

To sum up:—for the point after  $\text{L}\omega\omega$ , i. e. for Westcott and Hort's *text*, and the punctuation demanded by the rules of Syriac syntax, we have codd. 8\* 10 17\* 20, and perhaps also 14\*; for the point after  $\text{J}\omega\omega\text{? } \varphi\omega\omega$ , i. e. for Westcott and Hort's *margin* and the text printed by Mr. Gwilliam, we have codd. 1 7 23, and the later punctuators of 4 8 14 and 21.

There can be no doubt that the later tendency was to put the stop where Mr. Gwilliam has put it. It is implied in the Arabic *Diatessaron*, a translation made in the eleventh century; indeed, it would probably be difficult to get Syriac evidence for the stop after  $\text{L}\omega\omega$  later than the seventh century. But the earliest witnesses tell another tale. Both the MSS assigned by Wright to the fifth century (codd. 14 and 17) had the stop by the first hand, and they are doubtless right in having it. I cannot but consider it a matter of regret that the Oxford *Tetraevangelium* should have retained in this important verse a conventional punctuation that mangles the grammar and obscures the thought.

F. C. BURKITT.

#### NOTE ON ACTS xii 25.

IN a paper entitled 'A point in Pauline Chronology' Mr. G. A. Simcox has directed the attention of readers of this JOURNAL (vol. ii 586–590) to the difficult reading  $\text{ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν}$ . But his remedy, namely to omit the whole verse as an interpolation, is surely more desperate than the disease. Three alternatives at least seem preferable. (1) We may assume that the verse originally contained no reference to Jerusalem at all; or (2) we may connect  $\text{εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ}$  with  $\text{πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν}$ , giving it a more emphatic meaning than is usually suggested by those who favour this construction; or finally (3) we may be able to justify 'from Jerusalem' as after all the original reading.

(1) Most will admit that the textual phenomena are *prima facie* against the reading 'from Jerusalem,' either in its 'Western' form ( $\text{ἀπὸ}$ ) or in its Alexandrine and Syrian form ( $\text{ἐξ}$ ). It is discredited not only as a *lectio facilior* divided against itself, but also by the fact that it is not the common usage of Acts to specify the place *whence* return is made, wherever it is indicated by the context<sup>1</sup>. On the other hand, even the place *whither* is twice omitted after  $\text{ὑποστρέφω}$ , in Acts viii 28, xx 3. In the former of these we have  $\text{ἦν δὲ ὑποστρέφων καὶ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἄρματος αὐτοῦ}$ , where the destination is only to be inferred from a statement that the man was a eunuch of the queen of the Ethiopians. In

<sup>1</sup> Τότε  $\text{ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ ἀπὸ ὄρους τοῦ καλουμένου Ἐλαιῶνος}$  is the one case in which the place whence is named at all.

the latter we read that Paul ἐγένετο γνώμης τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν διὰ Μακεδονίας, where ὑποστρέφειν may be rendered 'to retrace his steps.' Accordingly one can fairly say that our author's use of this verb is sometimes rather allusive in its reference. Hence also it is just possible that both forms of the reference to Jerusalem are glosses, εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ being due to the copyist's habit<sup>1</sup> of writing εἰς after ὑποστρέφειν.

(2) But it is hard to believe that such a gloss was added independently in so many distinct lines of transmission, the original reading failing to survive in any MS, Father, or Version. It seems better to take even the difficult εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ (supported by  $\kappa$ BHLP, *minusc. aliq.*; Syr.-Harcl. *mg.*; Chrys. *codd.*) as original, and try to find out how our author could write it. Now if we are to justify the reading, instead of smoothing it to τὴν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ πληρώσαντες διακονίαν, as Westcott and Hort suggest, we must discover some reason for the emphatic position of εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ. If εἰς . . . διακονίαν meant no more than τὴν εἰς . . . διακονίαν, it would probably be indefensible as Greek. But need it? The root of the difficulty seems to lie in the common misreading of the facts implied in xi 29 f., into which a special reference to Jerusalem is wont to be imported. But if we take the passage as it stands, namely as stating that relief was prepared for 'the brethren in Judaea' and that it was sent 'to the elders' (i. e. in Judaea), we shall begin to see a fresh point in xii 25, which adds the information that its bearers 'fulfilled the ministration up to Jerusalem.' That is, they reached the mother-church itself with relief, and did not merely minister to the needs of more rural centres, where the famine would be felt most acutely.

(3) But having reached a point of view which invests the reference to Jerusalem (at all) with a fullness of meaning lacking on ordinary theories of the passage, we may ask whether 'from Jerusalem' may not after all be original. For it is only on the assumption that the relief was intended for and indeed sent to Jerusalem, rather than Judaea, that 'from Jerusalem' can be called *lectio facilior*. If on the contrary it be a pregnant and allusive touch, suggesting that the delegates ended up their relief journey through Judaea at Jerusalem—a circumstance which explains their returning with John Mark in their company—all this may have been missed by some scribe, who then substituted εἰς (possibly with Gal. ii 1 ff. in mind). We are so apt to forget that there is no explicit mention, in the whole context, of any visit to Jerusalem; and when it is assumed among us, this is largely in connexion with a special and restricted exegesis of the reference to 'the elders' in xi 30. If the idea of 'from Jerusalem' be thus justified, it is immaterial whether

<sup>1</sup> Only this requires the further assumption that his attention was nodding; else he would have written εἰς Ἀντιοχείαν, as read by E, the Peshitta, the Thebaic and Ethiopic, and some minuscules.

ἀπό or ἐξ be original. But the former is perhaps preferable, both on Lucan usage and on MSS evidence (including the Latin), especially if Tischendorf is right in thinking that B\* began to write ἀπό.

If such a view be correct, it has some bearing on the other matter to which Mr. Simcox refers, that of Paul's visits to Jerusalem. For it makes it less likely that Paul would represent a relief journey to Judaea generally, in the light of a visit to Jerusalem on purpose to interview the apostles. Nor does the preceding narrative itself in Acts xii 17, 'and he (Peter) departed and went to another place,' at all encourage the notion that Paul saw him in Jerusalem on this same relief journey. If, then, we are to distinguish the visit of Gal. ii 1-10 from that of Acts xv, as I cannot but think that we must, it seems more likely than ever that the enigmatic visit was a private one *ad hoc*, unrecorded in Acts (as having no immediate public issue) and prior even to Peter's imprisonment by Herod Agrippa I.

VERNON BARTLET.

#### TERTULLIAN'S USE OF SUBSTANTIA, NATURA, AND PERSONA.

IN a notice in the JOURNAL (vol. iii p. 291) of my inquiry into the meaning of Homoousios in the 'Constantinopolitan' Creed (*Texts and Studies* vii 1), Dr. Strong took exception to what I had written in regard to Tertullian's usage of the words *substantia*, *natura*, and *persona*, and to my acceptance of the tradition that ὁμοούσιος was condemned at the Council of Antioch in 269.

As I am repeating the same statements in a *Short history of the development of Christian Doctrine to the Council of Chalcedon*, which is now in the press, it seems desirable to ask for a little space in the JOURNAL in which to consider the passages to which Dr. Strong refers; lest I should seem to ignore the criticism of one who has made a special study of the matter. My short history is intended as an introduction to the subject for students beginning their work, and therefore does not afford a suitable opportunity for such a discussion.

That Tertullian's use of the words is 'philosophical' as well as 'juristic' I do not think any one would be inclined to deny. I stated clearly my own opinion that it was. Perhaps I should have said that he passed from the philosophical to the juristic, rather than from the juristic to the philosophical, sense of the terms. But I think Tertullian was a jurist first, and a philosopher second: so I do not conceive that I wronged him much, or really misrepresented the dominant bias of his thought.

With regard to the two passages to which appeal is made by Dr. Strong,