

cognized this relation of His to the Old Testament. He made no greater claim for Himself than that He was come for its fulfilment. To destroy this relation would be ruthless enough if it were

possible. But it is not possible. And the more the Christian and theologian cares for an organic conception of his religion, the more has the Old Testament to say to him.

## The Evangelion Da: Mepharreshe.

BY MRS. AGNES SMITH LEWIS, HON. PHIL. DR. (HALLE-WITTENBERG), HON. LL.D. (ST. AND.),  
HON. D.D. (HEIDELBERG), CAMBRIDGE.

SYRIAC and Biblical scholars will accord a hearty welcome to the new edition of the Curetonian Gospels plus the text of the Gospels in the Sinai palimpsest, which has been edited by Mr. Burkitt, under the appropriate title of *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe*, and published by the Cambridge University Press. A new edition of Cureton has long been wanted, as I know to my cost, for in 1892-1893, after it was known to a small circle that I had discovered the sister manuscript, I was unable to buy, steal, borrow, or even see a copy of this book until the very eve of my second departure for Sinai, when Canon Cureton's own copy was kindly put into my hands by one of his daughters, who had been for two years our next-door neighbour.

The preparation of a second and critical edition was entrusted by the Syndics of the University Press to the late Professor Bensly some twenty-four years ago. Few men could have brought to the task a greater store of erudition, or a better endowment of the caution so necessary in dealing with conflicting theories as to the origin and history of the Syriac versions; and it is matter for regret that he left but little record of the labour he had bestowed upon it, so that when his mantle fell upon the shoulders of his accomplished pupil, Mr. F. Crawford Burkitt, the work had to be begun almost *de novo*. The task of editing the text cannot be a difficult one; for it had already been carefully done by its first decipherer from a manuscript whose writing is still very distinct. But the problems which surround this interesting version, and especially the question, in what relation it stands to the *Diatessaron* of Tatian, are still, even after the floods of discussion called forth by the publication of the Sinai text in 1894, almost as far as ever from solution. Mr. Burkitt has attacked them with boldness. He brings to bear on them a great amount of erudition and

patient industry, logical acumen, and a capacity for taking trouble with minute details which Cureton's text would not have given him scope enough to exercise. He has therefore done well to include in his volume the text of the Sinai palimpsest, so infinitely more difficult to decipher; and so suggestive of problems which affect the very foundations of historic Christianity.

The Sinai text has been published in two forms, the Syndics' edition, containing a transcription made from the manuscript itself by three Cambridge scholars, the late Professor Bensly, Dr. Rendel Harris, and Mr. F. Crawford Burkitt, in the spring of 1893, and a reprint of 98 pages, containing the result of my own investigation in the spring of 1895, when I re-examined the manuscript and filled up many *lacunæ*, ranging in extent from single words to half pages, and even to whole ones, which, for lack of time, had been left by the first transcribers. This was partly done by the help of a reagent from which Mr. Burkitt and his coadjutors had also profited more or less during the last thirty days of their stay at the Monastery in 1893; Professor Bensly being the only one who had scruples about using it. I need not say that it was by no means the easiest part of the pages which was left to me. If Mr. Burkitt had investigated the interior portions of pages 106a, 109b, 123a, and 128b, instead of merely copying a few distinct words in the margins and elsewhere, he would not question Dr. Rendel Harris' opinion that the surface of some of the pages has been scraped with a knife (vol. ii. p. 28 note). My verdict is, 'If not with a knife, then with very rough pumice stone.' For even the letters are disjointed, and can only be recognized by their heads being sought for above the place where they ought to be, and their tails, when they have any, at a corresponding distance beneath. Mr. Burkitt is most

impartial in his proposed corrections, some of these being in his own transcript, and some in the transcripts of his friends, including myself. He has also adopted many of the corrections which I made in 1895.

Mr. Burkitt is a close observer and a careful reader. He has made excellent use of the four volumes of photographs which I placed in the University Library, and of the still clearer ones which I took in 1902, and which I lent to him for a whole year before they were added to the Library volumes last August. He has also examined the transcript which I made in 1895, from which, to my lasting regret, I was persuaded to edit away several characteristic and perfectly correct phrases, and to replace them by Peshitta words in brackets. I am therefore grateful to Mr. Burkitt for restoring the true reading in Mk 12<sup>23, 29</sup>, Lk 6<sup>24</sup> 12<sup>55</sup>, partly in Lk 6<sup>33</sup>, and in Lk 13<sup>20</sup>.

This book marks a considerable advance in our knowledge of what the text really is. But we are not yet at the final goal. In some verses the author says, 'S. illegible,' yet the text of them has been for three years in my desk. In other verses he has made conjectures, aided by the Peshitta, which differ considerably from my latest transcript. Thus I am in a position to dispute his reading of more than eighty verses. Two sources have been open to me for ascertaining these.

First, the MS. itself. True, I got little new information from it in 1897. I was then just recovering from a long and very enfeebling rheumatic illness; and the purpose of that visit to Sinai was an inspection of the Palestinian Syriac lectionaries. In 1902 I had completely recovered my health, and the five years' interval had been spent, for the most part, in the work of deciphering other palimpsests.

Secondly, I have adopted a suggestion made by my sister, Mrs. Gibson, while we were in New York, in the autumn of last year. Observing that a page of the Sinai palimpsest, thrown on a screen during a lecture given by us at the Jewish Theological Seminary, could be very easily read, she said to me, 'Why do you not turn all your photographs of that MS. into slides, and read them in the light of an electric lantern? You would get a much better control of the text.' That proposal was carried out by us as soon as possible after our return home, and so for seventy days in the spring and autumn of 1904 we spent our evening hours

reading all we could see of the text from beginning to end.

We were disappointed to find that the light would not show up any part of the text that is quite illegible in the manuscript. But for the determination of spaces it is unrivalled. It can tell to a nicety how many letters there are in each word, and whether any word has been dropped out in the transcription. Especially is it valuable in determining the presence or absence of a *yod*; the writing being so regular that each single letter occupies the same amount of space as its neighbour. In this way we soon ascertained that the unjust steward of Lk 16<sup>8</sup> was commended by the lord (מריא), and not by the Lord (מריא). I am glad to observe that Mr. Burkitt has also made this important correction.

The verses in which I firmly believe that I have the better text divide themselves into two classes.

i. Cases in which Mr. Burkitt has either said, 'S. illegible,' or in which he has filled up a gap with words copied from the Peshitta, placing these in brackets. My transcript of such verses from the manuscript is, I venture to think, more to be depended on, in so far as it sometimes shows a text which would not naturally have occurred to me, and which is not identical with either the Curetonian or the Peshitta. Such verses are:—  
Mt 8<sup>26, 29, 33</sup> 9<sup>1, 2, 3, 10</sup> 11<sup>4, 23</sup> 17<sup>17</sup> 24<sup>43</sup> 25<sup>11</sup> 26<sup>3, 5, 15</sup>,  
Mk 4<sup>1</sup> 9<sup>18</sup> 12<sup>19, 20, 22</sup> 14<sup>22, 24</sup>, Lk 5<sup>22, 26</sup> 6<sup>33</sup> 8<sup>15</sup> 9<sup>52</sup> 10<sup>8, 4</sup>  
17<sup>17</sup> 19<sup>4, 5</sup> 23<sup>53</sup> 24<sup>39, 41</sup>, Jn 1<sup>29, 32</sup> 3<sup>14, 21</sup> 4<sup>1</sup> 5<sup>19, 20, 21</sup>,  
23, 25 6<sup>12, 19, 22</sup> 7<sup>11, 25</sup> 8<sup>22</sup> 9<sup>9</sup> 10<sup>11, 36, 38, 39</sup> 11<sup>44</sup> 12<sup>29, 44</sup>  
13<sup>23, 29</sup> 13<sup>32</sup> 14<sup>28</sup> 15<sup>3, 7, 8</sup> 15<sup>24</sup> 18<sup>10</sup>.

ii. A few cases in which Mr. Burkitt, in the impulse of a natural enthusiasm, has made changes which I feel to be arbitrary. It will perhaps be difficult, in the face of his deservedly high reputation for accuracy, to convince scholars that this can be. But I will try.

Take first the second line of the final colophon to the upper writing on f. 181a.<sup>1</sup> I edited this in *Studia Sinaitica*, No. ix., and I kept back the book for a few days from publication, in order to allow of Mr. Burkitt's printing in an appendix the text of a shorter colophon on f. 165b which I had stupidly overlooked, and from which he supplied the word מוצרין to my transcript, it being quite illegible in the two dim photographs of a faded page which I had with difficulty read. So far well. But he went further, and insisted on changing my כוכב or כורב

<sup>1</sup> *Studia Sinaitica*, No. ix. pp. xxiv and 7f.

כור. Being at Sinai in 1902, Mrs. Gibson and I both verified it as a word of four letters. Of these כו and ב are as legible as anything else in the upper writing of the manuscript. The third letter has been partly rubbed out, and is either a *kaf* or a *resh* with two dots over it. I have stated this in *Studia Sinaitica*, No. xi. pp. v, vi. Mr. Burkitt repeats his erroneous emendation on page 19, vol. ii., of the present work. Syriac scholars can perhaps judge for themselves by looking at the penultimate page of my photographs in the University Library. It is numbered f. 181a or 361. The reverse of that leaf contains only five lines of the upper writing at the top of the page, being the latter half of the final colophon. The palimpsest text, which occupies the rest of that page, is in *sloping* Greek uncials. None of them could by any means fall into the shape of a כ and show through the vellum. Just after the כ we find what Dr. Rendel Harris calls a 'lapidary stop' (:); and there is a similar stop separating each word of that colophon from its neighbour.

Mt 5<sup>20</sup>. Mr. Burkitt has done well in restoring the word זרִיקוּת[בן] to this difficult verse. But when he tries to squeeze the word דְּשָׁמַיָא, 'of heaven,' into a line which distinctly ends with למְלוּכוּתָא, 'kingdom,' in the MS., he does something for which I can see no justification (vol. i. p. 542). Mrs. Gibson and I examined the place, at Mr. Burkitt's request, during our last visit to the Monastery, and we could find no trace of that word either above or below the line. After all, what is wrong with the reading? May our Lord not have spoken, at least once, of 'the kingdom,' which is surely not confined to any place with a conventional name?

In Mt 27<sup>43</sup> Mr. Burkitt suggests (Appendix, vol. i. p. 544) that the true reading of this verse may be הוּא עַל אֱלֹהֵי [אֲנִי] הוּא [דִּן] חֵכִיל הוּא עַל אֱלֹהֵי, thus assimilating it to the text of D a b d. There is no need for such cumbersome phraseology. The true reading will be found by substituting הֵא, *ecce*, for הוּא at the beginning of the sentence.

בֵּה is not the reading of Mk 4<sup>17</sup>. It is בְּהוּן, as I have ascertained from the manuscript. 'And they have no root in them.'

I agree with Mr. Burkitt that the words הֵא וְהֵנָּה in Lk 2<sup>12</sup> must be wrong (vol. i. p. 548). In a duplicate copy of my transcript, made each evening in my tent while at Sinai in 1895, I find that the line runs הֵא וְהֵנָּה לְכֹן אֵתָא, 'Behold, and thus there

is a sign unto you.' I do not know that this is more satisfactory.

I am certain that I have examined the word הוּוּוּ on v.<sup>9</sup> on three different occasions—in 1895, 1897, and 1902—with a strong desire to abolish the *waw*, but it was too distinct to permit of my doing so. Whether the sign of the plural be on the word מַלְאֲכָא, 'angels,' or whether it be the conventional 'angel,' we cannot easily discover, owing to the impenetrable veil cast over it by John the Stylite: but we may find a way out of the difficulty by supposing that some other words than קָאָם preceded דְּמֵרִיא.

We now come to the shepherds. I have happily no longer any doubt as to what word they are reported to have used for 'let us go.' I have spent hours over the page trying to decipher the two or three letters which follow נַת (v.<sup>15</sup>) Three years ago they yielded up their secret. I therefore protest strongly against the very distinct *tau* being deleted. The word is [נַתְעַלְלִין], the first person plural, imperfect 'Ethpaal of the verb עַל.

I am glad to observe, however, that some emendations which I have made by the light of the lantern, or in the more glowing effulgence of the desert sunshine, have occurred to Mr. Burkitt either as conjectures or as realities.

Examples of these will be found in Mt 2<sup>22</sup> 4<sup>18</sup> 9<sup>27</sup> 12<sup>34</sup> 13<sup>5</sup> 22<sup>13</sup> 26<sup>34</sup>, Mk 4<sup>5, 9</sup> 8<sup>20, 21</sup> 11<sup>36is 23</sup> 13<sup>15, 25</sup> 14<sup>22, 54</sup>, Lk 2<sup>44, 52</sup> 5<sup>18</sup> 8<sup>47</sup> 11<sup>50</sup> 12<sup>54</sup> 13<sup>7, 25</sup> 14<sup>4, 28</sup> 24<sup>41</sup>, Jn 1<sup>20</sup> 3<sup>23</sup> 4<sup>34</sup> 7<sup>10, 26</sup> 8<sup>21, 44</sup> 9<sup>13</sup> 10<sup>12</sup> 12<sup>17</sup> 13<sup>30, 38</sup> 14<sup>22</sup> 18<sup>11</sup> 15. These do not include the emendations which Mr. Burkitt has adopted from my paper in the *Expositor* for August 1897.

Others which I have verified and found correct with the help of Mr. Burkitt's book are in Mt 15<sup>22</sup> 17<sup>9</sup> 22<sup>18, 17, 18, 31</sup> 26<sup>24</sup>, Mk 7<sup>31</sup> 10<sup>21, 35</sup> 12<sup>32</sup> 13<sup>28</sup>, Lk 5<sup>18</sup> (partly) 8<sup>6, 44</sup> 9<sup>33, 44</sup> 10<sup>34</sup> 11<sup>8</sup> 16<sup>3, 8</sup> 17<sup>6</sup> 19<sup>17</sup> 20<sup>28</sup> 24<sup>26, 31</sup>, Jn 3<sup>14, 18</sup> 6<sup>15</sup> 7<sup>23, 29, 32, 33, 35</sup> 12<sup>17, 48</sup> (2) 17<sup>22</sup>. But I dissent from the alterations in Mt 16<sup>9</sup>, Lk 14<sup>10</sup> 16<sup>28</sup> 19<sup>7</sup>, Jn 1<sup>30, 36</sup> 7<sup>50</sup> 12<sup>48</sup> (1) 13<sup>22</sup> 17<sup>26</sup>.

The word אֵרֵנָּה, in Lk 7<sup>14</sup>, occurs in Codex B of the *Palestinian-Syriac Lectionary*. Mr. Burkitt will find that I have anticipated his adoption of it for the Sinai text on p. xxiv of our edition.

The phrase 'as now bound,' beneath the two illustrations of the Sinai palimpsest given in vol. ii., must surely be meant in irony. For the last eleven years two inches of binding on one side only have remained attached to the manuscript.

A slight mistake in vol. ii. p. 18 may be noted. Mr. Burkitt credits me with more generosity than I deserve; for the four volumes of my photographs which are now in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, are there by right of purchase.

We owe Mr. Burkitt special thanks for the well-nigh exhaustive collection of corroborative quotations from the *Syriac Fathers*, which he has presented to us in vol. ii. The treatise on 'Grammar and Syntax' (chap. ii.); that on 'Notable Greek Transliterations,' and the 'Notes on Select Passages,' are admirable. But in assigning to the version, as represented by this Sinai palimpsest, a date posterior to the *Diatessaron*; in actually fixing that date as about 200 A.D.; and in dealing with Dr. Hjeldt's theory, I cannot say that he is so happy. If Mr. Burkitt be right, the *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe* was never used by any Church or nation. It came into existence during the period when the *Diatessaron* reigned supreme; and the only use it has served is that it has been a base for the revision of itself into the Peshitta. Two of Dr. Hjeldt's strongest arguments are not even mentioned in this volume; much less confuted.

i. The occurrence of two notable mistakes in the Sinai text—mistakes made by a translator who was better acquainted with Syriac than with Greek, and which are non-existent in the *Diatessaron*. These are  $\eta\beta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\iota\ \eta\gamma\alpha\delta\epsilon$ , 'invitation' for  $\tau\eta\eta\ \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\upsilon\ \delta\mu\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ , 'your consolation,' in Lk 6<sup>24</sup>; and of  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \kappa\rho\epsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota$  for  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\eta\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\iota$ , in Lk 4<sup>29</sup>.

ii. The omission of one of our Lord's most beautiful and characteristic sayings from the Cross—'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' If the Old Syriac text had come into existence later than the *Diatessaron*, so Dr. Hjeldt argues, the translator could never have omitted a phrase which must have become endeared to all Aramaic-speaking Christians.

But the weakest point in Mr. Burkitt's argument is that on p. 212. 'The earliest Church in Edessa,' he says, 'under Addai and Aggai had no New Testament. For the first generation of Syriac-speaking Christians the Law and the Prophets sufficed.' Mr. Burkitt would have us believe that not only in Edessa, but also at Antioch, where the disciples were first called Christians, and whither the gospel-story was brought by un-named humble men (see Ac 11<sup>19</sup>), a Church which was the mother of missionary enterprise, was content

to wait a whole century before it read the four records of our Lord's life in its own tongue. Mr. Burkitt may believe this; I cannot. If there was a Syriac translation of the Gospels before Tatian's time, it is difficult to believe that this was any other than the Sinai version. The success of the *Diatessaron* may be explained on other grounds. If we accept Dr. Hjeldt's view that the four Gospels were carried separately in their Syriac dresses to Edessa, each being the work of a separate translator, we may assume that many of the chief families and the chief congregations would only be able to purchase one of them. These would hail with acclamation the idea of having all four Gospels together in a compendious portable treatise.

As for Antioch, we know that in Chrysostom's time there was a difference in language, but a complete unity of faith, between its educated townsmen and the agricultural population around it. But can we believe that St. Peter never preached to the latter in his native Aramaic? Everywhere else Christianity spread from beneath upwards; and the excellent character which these country folk bore in the fourth century was surely the outcome of several generations of gospel teaching.

I cannot therefore accept Mr. Burkitt's identification of Bishop Palût (about 200 A.D.) as the translator of this version. It is easy to believe that Rabbula, in the beginning of the fifth century, superintended that revision of the Old Syriac which was called the Peshitta. For when he ordered the *Diatessaron* to be replaced in every Church by a copy of the separate Gospels, what more natural than for the people to say: 'Where shall we find a correct one? The Greek differs from the Syriac in so many little points.' But the connexion of Palût with the Old Syriac rests upon no evidence whatever. To make this kind of supposition is possibly to lead us as far astray as to fill up the lacuna in Mt 8<sup>29</sup> from the text of the Peshitta. *Vixere fortes ante Agamemnona multi*; and to attribute every service rendered to the early Christian Church to some highly placed ecclesiastic is to imitate the mistake of the historian who first attributed the origin of the English Reformation to Henry VIII.

It would have been an advantage to this book if the contents of vol. i. could have been so arranged that the superior text should not have been sub-

ordinated to the inferior one. For an edition of the Curetonian this would have been quite right, but for a book bearing the title of *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe* it is quite wrong. And Mr. Burkitt would have laid us under an additional obligation if he had indicated where the pages of the Sinai palimpsest begin. Syriac students who visit the Convent Library in future days will take this book with them. But if they wish to verify a word, or to coax a few more letters out of some faded page, they must also burden their camels with the Syndics' edition, or, better still, with my *Select Narratives of Holy Women (Studia Sinaitica, No. ix.)*. For I have there indicated not only each page, but the verse which begins it, on the margin.

These considerations detract only a little from the value of vol. i.; and not at all from that of vol. ii. They are, however, of sufficient importance to make me resolve on the preparation of a more complete edition; so as to place on record what

I believe to be, in all particulars, the true text of the Sinai manuscript.

### Postscript.

(By Mrs. Gibson.)

I SHOULD like to add a word about an expression on p. 17 of Mr. Burkitt's Introduction, namely, 'they knew.' It would be kind in him thus to include me in his account of the discovery, were it not for the fact that I did not know one word of Syriac on my first two visits to Sinai. I therefore left the investigation of the Syriac MSS entirely to Mrs. Lewis, whilst I confined my attention to Greek and Arabic ones. I have twice before remonstrated with Mr. Burkitt for stating that I, as well as Mrs. Lewis, recognized the nature of the Gospel text in 1892. We ought to be accurate about events that occur in our own day, as well as about those that took place eighteen centuries ago. MARGARET D. GIBSON.

## The Great Text Commentary.

### THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

#### ACTS XXIV. 25.

'And as he reasoned of righteousness, and temperance, and the judgment to come, Felix was terrified, and answered, Go thy way for this time; and when I have a convenient season, I will call thee unto me.'—R. V.

#### EXPOSITION.

'And as he reasoned of righteousness, and temperance, and the judgment to come.'—This speech of Paul's was probably given in Felix's audience chamber, and the scene was an anticipation, on a smaller scale, of that described in chap. 26. Felix, however, was a man of a different moral fibre to Festus. Paul read his character well; he would also know that Drusilla was another man's wife. Therefore, instead of delivering an oratorical 'apologia,' St Paul, like another John the Baptist, reasoned concerning the first principles of the Christ, namely, righteousness, continence, and the judgment to come.—RACKHAM.

'Righteousness.'—Our English translation very poorly represents the Greek original *περὶ δικαιοσύνης*, a word embracing these varied duties which every upright citizen owes to another, how much more one set over his fellows as a judge!—HOWSON.

'Temperance.'—This term must be understood in its widest sense of self-control: it implies keeping under the body with all its passions and appetites.—RENDALL.

THIS virtue was not unknown even in the story of pagan

Rome; and Felix's companion, the Jewess Drusilla, would call up before her mind many a fair example set by noble Hebrew matrons in the old days of Israel, an example she had never tried to follow.—HOWSON.

'Felix was terrified, and answered.'—His conscience told him that what Paul said was true. Note that it is not said that Drusilla trembled. Eugene Stock says that it was because she was too reckless and hardened. She was past feeling. Her conscience was seared as with a hot iron, for she, having been brought up as a Jew, had sinned against more light.—PELOUBET.

'Go thy way for this time; and when I have a convenient season, I will call thee unto me.'—Felix was alarmed, and broke off the audience, saying that when he found another opportunity he would summon him again for a public audience. For in private Felix had frequent conversations with him. St. Paul remained in confinement in Caesarea, waiting for the second hearing, two full years.—RACKHAM.

#### THE SERMON.

#### Now, Now—Not By-and-By.

By the Rev. Alexander Maclaren, D.D.

Felix was born a slave, but, becoming a great favourite with the Emperor Claudius, he was made procurator of Judea. He was not fit for the