

MEMBERS OF THE BEZAN CLUB:

- TH. ZAHN, *Hon. President*, Erlangen.
J. RENDEL HARRIS, *President*, 210 Bristol Road, Birmingham
D. PLOOIJ, *Secretary*, Leiderdorp nr. Leyden.
Rev. C. A. PHILLIPS, *Treasurer*, 36 Dean Park Road,
Bournemouth.
Prof. A. BAUMSTARK, Rheinweg 111, Bonn a. Rh.
Prof. R. P. CASEY, 114 Park Street, Dorchester (Mass.,
U. S. A.).
Prof. A. C. CLARK, Corpus Christi College, Oxford.
Rev. A. M. COLEMAN, 2 Hagley Grove, Birmingham.
Prof. J. A. FINDLAY, The College, Didsbury, Manchester.
Prof. JAC. VAN GINNEKEN, S. J., Stijn Buysstr. 11, Nijmegen.
Prof. F. W. GROSHEIDE, Amsteldijk 83, Amsterdam.
Mr. HERMAN C. HOSKIER, "Braeside", Wyoming Ave., S. Orange,
(N. J., U. S. A.).
Père M.-J. LAGRANGE, Convent of St. Stephen, Jerusalem.
Prof. BENEDIKT KRAFT, Eichstätt (Bayern).
Prof. K. LAKE, Harvard University, Cambridge (Mass.,
U. S. A.).
Prof. HANS LIETZMANN, Berlinerstrasse 65, Berlin-Wilmersdorf.
Dr. E. A. LOWE, 6 Oriel Str., Oxford.
Prof. A. MERK, S. J., Ignatiuskolleg, Valkenburg (L.),
(Holland).
Dr. A. MINGANA, Rylands Library, Manchester.
Prof. JAMES H. ROPES, Harvard University, Cambridge,
(Mass., U. S. A.).
Prof. H. A. SANDERS, American Academy in Rome,
Porta San Pancrazio, Roma.
Prof. K. SNEYDERS DE VOGEL, Turfsingel 23, Groningen.
Prof. HANS VON SODEN, Wörthstrasse 37, Marburg a/d Lahn.
Canon B. H. STREETER, Queen's College, Oxford.
Prof. C. C. TORREY, Yale University, 191 Bishopstreet,
New Haven (Conn., U. S. A.).
Prof. H. J. VOGELS, Argelanderstr. 49, Bonn a. Rh.
Canon JAMES M. WILSON, Steep, Petersfield (Hampshire).
Prof. J. DE ZWAAN, Leyden.

BULLETIN OF THE BEZAN CLUB

Nº. 8.

OUR TREASURER: Mr. C. A. PHILLIPS

Hitherto the Bezan Bulletin has been financed for the most part by Dr. HARRIS. But it seemed to me that it was neither right nor wise to lay this burden on one pair of shoulders only. Every member will be glad to have his share in this part of the responsibilities also. Mr. C. A. PHILLIPS is willing to act as our Treasurer. The contributions should be entirely voluntary, and in agreement with everybody's own circumstances. Just to give some idea of the actual costs of our Bulletin from which every member may draw his conclusion with regard to his personal share, I add that this number will cost about £ 13.

It should be understood very distinctly and clearly, however, that it should be left entirely to the decision of each member whether and how much he wishes to contribute. There should be no pressure of any kind in this respect.

Leiderdorp nr. Leyden

D. PLOOIJ

The present Bulletin is devoted, as was intimated in a previous issue, to a challenge on the part of Canon WILSON, who thought that the time was come for the re-examination of the hypothesis of Blass with regard to the dual tradition of the Lucan writings, and in particular to the dual text of the Acts. In order to meet this challenge fairly, for it certainly could not be taken for granted that BLASS and his theory of two successive editions of his works by Luke were finally ruled out of court, I suggested a Bezan Symposium on the theme, with the added proviso that none of us was to talk too long, and Canon WILSON was so kind as to offer copies of his translation of the Bezan Acts to such of our members as would be glad to receive them, and would find his translation and introductory notes helpful to their critical revision of the problem.

I had a special link with my dear friend BLASS and his Lucan researches in the fact that he wrote the first part of his study when he was my guest at Clare College, and was dividing his time between St. Luke and the newly-recovered text of Bacchylides. It is a great memory to have had the friendship of one of the greatest scholars of our generation; but one's retrospect in the particular case which we are discussing involves of necessity a retrospect of one's own personal opinions, so that when Canon WILSON wrote to me on the subject it was inevitable that one should ask oneself the question how the matter strikes us to-day, 'to-day, after so long a time', as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews would put it. Here are one or two preliminary thoughts that come to one's mind at once in this connection.

When BLASS was working on his two texts of Luke, there were actually two Greek texts to work upon, both of them ancient and both of them possibly original. The situation to-day is somewhat different. We are not so sure as we were that the Western Greek of the New Testament is Greek at all. Sometimes it looks like a re-translation from other languages. This is now practically conceded

as far as the Bezan Greek is concerned, which is seen to be strewn with Latinisms from its own companion text (or a similar one); it raised a hailstorm about my head when I first ventured to revive the ancient heresy of Latinisation, but there are not many hailstones left in that corner of the sky. Then there arose, again somewhat of a revival, the belief that Bezan readings were, in part at least, the result of a re-translation from the Syriac, and there was so much to be verified both as to the existence of such readings in early Syriac texts and in their explanation as factors of re-translation in the Greek, that it is no wonder if in some quarters the two heresies of Latin and Syriac re-action should have given rise to another, viz., that there is no Western Greek text at all. Do not hastily say 'Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum'. Something similar is being suspected in the case of the Tatian Harmony, for which, up to the present, no certain Greek evidence has been produced.

In BLASS' time, as in HORT's, there was no suspicion that the Western Greek text might disappear under criticism: both forms existed, the Western and the non-Western, and it was allowed that, of the two, the Western had the earlier attestation.

The next point that strikes me is this, that the advance in knowledge in other quarters has a reaction upon our knowledge of the Western text. I may be excused if I refer to a discovery of my own with regard to St. Paul's speech before the Areopagus. It was pointed out by me, on the evidence of certain Syriac writers who were transcribing from the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia, that St. Paul's statement that 'in Him we live and move and have our being', was a line taken from the *Minos* of Epimenides, a discovery which is rapidly developing a literature about itself, though it penetrated slowly into Germany, and was, if I remember rightly, quite unknown to Norden when he wrote his 'Agnostos Theos'. Assuming the accuracy of the identification we observe that, in the Codex Bezae, Epimenides has been made the subject of a various reading.

Here is the Greek text of Acts xvii, 28:

εν αυτη [sic] γαρ ζωμεν και κεινουμεθα
και εσμεν το καθ ημεραν.

Now here is an addition which mutilates the quotation and is, therefore, impossible: even if we had not recognised that a verse of hexameter poetry was being quoted, we should have said that the expression 'so far as from day to day' was harsh Greek and obscure sense. There seems to be no doubt that it is a genuine Western reading and in Greek: so we must either justify it or explain it away: is it a gloss on the text or is it to be allowed to stand as part of the text? The answer is that it is a gloss: for if we copy the next line of the text we have
ωσπερ και των καθ υμας τινες ειρηκασιν.

Here a corrector wished to alter *των καθ υμας* into *των καθ ημας* 'some of your own poets' into 'some of our own poets'. He indicated this on the margin in a sort of shorthand, which was misunderstood as *το καθ ημεραν*, and inserted as an expansion into the previous line. The Western Greek reading is due to a misread and misplaced marginal annotation.

This theory of misplaced marginal annotations which I developed in a number of instances in my *Four Lectures on the Western Text* requires a more careful examination than it has yet received. Our Bezan paleographer, Dr. LOWE, tells me that he does not see that, as a paleographer, he is invited to this Symposium. I assure him that he is really wanted. We need a further paleographical study of the errors that arise from misplaced marginal notes or corrections, including such cases as occur where a MS. being written in columns, a correction meant for one column finds its way into another. Especially we want evidence for the transference of marginal readings in Syriac MSS. where the scribe has written his note vertically in the ancient Syriac manner, with his page turned through a right angle. I see that Dr. WILSON has accepted, or suggested as acceptable, the explanation which I gave of the Bezan expansion in Acts vi, 15, where the angel standing

in the midst turns out to be a misplaced high priest from the next verse.

Another direction in which fresh light has been coming on the text is that the so-called We-sections turn out to be more extensive than was formerly supposed to be the case, and amongst the newly found We-sections there will be some that have Western characteristics. I leave them to others to discuss, observing only that if there is anything that is certainly Lucan in the Acts it is the We-sections.

I should like to draw the attention of the Club to the evidence which the Armenian Catena on the Acts supplies for the actual authorship of Luke in the Western text. In Acts 20¹³, the Catena reads: "And [I] Luke and those who were with me went on board". This astonishing reading (both in text and commentary) appears to have been set on one side by CONYBEARE and myself at the first reading, as if it were a mere gloss; but it was recalled to notice by PREUSCHEN; and the members of the Bezan Club should also give it renewed attention. In these brief introductory notes my object is merely to open the discussion, not to announce a verdict or express a final opinion.

Returning to the possibility of an original Greek Western text being non-existent, it should be observed that on the one hand the evidence for Greek Western readings is steadily diminishing; on the other hand it is strongly increased. No one will, I suppose, any longer quote the Greek of Codex Laudianus as a prime authority; it is obviously Latinised. On the other hand the Michigan Papyrus which came to light not long since is evidently a Greek text of the Bezan order from Egypt. Can it be explained away as regards its expansions by Latin or Syriac reactions?

These, then, are some of the points which occur to my mind on reading Canon WILSON's appeal.

R. H.

FROM CANON WILSON TO THE BEZAN CLUB ¹⁾.

I have said that I am perplexed: and my perplexity is this. To me, as well as to competent critics such as BLASS and HARNACK and others, the Bezan text of the Acts of the Apostles appears the key to certain positive conclusions and certain probable inferences as to New Testament History — and I deal only with the New Testament, and with nothing of later date — while to Canon STREETER it does not appear in at all the same light. It is these conclusions and inferences that are submitted to a symposium of the members of the Bezan Club.

There can be no comparison of course for an instant between Canon STREETER's learning and ability and mine. But the difference between our views depends, almost entirely, on a difference on one point, which can scarcely be called a matter of learning and ability. I am convinced that the origin of the various readings of the Bezan text are due to a totally different cause to that of the various readings of most MSS.

I have sufficiently explained my point of view on this matter in my book, "The Acts of the Apostles translated from the Codex Bezae" (S. P. C. K. 1923 2nd ed.), and in my letter to Dr. RENDEL HARRIS in Bulletin N^o. VII. These form my chief contribution to the symposium, and have been sent to all members of the club. It is from a careful study of the whole text of the Acts in this Codex that it is inferred that it rests on an early draft of the ordinary text by its author. To infer this was barely possible, it must be remembered, for Canon STREETER till 1923; and the means of doing it by my translation may easily be still unknown to him.

This is no wild or violent hypothesis. Such drafts are well known in the history of literature. Canon STREETER

1) This paper is not my main contribution to the symposium of the Bezan Club, but only a supplement to it.

himself writes (Four Gospels p. 379) "Has anyone ever "written anything of which the draft was not full of this "kind of thing", (viz. repetitions, digressions, qualifications, obscurity, inconsistency) and, I may add, exaggerations. But hitherto this has been rarely recognized in the New Testament. The survival of a draft is the only novelty in our view.

I entirely agree with Professor JAMES H. ROPES, of Harvard, who writes on Nov. 11th 1929 "It has long seemed "to me of great importance that this text should be studied "as a continuous whole, and not merely as isolated readings, and your book is a contribution towards this end".

I think it will be best for me to state here briefly "the positive conclusions and probable inferences" which seem to follow from the principle so well summarized by Professor ROPES, without repeating what has been said in my Introduction by way of proof. All references to the text of the Acts must be understood as made to the Bezan text in my book.

My first conclusion is that we have in the Codex Bezae the descendant of such a draft: and my inference is that Manaen exercised a powerful influence on Luke by furnishing him with valuable material for his writings. This is not recognized by Canon STREETER.

I must however first acknowledge a small error in my book, on p. 11. I there stated that DEAN PLUMPTRE had said, as I believed on the authority of Josephus, that Herod the Great, on the elder Manaen's refusal to come to his court, invited his son or grandson to do so. This is incorrect. PLUMPTRE says "What the identity of name "*renders probable* is that on the refusal of the old man "the king transferred his offer of patronage to his son or grandson" ¹⁾).

I have to thank the Librarian of the London Library for an exhaustive search for mentions of the younger Manaen. But the sole result is DEAN PLUMPTRE's Biblical Studies, published in 1870, which I had not heard of — a careful

1) PLUMPTRE's Biblical Studies, p. 378.

and suggestive book for that date. He fully recognizes that to such a man as Manaen was, by his training and position, the Gentile Church must have owed much. The essay is well worth reading.

From Acts, Chap. x. i to xi. 18 we learn how St. Peter was strongly attracted to the conversion of Gentiles; and in xi. 19 St. Luke, after tracing the origin of the Jewish Church in Antioch back to the time of Stephen, notes that, at a later date, some men of Cyprus and Cyrene had come and preached also to Gentiles with great success. This was made known to Jerusalem, and they sent Barnabas to Antioch to enquire and report. He also is most favourably impressed by what he saw, (v. 23) — to the manifest pleasure of Luke (v. 24), himself a Gentile member of the Church — and he goes to Tarsus to fetch Saul. They remain at Antioch for a whole year teaching this large mixed Church of Jews and Gentiles. St. Luke (v. 28) in the most natural way mentions that ‘there was much rejoicing’ ‘when we were gathered together’ to hear some prophets that were come down from Jerusalem.

We do not know when Herod the tetrarch was banished with Herodias to Lyons, (Josephus xviii. vii. 3), and his tetrarchy given to Herod Agrippa, the first of that name. But he was banished by Caligula, and therefore before A.D. 42. It was probably then, or near that time, that Manaen his foster-brother¹⁾ left Herod the tetrarch, and declared himself openly a Christian, and joined the Church at Antioch. I think however that his conversion to Christ took place, and was privately known, long before that time as the βασιλικός of St. John (c. iv), so that he would be at once on Herod's banishment admitted to that Church. In any case he must have been an extraordinary recruit, and a great influence on Luke. He would take a wide statesman's view of things. He had been at Athens and Rome. He became a “prophet or teacher” of an unusual kind in the Church. He was certainly concerned in sending out Paul and Barnabas on their first missionary journey

1) Josephus, Ant. XV. x. 5.

for the great extension of the Church. I infer that he may have been a potent influence on Luke to become a historian of the beginnings of Christianity.

I do not wish to repeat here anything that I have said in my Introduction, but I wish to add one or two points.

Manaen appears to have greatly assisted Luke with materials for his Gospel and the Acts. I enumerate the passages for reference. Luke III. 3—20; VII. 18—35; VIII. 3; IX. 7—9; perhaps XIII. 31; XXIII. 6—11; XXIV. 10. Acts *passim*, and specially XII. 19—23.

Part of the first passage also appears in St. Matthew, and is probably taken from Q. But there are additional particulars given by St. Luke which plainly indicate the report of a hearer of John. I suggested and gave reasons for thinking in my Introduction, that this hearer was Manaen (§ 15). But the supposition that Manaen may have been in command of the "Soldiers on Service" (*στρατευόμενοι*) at that time in the Jordan Valley, and heard John speak, receives a slight support from Nonnus who, it will be remembered, turned the Gospel of St. John into Greek Hexameters. I was curious to see how he would deal with the four short syllables of *βασιλικός*. He translates John iv. 26 as

ἦν δέ τις, ἰδύνων στρατιὰν βασιλῆις ἀνῆρ.

Or take the last passage from the Gospel, xxiv. 10. Just two words. "And Joanna". Stop and reflect. How did Luke, after some 15 years at least, get to know and verify that Joanna was present at the empty tomb? Joanna, the wife of Chuza Herod's Steward, a member of the court of Herod the tetrarch, an important Gentile. It is a little item in St. Luke's careful and historic narrative. "And Joanna".

I leave § 11 of my Introduction without addition. I think the balance of evidence is in favour of Luke's having accompanied St. Paul in his first missionary journey for the reasons, and others, derived from the Bezan text, and given in that section, and pass on to C. XV. I submit that the Bezan text of the decree in v. 23—29 is the original. I take the meaning of v. 19—21 to be that JAMES is shewing that he has considered the interests of

both sections of a mixed Church of Gentiles and Jews: the Gentiles are not to be troubled by any requirements of the Jewish ceremonial law, and the instruction of Jews, and the maintenance for them of that law, is amply provided for by the constant readings from Moses in the synagogue. With that preface he gives the decree that all Christians alike must "abstain from attending idol-feasts, from "blood-shedding and from fornication: and that whatsoever "ye would not should be done to yourselves ye are not "to do to another. From which if ye keep yourselves "ye shall do well, being sustained by the Holy Spirit".

I do not repeat Section 16—22 of my book. But I give the opening sentence of the Didache for comparison. "There are two Ways, one of Life and one of Death, "and there is a great difference between the two Ways. "The Way of Life is this. First of all thou shalt love "the God that made thee: secondly, thou shalt love thy "neighbour as thyself: and all things whatsoever thou wouldest "not have befall thyself, neither do thou to another".

I think the Decree was the origin of that last sentence of the Didache, and the cause of its name: and that JAMES and the Apostles that were with him believed in the possibility of the two sections of the growing Church, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, being able to worship together. Here, they thought, was the *esse* of the Church of Christ.

I do not go through the rest of the narrative though I hope that others will, and that of course in the Bezan text.

The narrative here, like that in the Gospel, like all that Luke wrote, appears to me to be scrupulously careful, accurate and truthful. It is veracious, but not in the modern sense critical. It was the report of a believer; a believer in Christ, and in the Holy Spirit. He was also a rarely gifted historian of that age. The supernatural presented no special difficulty to him, as it does to most of us. We can all admit the super-normal; but who can say where the supernormal ends and the supernatural begins?

I think that Luke fell into a slight inaccuracy in shortening his account of the journey from Caesarea to Jerusalem

in C. xxi. 15. He made it seem to be one day's journey instead of two, a quite unimportant matter.

But now I pass to another, but connected, and more serious matter, in which Canon STREETER perplexes me. His entire suppression of Manaen, and of the light thrown on history by the Bezan text considered as a Lucan draft of the Acts, has led him, it seems, to a view of St. Luke which appears to me both utterly unworthy of St. Luke and otherwise incredible. I wish I were able now to go into this fully in some critical magazine. But I am now in my 94th year, and I find it impossible.

Canon STREETER's theory, in his own words is that "The Lucan writings were primarily written to present the case for Christianity to certain members of the Roman aristocracy" (Four Gospels, p. 535), and that the Acts is "the first of the Apologies *i. e.* of defences of Christianity "addressed to the educated Roman World" (p. 529). It is suggested that this is partly "an inference from internal "evidence" (p. 532).

The internal evidence on p. 531 seems to me to have been inferred from the theory, rather than the theory supported by the internal evidence. Luke's aim is given by Luke himself; to state what he knows of the origin and growth of Christianity.

And no *direct* support is given by Canon STREETER, from any quarter to the theory. It is only made probable that in the reign of Hadrian such a book would have been suitable for the purpose of an Apology. This is the only support that I can see for the theory. It is made plausible by the fact that no reference is made to the very strong arguments against any such theory. These are entirely suppressed. It is not only that "*fine libri tempus compositionis definitur*", the plain commonsense inference that the book was written when, on the face of it, it seems to have been written, at the end of the 2nd year of St. Paul's detention at Rome (Acts xxviii. 30); but Canon STREETER attributes to Luke, by assuming that he wrote in A. D. 80 a book which on the face of it was written 20 years earlier, a degree of skill and artifice wholly incredible.

I can only refer to § 35 of my Introduction for a summary of these objections, and in particular to the article by Mr. RACKHAM in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for Oct. 1899, which I offer as part of my contribution to our symposium.

If I must give very briefly my own theory, it is that Luke began his investigation, with the co-operation of Manaen, soon after A.D. 42 or 43; and continued it till he went to Philippi and Troas and again met St. Paul; that he had already accumulated some of those precious materials to which Canon STREETER has given the appropriate name of Proto-Luke; that he was alluded to by St. Paul on that account (2 Cor. viii. 18) as "the brother whose praise in the Gospel is spread through all the Churches"; that he attached himself again to St. Paul, travelled with him to Jerusalem and Caesarea, and there completed the first draft of his Gospel; that he then went with St. Paul to Rome, and used the period of detention there for two years in writing the Acts, which he revised and dedicated to Manaen, whom I identify with Theophilus.

And then a cloud settles down on our history; and the events that concern the principal actors in it can only be conjectured; principally from the circumstances that appear very many years later. Of those circumstances and the inferences or conjectures from them, I am incompetent to deal, nor do they form any part of the subject of this symposium. But I imagine that the draft copy of the Acts remained at Rome and was treasured there; and was cautiously copied for the purpose of a Latin, a Syrian and an Egyptian and possibly an Armenian translation. (The Four Gospels p. 30). Meantime the copy sent to Manaen is in private keeping, and not copied or circulated for some time; and when it was copied, the circumstances being different, some scribe inserted the fatal word *πνικτοῦ* as an explanation of "blood", Acts xv. 20, 29.

But I must stop. I trust I have said nothing incompatible with my profound respect for Canon STREETER.

Jan. 3. 1930

J. M. W.

There are many examples among ancient books of several successive editions of the same work made by the original author, all of which have left their mark on the manuscript tradition so as to be recognizable at the present day. But the application of such a theory to Acts, as made by BLASS and ZAHN, and others, seems to be excluded by a number of considerations. Many of the differences in the 'Western' text of Acts represent special interests of the author of that text, entirely natural and harmless and such as he would not have been likely to eliminate in a revision or second edition. Others show a difference of literary habit and taste, and are not easily attributable to the same writer. In many passages the picture in the writer's mind of the event described or the scene depicted is seen to be different in the two forms of the text, when these are carefully studied. As between the two forms of the text of Acts, it is easy to see how in general the 'Western' text can have arisen by a process of 'rewriting' the other text. In contrast, the reverse process, when the facts are fairly faced for the book as a whole, seems inconceivable. It is, of course, not impossible and in some instances it is probable that for individual words and phrases, here and there, the 'Western' text, which was made at a date far earlier than that of our earliest Greek manuscripts, preserves the better reading.

December 12, 1929

JAMES HARDY ROPES

My admiration for BLASS is profound. I feel that I owe more to him than to any other editor of the Acts. At the same time I remain entirely unconvinced by his theory that the rival texts of Acts proceed from the same writer. If the problem concerned the Acts only, a fair case could be made out, subject to a serious objection, to be mentioned shortly. BLASS, however, extended his enquiry to the third Gospel, in which his solution was different and in his preface to his *ed. mai.* of Acts (p. 33) says that there were also two editions of Mark. The matter, however, does not rest there, since a similar problem exists not only in the other Gospels, but throughout the N.T. The hypothesis of two editions can hardly be extended to so many documents.

There remains the more serious objection stated by CORSEN after the appearance of BLASS's work (in *Göttinger gelehrte Anzeigen* 1896) that the two texts frequently differ in their conception of the events described and that this would be impossible, if both proceeded from the same writer. Thus in XIII. 20 according to the Received Text the period of 450 years refers to the time before the institution of Judges, while in D it is used of the time during which there were Judges. In XXI. 15—17 the Received Text does not mention any halt on Paul's journey from Caesarea to Jerusalem and makes Mnason come with him from Caesarea, in order to become his host in Jerusalem, while according to D the party halted in a village where they were given shelter by Mnason. Perhaps the most striking case is XXIV. 7 where D is not extant, but is represented by its allies which give a long passage (καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἡμέτερον νόμον . . . ἔρχεσθαι πρὸς σε) before παρ' οὗ δυνήσῃ, which does not appear in the Greek uncials. ROPES says (*ad loc.*): 'The chief effect of the addition is to cause παρ' οὗ, v. 8, to refer apparently to Lysias, cf. v. 22, instead of Paul'. Exactly so! No evidence could be so cogent as that of the Roman official who made the arrest. Paul would be a suspect witness. In v. 22 Felix says ὅταν Λυσίας ὁ χιλιάρχος καταβῇ, διαγνώσομαι τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς.

My own view is that the longer text, *i.e.* that found in D and its allies, often in the allies of D against D, or without D where it fails, is prior to the Received Text, which is the work of an abbreviator. I hope before long to set this forth in an edition upon which I have been engaged for many years. I may add that my text and apparatus are already in the hands of the Clarendon Press.

Jan. 9. 1930

ALBERT C. CLARK

ACTS 18₂₇, A TEST CASE.

Is the 'Western' text of Acts an unity? ROPES answers in the affirmative. He writes (Text of Acts, page viii): 'That the "Western" text, if, as I hold, not the work of the original author of Acts, was a definite rewriting, rather than an accumulation of miscellaneous variants, ought not to have been doubted, and that for two reasons. In the first place, it has an unmistakably homogeneous internal character. Secondly, its hundreds or thousands of variants are now known to have arisen in a brief period, scarcely, if at all, longer than the fifty years after the book first passed into circulation'. Cf. page ccxxii sqq.¹⁾

These are valid arguments. But there are other facts, which make their significance a little doubtful. We do not know the 'Western' text as an unity: all we have, is a mass of scattered readings, which we suppose to belong to the 'Western' text. There is not one witness which offers us a reliable form of the 'Western' text, not codex D, not the Harcleian version. The 'Western' text is a product of the scholars: not a product like the text of Westcott and Hort; for the variety within the supposed limits of the 'Western' text is much greater than within the limits of the Alexandrian or even the Syrian text²⁾. Secondly, there are some texts which remain unexplained by any theory upon the 'Western' text as an unity: Acts 15₂₉ par. is one of them³⁾.

This state of affairs makes it necessary, I believe, to examine at least each important reading of the 'Western' text by itself. We commence by supposing that the external authority of the 'canonical' and the 'Western' text is the same. We ask, what reading is the more probable. The

1) We find also other judgments by ROPES, e. g. page CCXL.

2) ROPES, page CCCXIII.

3) See my article Geref. Theol. Tijdschr. March 1928, Extract Bull. Bezan Club, No. VI.

sum of the answers gives us a verdict upon the 'canonical' and the 'Western' text.

Take Acts 18₂₇. The text of B. runs:

βουλομένον δὲ αὐτοῦ διελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Ἀχαίαν προτρεψάμενοι οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἔγραψαν τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἀποδέξασθαι αὐτόν· ὃς παραγενόμενος συνεβάλετο πολὺ τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν διὰ τῆς χάριτος.

D has:

Ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἐφέσῳ ἐπιδημοῦντές τινες Κορίνθιοι καὶ ἀκούσαντες αὐτοῦ παρεκάλουν διελθεῖν σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτῶν. συγκατανεύσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ οἱ Ἐφέσιοι ἔγραψαν τοῖς ἐν Κορίνθῳ μαθηταῖς ὅπως ἀποδέξωνται τὸν ἄνδρα. ὃς ἐπιδημήσας εἰς τὴν Ἀχαίαν πολὺ συνεβάλλετο ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

The reading of B suits very well with the context.

The reading of D on the contrary is highly improbable: it is contradictory in itself and it does not harmonize with other data of the N.T. In the Acts we never hear that members of a church are acting in another church; we never hear of any invitation to an apostle or evangelist to come to a church. But there is a more serious difficulty. If the Corinthians themselves invite Apollos to go to Corinth, why is it necessary that the Ephesians write a letter of recommendation? The 'Western' text emphasizes that Apollos is asked to travel to *Corinth*, but it tells of his sojourning in *Achaia*. How can Apollos help them *in the churches* by powerfully confuting the *Jews*?

There is also some trouble on account of the words. We meet twice with *ἐπιδημεῖν* here, once in the signification of *to sojourn some time*, and once in the signification of *to travel to*. But in Acts 2₁₀, and 17₂₁, *ἐπιδημεῖν* has the signification: *to dwell as a stranger in a certain place*. *Διελθεῖν σὺν αὐτοῖς* is strange, as it speaks of one continued action of several persons with different plans. *Πατρίς* does not occur in Acts.

Finally, it is not the custom of Apollos to alter his plans at the request of others, 1 Cor. 16₁₂.

The 'canonical' text on the contrary suits very well. It

is the intention of Apollos to travel to other countries (*διελθεῖν*); and being a Christian, he needs a letter of recommendation that the Corinthians may receive him as a *μαθητής*. He helps the believers by confuting the Jews, their enemies (cf. Acts 18_{6, 12} sqq.). When Apollos goes to Achaia, he can stay at Corinth, while Paul is travelling in Asia: Paul has not seen him in Asia.

To come to a conclusion. It is impossible, that the same author has written the 'canonical' and the 'Western' text, impossible therefore that Luke has given the two 'recensions' in two editions of his book. Acts 18₂₇ is a case like 15₂₉ par: both are an obstacle to accepting a twofold edition of the Acts by Luke himself.

What is the character of the 'Western' text of Acts 18₂₇? It is an intentional but awkward interpolation; awkward, as we have demonstrated supra; intentional, as appears, at the outset, from the omission of *ἐν τῷ τὸν Ἀπολλὼ εἶναι ἐν Κορίνθῳ* in D, 19₁. The interpolation is the effort of one who had read the 1 epistle to the Corinthians, to insert a relation between some Corinthians and Apollos into Acts.

We cannot answer here the question, whether all the interpolations of the 'Western' text have the same character. Nevertheless it is permissible to remark, that there are more enlargements, which find their explanation in other passages. Compare Acts 5₁₈ with John 7₅₃ (!); Acts 17₁₅, 19_{1, 21} with 16₇. The 'Western' text has also other contradictions; compare 11₁₇ (*δοῦναι αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα ἅγιον*) with 10_{44, 47}. Of all these additions it may be said that they are capable of explanation by the theory that they proceed from an editor later than the author (ROPES, page CCXXV).

Amsterdam

F. W. GROSHEIDE

Acts. 2³⁷ add. *ὑποδείξατε ἡμῖν*¹⁾
 5⁸ *ἐπερωτήσω σε* l. *εἰπέ μοι*

These two Bezan variants belong to the same habits of speech and writing; and it is the purpose of this note to shew up some of their affinities, and, it may be, point the direction of their sources.

Acts 2³⁷. This addition or prefix to a question is more or less familiar throughout the Biblical writings; and Dr. MINGANA assures us that it is also a thoroughly Eastern form of speech and writing. He writes: "Such a colloquialism is used in almost all the spoken languages of the East, even the non-Semitic dialects. It is also, I believe, found in good authors, as the expression sounds familiar to me".

It may be well to point out that 'shew' and 'tell' can be practically synonymous in this use. The Hebrew is *הגיד*, 'to tell' or 'describe', so that the event stands out conspicuously before the hearer's mental vision: the Syriac is *ܐܡܬ*. As an example of its use in poetic parallelism, cp. Deut. 32⁷:

Ask thy father, and he will shew thee; *נֹר*

Thine elders, and they will tell thee. *יֹאמְרוּ*

or of synonymous use, cp. Ezek. 24¹⁹, 37¹⁸:

Wilt thou not tell us what these things are to us, that thou doest so?

Wilt thou not shew us what thou meanest by these?
 cp. also Lk. 12⁵

*ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα φοβηθήτε . . .
 καὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, τοῦτον φοβηθήτε.*

It is interesting to observe that our A.V. translators, or their predecessors, were so imbued with this O.T. use of 'shew', that they thus render *ἀπαγγέλλειν* in several places in N.T. Among these, sy^{sc} in Mt. 11⁴, Jo. 16²⁵ uses, *ܐܡܬ*

1) Canon WILSON in the Introduction to his translation of the Codex Bezae quotes Acts 2³⁷ (as a whole) as a typical example of the longer text.

(c. hiat in Jo.), and this is not considered a variant either by VON SODEN or HORNER, though VOGELS¹⁾ notes that in Jo. *b* has *manifestabo*, and *r indicabo*.

In the above O.T. passages the LXX has in Deut. ἀναγγελεῖ.... ἐροῦσιν, and in Ezek. ἀναγγέλλειν in both. ὑποδεικνυμι = λέγω is used mainly in the later books, especially in Esdras and Tobit (15): in the latter, 5¹¹, there is also an example of this use as an interrogative suffix:

Ἀδελφέ, ἐκ ποίας φυλῆς καὶ ἐκ ποίας πατρίδος σὺ εἶ;
ὁπόδειξόν μοι.

For such uses of יָרַח with a question = 'tell us', 'tell me', see Gen. 24³³, 29¹⁵, 2 Sam. 1^{4*}, 2 Kgs. 4^{3*}, Jer. 36¹⁷, Job 38¹⁸, Cant 1⁷, and cp. 2 Kgs. 9¹⁹ (*following the question).

In turning to the N.T. let us notice first the use in the non-Lucan writings, and in the Received Text. We find it in Matt. 22¹⁷, Mt. 24³ = Mc. 13⁴, and Gal. 4²¹: a comparison of Mc. 14⁶¹ = Mt. 26⁶³ = Lk. 22⁶⁶ and Jo. 10³⁴ may well suggest that in both cases the original form of the question was

ⲁ ⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲓⲁⲛ ⲁⲙ ⲁⲓⲕ,

being left ambiguous in Mc., and more or less grecized in Mt., Lk. and Jo. — less in Lk. This passage is a good example of the frequent need of some interrogative addition to distinguish between statement and question.

In the Lucan writings it occurs in Lk. 7^{42 3)}, 20² Acts 5⁸, 22²⁷: in the answer to a question, Lk. 12⁵¹, 13³, 18⁸. It may be noted that in the parallel passages to 20³, Mt.

1) *Vulgatastudien*, Münster, 1928.

2) Here τί σοι δοκεῖ; is also added after εἰπέ ἡμῖν — another interrogative prefix, occurring by itself in Mt. 17²⁵, Lk. 10³⁶, Jo 11⁵⁶, and in introducing short parables ending in a question, Mt. 18¹², 21²⁸; cp. putas = ἄρα, Lk. 18⁸ and elsewhere.

3) The only instance in the middle of the question,

τίς οὖν αὐτῶν, εἰπὲ, πλεῖον αὐτὸν ἀγαπήσει;

Is it for this reason that sy-lat omit altogether, while pal adds, rightly at the end of the question? Note Pep. Harm. p. 32³⁹ 'Now' aske ich 'wheßer loved he most?' — to which we shall refer later.

and Mc. omit, while in the parallels to Mt. 22¹⁷, 24³, Lk. has prefaced the question by an *ἐπηρώτησαν*.

These are all examples from the Received Text; there remain these further 'Western' instances:

Mc. 11³⁰ (...*ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων;*) ἀποκριθῆτέ μοι becomes, in Ta^{ar} sy^(c) sah (<> boh) Gr^g 1,2 *k: dicite mihi*.

Jo. 1²² add *dic nobis*, sy^(s) Old Lat. ε 1279 (1081) Ta^{ned}; the order in sy^(s) e l 1279 is *quid es? dic nobis*.

Mc. 5⁸ *dic, quid est nomen tuum*: Fuld. Zach. Ta^{ned} our Acts 2³⁷ D E e g p sy^{hmg} Aug (not Iren).

Tepl.: *zeigt uns, was tun wir*.

Also, but under the harmonising influence of Mt. 22¹⁷,

Mc. 12¹⁴ C* D Θ W. 28 565 700, 124, 713. fam. 1424, al.

Old Lat. *DLQT* gat Gr^g 1,2: add also the *τί σοι δοκεῖ*; *k* and 2 min.

Lk. 20²² N.

The above passages seem to lead to the conclusion that while this addition is characteristically Semitic and prevalent throughout O.T. and N.T., it is somewhat more prominent both in the Lucan writings and in the 'Western' text, so that it might be equally a part of Luke's original text or a Western addition.

But the use of *ὑποδείξατε*¹⁾, instead of *εἰπατε*, may help us here. While, as we have seen, there is a wide use of 'shew' and 'tell', which are scarcely distinguishable, (and an actual example in Tobit of *ὑποδ.* = *εἰπατε* as an interrogative suffix), there is also that of *וַיִּתֵּן* and *אָמַר*, which is specially appropriate, when addressed to, or in the mouth of, the seer and the prophet; and this use of *ὑποδείκνυμι* in N.T. is almost entirely confined to Luke and Acts:

Lk. 3⁷ (= Mt. 3⁷)²⁾ 6⁴⁷, 12⁵ Acts 9¹⁶, 20³⁵.

When the turn to Acts 5⁸ we find that the Bezan reading, on the Greek side only, of *ἐπερωτήσω σε* for *εἰπέ μοι*, has also its Semitic background. For instance,

1) The examples in the papyri (Moulton & Milligan, Vocabulary Greek Test. p. 656) all give the stronger meaning of 'indicate', 'give full information or exposition.'

2) Here we seem to want a note from an expert in the Q text.

there are the familiar examples in the Great Questioning from the Whirlwind, in Job 38³ 40³, and in 42⁴. The only simple instance in N.T. is Lk. 6⁹, ἐπερωτῶ ὑμᾶς τί ἔξεστιν τῷ σαββάτῳ ἀγαθοποιεῖν ἢ κακοποιῆσαι; where the 'Western' and Antiochian texts have ἐπερωτήσω and sy^(sc) ~~αδλκικ~~: there is no such prefix in the parallel passages in Mt. Mc. In Lk. 20³ and parallels we may catch a glimpse of the colloquialism hidden under repartee:

Mt. (ἐπ) ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς κἀγὼ ἓνα λόγον, ὃν ἐὰν εἴπατε μοι, κἀγὼ ὑμῖν ἐρῶ

Mc. ἐπερωτήσω ὑμᾶς ἓνα λόγον, καὶ ἀποκριθῆτε μοι, καὶ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν

Lk. (ἐπ) ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς κἀγὼ λόγον, καὶ εἴπατε μοι, has become in sy^c *e a ff₂ i*

interrogabo vos et ego: dicite mihi

as the reply to the *dic nobis* of vs 2.

It might be suggested that the colloquialism was current in a longer and shorter form:

1. ἐπερωτήσω σε καὶ εἰπέ μοι¹⁾

2. (a) either ἐπερωτήσω σε²⁾

(b) or εἰπέ μοι.

Dr. Rendel HARRIS calls attention here to the parallelism, again in Lk. (22^{67, 68}), ἐὰν ὑμῖν εἴπω ἐὰν δὲ ἐρωτήσω

At any rate it is in Luke that we find the only other N.T. instance of ἐπερωτήσω σε as an interrogative prefix.

Here then in these two passages in the Bezan texts of the Acts (2³⁷, 5⁸) we have *kindred* colloquialisms, which, while thoroughly Semitic and prevalent in the Biblical writings, are *both* more incident in Lk. and Acts, while the former only is also more incident in the 'Western' text. The inference seems obvious; they may both be attributed to the vocabulary of Luke the Antiochian.

C. A. PHILLIPS

1) cp. Job 38³ etc. supra cit: יהוה יעניך ואתה תעני

2) Have we in Pep. Harm (Lk. 7⁴²) 'Now' aske ich 'wheper ...' behind the Old French, a reading, *te rogo*, for *dic* or *dic mihi*?

I may be allowed to contribute just one or two remarks to the problem raised by Canon WILSON. Personally I am very sceptical with regard to BLASS' theory, and would generally endorse ROPES' position. Perhaps it is however useful to emphasize that in the 'Western' text there are at least two *strata*, one corresponding to the basic text, which is the text circulating in the time of Marcion, and the other, which I would regard as a systematic paraphrastic revision of that text, which was performed in the 2nd part of the 2nd century. I believe that the existence of these two *strata* is not always sufficiently realized.

With regard to that second form of the 'Western' text, I would remark that its paraphrastic character seems quite similar to that with which we have become acquainted especially in the Latin, but also in the Syriac tradition of the Tatianic Harmony. To give only one instance: In Acts 2³⁷ the Bezan text and the Harclean margin both have the addition

Then all those who had come together

which is a phrase occurring several times in the Liège Harmony for instance ch. 15 (Lk. ii. 38)

al dat volk dat daer versament was,

in which place it is an anti-Judaistic variant which we may safely ascribe to Tatian.

My second remark would be to this effect:

The Bezan Text shows traces of Semitic influence from some source or other. This thesis was defended already by Chase. Mr. PHILLIPS gives two instances in this Bulletin, which however might be esteemed not to be decisive. We can show, I think, undoubtedly that Luke has used in his *Gospel*, sources not only of Palestinian origin, but written in the *Aramæic* language, — as indeed we should expect from him if he is an Antiochian by origin: stray Semitisms in his writings would not be unexpected.

The situation however is entirely different, if we find a good Greek word, rendered in the Syro-latin tradition

by an expression which is all right for the Syriac but awkward for the Latin. One of the clearest instances is given by Mr. PHILLIPS in Bulletin V, p. 44. The Greek οὐδὲν . . . ἔμελεν of Acts 18¹⁷ is rendered in the Latin of *d* by *fingebat eum non videre* and in *h* by *simulabat (se non v)idere*, which is evidently a direct translation from a Syriac ܕܡܠܐ¹⁾ explained in Ephrem's Comment as: *in order not as it were to see and he became as one not seeing*²⁾.

It would seem to me that if in the 'Western' Acts the same process can be seen at work which, I think, we find in the Old-Latin Harmony, viz. that a Syriac text is responsible for the 'Western' glosses and paraphrases, the possibility of attributing this form of text to Luke is excluded.

1) cp. syp ܕܡܠܐ ܕܡܠܐ, *negligebat*, literally: *avertebat oculos ab*.

2) Zahn retranslates it in his Greek edition of the 'Western Text' as: ὑπεκρίνετο μὴ ἰδεῖν, though there is not the least trace of such a reading in the Greek textual traditions.

D. PLOOIJ