more impressive. Again, much of the thesis is built on Jesus' choice of a Zealot for an Apostle (cf. e.g., pp. 10, 16, 42–43, 243–245, etc.). Why not simply think that Simon *had been* a Zealot, as Matthew had been a tax-collector? Then, great play is made (p. 202) of Matt. 10 : 34, 'not peace but the sword'. But is 'sword' taken actively or passively? For the evil that we do is very different to the evil that we suffer. And for the 'sword' of Lk. 22 : 38, we need only cite Professor Caird 'an example of Jesus fondness for violent metaphor, but the disciples take it literally, as pedants have continued to do ever since' (St Luke, Pelican Ed., p. 241). Heavy weather is made of Iscariot (p. 204 n.), which can be explained as 'man of Qeryoth' cf. Jos. 15 : 25.

A total of such particular points would in the end serve to demolish the thesis of the book. So too no doubt would a more profound investigation of the traditions behind the gospels, and in particular an examination of the traditions in I. Corinthians and Romans (both earlier than St Mark): St Paul after all had to say with anguish in his heart that his own people had 'crucified the Lord of glory' (I Cor. 2 : 8; Romans 9–11). It is also important to remember that the death of our Lord was the term of a long conflict; opposition and enmity were mounting up during all his ministry. We cannot take the crucifixion in isolation.

Such are some of the thoughts that come to us as we read this thought-provoking book. For the rest, it is well produced, with excellent plates of Roman and Jewish coins, of the site at Masada, of the inscription of Pontius Pilate found at Caesarea in 1961, as well as the well-known carvings on the arch of Titus. With the indices and bibliographies, we have an altogether handsome volume in the best traditions of the Manchester University Press.

ROLAND POTTER, O.P.

THE THEOLOGICAL TENDENCY OF CODEX BEZAE CANTABRIGIENSIS IN ACTS, by Eldon Jay Epp. (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 3.) *Cambridge University Press,* 1966. 45*s.* ($8.50).

Codex Bezae, which now lies in the Cambridge University Library, used to be in the monastery of St Irenaeus at Lyons. Guillaume du Prat, Bishop of Clermont in Auvergne, borrowed it to take with him to use as evidence for unusual Greek readings at the Council of Trent. Théodore de Bèze, Calvin's successor in Geneva, acquired the Codex which now bears his name after it had been found in the monastery at Lyons during the civil commotions in 1562, the year Lyons was sacked by Huguenot troops. In 1581 Bèze presented the manuscript to the University of Cambridge. It is perhaps appropriate that a Presbyterian reviewer should be allowed to report in a Roman Catholic journal on the latest attempt to explain the Codex which, wherever it lies, belongs to all.

Codex Bezae was written in both Greek and Latin, on facing pages, as early as the fifth century A.D. The text of those parts of the Gospels and Acts that it contains is usually longer than the text of the Codex Vaticanus (in the Vatican Library, eventually published because of the persistence of a German Lutheran). Codex Bezae is the best witness to the 'Western' text and Codex Vaticanus is the best witness to the 'Egyptian' or 'Alexandrian' text, and the intriguing problem is, which text is more faithful to the original text of the New Testament? Naturally each is likely at times to provide readings which are superior to those of the other, because no text is ever copied completely accurately, but the disparity in length between these two suggests that there may have been deliberate editing involved; perhaps Codex Vaticanus represents a pruning, and perhaps Bezae represents a paraphrasing expansion.

Textual critics like J. H. Ropes and M.-J. Lagrange, O.P. agree in thinking that Codex Vaticanus represents a better text than Codex Bezae; they think that the 'Western' text is longer because an editor tried to explain seeming difficulties, or to heighten the vividness of the narrative, or to smooth out rough or puzzling expressions. They agree that sometimes the 'Western' text is more anti-Jewish and more universalistic than the 'Alexandrian' text, but Lagrange detects more of a consistent theological bias than does Ropes.

Professor Epp claims to find a far more pervasive theological tendenency in the readings peculiar to Codex Bezae than any of his predecessors. He says that Codex Bezae betrays a theological tendency in the same way as a theological tendency can be found in the writings of Luke or Paul; the bias is towards 'a decidely heightened anti-Judaic attitude and sentiment', according to which the Jewish leaders are more blamed for Jesus's death, Judaism is seen as less important in the early

history of the church, and the Christian leaders are worse treated by the Jewish leaders (and come out more triumphant).

He sets out in full more than sixty passages for consideration; for most of these the text of Codex Vaticanus is printed beside the text of Codex Bezae, with a detailed critical apparatus giving the readings of other 'Western' witnesses. The whole is accurately and beautifully printed as one would expect from the Cambridge University Press. But the apparatus, the footnotes, and the discussion are far longer and more elaborate than necessary to prove the point; Lagrange's twenty pages on the 'Western' text of Acts cover a wider range of questions than this whole book.

The basic difficulty in Epp's thesis, a difficulty he never mentions, is that the Codex Vaticanus text of Acts already places a large share of the blame for Jesus's death on the Jews, already shows Christianity breaking away from Judaism, and already shows the apostles as persecuted heroes. If the longer Codex Bezae should give us the result of repeated copyings by scribes who were variously pious, liturgically minded, pedantic, ready to explain, and perhaps not averse to adding a touch of colour, we should expect the result to heighten tendencies already present in the original. In fact it is surprising how few passages betray the anti-Judaic bias Epp claims to find; he has possibly succeeded in adding two to the commonly accepted list, but most of his arguments completely fail to convince. I can see no basis for his claim that 'the relatively few D (Codex Bezae) – variants previously recognised as distinctly anti-Judaic have been vastly expanded so that a clear and consistent tendency comes boldly into view'.

My own feeling is that the way forward lies in asking, not just why Codex Bezae is long, but also why Codex Vaticanus is short. Whether or not the 'Western' text was the work of one editor, the 'Alexandrian' text almost certainly was – and he a brilliant and faithful scholar of whose methods and resources it would be good to know more.

J. C. O'NEILL

THREE FOURTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLISH MYSTICS, by Phyllis Hodgson. *Longman, Green & Co.* 1967. 47 pages. 3*s.* 6*d.*

WHAT IS MYSTICISM?, by David Knowles. *Burns & Oates.* 1967. 140 pages. 18*s.*

Professor Hodgson's little book is a convenient, readable introduction to Rolle, Hilton, and the author of the *Clowde of Unknowyng*. It is one of a literary series, and there is not much theological rigour in its treatment of these writers – there are some puzzling attempts to find parallels in more modern poets, like Matthew Arnold (of all people). But, as we know from her editions for the E.E.T.S., Prof. Hodgson, even if strictly an amateur in the field of mysticism, is a very informed one, and, apart from one or two strange excrescenses such as those referred to, her summary of the thought of the writers she deals with is exemplary. My only regret is that no room could be found for Julian of Norwich; though she is outside the mainstream of Dionysian mysticism, she is probably more immediately accessible to modern religious thought, with her great concern for the Church and her 'even-Christians', and her thoroughly scriptural inspiration.

The same sort of regret may be felt much more acutely with regard to Professor Knowles's new book, *What is Mysticism*? This is a competent, if rather plodding, account of the standard categories of Catholic mysticism, together with a brief enquiry into non-Catholic and non-Christian mysticism. Like the orthodoxy it represents, it is a highly selective account – it seems to exclude St Thomas Aquinas, for instance (why is 'one who indulges in theological speculation . . . no mystic'?). But the real complaint against the book is that it still operates within an entirely closed system. Like Mariology, mysticism has developed as a rather too independent and esoteric study, having but little contact in depth with theological and scriptural studies. It is now high time for all these various disciplines to be synthesised, or rather concentricised, within an overall Christian awareness, within the general consciousness of herself that the Church is developing today.

Professor Knowles gives us a lucid discussion of most of the standard problems, such as the relationship between meditation and contemplation, and the significance of visions and ecstasies. Such discussion may be useful; but what we need much more is an enquiry into mysticism which takes seriously the insights of the modern Church, especially the insights and movements of thought canonised by Vatican II. It is a central contention of mystical theology that in the highest forms of prayer God is the sole agent: it is now imperative that this be related to the sacraments, for it is there that we know with absolute certainity that God is the agent. And this immediately