

SWEETGOSPELHARMONY.COM

## PART III

### CORSSSEN AND BLASS ON THE WESTERN TEXT OF THE ACTS.

Let us now try, before proceeding to examine Mr Chase's theory of the Syriac influence on the Western text, to get some idea of the results which have been arrived at, and the prospects of further conclusions which are being held out to us, by two distinguished German scholars, one of whom approaches the subject from the side of the Latin versions, and the other from that of the recensions of the Greek. We will begin with Corssen's Programm, entitled 'The Cyprianic text of the Acts of the Apostles'<sup>1</sup>. As there is probably no living scholar who is more familiar with the Old Latin texts of the Bible, nor one who knows better how to present his reasonings and results, we shall be sure to get some daylight on the Western question from this tract, although it is only a preliminary notice of further enquiries and is contained in less than 30 pages. Corssen begins by drawing attention to the importance of the Fleury palimpsest from which Sabatier published in 1743 a couple of fragments of the Acts<sup>2</sup> and which has, after various attempts by other transcribers, been lately published in what is probably a final textual form by Samuel Berger<sup>3</sup>. The value of this version (of which one can only deplore that more leaves have not been preserved) lies in the fact of its being an Old Latin rendering, presumably of a Greek text which must have been in singular agreement with the text of Codex Bezae. It

<sup>1</sup> Peter Corssen: *Der Cyprianische Text der Acta Apostolorum*. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1892.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted as *reg* in Tischendorf's Apparatus.

<sup>3</sup> Berger: *Le Palimpseste de Fleury*. Paris, 1889.

becomes, therefore, a textual authority of the highest importance, not only on account of the support which it gives to the Bezan text, and the help which it occasionally furnishes where that text is *in lacuna*, but also because it is suspected of being often more archaic than Codex Bezae itself.

Further, as Corssen points out, the Fleury Latin is in the Acts of the Apostles in close agreement with the quotations of Cyprian, and other Latin fathers whose text is related to that of Cyprian, so that it becomes possible to restore by skilful editing a large part of what Corssen calls the Cyprianic text of the Acts. We thus obtain a Latin text of the Acts, not merely of the sixth century, to which period the Fleury MS. may be referred, but at least, according to Corssen, of the middle of the third. The importance of this is obvious, and we shall probably be able to shew that Corssen's estimate of the age of the restored text is too modest. It must go back farther than Cyprian.

The argument by which the antiquity of the text is demonstrated depends upon a comparison of the readings of the Fleury text with (i) the quotations of Cyprian, (ii) with similar quotations in two works of Augustine entitled *De Actis cum Felice Manichaeo* and *Contra epistulam Manichaei*, (iii) with the quotations made in a work of the fifth century, wrongly attributed to Prosper, and entitled *De promissionibus et praedicationibus Dei*. From a comparison of these various texts, Corssen shews their derivation from a common Latin primitive, which he calls the Cyprianic text. And this common primitive was a text which had an internal unity and sequence which we look for in vain in the text of Codex Bezae, however much we may be persuaded that the Cyprianic text agreed in the main with the peculiarities of the Bezan Greek. That is to say, the restored Cyprianic text is a Western witness of greater worth than even the Greek of Codex Bezae.

Corssen then proceeds to suggest that the text of Codex Bezae is composite, and can be resolved into an original Western text *plus* certain contaminations and insertions which are due to the influence of the Common Greek text. In order to make this clearer we will reproduce Corssen's first and leading illus-

tration. The opening verses of the Acts in the two tracts of Augustine against the Manichees agree in the rendering

in die quo apostolos elegit per spiritum  
sanctum et praecepit praedicare evangelium.

This, according to Corssen, was the primitive rendering; its influence may be seen in an extract from Vigilius *Contra Varimadum*

in die qua apostolos elegit per spiritum  
sanctum praedicare evangelium,

and, with some re-action from the common text in Augustine's *De Unitate ecclesiae*,

usque in diem, quo apostolos elegit per spiritum  
sanctum mandans eis praedicare evangelium.

But if this be the primitive form, we arrive at the important conclusion that it cannot have been made from the text of D as it now stands, for while the restored Cyprianic text is the equivalent of a Greek text

ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας  
ἐξελέξατο τοὺς ἀποστόλους  
διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου  
καὶ ἐκέλευσε  
κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον

the text of D is

ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας  
ἀνελήμφθη ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις  
διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου οὓς ἐξελέξατο καὶ ἐκέλευσε  
κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

This latter text is, according to Corssen, due to the influence upon the equivalent of the Cyprianic text of the common Greek text

ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας  
ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις  
διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου  
οὓς ἐξελέξατο  
ἀνελήμφθη.

We are therefore to regard the text of Codex Bezae as made up out of (i) a primitive Western text (call it the  $\beta$ -text) corrupted by mixture with the common text (which we will call the  $\alpha$ -text). According to this theory the words *καὶ ἐκέλευσε κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* are not a mere gloss on the common text from some outside source, as they certainly seem to be at the first examination, but a part of an early redaction of the text of the Acts which does not agree with the common text<sup>1</sup>.

The first thing that we have to reflect upon is the way in which Corssen restores the Cyprianic text in this passage. We will add something to the demonstration of the antiquity of the words which have been apparently appended to the primitive text by Codex Bezae, and we will do something to justify the apparent absurdity of the text restored by Corssen, which makes the choice of the Apostles take place on Ascension day. In the first place, there is evidence earlier than Cyprian of the currency of the words

*καὶ ἐκέλευσε κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.*

In the 21st chapter of his *Apology*, Tertullian speaks of the Ascension as follows:

ad quadraginta dies egit docens eos quae docerent. Dehinc ordinatis eis ad officium praedicandi per orbem, circumfusa nube in caelum est receptus.

We have here the trace of the commission *to preach* in an account of the Ascension and notice that it is like the added words in Codex Bezae, in that, although the account is in the main that of the Acts, it is connected with the terms of Mark xvi. 15; and there can be little doubt that Tertullian in his text of the Ascension had at least the equivalent of the word *κηρύσσειν*. But in the second place, the peculiar language

*ordinatis eis ad officium praedicandi*

<sup>1</sup> Corssen points out in a foot-note that I have, in my *Study of Codex Bezae*, missed the explanation of the genesis of the variants, through a failure to detect the reconstruction which D exhibits of an archaic text under the influence of the received text. Possibly this may be so, but we are not yet quite convinced on this point.

seems to imply something more than the equivalent of ἐν-τειλόμενος or ἐκέλευσεν; it is almost as strong as *elegit ad praedicandum*; but, if this be the case, Tertullian's text would be uncommonly like that which we have found restored by Corssen, for it involves the election of the Apostles on the day of the Ascension. We may say, then, that there is a very high probability that Tertullian had in his text of the Acts the injunction *to preach*; and a lesser probability that he had words which implied the Apostolic election as occurring on the day of the Ascension. So that something can be said in favour of the antiquity of Corssen's restoration; and I, for my part, am quite satisfied that the supposed gloss in the Western text is earlier than the time of Tertullian. We will give another little illustration of the way in which the Fleury text and its companions can be put in evidence for the existence of a *Latin* translation of the story of the Ascension earlier than Tertullian.

The manner in which Tertullian quotes the verses Acts i. 10, 11 implies, at all events in certain touches, something more than his own habitually free renderings of the text: we have as follows:

*De Resurr.* c. 22. Quis caelo descendentem *talem* conspexit, *qualem* ascendentem apostoli viderant secundum angelorum constitutum?

*Ibid.* c. 51. Idem tamen et substantia et forma qua ascendit, *talis* etiam descensurus, ut angeli adfirmant.

*Adversus Praxeam* c. 30. Hic et venturus est rursus super nubes caeli, *talis qualis* et ascendit.

It will be noticed that in these three passages Tertullian harps upon the words *talis* and *qualis*. I infer that they were known to him in a Latin translation of the Acts: (the Vulgate and most other fathers have *sic veniet quemadmodum*, which is a more literal rendering). If we now turn to the Fleury palimpsest, and examine its reading of Apoc. i. 7, we have

et uidebunt eum omnes tribus terrae *talem*.

The added word *talem* is not a mere blunder of the Fleury text: the Fleury text is in the Apocalypse the same as that of

Primasius and Cyprian, and is used by Haussleiter to restore the so-called Cyprianic Apocalypse, just as Corssen wishes to use it for the editing of the Cyprianic Acts. When we turn to the text of the Acts used by Primasius, as edited by Haussleiter, we find

et uidebit eum omnis terra *talem*.

It is impossible to resist the conclusion that the primitive Latin Apocalypse in very early days had *talem* in its text, perhaps as the remains of a primitive gloss, something like Tertullian's *talem qualem ascendentem apostoli viderant* or *talem qualis ascendit*. But such a text must be held to be assimilated to that of a passage in the Latin Acts. The commentary of Primasius does not help us to restore the missing clause; it has *talem* hidden away amongst the explanation of the author, but it does not seem as if more than this were in Primasius' text, for he has made an expansion of his own, *cum talem viderint qualem non credebant*<sup>1</sup>.

But even if it should be maintained that *talem* is a corruption of *amen*, which occurs a little later in the text, the error is still due to the influence of the passage in the Acts, and implies the word *talem* in Acts i. 11. If this reasoning be of any force, we must again say that the restored Cyprianic text is earlier than Cyprian. It might just as well be called Tertullianic.

Even where we cannot carry a gloss back with certainty into the Latin of Tertullian, we can shew sometimes that the gloss itself was known to him, without determining the form in which he read it. For example in *Apology* c. 39 we have

itaque qui animo animaque miscemur, nihil de rei communicatione dubitamus; omnia indiscreta apud nos praeter uxores.

The first sentence is an obvious paraphrase of *καρδία καὶ ψυχὴ μία* in Acts iv. 32 and the last is the equivalent of *ἀλλ'*

<sup>1</sup> The whole passage is "Et uidebit illum omnis terra. Omnes etiam terreni uel omnes generaliter mali, maxime Iudaei, qui eum ut minimum putavere necandum, cum talem uiderint qualem non credebant, sera semetipsos poenitentia lamentabuntur, et plangent se adveniente eo. Ita amen."

ἦν αὐτοῖς πάντα κοινά in the same verse. The intermediate sentence is, therefore, a reproduction of the Bezan gloss

καὶ οὐκ ἦν διάκρισις ἐν αὐτοῖς οὐδεμία,

but whether it comes from the Greek, or from a Latin rendering  
et non erat dubitatio in eis ulla

we cannot tell.

But the gloss must have been known to Tertullian, and have stood in the same place which it occupies in the Bezan text.

Other instances of the same kind may readily be brought forward; for example in *De Pudicitia*, c. 21

In illa disceptatione custodiendae necne legis primus omnium Petrus spiritu instinctus et de nationum vocatione praefatus: Et nunc, inquit, cur tentastis etc.

Here *spiritu instinctus* is due to the gloss in the Bezan text of Acts xv. 7

ἀνέστησεν ἐν  $\overline{\pi\upsilon\iota}$  πέτρος

*primus omnium* may be due to a similar gloss in Acts ii. 14 where the situation is similar, ἐπῆρεν πρῶτος τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ. Even where the text of Tertullian is not under the influence of Bezan glosses, it sometimes gives us the key to the genesis of the glosses.

For example, in *De Baptismate* c. 10

quoniam qui Joannis baptismum habebant non accepissent spiritum sanctum, quem ne auditu quidem noverant,

the language of Tertullian suggests to us the following primitive and idiomatic rendering of Acts xix. 2

sed ne auditu quidem spiritum sanctum accepimus.

Now compare with this the Bezan confusion,

ἀλλ οὐδε  $\overline{\pi\eta\alpha}$  ἁγίον [λαμβάνουσι  
τινec] ἠκοῦσαμεν

= sed neque  $\overline{s\pi m}$  sanctum [accipiunt  
quidam] audivimus.

And it is not unreasonable to suppose that the *accipiunt quidam* of the Bezan text goes back into *quidem accepimus*, and that the attempt to bring the translation and text into closer harmony with one another has led to the Bezan conflation and confusion.

Returning now to Corssen, and his theory that the original form of the Western text has been mixed with the common text, we remark that the theory is an attractive one in so far as it furnishes an explanation of the structure of a number of passages that appear double in D, but it is encumbered by the difficulty that it does not furnish a single explanation of any residual Western variations. The text is thus, from Corssen's view, a double redaction, the reason for whose variation must be sought in the sources.

The following specimens are given by Corssen to illustrate the double redaction :

Acts iii. 7, 8.

Text. rec.

καὶ πιάσας αὐτὸν τῆς δεξιᾶς χειρὸς ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν  
 παραχρῆμα δὲ ἐστερεώθησαν  
 αἱ βάσεις αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ σφυρὰ  
 καὶ ἐξαλλόμενος ἔστη  
 καὶ περιεπάτει

with which cf. D

καὶ πιάσας αὐτὸν τῆς δεξιᾶς χειρὸς ἤγειρεν  
 καὶ παραχρῆμα ἐστάθη  
 καὶ ἐστερεώθησαν αὐτοῦ  
 αἱ βάσεις καὶ τὰ σφυρὰ [καὶ ἐξαλλόμενος ἔστη]  
 καὶ περιεπάτει χαιρόμενος

the bracketed words being assumed to be borrowed from the common text.

The Fleury text agrees closely with D, as follows : (italics where the text is illegible or doubtful)

Et adpraehensa manu *eius dextera*  
 excitavit eum  
 et continuo stetit



*confirmatique sunt*  
*gressus eius et laccania*  
*et ambulabat gaudens et exultans*

where observe that the Fleury text has no trace of the words which Corssen considers an interpolation from the common text.

Or we may take Acts xviii. 8, where Text. rec. has

*καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν Κορινθίων*  
*ἀκούοντες ἐπίστευον*  
*καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο*

and D *καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν Κορινθίων*  
*ἀκούοντες [ἐπίστευον*  
*καὶ] ἐβαπτίζοντο πιστεύοντες τῷ θεῷ*  
*διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυ ἡμῶν ἰηυ χρυ*

and the Fleury text

*et quomodo multa plebs corinthiorum*  
*audierant uerbum dñi*  
*unti sunt credentes*  
*in nomine ihu xpi*

where again the text of the palimpsest has not the repetition which characterises D, and may perhaps be regarded as an earlier form of the Western text.

There can be no doubt that the Bezan text is marked by such doublets as Corssen points out, whatever may be their origin, and that whether they consist of whole sentences or occasional words, one of the first things necessary for the clearing of the Bezan text is the separation of the doublets.

For example Acts xix. 8 (D)

*εἰσελθὼν δὲ ὁ Παῦλος εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν*  
*ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλη ἐπαρρησιάζετο*

is probably the resultant of two texts; the (a) text

*εἰσελθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν*  
*ἐπαρρησιάζετο*

and the ( $\beta$ ) text

*εἰσελθὼν δὲ ὁ Παῦλος εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν  
ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλη ἐλάλει (?)*

So in Acts iii. 13 the text of D

*κατὰ πρόσωπον Πειλάτου  
τοῦ κρέιναντος ἐκείνου  
ἀπολύειν αὐτὸν θέλοντος*

should be resolved into the  $\alpha$ -text,

*κατὰ πρόσωπον Πειλάτου  
κρέιναντος ἐκείνου ἀπολύειν*

and the  $\beta$ -text

*κατὰ πρόσωπον Πειλάτου  
θέλοντος ἐκείνου  
ἀπολύειν αὐτόν*

The difficulty here would be that the Fleury text has 'cum ille iudicaret eum dimittere'; the text avoids the doublet, but sides with the  $\alpha$ -text, instead of presenting the desiderated  $\beta$ -text.

In the same way Acts xx. 18 (D)

*ὥς δὲ παρεγένοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν  
ὅμως ἐόντων αὐτῶν εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς*

should be resolved into the  $\alpha$ -text

*ὥς δὲ παρεγένοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν  
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς*

and the  $\beta$ -text

*καὶ ὅμως ἐόντων αὐτῶν  
εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς.*

(Here again the Fleury text is absent; it is significant that the Gigas MS., which represents the text of Lucifer, is double and reads "cum convenissent ad eum simulque essent.")

It is not surprising that after suggesting this means of purifying the text of D, of whose base he has justified the antiquity, Corssen should say some significant things about the

modern edited texts of the Acts, which he declares to be the reflected images of a fourth-century recension, which itself is arbitrary in character. We build, says he, on the great uncials, as if they were rocks! Such language as this would, in England, be credited to a disciple of Burgon, and set aside as mere fanaticism. But it would hardly be wise to treat Corssen with that kind of contempt.

Upon the whole we should say that the value of Corssen's Programm consists chiefly in the demonstration it furnishes of the antiquity of the Western Latin, but that further investigation is necessary before we could say decidedly that the  $\beta$ -text had existed in Greek, unmixed with the  $\alpha$ -text. It needs to be shewn that the  $\beta$ -text is something more than the possible contamination of a text by a version<sup>1</sup>.

Precisely at this point of difficulty, Blass comes forward with a learned and acute investigation of the essential doubleness of the early text of the Acts in which he tries to detach the Bezan base from the received text with which it has been encumbered, and to justify the text so detached as in linguistic harmony with the language of the New Testament in general and of S. Luke in particular.

Blass's theory is that it is significant that the Western variations are most intense in the writings of S. Luke, and that it is a natural assumption to make that two copies of the author's works got into circulation, the rougher and earlier of which (the  $\beta$ -text) is represented to us approximately in the Codex Bezae, the Fleury-text, and the marginal annotations of the Heracleian Syriac (which are translated from a Greek MS.) together with sundry survivals in other texts and versions.

The supposition that the Western text makes no material addition to our knowledge is held by Blass to be a mistake; we cannot explain all the Western expansions of the Acts by carelessness and harmonistic corruption; but if this be so, the Western tradition acquires at once a certain independence.

<sup>1</sup> Corssen's attempt to restore the text of the vision of Ananias in c. ix. 10—12, and to reduce it to a mere subjective impression of S. Paul's own inner experience, does not need any serious treatment; for, as Blass says, 'Who performed the baptism?'

The scribe and translator give place to the author. Accordingly Blass proceeds to analyse and justify the Western peculiarities, beginning with the tenth chapter of the Acts and working forward through the tract where the glosses are most significant, and then returning to read the first nine chapters in the light obtained from the study of the rest of the book, the linguistic analysis of which is often extremely suggestive.

The originality of some of the Western expansions of the text ought, I think, to be at least provisionally conceded; it is difficult to believe that a mere transcriber invented the 'seven steps' of the prison at Jerusalem which S. Peter and the angel descend together; the detail which is given in the visit of Peter to Cornelius that when they came near to Cesarea, one of the slaves ran forward to announce Peter's approach, and that Cornelius sprang forward to greet him, is as life-like as anything we could wish, and agrees with the statement that Cornelius had sent *two* slaves along with a devout soldier.

The story of the sons of Sceva the priest is free, in the Bezan form, from the contradiction which is involved in speaking of seven sons in the beginning of the story and calling them *ἀμφοτέρου* in the conclusion of it; yet it does not seem as if the Bezan text were a corrupt and late reconstruction reducible on examination to the form of the received text.

The visit of S. Paul to Jerusalem in company with Mnason is obscure enough in the received text, which makes it one day's journey, and yet implies that S. Paul carried his host with him into a city where he had many friends. The Bezan text knows that it is two days' journey (68 miles, as Blass points out), and makes it intelligible why Paul's entertainer on the road should travel with him<sup>1</sup>.

The statement that S. Paul lectured every day in Ephesus from 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. (the hours when Tyrannus' school was

<sup>1</sup> Many of these Bezan singularities are discussed by Prof. Ramsay in his *Church in the Roman Empire*, and some of them are approved by him as bearing the stamp of originality.

disengaged ?) has every appearance of being a statement based upon direct knowledge<sup>1</sup>.

More remarkable still is the fact which Blass points out that the Western glosses occasionally add to what are called the *We-sections* of the Acts.

In Acts xi. 27 the current text tells us that ἐν ταύταις δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις κατήλθον ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων προφῆται εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν· ἀναστὰς δὲ εἰς ἕξ αὐτῶν ὀνόματι Ἀγαβος κτέ., to which Codex Bezae adds as follows after Ἀντιόχειαν,

ἣν δὲ πολλὰ ἀγαλλίασις  
 συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν  
 ἔφη εἰς ἕξ αὐτῶν ὀνόματι Ἀγαβος

where the peculiar form of the second line will be noticed; whoever the writer is, he has at all events thrown himself pretty vigorously into the situation. Nor is this the only case of the kind, for we find Irenaeus (ed. Mass. 201) quoting amongst the proofs that Luke was the inseparable companion of Paul a passage from the Acts as follows:

“Quoniam autem is Lucas inseparabilis fuit a Paulo et cooperarius eius in Evangelio, ipse facit manifestum, non glorians, sed ab ipsa productus veritate. Separati enim, inquit, a Paulo, et Barnaba et Johanne qui vocabatur Marcus, et cum navigassent Cyprum *nos venimus in Troadem.*” The whole argument of the passage turns on the occurrence of the words *nos venimus* in the text; and Irenaeus goes on to quote passage after passage from the *We-sections* in order to shew that Luke was the constant companion of S. Paul, much in the same way as if he were writing an introduction to the Acts for the Cambridge Bible for Schools. I do not see how we can refuse to recognise the existence of the words

κατηντήσαμεν εἰς Τρωάδα

in the text of Acts xvi. 7 in Irenaeus. Nor can the reading be very well dissociated from the previous case, since the tendency

<sup>1</sup> Mr Chase's theory is that it is an assimilation to the darkness at the Crucifixion, with an hour put on at each end; I suppose, to make the darkness of S. Paul's teaching more visible! Are we to take this as a *jeu d'esprit*?

in both is to intensify the personal element in the narrative. A similar personal touch is preserved in Acts xxvii. 35, where, Cod. 137, the obelized Heracleian and the Sahidic add after *ἐσθίειν* the words *ἐπιδιδούς καὶ ἡμῖν*.

Where shall we find a reviser or glossator earlier than the days of Irenaeus, whose critical faculties were so highly developed as to make all these alterations and expansions in the text, who had travelled so far as to correct and expand the geography at every point, and had studied the history so carefully that he was able to illustrate the text with fresh meanings, and to remove inconsistencies which would hardly have been alluded to in an uncritical age? Can Tatian or the first Syriac translator or reviser be responsible for all this? We admit that if the glossator be a separate person from the author, he must have had the soul of a harmonist, but he must also have been gifted with some of the trained instincts of a modern critic. Such explanations as that of the double persecution at Iconium (Acts xiv.) or the remark that when Paul took up his lodging at the house of Justus, he had left his old friends Aquila and Priscilla (Acts xviii. 7), are of the nature of a modern commentary. Now I am willing to admit that Tatian was something of a commentator, and in my notes on his Diatessaron have shown that this wonderful work may be described from one point of view as the earliest commentary on the New Testament; but the rehandling of the text of the Acts is so much more extensive than the explanatory touches in the Gospels, that one hesitates to say that the Western text is due entirely to Tatian, and to his translation of the New Testament into the Syriac language. It may be so, but the theory of Blass is much easier, which throws back a part at all events of the textual changes upon the author and his sources. And the theory demands the more consideration inasmuch as it is now practically certain that the so-called Cyprianic Latin text cannot be later than the second century, so that any texts or versions which lie behind this must be not very remote from the actual sources.

On every account therefore the Blass-Corssen theory needs to be carefully looked into; even if it be not the true solution

of the textual bifurcation, we must at least allow this much, that the bifurcation itself is demonstrably so early, that it would be very unreasonable to suppose that none of the Western readings were genuine. It may be justified in select readings even where it cannot be justified as a whole. And this means that there is nothing against which we need to be so much on our guard as the seductive supposition that the cause of certain variants is necessarily the cause of the remainder, or that we can, because we have explained two or three obscure changes in the text, use the Newtonian *vera causa* over the remainder. The Bezan text and all other Western texts will remain complex until their simplicity has been demonstrated in a sufficiently broad and comprehensive manner.

The actual test of the correctness of Blass' reconstructions will be best made by a close study of individual passages; and, where it is possible, by setting up the  $\alpha$ -text and  $\beta$ -text side by side and comparing them with the earliest versions.

For example in Acts xvi. 10 the current text is

ὥς δὲ τὸ ὄραμα εἶδεν  
εὐθέως ἐζητήσαμεν ἐξελθεῖν εἰς Μακεδονίαν  
συνβιβάζοντες ὅτι προσκέκληται ἡμᾶς ὁ  $\theta\varsigma$   
εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτούς.

But Codex Bezae reads

διεγερθεῖς οὖν διηγῆσατο τὸ ὄραμα ἡμῖν  
καὶ ἐνοήσαμεν ὅτι προσκέκληται ἡμᾶς ὁ  $\kappa\varsigma$   
εὐαγγελίσασθαι τοὺς ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ.

Here Blass justifies *διεγερθεῖς* as a Lucan expression by Luke viii. 24, and observes that *ἐνοήσαμεν*, though not Lucan, is common in the language of the N.T. He points out that the Sahidic version supports in part the expansion of D, though it soon falls in line with the received text (*cum autem surrexisset, narravit nobis visionem; statim quaesivimus egredi in Macedoniam, ostendentes iis quod Dominus vocaverit nos ad annuntiandum iis evangelium*). Further, at the commencement

of the next verse, the  $\beta$ -text gives us a note of time which is wanting in the current text,

*τῇ δὲ ἐπαύριον ἀχθέντες ἀπὸ Τρωάδος.*

The question is, whether all this precision and expansion is due to scribe and commentator. We shall in our next lecture be able to throw a little light upon the subject, though not, perhaps, to come to a complete solution of the questions at issue.