae goes back to the fourth century. Two scholars of equal standing who disagree with such an early date are Scrivener and Kenyon. Although Scrivener had given the Greek text a date of the early fifth century he was misled by the Latin to the degree that in the end he assigned the codex to the fifth century. Kenyon on the other hand was not adverse to a fifth century date, should the palaeographical evidence become available. It should also be remembered that both these scholars were harbingers of the others and would not have had the same resources as these later scholars. Clearly as more and more manuscripts have become known the further the date of Codex Bezae’s origin has been pushed back.

Added to the voices of Bischoff, de Ricci, Lowe, and Wilmart who suggest a possible fourth-century origin are the recent voices of Mallon, Frede, and Fischer all of whom have no doubt that Codex Bezae is a manuscript of the fourth century. The other piece of evidence supporting a fourth century

---

1 Bernhard Bischoff is Professor Emeritus of Medieval Latin Philology, Munich University.

2 Chapman (Gospels, p. 346) argued for a date of the early fifth century.

3 Lowe (A Note, p. 11) described Dom Chapman as an expert in Biblical studies.


5 Fischer, p. 41.
genesis is the similarity in the hand of Corrector G with that of the two papyri dated about the year 346 A.D.\textsuperscript{1}

Apart from the palaeographical evidence there is the matter of the missing doxology from the Lord’s Prayer (Matt. 6:13), which Kipling had raised as proof that the Codex Bezæ had been written before the fifth century.\textsuperscript{2} In this regard it certainly ranks with the two other great codices of the fourth century, namely, $\aleph$ and $B$.

Another factor which militates against a late fifth century or later date is the accepted fact that the $D$ text fell out of favour in the fourth century, despite its widespread popularity prior to that time.\textsuperscript{3} Under these circumstances a suggested late origin can only be accounted for by personal preference for the Bezan text and or a provincial origin remote from the main stream of Church life e.g. a monastery. The latter would most certainly rule out a centre ‘of significant textual activity’ as suggested by Parker and which is fundamental to his argument for a Berytus origin.\textsuperscript{4}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} Burkitt, p. 506.
  \item \textsuperscript{2} Kipling, p. iii.
  \item \textsuperscript{3} Aland, \textit{Text}, p. 65; Westcott & Hort, pp. 149, 178
  \item \textsuperscript{4} Parker, \textit{Bezæ}, p. 267.
\end{itemize}
Dictated or visually copied?

The idea that Codex Bezae had been dictated is not new. Indeed, from Kipling's remarks, as well as those of Credner\(^1\) and von Soden\(^2\) one gains the impression that the *opinio communis* was that it was the method by which books were copied in antiquity.\(^3\) None of these scholars questioned the use of dictation in the production of Codex Bezae, and the examples put forward by Kipling and Credner are by way of illustration rather than proof of the theory. Had there been any question about the method used in copying Codex Bezae it seems doubtful if scholars of the calibre of Kipling and Credner would have put forward the examples they did to prove the use of dictation, for their examples either prove nothing - one way or the other - or they are errors that demonstrably arise from visual copying, or they are not errors at all, but were acceptable ways of spelling the words in question at the time in which copying took place.

The orthographical errors listed by Kipling consist of: itacisms, consonants wrongly added, and vowels wrongly omitted, none of which prove the use of dictation. Of the ten examples put forward by Credner, which he believed came about through the manuscript being copied using dictation, Harris clearly demonstrates that four of them are errors from visual copying, and although a

---


3. This impression was later confirmed when this writer read the following statement by T. S. Pattie (*Manuscripts of the Bible*, London: British Library, 1979, p. 21): ‘The traditional view was that commercial copies of books were made by a group of scribes listening to a reader.’
fifth could have arisen from dictation, it could just as easily be put down to confusion of the mind.1 Having proved his case Harris ignores the remainder. In order that there should be no doubt about the remaining five errors these will also be looked at, as follows:

Matthew 10:35

\[ \text{\textgreek{ηλθον γὰρ δικάσαι \textgreek{αὐθρωπον}} } \]

Cod. D.  \[ \text{\textgreek{ηλθον γὰρ δικάσαι \textgreek{υίον}} } \]

V. L.  \textit{ueni enim separare filium.}

Although \( \chi \) and \( \kappa \) are gutturals and could be confused phonetically, the difference can also be explained by the substitution of the more common word \( \text{δικάσαί} \). Even if the error was phonetically derived it would not prove copying from dictation, for as Desrousseaux says: 'the very act of copying involves an element of "interior dictation", which is sufficient to explain the confusion of sounds.'2 T. C. Skeat also points out that phonetic errors can no longer be used as proof that dictation had taken place.

Matthew 11:3

\[ \text{\textgreek{Σὺ εἰ \ ο ἐρχόμενος}} \]

Cod. D.  \[ \Sigma \upsilon \varepsilon \iota \omicron \epsilonpsilon \rho \\
\text{\textgreek{γαζόμενος}} \]

V. L.  \textit{Tu es, qui venis.}

---

1 This writer finds it of interest that Harris (\textit{Lectures}, 1894, pp. 11ff.) has two typical copyist errors in his quote of the four readings in question. Both are errors of the mind. In the first, the \( \nu \) and the \( \iota \) have been transposed giving Luke xvi. 26 instead of Luke xiv. 26. In the second, the \( \iota \) in Acts vi. 5 4 comes from Luke vi. 20 immediately above it - in fact it should read: Acts v. 4.

2 Vaganay, p. 56.

The ἔργα of ἐργαζόμενος comes from two lines above (l. 11)

Matthew 15:27

τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν.

Cod. D. τῶν κυναρίων αὐτῶν.

V. L. dominorum suorum.

The κυνα of κυναρίων comes from κυνάρια three lines above (l. 1)

John 5:39

καὶ ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι.

Cod. D. καὶ ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν ἀμαρτάνουσαι.

V. L. et illae sunt, quae testantur.

Without a space between the original words the i was accidently dropped.

Mark 12:38

Βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων

τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν

Cod. D. Βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματαίων

Καὶ τῶν τελωνῶν ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν

V. L. Videte ab scribis

Et qui volunt in stolis ambulare.

The confusion between ε and α, ο and ω arise phonetically.

We see therefore that the examples given by Credner do not bear scrutiny. Harris informs us that Alfred von Resch only repeated Credner’s argument

---

1 Nestle-Aland²⁷ has αὐτῶν.
without adding new evidence, therefore his thoughts on this matter need not be addressed.  

Von Soden gives a number of examples of what he recognized as visual errors, but in his opinion these were from the dictator of the text and not from the copyist himself, for he states: ‘Either the copyist himself or, to explain things much better, the person who dictated the text to the copyist letter by letter had been vary careless with his eyes.’

R. S. Mackenzie moved away from the Greek text, and argued instead that dictation was used in writing the Latin text of Codex Bezae. Two years later in the same journal Parker disproved Mackenzie’s claim to such a degree that there is little doubt that the Latin text came about from visual copying. Stone had recognized phonological errors in the Latin text, but made no suggestion as to how they may have come into being.

To determine whether Codex Bezae had been copied using dictation or not would enable future research to be directed towards a particular area or activity e.g. if the use of dictation could be proven it is more likely that copying

---

1 Alfred von Resch, *Ausserekanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien: textkritische und quellencritische Gründlegungen [sic.]*, Leipzig, 1892, pp. 1, n. 2; 34. Cited by Harris (*Lectures*, p. 11). As this publication by von Resch was unobtainable this writer is grateful for the extensive details of von Resch’s work given by Harris.


3 MacKenzie, pp. 58f.


took place in a *scriptorium*.\(^1\) Visual copying on the other hand leaves open a whole range of possibility *e.g.* a private copying in a home or monastery. If reading aloud of what one was copying was the practice of the day, as stated by Balogh,\(^2\) visual copying in a *scriptorium* among other copyists must be excluded\(^3\) - unless of course it was copied in a monastery where its inmates had already undertaken a vow of silence.

\(^1\) A factor to be considered when discussing Codex Bezae and its production is the writing position of the scribe, *e.g.* did he write using a bench or did writing take place using the lap or knee. Skeat (p. 191) reports that M. A. Dain states in his book, *Les manuscrits*, 1949, that the latter position apparently held favour until the very end of the middle ages. If this is true, and this writer finds it difficult to believe that the practice lasted for so long, such a writing position would almost certainly dictate the need of a second person to read that which the writer was either copying or making notes of. P. Veyne makes the point that the introduction of the codex circumvented the need for a reader when one wished to take notes from a manuscript. (Paul Veyne (ed.), *The History of Private Lives*, vol. 1: *From Pagan Rome to Byzantium*, Translator, Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1985, English translation, 1992, p. 541). If readers were used when copying from scrolls, and since Codex Bezae was written from visual copying, one must conclude that Codex Bezae's exemplar/s was also a codex.

\(^2\) Skeat (p. 187) refers to an article by Joseph Balogh published in *Philologus* entitled 'Voces Paginarum', in which Balogh 'established once and for all that in the ancient world all readers, whether of books or documents normally pronounced aloud the words as they read them, and that the silent reading which is so universal today was then looked upon as something phenomenal. This position continued until about the fifth century A.D., after which various influences such as the rise of monasticism, with its ascetic ideal of silence, gradually turned the scale in favour of the silent reading which we know today.'

\(^3\) With every copier reading his text aloud, visual copying by a number of scribes in the same room would be prone to make a great number of errors. It would seem inevitable,
That Codex Bezae is unique does not in itself automatically preclude the possibility that it was one of a number of copies made, say in a scriptorium, for it is well known that in the year 332 Constantine ordered Eusebius to provide fifty vellum Bibles, and all we have of these today is speculation over two possible survivors.\textsuperscript{1} Given that the D text began to fall out of favour during this same century it is surprising, nay miraculous, that even one copy exists today.

In conclusion the evidence is irrefutable that Codex Bezae was written using visual copying. It might also be concluded from this evidence, but not without some reservation, that it was not written in a scriptorium along with other copies unless in a monastery where a vow of silence was practised. Considering that Codex Bezae is either a late fourth or early fifth-century composition the later is just possible.

Exemplar of Codex Bezae

The Gospel and Acts have different origins.

Kipling appears to be the first to have recognized a difference between the Gospels and Acts. The difference, he argues, is the result of a change in therefore, that dictation would be used where a number of scribes were working in the same room copying the same manuscript. This assumes of course that the scribes did not repeat aloud the words they were writing - a matter this writer could neither affirm or deny through lack of information.

\textsuperscript{1} The two codices referred to are Vaticanus and Sinaiticus and at least one of these is extremely doubtful. \textit{Vide} Metzger, \textit{Text}, pp. 7f., 48, n. 1.
translators. The basis for this conclusion was the Greek words in Bezan Acts that were rendered into Latin in a different manner from the way they were rendered in the Gospels, e.g. ἀνατίος into anetios (Acts 16:37), sine culpa (Matt. 12:5), innocentes (Matt. 12:7); ἀδύνατος into adynatus (Acts 14:8), and δοξάζω into clarifico (Acts 3:13, 4:21, 11:18, 21:20).¹

Kipling’s first and second examples are weak and do nothing to sustain his argument. Concerning his first example, ἀνατίος is used only three times in Codex Bezae - as shown - and each time it is rendered differently. In his second example ἀδύνατος and δυνατός is either translated (im)possibilis or turned by using possum in the Gospels (fourteen times), but also four times in Acts. Thus these two Graecisms, anetios and adynatus, must be explained in some other way. In fact Graecisms are common to all the books in Codex Bezae and prove nothing in this regard, but it should be observed that the prime examples, such as the transliteration into Latin of Greek words, occur mainly in Luke and Acts. This would suggest, therefore, that these two books have a common history.²

Nevertheless Kipling’s third example does support his argument. The rendering of δοξάζω into Latin in the Gospels is either honorifico (6x John,

¹ Kipling, p. xii.

² One is encouraged to quote Clark (p. 192) at this point, for he says of such Graecisms: ‘As a matter of fact such errors are of little or no importance, so far as the provenance of D is concerned, since they would easily occur in any bilingual MS.’ For greater detail on Graecisms in Codex Bezae the reader is referred to Clark (pp. xliii, 191-204), with particular reference to the list of ‘chief cases’ on p. 192.
5x Luke, 1x Mark)\textsuperscript{1} or \textit{glorifico} (4x Matt., 15x John)\textsuperscript{2}, neither of which are used in Acts. Whereas of the five times δοξάζω occurs in Acts it is translated: \textit{clarifico} four times (3:13, 4:21, 11:18, 21:20) and \textit{uisum} once (15:22)\textsuperscript{3}. Kipling, wrongly states that 'in Acts δοξάζω is rendered every time by \textit{clarifico}.'\textsuperscript{4}

Over a century later A. C. Clark claimed that the Latin text of the Bezan Acts was from the hand of a different translator to that of the Gospels.\textsuperscript{5} Indeed he could see several hands in the Latin text, but was not fully convinced of his conclusions regarding the differences within the Gospels. Clark’s argument, like Kipling’s, was based upon differences in vocabulary, but he gives a far greater number of telling examples, such as the use of the \textit{nomina sacra}, the

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1} Clark (p. 206) gives a total of 15 against this writer’s 12, however, Clark includes in his statistics the use of \textit{honor}, which is used three times in the Gospels to render δοξάζω, (1x John, 2x Luke).
  \item \textsuperscript{2} Clark (p. 206) gives a total of 21 times that \textit{glorifico} is used in the Gospels to render δοξάζω: this writer’s investigations give a total of 19, a figure confirmed from Stone’s \textit{Index Verborum}.
  \item \textsuperscript{3} \textit{uisum} is not shown in Stone’s \textit{Index Verborum}.
  \item \textsuperscript{4} \textit{Sed in Actis nusquam non δοξάζω in clarifico convertitur}. Kipling, p. xii.
  \item \textsuperscript{5} B. H. Streeter addressed Clark’s book in an article entitled: ‘The Primitive Text of Acts’, which was published in \textit{The Journal of Theological Studies}, 34 (1933) pp. 232-241. In this article Streeter (p. 241) rejects what he believes is Clark’s claim, \textit{i.e.} ‘that the Third Gospel and Acts came by different authors.’ However, Clark does not make this claim, for he had argued that these two books came from different translators, not different authors. In fact his exact words are: ‘\textit{Ld} in Acts is the work of a separate translator.’ For this reason Streeter’s argument will not be addressed here.
\end{itemize}
rendering of such words as δόξα, ἀρχιερεύς, ἀποκτείνω, and ἀναίρω.\textsuperscript{1} Stylistic differences are also considered, \textit{e.g.} the use of the Greek aorist participle in the nominative\textsuperscript{2}. Stone added further weight to Clark’s argument by pointing out that the use of \textit{ipse} as an article is unique to Acts (twenty-three times).\textsuperscript{3}

The question that naturally arises is whether these variations that have been ascribed to different translators are not the result of two or more exemplars.

\textbf{Luke and Acts - are they from different sources?}

The manner in which John’s name is spelt throughout Codex Bezae led Blass to conclude that Luke and Acts came from a different source to that of the other Gospels and that the codex had been meticulously copied.\textsuperscript{4} His argument can be readily seen from the following figures: the spelling ‘Ἰωάννης as against ‘Ἰωάννης dominates in Matthew (24 to 2) and in Mark (24 to 2), but the reverse takes place in Luke so that ‘Ἰωάννης is preferred to ‘Ἰωάννης (27 to 1) and Acts (21 to 2). The figures given by Blass for John (17 to 7) are bewildering in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} Scrivener (\textit{Bezae}, p. xxxiii, n. 2) had made a similar comparison much earlier, but he does not appear to have been fully convinced that they indicate a different hand for Acts. \textit{Q.v.}, p. xliiv.
\item \textsuperscript{2} Clark (p. 207) points out that the ‘chief methods adopted were to use the pres. part., \textit{cum} with the subj., or the abl. abs.’ The use of \textit{cum} in this way is as follows: 8x Matt., 8x John, 6x Luke, 20x Mark, and 115x Acts.
\item \textsuperscript{3} Stone, pp. 65f.
\item \textsuperscript{4} The difference in spelling was brought to Blass’s notice by E. Lippelt, one of his students. (Blass, \textit{Philology}, p. 76, n. 1).
\end{itemize}
that they in no way resemble reality. The only explanation this writer can give is that he has mistakenly combined the figures for Iohannes and Iohanes from the Latin text with those of Ἰωάννης and Ἰωάννης from the Greek text.

Out of this seeming inconsistency in spelling Blass recognized the work of a careful scribe who had diligently reproduced that which he was copying without attempting to correct the inconsistencies. Blass also recognized that a change in the order of the Gospels in the exemplar (or one of the exemplars), so that Luke stood next to Acts, would remove a great deal of the inconsistency in the spelling of the name of John. To account, therefore, for this change in order, Blass suggested that Luke and Acts had a different source from that of the remainder of the Gospels.

Chapman could also see from the different spelling of the name of John that the Bezan exemplar had a different order to the Gospels. He argued his case, however, not only from the change in the spelling of John’s name, but also from the use of a single dot as a punctuation mark. He also pointed to the

---

1 Blass, Philology, pp. 75f.
2 Ibid., pp. 76f.

Streeter (‘The Primitive Text of the Acts’, JTHS 34 (1933) 232-41, 234) believed the scribe to be ‘careless and ignorant’, but he made his assessment on the errors in the text, which for a provincial product are to be expected. Fischer (p. 41, n. 131) also highlights the fact that the ‘Unregelmäßige und vulgäre Formen sind Zeugen für die Entwicklung der Sprache und für die Treue des Schreibers, aber nicht für seine Nachlässigkeit.’ [the irregular and vulgar forms are witnesses to the development of the language and for the accuracy of the scribe, not to his thoughtlessness].

Scrivener (Beze p. xvii) in agreement with Blass also said: ‘... the manuscript as it stands at present was closely and exactly copied from another, ...’

3 Ibid., p. 77.
dissolution of the sense-lines, as reported by Scrivener, as further proof of his argument. Given these three factors, he rejected Blass’s theory on the basis that it was improbable that two manuscripts of the Bezan text would have existed that had quite similar character, but with one having a quite different system of spelling from the other.¹ This of course is true if we think of two complete Bezan manuscripts as Blass did, but if Luke and Acts came from a manuscript in which they alone were contained, the argument must still hold. If, as is generally accepted, both Luke and Acts were written by Luke it is quite possible that these two books alone were contained under the same cover.

The evidence for a different order in the sequence of the Gospels of Codex Bezae’s exemplar is substantial and there can be little doubt that the order would have been: Matthew - Mark - John - Luke. However this still leaves the problem of explaining the changes that take place in the spelling of John’s name, the punctuation, and the sense-lines. Chapman provides an explanation, but it is somewhat glib, for he states:

... the difference is due simply to a director of the scribe of the parent MS, who obliged the scribe to change the primitive Ἰωάννης to Ἰωάννης, and Johanes (the servile but unusual transliteration he found in the grandparent MS) to Johannes. When the director’s back was turned, the scribe neglected stichometry, punctuation and orthography alike.²

¹ Chapman, Gospels, p. 344.
² Ibid., p. 344.

Chapman (p. 345) also argued that the ‘neglect of the stichometry both in the line-divisions and in the substituted punctuation’ suggested that the codex was privately owned and not for use in a church. The basis for making this assumption is not given, nor can this writer think of a reason why one (the neglect of the stichometry) should automatically lead to the other (private ownership).
This writer is somewhat surprised at this explanation, for what scribe of the fourth or fifth century would have had the audacity or temerity to go against the command of his superior and in a manner that was so easily detected?

Another criticism this writer has of Chapman’s general argumentation is his over-statement of the facts, e.g., he states that the second half of John and all of Acts are not dotted, when in fact they are - even though considerably less than Matthew and Mark. Obviously Chapman is speaking relatively, but in doing so he paints a far sharper picture than the facts allow.

Acts - did it come from a different exemplar?

Parker’s analysis of the Bezan text confirmed Chapman’s conclusions regarding the sequence to the Gospels in the exemplar, and provided evidence, which he believed proved, that the present Latin text of Acts is the accommodation of an earlier, shorter Latin text to the Bezan Greek text.¹ In his study he investigated the use of the nomina sacra, the spelling of the name Abraham, and the use of the numerals twelve and seven. His detailed analysis of the sense-lines and punctuation, and for that matter his analyses in general, are invaluable for their depth and presentation; they are far superior to any previous study and are worthy models for all to emulate.

Parker’s argument that the exemplar of Acts was different from that of the Gospels rests on a number of points, viz. (1) the sense-lines of its exemplar were longer than those in the exemplar(s) of the Gospels and changed little when

¹ Parker, Bezae, p. 284.
copied into Codex Bezae.\textsuperscript{1} However, because of the high number of sense lines in Acts consisting of only one or two words it must be acknowledged that at some time in its past its sense lines were short as were the Gospels.\textsuperscript{2} (2) The *dns-dni* type of nomina sacra is different from those used in the Gospels. (3) The high point used for punctuation is unique to Acts;\textsuperscript{3} (4) there are far more particles used in Acts than in the Gospels;\textsuperscript{4} (5) the spelling of the name of John in the Latin text also corroborates the separate existence of Acts. In the Greek text, the earlier form, Ἰωάννης is by far the preferred spelling in Luke and Acts, while in Matthew and Mark Ἰωάννης has preference. Yet in the Latin text Acts aligns itself with Matthew and Mark against Luke - the Latin Gospel of Luke is alone in preferring the earlier form, Iohannes. Chapman accounted for this change by suggesting that a corrector had ‘carefully’ altered the book of Acts to the later form, Iohannes at some time earlier than the present codex.\textsuperscript{5} If this explanation is true one has to ask why the Iohanes in the first verse of the third chapter was not changed when the earlier references to John (1:5, 13, 22) were?

If Acts did come from an exemplar other than that containing the Gospels, Blass’s suggestion that Luke and Acts came from the same exemplar is effectively negated.\textsuperscript{6} Also negated is the idea that Codex Bezae contains the original writings of Luke.

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid., p. 80.

\textsuperscript{2} This point must be conceded if it is accepted that the sense-lines of one or two words, which are so prominent in Matthew (74x), Mark (38), and Acts (81), signify columns made up of short lines. (Clark, Acts, p. 179).

\textsuperscript{3} Parker, Bezae, pp. 32f., 80.

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., p. 192.

\textsuperscript{5} Chapman, Gospels, p. 344.

\textsuperscript{6} Parker, Bezae, p. 109.
Parker, however, goes beyond suggesting that Acts had simply a different exemplar to the Gospels, for he also argues that it came from a later tradition than that of the Gospels. His claim rests on the earlier *dms-dmi* type of abbreviation found in the Gospels, but found only once in Acts. However this argument has its weaknesses, as can be found under the section: *Nomina Sacra*.

**The ‘Division of Labour’ argument.**

To explain the change in spelling of the name John, the dilution of the use of the single point for punctuation, and the break up of the sense-lines that takes place in John, Parker suggests that these came about through the division of labour when the Gospels were copied from an exemplar arranged in the order Matthew - Mark - John - Luke. There is a major flaw in this hypothesis in that the place of change in John for each of these three phenomena is not the same. Parker recognized this and attempts to dismiss the most marked of the three - the change in the spelling of John’s name - by suggesting that the *Ἰωάννης* on folio 121b (John 5:36) arose through chance. The basis to his argument is that in the same verse of the Latin text John is spelt *Iohannen* and that *Ἰωάννης* occurs twice in Matthew although it is spelt *Ἰωάννης* on all other occasions. This suggestion puts the change of *Ἰωάννης* to *Ἰωάννης* at 10:40, which is after the place where the single point in the punctuation begins to drop sharply in use. While this suggestion eliminates one problem, it produces another, because it somewhat negates the division of labour theory. Had the point of the division been in folio 122a the number of leaves in Matthew, Mark, and the first portion of John would have been 186 against 163 leaves in Luke and the
second portion of John. This division of labour is made considerably worse if the split takes place at folio 136, which is the point the dissolution becomes more marked. A break at this folio gives a ratio of 227 to 122 leaves.

As can be seen the 'division of labour' theory is not particularly strong and indeed it raises problems of its own, for had there been a change in copyists at folio 136 why is there a continued but sporadic use of the single point after this folio? This can be better understood if we look at the number of times the single point is used, starting with folio 135, which has six single points. The number of points per page on the following folios is as follows: 9, 2, 3, 3, 2, 3, 0, 7, 0, 1, 0, 2, 1, 2, 1, 0, 0, the last figure is for folio 152, but this is still not the last folio to have at least one single point. If the new scribe, who did not favour the use of the single point for punctuation, began his work at folio 137, why did he suddenly use seven of them on folio 143? If there was no division of labour and the drop in the use of the single point began through lack of assiduity on the scribe's part, why was his diligence suddenly lifted on folio 143 then fall to nothing on the very next, to dribble along again for a few more folios? The oversight of a supervisor might explain the sudden increase in the use of the single point, and his departure, its drop to zero, but it does not explain its continued use on the following folios. Also my earlier statement regarding supervisors and the audacity of scribes is still pertinent.

1 This division was derived from the folios in Codex Bezae and not from Nestle-Aland as does Parker. This writer avoided using Nestle-Aland since it contains an extensive critical apparatus. Also, since we are referring to Codex Bezae there is every good reason to base our calculations on the existing manuscript. When considering the Gospels alone and assuming major parts of the text have not been lost and that the cola are the same for all Gospels, the ratio for the division of labour would be the same even for Codex Bezae's exemplar.

2 The number of points per page has been taken from Scrivener's facsimile.
The same argument is appropriate for the change in the breakdown of the sense-lines. In Parker's opinion the breakdown in the sense-lines starts at folio 127b, which is before the marked reduction in the use of the single point for punctuation, but after the change in the spelling of the name John on folio 121b. Nevertheless he again attributes the breakdown to a change in scribes. However the breakdown is not as dramatic as one would hope if the theory was to withstand close scrutiny, for a number of folios following 127b are not free of the phenomena. Thus the previous argument regarding the reduced use of the single point for purposes of punctuation can also be applied to the breakdown of the sense-lines.

This writer has read no plausible explanation for either the sporadic decline in the use of the single point or the sporadic increase in the breakdown of the sense-lines in John. Parker's suggested division of labour does not adequately account for the gradual changes that take place in both phenomena. These changes that have their beginning in John carry on into Luke to the point that the breakdown in sense-lines is common to the whole of this Gospel; the use of the single point for punctuation is also negligible. Both Luke and John exhibit distinctive characteristics that separate them from each other and from the other Gospels. Only Matthew and Mark demonstrate unity, suggesting that these two Gospels have a common history, at least as far as the Codex Bezae tradition is concerned.

---

1 Parker, Bezae, p. 114.

2 Ibid., pp. 102f., 115.
The common features of Matthew and Mark.

The use of the *nomina sacra* in the Latin text demonstrates the uniqueness of Luke’s Gospel and its affinity with John’s Gospel, and the closeness of Matthew to Mark. The abbreviated form of the accusative of *dominus* in Matthew and Mark is always ĐMN while in John and Luke it is always ĐOM. Matthew and Mark are also the only Gospels that use ĐI, for the genitive of *deus*, *viz* Matthew (7), Mark (16).\(^1\) Because Matthew and Mark share these common Latin elements, Parker suggests that these two books were possibly together in a Latin form before they were joined to their Greek counterparts and before their combination with the other Gospels (Latin and Greek) all of which, he argues, existed separately.\(^2\) This writer believes, however, for reasons about to be stated, that the evidence clearly shows that Matthew and Mark also had a common existence in their Greek form.

The Gospels of Matthew and Mark have similarities in the following details: (1) there is a close affinity between these two Gospels in their use of the single point for punctuation as against the use of a space by Luke and a combination of both in John.\(^3\) (2) The spelling of the name of John, as previously discussed. (3) The sense-lines in Matthew and Mark are less broken than in either of the other two Gospels.\(^4\) This is reflected in the great number of lines that have only one or two words, *viz* Matthew (a total of 74) and Mark


\(^2\) Parker, *Bezæ*, p. 119.


\(^4\) The figures for the number of times the article is placed at the end of a στίχος, as provided by Clark (*Acts*, p. 179), clearly demonstrates the differences between the books in this regard. These are: Matthew 3, John 53, Luke 135, Mark 6, Acts 31.
(38), against that of John (6) and Luke (5).\footnote{Ibid., p. 179. Repeated in Parker, *Bezae*, p. 81.} All these factors along with the common details of the *nomina sacra*, previously mentioned, strongly suggest that the bilingual Gospels of Matthew and Mark had a common history before their combination with the other Gospels.

Did the Latin have its origin outside the bilingual tradition?

Whether the Gospels of Luke and John were bilingual before being united with Matthew and Mark cannot be ascertained from the existing evidence. Parker’s argument that the Gospels were written two columns to the page appears well founded,\footnote{Parker’s argument is given in part I, p. 209ff.} but were all or only some bilingual, such as 0231, or did they consist of two columns of Greek text? Certainly it is not as clear as Parker would have us believe that ‘the Latin has its origins outside the bilingual tradition.’\footnote{Ibid., p. 118.} Indeed the evidence of Matthew and Mark would suggest otherwise. The differences between the columns as argued by Parker, *e.g.* where $d$ follows a text that is divergent from $D$, could have resulted from a

Credner (p. 508) had said that the exemplar of Codex *Bezae* had been divided stichometrically. Scrivener (*Bezae*, p. xxiii) had even argued that it had been ‘similarly divided in respect of στίχοι though not similarly paged.’ Harris (*Bezae*, p. 242), in agreement, felt there was ‘no reason to doubt the accuracy of Scrivener’s statement’. He did recognize, however, that there are cases when the lines of the Bezan text do not agree with the primitive model. He goes on to say: ‘in almost every case where there is a dividing point in the middle of a line in the Bezan text, it is because two cola have been run together, or because in some other way the regular colometry has been deserted.’ Parker argues that the anomalies in the cola reflect the actual cola of the exemplar.
copyist giving great attention to a revered Latin version while translating from
the Greek text,¹ and this could have occurred individually before they were
combined to start a common tradition as appears to have happened with
Matthew and Mark.

The evidence confirms in some measure Lowe's earlier conviction that the
exemplar of Codex Bezae 'was evidently not all of a piece or of one period'.²

¹ Scrivener (Bezae, p. xxxi) had suggested this earlier. So did Clark (Acts, p. xlii), for
he states: 'It was noticed by Scrivener that important differences between D and ℓ4 are
chiefly found in Mk. and Acts. It is precisely in the case of these documents that the use of
an old-Latin MS. can be proved. In Mk. the translator employed a MS. similar to the
Veronensis (ℓb) or Corbeiensis (ℓf), with the result that the Latin vocabulary in this Gospel
differs notably from that in the rest of EVV. In Acts the MS. used was similar to the Gigas
(ℓg). This the translator employed very freely, probably distrusting his own powers, with
the result that the differences between D and ℓ4 are very frequent and that ℓ4 exhibits some
astonishing mixtures of variants.'

² Lowe, A Note, p. 12.

Michael W. Holmes ('Early Editorial Activity and the Text of Codex Bezae in Matthew,'
(Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1984) p. 236) concluded from his study of the
text of Codex Bezae in Matthew that '... Bezae in Matthew has not been affected by this
[theological] bias in the same way or to the same extent as have Luke and Acts. Indeed, the
difference is such as to at least raise the question whether Bezae is a homogeneous codex
from book to book.' Cited by George E. Rice ('Is Bezae a Homogeneous Codex?' in

Rice (Op. cit. p. 54) conducted a similar study of the Bezan Mark and concluded
that: 'The present study of Mark adds weight to the question raised by Holmes [re: the
homogeneity of Codex Bezae]. It does appear that Bezae is not a homogeneous codex.
Clark also observed that 'the text of the Gospels has been transmitted through a series of MSS.'\(^1\) Meanwhile, Blass's statement, which was confirmed by Scrivener, that the copyist of the present Codex Bezae was meticulous in his task should be kept in mind. Thus the great divergences between the various books must have arisen a good deal prior to being brought together as Codex Bezae's exemplar, which goes back to possibly the beginning of the fourth century and earlier - into a period when the \(D\) text was the most widely used throughout the empire,\(^2\) and in a period when the text was not treated with the sacred care of later centuries.\(^3\) It is most unlikely therefore, that these books, individually or collectively, would have passed through this period without the attention of a number of people who would have made changes to reflect their views and to satisfy their needs. Even if the various books had been brought together under one cover very early in their history there is no reason why particular books should not have been the focus of particular scribes, just as the Latin text of Matthew and the first few chapters of Acts of our present codex received the attention of Corrector G. Also such work by Latin scribes in the early history of the text would create the illusion that the Latin text of Codex Bezae had its origins outside the bilingual tradition. Furthermore, such concentrated attention would also account for the common features of

Although the Bezan text of Matthew and Mark do reflect some variants that may be attributed to a bias, they are insignificant in the comparison with the text of Luke/Acts.\(^1\)

\(^1\) Clark, *Text*, p. 21.

\(^2\) Westcott & Hort, pp. 149, 178.

The early existence of the Bezan text is well known, as proven by the third-century papyri \(\text{P}29\), \(\text{P}48\) and \(\text{P}69\), and \(\text{P}38\) of c. 300. The Patristic evidence is also well known, for the writings of both Tertullian (\(\dagger 220\)) and Cyprian (\(\dagger 258\)) prove the existence of the Bezan text in the third century.

\(^3\) Aland, *Text*, pp. 56, 64.
Matthew and Mark without the need to speculate on an earlier separate existence, and the same applies to the individual character of Acts. In short, the present theories about the early history of the various books associated with Codex Bezae are built on calculated guesses, and as such must be recognized as fragile structures and treated accordingly.

Conclusions

From an analysis of the evidence the following conclusions might be made with some confidence: (1) Codex Bezae is a faithful reproduction of the text of its exemplar. (2) The Gospels in the exemplar of Codex Bezae, or its grandparent, had the Western order: Matthew - Mark - John - Luke. (3) At some time in their history the Gospels and Acts had cola with short lines. (4) The individual character of the various books is most probably a reflection of their earlier separate histories, but it should be recognized that if they had been united to form a codex very early in the tradition the concentrated attention of individuals on one or two books in the codex during its passage through time would have created the same individual character now seen in the books. In fact there must be a high probability that the individual books were altered before and after their formation as a codex. Indeed, our present Codex Bezae provides clear and irrefutable proof of how extensively and quickly such alterations took place. Corrector G, who is believed to be contemporary with the author, is a case in point - regardless of all the others that followed - and Corrector G operated in a period when the letter of the Word was regarded with greater respect than it had been a century before. When one considers how quickly the New Testament text was corrupted in the earlier years, the text of

an ancient manuscript like Codex Bezae must be expected to reflect the course of its history.

Whether it is at all possible to construct a stemma of Codex Bezae itself with any degree of certainty from existing data is highly improbable. The problem is in large part one of textual criticism, but present witnesses to the D text before the formation of Codex Bezae are so scarce as to certainly render any attempt in this direction futile. The other avenue left open to immediate research is one in which there is a pressing need and that is the internal evidence. The need to carry out a complete analysis of both texts is vital. A complete index of the words in the Greek text, like Stone’s Index Verborum is

University Press, 1990, pp. 19, 24) argued for the early development of the text as did H. Vogels, who believes that the vast majority of deliberate changes in the New Testament were made by A.D. 200. Nevertheless, even though this view is widely accepted, not all scholars agree with it. Frederik Wisse (‘The Nature and Purpose of Redactional Changes in Early Christian Texts: The Canonical Gospels’, in: William L. Petersen (ed.). Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989, p. 52) looked at this matter in some detail and argued that there was a distinct lack of textual evidence to support such a belief and that harmonising changes and interpretive glosses do not stop with the second century, but ‘clearly continues unabated throughout the manuscript tradition.’

That corruption of the text was still common in the fifth century and how quickly it took place, can be gauged from the comment made by Jerome († 420) in the preface to his Gallican Psalter where as H. F. D. Sparks (‘Jerome as Biblical Scholar’, in P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans, The Cambridge History of The Bible, vol. 1, Cambridge: C.U.P., 1970, 1989, p. 527) says, ‘he complains that the text of his first revision had been hopelessly corrupted by contamination with the unrevised texts within four or five years of its issue (‘so much more potent is ancient error than modern correction’).’
long overdue. Yoder’s Concordance is helpful but it is not exhaustive. In this day of computers and software, where the analysis and sorting of texts is commonplace, we need to go beyond Stone and sort all Bezan words into tables of use within the various books, like the manual sort of words like δοξάζω, clarifico, and the name of John. This type of analysis would go far to prove how extensive the differences are between the various Bezan books. Moreover, thanks to the resource: CD Rom #6 of the Packard Humanities Institute (PHI), which contains Inscriptions, Papyri, and Coptic texts, it is now possible to determine the time and the place of use of any distinctive words that are bound to emerge from such an analysis. A list of irregularly spelt words found in Acts is provided in Appendix C along with the results of a search of PHI’s CD Rom #6 for the use of these words. However, the outcome of these investigations was inconclusive because of the limitations of the existing data, as discussed in the appendix.

History of Codex Bezae prior to 1582

Refer to appendix A.

Lectionary notes

Since the hands of the lectionary notes and their dates have been discussed under the section, ‘Annotations’ they will not be reconsidered here. Instead the following discussion will centre upon the system represented by the lectionary notes and their place of origin.

Early last century Credner made the somewhat axiomatic observation that since the lectionary notes are found exclusively on the pages containing the
Greek text, they must have come into being in regions in which the Greek language and Greek liturgy dominated.\textsuperscript{1} What is not self-evident, however, is the type of system represented by the readings or their place of origin. Credner goes on to say that the barbarous style and expression of these marginalia, which are written in Greek, must preclude a region where Greek was the vernacular. He suggested a region in which Greek was the language of the church, but not the mother tongue. The guttural characteristics of the Greek, and the extent and liturgical quality of the marginalia, led him to believe that they came from Jewish Christians.\textsuperscript{2} Credner’s argument rests upon an early date for the lectionary marginalia, for he believed they had come from Codex Bezae’s exemplar and, therefore, from a very early period of church history. Alfred Resch considered Credner’s argument well founded and therefore agreed with him.\textsuperscript{3} J. Rendel Harris, on the other hand, rejected Credner’s argument simply by referring to Scrivener’s dating of the hands and by explaining how the misinterpretation of the data came about in the first place.\textsuperscript{4}

Although Credner’s argument that the lectionary marginalia were in existence before Codex Bezae was written is manifestly wrong, his argument that they demonstrate a Jewish Christian origin still stands, despite Harris’s concluding statement that: ‘Credner’s remarks on the liturgical annotations in the Codex Bezae are at fault: first, they do not belong to the date to which Credner wishes to refer them; secondly, they have nothing to do with the Jews.’\textsuperscript{5} In actual fact, although Credner’s date for the lectionary notes does

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} Credner, p. 11.
\item \textsuperscript{2} Vide: part I, pp. 64f.
\item \textsuperscript{3} Alfred Resch, Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien: textcritische und quellencritische Gründlegungen [sic.], Leipzig, 1892. Cited by Harris (Lectures, pp. 1f.).
\item \textsuperscript{4} Ibid., p. 7.
\item \textsuperscript{5} Ibid., p. 7.
\end{itemize}
not meet Scrivener’s estimates - which are now recognized as far too late anyway - and are even too late for the presently accepted limits, his arguments for a Jewish-Christian environment have not been disproved despite Harris’s claim to the contrary. In fact Harris does not address Credner’s argument in this regard; having proved Credner’s dating wrong he seems to have concluded that the remainder of the argument was also wrong. Nevertheless, Credner’s concept of a Jewish-Christian community moving closer to the Catholic Church at such a late stage in the history of the Church, i.e. the eighth century, must be ruled out, because by the end of the first century the separation of the Christian and Jewish churches was complete. It must be concluded, therefore, that Credner’s argument for a Jewish-Christian community is without foundation.

Harris’s attempt to place Codex Bezae in Gaul at the time the lectionary notes were written, rested upon the belief that particular notes (ascribed by Scrivener to Hand J) were from a system current in the Gallican Church.¹ Brightman however proved conclusively that they were not of Gaul but were of the Byzantine system.² In a later publication Harris acknowledged the correctness of Brightman’s claim, but then argued that the lectionary system of Hand J was an earlier system than that used by Hand L.³ Brightman recognized no difference, but Harris maintains that since Hand L erased the whole of J’s note a different system is referred to. Harris’s argument, which must be considered tenuous, begs the question: if Hand L updated Hand J’s entry on Fol. 150b⁴ to a later system why didn’t he do the same to Hand J’s entry on Fol.

---

¹ Harris, Bezae, pp. 12-15.
² Brightman, p. 446.
³ Harris, Annotators, pp. 26, 34ff.
⁴ This entry reads: τη κυριακη των προφητησιματων accompanied by a Greek cross (+) with a top looped like rho (ρ) (similar to Constantine’s labarum), with σ on the
67b, particularly since Hand L made an entry on Foll. 66b and 68b? If, however, there is a difference between the systems used by Hands J and L the earlier system might be located geographically and chronologically.

If Brightman is right in that there is no difference in the lectionary systems used by Hands J and L, his observation that the system used by these hands diverges slightly from the normal Byzantine series might prove useful in locating Codex Bezae geographically and chronologically, but one should not rule out the possibility that they contain errors. It goes without saying that a list of all lectionaries (approx. 2300), their systems and differences, and where possible their locations would require a great deal of work, but would be most useful in resolving questions such as these, not only for Codex Bezae but for any manuscript with lectionary details.²

---

left and ω on the right of the cross. This sign originally meant ἀρχή, i.e. the beginning of the lesson.

¹ This entry, which Scrivener failed to give in his marginalia, and which begins with the previously described labarum, reads: τῶ σαββάτο / τῶ [τῶν προ] / φοιτοσματω - the solidus (/) signifies a new line.


Nomina sacra

The important details of the nomina sacra have already been brought out during the discussion of other topics, but in order to view the data unencumbered with the trappings of other topics these details will be discussed in their own right.

Scrivener gives a rough tabulation of the various forms of the nomina sacra found in the Greek text\(^1\) and the Latin text\(^2\) but makes no comment upon them, apart from pointing out that the abbreviation DNS, which is the usual form in the Gospels, is also the form preferred by Codd. Vercellensis\(^3\) and Claromontanus (\(dp\)), and that DNS, which is the usual form in Acts, is preferred by Codd. Palatinus\(^4\), Amiatus\(^5\), and Fuldensis.\(^6\) Having noted these differences, which he calls 'minute peculiarities', he acknowledges that they have led some to believe that Acts came from a different translator - an obvious reference to Kipling.\(^7\)

\(1\) Scrivener, Beza, p. xviii.

\(2\) Ibid., pp. xliiif.

\(3\) A fourth- or fifth-century Old Latin codex, which contains the four Gospels in the same sequence as those in Codex Bezae, \textit{i.e.} Matt., John, Luke, Mark. (Metzger, Versions, p. 296).

\(4\) The details for this codex are the same as those stated above for Vercellensis. Ibid., p. 297.


\(7\) Scrivener, Beza, p. xlv.
Harris devotes a short chapter to the abbreviated forms of the *nomina sacra*, but apart from demonstrating errors in Codex Bezae, which he believes arose because the copyist misunderstood the abbreviations in his exemplar, he has little to say that is helpful outside of pointing out that the three-letter form of abbreviation, as against the two-letter form, is very ancient.¹

Lowe provided more information than either of his predecessors and really demonstrates how incidentals such as the *nomina sacra* can be useful for providing information about the history of a document. Briefly these are:

(1) the *dns-dni* type, the preferred form in Acts, is a later stage in the abbreviated forms of the *nomina sacra* than the *dms-dmi* type, which is preferred in the Gospels.²

(2) The oldest Biblical manuscripts of the Old-Latin version, *i.e.* Vercellensis, Veronensis,³ Corbiensis,⁴ the Fulda Weingarten fragments,⁵ the Sangallensis⁶, all use the *dms*-type of abbreviation for *dominus*. He acknowledges, however, that the oldest manuscripts of the Vulgate, *i.e.* the

---

¹ Harris, Bezae, p. 250.

² Lowe does not provide any figures; therefore, the following, which are taken from Parker’s well tabulated data (Bezae, p. 102, Table 15), are given: the *dns-dni* type (Acts 98 times, Gospels 12) against the *dms-dmi* type (Acts once, Gospels 207 times).

³ A fourth or fifth-century Old Latin codex, which contains the four Gospels in the same sequence as those in Codex Bezae, *i.e.* Matt., John, Luke, Mark. (Metzger, Versions, p. 296).

⁴ An eighth- to the eleventh-century document, which contains Matthew. (Ibid. p. 297).


⁶ A seventh or eighth-century manuscript, contains John 9: 14-44. (Ibid.)
Analysis of the Evidence

Fuldensis and the Sangallensis\(^1\) (both of which have Italian type texts) are consistent in their use of the *dns*-type.

(3) A number of Biblical manuscripts that use the *dns*-type also write *deus* and *dei* in full, but distinguish it as a *nomina sacra* by placing a line above it. The same practice is also common in the Gospels of Codex Bezae, where *DEI* is found 122 times, but not at all in Acts.\(^2\)

Lowe provides one other piece of information that may prove helpful and that is the occurrence of ΘΗΝ, which is used as an abbreviation for the accusative of Ίησοῦς, not only in the Greek text of Codex Bezae, but also in the African Old Latin Codex k\(^3\) of the Gospels.\(^4\)

A. C. Clark brings to our notice that the abbreviations THC and XFC are to be found in the Egyptian manuscript W,\(^5\) and in the Sahidic and Bohairic

---

1. Fifth-century manuscript with an Italian type of text. Written in Verona, it contains about half the leaves of the four Gospels. *(Ibid. p. 335).*

2. Again these are Parker's figures. There is, however, a discrepancy between the 69 times in Luke and twice in Acts, as given by Lowe *(A Note, p. 13)*, and the 66 times and none in Acts, as given by Parker *(Bezae, p. 101, Table 14).*

3. Codex Bobiensis, of the fourth or fifth century, 'was copied from an exemplar of the period before Cyprian and presents a text whose Greek base is thought by some to be traceable to the second century,' *(Aland, Text, p. 187).*


5. A fifth-century codex, which contains the four Gospels in the same sequence as Codex Bezae. *(Metzger, Text, p. 56).*
versions, and sporadically in codices δ and B. The last two manuscripts are generally held to be Egyptian.¹

Paap's study of the *nomina sacra* in the Greek papyri of the first five centuries C.E. clearly shows: (1) of the eight abbreviated forms found in Codex Bezae five (θεός, κύριος, πνεῦμα, πατήρ, and Ἰησοῦς) were in use at least as early as the first half of the second century, and that Χριστός and σταυρός were in use at least a century later;² (2) the abbreviations found in Codex Bezae were not restricted to any one century and were still in use into the sixth century - the upper limit of the study; (3) παρ, used as an abbreviation for πατήρ (John 12:26, 14:28, 15:1) is not found in the manuscripts listed, nor is στ, an abbreviation for σταυρός (Mark 15:30, 32), to be found. However, the use of σταυρός or its forms is comparatively limited in the manuscripts reviewed.

Paap’s study also proves the early existence of the Greek text of Codex Bezae, for only θεός, κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, and Χριστός are regularly contracted. The other words that appear in Codex Bezae and which became abbreviated in time, *i.e.* οὐρανός, ἄνθρωπος, Δαυίδ, Ἰσραήλ, Ἰερουσαλήμ, νῦν, σωτήρ and μήτηρ, are always written in full, and generally speaking σταυρός also; πατήρ is generally written in full, even when used in the sacrificial sense; and in the majority of cases πνεῦμα is contracted.

Paap also points out that the Latin abbreviation DNS is also to be found in the fourth-century manuscript P. Ox. VIII. 1073.³

---

The differences in the *nomina sacra* between Acts and the Gospels prompted Parker to argue that these suggest that Acts came from a later tradition than that of the Gospels.\(^1\) Lowe saw them as indicating that Codex Bezae was 'written in the transition period when the type *dms* was slowly giving place to *dns* and this must have been, judging from dated manuscripts, before the sixth century.'\(^2\) Lowe's argument that Codex Bezae was written in a period of transition is born out by Paap's study, for both the earlier and later forms were used at least in the five centuries. Lowe does not, however, explain why Acts should be so markedly different from the Gospels in its use of the *nomina sacra*. Parker does give an explanation for this difference, but his conclusion that Acts came from a later tradition is weak even though his argument rests upon the accepted fact that the *dns*-form of abbreviation came after the *dms*-form. The weakness lies in: (1) the early witnesses to the use of the *dns*-form, *e.g.* Palatinus (IV/V) and P. Ox. VIII. 1073 (IV), are as early as the manuscripts that bear witness to the *dms*-form of abbreviation.\(^3\) (2) The considerable overlap in use, therefore, of both the *dms* and the *dns*-form of abbreviation, and the use of both abbreviations in the same document, *e.g.* Matthew has the *dms*-form fifty-two times and the *dns*-form eleven times, makes it impossible to talk of a different tradition on this ground, unless the exclusive use in time of the two forms can be clearly demonstrated.\(^4\) The differences in

\(^{1}\) Parker, *Bezae*, p. 118.


\(^{3}\) *Vide supra*, p. 275.

\(^{4}\) Parker, *Bezae*, p. 102, Table 15.

It will be readily seen from a glance at Lowe's list of Latin manuscripts, given in *More Facts*, that both forms of abbreviation were used in the fifth, sixth and seventh century. This coupled with the manuscripts of the fourth century, already cited, makes it
the use of the *nomina sacra* in the Acts and the Gospels could quite easily have arisen through the preference of the various scribes even when copying from the same codex, particularly with a manuscript that has a tradition as long as Codex Bezae's. Also if the use of the *dns*-form is to be ascribed to a different tradition to that of the Gospels, how does one explain its high occurrence in Matthew (11x) and yet zero use in Mark - particularly when these two Gospels give every indication of having a long common history?¹

The importance of the *nomina sacra* can be readily seen and should not be ignored; the continued collection and cataloguing of the various forms, when and where used in the textual tradition should prove helpful. Certainly, from Paap's study, παπ, as an abbreviation for πατηρ, appears to be unique and thus may prove geographically specific.

**The books that were contained in Codex Bezae**

Having made the statement that 'A copy of the Greek Scriptures, furnished with a Latin version, would most likely be written among a people with whom Latin was vernacular.',² Scrivener uses the order of the Gospels in Codex Bezae

impossible to make categorical statements about one manuscript being written before the other on the bases of the *nomina sacra*.


² Both Kenyon (Bezae, p. 296) and Burkitt (p. 505) made the same observation.
(considered by him to be peculiar to the West)\textsuperscript{1} as a proof of Western influence.

Clark on the other hand was more specific, for he used the order of the Gospels as found in Codex Bezae and the Egyptian codex W, and the placing

\begin{footnote}
Scrivener (Bezae, pp. xiv, xxx) cites the following: 'Old Latin Vercellensis (a), Palatinus (e), Brixianus (f), the Gothic version, and a Greek copy seen by Druthmar, a monk of Corbey in the ninth century'.

The main witnesses to this order, apart from Codex Bezae, are cited by Metzger (The Canon, p. 296) as: the fifth-century Codex Freerianus, Washingtoniensis (W 033), which came from the monastery of Shenute in Atripe near Achmim in Upper Egypt (Helmut Koester, Introduction to the New Testament, Hermeneia Foundations and Facets (Robert W. Funk ed.) vol. 2: History and Literature of Early Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982, p. 27), and the tenth-century Codex Monacensis (X). He goes on to say that the order is to be found 'in several of the older Greek minuscule MSS, in the Gothic version [Codex Argenteus of the early sixth century], in a few of the older MSS of the Peshitta Syriac, and in a considerable number of Old Latin MSS.'

Metzger (Versions, pp. 49-51) lists the following Peshitta Syriac manuscripts as having the four Gospels: Codex Phillipps 1388, of the end of the fifth or beginning of the sixth century - no order given; British Museum manuscript (BMM) Add. 14453, of the fifth or sixth century - no order given, but ends with John 20:25; BMM 14470, mainly of the fifth or sixth century - no order given; Vatican Cod. Sir. 12, written at Edessa in 548 - no order given.

Metzger (Versions, p. 300) lists the Old Latin manuscript r, r\textsuperscript{1}, Codex Usserianus, of the sixth or seventh century as another codex whose Gospels have the same sequence as Codex Bezae. Parker (Bezae, pp. 116f.) gives a number of manuscripts which have their Gospels in the Codex Bezae order, e.g. for the Old Latin manuscript he cites a b e f ff\textsuperscript{2} and q. Metzger (Versions, p. 297), however, states that ff\textsuperscript{2} (8), Codex Corbeiensis II, of the fifth century, contains the four Gospels in the sequence: Matt., Luke, John, Mark.
of the Catholic letters before Acts, which is the same order found in the Bohairic and Sahidic version, as indicating a possible Egyptian origin for Codex Bezae.\footnote{Clark, \textit{Acts}, p. lxiv.} Parker rejected this argument, however, because neither of these versions place the Catholic Epistles immediately after the Gospels, nor do they have the Gospels in the same sequence as Codex Bezae.\footnote{Parker, \textit{Bezae}, p. 264.} Because we really do not know what books came between Mark and III John, it is pointless entering a discussion on the merits of Clark’s claim. Although Scrivener had addressed the problem of the missing leaves and what they may have contained,\footnote{Scrivener, \textit{Bezae}, pp. xivf.} it was Chapman who made the first detailed attempt to resolve the question.

Chapman’s study of the texts of the Church Fathers led him to conclude that the missing leaves of Codex Bezae would not have contained all the Catholic epistles, but rather only the three epistles of John and the Apocalypse.

Chapman’s argument contains the following flaws: (1) he assumes without any apparent justification that the only Catholic epistles contained in the missing leaves would have been the three written by John. In light of his own data, which he obtained through the analysis of the writings of the earliest Church Fathers who made use of the \textit{D} text, and which was the basis for concluding that James, II Peter, and possibly Jude were not part of Codex Bezae, there is no good reason why he excluded I Peter, and if Jude is doubtful so must be III John.\footnote{Chapman is quoted \textit{supra} p. 135, n. 1.} (2) He assumes that the missing leaves contained only canonical material.\footnote{Parker (\textit{Bezae}, pp. 8f.) was right to question the validity of assuming that the lacuna was occupied by canonical material. Since, however, there is only one known Latin biblical}
missing leaves depends upon the assumption that the structure of the missing books contained a similar number of syllables per page to that of the Gospel of Mark.

Chapman's argument is dependent upon far too many assumptions, some of which are contrary to the available evidence, and must, therefore, be considered as nothing more than conjecture, and treated accordingly.

Ornamentation

Those scholars who have expressed an opinion on the ornamentation in Codex Bezae agree that the arabesque ornamentation at the end of each Gospel is indisputably Latin. Scrivener, who does not link them to any ethnic group, simply states that these and the brief subscriptions are 'in a style not more elaborate than is seen in corresponding parts of Codd. Sinaiticus and Alexandrinus.'¹ Mercati was the first to state that these and 'the explicit and incipit in Codex Bezae recur in the most ancient Latin MSS, but not in Greek ones, where the style and shape and arrangement of them are quite different.'² Lowe agreed with Mercati and states that these and 'the wording of the colophons, the manner of abbreviating the running titles, and the position of the manuscript containing extra-canonical material - a fifth-century codex of the Gospels of Matthew, Nicodemus, and Thomas (Vienna, Nationalbibliothek Lat. 563; CLA 10, 1485), he considered the assumption 'not unreasonable'. Nevertheless he acknowledges that, 'a number of Greek manuscripts, including the Codex Sinaiticus, do contain extra-canonical books.' (Ibid., p. 9).

¹ Scrivener, Bezae, p. xv.

² Mercati, p. 449.
quire-marks, are in keeping with Latin and not with Greek scribal tradition.'

Parker points out that a Bezan type ornamentation is to be found in the fifth-century Stuttgart Old Latin fragment of the prophets.

Nevertheless despite the overwhelming acceptance of a Latin ornamentation as well as the other factors given above, which point to a Latin origin, one should bear in mind Lowe's words of caution: 'But to infer from this that the Codex Bezae was written in a Latin centre, ... would be to ignore all the non-Latin features of the manuscript.'

The pen

F. C. Burkitt appears to be the first to address the question regarding the physical aspects of the pen used in writing Codex Bezae, namely, had it been cut for writing Latin or for writing Greek? The answer to this would provide some information on Codex Bezae's place of origin, i.e. did it come from a Latin or Greek environment?

Burkitt states that at least until early in the sixth century, Latin uncialis were customarily written with a slanting pen, while a straight pen was the custom for Greek uncialis. He explains this by saying:

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

---

1 Lowe, Lyons, p. 271.
2 Parker, Bezae, p. 13.
3 Lowe (Lyons, p. 271) does not enumerate these Greek features.
4 Burkitt, p. 501.
the thickest will be from NW. to SE., and the finest from SW. to NE. ... 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.¹

Unfortunately Burkitt provided no supporting evidence and one is left to wonder if his statement is not, as Parker says, 'a hypothesis aimed at explaining what he believed to be the facts rather than a piece of verifiable information.'²

Lowe was to say even less on the subject. Apart from confirming Burkitt's opinion that the pen had been cut for writing Greek, he simply says: 'if his [the scribe's] Greek letters strike one as somewhat odd, his Latin characters are still queerer.'³ Parker, however, rejected this opinion.

It is to Parker's credit that he thoroughly investigated this matter and in so doing provides the reader with an appreciation of the complexities faced by anyone attempting to resolve questions dealing with methods of writing. Further to this, his study highlights the simplicity of Burkitt's approach to the problem.

Parker refers to the writings of Edward Johnston who lists seven interacting factors associated with writing that are essential characteristics of any formal script. Johnston also demonstrates that by varying the angle of pen and material a single script can be produced in a number of ways. After considering the various factors involved in writing, Parker points out what must

---

¹ Ibid., pp. 501f.
² Parker, Bezae, p. 24.
³ Lowe, A Note, p. 13.
be of vital importance to one investigating this issue, for he states: '... the boundaries are between types of script, not according to the language of the text being copied.' He states:

... examples of each type of script are to be found in both languages. Mallon provides two examples of each from Latin hands. Turner gives a Greek representative for each from the second century AD (GMAW, plates 13 and 28 - Bodley Gr. Class. a. 1 (P) and Cambridge Univ. Lib. Add. 5895). The two ways of writing are not confined the one to Greek, the other to Latin scripts. With this fact, the claim that the scribe of D cut his pen as would a Greek scribe falls to the ground. Even more than that, the view that all Greek scribes cut their pens differently from all Latin scribes is shown to be without foundation.

On considering the above it can readily be seen that Burkitt and Lowe were wrong, and it would be foolish to attempt to draw any conclusions regarding the cut of the pen from the script.

**Physical aspects of Codex Bezae**

Lowe had originally stated that the rulings on the pages of Codex Bezae are on the hair side of the skin. Later he changed his opinion to say that it was

---

3 Ibid., pp. 26f.
ruled on the flesh side.\textsuperscript{1} Parker also contends that they are on the flesh side, being ‘especially clear on the opening sheets, and both they and the prickings may best be seen on F10.’\textsuperscript{2} Nevertheless, because collated data on manuscripts and the ruling of their sheets is sparse, this piece of information is of no benefit to us at this stage. Whether such information would furnish, as Lowe suggested, ‘new and unsuspected touchstones for localizing manuscripts,’\textsuperscript{3} has yet to be proven.

Bischoff explains the purpose of pricking the leaves, as follows:

In general, the leaves were ruled when the gatherings were put together. In preparation for the ruling the leaves were pricked to mark the positions of the vertical lines and the spaces between the horizontal ones. There are, however, manuscripts from late antiquity in which only the frame for the writing space was drawn. In antiquity, and in most countries in the middle ages up to the twelfth century, the unfolded sheets (double leaf, bifolium) were pricked and ruled, either individually or in groups of two, or even the whole gathering together. In this way, each individual leaf (folio, half-sheet) shows only one vertical series of prickings (or small slits). In manuscripts up to the sixth century the prickings were frequently inside the writing area; later, they normally appear at the edge of the writing area or at the outer margin.\textsuperscript{4}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1} CLA II, p. 7.
\item \textsuperscript{2} Parker, Beza, p. 9.
\item \textsuperscript{3} Lowe, Pal. Papers, I, p. 274.
\item \textsuperscript{4} Bischoff, pp. 21f.
\end{itemize}
Parker informs us that the prickings in Codex Bezae extend well into the writing area - 16 mm and 26 mm on some pages, which, as Lowe states, is the same 'as in the Codex Sinaiticus and in several very ancient Latin MSS.'

When considering the shape of codices Bischoff states:

In classical and early Christian parchment codices two principal types were current: a square format and a tall, narrow rectangular one. The former is relatively frequent amongst early codices (and not only in de Luxe manuscripts).

This writer recognizes that Bischoff's book is on Latin palaeography, but in the early part of the book, he says: 'The first part [of this book] describes the materials used in books and the procedures in book-making.', therefore there is some doubt in this writer's mind as to whether he is talking about codices in general or just Latin codices - the former appears the more likely. Turner makes a statement similar to Bischoff's, and it is one that leaves the reader in no doubt, for he says: 'the presence of a square written area ... is not often attested in early Greek codices, though it seems to apply fairly well to Latin codices of the fourth century.' Earlier in the same book Turner says: '... a goodly number of Latin parchment codices of high antiquity do display this peculiarity [of having a square written area]. But not all do.' From Turner's statement two firm facts

---

1 Parker, *Bezae*, pp. 9f.
2 *CLA II*, p. 7.
5 Turner, p. 98.
emerge. These are: (1) a square written area is not peculiar to all Latin manuscripts; (2) although not common, Greek manuscripts are not excluded from having a square written area.

Turner, who discusses the format of codices, classifies Codex Bezae (dimensions: 21.5B x 25.8H cm) as “Large ‘Square’”¹ along with a sixth-century copy of Strabo (Vat. gr. 2306, 26 x 28.1); the fourth-century codices Vaticanus (Vat. gr. 1209, 25.4 x 26.7); and the fourth- or fifth-century Heptateuch, Saravarianus Colbertinus (23.8/23 x 25/24.3).² Parker cites these Greek documents and refers to Schubart who defined square as those manuscripts which have ‘a proportion of breadth to height of 7 to 8.’³ Given this standard, Parker acknowledges that Codex Bezae ‘is the least square of these [four Greek manuscripts], and only by assuming that the sides have been cropped more than the top and the bottom can we allow it precisely to meet the definition.’⁴ Parker then refers to Bischoff’s above quoted statement and from this says: ‘The square format was popular with Latin scribes of the oldest period (Bischoff, p. 26), and there is every likelihood that its shape is another indication that D was produced in a Latin scriptorium.’⁵ We have here a typical example of Parker’s overwhelming desire to attribute everything possible to Latin influence. Later on, these possibilities become fact, but more on this when we come to discuss the sense-lines.

¹ Parker (Bezae, p. 10) is in error when he cites Turner as: ‘22x25.4 cm (Turner, Typology).’
² Turner, p. 27.
³ Parker, Bezae, p. 10. No reference given.
⁴ Ibid.
⁵ Ibid.
For the moment let us look at Parker’s deduction in light of the evidence: Firstly, it is doubtful if Bischoff’s statement is only about Latin manuscripts. Thus, Parker’s inclusion of the word ‘Latin’ in his reference to Bischoff is misleading. Secondly, there are at least three Greek manuscripts, apart from Codex Bezae, of around the same period as Codex Bezae, which meet the description of square. Thus the square format is not restricted to Latin manuscripts. Thirdly, on Parker’s own admission, Codex Bezae is the least square of the four and meets the definition only if it is assumed that the sides were docked more than the top and bottom. Moreover, we have no way of knowing how much has been docked from the sides of Codex Bezae and it could well be that its original dimensions did not meet the criterion for being deemed square; and if this is so, Bischoff’s statement does not apply to Codex Bezae. Furthermore, even if it could be proved that its format was square, the fact that there are Greek manuscripts that meet the criterion for square must automatically disallow any belief that manuscripts with a square format came from Latin writing centres - unless of course it can be proved conclusively that all Greek manuscripts with a square format originated in such centres. From the above evidence it must now be obvious to the reader that Parker has built his case on assumptions and pushed the evidence too hard. Therefore on the basis of its format there are no grounds for linking Codex Bezae with a Latin scriptorium, any more than with a Greek scriptorium, or with any scriptorium for that matter.

Place of origin

The earliest reference to Codex Bezae’s place of origin that this writer has sighted, is that of Beza who argued that because of some barbarous Greek
jottings in the margins the codex had come from Greece.¹ Following Beza are
the scholars cited by Kipling, namely: L. Ellies Du Pin,² Pfaff,³ William Whiston,⁴
all of whom upheld the belief as did Wetstein⁵ that it had been written in the

¹ Quotations of Beza by the several following writers vary as indicated by the
highlighted words.

*Est hoc exemplar venerandae vetustatis ex Graecia, ut appareat ex barbaris
quibusdam notis ad marginem adscriptis, adportatum.* This (mis)quote is
from Richard Simon (p. 360, note d) who mistakenly cites Beza’s covering letter to
Cambridge as the source. The quote does come from Beza and it is, as Scrivener (p. viii)
says, ‘fixed to the book’ [Codex Bezae]; however, it is separate from the covering letter.

*Est hoc exemplar venerandae vetustatis ex Graecia, ut appareat ex barbaris
quibusdam Graecis ad marginem notatis.* (Schulz, p. 7).

*Est hoc exemplar venerandae vetustatis ex Graecia, ut appareat ex barbaris
graecis quibusdam ad marginem adscriptis.* (Scrivener, p. viii).


Kipling (p. xii, note a).

⁵ Wetstein (p. 30) says: ‘It was not written in Greece or by a Greek, as Beza thought,
but in the West by a man better skilled in calligraphy than in Greek or Latin. That he was a
Latin himself is shown by the addition of a Latin translation, which no Greek would ever
have troubled to add to a manuscript written in his native tongue; indeed a glance at the
codex makes it plain, for how could any Greek have had the idea of remodelling Greek
words according to the Latin way of writing?’ *Scriptum fuisse neque in Graecia neque a
Gracco (ut Beza putarat) sed in Occidente ab homine, καλλιγραφίας quam vel
Graecae vel Latinae linguæ peritiori, Latino tamen appareat; quod & adjecta Latina
interpretatio docet, quam nemo Graecus unquam adjungere patria lingua scripto
West by a Latin scribe.'

Marsh includes Mill among those who upheld this view and even states himself that 'it might have been written in the West of Europe.' J. M. A. Scholz appears to be the first specifically to opt for a Southern Gaul origin. From his statement which follows one can conclude that it was a topic that had held the attention of scholars for some time and that the opinions of those just cited might be reasonably considered as only some of many, for he says:

There is much dispute among critics as to the provenance of the Cambridge manuscript. But after giving due weight to all arguments it appears that, like Regius 375, it was written in the south of Gaul.

---

Codici curaverit; & planius ipsius Codicis inspectio declarat, cui enim Graeco nato venisset in mentem, ut ad Latinam scribendi rationem Graeca refereret?

1 Exemplar Bezae, ut quorundam fert opinio, haud a Graeco exscriptum fuit educato inter Graecos, verum in Occidente a Latino librario. (Kipling, p. xii).


David Schulz reports that J. F. Eichhorn supported the idea of a Southern Gaul genesis, but as for himself he considering the idea as ‘implausible’.\(^1\) Credner, Scrivener, and a number of other scholars were among the supporters of this suggestion.\(^2\) Although Harris made an attempt to prove conclusively the validity of the claim by writing a major work based on the phonology of the Bezan Latin,\(^3\) his analysis was fatally flawed and quickly proved to be so. In fact our present understanding of comparative Romance philology leaves Harris’s argument utterly untenable. Ropes rejected Southern Gaul on the basis that the Greek annotations (thought to be of the seventh or eighth century) could not be explained in a society which would not have known Greek.\(^4\) Despite these arguments Sneydiers de Vogel attempted to resurrect, on the basis of linguistic phenomena, what by this time was generally presumed to be a dead issue.\(^5\) However, the challenge was short lived, for in the very next edition of \textit{BBC}, E. A. Lowe was to prove that de Vogel’s argument was without foundation. Nevertheless even as late as 1986 G. J. C. Jordaan, from a study based on the variation in word order of the Bezan text, was to argue that ‘codex Bezae has probably been copied in the West’.\(^6\) Jordaan’s suggestion,

\footnotesize

2 For a detailed list of those who supported and rejected Southern Gaul as the place of Codex Bezae’s origin refer: \textit{Appendix B, § Place of Origin}..


4 Ropes, p. lxiii.


6 Jordaan, p. 110.

It should be noted that Frank Pack (‘The “Western” Text of Acts’, \textit{Restoration Quarterly} 4 (1960) 220-234, 220) had also said in 1960 that Codex Bezae was ‘written
however, is based solely on his belief that the scribe of Codex Bezae was ‘Latin-speaking’. Surely, though, this is not sufficient grounds for claiming a Western origin. Parker also argues that the scribe was a Latin, but he is not so rash as to draw from this the conclusion that the codex was written in the West, for in fact he argues for a Berytus (Beirut) origin.\(^1\) More will be said of this later.

J. A. Bengel’s suggestion for a British origin was on the grounds that the remarkable agreement between the Cambridge codex and the Anglo-Saxon version of the four gospels shows that the manuscript was written there.\(^2\) Kipling’s following response is sufficient for this simplistic argument:

> I admit of course this striking agreement. But critics are well aware that the text of the codex Bezae agrees not only with the Anglo-Saxon version, but with the Syriac - indeed more closely with the latter. Are we then to suppose that the native land of the codex was not just Britain, but Syria as well?\(^3\)

probably in the fifth century somewhere in Western Europe.’ Nevertheless, having said this he goes on to cite, as part of his reason for the choice, the evidence that points to Egypt, \(e.g.\) \(\Psi^{29}, \Psi^{38}, \Psi^{48}\), the Harklensis, etc. Perhaps he is talking theologically.

\(^1\) Parker, *Bezae*, pp. 22, 29, 266.

\(^2\) A complete quote of Bengel can be found in part I, p. 19, n. 1. It can be seen that he does not specify the version.

\(^3\) *Singularem hanc convenientiam profecto agnoscimus. Caeterum probe jam norunt critici Bezae codicis textum non versioni modo Anglosaxonice, verum etiam, idque arctius quidem, Syriacae convenire. Num idcirco credendum est, non modo Britanniam, sed et Syriam quoque, Bezae codicis esse patriam?* (Kipling, p. v).
H. Marsh reports that after Semler had compared Codex Bezae with the Coptic, Ethiopic, and Armenian versions, and the Alexandrine fathers, he came to the conclusion that the exemplar of the Greek text of Codex Bezae was Egyptian. Kipling, however, was the first to suggest that Codex Bezae had been written in Egypt. This opinion was to find support from other notables such as Hug, Schulz, Clark, and Kurt and Barbara Aland. Schulz accepted Kipling’s argument with the added observation that the ‘noting of liturgical readings is elsewhere very rarely found.’ Clark agreed to an Egyptian origin, but used a novel argument, for he suggested a trilingual country where not only the native language was known but also Latin and Greek, particularly Greek.

---


2 Verisimile est igitur codicem Cantabrigiensem, in Aegypto descriptum, aliquot etiam annos in eadem regione mansisse. (Kipling, p. xvi).

The grounds for Kipling’s belief can be found in part I, pp. 35ff.

3 Vide: part I, pp. 44f.

4 ... eiusmodi lectionum liturgicarum notatio in aliis locis rarissime deprehendatur. (Schulz, p. 8).

5 Schulz (p. 9) previously implied the same when he said: ‘Every page makes it plain that the copyist of D was wholly ignorant of Latin. We also learn that he was not well trained in Greek since he commits many frightful crimes against Greek usage and grammatical laws, so that you might well suppose that the book came into existence neither among Romans nor among Greeks, particularly since in many of its striking readings it is at variance equally with Latin and with Greek authorities.’ The Latin is given in part I, p. 54, n. 2.

Kenyon (Bezae, p. 295) also believed it came from ‘a country of mixed languages.’

Lowe (A Note, p. 13) had also come to the same conclusion prior to Clark, for he had said in his 1927 article: ‘For if one thing is clearer than another it is that the Codex
Moreover he chose Egypt because of the many bilingual manuscripts that come from there, and because of the Michigan papyri, \(\beta\)\(^{38}\), and the Harkleensis (which he refers to as: 'the Ms of Thomas') - both Egyptian documents. That Tischendorf believed that D 06 came from Alexandria also influences his decision.\(^1\) Egypt as a place of origin has supporters even today, for the Alands are of the opinion that 'it was written in either Egypt or North Africa.'\(^2\) Nevertheless, Egypt has been rejected by equal notables such as Credner, who effectively destroyed Kipling's argument,\(^3\) followed by Scrivener, Kenyon, and Zuntz. Scrivener generally followed Credner in rejecting Kipling's argument.\(^4\) Kenyon dismissed the idea on the grounds that 'of all the oldest MSS of the Greek Bible this is the one in which it is least possible to detect Egyptian characteristics.'\(^5\) Similarly, Zuntz dismisses Egypt 'by palaeographic features'.\(^6\) Parker, the last to write on the subject, is equally dismissive of the suggestion. Centring his attack upon Clark's argument, Parker demonstrates its weaknesses. Clark's trilingual argument is also dismissed by Parker because of lack of Græco-Latin Christian manuscripts.\(^7\) In concluding his argument against Clark he says:

---

Bezae belonged to a mixed community in which Greek was the liturgical language and Latin was also used. Yet neither seems to have been the native tongue of the Bezan scribe ....

---

3 *Vide*: part I, pp. 69f.
4 *Vide*: part I, pp. 76f.
6 Zuntz, p. 205.
7 Parker, *Bezae*, pp. 263f.
None of Clark’s evidence has any cogency. He produces no evidence for any group in Egypt that could possibly need such a text as Codex Bezae. Indeed, the history of Egyptian Christianity is of Hellenistic Alexandria on the one hand, and of a rural Coptic church on the other. Unless research reveals the existence of a Latin community in Christian Egypt of a kind from which codex Bezae could have come - and so far it has done nothing of the kind - then the evidence must be taken as showing it to be impossible that it could be Egyptian in origin.¹

Credner argued that because of the nature of the text, the style of writing, and the liturgical marginalia with their Sabbath lessons, the exemplar of Codex Bezae had its origin in a Judæo-Christian environment, either in Cyprus or Palestine.² The copying of the exemplar which produced the Bezan Greek text, to which a Latin text was added, was carried out either in the homeland of the exemplar or in Southern Gaul after the exemplar had been taken there. Credner, however, undermined his own argument by believing that the lectionary notes were part of Codex Bezae’s exemplar. Furthermore, it was Harris’s opinion that these annotations ‘have nothing to do with the Jews’,³ but apart from this, he held a Judaeo-Christian community in the eighth century to be highly improbable.

---

¹ Ibid., p. 264.

² The quote is given in part I, p. 69, n. 7.

³ Palestine, particularly Jerusalem, was Clark’s original choice for the home of Codex Bezae, but in the end he opted for Egypt. (Clark, Acts, p. lxii).

³ Harris, Lectures, p. 7.
Credner, Scrivener, Kenyon, and Burkitt all claim that the addition of a Latin text to a Greek text indicates a Latin speaking community. The question which arises from this axiomatic statement is whether the Latin text was added to the Greek at the time when Codex Bezae came into being or was it already incorporated into Codex Bezae’s exemplar? If, however, it is accepted that the addition of a Latin text indicates a Latin speaking community the same must hold true for the copying of a Latin text. The work of Corrector G, which is devoted totally to the Latin text, and which is contemporary with the hand of the original scribe leaves little room to doubt that Codex Bezae was written for a Latin speaking community.

The change made to the sequence of the Gospels so that they would conform to the Old Latin order prompted Chapman to claim that Codex Bezae was written in a Latin country. However, this might simply reflect a Latin community accustomed to a Latin tradition.

---

1 Credner, p. 517. Burkitt, p. 505.
2 Scrivener, Bezae, p. xxx.
3 Kenyon, Bezae, p. 296.
4 Burkitt, p. 505.
5 Vide supra: § Annotations and Corrections.
6 Chapman, Gospels, p. 346.

Vide supra: § Luke and Acts - are they from different sources?
Another factor which was noted by Scrivener, and supported by Kenyon, and Lowe, and which has never been disputed, is that Codex Bezae is a provincial product.

The next person in chronological order to suggest a home for Codex Bezae was Chase, who argued that the Bezant text of Acts is the result of an assimilation of a Greek text to an Old Syriac text. He also chose Antioch as the home of Codex Bezae on the grounds that that city was a major commercial centre ‘where a succession of MSS. might be produced in near juxtaposition to each other’. Zuntz was not adverse to the region but rejected Antioch, arguing that had it come from there ‘we should expect a Lucanian form of the text’. Parker likewise rejected Antioch, but declined to offer a ‘formal rebuttal to a theory which is presented with such slight support.’ Kipling’s rebuttal of Bengel’s argument for a British origin is equally applicable here.

---

1 Scrivener, Bezae, p. xl.
3 Lowe (Bezae, p. 385) defines what he means by the term, ‘provincial product’, by stating that ‘it originated in a non-Italian centre.’
4 This quote by Chase (p. 142) is of William Sanday (The Guardian, 18 and 25 May 1892), but as he is quoting Sanday as one who expresses his own opinion (Chase, p. 138) it is taken as having been said by Chase himself. Q.v., Chase, pp. 1, 115-131, 136, 142f., 147-149.
5 Zuntz, p. 205f.
6 Parker, Bezae, p. 264.

Parker’s reference (ibid.) to Sanday as having argued ‘for an Antiochian origin for the Latin column’ is misleading in that the topic Parker is discussing is the origin of Codex Bezae while Sanday is in fact referring to the Bezant text. It should not be assumed that the place of origin of one is necessarily the place of origin of the other. The Harklensis is a
The next suggested place of origin, Southern Italy, was proposed in a joint paper by Kirsopp Lake\(^1\) and Brightman.\(^2\) While Lake’s argument rests mainly upon the text of Codex 1071 and its close affinity with that of Codex Bezae, Brightman’s argument centres upon the lectionary system introduced by the later hands. Sanday\(^3\) also considered Southern Italy, but only as a possibility, as did Chapman.\(^4\) After studying the phonology of the Bezan Latin, Harris, dismissed a Italian production.\(^5\) The reason given by Kenyon for rejecting Southern Italy should be kept in mind when considering other regions, for he states: ‘... the chief objection to this theory is that Greek was so well known in that region that we should have expected the Greek part of the MS to be better written than it is.’\(^6\) Lowe said it was ‘possible to bring objections against South

---


1 Lake, Origin, p. 443.

Lake’s argument is to be found in part I, p. 112ff.

2 Brightman, p. 254.

3 Cited by Harris, Annotators, p. 4.

4 Chapman, Gospels, p. 345f.

5 Harris, Bezae, pp. 21f., 26.

6 Kenyon, Handbook, p. 75.

Kenyon (ibid., p. 81) believes that the ‘excellence’ of the Greek hand in which D 06 was written ‘is a point in favour’ of an Italian origin, as proposed by Corssen and Sanday.

Italy’, but declined to give his reasons. Ropes points out that the history of Southern Italy precludes a Greek culture from after the end of the fifth century right up to the influx of Greek refugees from Constantinople in the eighth and ninth century, and since he believed the origin of Codex Bezae fell within this period, the region should not be considered. In dismissing Southern Italy, Clark and Stone use Ropes’s argument. On the other hand, Parker follows Birdsall, when he dismisses Lake’s statement that: ‘Codex Bezae (or, less probably, a sister MS to it) was at or near Amalfi in the eleventh or twelfth century’. Birdsall had argued that there is every reason to believe that the codex was in Lyons by the ninth century. Parker also rules out the possibility of Southern Italy on the internal evidence, in that there is nothing to link the Bezan text with the old Italian manuscripts and, like Ropes, he argues that the history of the region, does not allow for an origin in Southern Italy.

Alexander Souter, who had argued that the Greek-Latin diglot, D 06, had a Sardinian origin, also suggested that, since Codex Bezae and D 08, which also contain Latin and Greek texts and which were of the sixth century, as was D 06, they also came from Sardinia. Lowe ruled out Sardinia as a possibility, but

belonged to a congregation that understood practically no Greek and conceivably was written by a scribe whose ‘accomplishment in Greek was likewise limited.’

1 Lowe, A Note, p. 13.
2 Ropes, Acts, pp. lxxvii.
3 Clark, Acts, p. lv.
4 Stone, p. 67.
5 Lake, Origin, p. 443.
6 Parker, Bezae, pp. 262f.
for reasons not given. Parker points out that Souter’s argument, which rests on the historical fact that in 533 Sardinia came under the authority of the Eastern Byzantine empire - thus the infusion of the Greek language, and need for a Greek Bible, into what was a thoroughly Romanized society - can no longer be sustained, since Codex Bezae came into existence over a century before 533.1 Nevertheless, even though Chapman had placed the origin of Codex Bezae at the beginning of the fifth century, as does Parker, he still considered Sardinia, along with Southern Italy and Gaul, as Latin countries from which the codex could possibly have originated.2 The difference of opinion rests on the dating of the Correctors. Parker has a number of the correctors of the Greek text at work in the first half of the fifth century and naturally Sardinia’s history does not accord with this. Since it is recognized that Corrector A was very close in time to the copyist, if not contemporary, only a very late fifth-century production or later would allow a Sardinian origin. Therefore Sardinia is precluded if an early fifth-century origin at the latest is accepted.

Lowe’s suggestion that Codex Bezae originated in a Greek scriptorium,3 was quickly challenged by Mercati.4 Another ten years were to pass before Lowe acknowledged the correctness of Mercati’s argument. The belated response was possibly from want of convincing proof, for Mercati had made a number of sweeping statements in his article without providing the supporting evidence.5 Nevertheless even though Lowe accepted that Codex Bezae could

---

1 Parker, Bezae, p. 262.
2 Chapman, Gospels, p. 346.
3 Ibid.
4 Mercati, p. 450.
5 Lowe, Lyons, p. 271.

Ropes (p. lviii) gives no reason for his following statement, but from his reference to Mercati’s argument and Lowe’s response, it would appear that he simply accepted the
not have come from a Greek *scriptorium* he rejected any thought of a Latin centre, because of the number of ‘non-Latin features of the manuscript.’¹ Ropes was to concur with Lowe on this point.² Later Lowe was to say that it ‘is certainly a product of some Greek-speaking and Greek-writing community.’³ Thus because the codex contains a Latin text we have a strong argument for a Latin community while at the same time one of the world’s most respected palaeographers in light of this evidence still argues for a Greek community. Surely the only answer to this seeming impasse is to accept the argument that we should be looking for a community of mixed languages, as originally argued by Schulz, and supported by Kenyon, Lowe, and Clark.⁴ Further weight is given to this argument when we consider Kenyon’s statement regarding the poor quality of the Greek script, which suggests a community versed in Greek but not as fluent as one could expect for a totally Greek community.

Ropes, who chose Sicily on the basis of that country’s history,⁵ gained the support of Lowe, who considered Sicily and also Dacia as ‘reasonable hypotheses’, but they are, as he states: ‘mere guesses’.⁶ In an attempt to uphold a Southern Gaul origin, de Vogel challenged this suggestion with an

---

*status quo, viz* ‘It cannot be maintained that the codex originated in a centre of strictly Greek writing, where Latin was a wholly foreign language.’

⁶ For details of Ropes argument the reader is referred to part I, pp. 158ff.
unsustainable argument.¹ Birdsall was originally sympathetic to Sicily, but the palaeographical data of the Latin led him to look to an Eastern origin.² Parker's early dating of the Greek annotators (650 at the latest) left him with no alternative but to reject Ropes' argument.³ Certainly an origin as early as the late fourth or early fifth century in a location where Latin was of some importance to the community, does not sit at all well with the early history of Sicily, where according to Ropes the Latin clergy did not gain numerical supremacy until the end of the sixth century and where Greek remained the language of the people. Given this history one would expect the Latin text of Codex Bezae to receive attention at least up to the end of the sixth century unless of course it was removed from Sicily soon after the corrections by Hand G. Furthermore, if Southern Italy is rejected on the grounds that one would expect a better style of Greek from that region surely the same argument holds for Sicily.

Lowe appears to be the first to suggest an African home for Codex Bezae - it was one of six acceptable locations.⁴ Having no doubt that the codex 'belonged to a mixed community in which Greek was the liturgical language,


² Birdsall, p. 112.

³ Parker (Bezae, p. 262) states: 'One of his [Ropes's] stronger points was to suggest that the Muslim invasions of the East, which drove many Greeks into Western exile, is the cause of the lack of corrections to the Latin text, since the predominant language of the area was changed to Greek. But this would put an impossibly late date on the early Greek correctors, and still leave a large gap between Corrector G and the period of the invasions and expatriations.'

⁴ The other five are: Lyons, South Italy, Sardinia, Sicily, and Dacia. (Lowe, A Note, p. 13).
and Latin was also used'. Lowe also felt Africa was worthy of consideration because of the palaeographical evidence that supports the notion of a mixed community in Africa. Although the Alands supported Africa as a likely place of origin they give no reasons for their choice. Clark originally considered Africa, but in the end concluded:

The claims of Africa, however, cannot be seriously considered in view of the great number of Graecisms found in \textsuperscript{1}, especially in Lk. and Acts. Also, apart from the work of one very early corrector (\textit{G}), all the corrections and marginalia in \textit{D} prior to c. A.D. 800 are on the Greek side, while the Latin side is neglected. This could not have happened if the MS. had been domiciled in a Latin-speaking country.\textsuperscript{3}

Birdsall also points out that the palaeographical evidence to hand can no longer sustain an African origin. He goes on to say that even if an argument based on palaeography and text could be made for the Latin, ‘it would in any case be difficult to envisage the circumstances which, on such an hypothesis, gave rise to the production of the codex.’\textsuperscript{4} Parker’s reasons for rejecting Africa are also palaeographically based. He ruled it out because of the lack of similarity between the Bezan Latin and ‘the well developed style of Codices Bobbiensis [\textit{sic.}] and Palatinum, the Leningrad Augustine, the Vatican Hilary, and other manuscripts known to be of African origin.’\textsuperscript{5} Nevertheless back in 1968 Mizzi published an article in which he concluded: ‘Our investigation

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ibid.}
\item Clark, \textit{Acts}, p. lviii.
\item Birdsall, p. 112.
\item Parker (\textit{Bezae}, p. 262) cites as his source: \textit{CLA Supplement}, Introduction.
\end{enumerate}
seems to lead to the conclusion that at the base of the Latin version of Mt. XXIV of \( d \) lies a very primitive or Cyprianic text ...."\(^1\)

Clark was initially led to consider Jerusalem as the home of Codex Bezae because of Aetheria's account of the services there, for she speaks of sermons and lections in Greek being rendered into Latin and Syriac.\(^2\) Clark, however, finally opted for Egypt because of the textual evidence. Stone favoured Jerusalem because its history\(^3\) matched his criterion of a 'Roman military colony in a region imperfectly Hellenized.'\(^4\) Birdsall not only favours Jerusalem because of Aetheria's account of the services there, which he says: 'would give the raison-d'être of such a bilingual, but also because the text of codex Bobiensis has been found by Bakker to have affinities with \( d \). This latter point becomes important if one believes, as Birdsall deemed possible, that the text read in Jerusalem in the fourth or fifth century would have been akin to the Old Latin text. At this point Birdsall makes a suggestion that gives direction to future research, \( \textit{viz} \):

Here as elsewhere we are challenged to investigate a number of things still to some degree unknown, for example, the relation of the Greek text of \( D \)

---

\(^{1}\) J. Mizzi, 'The African element in the Latin text of Mt. XXIV of cod Cantabrigiensis', \( RBen \) 78 (1968) 33-66, 66.

Metzger (\textit{Text}, p. 86) says this of the text found in Cyprian's writings: 'since the quotations which Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage in North Africa about A.D. 250, includes in his letters agree almost always with the form of text preserved in the Old Latin manuscript \( k \), scholars have correctly concluded that this fourth- or fifth-century manuscript is a descendant of a copy current about 250 in North Africa.'

\(^{2}\) Clark, \textit{Acts}, pp. lxif.

\(^{3}\) The reasons are given in part I, p. 180f.

\(^{4}\) Stone, pp. 67f.
to quotations by writers in Jerusalem in the relevant period, the relation of \( d \) to
the Old Latin in general, textual affinities (if any) between codex Bezae and the
Jerusalem lectionary which latter is now better known than hitherto.\(^1\)

Apart from the palaeographical evidence which Birdsall admits is the main
reason for choosing Jerusalem, he cites the homilies of Andrew of Crete
(Andreas Cretensis, \textit{ca.} 670-740, 678 monk in the Monastery of the Holy
Sepulchre in Jerusalem and cleric)\(^2\) which have ‘some distinctive variants
otherwise singular to \( D \).’\(^3\) The last piece of evidence comes from the ‘Jerusalem
colophon’ as found in Codex 1071,\(^4\) which records that a collation was made
using old Jerusalemite manuscripts ‘in the holy mountain.’\(^5\) The tenuous nature
of this evidence does not escape Birdsall, for he says:

\begin{quote}
   It would be rash to adduce this slenderest of links with Jerusalem as any
kind of proof. It may however just hint at the plausibility of this hypothesis
for codex Bezae, somewhat less strongly than the evidence of Andreas of
Crete.\(^6\)
\end{quote}

\(^1\) Birdsall, p. 113.
\(^2\) Aland, \textit{Text}, p. 175.
\(^3\) Birdsall, p. 113.
\(^4\) \textit{Vide}: part I, § 1900 - Kirsopp Lake (1872-1946).
\(^5\) Lake, \textit{Origin}, p. 44.
\(^6\) At this point Birdsall (p. 114 and n. 53) again gives direction to future research, for
he says: ‘Here once more, we may indicate a topic on which research has stood still: the
manuscripts containing this intriguing colophon have not been investigated since 1911, in
the work of Schmidtke.’ \textit{Footnote reference}: ‘Alfred Schmidtke. \textit{Neue Untersuchungen zu
Leipzig, 1911.’
Of the evidence for Jerusalem Zuntz says: 'Jerusalem - though appealing from certain general considerations - is disallowed by the form of its text as well as by the lack of any relation to the system of lessons in use at Jerusalem.' However, this is, as Bird'sall points out, an area that requires further research.

Parker's objections to a Jerusalem origin are much the same as Zuntz's in that the palaeographical evidence is lacking. He does, however, add a new dimension by questioning the precise meaning of Aetheria's words. He also rightly points out that the only corrections made to both texts are those of Hand G, after which all corrections are to the Greek - which in itself does not reflect an environment where both texts are used regularly for services to pilgrims.

Zuntz, on the other hand, revitalised Chase's theory that a Syrian text lies at the base of the Bezan text. The grounds to his argument lie in the lectionary opening and closing phrases in the Bezan witnesses, which Burkitt had identified as having been used at Edessa. Also, he points to the strong links between Codex Bezae and the Syrian witnesses, particularly the Peshitta. He rejects, however, an Antioch origin, preferring instead Edessa, which lay farther to the East, and nearer to the centre of genuine Syriac traditions. No one, to this writer's knowledge, has challenged Zuntz's argument.

1 Zuntz, p. 205.
2 Parker, Bezae, pp. 265f.
3 Zuntz, pp. 204f.
4 Ibid., p. 206.
Bischoff, one of today’s leading palaeographers in Latin texts, linked the script of the Bezan Latin with a legal text of a type associated with the Latin law school in Berytus\(^1\) (Beirut), which he says, ‘probably played a rôle, if not already in its formation then certainly in its use from the third to the fifth century.’\(^2\) The eastern half-uncial, of which the \(b\)-\(d\) uncial script of Codex Bezae belongs, is, as Bischoff states, ‘represented by a number of examples almost exclusively of Egyptian provenance (though not by any means necessarily of Egyptian origin).’\(^3\) In a letter to Birdsall, T. J. Brown, whom Birdsall describes as the ‘leading English authority on Latin palaeography’,\(^4\) stated that he agreed with Bischoff’s understanding of the \(b\)-\(d\) uncial and accepted an Eastern origin.\(^5\) After due consideration of the evidence Birdsall himself, ‘reached the conclusion that the East must be the place of origin.’\(^6\)

It is of no surprise that once Bischoff linked the Bezan Latin script to Berytus someone would build a case to have Codex Bezae produced there. Parker did just this with a most detailed study, which is arguably the most comprehensive since Clark’s.

---

1 Bischoff (p. 74) has spelt it Berytos.

2 Ibid., pp. 74f.

3 Ibid., p. 72.

4 Birdsall, p. 108.

5 These letters are dated: 23 July, 28 July, and the 12 August 1983. (Ibid.)

6 Ibid., pp. 108f.
Assessment of the evidence

The following parameters, which can be stated with some measure of confidence, must be kept in mind when considering the provenance of Codex Bezae:

1. Codex Bezae was written in the early fifth century and possibly the late fourth.

2. Corrector G, who was contemporary with the original scribe, virtually corrected only the Latin text, which suggests a Latin community.¹

3. Corrector A, who is very close in time to the original scribe, virtually corrected only the Greek text. This indicates either a change in location with a change in circumstances (cultural, political, and ecclesiastical), or just a change in circumstances.² Whatever the reason, within a short period of time from the writing of the codex, the emphasis has suddenly shifted from the Latin to the Greek text.

4. None of the annotations, all of which are in Greek, is later than 800.

5. It was written in one of the Roman provinces.

6. The community in which it was written was at least trilingual, i.e. Greek, Latin, and the local dialect.

The sudden changes in emphasis from the Latin text (Corrector G) to the Greek text (Corrector A) would suggest a particular interest in the Greek text

¹ This evidence effectively rules out Lowe’s suggestion that it came from a Greek-speaking community.

² Fischer (p. 40) who suggests three periods (Corrector A would be a shift from the first, the bilingual period. to the second, the Greek period) for the history of Codex Bezae also argues that different locations are almost certainly coincidental with these three periods in which the manuscript is located. As he states: ‘Fast sicher entsprechen diesen drei Perioden verschiedene Orte, an denen die Hs sich befand.’
not demonstrated before. Parker’s analysis of A’s corrections led him to conclude that ‘This corrector is not much concerned with text. His main aim is to tidy up D* as he finds it.’¹ Sudden change is more likely to reflect a change in location, and all that goes with such a change, than a change in ecclesiastic emphasis. To envisage simply a change in ecclesiastic emphasis in the same location in simply Christian terms would require a complete change in culture, i.e. Latin to Greek. What would bring such a change about? The sudden establishment of a colonia could bring a change in emphasis from Greek to Latin, but what would bring the reverse process? Because coloniae were primarily established, as Jones reports, ‘to provide land for certain Roman citizens’,² the citizens of a colonia would not suddenly leave, unless driven out by an enemy. This writer can think of no reasonable scenario that would bring about a sudden change in the same location under peaceful circumstances. However, natural catastrophe, which is part of Parker’s scenario, should not be ignored, but for the moment let us explore the war option.

In about 370 the Ostrogoths in Dacia were invaded by the Huns,³ but this date would be too early to fit in with the present dating of Codex Bezae. The Vandals under Gaiseric swept through North Africa during the second decade of the fifth century, capturing Carthage in 439, and Rome in 455. Rome must be discounted if we are looking for a province, as Scrivener, Kenyon, and Lowe had suggested. North Africa on the other hand is provincial, but the palaeographical evidence to link Codex Bezae with that region rests solely with Mizzi’s study.

¹ Parker, Bezae, p. 133.
Southern Italy with its Greek culture giving way to Latin would certainly provide the need for a Greek-Latin diglot. The invasion of this region by Alaric after he sacked Rome in 410 would also meet the chronological sequence we are seeking. However, the poor quality of the Greek script and the inability to link the Bezan text with the old Italian manuscripts leaves the suggestion critically weakened.

Parker’s Berytus argument is critically flawed for a number of reasons: firstly, because of its dependence upon a very compressed period of time for the correctors and annotators as well as a totally inadequate dating of the annotators.\(^1\) The results leave his scenario for the origin of Codex Bezae and its immediate history in that area in tatters. Secondly, a late production of the D text, which had lost favour during the fourth century, suggests a location away from the mainstream of textual activity.\(^2\) The third reason is the rustic and unique style of the text itself. This in itself must preclude a major writing centre of the type located at Berytus.

Palestine and Syria did not suffer from invasions during the period from the late fourth up to the end of the fifth century. However during the fourth and first half of the fifth century the great Church Councils were held, during which the Church hammered out its Christology.\(^3\) Any one of the Bishops driven into exile as a result of these councils could have taken Codex Bezae with him or it may have simply accompanied a senior member of a church to a

\(^1\) *Vide supra*, § *Annotators*, particularly comments regarding Hand L.

\(^2\) As stated earlier one of the reasons Parker chose Berytus was on the basis of its location in the mainstream of textual activity. *Vide supra*, § *Date of Origin*, particularly comments at the conclusion of the section.

\(^3\) The first of these was the Council of Nicæa (325); the second, Constantinople (381); the third, Ephesus (431); and the fourth, Chalcedon in late 451.
new posting. This would certainly account for its sudden change from a Latin to a Greek environment. To prove this suggestion would necessitate listing all the Church Fathers who had moved within the period of either the second half of the fourth century or during the fifth century. This list could then be reduced to those whose writings disclose familiarity with the Bezan text. For each of the Fathers still on the list research into the communities from which they came and to where they went would be required to determine whether they were either Greek or Latin. As stated in the section dealing with the date of origin, such a late writing of the D text would suggest a location removed from the main stream of the church, where changes in the accepted text would not be so quickly introduced.

As for an actual location, the only thing that appears to be beyond dispute is that it is an Eastern production (Egypt and North Africa included). Any Roman colonia within this great region could constitute the conditions whereby a group of Latins are located among a people who not only speak in some measure what had been the lingua franca of the Empire, namely, Greek, but also their own mother tongue. Therefore a number of the above discussed locations meet this criterion. Because of the sparsity of documentary evidence the lack of such evidence should not automatically render a location out of contention. Certainly much more research of documents from all these areas is required.

Of all the regions considered the one which is consistently linked to Codex Bezae in one way or another is Egypt, e.g. the D text can be located there as early as the third century as witnessed by \( \mathfrak{P}^{48} \) and \( \mathfrak{P}^{69} \). Another from around that period is \( \mathfrak{P}^{38} \). The Sahidic and the Bohairic\(^1\) versions are linked to

---

\(^1\) Parker (Bezae, p. 264) states that it is ‘questionable how close these witnesses, and particularly the Sahidic, actually are to Codex Bezae.’ Metzger (Versions, p. 133), on the
the Bezan text, as are a number of other manuscripts cited by Clark. A manuscript with a text very similar to that of Codex Bezae was used there in 616, at the time of the writing of the Harklensis. The b-d type uncial was used there as a principal script - it must be remembered however that it was also used in North Africa, Asia, and Greece. Codex Bezae has unique links with the Egyptian text of Pap. lat. Argent. I. Hand G, which was contemporary with the scribe of Codex Bezae has, in Burkitt's opinion its closest parallels with B. M. Pap. cccxi and ccxl, both of about the year 346 C.E. The Anchora Superior/Inferior used in Codex Bezae has its links with Egypt.

Nor can Egypt be dismissed from contention through lack of Græco-Latin Christian manuscripts. Until recently all extant Græco-Latin manuscripts from Egypt have been dismissed as inadmissible evidence, because they were of a

other hand, makes the following statement re the Sahidic version: 'According to earlier textual analyses undertaken by Horner for the Gospels and by Hatch for the Acts of the Apostles, the Sahidic version discloses a complex character, combining elements found in the Alexandrian and the Western texts. Inasmuch as the Sahidic version of Acts lacks almost all of the major Western readings, whereas it reads a large number of minor Western variants, the likelihood is that the Greek text of Acts on which the Sahidic was based was in origin a Western text which had been corrected in accordance with another of the Alexandrian type.'

Metzger (Ibid., p. 137), also points out that 'In the opinion of most investigators the Bohairic version is closer to the Alexandrian type of text than is the Sahidic.' It is, however, certainly not without Western readings.

1 Clark, Acts, p. lxiv.
2 Lowe, The Date, p. 33, n. 2.
3 Burkitt, pp. 506, 507, n. 1.
secular type and thought to be used for educational purposes. However, not all of the known Græco-Latin manuscripts can be dismissed in this way, e.g. the manuscript *P. Vindob.* L.91 (Fayum, V/VI), which has parts of Matthew 6:10-12 (*vetus Latina*) with an interlinear Greek translation, is placed by Alain Martin in the context of Latin speakers in Christian Egypt who knew neither Greek nor Coptic. Where Lowe and van Haelst claim that this is a school exercise, Martin places it in the context of Latin speakers in Christian Egypt and refers to R. Seider, who ‘prefers to recognize it as a Christian amulet.’ Horsley also believes it to be an “amulet rather than a school exercise.” Thus by this one manuscript we establish a Latin speaking Christian community within Egypt, which is just the environment required for a Græco-Latin diglot such as Codex Bezae.

Apart from Egypt, the social environment at Jerusalem makes that place a distinct possibility, and any research in the direction, as suggested by Birdsall, must be of great benefit. Furthermore, Edessa cannot be ruled out of contention without first dismissing Zuntz’s argument. Nor can North Africa be totally ignored, despite the fact that the evidence that links Codex Bezae with that region rests solely with Mizzi’s claims.

---

1 Parker (*Bezae*, p. 264) uses this argument to dismiss Egypt from contention.
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Quire signatures

Mercati appears to be the first to have made a definitive statement about the quire signatures, for when Lowe argued that Codex Bezae had its origin in a Greek scriptorium, Mercati responded by saying:

... it is only in very ancient Latin MSS, and not in Greek ones, that we find the practice of numbering the quires at the inner corner at the foot of the last page, and of adding an ornament like the \(\Lambda B\) of the Codex Bezae, ff. 256\(^v\), 302\(^v\), 462\(^v\), &c.\(^1\)

Mercati goes on to point out that the use of Greek ciphers to mark the quires cannot be used as support for a Greek scriptorium, because the Latin manuscript of the ‘Epistle of St Paul in sixth-century uncials, which can be seen under the later writing of the Bobbio MS, Vatican. lat. 5755, also has its quires numbered in Greek.’\(^2\)

In a later publication Lowe acknowledged the truth of Mercati’s claims,\(^3\) and later again he gave substance to the claim by publishing the results of his own investigations. In this he states that placing the signatures in the lower right-hand corner of the last page of the quire, ‘is normal in Latin but not in Greek manuscripts.’\(^4\) Of the one hundred and fifty manuscripts listed by Lowe

---

1 Mercati, p. 449.
2 Ibid.
3 Lowe, Lyons, p. 271.
the seven that use letters in place of numerals are dated from the end of the fifth century onwards.

Parker suggests that the use of Greek numerals in the quire signatures is the result of conforming to the script of those pages, which in Codex Bezae is Greek.¹

Running titles

The running titles in Codex Bezae, which are in small uncial on every page,² are considered by Mercati to be of a Latin type and because of this he argues that ‘the copyist was not a real Greek but a Latin.’³

Lowe’s investigations were to reveal that, ‘the use of a different type of script for the running title from that used in the text is first noticeable in manuscripts of the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century.’⁴

Parker, by providing tables of Greek and Latin manuscripts, clearly demonstrates that ‘running titles are far less common in Greek than in Latin biblical manuscripts ... [and] that the Greek running titles of D are modelled on Latin forms, particularly in the use of abbreviations.’⁵

---

¹ Parker, Bezae, p. 9.
² Lowe, CLA, N° 140.
³ Mercati, p. 449.
⁵ Parker, Bezae, pp. 13-22.

Obviously, Bischoff (p. 79) had no reason to dispute Lowe’s statement regarding the running titles for he refers to Lowe’s article when making the same statement.
Parker's evidence is substantial but not decisive proof that the scribe was a Latin. At best it can be deduced that the codex was not written in a Greek *scriptorium*. Most certainly, the evidence of the running titles as well as the quire signatures, suggests a Latin *scriptorium* and/or a copyist accustomed to Latin scribal practices. The same evidence would also suggest that Codex Bezae was written at the end of the fifth century at the earliest. The evidence, however, is that of Western manuscripts and may not give a true reflection of Eastern scribal habits.

**Scribe**

Richard Simon appears to be the first to challenge Beza's opinion that the scribe of Codex Bezae was a Greek. Contrary to Beza, Simon describes the writers of Codex Bezae as a Latin copyist who had a knowledge of Greek.\(^1\) Simon's opinion found the support of a number of scholars.\(^2\) Wetstein considered the scribe to be a man better skilled in calligraphy than in Greek or Latin. The addition of a Latin translation, however, led him to conclude that the

\(^1\) 'ayant été écrit par des Copistes Latins. ... les Latins qui avoient quelque connoissance de la langue Grecque.', (Simon, p. 360).


scribe was a Latin.\textsuperscript{1} For the same reason, Scholz also concluded that the scribe was a Latin.\textsuperscript{2} Scrivener supported this argument by pointing to the Old-Latin order of the Gospels and the insertion of Latin letters in the Greek text\textsuperscript{3} and the Latin forms and terminations.\textsuperscript{4} Kenyon cast a new light on the debate by suggesting that the ‘existence of a Latin text is in itself evidence that the MS was originally written in the West.’\textsuperscript{5} He goes on to suggest that the style of Greek is of such a nature that it ‘has the appearance of having been written by a scribe whose native language was Latin.’\textsuperscript{6} He, like Scrivener, also offers as further evidence such errors as $l$ for $λ$ and $c$ for $κ$ in the Greek text, but makes no comment upon the Greek letters in the Latin. This statement by Kenyon does not rest well with his description of the Latin text, published in an article just twelve months earlier, in which he states: ‘neither its [Codex Bezae’s] Greek nor its Latin hand is wholly natural. Written, as its bilingual character shows, in

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{1} \textit{Scriptum fuisse neque in Graccia neque a Graeco (ut Beza putarat) sed in Occidente ab homine. καλλιγραφίας quam vel Graecæ vel Latinae linguae peritiori. Latino tamen apparat: quod & adjecta Latina interpretatio docet, ....} (Wetstein, p. 30).

Kipling (p. xii. n. a.) refers to F. A. Antonius Georgius (\textit{Fragmentum Graeco-Copto-Thebatico Ioannis Evang.} Rome, 1789, pp. 199ff.) as one who challenged Wetstein’s argument.

\textsuperscript{2} Scholz, \textit{N.T.}, p. xxxix.

\textsuperscript{3} It is interesting to note that Scrivener not only used the presence of Latin letters in the Greek text as proof of a Latin scribe he also used the presence of Greek letters in the Latin. Scrivener (\textit{Bezae}, p. xxx) explains away the latter as the result of ‘the mere strangeness of the task’. Surely, if this form of argument is acceptable it could justifiably be used as proof of a Greek scribe.

\textsuperscript{4} Scrivener, \textit{Bezae}, p. xxx.

\textsuperscript{5} Kenyon, \textit{Handbook}, p. 75.

\textsuperscript{6} \textit{Ibid.}
a country of mixed languages, and probably remote from the great centres, ....'¹
The Alands declare, without explanation, that it was written 'probably by a
scribe whose mother tongue was Latin.'² A study of the word-order differences
between the Greek and the Latin texts by Jordaan led him to conclude that the
'Bezan scribe was Latin speaking.'³ Parker also argued for a Latin copyist on
the bases of the many characteristics that are in accord with Latin methods of
book production contained within the codex, and, like Scrivener and Kenyon,
because of the Latin letters in the Greek text.⁴ Mercati, in agreement with
Kenyon, considered the Latin to be 'far from elegant and pure',⁵ but the Greek
'much more unsteady, much more less spontaneous and flowing; I might even
call it barbarous.'⁶ Moreover, any argument for a Greek scribe based on
orthographical errors in the Latin is rejected by Mercati, for the following
reasons:

I would ignore entirely certain faults in spelling, like magika, qem, since
such faults, and still more serious faults, are found in the most famous MSS of
Virgil, in k of the Gospels, and elsewhere. Everyone has noticed in MSS and in
inscriptions, such forms as arkarius, kandidatus, karissimus, karitas, &c.⁷

¹ Kenyon, Bezae, p. 295.
² Aland, Text, p. 109.
³ Jordaan, p. 109.
⁴ Parker, Bezae, pp. 22, 29, 75, 266.
⁵ Mercati, p. 449.
⁶ Ibid., pp. 449f.
⁷ Ibid., p. 450, n. 2.

Stone (p. 65.) describes the scribe as 'careless and ignorant' and later (p. 67) he
states 'That the scribe knew little Latin has appeared from the great number as well as the
character of the errors that may be observed on almost every page.'
Thus he rejected a Greek scribe, but at the same time he does not say it came from a Latin *scriptorium* or, for that matter, from the hand of a Latin scribe, despite referring to its many Latin qualities. His comments on the quality of the Latin would suggest that he favoured a scribe whose mother tongue was neither Latin nor Greek, but who was more accustomed to writing Latin than Greek. Also, if one is able to ignore the errors in the Latin that reflect a Greek scribe on the grounds that they cannot be used to indicate a Greek scribe, as Mercati does here, one must also conclude that errors in the Greek that might be considered as reflecting a Latin scribe must also be ignored. This leaves only Jordaan’s argument unchallenged and Parker’s argument, which was made on

Stone was taken to task by Fischer (pp. 41ff., n. 131) who referred to Stone’s description of the scribe as ‘... falsch und offenbart nur die sinnlose Methode von Stone, der eine Hs dieser Zeit an den Regeln der klassischen Schulgrammatik messen will. Unregelmäßige und vulgäre Formen sind Zeugen für die Entwicklung der Sprache und für die Treue des Schreibers. aber nicht für seine Nachlässigkeit. In Wirklichkeit zeigt das Wortverzeichnis von Stone, daß die Orthographie des Schreibers relativ gut ist, insbesondere bei den griechischen Fremdwörtern und bei der Aspiration; er wird nur unsicher bei selteneren Wörtern; die Präpositionen in den Komposita sind meist nicht assimiliert.’ [‘... false and clearly nothing but Stone’s futile method; he likes to measure the one manuscript of this time against the standards of classical school grammar. The irregular and vulgar forms are witnesses to the development of the language and for the accuracy of the scribe, not to his thoughtlessness. In reality, the concordance by Stone shows that the orthography of the scribe is relatively good, particularly with the Greek loan words and in aspiration, he was only uncertain of the more strange words; the prepositions are mostly unassimilated in composita.’].
the grounds of the characteristics that suggest Latin methods of book production.

Jordaan’s argument, which is based on the word order differences, at best proves that the scribe was more familiar with Latin than Greek. It most certainly does not prove that he was a Latin. Parker deduced that the scribe was a Latin from the various indications of Latin book production seen in the codex. Surely we can say, at most, it was written by a person or persons who employed methods and a style commensurate with Latin methods of book production. That person or persons may have been a Latin or a Greek or, going on Kenyon’s and Mercati’s comments, neither. Indeed, a number of scholars have argued just this point, *viz* Kipling,¹ Schulz,² Lowe,³ Clark,⁴ and Stone.⁵

Scholars such as Kipling, Schulz, and Streeter⁶ had earlier rejected the suggestion of a Latin scribe because of the errors in the Latin, but we know today that such errors are common provincialisms and vulgarisms.⁷ However,

---

¹ Kipling, pp. xiiif.

Kipling (p. xii, n. a) also refers to F. A. Antonius Georgius (*Fragmentum Graeco-Copto-Thebaico Joannis Evang.* Rome, 1789, pp. 199ff.) as one who challenged Wetstein’s argument for a Latin scribe.

² Schulz, p. 9.


Lowe, *CLA* II. No. 140.


⁵ Stone, p. 38.

⁶ Because the codex is full of what B. H. Streeter (‘The Primitive Text of the Acts’, *JTHS* 34 (1933) 232-41, 234) argues are ‘egregious blunders’ he describes the copyist as ‘careless and ignorant’.

⁷ Burkitt, p. 512.
even accepting that the rusticity of the Latin is normal for the provinces it does not prove that the native tongue of the scribes who wrote such Latin were Latins. It only proves that such Latin is to be expected in writings from the provinces.

The arguments that suggest that the scribe was a Latin are very weak and such arguments as there are, in fact are directed towards the methods of writing and not the native tongue of the scribe. When one considers this along with the universally recognized provincial character of both the Greek and Latin script,\(^1\) and that the provinces were more likely to consist of trilingual

\[\text{Birdsall, p. 111.}\]

\[\text{Fischer (p. 41, n. 131) rejects the notion that the scribe was careless and thoughtless. Indeed after a study of Stone's Index Verborum he concluded that '... die Orthographie des Schreibers relative gut ist, insbesondere bei den griechischen Fremdwörtern und bei der Aspiration; ...' [... the orthography of the scribe is relatively good, particularly with the Greek foreign words and with the aspiration ...].}\]

\[\text{During the course of translating Schulz's work, Professor James Willis made the following remark regarding Schulz's examples of the poor quality Latin: 'I do not find this argument as convincing as it obviously was to Schulz. Since his day we have learned more about vulgar Latin, and in texts written in Italy and other Latin-speaking areas we find blunders of this very kind.'}\]

\[\text{Fischer (pp. 40f., n. 131) was also to observe that the Latin is a normal late Latin and that the irregular and vulgar forms are witnesses to the development of the language rather than to a scribe ignorant of Latin.}\]

\[^1\text{Scrivener, Bezae, p. xii; Kenyon, Bezae, p. 295, and Lowe, Bezae, p. 385, A Note, p. 14 (CLA, No. 140).}\]
communities, viz the lingua franca of the Empire (at least in the East), Greek;\(^1\) the language of the administration and army, Latin;\(^2\) plus the language of the indigenous people,\(^3\) the suggestion first made by Kipling, viz that the scribe was neither a Greek nor a Latin appears to be the most credible argument. Indeed T. J. Brown's\(^4\) description of the scribe, as a 'specialist hack, technically

---

\(^1\) With regard to the continuing widespread use of the Greek language in the Roman East Wendy Moleas (The Development of the Greek Language (Studies in Modern Greek), U. K.: Bristol Classical Press, 1989, p. 16) states: 'Eventually the Greek, Roman and Christian influences were all to come together in one city, Constantinople. The Emperor Constantine transferred the capital of the Roman Empire there in the fourth century AD and made Christianity the Empire's official religion. Although Latin continued to be used for formal purposes at first, it was Greek that predominated in every other aspect of life. In the sixth century AD Greek became the official language of the independent empire which had developed around Constantinople, the Eastern Roman or Byzantine Empire.'

\(^2\) Garnsey & Saller, p. 190.

\(^3\) The persistence of the local languages in Anatolia is well attested by: W. M. Ramsay (The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915, pp. 67, n 1. 71ff.) and A. H. M. Jones (The Greek City: From Alexander to Justinian, Oxford: Clarendon, 1940/1984, pp. 42, 289ff.). W. M. Ramsay (Asiatic Elements in Greek Civilisation, Chicago: Ares Pub., 1927, r.i. 1979, p. 228) refers to Jerome who mentions that the Gauls had retained their language and this was as late as the fourth century after Christ. The trilingual nature of Egypt and Palestine is attested by Clark (Acts, pp. IxxIf.). Garnsey & Saller (pp. 191-193) also speak of the persistence of the indigenous languages in the Roman provinces. They conclude by saying: 'it would be reasonable to expect indigenous languages to have survived the impact of Romanization as languages of ordinary discourse, and not only among the lower classes, in the urban setting.'
competent but poorly educated, ...",\(^1\) even suggests a person whose apparent poor education might best be explained by the fact that his native language was neither Greek nor Latin.

If it is accepted that the scribe was neither a Latin nor a Greek the discussion comes down to the likely place of production and this has been discussed under the section entitled, 'Place of Origin'. However, even if the nationality of the scribe could be proved conclusively, it does not automatically follow that the place of origin of the codex was the birth place of the scribe. At best it would simply be one more thread of information, which, added to the others, will hopefully add up to some measure of certainty.

In addition to his description of the scribe, which is quoted above, T. J. Brown also said that the scribe 'had been engaged in the more or less exclusive copying of texts in Roman law, which he did in 'early half uncial' somewhere in the Roman East.'\(^2\) It cannot be claimed that Codex Bezae's \(b-d\) type half uncial was used by the Romans as a legal script, because, as Lowe points out, it was a \(b-r\) type half uncial that was used in legal texts.\(^3\) Furthermore, the evidence to substantiate the claim that the scribe of Codex Bezae 'had been engaged in the more or less exclusive copying of texts in Roman law,' is entirely lacking. At least it is not apparent to this writer nor was it provided by Birdsall.

---

\(^4\) Whom Birdsall (p. 108) regards as the leading English authority on Latin palaeography.

\(^1\) Brown expressed this opinion in a private letter to Birdsall. \textit{Ibid.}

\(^2\) \textit{Ibid.}

\(^3\) \textit{Vide infra, § Script}, where this matter is discussed in depth.
The evidence, therefore, would suggest a copyist located remote from the Empire’s main centres, who had been influenced by Latin legal script, and whose native tongue was neither Latin or Greek.

**Script**

Lowe was the first to point out that as a bookhand the *b-d* type half uncial is unique to Deap.¹ The evidence of several legal fragments initially led him to suggest that this text was probably used in writing Latin law books.² His later studies, however, led him to be more discerning, for he was to say some forty-eight years later:

The Codex Bezae is not written in the type of [br-] uncial found in the legal group, but rather in a type we have called bd-uncial because these two letters consistently have the half-uncial form. Now this bd-type, as I hope to show elsewhere, usually occurs in manuscripts with definite Greek connections, as in the Graeco-Latin manuscript of the Pauline Epistles [D*], and in papyri coming from Egypt and most probably originating there.³

Thus Lowe made a distinction between the half uncial used in the Latin legal texts and that used in both biblical codices, Cantabrigiensis and Claromontanus. This distinction is not always made by others, e.g. Birdsall refers to Codex Pisanus (Florence Laurenziana S. N.) as a legal document with a

---


² Lowe (*Bezae*, p. 386) gives as examples: ‘the Formula Fabiana of Vienna and the Oxford and Berlin vellum fragments from Egypt.’

bd-type uncial,1 and in so doing refers to Lowe’s list of Latin legal manuscripts, among which this codex is listed (MS No. 1). However, although this list is of Latin legal texts it is clearly headed ‘MANUSCRIPTS IN BR-UNCIAL’ and these are not manuscripts in a bd-type uncial.2 Bischoff is no less misleading for although he refers to Codex Bezae as one of the manuscript that is written in the ‘The older (eastern) half-uncial ‘,3 when he refers specifically to manuscripts that contain ‘half-uncial b and d’ text, he does not include Codex Bezae and of the three he does list only one, Dp, is a recognised bd-type uncial.4 The other two, Ea (08)5 and Codex Theodosianus (Vat. lat. 5766)6, are both b-type uncialis. On the other hand the manuscripts to which Lowe refers as containing a bd-type uncial text, apart from Dena,p both of which are entirely written in this script, are: Codex Cavensis (Cava, Arch. della Badia I) of the ninth century, which has parts of the text written in this form;7 and Codices Bambergensis (Bamberg, Staatl. Bibl. Patr. 87 - B. IV. 21) of the sixth century;8 Vatican Eugippius (Vat. lat. 3375) of the seventh century,9 and (Milan, Ambros C. 238)

1 Birdsall, p. 113 and n. 51.
2 Lowe, Symbols, pp. 470b-470c.
3 Title of section 6. Bischoff, p. 72.
4 CLA, V, No 521.

At this point Bischoff has errors in his footnotes, in that the information in the footnotes is out of synch with the reference numbers, e.g. footnotes numbered 154 to 156 should be numbered 153 to 155.

5 CLA, II, No 251.
9 Ibid.
of either the fifth or sixth century,¹ all of which contain marginalia in this script. There is one other manuscript to which Lowe refers and which is of particular interest, and that is the palimpsest: Vatican Palat. Lat. 24,² which has buried under its sixth- or seventh-century text of the Old Testament a number of ancient texts one of which, Seneca de amicitia, de vita patris, is written in a bd-type uncial of the third or fourth century, and which is thought to be similar to the script of Codex Bezae.

Since the half uncial was the text of legal documents its presence in the provinces is prominent. This, along with its relative absence in Italian and other Western centres,³ led Lowe to conclude ‘that the Codex Bezae is, palaeographically speaking, a provincial product’.⁴ He also suggested that the legal text would have become the model for the provincial scribe or engraver.⁵

Bischoff also recognizes the older half-uncial as an eastern script, and apart from acknowledging that the Berytus (Beirut) Latin law school played a

---

¹ CLA, III, No 325.
² CLA, I, No 69.
⁴ Hermann Josef Frede (Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften, Freiburg: Herder, 1964 (Vetus Latina: Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 4), p. 18) has an error in that he refers to this manuscript as CLA, No 169.
⁵ Bischoff (p. 75) also says: ‘In the West this script [older (eastern) half-uncial] apparently had no great resonance as a bookhand.’
⁶ Lowe, Bezae, p. 386.
⁷ He was still of the same opinion fourteen years later. Lowe, A Note, 14.
part in the use of this type of text from the third to the fifth century,\(^1\) adds nothing to what Lowe had previously said.

Apart from the differences between the half-uncial used for Latin legal texts (a \textit{br}-type half-uncial) and that used in Codex Bezae (a \textit{bd}-type half-uncial) the poor quality of the Bezan script\(^2\) and the orthographical errors are contrary to what one would expect from a major centre such as a Latin law school or a centre that produces law books for the regions. The only plausible explanation remaining for such a rustic script is to be found in Lowe and Bischoff’s suggestion that the legal text became the model to the provincial scribe and engraver.\(^3\) A remote outpost or centre where the indigenous scribe(s) modelled their Latin script upon that of the Latin law books would certainly account for the orthography and the quality of the script. It is, therefore, wrong to link Codex Bezae, which is written in the rustic \textit{bd}-type

---

\(^1\) Bischoff’s statement (p. 72) that this half uncial type script dates ‘from the third to the fifth century’ is contrary to Lowe’s list of ‘MANUSCRIPTS IN BR-UNCIAL’, because of the twenty-one manuscripts (codices) listed, five are of either the fifth or sixth century, while twelve are of the sixth century. Lowe, Symbols, pp. 470b-470c.

\(^2\) Kenyon (\textit{Bezae}, p. 295) describes it as uneven and awkward. Lowe (\textit{CLA}, II, \textit{No} 140) believes that the Latin had been written in the Greek manner. Burkitt (p. 501) considers it: ‘unlike that of any other extant MS’, he even considers the Latin script as ‘more peculiar than the Greek’.

\(^3\) Lowe, \textit{Bezae}, p. 386.

Bischoff (p. 74) does not state it as unequivocally as Lowe, but his following statement is understood to mean this, for he states: ‘Given the very considerable component of legal texts transmitted in this kind of writing [the older (eastern) half-uncial], the Latin law school of Berytos (Beirut) probably played a rôle, if not already in its formation then certainly in its use from the third to the fifth century.’
uncial, with a major centre, such as Berytus (Beirut), where Latin legal texts were written in a br-type uncial.

Given the above factors this writer has no alternative but to reject Parker’s argument that Codex Bezae came from Berytus. We must, therefore, look for a less important centre. It is patently obvious that much more work is required in this area. The bd-type uncial text buried under the palimpsest Vatican Palat. Lat. 24 is worthy of particular attention.

**Sense-lines and colometry**

Whether the lines in which the text of Codex Bezae is written should be called στιχοι (Scrivener, Clark, and Chapman)\(^1\) or στιχηδόν (Blass and Devreesse)\(^2\) or κώδα (Kenyon)\(^3\) or simply sense-lines as argued by Parker,\(^4\) will not be discussed here, simply because it has no bearing upon the objectives of

---

1 Scrivener, *Bezae*, p. xv.


4 Parker, *Bezae*, pp. 73-75.
this study. Therefore, this writer will, for reasons put forward by Parker use the
general term: *sense-lines.*

Euthalius\(^2\) who had edited the Acts of the Apostles in sense-lines, was also
thought to have started the practice, which led Credner to date Codex Bezae
wrongly.\(^3\) However Scrivener,\(^4\) Harris,\(^5\) and Lake\(^6\) have all shown that the
practice of writing the Scriptures in sense lines goes back well before Euthalius.
Indeed, Harris believed that as far as the Gospels go, this method of line division
could go as far back as the second century.\(^7\) A further example of the early
writing of Scripture in sense-lines is that referred to by Metzger, who points to
that portion of the Septuagint preserved in the second- or third-century
Bodleian fragment of the Psalms.\(^8\)

---

\(^1\) This topic is also discussed in some detail by the following scholars: Charles Graux,
‘Nouvelles Recherches sur la stichométrie’, *Revue Philologique* 2 (1878) 97-144; J. R.
*JBL* 53 (1934) 34-45, 36-39.

\(^2\) ‘Euthalius, fourth century. A Christian grammarian, perhaps also deacon and
bishop, edited the Apostolos [Acts and the Catholic letters] in sense lines following Greek

\(^3\) Credner, p. 508.

Credner (p. 508, n. 3) cites as his source: ‘Wetstein: prolegg. ed. Semler. p. 197.’


\(^5\) Harris, *Lectures*, p. 11.


\(^7\) Harris, *Lectures*, p. 11.

\(^8\) Edited by J. W. B. Barns and G. D. Kilpatrick (*Proceedings of the British Academy*,
Clark links the use of sense-lines with Egypt, and points out that there are a number of Egyptian bilingual manuscripts written in this style, but gives no references. He also quotes Heer as having said 'the principle of colometry or arrangement in στίχοι was in the Gospels an ancient inheritance from Egypt, which in later times was imported into the West.\(^1\) Certainly Scrivener's list of Church Fathers who speak of Scriptures written in sense-lines would suggest that in the early centuries the practice was common in the East, for these are: Origen († c.254), Eustathius of Antioch († c.337), Athanasius († 373), Gregory of Nyssa († 394),\(^2\) Epiphanius († 403), Chrysostom († 407), Jerome († c.420).\(^3\) It's apparent from Parker's list of 'Graeco-Latin manuscripts of the New Testament' that by the sixth century the use of sense-lines in Scriptures was in the West.\(^4\)

Although Codex Claromontanus has sense lines they are shorter than those of Codex Bezae.\(^5\) Harris demonstrates a coincidence in colometric structure between Codex Bobiensis (k) of the fourth or fifth century and Codex Bezae, from which he suggests: 'that it [the colometry of k] is in the main the same as existed in the ancestral text from which Codex Bezae is derived.'\(^6\) He

---

1. Clark, Acts, p. lxii. Again Clark has no reference apart from one cited earlier (ibid., p. lvi.) in which he gives the following details: 'Oriens Christianus, ix (1912), Neue Serie, vol. ii.

2. Scrivener (Bezae, p. xvii) has 396.

3. Ibid.

4. The manuscripts referred to are: D (05); D (06), S. Italy(?) or Sardinia(?) of the fifth or sixth century; Dalss Corbie, ninth (the source of which was D (06); E (08) Sardinia, sixth or seventh century; 0230, origin unknown, ninth century.

5. Aland, Text, pp. 109f.

6. Harris, Bezae, pp. 242f.
also suspected that the same colometry underlies the Curetonian Syriac (sy\textsuperscript{c}).\textsuperscript{1} Clark went beyond this and stated that ‘the Greek MSS. in general were drawn from a single ancestor written in στὶχοι, such as those found in D, ....’\textsuperscript{2} Nineteen years later he had still not wavered in his opinion, for he repeated the claim.\textsuperscript{3} In reference to the colometry in codices Bezae, Claromontanus (D\textsuperscript{p}), and Coislinianus (H\textsuperscript{p}) Metzger refers to a statement by N. A. Dahl in which he claims that the original edition from which these copies were derived ‘must have been a product of ancient book-publishing of high standards, in some way connected with the traditions of the library at Caesarea.’\textsuperscript{4}

There appears to be little doubt that the exemplar of Codex Bezae was also written in sense-lines, and, according to Scrivener and Harris, similarly divided to the present Codex Bezae.\textsuperscript{5} Parker, however, makes a distinction by arguing for two exemplars: that of the Gospels, which consisted of short sense-lines, and that of Acts, which contained longer sense-lines.\textsuperscript{6} Certainly Parker’s argument for a Gospel’s exemplar with short sense-lines stands on firm ground, but his argument that the scribe never changed the lay-out of Acts is far less convincing. Built on the belief that the punctuation marks in the text indicate

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid., pp. 243ff.
\textsuperscript{2} Clark, Text, pp. 81, 89f.
\textsuperscript{3} Clark, Acts, p. xxvi.
\textsuperscript{4} Metzger (Text, pp. 30, n. 1) cites his source as follows: ‘Quoted from a summary of a paper entitled ‘Bilingual Editions of the Pauline Letters’, read by Nils A. Dahl at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis held at St. Louis in 1961.’
\textsuperscript{5} Scrivener, Bezae, pp. xxiii, xviif.
\textsuperscript{6} Parker, Bezae, pp. 75, 114.
where the scribe altered the lay-out of his exemplar, Parker suggests that the relative lack of punctuation marks in Acts indicates that few if any changes were made in Acts. He admits, however, that the few punctuation marks that are in Acts may have been inherited from its exemplar. In this argument, as in so many others, Parker builds a very shaky structure by interspersing it with ‘if’ clauses and statements like: ‘remains an impression’, and ‘categorical assertions are not possible’.¹ Unfortunately all too often such conclusions became ‘categorical assertions’.

Despite the weaknesses in Parker’s argument regarding the lay-out of Acts’ exemplar, it cannot be ignored. At least he has highlighted a difference in the punctuation that has yet to be explained, should his present explanation not prevail.

Unless the use of sense-lines can be shown to be restricted to a particular region up to the time of the writing of Codex Bezae the sense-lines do little or nothing to help us locate the birth place of Codex Bezae. Certainly the practice goes back long before the origin of Codex Bezae and, if Codex Claromontanus is a Western production, its use was so widespread by the fifth or sixth century that further research in this direction promises few, if any, rewards.

**Sequence of the Gospels in Codex Bezae’s exemplar**

Chapman presents a strong case to prove his claim that the order of the Gospels in Codex Bezae (Matt., John, Luke, Mark) was not that of its exemplar,²

---

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 80. For another example of this type of argument the reader is referred to p. 114. Nor are these two pages unique.

² Blass (*Philology*, pp. 76f.) had suggested this earlier.
which he maintains had the sequence: Matt., Mark, John, Luke. After an
independent study Parker also came to the same conclusion. The sequence:
Matt., Mark, John, Luke is found in the Old Syriac version, Curetonianus, and in
the Latin translation of the *Commentary of the Four Gospels* by Theophilus.

This change in the sequence of the Gospels reflects a cultural change,
which may have arisen through either a geographical change, a change in
owners, or simply a change in attitude of its owner or owners. It is, at least, a
piece of evidence that should be kept in mind.

**Siglum (§) for δηνάριον**

Although a number of earlier scholars had commented on the use of the
siglum § for the word δηνάριον in Greek sources, only recently have more
examples of this phenomenon come to light, e.g. Mercati knew of no other
manuscript, apart from Codex Bezae, that used this siglum, and even cites
Gardthausen as another who knew of its use in no other document. It was
Birdsall who discovered that Montfaucon had addressed this phenomenon as
early as the beginning of the eighteenth century, and had described it as
‘frequentius’. He also uncovered the observations of the more recent scholars:
F. Bilabel and M. Avi-Yonah.

---

1 Chapman, *Gospels*.
2 Parker, *Bezae*, p. 113.
3 Gardthausen, *Griechische Paläographie* ii, 1913, p. 372
4 Mercati, pp. 450f.
5 Birdsall (p. 108, n. 28) provides the following information and references: ‘It has
become clear, since this paper was originally given, that the sign * [the siglum is actually §]
for denarius has been known as an abbreviation on Greek sources since the time of
It is significant that the use of this particular siglum reflects a Greek practice. However it should be noted that of the thirteen times that δηνάριον is used in Codex Bezae,¹ this siglum is found only once, viz Mark 14:5. This in itself could be taken as further proof that the copyist was meticulous in his task and that the use of the siglum had its origin before Codex Bezae’s immediate exemplar. Furthermore that δηνάριον is written in full in two earlier verses in Mark suggests to this writer that the pericope that contains this siglum (Mark 14:3-9 - The anointing of Jesus by Mary of Bethany) was either an addition to the original Bezan Gospel of Mark or one of a number of different sources that made up the original Bezan Mark. Moreover it points to this pericope being the original version since, according to the maxim lectio difficilior lectio potior, it is more likely that the less understood siglum would be changed to the universally recognized, δηνάριον, than the reverse would take place. This in turn gives weight to the priority of the Gospel of Mark when considering the synoptic question.

Montfaucon (Palaeographia graeca, Paris 1708, pg. 359) who describes it as “frequentius”. More recent remarks, which confirm that early observation, may be found in the article “Siglae” by F. Bilabel (Pauly-Wissowa RE 2te Reihe 2te Bd. (1923) columns 2286 and 2306); and in M. Avi-Yonah. Abbreviations in Greek Inscriptions (The Near East, 200 B. C. - A. D. 1100) London 1940 (The Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine. Supplement to vol. IX) pg. 114.’

¹ These are: Matt. 18:28; 20:1, 9, 10, 13; 22:19; John 6:7, 12:5; Luke 7:41, 10:35; Mark 6:37, 12:15, 14:5.
Sortes sanctorum

The sortes sanctorum, which are written in Greek and only on the Greek side of the manuscript in the Gospel of Mark, are believed by Harris to have been possibly written by a Latin.\(^1\) He also clearly demonstrates that the system of sortes in Codex Bezae is that which is also found in John's Gospel in the Latin Vulgate Bible from St. Germain, Codex Sangermanensis I (g'). The latter manuscript is thought to have been written in the vicinity of Lyons in either the eighth or ninth century.\(^2\) Because the sortes of both these codices are thought to have come from a common ancestor and because of the coincidence in time between the date of origin of g' and the date of the sortes in Codex Bezae - believed then to be of the tenth century\(^3\) - Harris argues that Codex Bezae was in France at least when the sortes were added.\(^4\)

A good deal rests upon the dating of Hand M₃, which wrote the sortes sanctorum. Scrivener felt that the writer of the sortes in Mark 'may be a different person' from Hands M₁ and M₂.\(^5\) Parker 'suggests' that M₁ and M₃ were the same hand.\(^6\) Harris thought that Hands M₂ and M₃ were the same. That there is difficulty in distinguishing one hand from the other would suggest

---

\(^1\) Harris, Annotators, p. 12.

\(^2\) Harris, Bezae, pp. 7-11.

\(^3\) Ropes, Acts, p. lx.

\(^4\) Harris, Bezae, p. 11.

\(^5\) Scrivener, Bezae, p. xxviii.

\(^6\) Parker, Bezae, p. 43.
amateur in such matters that they came from much the same time and place, even if they are from different hands.

Now Harris clearly proves that Hand M₂ came before Hand L, the hand that wrote the lectionary notes. We also know from Hunt’s assessment that the lectionary notes were written before the year 800. Therefore, if Harris assessment of Hands M₂ and M₃ is correct the sortes were also written in the eighth century along with J, M₁, M₂ and L.¹ An eighth-century date for Hand M₃ ties in more closely with g¹’s date of origin (of either the eighth or ninth century)² than the tenth century originally given by Scrivener.

The above deductions locate Codex Bezae in France as early as the eighth century, which is a century earlier than previously recognized. Since, however, an eighth-century presence in France rests upon the date of Hand M₃, a concerted effort to date correctly this hand along with all the rest is of paramount importance.

The supplemental leaves

The substantial evidence for Codex Bezae’s presence in Lyons in the ninth century has been discussed during the review of its history prior to its arrival in Cambridge, thus this aspect of its history will not be repeated here.³

---

¹ Vide supra, § Annotators.

² José M. Bover, dates it as early as the seventh century. Vide: Metzger (Versions, p. 298).

³ Appendix A, § The Ninth Century.
The supplemental leaves contain in the Latin, Matt. 2:21 *qui* to 3:7 *fugere*; John 18:2 *iudas* to 20:1 *essent*; Mk 16:6 *crucifixum* to 16:20 *amen*; and in the Greek, Matt 3:7 *απο* to 3:16 *Θυ*; Jn 18:14 *ευ* to 20:13 *κλαεις*; Mk 16:15 *παση* to 16:20 *αμην*. Over the years these have been variously dated.

Pointing particularly to the manner in which the scribe of the supplemental leaves represents *y* and *e* in the form of the Latin letters, Wetstein suggests that he was a Latin, possibly of the tenth century.¹ Both Marsh and Kipling report that Griesbach refers to the supplements as twelfth century.² Kipling, however, saw a difference in the hand that wrote the cursive Latin to that which wrote the uncial Greek. He argues that the lacuna in the Latin of Matthew (2:20 - 3:8) had been supplied by a Latin hand of either the ninth or tenth century. He also points out that the text of ‘this supplement agrees entirely with the text of a Latin manuscript which was written before the tenth century and preserved for many years in the ancient monastery of Corbie.’³ He, in agreement with Wetstein, also concluded that since Druthmar retired into that monastery in the middle of the ninth century⁴ Codex Bezae came at some time into his hands. In

---

¹ Wetstein, p. 31.

² *Symbolae criticae*, 1787, p. lvii. Also in Marsh (p. 677) and Kipling (p. xviii, n. e).

³ ... *reperiet lector hoc supplementum cum textu latini codicis omnino convenire, qui, ante decimum descriptus saeculum, complures annos asservatus est in CORBELÆ antiquæœ cenobio*. (Kipling, p. xviii).

Kipling (*ibid.*) does not name this manuscript, however he does say in the footnote:

‘This manuscript was printed first by D. J. Martianay, then by J. Blanchinus.’ (Footnote: *Typis edidit Mstum hunc codicem primo D. J. MARTIANAY, deinde postea JOSEPHUS BLANCHINUS*.)

⁴ Kipling (*ibid.*, n. b) simply cites as his reference: *Hist. litt. de la France*, vol. 5, p. 84ff.
his opinion, it was not until the twelfth century that the supplemental leaves of
the Greek text were added by another Latin hand.¹

Scrivener suggested that Kipling had been misled by the different
coloured inks and the bolder Greek script into believing that the Latin and
Greek texts came from different hands. He argues however that closer
inspection reveals the same hand at work in writing both scripts. He concludes:
‘We are convinced - indeed the contrary supposition seems even a priori very
improbable - that all the supplemental leaves were written in the same hand, that
of a Latin of about the tenth century.’² According to Scrivener’s assessment of
the various hands, a tenth-century date places a number of the annotators and
correctors after the inclusion of the supplemental leaves.

Scrivener’s claim that the same Latin hand was responsible for both the
Greek and Latin texts in the supplemental leaves stood unchallenged until
Parker, who argued, from the point of view of the scribal differences between
the two texts, for a different writer for each column.³ Very early in this century,
Lowe had also rejected Scrivener’s tenth-century date. He had originally stated
that they had been written in an unmistakably Western script either at the end
of the eighth or beginning of the ninth century,⁴ but ten years later he was to
refer to them as ninth century.⁵ He never again wavered in his opinion, for in

¹ Ibid.
² Scrivener, Bezae, p. xxi.
³ Parker, Bezae, pp. 47, 93.
⁴ Lowe, Bezae, p. 388.
⁵ Lowe, Lyons, p. 272.
1954 he repeated this assertion.¹ Dom Charlier also classified them as of the ninth century, as does Parker.²

Harris challenged Scrivener’s dating of the annotators and placed all but $M_1$ before the restorer of the supplemental leaves. He also suggests from the phonetic error in spelling δούλος as δόλος, which is common to both the restored text in John 18:26 and a τίτλος written by $M_1$ on folio 69b, that Hand $M_1$ may have been the restorer.³ Since, however, there is only the one instance the argument is very weak, and the fact that δούλος is spelt correctly in John 18:18 does not help his case. Furthermore, since the δόλος is found at the end of a line that reaches to the end of the writing area, it is not hard to imagine this error arising through the scribe being distracted by wondering whether he was going to fit the word into the space available.

That the restorer(s) were Latin has never been disputed. After studying the errors in the Greek text, Harris concluded that the scribe was a Latin unacquainted with spoken Greek.⁴ From his analysis of the Greek text, Parker also concluded that the scribe of the Greek text was ‘a Latin of indifferent Greek scholarship.’⁵ Lowe⁶ and Charlier⁷ even suggested that the scribe was

---

¹ Lowe, Pap. Papers, p. 404, n. 2.
³ Harris, Annotators, p. 108.
⁴ Ibid., p. 107f.
⁵ Parker, Beza, p. 169.
⁶ CLA, II, No 140.
⁷ Charlier, op. cit., pp. 82f.
none other than Florus, Bishop of Lyons († c. 860).\(^1\) However, the various writings that purport to be those of Florus\(^2\) were inspected by Parker and found to be so diverse\(^3\) that it was impossible to make a decision on the validity of the claim.\(^4\) The distinctive use of blue ink in the colophon at the end of St Mark on the Greek side of the text and the particular form of the interrogation mark are peculiar to French manuscripts and in most instances are Lyonese manuscripts.\(^5\)

Some of the added leaves are written in a text which Lowe designates as Q-uncial.\(^6\) The peculiar characteristic of this uncial is in the rendering of the letter q, which is written as a capital. It is a distinction that assists us in locating the manuscript in the West for Lowe reports that it is a type of text that is found in France, Germany and England.\(^7\) It also helps us to locate the text in time for Lowe states that ‘... the type [Q-uncial] came into being after uncial had ceased to be a normal book-hand and became a display script, that is, roughly in the eighth century.’\(^8\) This information agrees with the other evidence which attests to a Western presence at the time of writing.

The final issue to be discussed here is the source or sources of the added text. Scrivener had suggested ‘All these Latin pages are transcribed from

\(^1\) Sometimes known as Florus diaconus other times, Florus magister. (Tafel, p. 40).
\(^2\) Charlier, *op. cit.*, pp. 82f.
\(^3\) Parker (*Beze*, p. 46) describes them as ‘a bewildering variety of hands’.
\(^4\) Parker, *Beze*, pp. 46f.
\(^5\) For greater detail the reader is referred to Part I, § *The Ninth Century*, or the following:
copies of the Vulgate which resembled the Clementine printed edition more closely than do Cod. Amiatinus and the best manuscripts, ....'¹ Ropes and Mizzi also recognised the Latin text of the added leaves (d³) to be from the Vulgate.² Mizzi's detailed study, however, proved conclusively that, contrary to Scrivener's claim, d³ is 'more often in agreement with Cod. Amiatinus and the best MSS. than with the Clementine printed edition.'³ As Parker points out, however, although the study proves Scrivener's claim to be false it falls far short of precisely identifying the source of the Latin restoration.⁴ Parker, on the other hand, saw a strong similarity between the Lyonese manuscript Bibl. Munic. 431 and d³. However, according to Bischoff this manuscript was 'written in the scriptorium of Saint-Amand in the third quarter of the ninth century',⁵ which may prove too late for Codex Bezae's source. This last suspicion is somewhat strengthened by Parker's following statement 'At three of the orthographical changes, the text of 431 has been corrected to that of d³.'⁶ This writer, therefore, would be inclined to look for a common exemplar for both d³ and 431.

Parker's collation of the Greek text in the supplemental leaves with the textus receptus,⁷ led him to conclude: 'There has been no attempt to bring these

¹ Scrivener, Bezae, p. xx.
² Ropes, Acts, p. lx.
³ Ibid. pp. 150, 163.
⁵ Parker, Bezae, p. 172.
⁶ Ibid.
⁷ Ibid., pp. 167-172.
two texts into conformity with each other. Thus Ds gives us a glimpse of a particular Greek text that was used in the West in the ninth century.'

Codex Bezae's presence in the West, and particularly Lyons, when the supplemental leaves were written is substantiated by all the available evidence. However, the exact source and the writer of these pages have yet to be identified with certainty.

The text of Codex Bezae

The opinion of scholars regarding the value of Codex Bezae's text has varied dramatically down through the centuries. The beliefs and opinions of people have swung from outright rejection to total acceptance and every stage in between. Certainly the general opinion of total rejection by early scholars has softened today to one where it is recognised by many, if not by most, as containing in part the original text.

Possibly the most critical assessment of Codex Bezae is that of A. Arnauld who in 1691, published a book in which he declared the text of Codex Bezae to be totally worthless, since it was the invention of a sixth-century forger. The following, which Arnauld considers to be the strongest point in his argument, demonstrates the utter vulnerability of his reasoning:

In the Cambridge manuscript a great many things are told of Jesus and of the Apostles, on which all books before the sixth century are wholly silent.

1 ibid., p. 172.

2 Strange (p. 3) spells his name as: Arnaud. Webster's (p. 49) states that it can be also spelled Arnault or Arnaut.
Examples of this are the matter which you will find added in Matt. 20:28; Luke 6:5; Acts 10:25.¹

Even in Kipling’s day the readings referred to by Arnauld as unique to Codex Bezae were readily recognized as not being so. A glance at the Critical Index of Nestle-Aland²⁶ or²⁷ will certainly confirm that the argument is without foundation. Apparently Arnauld’s other arguments were even less convincing for Kipling completely ignores them, citing Richard Simon as having refuted them earlier.

The other extreme to the Bezan text’s outright rejection is that of Bornemann² who considered the Bezan text of Acts to be the original, which had been shortened to produce the non-Bezan text. Over half a century later Clark took up the same hypothesis and even argued that the accidental shortening of the text was the result of homoioiteleuton. Later, however, in consideration of the weight of evidence set against his theory he acquiesced and acknowledged that although such errors had taken place they were not the prime reason for the shorter text - it was instead the work of an ‘abbreviator’. Thus he upheld the primacy of the Bezan text of Acts.³

¹ Arnaud (Arnaldus), A. Dissertation critique touchant les exemplaires grecs sur lesquels M. Simon prétend que l’ancienne Vulgate a esté faite, et sur le jugement [sic.] que l’on doit faire du fameux manuscrit de Bèze, Cologne, 1691. Cited by Kipling (p. vf.). The full title was obtained from Strange’s publication, p. 205, n. 4.
³ For greater detail the reader is directed to part I, p. 168f.
The attitude of most of today's scholars towards the Bezan text may best be expressed by the Alands, who say: 'When D supports the early tradition the manuscript has a genuine significance, but it (as well as its precursors and followers) should be examined most carefully when it opposes the early tradition.' Ramsay, who had made the same observation nearly a century earlier, presents a somewhat unusual argument in that it rests upon historical details contained within the text itself. He maintained that the additional material in Acts suggests a revision that took place in Asia Minor, possibly Antioch, by a person well acquainted with that region. The reason for believing that Antioch was the probable location for the revision rests upon the 'we' in the additional material in 11:28 (the setting of which is Antioch). He also argued for a second-century revision because first-century forms and facts had been changed to conform to second-century details. One need hardly say

---

1 Aland, p. 110.
3 Ibid., p. 27.

Ramsay (Church, p. 167, n.) states that only after coming to this conclusion had he been advised that Joseph B. Lightfoot had already suggested it in the Dictionary of the Bible.


4 Ramsay, St. Paul, p. 27.

5 The examples Ramsay (Church, pp. 163f.) offers are 13:14, 14:19, of which he says: 'As he [the reviser] altered the text freely in order to make it clear to contemporary readers, he would certainly have altered the phrase "the Galatic country," if he had lived so long after the change introduced into the constitution of Galatia and Lycaonia as to have realised the effect upon the nomenclature. It is conceivable that, if he was living in Asia, he
that this argument makes the original Bezan text very early indeed. Further to
these observations Ramsay suggested that because of the freedom exercised in
the revision the author was a person of ‘position and authority’.1

The text of Codex Bezae has long been seen as one that has an affinity
with a number of other versions. Michaelis, as did Storr2 before him,3 saw
agreement between the Greek text of Codex Bezae and several ancient versions,
and in particular the Syriac version. Some were even to claim that the text of
Codex Bezae was derived from the Syriac text.4 Even in Kipling’s day it was
claimed that the Bezan Greek text agreed with the Latin version, along with the
Syriac, Jerusalem, Sahidic, and Coptic versions, and the remains of Irenaeus.5
Mizzi also saw evidence of an African element in the Latin text.6 However, this

might not for some years realise that what he had once been familiar with as the Galatian
district could no longer be called so, and that the old phrase was rapidly becoming
unintelligible. But even if we allow for this possibility, the revision can hardly be dated later
than A.D. 150-160.’

1 Ibid., p. 163.

2 Possibly, Gottlob Christian Storr (1746-1805).

3 Storr, Observationes super Novi Testamenti versionibus Syriacis, (no date), § 8.

Cited by Michaelis (p. 231, n. k).

4 Michaelis, p. 231.

The following scholars have made the same observation - it should be observed
however that the list is by no means exhaustive:

Schulz, p. 21; Chase, p. 1, 205f.; D. Plooij, [no title] BBC 5 (1928) 29f., 30; D.

5 Kipling, pp. vif.

aspect of Codex Bezae's history and details of how the text of Codex Bezae came into existence lie well outside the scope of this dissertation. The reader, therefore, is directed to the works of Klijn, who covers such details in depth, and the first chapter of the more recent publication of W. A. Strange, who provides a history of the study of the text of Acts.\footnote{Albertus Frederik Johannes Klijn, A Survey of the Researches into the Western Test of the Gospels and Acts, Utrecht: Kemink en Zoon, 1949.}

\textbf{The relation of the Greek (D) to the Latin (d)}

Debate over the relation of the Greek text in Codex Bezae to its accompanying Latin text reaches across the centuries. Erasmus (1466?-1536) appears to have set the tenor of opinion regarding the Greek texts of Greek-Latin diglots generally,\footnote{W. A. Strange, The Problem of the Text of Acts, (MSSNTS 71), Cambridge, CUP, 1992, pp. 1-34.} for Mill reports that Erasmus and other scholars such as Lucas Brugensis († 1606?), Willem Estius (1542-1613), Hugo Grotius or de Groot (1583-1645) and others, dismissed them, believing that either the whole

\textit{Appendix B} contains a limited number of references regarding this matter, which have been gleaned from the works of scholars addressed in the course of this thesis.

\textit{Vide:} De Jonge, p, 384f.
of the Greek texts had been translated from Latin or had been at least edited and emended in its various parts against a Latin version.\(^1\) Apparently they came to this opinion because of the remarkable agreement between the Greek text and the Latin against the testimony of other Greek books including, what


Mill is quoted in part I, p. 9, n. 1.

Ropes (p. lxxvi) refers to all of these scholars as people who had rejected Codex Bezae’s Greek text because of Latinization and yet by all accounts Erasmus had never seen Codex Bezae nor did he have it in mind when he made this assessment of Greek-Latin diglots. If he had seen Codex Bezae, where? Furthermore, by what title would he have referred to it? The Council of Trent (1546/7) and the discovery of the codex at Lyons (1562) was well after his death. Moreover Mill’s statement (p. 41) leaves no doubt in the reader’s mind what the opinion of these scholars was regarding diglots in general and not just Codex Bezae, for he states: ‘That was the express opinion of a number of learned men [Erasmus etc.] of our age and the generation before concerning books of this kind [diglots], ... ’ Regrettfully, Mill is not sufficiently specific to enable one to determine whether the opinion of the others was directed to diglots in general or simply Codex Bezae.

De Jonge (p. 387) quotes Erasmus’s reasons for rejecting ‘certain Greek’ diglots and translates the passage as follows: ‘It should be pointed out here in passing, that certain Greek manuscripts of the New Testament have been corrected in agreement with those of the Latin Christians. This was done at the time of the reunion of the Greeks and the Roman church. This union was confirmed in writing in the so-called Golden Bull. It was thought that this (sc. the adaptation of the Greek biblical manuscripts to the Latin) would contribute to the strengthening of unity. We too once came across a manuscript of this nature [Minuscule Gregory I], and it is said that such a manuscript is still preserved in the papal library (...) written in majuscule characters [B 03].’ *Contra morosos quosdam ac indoctos*, in ed. Clericus, tom. VI, fol. *** Ir., (*Ibid.*, n. 38).
Mill called, 'the good ones'. It would also appear from reading Mill's statement on this matter that his whole reason for accepting the opinion of these scholars was simply because of their eminence, for immediately after he refers to them and their opinion of Greek texts in diglots, he states: 'and it is not surprising that we have adopted their opinion in this edition.' Nevertheless, although he endorses the opinion of these scholars, when specifically addressing Codex Bezae's Greek text, Mill takes a more moderate stance, for he argues that the Greek text has a Greek exemplar at its base, one that was similar to the exemplar of the Latin text, but one that had been altered to conform to the Latin at various points.

The hypothesis that the Greek text of Codex Bezae had been Latinized, was not without its opponents, for Wetstein reports that J. Morinus did not agree with this supposition, but argued instead that the Latin version could derive confirmation from such Greek codices as these. Wetstein, however, attacked Morinus's arguments in detail and in the end accused him of being ignorant of Greek. He goes on to say that 'Long before Morinus's time the same view was held by J. G. Sepulvedas [c.1490-1573]: in a letter written from Rome to Erasmus on the 23rd May 1534.' Further to Wetstein's evidence

---

1 In Harris, Bezae, pp. 41f.
3 Ibid., p. 42.
5 Ibid.
there is that of Harris¹ and Kipling² who record that Bentley rejected the idea of Latinization. Parker also states that although Semler had originally accepted the premise of Latinization he came to reject it.³ Michælis, another scholar of the eighteenth century, was also not convinced of the charge, for he says: ‘On the other hand, I have found examples, which seem to rescue the copyist from the charge of having corrupted the Greek from the Latin.’⁴ Griesbach, arguably the most esteemed scholar of the period, denied any possibility of a systematic adaptation of the Greek text to the Latin. He did, however, acknowledge that an occasional gloss may have slipped in from the Latin, but considered these to be of no consequence.⁵ The two lists of those who rejected the argument that Latinization has rendered the Greek text of Codex Bezae worthless and those who accept some degree of influence, although only to a minor degree, are extensive and clearly shew that Griesbach has the support of the majority of scholars.⁶

---

¹ Ellis, Bentleii Critica Sacra, p. 15. Cited by Harris (Bezae, p. 53, n. 2).
³ Johann Salomo Semler, Spicilegium observationum, 1766. Cited by Parker, Bezae, p. 185.
⁴ This quote came from Marsh’s translation of Michælis’s 1788, fourth edition, (pp. 230ff.), but it is assumed that Michælis would have made the same or a similar statement in an earlier German edition, thus giving him priority in time to Griesbach.
⁵ Griesbach, Symbolae criticae, 1787, p. cxi. Cited by Harris (Bezae, p. 43, and n. 2) and Wilkins (p. 387).
⁶ A glance at the number and the standing of the scholars who spoke for and against the idea of systematic Latinization (listed in Appendix B, § Text) will quickly convince the reader that by far the greater weight of numbers was against the theory. The idea had its
After Griesbach, the debate lay in virtual limbo until J. Rendel Harris published a detailed study of the text of Codex Bezae with the question of Latinization of uppermost importance for his inquiry. Harris was to conclude from his investigations: ‘We have now verified completely the hypothesis to which our investigations of the Bezan text led us, viz. that the Greek text has been thoroughly and persistently Latinized.’ However, Harris’s study was seriously flawed and soon proven to be so. Nevertheless despite the rejection of Harris’s claims, the idea of Latinization continued to gain its champions. Von Soden, for one, is said to have upheld the hypothesis. Plooij, another, was to say also: ‘It seems to me undoubtable that the Greek column of Codex Bezae in its base is simply the interlinear translation of its parallel Latin in its base.’ Fischer records that Adolphine Bakker was in accord with Harris’s point of view, as was H. Sahlin, who as late as 1945 published an article upholding this argument. However, Sahlin’s work is rejected outright by Fischer who says of origin in a suspicion, which subsequent scholars were unable to substantiate, try as they may.

1 Harris, Bezae, pp. 107. Q.v., 41-46, 61, 94-108, 113f.

2 The first convincing challenge to Harris’s arguments was published in two excellent articles by A. S. Wilkins, ‘The Western Text of the Greek Testament’, The Expositor, Fourth Series, 10 (1894) Part I, 386-400; Part II, 409-428. Another article which inflicted further damage to Harris’s claims was that of F. E. Brightman, ‘The Marginal Notes of Lections’ JTS I (1899-1900) 446-454.


5 Fischer, p. 42, n. 137.
it: ‘but the cited proofs are by no means conclusive, in fact, the entire method of argumentation is unacceptable for a text critic.’

Not only did Kipling reject the idea of Latinization of the Greek text of Codex Bezae, he even argued that ‘the Latin of our manuscript [Codex Bezae] follows the Greek text with painful fidelity.’ Scrivener came to the same conclusion, saying of the Latin text: ‘The Latin of Cod. D was really constructed immediately from its Greek text, servilely following it … to the violation of the simplest rules of Latin syntax.’ Clark was to give wholehearted support to Scrivener’s point of view. However this stark claim was rejected by not only Wilkins as unproven, but also by Stone, who states: ‘… to say that the Latin is a mere translation of the Greek is to ignore the many differences between the two, and also the relation of the Latin to other Latin renderings.’ Wilkins, however, accepts that the Latin was derived from a Greek text, but not that of Codex Bezae. On the other hand, Ropes suggested a parent ‘closely akin to the fundamental text which appears in corrupt form in D.’ Further on he adds: ‘It seems, however, that a text akin to, but not perfectly identical with, that of gig was used as the basis of d; …’

---

1 ‘aber die angeführten Beweise sind keineswegs stichhaltig, ja die ganze Methode der Beweisführung ist für einen Textkritiker unannehmbar.’ (Ibid.).

2 Kipling, p. xi.

3 Scrivener, Bezae, pp. xxxv, xxxi, xxxix.

The basis to his argument can be found in part I, § 1864 - Frederick Henry Ambrose Scrivener (1813-1891).

4 Clark, Acts, pp. xliiif.

5 Wilkins, p. 391.

6 Stone, p. 16.

7 Wilkins, p. 392.

8 Ropes, Acts, pp. lxxx, cxi.
scholars who argue that the Latin text of Codex Bezae was derived from the Bezan Greek are: Schulz, Hort, Jordaan, and Parker who argue that the Latin text of Codex Bezae was taken from a Latin text.\(^1\) Parker is most specific for he states that he worked from 'the hypothesis that the Latin column of Codex Bezae is descended from a text translated from a Greek text similar to, but by no means identical with, the Greek column of D.'\(^2\) Although a good number of scholars do not express an opinion either way on this matter, of those that do many agree that the Latin text had been assimilated to its accompanying Greek text to some degree.

Simon reports that both Jerome († 420) and Augustine († 430) believed that the Latin texts of Latin-Greek diglots had in some way been assimilated to their accompanying Greek texts.\(^3\) However, as already noted, the prevailing view of Erasmus and previously named scholars of the seventeenth and early eighteenth century held sway until the tide of opinion began to swing away from the total rejection of the Greek text in Latin/Greek diglots towards a more realistic view. Later scholars, even if they could not agree with the hypothesis that the Latin text came from the Greek text or a text similar to it, recognised, at least, that it was assimilated to its Greek companion to some lesser or greater degree.\(^4\) Ropes for example considered the adaptation of the Latin to the Greek so great that it cannot be used as a witness to the Old Latin text lying at its base.

---

1. Schulz, p. 15.
   Hort, pp. 82f.
   Jordaan, p. 110.


4. The list is too long to repeat here, therefore the reader is directed to *Appendix B*, § Text.
without the support of known witnesses to that text.¹ Fischer felt as strongly as Ropes and considered it a fact that there is an almost continuous subordination of the Latin to the Greek, and adds that the claim is almost generally recognised today.²

That both the Latin and Greek texts should have influenced each other would not be surprising considering the long tradition of the Bezan text. Indeed, Corssen makes just this point in his publication of 1896.³ After considering the evidence of the opposing parties, Kenyon came to what he called the 'only possible conclusion derivable' from such conflicting, but 'separately convincing' arguments, which is 'that assimilation has taken place from both sides.'⁴ Ropes also states: 'Both sides are mixed texts, and this is exactly what our knowledge of other manuscripts written with parallel columns would lead us to expect.'⁵ Vogels also supported the idea.⁶ Burkitt suggests that both texts 'have a character of their own. D is not simply a Greek rendering of d, nor is d simply a rendering of D.'⁷ Added to these opinions is

¹ Ropes, Acts, pp. cxi, lxxx.
² 'Der Tatbestand der fast durchgehenden Abhängigkeit vom danebenstehenden griechischen Text wird heute beinahe allgemein anerkannt, ... .' (Fischer, p. 42).
³ 'Die Vergleichung mit a [Luke's final text, whereas his original draft is designated b] hat bald auf den griechischen Text (D), bald auf den lateinischen (d) eingewirkt, und dann hat wieder D auf d und umgekehrt dieser auf jenen zurückgewirkt.' (Corssen, Acta, p. 430).
⁴ Kenyon, Handbook, p. 78.
⁵ Ropes, p. lxxvii.
⁶ Heinrich Vogels ('Codex Bezae als Bilingue', BBC 2 (1926) 8-12, 10f.) states: 'dass auch im Cantabrigiensis nicht allein der Grieche auf den Lateiner, sondern ebenso rückwärts der Lateiner auf den Griechen eingewirkt hat.'
⁷ Burkitt, p. 502.
that of Stone who believed that both columns have 'affected each other greatly.'\(^1\) It was, however, only after Parker's detailed study of how one Latin word was used to translate a single Greek one, that the belief was given a solid foundation. Parker not only found that there had been a reciprocal influence between the columns, he also found that in the case of singular Greek readings the Greek text agrees with the Latin more than disagrees. Of this later observation he was to say: 'This partly reflects the measure of assimilation - of both sides - that has occurred. It also indicates how closely allied D is to the text on which its Latin column is based.'\(^2\) He was to conclude: 'The main influence on the Greek text is that of harmonisation to Gospel parallels. Assimilation to the Latin has a subordinate role, as does the corruption of poor copying.'\(^3\)

**The Latin text**

From his detailed study of the Latin text of Codex Bezae, Stone was to conclude that there were but few general differences in character between this text and other literary remains from the same approximate period (saec. iv-vii).\(^4\) Fischer was also to observe that the Latin is a normal late Latin and that the irregular and vulgar forms are witnesses to the development of the language rather than to a scribe ignorant of Latin.\(^5\)

---

1 Stone, p. 16.

2 Parker, οὖν, p. 272.


4 Blass (*Philology*, pp. 76f.) had also argued that the copyist was accurate in his copying.

5 Fischer, pp. 40f., n. 131. Quoted, *supra* p. 320, n.5.
From his detailed study of the Latin text, Parker was to affirm that it was homogeneous. From this observation he concluded that the ‘four Gospels were translated by one man, or by the same group of men.’ He goes on to say, however, that the Latin text of Acts is in many ways different from the Gospels. It was, however, an observation made by Kipling almost two centuries before, but in this case the difference was put down to different Latin translators and not copiers.

**Greek text**

Klijn had described the Greek text of Codex Bezae as ‘rather heterogeneous.’ Birdsall describes the orthography as: ‘archaic and even archaizing’, and goes on to make the useful suggestion that: ‘We need a discussion of the Greek of D against the numerous recent works on the Greek of the papyri of the Roman period.’

---

1 Parker, οὐ, pp. 267f.
2 Kipling, p. xif.
3 Klijn, Survey II, p. 172.
4 Birdsall, p. 111.
Conclusions

The following is a summary of the salient details of the various issues discussed above and which can be argued as substantially true with some conviction. Of course the reader will need to refer to the main body of the work if the arguments behind each conclusion are to be appreciated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ammonian sections</th>
<th>written in the eighth century and only associated with the Greek text which suggests a church where Greek language and liturgy were in use.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anchora superior/inferior</td>
<td>A Greek writing practice, with links to Egypt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annotators</td>
<td>All of the eighth century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colophons and headings</td>
<td>Predominantly of a Latin form, but not totally without Greek influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctors</td>
<td>Have the order: G A B D C E H F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporary or very close in time with the scribe. He centred his attention upon the Latin text. A person of standing and authority. Matthew and the first four chapters of Acts were important to him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Also close in time to the scribe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates a break with the Bezan tradition as does D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Begins a shift towards a Byzantine text, which reaches finality in F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of origin</strong></td>
<td>A fifth-century origin is generally accepted, but the weight of opinion of the leading palaeographers ranges from the fourth to the early fifth century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dictated or visually copied</strong></td>
<td>There is little or no reason to doubt that the manuscript was written using visual copying, leaving a single copying a distinct possibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exemplar of Codex Bezae</strong></td>
<td>Codex Bezae is a faithful reproduction of the text of its exemplar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lectionary notes</strong></td>
<td>Diverge slightly from the normal Byzantine series. Possibly linked to Syria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nomina sacra</strong></td>
<td>Prove the early existence of the Greek text of Codex Bezae.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequence of the gospels</strong></td>
<td>That of the old Latin or Western order, but not that of its exemplar, which had the sequence: Matt., Mark, John, Luke - an order which has Syriac links. The change in sequence suggests a change in circumstances, possibly to a Latin speaking community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ornamentation</strong></td>
<td>A Latin form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical aspects</strong></td>
<td>Provide no conclusive evidence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Place of origin
A mixed eastern provincial community where the number of Latins necessitated the use of a Latin text, but where Greek was the liturgical language and, because Greek was the *lingua franca* of the Empire, no doubt spoken to some degree by the community. Possibly Egypt.

Quire Signatures
Follow Latin practices.

Running titles
Follow Latin practices.

Scribe
A copyist, located remote from the Empire’s main centres, who had been influenced by Latin legal script, and whose native tongue was neither Latin nor Greek.

Script
*b*-d type half uncial, which is unique to *Dea.P*, and which is not the same as the *b*-r type half uncial that was used in legal texts. The *b*-d type half uncial is a provincial product and peculiar to the East.

Sense-lines and Colometry
A long standing practice, but offers no clues at present.

Siglum (ἡ) for δηνάριον
A Greek practice. Its presence in only one place in Codex Bezae, *viz* Mark 14:5, suggests that the pericope, which contains this siglum, is the original.
Sortes sanctorum

Of the eighth century and linked to Codex Sangermanensis I (g'), which originated in the vicinity of Lyons. This would suggest that Codex Bezae was in France by the eighth century at the latest.

Supplemental leaves

Written in a Q-type uncial, which is found in manuscripts from France, Germany, and England, and which became a display script roughly in the eighth century. There is a strong similarity between the Lyonese manuscript Bibl. Munic. 431 and d5.

The Text of Codex Bezae

As the Alands say, it contains: ‘... an outstanding example of the early text, and it contributes to D an element of authority.’

The Relation of the Greek

(D) to the Latin (d)

Reciprocal influence between the columns.

Latin text

Normal late Latin.

The preceding material makes up the threads to our tapestry. The picture they weave is of a codex whose text, at least in part, is very early in the tradition. It is a codex that had been meticulously copied from an exemplar

---

1 Aland, Text, p. 109.

2 Apart from the use of the siglum ι, which points to an original pericope the Alands (Text, p. 110) recognize that at times the Bezan text supports the early tradition.
whose only divergence from the present codex may have been in the sequence of the Gospels, and if not in the exemplar the one before that. It was written, either in the late fourth or early fifth century for a community that was not a major centre and whose Latin presence was sufficient to require a Latin text. It appears that because Greek was the liturgical language of the Church and, therefore, considered inviolable, the Greek text of Codex Bezae remained virtually untouched by the first corrector (G).\textsuperscript{1} There is, however, the distinct possibility that no changes were made to the Greek text because there was no rival text. If true, this would also give credibility to the argument that the place in which Codex Bezae had its origin was not a major centre, but one away from the main stream of the Empire's activities. Doubtless, as Greek was still widely used in the Eastern Roman Empire, even during the sixth century, it would have been understood in some degree by the people in this region; and of course there would have been the local tongue. The scribe, being a local who was not an expert in either language, modelled his Latin script on that of the Latin legal text. He also used a format in keeping with Latin practices.

Where exactly the codex had its origin has yet to be determined. There is, however, every indication that it had its origin in the eastern half of the Empire - with the weight of evidence pointing to Egypt.

Not long after its birth Codex Bezae was relocated to an area where there was a rival text similar to the Bezan text and where the Latin population, if it existed at all, was not of sufficient number to demand a Latin text, whence its neglect. During the following centuries the codex remained in the same centre, but if it was moved, only to another or other centres where there was still no

\textsuperscript{1} Parker (\textit{Bezae}, p. 125) points out that the corrections by Hand G are mainly orthographical, which suggests that there were no rival texts in the community, or if there were they were not considered as such.
need for a Latin text, but where it came more and more under the influence of
other texts and particularly the Byzantine text. By at least the eighth century
the codex was located in France where the various annotations were added.
The Ammonian sections and lectionary notes, which were added in the eighth
century, suggest a church where Greek language and liturgy were in use - quite
possibly Lyons or a centre near by. The supplemental leaves, which were
written in the ninth century at the latest, and which are in a Q-type uncial, also
point to Lyons.

Apart from a short excursion in 1546 to Northern Italy, at the time of the
Council of Trent, Codex Bezae remained in France, presumably in Lyons, until
its removal from the monastery of Saint Irenæus in 1562. At this time it came
into the possession of Theodorus Beza, who retained it until he gave it to the
University of Cambridge in December 1581.

Thus our tapestry, although not by any means complete, at least provides a
picture. It must also be admitted that very few of the threads are new. It is just
that this writer has argued for their use against others used by previous scholars,
and it is the use of these different threads that gives an overall different picture.
It is hoped that the blank spaces will prompt further research into such areas as:

1. The various lectionary systems used in the eighth century, particularly
the normal Byzantine series, requires further attention. Although Codex Bezae has
the normal Byzantine series there are distinctive nuances that might not be unique.
2. The exemplars to the supplemental leaves have yet to be located,
presumably they are in France somewhere, but one cannot just assume this.
3. To this writer’s knowledge no one has ever compared the script of
Codex Bezae with that of the Coptic manuscripts and yet the script of the Coptic
Codex P. Paulau Rib. 182, of the fifth century,\(^1\) has a superficial similarity that prompts further investigation of Coptic manuscripts in general.\(^2\)

4. The placing of Codex Bezae's text on the Packard Humanities Institute's CD ROMs #5.3 and #6, would certainly facilitate a detailed analysis of the text.

5. Birksall's suggested investigation of the relation of the Greek text of Codex Bezae to quotations by writers in Jerusalem in that time is still to be taken up.\(^3\)

6. There is also the history of the early Church Fathers to be investigated to determine if any one of them fits that of Codex Bezae.

Having suggested an investigation of the Church Fathers, may this writer give some background to the suggestion? That the D text was so widely used up to the fourth century and then suddenly dropped out of popularity has, for this writer, always been a matter of reflection. What momentous event could have caused this dramatic change? That the event would have to be of significance goes without saying, for the ecclesiastic world is not known for its willingness to change without a great deal of argument and even war. The one matter of major concern to the ecclesiastic world in the fourth century was that of the trinity. The Council of Nicæa of 325 was the first major debate on the deity of Christ. This was followed by the Council of Constantinople in 381 during which Christ's nature was again discussed and the faith of Nicæa

---


\(^2\) Dr. Franz - Jürgen Schmitz, of the Westfälische Wilhelms - Universität Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung, kindly responded to this writer's inquiry regarding the similarity between Codex Bezae and Codex P. Paulau Rib. 182 by saying that although at first sight there appeared to be similarities between the two manuscripts, a closer inspection proved the differences to be much greater.

\(^3\) Birksall, p. 113.
reaffirmed. The Nicene orthodoxy that was effectively established by this last council would automatically render anything that went against its conclusions as heretical. Having faced the issue and made a ruling the Church had no alternative but to uphold its conclusions and to do all in its power to affirm its understanding of Christ’s nature. That the additional words in the Bezan text at Luke 3:22: νῦν Μου ἐν σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκα σε (Psalms 2:7), could have been used by the adoptionists to uphold their claim that Jesus was in nature a man who became God by adoption, leaves little room to doubt that if used in this manner (and surely the adoptionists would not have neglected to use the accepted Scriptures to uphold their case) the Church would have had no alternative but to turn its back on the D text. Although adoptionism flourished mainly in the second and third centuries it was not entirely without its supporters in the fourth and fifth centuries, and even had them in Spain in the latter part of the eighth century. During the many controversies of the fourth and fifth century a number of Church leaders were ostracised and relocated. Surely, therefore, it is not unreasonable to envisage one of these men taking Codex Bezae with him, thereby giving it the new location that came after the corrections by Hand G.

In addition to the type of research that has been going on for centuries - as discussed above - and which is still required, this writer wishes to suggest a novel approach which may prove decisive in determining the region where Codex Bezae was written and where it may have sojourned before its arrival in

---

1 Similarly, one of the reasons given for the final rejection by the Jews of the long established and universally recognized Septuagint was its use by the Christian Church to uphold its argument that Jesus was the long promised Messiah. Alfred Rahlfs (ed.), Septuaginta, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935, 1979, p. lvii.

France, and that is to call upon the services of science, particularly that of gas chromatography and the identification of pollens.

The treatment of animal skins for writing upon must have varied from centre to centre, for it is doubtful if each centre used exactly the same chemicals. Therefore the chromatograph of any skin treated at any particular centre must be unique to that centre. Given this fact, a gas chromatograph of a codex whose place of origin is known, would provide a fingerprint that could be used to identify other unknown manuscripts. It must be remembered, however, that this only identifies skins with a common centre of origin and that centre may not be close to where the manuscript was written. Moreover, skins from different centuries may also have different fingerprints, but this would not render the idea unusable. However, these unknowns could be resolved by analysing three or four pages from each codex - depending on the number of pages in the codex - for one would anticipate that in the majority of cases each codex would demonstrate a common fingerprint; and by the analyses of a good number of codices with a known origin. The more codices analysed the greater the data base and the more accurate the result. Gas chromatography today has developed to the point that an effective analysis can be undertaken with the use of only a three millimetre square of material, thus making the process quite practical.

The second suggestion rests on the fact that within every region there are unique pollens. As these pollens are born by the air currents there is every probability that enclosed in the pages of Codex Bezae are the pollens that will disclose where our codex has been down through the centuries. A light brushing and vacuuming of each page would release and gather the pollens trapped within the pages ready for analysis. It is a process that should do no damage whatsoever to the codex, but disclose much which is now a mystery to us.
It is readily seen that there are many threads still to be discovered before our tapestry is complete. May the quest continue.

..........................000..........................
APPENDIX A

HISTORY OF CODEX BEZÆ PRIOR TO 1582

Introduction

Up to the time of its discovery in 1562 nothing of absolute certainty is known of Codex Bezæ’s history; therefore, the history that is constructed for this period, in the following pages, has been derived from extraneous sources.

The seventh century

Wetstein had argued that the marginalia in the Harkensis confirm the use of Codex Bezæ by Thomas of Harkel in his revision of the Philoxenian in 616, thus placing the codex in Egypt in the seventh century. Ridley, however, after an analysis of the marginalia rejected the hypothesis.\(^1\) Nevertheless, Marsh upheld Wetstein’s claim by referring to Adler’s collation of the marginalia in the Harkensis\(^2\) version of the four Gospels, and the nineteen readings peculiar to Codex Bezæ found there - one of which is the lengthy addition after Matthew 20:28. His own investigations of Acts also disclosed a number of similar

---

\(^1\) Ridley is quoted part 1, p. 36f.

\(^2\) Marsh (p. 679) has ‘Philoxenian’, because at that time the Harkensis was not considered to be a revision in its own right. Indeed the matter of whether Harkel’s work is a revision or simply one of adding marginalia to the Philoxenian version has been debated for centuries. (Vide: Metzger, Versions, pp. 63-65). The Alands (Text, p. 197) are in no doubt that it was a revision, for they say: ‘it is now clear that Thomas undertook a thorough revision.’
readings which were, to his knowledge, unique to Codex Bezae. The examples he refers to are the additions in Acts 6:11; 14:4, 10; 15:7. This writer was unable to obtain Adler’s work to check the readings to which he is referring, but of the above examples given by Marsh, Matthew 20:28 included, Acts 14:4 is the only one whose reading remains unique to Codex Bezae; all the other readings have additional witnesses as is readily seen in the Critical Apparatus of Nestle-Aland26 or 27. In light of this a check of Adler’s other readings for their uniqueness to Codex Bezae is required.

The eighth century

That the same system of sortes sanctorum is used in both the Latin Vulgate Bible from St. Germain, Codex Sangermanensis I (g’), and Codex Bezae would suggest that Codex Bezae was in France at least at the time of the annotations. However, this claim is dependent upon the dating of the hand that made these entries, and although it can be argued with some force that it is of the eighth century, further analysis might remove any lingering doubts.1

The ninth century

As proof of Codex Bezae’s presence in France in the ninth century Wetstein refers to a statement by Christian Druthmar who was a native of Aquitaine and afterwards a monk at Corvey (Corbie) who died after 880.2 The quote from Druthmar’s exposition on Matthew is as follows:

---

1 Vide: part II, § Sortes Sanctorum
2 Aland, Text, p. 216
I have seen a manuscript of the gospel written in Greek, which was said to have belonged to St Hilary, in which the Gospels of Matthew and John came first, the other two afterwards. I asked the Greek monk Euphemius why this was, and he said to me, 'He acted like a good farmer, who yokes his strongest oxen first.'¹ Wetstein goes on to say:

He does not tell us whether he saw this codex in the city of Poitou, which was part of Aquitaine, or at Clermont, or at Corbie; but at all events, if I do not greatly err, he saw this very Cambridge codex, which is the only one of all the Greek codices to preserve this order of the gospels.'²

---


Scrivener (*Bezae*, p. xxx, n. 1) cites this same passage, but with considerable differences in wording as shown highlighted in the following: 'Vidi *tamen*, librum Evangelii Graecè scriptum, qui dicebatur. *S. Hilarii fuisse, in quo primierunt Matthaeus ... Johannes, et post alii duo. Interrogavi verò Eufemium ... Graecum, cur hoc ita esset? dixit mihi: in *similitudinem* boni agricolae, qui ... quos fortiorem habet boves, *primos jungit.*' Christian Druthmar, *Matthaei Expositio*, p. 11, Basil. 1528.'

² *Utrum vero Codicem in urbe Pictavorum, quae Aquitaniae pars erat, an in Claro Monte, an Corbejae viderit, non dicit: vidit tamen, nisi admodum fallor, hunc ipsum Codicem Cantabrigiensem, qui unus & solus omnium Codicum Graece scriptorum hunc ordinem servat.* (Wetstein, p. 28).
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However, since there are a number of Greek manuscripts now known to have the Gospels in the same order as Codex Bezae this evidence is very tenuous.¹

Marsh, in an endeavour to substantiate Wetstein's claim refers to the omission of the words, ἐκπορευομένω διὰ στόματος² (Matt. 4:4) from both Codex Bezae and Druthmar's Latin writings. Marsh states that the text of Druthmar's quotation is,

... like the text of the Codex Bezae, Non in solo pane vivit homo, sed in omni verbo Dei.³ And in his commentary on this verse he repeats verbo Dei not less than four times, but takes not the least notice of any words like ἐκπορευομένω διὰ στόματος, as being between them, though he explains in general every word.⁴

However, just as before, where Codex Bezae may have been the sole witness to this omission in Marsh's day, a cursory glance at the Critical Apparatus of Nestle-Aland²⁶ or ²⁷ will prove to the reader that this omission is also witnessed by a b, apart from g¹ and Codex Bezae.⁵ Furthermore, following up on Marsh's suggestion that a full collation of Druthmar's quotations may uncover further examples of coincidence between them and readings unique to Codex

---

¹ Metzger (The Canon, p. 296) reports that there are now a number of manuscripts with the Gospels in the same order as Codex Bezae. Q.v., part II, p. 280, n. 1.
² Scrivener (Bezae, p. xxx, n. 1) in referring to Marsh on this matter includes the word θεοῦ after στόματος, which Marsh had not given.
³ Codex Bezae reads exactly the same except the order of pane and solo are reversed.
⁴ Marsh, p. 701.
⁵ Nestle-Aland²⁷.
Bezae,¹ Scrivener personally investigated Druthmar's writings and from this concluded:

I have found on trial that Druthmar usually follows the Vulgate, and never in the least resembles the Latin of Cod. Bezae; that when he departs from the Vulgate to accord with D, the manuscripts of the Old Latin more or less agree with him (e.g. Matth. iv. 4, ἀποκρίθης δὲ ὁ Ἰσα; ix.. 4, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς); and that the several editions of Druthmar himself vary so much, that that of Basle contains the very clause whose absence (in other editions) was noticed by Marsh. From such premises no safe conclusion can be drawn.²

Despite the fact that the previous evidence does not point exclusively to Codex Bezae it cannot be totally ignored. A more decisive proof of Codex Bezae's presence in Lyons in the ninth century is that furnish by Dom Henri Quentin³ who based his argument on a number of biblical citations, found in the Martyrology of Ado. Although a number of these readings are shared with two or more of the following witnesses, i.e. e g² gig p t vg, one, the use of the word altercantes in Acts 6:9, is unique to Codex Bezae.

According to the best authorities Ado's Martyrology was produced in Lyons during the period 850-860, and depended at least in part on Florus Diaconus, Bishop of Lyons (✝ c. 860).⁴ It is of relevance that Florus not only possessed a library of considerable note, but also cherished an interest in the bib-

¹ Marsh, p. 701.
² Scrivener, Bezae, p. xxx, n. 1.
³ Vide: part I, § 1906 - Dom Henri Quentin.
⁴ Quentin, p. 23; Lowe, Lyons, p. 272.
lical text and consequently had correspondents of like interests in Italy.\textsuperscript{1} It was this abiding interest in textual matters that prompted Quentin to suggest that Florus may have been the reason Codex Bezae finally arrived in Lyons.\textsuperscript{2}

Further to the above there are two items of internal, palæographical, evidence that give additional support to the supposition that Codex Bezae was located in Lyons during the ninth century. The first of these is the colophon found in the supplementary leaves at the end of Mark’s gospel, which, contrary to the norm, has an entry in blue ink. Lowe, who brought this to our attention, writes that entries in blue ink are found in only three other documents, all of which are French, two of them Lyonese.\textsuperscript{3} The second piece of palæographical evidence is the question-mark, found in only five manuscripts outside the supplementary leaves of Codex Bezae. Again, all of these are French manuscripts with all but one belonging to Lyons and even this has links with Lyons.\textsuperscript{4}

---

\textsuperscript{1} Quentin (p. 23) refers to Wandelbert as one who writes of Florus’s wealth in authentic books, for he states: ‘Que l’on relise le témoignage de Wandelbert sur la richesse du célèbre diacre [Florus] en livres authentiques ....’

\textsuperscript{2} ‘Aussi bien, si l’on admettait tout à la fois que le Codex Bezae séjournait d’abord en Italie, puis fut à Lyon dès le IX\textsuperscript{e} siècle, serait-ce une hypothèse séduisante que de le faire émigrer à l’époque et par le moyen de Florus et de ses correspondants.’ (\textit{Ibid.}, p. 23).

\textsuperscript{3} \textit{Vide:} part I, § 1924 - E. A. Lowe, (2) ‘The Codex Bezae and Lyons’.

\textsuperscript{4} \textit{Ibid.}

The type of corrections to the above manuscripts and Florus’ interest in biblical texts led Parker (\textit{Bezae}, pp. 47f.) to conclude that ninth century Lyons was a locale for the conservation of ancient manuscripts.
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The restorative work which was performed on Codex Bezae in the ninth century might reasonably be linked to Lyons.¹ This, coupled with the scriptural references peculiar to Codex Bezae in Ado’s Martyrology make a strong case for believing that the codex was located in Lyons at least as early as the ninth century.

The sixteenth century

The first definite reference to Codex Bezae

The first known concrete² reference to Codex Bezae is that made in the margins of Robert Estienne’s³ Editio Regia edition of 1550.⁴ Not only is it the first known reference to Codex Bezae, but also the first known use of this codex as a witness to the printed text. In this, his third edition of the Greek New Testament,⁵ Estienne imputes 389 variations to Codex Bezae which he refers to as β’⁶

¹ Vide: part II, § The supplemental leaves.

² Although initially there was some controversy over the identity of the witness designated β’ by Stephens, it is an accepted fact today that Stephens is referring to Codex Bezae; as Scrivener (Bezae, p. ix) states: ‘The identity of Codex Bezae with β’ in Stephens’ margin ought never to have been doubted by any one who had availed himself of the means at our disposal for testing that editor’s accuracy.’

³ Stephanus, 1503-1559.

⁴ The Editio Regia, a folio, was Estienne’s most famous edition, because it was regarded by many as the received or standard text, it also became the basis for Beza’s published text and ultimately contributed to the Textus Receptus. Vide: Scrivener (Introduction, pp. 435-442).

⁵ Wetstein (p. 28) considers this to be Estienne’s second edition, i.e. A⁰. 1550. est enim ipsius Codex secundus . . . . Scrivener (Introduction, pp. 435) gives the following dates for

6 Although Estienne does not specifically identify β' as Codex Bezae, his textual references are sufficient to identify it as such. Wetstein (pp. 28f.) was in no doubt that Estienne's β' was also Codex Bezae, referring not only to the 450* common variations, but also the lack of variant readings corresponding to the missing leaves in the codex, even though β' is quoted by Estienne in every page. Because Wetstein came under severe criticism for claiming that Estienne's β' and Codex Bezae were one and the same manuscript (he had originally made the claim in the 1730 edition of his *Prolegomena*) he spends a considerable amount of space in his 1751 edition (pp. 35-38) on answering his critics. Michaelis (Marsh, pp. 236-8, 241) agreed with Wetstein. However, Marsh (pp. 686, 689f.) points out that although Matt. 27:1-12 and Acts 8:29 - 10:14 are missing from Codex Bezae, Estienne quotes his Codex β' four times in these intervals, and Estienne does not quote β' on every page. But Wetstein (p. 36) had pointed out earlier that the letter β' may have been used in such instances, by mistake, in place of another letter. After his investigation of the matter, Scrivener (*Bezae*, p. ix) was to report that, 'After a careful analysis of all the variations imputed to β' we are enabled to state that (excluding itacisms and the like, which early collators always neglected) they amount to 389 in all the parts written by the original scribe of Codex Bezae;'. In clear support of the claim he states in a later work (*Introduction*, p. 121, n. 1): 'It is surprising that any one should have questioned the identity of Cod. D with Stephen's β'. No other manuscript has been discovered which agrees with β' in the many singular readings and arbitrary additions in support of which it is cited by Stephen.'

* Marsh (p. 688) disputes this figure, for he states: 'The lectiones singulares, quoted from the Codex β, do not amount to 450, but only to 211. In conjunction with other manuscripts it is quoted 128 times, so that the whole number, both of lectiones singulares, and lectiones communes, amount only to 339'.

Marsh (pp. 688-699) gives a detailed discussion of the arguments for and against the question on whether or not Codex Bezae is Estienne's β', at the end of which, and despite his
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Considering the research that has gone into analysing the marginalia in Estienne’s third edition there seems little doubt that the many singular readings and arbitrary additions prove that these readings came from the Bezan text.

Estienne also tells us in his Epistle to the Reader, contained within his 1550 edition, that this manuscript $\beta'$ was in Italy at the time of its collation, for he states: τὸ δὲ $\beta'$ ἐστὶ τὸ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ ὑπὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀντιβληθὲν φίλων.\(^1\) If we accept, therefore, that manuscript $\beta'$ and Codex Bezae are the same document we can conclude with some measure of certainty that Codex Bezae was in Italy at some time before 1550.

The council of Trent

That which might also be taken as referring to Codex Bezae comes two decades later from the hand of Marianus Victorius (Mariano Vittori) who was Bishop of Amelia and later of Rieti\(^2\) from June 2 until his death on June 29, 1572.\(^3\) Victorius, who was at the Council of Trent, provided notes to his edition of St Jerome.\(^4\) In one of these notes he refers to a bishop who took to the Council of Trent a very ancient manuscript that contained a unique reading in earlier objections, he concludes 'the Codex Bezae and the Codex Stephani $\beta$ are one and the same manuscript.

---

1 Cited by Wetstein (p. 28), Kipling (p. xix), Scrivener (Introduction, p. 121), and Klijn (Survey, p. 3).

2 Of the Lazio region of central Italy.

3 Ropes (p. lvi, n. 4) and Lowe (Lyons, p. 271, n. 5).

4 First published in Rome 1566. (Ropes, p. lvi, n. 4 (1)).

Vide: part I, § 1906 - Quentin, Dom Henri.
John 21:22, namely, *si eum volo sic manere* (ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν οὕτως, ἔως ἔρχομαι). Even to this day the only manuscript known to contain this reading is Codex Bezae. Less convincing are two other notes by Victorius with citations from Matthew 1:23 and 9:13 with readings that are no longer unique to Codex Bezae. Nevertheless Victorius refers to each of the witnesses as *a very ancient manuscript* - the first coming from Lyons, the second, Clermont. Lowe accounts for this seeming confusion of names by saying: ‘a confusion arising from the circumstance that the manuscript had been used on a public occasion by a bishop of Clermont [apparently referring to the Council of Trent]. The “Codex Lugdunensis” quite naturally became a “Codex Claremontanensis”.’

The Bishop spoken of by Vittorius was William à Prato, Bishop of Clermont (1528-1560), Auvergne, France. He took what is generally thought to be Codex Bezae to the Council of Trent in 1546, because of its unique reading in John 21:22, apparently in an attempt to give celibacy a biblical foundation.

**Theodorus Beza (1519-1605)**

A statement prefixed to the codex itself provides further evidence regarding the history of Codex Bezae. In this note Beza states that, he had obtained the manuscript at the outbreak of the civil war in 1562 and that prior to its acquisition it had lain mutilated and in dust for a long time in the monastery of Saint

---

1 antiquissimus quidam Graecus Codex, quem Tridentum attulit Claremontanensis Episcopus anno Domini 1546: ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν οὕτως, .... (Quentin, p. 24).

2 Lowe, Lyons, p. 272.

3 Quentin, p. 24.

4 Klijn, Survey, p. 3.
Irenæus of Lyons. Scrivener reports that the script is of Beza’s style, leaving no doubt that these are Beza’s own words. Thus, Codex Bezae had been in France

1 ... et in Sancti Irenæi monasterio, Lugduni, ad ita ut hic cernitur, mutilatum, post-quam ibi in pulvere diu jacisset, repertum oriente ibi civili bello, anno Domini 1562. (Scrivener, Bezae, p. viii).

It was Wetstein’s contention (p. 30) that Beza confounded the manuscript that was discovered at Lyons with one that came from Clermont. Further to this, Wetstein also accuses Beza of being incorrect in saying that his manuscript of Paul’s epistles came from Clermont in the diocese of Beauvais and not from Clermont in Auvergne. The bases to his argument rests on Victorius’s statement and that Stephanus obtained readings of Codex Bezae when, as Beza himself says, it lay in dust for some considerable time in the monastery of Saint Irenæus. Wetstein’s actual words are as follows: Aut vero omnia me fallunt, aut Beza permutavit ac confudit nomina suorum Codicum, vocando Lugdunensem, qui Claromontanus erat, & vicissim: si enim statuamus Evangeliorum Codicem fuisse Claromontanum, egregie illustratur, quod supra ex Victorio attulimus, dummodo Clarum montem non obscurn apud Bellovaecos coenobium, ut Beza putavit, sed antiquissimam Episcopi sedem apud Arvenmates intelligamus: sin autem verum est, eum Lugduni in pulvere jacuisse ad annum 1562. difficultas inexplicabilis existit, unde Stephanus secundi sui h. e. ejusdem Codicis lectiones A. 1550. hauserit? (Now either I am much deceived, or Beza has changed and confounded the names of his manuscripts, calling that ms. ‘Lugdunensis’ which in fact came from Clermont and vice versa; for if we suppose the ms. of the Gospels to have come from Clermont, this well illustrates the passage that we adduced from Victorius, providing that we understand by Clermont not the obscure monastery near Beauvais, as Beza thought, but the ancient episcopal see in the Auvergne. If it be true, as he says, that it lay in the dust at Lyons until 1562, an inexplicable difficulty arises - viz. whence did Stephanus obtain his readings of his ‘second codex’ (i.e. this very one) in 1550?)
long before 1562. Considering this and the previous evidence it is quite possible that William à Prato borrowed the codex from the monastery of Saint Irenaeus while on the way to the Council of Trent. That Lyons lies on the most likely route William would have taken when travelling from Clermont to Trent, namely, from Lyons via the ‘col du Mont Cenis’ to Turin and on, adds further weight to this suggestion.¹

It appears that William à Prato was at the Council of Trent until the Pope adjourned it to Bologna in March 1547.² Friends in Italy would have had sufficient time to collate the document, particularly since the issue of celibacy was not discussed during the period that William was there,³ thereby leaving the codex free for such a collation. Indeed Estienne’s quest for manuscripts for his editions of the Greek New Testament may have encouraged him to seek out the Codex Bezae in order to have it collated by his son Henri. However, finding that

---

Wetstein’s argument rests on the very uncertain ground of a single quotation by Druthmar and complete confusion by Beza over his two major manuscripts. It hardly needs mentioning that Wetstein’s argument gained little to no support.

² Scrivener, Bezae, p. viii.


² Harris (Codex, p. 38) reports that there is no evidence that William à Prato was at the Council later than March 1547; the end of the seventh session. Q.v., Lake, Origin, p. 442.

³ Apparently the question of celibacy was not publicly discussed at the Council before 1563 (Harris, Codex, p. 38; Lake, Origin, p. 443, n.1). However this does not preclude the possibility that it was taken to the Council in those earlier years with the intention of using it in such a debate.
it was at Trent he asked his friends to perform the task for him.¹ Had the
collation been completed some time prior to William’s departure from Trent in
March or April, 1547, there seems no reason to doubt that it would have reached
Estienne in sufficient time to include the information in his Royal Edition of
1550.

Beza, whose name the codex bears, is the first person known definitely to
have held it for some years. After holding Codex Bezæ for nineteen years he
gave it as a gift to the University of Cambridge with an accompanying letter
dated from Geneva, 6 December, 1581. Contained in this letter is an all too brief
statement on how he obtained the codex; it simply reads: ‘Several years ago
there came into my possession a Greek and Latin manuscript of the four gospels
and the Acts of the apostles from the monastery of St Irenæus in Lyons.’² Thus
he gives no clue as to how he received the codex or from whom.³ Scrivener
suggests that Beza received it after it had been taken from the monastery of Saint
Irenæus as part of the spoils of war when the Huguenot army sacked that city in
1562. If received under these circumstances the reticence of the recipient to
provide such details is not surprising.⁴ Had it been received as a gift, either from
the monks of Saint Irenæus or from some person escaping this, the second of the

¹ Estienne used the Complutensian Polyglot and fifteen other manuscripts in compiling
his editions. (Kenyon, p. 230).

² Scrivener (Introduction, p. 437) also lists fifteen.

³ However Metzger (Text, p. 104) states that fourteen Greek manuscripts were used apart
from the Complutensian Polyglot.

⁴ Quatuor Evangeliorum et Actorum Apostolicorum graeco latinum exemplar
ex S. Irenac caenobio lugdunensi ante aliquot annos nactus. . . . (Scrivener, Beza, p. vi).

³ Contrary to what Harris (Beza, p. 17) states there is nothing in Beza’s writings which
suggests that it was sold to him.

⁴ Scrivener, Beza, p. viii.
religious wars,¹ one would expect it to have been accompanied by at least some of its history. If it was received as a gift there seems little reason why its history should not be spoken of openly. One would anticipate at least an acknowledgment, and if a gift there would have been no reason for not passing on all known details.

If, as suggested by Parker, it was given to Beza in Geneva by a refugee from the war, it would not be unreasonable to expect such a person to have some appreciation of the codex’s value, otherwise why go to the trouble of carrying such a large object for such a distance and in such circumstances? It would also be reasonable to assume that this information would have been passed on to the recipient of the codex, in this case, Beza. Beza’s limited knowledge of the history of the codex, or reluctance to impart what history he knew, militates against Parker’s hypothesis, and is in accord more with Scrivener’s suggestion that the codex was part of the spoils of war handed on to Beza.² Certainly, as Scrivener suggests, the words used by Beza in the preface to his 1582 edition of the New Testament, *viz nactus* (having obtained), *repertum* (discoverer), and *erutum* (to

---

¹ This is the stand taken by Parker (*Bezae*, p. 283).

² Lake (*Origin*, p. 442) also considers Beza to have obtained the codex as part of the spoils of war.

Tregelles suggested that a Huguenot soldier ‘rescued’ the codex from the general destruction which took place with the sacking of Lyons. Cited by Thomas Hartwell Horne (*An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament - The critical part re-written and the remainder revised and edited by Samuel Prideaux Tregelles*, London: Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, & Roberts, 1856, p. 170). However the term *rescue* suggests right motives, which is very doubtful under these circumstances. Surely the term *spoils of war* is far more appropriate.
unearth - anything unknown, latent or forgotten - bring to light), conveys 'no idea of a gift.'

Marsh also made a suggestion as to how Beza obtained Codex Bezae. It is one that is plausible and one that would indeed account for Beza's reticence over its procuration, for as Marsh states:

On the other hand, it must be observed that Beza's words do not necessarily imply that he did not find it himself. He was probably at Lyons in the very year, in which he says that his manuscript was discovered [1562]; for in that year he took a journey from Geneva to Paris, to be present at a council between the Catholics and the Hugonots [sic], as appears from the accounts of Freher, Moreri, and Bayle. If then he was guilty of a literary theft, and appropriated to his own use what belonged to the monks of St. Irenæus, a matter by no means improbable in itself, since critics, as well as connoisseurs, are sometimes unable to resist temptation, he would naturally have expressed himself in such a manner, as to leave it undetermined whether it had been stolen by himself, or another person.

Regardless of how the codex was obtained, and in light of all that has been said before regarding its history during this period, Beza's statement that Codex Bezae had been held by the monastery of Saint Irenæus of Lyons for some considerable time prior to coming into his possession in 1562, must be taken at face value. That it was absent from the monastery during the months that

---

1 Scrivener, Bezae, p. viii.
2 Marsh, p. 695.

This is the stand taken by Ian M. Ellis ('Codex Bezae and Recent Enquiry', *Irish Biblical Studies* 4 (1982) 82-100, 83).

3 Lake (*Origin*, p. 443) argued that by 'the middle of the sixteenth century Codex Bezae was in Italy; there is nothing to show that it came there from France.'
William à Prato took it to Trent does not detract from his statement, for its absence from Lyons for a number of months does not falsify the view that it had been in the monastery for some considerable time and generally in a state of neglect.

Although the above evidence is not perfectly decisive it is cumulative and in the main convincing. The lack of any information to the contrary also adds some measure of assurance that it can be trusted. We can conclude, therefore, that the codex was located in Lyons as early as the ninth century and that it was held by the monastery of Saint Irenæus of Lyons for some considerable time prior to its acquisition by Beza in 1562. Beza held it until December 1581 when he presented it as a gift to the University of Cambridge,¹ where it has remained ever since - apart from the seven years Richard Bentley (1662-1742) held it at his home for the purpose of preparing his much vaunted, but never produced, New Testament. Because of its long union with Cambridge, Codex Bezae gained the additional title: Cantabrigiensis.²

Beza’s opinion of Codex Bezae

Although Beza recognised the antiquity of his codex³ he chose to refer to it only in the last three of his five editions of the New Testament, those of 1582, 1589, and 1598, and then only occasionally.⁴ This suggests that he decided to

² Klijn (Survey, p. 3, n.2) states that,'... at that time the MSS were called after the place where they could be found.'
³ In his letter, which is prefixed to the codex, he states: ... tantum hoc venerandae, ..., vetustatis monumentum ... . (Scrivener, Bezae, p. vi).
make reference to the codex only after Cambridge scholars had expressed their
approval of the document. That representatives of Cambridge had seen the doc-
ument prior to its arrival in Cambridge can be deduced from a statement made in
Beza’s accompanying letter, *viz* ‘Although none have judged better than
yourselves what importance should be attached to this manuscript, ....’¹
Nevertheless, the difference in readings between Codex Bezae and other
manuscripts swayed Beza against using it in his text, thereby avoiding the wrath
of his peers. Instead, in his view his *great monument of venerable antiquity*
should be relegated to storage. As he states in his covering letter:

\[
\text{I have nevertheless deemed fit to tell you that in Luke’s gospel particularly I}
\text{have found such discrepancies between this manuscript and the others, even the}
\text{oldest of them, that in order to avoid offending certain people I think it should be}
\text{preserved rather than published.²}
\]

In a brief note prefixed to the Codex Bezae itself, and in a style that
Scrivener believed was Beza’s, he discloses something of his opinion regarding
the history of the codex.³ In this Beza expresses his belief that because of some
barbarous Greek jottings in the margins the codex had come from Greece.⁴ It
was, however, an opinion that was to be continually challenged.

---

¹ *Etsi vero nulli melius quam vos ipsi, quae sit huic exemplari fides habenda, 
estimarint, ....* (Scrivener, Bezae, p. vi).

² *.... estimarint, hac de re tamen vos admonendos duxi, tantam à me in lucae 
praesertim Evangelio repertam esse inter hunc codicem et caeteros quâtiús veteres 
discrepantiam, ut vitandae quorundam offensioni, asservandum potius quàm 
publicandum existimem.* (Scrivener, Bezae, p. vi).

³ Scrivener, Bezae, p. viii.

⁴ For this quote refer to part II, p. 290, n. 1.
Thus Cambridge became the possessor of this codex which now bears its name: Codex D 05 Cantabrigiensis.
### APPENDIX B

**TABLE OF CORRECTORS AND ANNOTATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>181 in text A</td>
<td>vi</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327 in text B</td>
<td>vii</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 in text C</td>
<td>vii fin.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163 in text D</td>
<td>vii fin.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 in text E</td>
<td>vii fin.?2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Latin</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 in text F</td>
<td>viii?3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>once</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283 in text G</td>
<td>xi4</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Latin</td>
<td>Latin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 in text H</td>
<td>xii?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 annot. I</td>
<td>ix</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 in text J</td>
<td>ix</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 annot. J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 in text K</td>
<td>modern</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 in text L</td>
<td>ix6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>- Latin7</td>
<td>Latin7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149 annot. L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 annot.? M</td>
<td>xii?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>lectionary notes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 annot. M1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>τίτλαοι in Matthew</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 annot. M2</td>
<td>x?8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>τίτλαοι in John &amp; Lk.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 annot. M3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>sortes in Mark10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 annot. M4</td>
<td>x?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>lect. &amp; liturgical notes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 annot. N</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>lect. notes in pencil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 annot. O</td>
<td>xii early</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8 liturg. notes - Acts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 annot. O2</td>
<td>modern</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>one liturg. note - Acts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. This is a reproduction of Harris's table (*Annotators*, p. 6) with additional information.

2. The question mark in this column signifies a date deduced by Harris from Scrivener's chronological order, but not specifically stated by Scrivener himself.

3. vii according to Kenyon (*Bezae*, p. 296).

4. vii and earlier than F, according to Kenyon (*ibid.*).

5. Although not stated here by Harris, hand I was the writer of two lectionary notes. (Scrivener, *Bezae*, p. xxviii).

6. Harris (*Annotators*, p. 6.) argues for the tenth century.

7. This is according to Harris (*ibid.*, pp. 12f.).

8. According to Harris (*ibid.*, pp. 6, 10) this should be at least the ninth century.


10. Parker (*Bezae*, p. 43) suggests that the sortes in Mark was also written by M1.
APPENDIX C

LIST OF TOPICS AND REFERENCES

ACCENTS
None in the text, but a few in later hands

AMMONIAN SECTIONS
Only on the Greek Side

ANCHORA SUPERIOR/INFERIOR
Greek Origin - Normally not found in Latin Manuscripts

ANNOTATIONS AND CORRECTIONS
Sequence of Changes Similar to that of Codex Marchalianus (Q)²
Ropes, 1926, p. xxxiii, n. 2; lx, n. 4.

ANNOTATORS
None apart from possibly J were scholars
Harris, *Annotators*, 1901, p. 74.

¹ The original article that contains this information was: *Miscellanea Mercati*, VI (Città del Vaticano, 1946), 36-37 = *Pal. Papers*, II, p. 349.
None later than the year 800.


Written in a Græco-Latin Centre

Harris, Annotators, 1901, p. 75.

Speakers of modern Greek and wrote it as they spoke it

Harris, Annotators, 1901, p. 18.

I

Date

550-650

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 49.

Ninth Century

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxviii.

J1

450-500


J

Date

550-600

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 40f., 49.

Ninth Century at the Earliest

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxvii.

Tenth Century

Kenyon, Bezae, 1900, pp. 293 - 299, 297.
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Possibly a Greek Scholar

Harris, Annotators, 1901, p. 74, n. 3.

Preceeds L

Harris, Annotators, 1901, p. 9.

L

Author of Ammonian Sections and a great body of the Liturgical Notes

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxvi.

Bilingual

Harris, Annotators, 1901, pp. 11; 34; 74, n. 2.

Date

550-600

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 41-42, 49.

<Seventh Century

Kipling, 1793, p. 15.

≥Ninth Century

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxvii.

Tenth Century

Kenyon, Beze, 1900, p. 297.

Harris, Annotators, 1901, p. 6.

<Supplementary leaves

Harris, Annotators, 1901, p. 107.

From the same phonetic influence/Greek school as M2

Harris, Annotators, 1901, pp. 12.

Follows M2, chronologically

Harris, Annotators, 1901, p. 9.

Hand

Greek

Mercati, 1914, p. 450.
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Latin

Harris, Annotators, 1901, pp. 13, 33.

Rejected

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 42.

Wrote from dictation

Harris, Annotators, 1901, pp. 12ff.

Written in Egypt

Schulz, 1827, p. 10.

M, M2, M4

Tabulation of annotations

Harris, Annotators, 1901, pp. 38ff.

A Ravenna Hand

Rejected

Burkitt, 1901-2, p. 505, note.


M

Date

Twelfth Century

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, pp. xxviiif.

550-600

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 41-42, 49.
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Bilingual

Harris, Annotators, 1901, p. 74, n. 2.
Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, pp. xxvii.

550-600

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 40f., 49.

Wrote τῆς ταξινομίας in Matthew
Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, pp. xxvii, 451.

Wrote Sortes (in Mark)sc. M₁=M₃
Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 43.

M₂

 Date

Tenth Century
Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, pp. xxvii.

550-600
Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 40f., 49.

Wrote τῆς ταξινομίας in John and Luke
Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, pp. xxvii, 451.

Possibly the same hand as M₁
Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxvii.

From the same phonetic influence/Greek school as L
Harris, Annotators, 1901, pp. 10, 12ff.

---

1 This writer is not sure whether Harris does not mean M₂ here. He states a number of times that L and M₂ came from the same Greek school and phonetic influence. (Vide: references to L and M₂). Harris makes a number of errors in this regard, some to which I refer in part II, p. 225, n. 2, but another not already mentioned is in the footnote on page 75, when he refers to the 'Sortes of M'.

2 Parker (Bezae, p. 43) has an error when he ascribes to Scrivener the belief that 'M² may be the same as the hand of the Sortes, M³.'
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Precedes L

Harris, Annotators, 1901, p. 9.

Wrote from Dictation

Harris, Annotators, 1901, pp. 12ff.

M3

Wrote Sortes (in Mark)

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxviii.

A Latin (possibly)

Harris, Annotators, 1901, p. 12.

M4

Date

550-650

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 49.

Tenth Century

Scrivener/Harris, Annotators, 1901, p. 6.

Wrote before the manuscript suffered loss of leaves

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 44.

N

550-650

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 49.

O

Date

550-650

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 49.

Early Twelfth Century

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxviii.
Date

550-650

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 49.

Modern

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxviii.

SIGLA (§) for δηνάριον - a Greek practice


BREATHINGS

Only in Matt. 25:15, but a few in later hands

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xix.

COLOPHONS

Alternate red and black lines of at least the fourth Century


Explicit & Incipit

Latin custom

Mercati, 1914, p. 449.

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 11, 22.

Not in oldest MSS.


Bischoff, 1979, p. 44.
Latin Form

Mercati, 1914, p. 449.
Lowe, Lyons. 1924, p. 271.
Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 10-12.

CORRECTORS

Collation of the Secondary hands as seen by Scrivener

Harris, Annotators, 1901, p. 6.

A

Corrections do not follow the Bezan tradition

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 130, 133.

Date

End of Sixth Century

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxiv.

400-440

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 37, 48.

B

Consulted

8C text (from Cæsarea) and one similar to D*/d

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 144, 146-149, 282.

Date

Seventh Century

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxiv.

400-450

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 37, 48.

Demonstrates an interest in different traditions

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 149.
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Should be placed after hand C

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 49, 139, 154.

C

Consulted a Byzantine text

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 139, 176.

Perhaps a Semitic-thinking Scribe.


Date

End of Seventh Century

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxv.

400-450


Should be placed before hand B

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 49, 139, 154.

D

A Scholar


Consulted a & B text generally


Date

End of Sixth Century

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxiv.

450


E

Consulted a text not readily identified

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 156.
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Date

450-500


Seventh Century

Scrivener/Harris, Annotators, 1901, p. 6.

Of a Greek tongue


Of a Latin tongue

Scrivener, Bezæ, 1864, p. xxv.

Harris, Annotators, 1901, pp. 10, 13.

Rejected

Parker, Bezæ, 1992, pp. 38, n; 156f.

F

Date

Eighth Century

Scrivener/Harris, Annotators, 1901, p. 6.

Seventh Century

Kenyon, Bezæ, 1900, p. 296.

450-500


The milieu: that of the Byzantine text

Parker, Bezæ, 1992, pp. 159, 162.

---

1 Scrivener does not give an actual date, and that given by Harris is an estimate made after considering the data.

2 Scrivener (Bezæ, p. xxv) does not give an actual date, he simply states: ‘... supplied by a hand (F) younger than any yet named, ....’ Again the date given is Harris’s estimate.

Kenyon (Bezæ, 1900, 293-299, 296) states, without a reference, that Scrivener placed the hand in the eighth to the eleventh century.
A Scholar

Burkitt, 1901-2, p. 508.

Plooij, D. *BBC 5* (1928) 29f., 29.

A Syrian or a person who knew Syrian

Plooij, D. *BBC 5* (1928) 30.

Consulted

**Exemplar of Codex Bezae**


**Syriac texts**

Plooij, D. *BBC 5* (1928) 29f., 30.

**Vulgate**


Harris, *Annotators*, 1901, p. 10.

Rejected

Burkitt, 1901-2, p. 507.


**Corrected Mt (224x), Jn (7x), and Ac (55x)**


**Date**

**Contemporary with Scribe**


Burkitt, 1901-2, p. 506.


c. 400
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< Fifth Century - Possibly Fourth

DE Ricci, Seymour. (Cited by Lowe, A Note, 1927, pp. 11f.; The Date, 1928, p. 32)

≤ Fifth Century

Hunt, A. S. (Cited by Lowe, A Note, 1927, p. 11f; The Date, 1928, p. 32f.).

Fifth Century

Burkitt, 1901-2, pp. 507, 511.

Sixth Century - first half

Lowe, The Date, 1928, pp. 32f.

Seventh Century

Kenyon, Bezae, 1900, p. 296.

Eleventh Century

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxvi.

More Latin than Greek in Character.


Of a Latin tongue

Harris, Annotators, 1901, pp. 10, 13.

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 175.

Person of standing

Burkitt, 1901-2, p. 511.

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 175.

Predates Hand A

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 49.
Appendix C

H

Date

Twelfth Century

Scrivener/Harris, Annotators, 1901, pp. xxiv, 6.

450-500


Predates hand F

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 159.

K

Recent

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxvi.

Scholar

Harris, Annotators, 1901, p. 9.

L - Two Corrections

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 162f.

DATE OF ORIGIN OF MS

Second Century


Cited by Kipling, p. 4 and Horne, p. 171, n. 1.

Kipling, 1793, p. 4. (guarded agreement)

Rejected

Horne/Tregelles, 1856, p. 171.

---

1 Scrivener (Bezae, p. xxvi) does not give an actual date, he simply states: ‘H and K are both recent, ....’ Again the date given by Harris is an estimate made after considering the data.
≤ Fourth Century

Wetstein, 1751, p. 34.


Fourth Century


Bischoff, Bernhard. (possibility). Verbal to Fischer, p. 41, n. 133.


Cited Fischer, p. 41, n. 133.

Frede, 1964, p. 18, n. 4.

Fischer, 1972, p. 41.

> Fourth Century

Simon, 1689, pp. 359f.

Fourth or Fifth Century


< Fifth Century

Kipling, 1793, pp. 3-5.

Lowe, A Note, 1927, p. 11.

= 400

Early Fifth Century


Rejected

Fischer, 1972, p. 41.

Fifth Century


Burkitt, 1901-2, p. 512.

Ropes, 1926, p. lvii.


Late Fifth Century


Fifth or Sixth Century


<Sixth Century


\[500\]


Sixth Century

Arnaud Antonius [Arnaldus]. *Dissertation critique touchant les exemplaires grecs, sur lesquels M. Simon prétend que lancienne Vulgate a esté faite, et sur le judgment que l'on doit faire du fameux manuscrit de Bèze.* Cologne, 1691. Cited by Kipling, p. ii, n. c; Strange, p. 205, n. 4.


Hort, 1881, p. 148.


Seventh Century

Credner, 1832, p. 517.
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Seventh Century at the Earliest


DICTATED or VISUALLY COPIED

Dictated

Kipling, 1793, pp. xiii.

Credner, 1832, pp. 463-5, 517.


p. 34. Vide: Harris, Lectures, p. 11.


p. 1305.


Rejected

Harris. Lectures, 1894, pp. 11f.

Parker, Dictation, 1982, 97-112.

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 108.

Phonological errors


DIFFERENCES IN AGE WITHIN THE LATIN TEXT


Rejected

Parker, Dictation, 1982, pp. 109f.
EXEMPLAR

Physical characteristics

Codex Bezae similarly divided

Credner, 1832, pp. 460, 508.

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, pp. xvii, xxiii.

Harris, Bezae, 1891, p. 242.

Rejected

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 75.

Bilingual similar to itself - only a possibility.


Pages in Exemplar not identical to Codex Bezae

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, pp. xvii, xxiii.

Interlinear

Lowe, Bezae, 1913, pp. 385, 388.

Rejected


Sense-lines

Short in Gospels

Clark, Text, 1914, pp. 21, 52.

Clark, Acts, 1933, p. 179.

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 95.

Sources

Acts and Gospels from different translators

Kipling, 1793, p. xii.

Clark, Acts, 1933, pp. xliii, 205ff.

Stone, 1946, pp. 65f.
Rejected


**Acts/Luke different from the rest of the Gospels**


Rejected


**Synoptics¹ different from that of Acts**


**Acts and Gospels from different exemplars**


**Text**

*d* has elements of Old Latin version & Jerome’s revised Vulgate


**Superscript Text.**


**From Latin Diatessaron**


**Refer**


---

¹ Ellis speaks of the Synoptics, but he appears to be referring to all the Gospels.
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$d$ derived from a Greek Western text.

Ropes, 1926, p. lxxx.

Exemplars of $d$ were Old Latin MSS

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 248f.

Exemplar of $d$ was a shorter version of the present $D$ text

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 248f.

Privately Owned - $D$ or the Parent?

Chapman, Gospels, 1905, p. 345.

GENERAL

Codex Bezae unlike any other extant Ms.

Kenyon, Bezae, 1900, p. 295.

Burkitt, 1901-2, p. 501.

HAND

Greek and Latin from the same Hand

Simon, 1689, p. 360.


HISTORY OF THE CODEX UP TO 1581

Seventh Century

Egypt

Wetstein, 1751, p. 28.

Marsh, 1788, pp. 701f.
Rejected


Kipling, 1793, pp. xvif.

Gaul

Credner, 1832, p. 517.

< A.D. 800 Centre where Greek was the Literary and Ecclesiastical Language.


Ropes, 1926. p. lxiii.


> A.D. 800 Latin Environment


Ninth Century

Gaul

Wetstein, 1751, p. 28.

Marsh, 1795, p. 701.


Quentin, 1906, p. 23.


Birdsall, 1986, pp. 113f.
Appendix C

Ninth to Twelfth Century - where Greek was the Literary and Ecclesiastical Language

Harris, Annotations, 1901, p. 75.
Lowe, Bezae, 1913, p. 388.

Tenth Century

Harris, Annotators, 1901, pp. 7-11.

Gaul

Harris, Bezae, 1891, pp. 7-11.

Paris - rejected

Harris, Annotators, 1901, pp. 76f.

Eleventh/Twelfth Century

Italy

Lake, Origin, 1900, 443.

Twelfth Century

Italy

Harris, Annotators, 1901, p. 106.

Judæo-Christian Circles

Credner, 1832, pp. 491f., 495-497, 505-507, 513, 516.

Rejected

Harris, Lectures, 1894, pp. 6f.

LECTIONARY NOTES

By hands

I, M, M2, M4, N, O, O2

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 43.
I, M, M₄, N, O, O₂


Place of Origin

Gallican


Rejected

Brightman, 1900, p. 446.


Judaeco-Christian Circles

Credner, 1832, pp. 504f.

Harris, *Lectures*, 1894, p. 5.

System

Byzantine

Brightman, 1899-1900, p. 446.

J’s not the same as L’s

Harris, *Annotators*, 1901, pp. 34f.

Written before the Seventh Century

Kipling, 1793, p. xv.

NOMINA SACRA

Ancient


Harris, *Bezae*, 1891, p. 250.


THC and XPC Latinized Forms

Rejected


Paap, 1959, p. 120.

THN found also in African Old Latin Codex k

Lowe, E. A. 'Two New Latin Liturgical Fragments on Mount Sinai'.


Egyptian


dns- and dni-type (in Acts) represent a later stage of development


ORIGIN OF THE CODEX

Copy of Irenæus’s Original?


Written for a Local Congregation


Written for Private use.

Burkitt, 1901-2, p. 512.
ORNAMENTATION

Latin

Mercati, 1914, p. 449.

Lowe, Lyons, 1924, p. 271.


Similar to that found in ฿ and A.

Scrivener, Beza, 1864, p. xv.

PEN.

Cut for Writing Greek

Burkitt, 1901/2, p. 502.


Rejected


PHYSICAL ASPECTS OF CODEX.

Prickings for lines inside the Writing Area - Common up to the sixth Century.

Bischoff, 1990, p. 22.


Ruling on Hair Side


Rejected

Lowe, CLA II, p. 7.

Square format

Square writing area - Early Latin


Square book format - Early Latin


Square book format - Links the Codex Bezae to a Latin scriptorium


PLACE OF ORIGIN.

Greece

Beza, in the covering letter that accompanied the manuscript to Cambridge, 1581.

From the West.

Simon, 1689, p. 360.


Pfaffii, *Dissertatio crit.*. p. 77. In Kipling, p. xii, note a.


In Kipling, p. xii, note a.

Wetstein, 1751, p. 30.

Marsh, 1795, pp. 681, 704f. (a probability)

Southern Gaul.

Scholz, J. M. A. *Curae Criticae in historiam textús Evangeliorum*.


*Novum Testamentum*, Leipzig, 1830, Proleg. i. pp. xxxixf., ciii.
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Credner, 1832, p. 517.


Harris, *Bezae*, 1891, pp. 3, 17, 26, 180.

Nestlé, 1895, 235-240, 238f.


Rejected

Schulz, 1827, p. 7.

Wilkins, 1894, 415f.

Brightman, F. E. ‘The Marginal Notes of Lections’. *JTS* I (1899-1900) 446-454, 254. (liturgical point of view)

Ropes, 1926, pp. lxiiiif. (historical point of view)

Lowe, *A Note*, 1927, p. 13. (palaeographical point of view)


Britain


Rejected

Kipling, 1793, p. iv.
Egypt

Exemplar of Codex Bezae


Matthaei. In Schulz, pp. 8f.

Codex Bezae

Kipling, 1793, pp. xvi.

Hug, 1826, p. 287.

Schulz. 1827, pp. 5, 8.


Rejected

Credner, 1832, pp. 509-11.


Zuntz, 1972, p. 205.


Additional Evidence


Country of mixed languages

Schulz. 1827, p. 9.


Cyprus

Credner, 1832, p. 513.

Judaeo-Christian circles

Credner, 1832, pp. 491f.


Rejected

Harris, Lectures, 1894, pp. 7ff.

Palestine

Credner, 1832, pp. 513f.

Clark, Acts, 1933, p. lxii.

Community in which Latin was the Vernacular

Credner, 1832, p. 517.

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxx.

Kenyon, Bezae, 1900, p. 296.

Burkitt, 1901-2, p. 505.

Province

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xl.

Kenyon, Bezae, 1900, p. 295.

Lowe, Bezae, 1913, p. 385.

Lowe, CLA II, 1935, No 140.

Antioch (Syria).

Chase, 1893, pp. 115-131, 136, 142f., 147-149.
Rejected

Zuntz, 1972, p. 205f.

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 264f.

Southern Italy

Lake, Origin, 1900, p. 443.

Brightman, 1899-1900, p. 254.

Sanday, William. Cited by Harris, Annotators, p. 4.

Chapman, Gospels, 1905, p. 345f.

Rejected

Harris, Bezae, 1891, pp. 21f., 26.

Kenyon, Handbook, 1901, p. 75.

Burkitt, 1901-2, p. 505, n. 1.


Ropes, 1926, pp. lxvii ff.

Clark, Acts, 1933, p. lvi.

Stone, 1946, p. 67.

Birdsall, 1986, p. 113f.

Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 262f.

Sardinia

Souter, Alexander. ‘The Original Home of Codex Claromontanus (DPAUL)’.

JTS 6 (1904-5) 240-243, 243.

Chapman, Gospels, 1905, p. 345f.

Rejected


Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 262.

Latin country

Greek Scriptorium

Rejected
Mercati, 1914, p. 450.
Ropes, 1926, pp. lviib.

Latin centre of calligraphy
Rejected
Ropes, 1926, pp. lviib.

Sicily
Ropes, 1926, pp. lxviiib.

Rejected
Vogel, K. Sneyders de. ‘Le Codex Bezae est-il d’origine sicilienne?’.

*BBC* 3 (1926) 10-13; 10, 12.
Birdsall, 1986, p. 112.

North Africa

Rejected
Birdsall, 1986, p. 112.
Dacia

Jerusalem
Stone, 1946, pp. 67f.

Rejected
Zuntz, 1972, p. 205.

Near-East centre - probability
Lowe, *CLA II, 1935, No* 140.

Congregation in which Greek was not well known

Western Europe

Product of a Greek-speaking and Greek-writing community

Edessa
Eastern

Bischoff, 1979, pp. 74f.


Berytus

Parker, Beza, 1992, pp. 269ff.

QUIRE SIGNATURES

Bracket, (∇) a Latin Custom

Mercati, 1914, p. 449.


Greek numerals - Latin position on the page in D

Mercati, 1914, p. 449.

Lowe, Lyons, 1924, p. 271.


Greek numerals - not uncommon in Latin MSS


RUNNING TITLES

Common to Latin Manuscripts

Mercati, 1914, p. 449.

Different Script from that in the Text


Bischoff, 1990, p. 79.

SCRIBE

Native language was Latin

Simon, 1689, p. 360.


In Kipling, p. xii.

Pfaff, Dissertatio crit., n. d., p. 77. In Kipling, p. xii, n. a.

Weitstein, 1751, pp. 30-32.

Scholz, N.T., 1830, p. xxxix.

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxx.

Kenyon, Handbook, 1901, p. 75.


Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 22, 29, 75, 266.

Rejected


Kipling, 1793, p. xii. (more than one scribe)

Marshall, 1795, p. 703.

Schulz, 1827, p. 9.

Clark, Acts, 1933, p. lviii.

Stone, 1946, p. 38.
Egyptian.


Neither a Latin or a Greek

Kipling, 1793, p. xii.
Schulz, 1827, p. 9.
Kenyon, Bezae, 1900, p. 295.
Lowe, A Note, 1927, pp. 13f.
Clark, Acts, 1933, p. lviii.
Lowe, CLA II, 1935, No 140.
Stone, 1946, p. 38.

Rejected


Accustomed to writing Greek

Marsh, 1795, p. 704.

Specialist hack/technically competent/poorly educated


Not Luke

Ramsay, St. Paul, 1895, p. 25.

Accustomed to Greek scribal tradition

Lowe, Beza, 1913, pp. 385f.

Rejected

Schulz, 1827, p. 9.
Mercati, 1914, pp. 449f.
Lowe, Lyons, 1924, p. 271.
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Lowe, CLA II, 1935, No 140.

Provincial.

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, pp. xl.


Lowe, CLA II, 1935, No 140.

Careless and ignorant.


Stone, 1946, p. 65.

Rejected

Blass, Philology, 1898, pp. 75f.

Fischer, 1972, p. 41, n. 131.

Copier of legal text


Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 266.

SCRIPT

b-d type uncial

A bookhand unique to Dca, p

Lowe, Bezae, 1913, p. 386.

Lowe, A Note, 1927, 14.

Not used in legal text

Half uncial type script

Egyptian and Greek Links


Bischoff, 1979, p. 72.

Represented by MSS from the third to the fifth Century

Bischoff, 1979, p. 72.

Used by the Latin Law School of Berytos (Beirut)

Bischoff, 1979, pp. 74f.

b-d uncial marginalia in MSS from Constantinople


SENSE-LINES and COLOMETRY

General reading


Began with Euthalius

Credner, 1832, p. 508.

Rejected


Harris, *Lectures*, 1894, p. 11.

Breaking up

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, pp. xviif.
Harris, Beza, 1891, pp. 242f.
Clark, Text, 1914, pp. 21, 51-57.

Closely linked to Codex k and very early

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xvii.
Harris, Beza, 1891, pp. 242f.

Similar to those of the Exemplar

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, pp. xxiii, xviif.
Harris, Beza, 1891, p. 242.
Harris, Lectures, 1894, p. 11.

Possibly of the Second Century

Harris, Lectures, 1894, p. 11.

All Manuscripts have an Archetype similar to that Found in D.

Clark, Text, 1914, pp. 81, 89f.

Egyptian Origin

Clark, Acts, 1933, p. lxii.

Misuse of the Term
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Exemplars of Gospels and Acts had different sense-lines.


SEQUENCE OF THE BOOKS:

Catholic Letters before Acts

Same order as in the Sahidic and Bohairic versions


Gospels

Same in W. which is from Egypt


An Indication that Codex Bezæ was written where Latin was the vernacular.


Not the Order of its Archetype.


Old Latin (Western) order


SORTES SANCTORUM

Similar to that in Codex Sangermanensis (g')

Harris, Bezae, 1891, p. 11.

Ropes, 1926, p. ix.

Totally Greek

Lowe, Bezae, 1913, p. 388.

SUPPLEMENTAL LEAVES

The supplemental leaves contain in the Latin, Matt. 2:21 qui to 3:7 fugere; John 18:2 iudas to 20:1 essent; Mk 16:6 crucifixum to 16:20 amen'; and in the Greek, Matt 3:7 απο to 3:16 Θυ; Jn 18:14 εν to 20:13 κλαιεις; Mk 16:15 παση to 16:20 αμην'.

Date when Written

Greek text

Tenth century

Wetstein, 1751, p. 31.

Twelfth century


Kipling, 1793, p. xviii.

Latin text

Ninth/Tenth century

Kipling, 1793, p. xviii.
Both texts

Tenth century


Ninth century


End of eighth, beginning of ninth century


Scribe

Latin

Wetstein, 1751, p. 31.


Harris, *Annotators*, 1901, pp. 107f.

Hand M₂


Unaquainted with spoken Greek?


---

\(^1\) Birdsall (p. 104, n. 15) incorrectly gives the date of publication as 1948. Parker (*Bezae*, p. 45) repeats the error.

Not a Calabrian


Florus¹


Lowe, *CLA II*, 1935, No 140.


Latin of indifferent Greek scholarship


Source

Derived from the Vulgate


Mizzi, 1963, p. 150.

Clementine Printed Edition


Rejected

Mizzi, 1963, p. 150.

Codex Amiatinus and the best Mss.

Mizzi, 1963, pp. 150, 163.

Ms Lyons 431 - possibility


A Greek text


¹ Lowe (*Pal. Papers* II, p. 467) states: 'it is important to bear in mind that no Lyons manuscript employs methods and practices not at home in a Latin scriptorium, none shows features unfamiliar to a Latin scribe.'
Blue ink linked to Lyons

Lowe, Lyons, 1924, pp. 272f.

Question-mark - linked to Lyons

Lowe, Lyons, 1924, p. 273f.

Q-Uncial

Used at least in France, England, and Germany.


Came into being after Uncia had ceased to be a normal Bookhand.


Columns written by same hand

Scrivener, Bezae, 1864, p. xxi.

Rejected

Parker, Bezae, 1992, p. 93.

Text

Greek text - Latinized to the point of being worthless


Wetstein, 1751, p. 32.


Harris, *Beza*, 1891, pp. 41-46, 61, 94-108, 113f.

Bakker, Adolphine. In Fischer, p. 42, n. 137.


---

1 Referred to as: Lucas Brugensis and Lukas von Brügge.

Wetstein (p. 32) quotes Luc de Bruges as saying: *Ad Latina castigagatum [sic.] vchemens mihi suscipio [sic.] est, cum ex hoc loco, tum ex aliis pluribus. [‘I strongly suspect both from this passage and from many others, that it has been edited to agree with the Latin.’].

2 The dates and some of the Christian names of these scholars were not provided by Mill, but have been gleaned from other sources.
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Rejected

Sepulvedas, Juan Ginez in a Letter to Erasmus, 1534. In Wetstein, p. 33.


Michælis, 1788.¹ *Vide*: Marsh, pp. 229f.

Kipling, 1793, p. vi.

Marsh, 1795, pp. 677ff.

Hug, 1808, p. 164.

Schulz, 1827, p. 10.

Credner, 1832, pp. 460, 462.


Hort, 1881, pp. 82f., 120.

Hort’s biography. Cited by J. Rendel Harris, *BBC* 3 (1926) 1-9, 4.

---

¹ This is the date of Michælis’s fourth edition; therefore he may have made the same statement in an earlier addition.
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Wilkins, 1894, pp. 391, 413.
Clark, Acts, 1933, pp. 219f., xliv; q.v., pp. 192-220.
Klijn, Survey, 1949, p. 41.
Fischer, 1972, p. 42.
Parker, Dictation, 1982, pp. 110f.
Parker, οὖν, 1985, p. 272.
Parker, Bezae, 1992, pp. 192f.

Result of a sixth-century falsifier

Arnaud (Arnaudis), A. Dissertation critique touchant les exemplaires grecs sur lesquels M. Simon prétend que l’ancienne Vulgate a esté faite, et sur le jugement que l’on doit faire du fameux manuscrit de Bèze.
Cologne, 1691.

D text influenced by Latin text, but only to a minor or negligible degree

Credner, 1832, p. 515.
Wilkins, 1894, p. 413, 417f.
Burkitt, 1901-2, p. 512.
Hort - from Biography. Cited by Harris, BBC 3 (1926) 1-9, 4.
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**Latin Text - derived from D or a text similar to it**

Kipling, 1793, pp. xf.


Ropes, 1926, pp. lxxx, cxi.


**Rejected**

Wilkins, 1894, p. 391.

Stone, 1946, p. 16.

**Latin Text - Assimilated to D to some degree**

Horne, 1868, p. 170.

Hort, 1881, pp. 82f.

Burkitt, 1901-2, p. 510.

Ropes, 1926, p. lxxx, cxi.


Stone, 1946, pp. 41, 65.
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Fischer, 1972, p. 42.

**Latin Text - Derived from a Latin text**

Schulz, 1827, p. 15.
Hort, 1881, pp. 82f.

**Both D and d have influenced each other**

Ropes, 1926, p. lxxviii.
Vogels, Heinrich Joseph. ‘Codex Bezae als Bilingue’. *BBC* 2 (1926) 8-12, 10f.
Stone, 1946, p. 16.

**Latin Text**

**Date**

**Fifth century**


**Second century**

Harris, *Codex*, 1891, pp. 51, 162, 164, 191.

**Ancient form of the Old Latin text.**

Hort, 1881, pp. 82f.
Ropes, 1926, pp. lxxx, cxi.

**Rejected**

Fischer, 1972, p. 42.
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General differences from other MSS exist, but few.

Stone, 1946, p. 65.

Language of the same character as other MSS. of the period

Stone, 1946, p. 65.

Influenced by the Greek original.


Has African links


A homogenous text

Parker, ooν, 1985, p. 267.

All four Gospels translated by one man/group of men.

Parker, ooν, 1985, p. 268.

Acts different to the Gospels.

Kipling, 1793, p. xif.

Parker, ooν, 1985, p. 268.

Greek Text

Dependent upon or influenced by a Syrian text


Schulz, 1827, p. 21 (or oriental text).

Chase, 1893, pp. 1, 205f

Plooij, D. BBC 5 (1928) 29f., 30).


Zuntz, 1972, p. 205f.
Rejected


Common text.


Independent text.


A composite of western and a common Greek text


A composite of western contaminated by non-western texts

Ropes, 1926, p. lxxxiif.

Conformed to old-uncial text of B.

Ropes, 1926, p. lxxx - lxxxiii.


Derived from a Greek text.

Ropes, 1926, p. lxxiv.


A composite of the original text and additions by one person
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Acts rather heterogeneous in character

Orthography - archaic and archaizing.

Difference in age between the two texts
Credner, 1832, pp. 466, 491.
Chase, 1893, p. 5.

Original text

Rejected

Redaction/revision
Ramsay, *St. Paul*, 1895, p. 27

Assimilation
Rejected
Wilkins, 1894, pp. 391, 414.

Independent texts
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Text of Synoptic Gospels different to the text of Acts

Epp. 1966, p. 86.

Supported to some extent


Derived from an Aramaic version of the true text


..........................o0o..........................
APPENDIX D

WORDS OF INTEREST

Given below is a list of all the words in the Bezan Acts that are spelled contrary to the Greek found in Nestle-Aland. Many of these are one off spellings and suggest errors in pronunciation, e.g. itacisms. There are, however, such words as βαπτισθεσθαι, ἀναγείνωσκω, ἀνακρείνω, Δαυείδ, Καισάρια, κείνω, θλείψις, σειγαω, and τεχνείταις, which appear more than once, and which are constantly spelled the same throughout the text. Such consistency in spelling goes beyond error and portrays a standard. If this is true, an analysis of the use of these words might disclose a pattern of their use in location and time. Initially a search of the various publications that centre upon Greek papyri, ostraca, and tablets was undertaken, but the rewards were few for the hundreds of hours spent, thus the project lapsed. When, however, the Packard Humanities Institute released their CD ROM’s, which contains such data, interest was again roused and an analysis of these words completed.

As to the data contained in the following list, a word of explanation will be of assistance: each word is given as it initially appears in Acts, followed in brackets by the root of that word with its conventional spelling. Cited immediately after that is the verse or verses in which the word appears - not necessarily in the same form, but containing the additional emboldened letter or letters, which make it, if not unique, at least different from the conventionally spelled word. Following these are the verses in which the same word appears, but in its usual form - these verses begin with ‘Cf.’. Then comes the word or that part of the word used in the search, e.g. a search using the following fragment, ἀναγινωσκ... specified as a fragment will result in every word containing these letters in this order including what ever letters might come
after, and if so desired, including any prefixed letters. Immediately after the word used in the search is the number of citations for that particular word.

The data of a number of these words was then sorted with respect to time and location. The results of which are contained in the table, pp. 447f. Unfortunately the exercise proved fruitless, mainly because of the many citations that are not dated, or, to a far lesser degree, not located geographically. Therefore most of the citations not of Greece and Egypt do not appear on the table giving a very biased result. Furthermore the majority of citations, which come from Egypt, show that both forms of spelling were used there. The few citations that come from Greece demonstrate a propensity to favour the spelling of the Bezan words, but are insufficient in number to draw a firm conclusion. The following breakdown of the citations of the word Καισαρεία should adequately demonstrate the limitations of the existing data.

Of the 47 Καισαρεία citations, the majority, 32, come from Anatolia. These citations, however, are not dated and therefore are not listed in the table. Of the five citations that come under the heading 'Greece'¹ none fall within the time span of the study. Of the remainder, four have no location, and five are cited in only four documents from Egypt. Consequently only the latter four appear in the table.

.....................o0o.....................

ἀντιπιπτεται (ἀντιπίπτω) 7:51. ἀντιπιπτεται - nil.

ἀντιπιπτετε - nil.

βαπτισθησεθαι (βαπτίζω) 1:5; 11:16. βαπτισθησεθαι - nil.

βαπτισθησθε - nil.

¹ The term Greece encompasses modern day Greece, the Islands, and the Peloponnese.
Appendix D

γυναικαῖος  (γυνή)  5:2. Cf. 1:14; 5:1, 14; 7:14; 8:3, 12; 13:50;
16:1, 13; 17:4, 12; 18:2; 21:5; 22:4. 57;
16:14; 17:34. γυναικαῖος - nil.


αἰχθεῖς  (ἐχθές)  7:28. αἰχθεῖς - nil, ἐχθές - 32x.


15:20, 29; 16:3, 7; 17:18, 20; 18:15, 21; 19:1,
14, 33; 20:3.

ἡθελησαί - nil, ἡθελησ... 112x.

Καισάρεια  (Καισάρεια)  11:11; 12:19. Καισάρεια... nil.

Καισαριαν  (Καισάρεια)  10:24f; 18:22. Καισαρια... 11x.

Καισάρεια... 47x.

μελλεταί  (μέλλω)  1:5; 5:35. Cf. 3:3; 11:28; 12:6; 13:34;
16:27; 17:31; 18:14; 19:27; 20:3f, 7, 13(2),
38; 21:27, 37. μελλεταί - 1x,

μέλλετε - 5x.

προσέχεται  (προσέχω)  5:35; 20:28. Cf. 8:6, 10f; 16:14.

προσέχεται - nil, προσέχετε - 4x.

............................................οόο............................................

ἀγνεισθείς  (ἀγνισθ)  21:26. Cf. 21:24. ἀγνεισθείς - nil,
ἀγνισθείς - 1x.

ἀδεικεῖται  (ἀδικέω)  7:26. Cf. 7:24, 26; 7:26f. ἀδεικεῖται - nil,
ἀδικεῖται - nil, ἀδικεῖτε - nil.


ἀναγεινω... 20x, ἀναγινω... 49x.

ἀναιτείους  (ἀναιτίος)  16:37. ἀναιτεί... nil, ἀναιτι... 31x.
ἀνακρεῖνω  (ἀνακρίνω)  4:9; 12:19; 17:11. ἀνακρεῖν... 1x, ἀνακρίν... 7x.

ἀνηγγείλλον  (ἀναγγέλλω)  14:27. Cf. 4:2; 15:4; 19:18; 20:20, 27. ἀνηγγείλλ... nil, ἀνηγγειλλ... 15x.

ἀποκρείθεις  (ἀποκρίνομαι)  4:19; 8:24; 21:37. Cf. 3:12; 19:15; 22:8, 28. ἀποκρεῖθ... 2x, ἀποκρεῖν... 11x, ἀποκριθ... 21x, ἀποκριν... 112x.

'Αρεοπαγείτης  ('Αρεοπαγίτης)  17:34. 'Αρεοπαγείτ... 57x, 'Αρεοπαγιτ... 14x.

ἀτενείσαν  (ἀτενίζω)  3:4f; 7:55; 13:9. Cf. 1:10; 3:3, 12; 6:15; 11:6; 14:9. ἀτενεία... nil, ἀτενείς... nil, ἀτενία... 2x, ἀτενίς... 1x.

βασιλείασα  (βασιλίσα)  8:27. βασιλεῖα... 1x, βασιλίσα... a great many (agm).

γεινεοθώ  (γίνομαι)  21:14. γεινεοθ... 89x, γενεοθ... agm.

γεινομενου  (γίνομαι)  12:9. γεινομ... agm.

γεινοσκετώ  (γινώσκω)  2:36; 19:15, 35; 20:23, 34; 21:37. Cf. 1:7; 17:13, 19f; 21:24, 34. γεινωσκ... 136x, γινώσκ... 380x.


δειωκεις  (διώκω)  22:8. Cf. 7:52; 22:4, 7. δειωκ... nil, διωκ... 38x.


\[\text{διετρεισθαι} \quad \text{(διατριβω)} \quad 15:35. \text{ Cf. 12:19; 14:3, 7, 19, 28; 16:12, 20:6.} \text{ διετρεισθαι} \ 1x, \ \text{διετριβα... 3x,} \ \\
\text{διατριβα... 15x,} \quad \text{διατριβα... 101x.} \]

\[\text{διεκπειν} \quad \text{(διακρινω)} \quad 15:9. \text{ Cf. 10:20; 11:2,} \text{ διεκπειν... 23x,} \ \\
\text{διακρινω... 24x, διεκπειν...} \text{ nil,} \ \\
\text{διακρινω... nil.} \]

\[\text{δυναμεσαι} \quad \text{(δυναμις)} \quad 2:22. \text{ Cf. 1:8; 3:12; 4:7, 33; 6:8; 8:10, 13; 10:38; 19:8, 11.} \ \\
\text{δυναμεσαι - nil,} \ \\
\text{δυναμεσαι - 7x.} \]


\[\text{Εγινπτιος} \quad \text{(Αιγυπτιος)} \quad 21:38. \text{ Cf. 7:22, 24, 28.} \]

\[\text{Εγινπτω} \quad \text{(Αιγυπτος)} \quad 7:17, 34. \text{ Cf. 2:10; 7:9, 10(2), 11f, 15, 18, 34, 36, 39f; 13:17. \quad} \text{Εγινπτ... 19x.} \ \\
\text{Αιγυπτ... 791x.} \]
εἰασεώς (ἰασίς)  4:22. Cf. 4:30. εἰασεῖ - 1x, εἰασι - 1x, εἰασίν - 3x, εἰασῶν - 1x, ἰασί - 2x, ἰασεῖ - 3x, ἰασεῖς - 35x, ἰασεώς - 3x, ἰασίν - 5x, ἰασίς - 3x, ἰασῶν - 191x.


εἰδεῖν - 4x.


εἰδοὺ - 43x, ἰδού - 162x.

εἰρεῖσ (ἰερεύς)  4:1. Cf. 6:7; 14:13. εἰρεῖ - 1x, εἰρεῖς - 1x, εἰρεος - 2x, εἰρεὺς - 8x, εἰρεων - 7x, εἰρεως - 10x.

Εἰεροσολυμα (Ἱεροσόλυμα)  8:25. Cf. e.g. 13:13; 18:21; 19:1, 20:16, 22. Εἰεροσολυμα... 2x, Ἱεροσολυμα... 17x.

εἰμασίν (ἰμάς)  22:25. εἰμας - 2x, εἰμασι - 2x, εἰμᾶς - 10x, εἰμάντος - 1x, εἰμάντι - 5x, εἰμάντα - 3x, εἰμάντες - 19x, εἰμάντων - 4x, εἰμαςι - 1x, εἰμάντας - 12x.

εἰματια (ἰμάτιον)  7:58; 18:6; 22:20, 23. Cf. 12:8; 14:14; 16:22. εἰματια - 6x, εἰματιον - 4x, εἰματίου - 7x, εἰματιων - 3x, εἰματίος - 4x, εἰμάτια - 103x, εἰμάτιον - 117x, εἰμάτιου - 33x, εἰμάτιο - 1x, εἰματίων - 64x, εἰματίος - 7x.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description and References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἰμιτισμοῦ</td>
<td>(ἰματισμός) 20:33, εἰμιτισμόν - 6x, εἰμιτισμοῦ - 6x, εἰμιτισμω - 1x, ἰματισμός &amp; declensions - 141x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰσχυσεν</td>
<td>(ἰσχύω) 19:16. Cf. 6:10; 15:10; 19:20. εἰσχυσ... 8x, ἰσχυσ... 22x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκεινηθη</td>
<td>(κινέω) 14:7; 17:28; 21:30. ἐκεινηθ... nil, ἐκινηθ... nil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐλπιδει</td>
<td>(ἐλπίς) 2:26. ἐλπιδει - 1x, ἐλπιδι - 16x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐξεισταντο</td>
<td>(ἐξίστημι) 2:7, 12; 8:9, 13. Cf. 8:11; 10:45; 12:16. ἐξεισταντ... nil, ἐξισταντ... 3x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔξεφυης</td>
<td>(ἐξαφυῆς) 22:6. ἔξεφυη... 1x, ἔξαφυην... 5x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπεδευθη</td>
<td>(παιδεύω) 7:22. Cf. 22:3. ἐπεδευθ... nil, ἐπαιδευθ... 2x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπειβαλουτεσ</td>
<td>(ἐπιβάλλω) 4:3. Cf. 5:18; 12:1; 21:27. ἐπειβαλ... 1x, ἐπιβαλ... agm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θλειψεων</td>
<td>(θλίψις) 7:10f; 8:1; 11:19; 13:50; 14:22; 20:23. θλειψ... 1x, θλιψ... 20x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰσραηλειται</td>
<td>(Ἰσραηλίτης) 2:22; 5:35; 21:28. Cf. 3:12; 13:16. Ἰσραηλείτ... 1x, Ἰσραηλίτ... 3x.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
καθερισθαι (καθαίρεω) 19:27. Cf. 13:19, 29. καθερισθ... nil, καθερισθ... nil, καθαίρεσθ... nil.

Κευχρειαὶς (Κεγχρεαίς) 18:18. Κευχρεια... nil, Κεγχρεα... nil. Κεγχρεια... nil, Κεγχρεα... 2x.


λευειτῆς (Λευέτης) 4:36. λευείτ... 2x, λευείτ... 3x.

λειμος (λιμός) 7:11; 11:28. λειμ...nil, λιμός & declensions - 172x.

μερεις (μερίς) 8:21. μερείς - 1x, μερίς - 26x.

Μειλητον (Μιλητος) 20:15, 17. Μειλητ... 24x, Μιλητ... 123x.

νυνει (νυνί) 22:1. νυνει - 81x, νυνί - 281x.


ομειλησας (ομιλέω) 20:11. ομειλ... 10x, ομιλ... 34x.

παραγγελειαν (παραγγελία) 16:24. Cf. 5:28.παραγγελει... 4x, παραγγελι... 347x.

παρεβειασατο (παραβιάζομαι) 16:15. παρεβειασ... nil.

πατερειον (πατήρ) 7:44. Cf. 1:4, 7; 2:33; 3:13, 22, 25; 5:30; 7:2(2), 4, 11f, 14f, 19f, 32, 38f, 45(2), 51; 13:17, 32, 36; 15:10; 16:1, 3; 22:1. πατερεια... nil, πατερασ... nil.

1 The first ε could have been added by mistake since all have it in the plural apart from the dative.
περιεστράψα (περιαστράττω) 22:6. περιεστρα... nil, περιεστρα... nil.

Πειλατος (Πιλάτος) 3:13; 13:28. Cf. 4:27. Πειλατ... 12x,
 Πιλατ... 17x.

ποιμενειν (ποιμαίνω) 20:28. ποιμενειν - nil, ποιμαίνειν - 2x.

πυμανειου (ποίμινον) 20:29. Cf. 20:28. πυμει... nil,
 ποιμνι... 9x.

πολειτειαν (πολιτεία) 22:28. πολειτει... 75x, πολιτει... agm.

προθυμειας (προθυμία) 17:11. προθυμει... 3x, προθυμι... 193x.

προσδοκειας (προσδοκία) 12:11. προσδοκει... 1x, προσδοκι... 93x.

 13:3; 14:23; 16:25. προσευχ... 6x.

ραβδειζειν (ραβδίζω) 16:22. ραβδειζ... nil, ραβδίζ... nil.

ρειπτουντων [ν] (ρειπτούντων) 22:23. ρειπτοντ... nil, ρειπτουντ... nil,
 ρειπτουντ... nil.


Σαυλ... nil, Σαουλ... 8x.

έσειγησαν (σιγάω) 12:17; 13:41; 15:12f. σειγ... 3x,
 σιγα... 6x, σιγη... 8x.

Σειλαν (Σίλας) 15:22, 32, 34, 40; 17:10, 14f. Cf. 15:27;
 16:19, 25, 29; 17:4; 18:5. Σειλ...5x,
 Σιλ...13x.

Σευνα (Σινά) 7:30, 38. Σευνα - nil, Σινά - 90x.

σειτια (σιτίων) 7:12. σειτ... 2x, σιτ... 8x.

σειωςπις (σιωπάω) 18:9. σειωπ... nil, σιωπ... 15x.στρατεια
 (στρατιά) 7:42. στρατεια - 45x, στρατειαι - 8x.
 στρατειαν - 7x, στρατειασ - 52x,
 στρατειων - 3x, στρατιά - 7x,

1 It appears that the writer has neglected the augment.
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υπολαμβανεται (υπολαμβάνω) 2:15. ύπολαμβανεται - nil.

συνεκεινησαν (συγκινέω) 6:12. συνεκεινησα... nil, συνεκινησα... nil.


Συρειαν (Συρία) 15:23. Cf. 15:41; 18:18; 20:3. Συρεία... 1x, Συρία... 158x.

tετρακισειλιους (τετρακισχίλιοι) 21:38. τετρακισείλ... 62x, τετρακισχίλ... 171x.

tεχνειταις (τεχνίτης) 19:24, 25, 38. τεχνειταις - 19x, τεχνίταις - 96x.


τειμωρησωσιν (τιμωρέω) 22:5. τειμωρ... 9x, τιμωρ... 64x.

Φοινεικης (Φοινίκη) 11:19; 21:2. Cf. 15:3. Φοινεικη... 27x, Φοινικη... 29x

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Χειου (Χῖος)</td>
<td>20:15. Χειοι - 1x, Χειοις - 1x, Χειου - 3x,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Χειουν - 3x, Χειω - 2x, Χειους - 1x,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Χειου - 1x, Χῖος - 60x, Χῖον - 61x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>others not checked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χρειστιανοι (Χριστιανός)</td>
<td>11:26. Χρειστιαν... 35x,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Χριστιαν... 97x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>έχρεισας (χρίω)</td>
<td>4:27. Cf. 10:38. έχρεισ... 4x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>έχρισ... 11x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFRICA*/ANATOLIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>αναγεινωσκ...</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>αναγινωσκ...</strong></td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ανακρειν...</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ανακριν...</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>αποκρειθ...</strong></td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>αποκριθ...</strong></td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>αποκρειν...</strong></td>
<td>0/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Αρεοπαγειτ...</strong></td>
<td>5/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Αρεοπαγιτ...</strong></td>
<td>0/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>γεινεθ...</strong></td>
<td>4/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>γινεθ...</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>γεινωσκ...</strong></td>
<td>5/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>γινωσκ...</strong></td>
<td>6/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>δεξ...</strong></td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>δεξαι...</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>διετρειβ...</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>διετριβ...</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>διατρειβ...</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>διατριβ...</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AFRICA*/ANATOLIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I    II   III   IV  V   VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐγυπτ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αἴγυπτ...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰδοῦ</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἴδοῦ</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἴματι... + decl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἴματι... + decl.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θέλεται</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θέλετε</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καισάρια...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καισάρεια...</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Where a solidus is given, the first number is the definite number of documents containing the particular word, the last is the possible number of documents containing the word. The latter number arises since the date of some documents fall outside the range of a single century. For example 2/3 for ἴδοῦ, indicates that there are two documents from both the second and third century that contain ἴδοῦ - this accounts for the 2 under both these centuries - with one further document, which is dated the second or third century, and since this latter document could fall within either the second or the third century it is added to both centuries and shown as a possible three.
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