

FOUR LECTURES
ON
THE WESTERN TEXT
OF
THE NEW TESTAMENT

BY

J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., D.LITT. (DUBL.)

FELLOW OF CLARE COLLEGE, AND LECTURER ON PALAEOGRAPHY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

LONDON:
C. J. CLAY AND SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA LANE.

1894

[All Rights reserved.]

“Nec sine voluptate audias eruditos viros, amicissime et
iucunda verborum verecundia dissentientes, ut non disputationi
quales re vera esse pleracque solent, sed colloquio qualia veteres
fingere consueverunt philosophi, interesse te putes.”

J. D. MICHAELIS,
(*Curae in Versionem Syriacam*, 1755, p. 160).

PREFACE.

THE lectures contained in the following pamphlet are concerned with that problem of problems, the interpretation of the Western text of the New Testament. Since my tract on the Codex Bezae was published in 1891, there have been a number of weighty contributions to the solution of the problem, which have added much to our knowledge of the textual history of the New Testament, and made it necessary for me, before continuing my imperfect examination of the Cambridge MS., to estimate the results of the other workers in the same field.

The fact is there are now four separate and distinct theories before the world; Resch's theory¹ that the bifurcation in the primitive text of the New Testament is due to independent translations from a Semitic document (probably Hebrew); Chase's², that all the variants are due to reflexion from an Old Syriac translation; Blass's theory³, that in the Lucan writings they are due to the issue of two separate drafts from the hand of the original writer—a statement which supports itself, in certain points, on a powerful programme of Peter Corssen, in which was demonstrated the antiquity and wide diffusion of that part of the Latin tradition of the text of the Acts which is in agreement with the quotations of Cyprian⁴; and my own,

¹ Resch, *Aussercanonische Paralleltex-te*. Leipzig, 1892.

² Chase, *The Old Syriac element in the text of Codex Bezae*. Cambridge, 1893.

³ Studien u. Kritiken, 1894, pp. 86—120, *Die zweifache Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte*.

⁴ *Der Cyprianische Text der Acta Apostolorum*. Berlin, 1892. Corssen says 'some significant things about the modern edited texts, which he calls 'der destillierte Text, den die Modernen aus einigen griechischen Uncialen gewonnen haben,...nur ein Spiegelbild einer willkürlich fixierten Recension des vierten Jahrhunderts' (p. 24).

which claimed that there had been a reaction on the Greek text from the primitive Latin translations, as well as, occasionally, from the Syriac version. Further we have a remarkable chapter on the Codex Bezae in Ramsay's recent work *The Church in the Roman Empire*, in which numerous changes of the text are assigned to the hand of a Greek reviser acquainted with the geography of Asia Minor. I shall set my own theory for the present on one side, not because I have abandoned it, but merely remarking that my critics were probably right in saying that I had exaggerated the sphere of Latin influence, and I believe, equally right in conceding that a certain amount of Latinisation did exist.

The first lecture which discusses Resch's views was delivered more than a year ago, and printed in the *Classical Review* for June, 1893; it was not meant to be a final examination of Resch's theory, but merely to point out that a closer acquaintance on his part with the actual text of the Codex Bezae was necessary, and a consequent restatement of the arguments, before Resch was likely to meet with the exhaustive treatment, which I have no doubt his hypothesis deserves.

The other lectures are concerned chiefly with Mr Chase's theory that the Codex Bezae is under Old Syriac influence, and Dr Blass's view, that it is an original document, in good Lucan Greek.

Both of these writers have added much to the subject upon which they treat; and Mr Chase's is a theory, which in spite of certain peculiarities in its presentation, challenges the fullest scrutiny, and will certainly, if sustained, greatly advance the subject in hand. The lectures are, of course, an incomplete treatment of the questions at issue; but I feel hopeful that they, too, will do something to speed us towards the goal which the critics have been so long striving to attain, the complete explanation of the primitive variation and bifurcation in New Testament texts.

CREDNER AND THE CODEX BEZAE¹.

In a work just published, entitled *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte*², by Alfred Resch, who is already known to the world of Biblical criticism by his treatise on the Agrapha of the New Testament, will be found certain criticisms of my tract on the History of the Codex Bezae, which was published last year in the Cambridge *Texts and Studies*, just as Resch's researches are in Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*. The parallel between our publications is not merely an external one, though I think it is fair to admit that we are distinctly imitating, in our little Cambridge series, the German research and enthusiasm which Harnack has done so much to crystallize: we are also working internally on parallel lines, and especially Dr Resch and myself are engaged on the very same questions, viz. the origin of the variant forms of the Gospels, only we are working from opposite ends; I am working up stream, and Resch is working down; I follow the readings of variant MSS. up stream until I find, as I suppose, their origin; Resch has divined, as he supposes, their origin and has only to read the facts in the light of his hypothesis; and we shall meet by and bye somewhere between our two starting-points, and it would be presumptuous at present to anticipate whether the meeting-point is nearer to my end of the line of action or of his.

But we may at least be grateful that each of us is able to appreciate the industry of the other, and not disposed unduly to depreciate the results which are brought forward; on my

¹ This Lecture was delivered in the Divinity School, Cambridge, Nov. 19, 1892.

² *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien: textkritische und quellenkritische Gründlegungen*; von Alfred Resch. Leipzig, 1892.

Credner's *Beiträge zur Einleitung in die Biblischen Schriften*, pp. 452—518. It is true that Resch points out a weakness in Credner's work, in that he did not recognize sufficiently the relations between the Codex Bezae and the Old Latin and Old Syriac texts, which constitute with it a distinct textual family. But I think we may say without injustice that Resch, with this single exception, endorses Credner's investigation and its results. For instance, the view that the MS. has a Judaeo-Christian origin is endorsed¹; the 'unknown authority' of Credner, which lies at the back of the Western text as one of its sources, is identified with a secondary translation of the original Hebrew Gospel²; and the stages of development which Credner indicates for the Western text, as we find it in Codex Bezae, are accepted and tabulated³.

¹ *E.g.* p. 33. 'Hatte der Redaktor jenes Archetypus, jenes ältesten Evangelienanons, ohne selbst Judenchrist zu sein, die—auch von Justin getheilte, vermittelnde Stellung dem gemässigten Judenchristenthum gegenüber zum Ausdruck gebracht, sofern er das judenchristliche Evangelium an die Spitze dieses im Uebrigen echt katholischen Evangelienanons gestellt hatte, so verdanken wir speciell die weitere Ausbildung der Handschrift, die uns jetzt im Codex Bezae vorliegt, *ausschliesslich judenchristlichen Kreisen*, welche die Apostelgeschichte und die katholischen Briefe, nicht aber das paulinische Schriftthum, der Handschrift einverleibten. Auch die weitere Conservirung der Handschrift im Laufe der nächsten Jahrhunderte wird, wie Credner ganz richtig gesehen hat, *auf dieselben judenchristlichen Kreise* zurückzuführen sein. Denn während in der orthodoxen Kirche in Folge der canonischen Textrecension die Exemplare jener vorcanonischen Evangelienammlung längst verdrängt und verschwunden und nur in Uebersetzungen erhalten waren, blieben *diese judenchristlichen Kreise* von der Textrecension der Grosskirche unberührt, und konnten so ein griechisches Exemplar jener vorcanonischen Evangelienammlung für ihren gottesdienstlichen Gebrauch bewahren und in jene spätere Zeit hinüberretten.'

² P. 144. 'Bei der Besprechung dieser wichtigen Handschrift...habe ich bereits darauf hingewiesen, dass die aussercanonische Textrecension, mit welcher speciell das Lucas-evangelium in diesem Codex auftritt, zu erklären sei aus dem Einfluss einer Uebersetzung des Urevangeliums, verwandt derjenigen, welche von dem ersten Evangelium benützt worden ist, und dass eben hierin die von Credner gesuchte "unbekannte Autorität" zu finden sei, "auf welche die kühne Textrecension des Lucas-evangeliums nach dem Codex D sich stütze, indem hieraus auch die zahlreichen scheinbaren Conformirung des Lucastextes nach dem Matthäustexte sich erklären."'

³ P. 35.

'A. Archetypus.

Griechischer Evangelienanon spätestens um 140.

It is further stated, in accordance with Credner's views ('hat Credner jedenfalls richtig bezeichnet'), 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, in order to allow for such corruptions as have arisen from the interaction of the Greek and Latin upon one another. But before this time the tradition of the text involved many marginal annotations, such as the Ammonian sections, and apparently the Sabbath lections, while at the time when this redaction was made, the lections of Euthalius were introduced, and the stichometric division of the text. For we know for certain (according to Resch) that the stichometric division of the Acts is due to Euthalius. And it is natural to assume that if at this time (about 500 A.D.) the Latin text, stichometrically divided, were added to the Greek, the Latin text would remain free from the previously existing Greek annotations of a liturgical character. And it is these liturgical notes, together with their Sabbath lessons, which more than anything else (*mehr als alles Andere*) entitle us to refer the origin and use of the Western text to Judaeo-Christian circles, and enable us to approve Credner's suggestion that the text was brought into Southern Gaul, in its later form, by some Syrian Jewish-Christian, probably a trader, and that it was finally dictated to a scribe, not very well acquainted with Greek, towards the end of the sixth century.

It is sufficient to present this brief summary, to show that Resch has absorbed Credner's views almost without modification; and since he has rarely added any reason for their reception except, by reference and implication, the reasons already given by Credner, we are entitled to conclude that he

- B. Evangelien canon
mit Apostelgesch. u. kathol Briefen
vor 200.
- C. Neue Redaktion von B,
Beifügung des lateinischen Textes,
um 500.
- D. Letzte Abschrift des
bilingualen Codex
gegen Ende des 6. Jahrhunderts.'

considers those reasons to be valid, and not to need much further enforcement.

The best way to see the error which Resch has made in thus endorsing Credner will be to follow the method which I adopted in my tract on the Codex Bezae, viz. to begin with the marginal annotations.

On p. 27 Resch has copied the following marginal note from the Codex Bezae, and given an elucidation of it:—

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \Gamma\text{ΝΟCMA} \\ \text{ΡΙΤΟΥCΑ} \\ \text{ΤΩΤΗC} \\ \text{ΑΚΟΥΝΙ} \\ \text{ΜΟΥ} \end{array} \right\} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} [\text{ανα}]γνοσμα \\ [\text{πε}]ρι του σα \\ [\text{ββα}]του της \\ [\text{δι}]ακουνι \\ [\text{σι}]μου \end{array} \right.$$

i.e. it is a lection for the Sabbath which precedes the Sunday after Easter, which is called the *διακινῆσιμος*. And it is inferred that since the lectionary direction is given in this imperfect form, it must have been copied from a previous MS. in which the direction had become partly illegible¹.

In this Resch was simply following Credner, who had taken the lection from Kipling, and had remarked that 'in unsere Handschrift konnten die verstümmelten Worte aber nur dadurch gelangen, dass sie, Buchstabe für Buchstabe, aus einer andern Handschrift eingetragen worden sind, welche schadhafft geworden war, dergestalt, dass die Anfangssylben fehlten.'—(*Beiträge*, p. 500.)

The mistake made (for as we shall see presently the explanation is erroneous from stem to stern) was partly due to Kipling, who had printed these liturgical notes on the margin of his text, in the same type as the text. But Kipling did not venture to make the liturgical note coeval with the MS., as must be the case, if the theory is to hold that it was to be found in the tradition of the text at an earlier date than the Codex Bezae itself. What Kipling said of it was as follows

¹ 'Die liturgischen Randbemerkungen, welche durch den fortgesetzten Gebrauch des früheren Kirchenexemplars defekt geworden waren, wurden in ihrer verstümmelten Gestalt der neuen Handschrift von einer andern Hand einverleibt.'

(p. xv.): 'notae liturgicae,...non a prima quidem manu, at certe tamen, ut mihi videtur, ante saeculum septimum appositae,' and Kipling's statement was copied by D. Schulz (*Disputatio*, p. 10) in the words 'Haec glossemata antiquissima, si minus a primâ quidem manu, at certe ante saeculum septimum iamiam adscripta esse.' How then did Credner come to attribute an artificial antiquity to such a liturgical note? Obviously it was the incomplete form in which the note occurs, which suggested that it had been copied from a previous Codex. But in this Credner was misled by Kipling, and did not see that what Kipling was trying to reproduce was an annotation on the margin of a MS., where a part of the MS. had been cut away.

And it is unfortunate that Resch, who has read through the Codex Bezae, both in Kipling's edition and in the edition of Scrivener, did not see the mistake that Credner had made, nor correct it, either by Kipling's preface or by Scrivener's preface and annotations. If he will turn to Scrivener's edition, p. 450, he will find the following note:

423 b. ll. 11—15...*αγνωσμα..ρι του σα...τω της...ακουι... μου* (i.e. *διακωνησιμου sive έβδομ. α'*, *marginē abscisso L* etc.);

and if he will further turn to the preface of Scrivener (p. xxvii.) he will find conclusive reasons for dating this corrector (whom Scrivener calls L) *not earlier than the ninth century*. It is, to say the least, unfortunate that Resch had not taken the trouble to verify such an easy point as the date of an annotator.

What then becomes of Credner's Judaeo-Christian liturgical notes, which, according to Resch, *more than anything else*, lead us to believe that the Codex Bezae goes back to a Judaeo-Christian origin? Not only does it appear that this particular case, on which so much has been built, is a delusion; but the whole of 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.

As Resch has challenged an appeal to Credner, to Credner he must go; but he must not go without the MS. or some trustworthy edition of its text. And if Credner wishes

to carry these liturgical notes back into remote antiquity, or even to the time of production of the Codex Bezae or the century before that time, he must be met with a stern palaeographical negative. None of these annotations are as early as the ninth century, and some of them are as late as the twelfth. Consequently it is hard to regard Credner's study of the Codex Bezae as the most instructive that has yet appeared; it is unjust to Scrivener, to say the least.

The number of errors which Credner has fallen into in his account of these marginal hands is simply appalling. I shall give one or two instances, if only to justify myself for having neglected Credner.

Would any one believe it possible that a lection marked against Matt. xvi. 28—xvii. 9 with the words *μεταμορφος αναγνωση* could be interpreted in the following manner?—

‘Ich weiss das seltsame erste Wort nur aus eine Vermischung des Griechischen mit dem Lateinischen zu erklären. *μεταμορφος* soll heissen, eigentlich: *μετὰ morbos*. Das Eindringen Lateinischer Wörter in die Griechischen Sprache des gemeinen Lebens ist aus dem N.T. bekannt. Hiernach sollte der bezeichnete Abschnitt als Gebet und Trost für Kränke und Genesende verlesen werden, und dazu passt auch der ‘Inhalt.’ The lesson is, as the matter shows, the regular one for the feast of the Transfiguration (*τῆς μεταμορφώσεως*). The date of the annotation is, as before, of the ninth century, yet Credner does not hesitate to say (p. 505) ‘auch der Umfang und die liturgische Beschaffenheit dieser Randbemerkungen führen uns auf Judenchristen.’

A more striking case still is in a marginal annotation attached to John v. 18; which reads

ΕΡΙΑΝΑΠΑΥ
ΑΜΕΝΟC

and is rightly given by Credner in the form *περὶ ἀναπαυσά-
μένων*. That is, we have here a church lection *pro defunctis*. But according to Credner, who wishes to find traces of Judaeo-Christian usage, we are to see in the words an allusion to those persons who rest on the Jewish Sabbath; for according to his

view (p. 506), 'Dies bezieht sich auf die Jüdische Feier des Sabbathes, welche *ἀνάπαυσις* heisst. Joseph. *Antiq.* 3, 12, 3. Derselbe *contra Ap.* 2, 2. Epiphanius *Haer.* 42, 3. Thilo, *Acta Thomae* pp. 146, 223. 'Αναπαυσάμενοι sind folglich diejenigen, welche den Sabbath nach Jüdischer Weise als Ruhetag feiern. Die Absicht des Verfassers dieser Bemerkung kann nun keine andere gewesen sein, als das Unrechtmässige der Jüdischen Feier des Sabbathes auf Johannes v. 18 gestützt hervorzuheben u.s.w.' And it follows that, if the allusion to those persons who rest on the Sabbath be attached to the passage in which Christ is charged with breaking the Sabbath, then we are in the circle where Jewish beliefs are in process of being antagonised; that is, the text belongs to a time when the Church is being withdrawn from its half-Jewish state into one more distinctly Christian. All this pyramid-on-apex-building depends on the curious interpretation which Credner makes of the marginal reading. Nor does he stop here, but realizing that the case was not dissimilar to the one which we previously discussed, he maintained that the imperfect form in which the marginal note is transmitted is again a case where marginal annotations have been taken from a copy in which they had become partly illegible.

But, as before, the marginal reading, which is by the very same hand, refers to lectionary usage of the ninth century; the two missing letters have been cut from the edge; and the lesson is the proper one to be read over the departed. And the reason for the selection of the passage is to be sought, not in any allusion to Sabbath breaking, but in the doctrine that the 'Son quickeneth whom he will &c.' It is the more strange that Credner should have missed the meaning, since he cites lower down (p. 511) a Roman burial inscription in the form *Τόπος ἀναπαύσαιως Ἀμμονίου καὶ Εὐτυχείου θρέπτου*. But the fact is that very little which Credner wrote will stand an appeal to the manuscript, and for this reason I am sorry that Resch has endorsed so much of his work, and especially that he has laid such stress on the demonstration of a Judaeo-Christian origin which Credner detected in the marginal liturgical annotations. A reference to Resch (p. 34) will show

that he has carried up to the date A.D. 500 the Ammonian sections, the pericopes for the Sabbath, the lections of Euthalius in the Acts, and the stichometry (= colometry) of the MS. Let us then see what Scrivener says on the subject of the Ammonian sections in the Codex Bezae. He tells us (*Cod. Bezae*, p. xx.) that 'The Ammonian sections, without the Eusebian Canons, are inserted in the side margin of Codex Bezae by a scribe whom we shall hereafter show to have lived several centuries later than this manuscript was written'; and again (pp. xxvi. xxvii.) 'it is evident from a careful comparison of the marginal numerals of the Ammonian sections with the great body of the liturgical annotations (written in thick, clumsy letters with ink of a purple hue), especially in the Gospels, that they are the work of one scribe, whom we shall call L..... A bare inspection of Facsimile Pl. iii. no. 12 will prove that L..... cannot be dated before the ninth century.' I suppose that Credner was here misled by Kipling's edition in which the Ammonian numbers are printed with the text, though Kipling did not assume them to be coeval with the MS.: and Resch must have followed Credner, though a reference to Scrivener would have kept him from this hydra-headed catalogue of errors. We have now disposed of the argument from the Ammonian sections, as well as that from the pericopes for the Sabbath (which are a mere relic of Gallican usage in the ninth century, as I think might have been gathered from my own modest little tract). We come next to the question of the lections of Euthalius in the Acts, which Credner, followed by Resch, carries back to the time of Euthalius, very nearly. Here again we are dealing with marginal references of a later date, by two separate hands of the twelfth century. I do not even believe that we can make out an identification of the lections with the Euthalian system; but, even if we could, there would be nothing gained, for no result follows from the marginal ascription of Euthalian lections in the twelfth century. And I am only sorry that Resch did not see that he was treading on the thinnest of thin ice in following Credner.

But, it may be said, the stichometry of the MS. is surely an

integral part of the MS. itself; and while on the one hand it cannot be more ancient than Euthalius, who invented it; on the other hand it must be early, for the Codex Bezae was obviously transcribed from a copy similarly divided to itself. But neither can this be made out, for a reference to Euthalius' reckoning of the *στίχοι* into which he divided the text agrees closely with the conventional book-measure obtained by dividing the text into breadths of sixteen syllables. And even if it be argued that Euthalius *colified* (to coin a word) his text into short sense-lines as well as measured it, there is no proof that the Codex Bezae contains his system, and, as far as the Gospels go, the line division can be carried back much farther, probably into the second century. So that all the details of the description of the MS. which Resch characterized as 'most instructive' are shown to be errors, arising from an insufficient acquaintance with the MS. itself. But, further, Resch has (p. 34) adopted from Credner the theory that the Codex was written from dictation. There is nothing in this which bears closely upon the problem of origins; and yet, as I have been directed to study my Credner, and Resch gives no other evidence than what is found in Credner, it may be worth while to look at the instances, and see whether the palaeographical argument is a just one.

Credner gives ten instances of errors introduced by aberrations of the ear in a scribe writing from dictation. Most of these would be rejected at once by any one familiar with the copying of uncial texts: *e.g.*

Luke xvi. 26, D has *πειρει* for *μειρει* (written *μειρει* in early texts).

Luke vi. 20, D has *ετιαραι* for *επαραι*.

Acts vi. 5, 4, D has *μερον κοι* for *μενον κοι*, where the eye has wandered two or three letters.

Acts iv. 29, D has read *απειλας* as *αγιας*, which is certainly a palaeographical error.

But what need to go further? for if these are copyists' errors, the scribe was reading the book for himself, and not writing from dictation. The only instance which Credner gives that

has any verisimilitude is John xiv. 21, where ἐμφανίσω has been read as ἐνφανήσω. But the human mind is quite capable of such confusions, without the introduction of a dictator.

It seems, then, that all the particulars of Credner's theory which Resch has taken over are invalid and unsustained by an appeal to the MS. We do not mean to say that Credner's theory of a Judaeo-Christian origin of the Western text is an impossible theory, or the closely related theory of Resch. Only the reasons which have been brought forward thus far are out of harmony with the palaeographical facts, and new reasons must be found. *Non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis.* We have no wish to disparage Resch's work on the text, which is extremely interesting and may lead to some very important conclusions. Only we must ask him to neglect Credner, and to allow other people to neglect him, when they can show good reasons for doing so. There is too much interesting work on hand for us to be justified in spending precious time in correcting the multitudinous errors of a critic of the last generation. Probably it would also be wise of Resch not to lay undue stress on certain other points, which he has borrowed from Credner, in reference to the theory of the Canon; for they do not affect his new theory of Gospel origins, and may cause it to be unfairly discredited. I mean, to take an instance, the statement that the original Judaeo-Christian Canon contained only the Four Gospels, the Catholic Epistles, and the Acts: and not the Pauline Epistles (Resch, p. 33). We are all agreed that the *Codex Bezae* does not contain the Pauline Epistles, and we are also satisfied that it contains one page of a single Catholic Epistle (probably the last of three originally extant Epistles of John); but we are not agreed that *Codex Bezae* is the Canon, nor that it is a Judaeo-Christian or Petrine book. Surely it would be better to reserve our judgments in the case of a MS. which is imperfect in the middle and at the end, and of which we have not even the right to affirm that it existed without a companion volume.

It is fair to make this last suggestion, because Resch has made a mistake of this very kind with regard to the com-

pleteness of a MS. in his notes on the Codex Sangallensis (Δ), which he thinks may go back into a very early base, partly because it is bilingual, and partly because it is limited to the Four Gospels. It is quite true that the Codex Sangallensis does contain many very early readings, but, as to its limitation to the Four Gospels, it is well known that the companion volume containing the Pauline Epistles is extant, and is known in the critical apparatus by the sign G^{paul} , and to librarians as the Codex Boernerianus.

I have said nothing so far in defence of my own theory about the Codex Bezae. The reader of Resch's little book will see that my explanations are not considered adequate, and that there are many readings where Codex Bezae deviates from the Canonical text, which are not easily explained by the hypothesis of Latin influence. I think this is quite possible and have no objection to make, if Resch can establish his contention; for I hope to see my way some day to all necessary corrections and expansions of my first statement. But perhaps I may remark that there are some weak spots in Resch's list, and in his deductions from them. For example, if it be true that the reading of D in Matt. x. 6 ($\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ for $\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$) cannot be due to any retranslation, as the words are wholly indifferent in meaning, why does it follow that in Luke ix. 57, where D reads $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ for $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\chi\eta$, we are entitled to infer that the Itala MSS. also must have had $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ or $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta\varsigma$ in the texts from which they were translated, because they now agree with Cod. Bezae in reading *ieris* (wenn nun alle Itala-Handschriften mit der Vulgata *ieris* lesen und also $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$... voraussetzen)? Or perhaps the retranslation would be invalid in support of Harris' theory, but good when employed in demonstrating the unity and antiquity of the Western text, which, of course, I hold as strongly as Resch?