
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

by the Spirit of Life to our fast failing pulses. So yielding to God's grace, China and all lands will find true enlightenment, permanent and beneficent reform; the soldiers need "exercise" no longer, but under the eternal rule of the Prince of Peace "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." "Oh! people of Sinim, loved and longed for, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the Lord."

A. E. MOULE.

ART. II.—THE WESTERN TEXT OF ST. LUKE.

OF the many questions in New Testament criticism which occupy the minds of scholars at the present day, one of the most interesting and important is that of the origin and history of what is called the Western text.

An examination of the MSS. quoted in cases where various readings occur, shows that in the main two leading groups may be distinguished, one of which centres round the Sinaitic and Vatican Codices ℵ and B, and the other round Codex Bezæ, or D as it is called. When in the eighteenth century Griesbach (1745-1812) was classifying the evidence then known for the New Testament, he gave the name Western to the latter group, and assigned to it Codex Bezæ and other Greek MSS. which contained a Latin translation, the Old Latin and the Vulgate Versions, and the Latin Fathers.

This title is still retained as a convenient designation, though it is much too narrow if taken in a geographical sense, for it is now found that this "Western" form of text is also attested by witnesses from the East. In fact, Westcott and Hort say[1] that "the text of all writers not connected with Alexandria, who have left considerable remains, is substantially Western"; and in view of this admission, Dr. Salmon suggests that non-Alexandrian would be a more suitable name.

The last twenty years have seen a vast change in the way in which the Western text is regarded; we may find in this partly a reaction from the contempt with which WH treated it, but it is also partly owing to the amount of fresh evidence which has lately been discovered for this form of text. Sixty years ago many of the best Western witnesses were inaccessible. Western readings were practically those of D only, supported by a few Latin versions (*a*, *b*, *c*) and quotations in Tertullian and Cyprian; the African Latin was unknown, except when it happened to be quoted by Cyprian and Tertullian, and the

[1] Introduction to Greek Text, p. 113. (For convenience Westcott and Hort are referred to as WH in this paper.)

existence of an old Syriac version, such as the Curetonian or that discovered by Mrs. Lewis, was only a conjecture.[1]

Consequently, D was looked on rather as a freak among MSS. Beza, when presenting it to the University of Cambridge in 1581, said that he had discovered such great discrepancy, especially in St. Luke's Gospel, between it and other MSS. that he thought it ought to be stored up rather than published, for the sake of avoiding offence. The prevailing opinion was of a similar kind until recent years. The copyists of D and its allies were supposed to be cursed with a double dose of the original sin of transcribers. Wherever these differed from other MSS. they were set aside as hopelessly wrong. Carelessness on the part of the scribes, a licentious love of change, and an unscrupulous readiness to insert anything they heard or read elsewhere, were supposed to furnish a complete explanation of these variations. "Quis enim sanæ mentis homo Codicem Bezæ sequatur?" was the contemptuous question of Matthaei. In the estimation of WH the Western text sank to the lowest point. Their fixed principle was to follow ℵ B in all cases where these documents agreed, and B where they differed. If a reading had only Western support it was at once rejected as having no claim to a place in the original text. If, as sometimes happened, the Western gave the most suitable sense, they only set it down to a lucky guess of the scribe. The only cases where they attach any weight to this form of text are what they call "Western non-interpolations"—that is, certain places, especially towards the end of St. Luke's Gospel, where D and its allies omit sentences and clauses found in ℵ B. In these cases WH follow the Western text because of their Canon that a transcriber is much more likely to add to the text than to omit. Elsewhere with them a Western reading stands self-condemned. In short, their opinion of the Western witnesses, and that which generally prevailed until recent times, cannot be better summed up than is done in the apt illustration of Dr. Salmon. He says it is like the character given by one Irish witness of another—"that he never told the truth in his life unless when he thought it was a lie."[2]

If this had been a complete account of the matter, scholars would hardly have devoted so much time to its consideration as has lately been given. But it is felt that there must be a limit somewhere to the audacity even of Western scribes, and that carelessness and corruption will not explain everything. It is admitted that documents of this class are marked by all

[1] *Cf.* Clement of Alexandria's Biblical Text, Introduction, p. xviii. (Burkitt).

[2] Article in "Hermathena," vol. ix. on Blass's "Commentary on Acts."

the common blunders of copyists, such as the insertion or omission of words, errors caused by mistaking what was written in the MS. from which they were copying, or by not catching correctly what was dictated to them, and the interchange of words of similar meaning. They were probably the produce of ordinary commercial manufacture, and cannot be compared in point of accuracy with such MSS. as ℵ and B, which were carefully corrected for Church use.

But granting this, there seems no reason to suppose that Western scribes were wilfully less careful than those of Alexandria and the East. Irenæus, who was Bishop of Lyons about 180 A.D., used a text which was distinctively Western, and in his book against Heresies[1] he employs an argument which throws some light on the way in which he regarded the sacred writings. He gives a reading in St. Matt. i. 18, which is only found elsewhere in Latin versions and the Curetonian Syriac—"But the birth of *Christ* was on this wise"—he is arguing against those Gnostics who said Jesus was a mere man, and that Christ descended on Him from above, and says Matthew might have said: "The birth of *Jesus* was on this wise"; but the Holy Spirit, foreseeing the depravers of the truth and guarding against their fraud, says by Matthew: "The birth of *Christ* was on this wise," showing that Jesus and Christ were one and the same Person. We cannot suppose Irenæus was alone among his Western contemporaries in believing in verbal inspiration, and how can we imagine that men with such a belief were wilfully careless in copying the text which they received?

A very remarkable fact bearing on this question has lately been pointed out in Codex Bezæ, which tends to show that the copyist of that MS. was scrupulously careful in his work. It is this: There are two ways of spelling the Greek equivalent of John—Ἰωάνης and Ἰωάννης. Now, in SS. Matthew, John, and Mark D has *νν* sixty-five times and *ν* only eleven times, while in St. Luke and Acts it has *νν* only three times and *ν* forty-eight times.

The order of the books in Codex Bezæ is Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, Acts—so we see the copyist used *νν* in Matthew and John, changed to *ν* in Luke, returned to *νν* in Mark, and once more changed to *ν* in Acts. Blass,[2] then, seems to be quite correct in his inference that any blunders in D must be referred back to its archetype.

The importance of all this is more clearly seen when we turn to St. Luke's writings, with which this paper is particularly concerned. The variants which the Western text presents here are much more serious than those in other

[1] Book III., xvi. 2. [2] "Philology of the Gospels," pp. 75, 76.

parts of the New Testament, and cannot be explained by any ordinary amount of carelessness and mistakes on the part of the scribe. Long passages are added, especially in the Acts; additional facts are given, and accurate notes of time and place are inserted; in certain places while the substance remains unchanged, the whole cast of the sentence is so altered that few of the words used are identical with those of the text of ℵ B; in other places the Western text resembles the ordinary text "only as a loose and explanatory paraphrase recalls the original from which it sprung."[1] If mere carelessness and licence were sufficient to account for these we would expect to find the same phenomena in the Western β-text of the Gospel. But there the state of the case is in many respects different; the Western witnesses are even more frequently marked by omissions than by additions; whole phrases are left out which are given by Alexandrian MSS. Can we imagine a number of scribes leaving out through carelessness, for example, the bulk of our Lord's well-known words to Martha, and giving as the Western text does, only "Martha, Martha, Mary hath chosen the good part, which shall not be taken away from her"? Or, take the form in which the words of the rich fool are given by D and the Latin version: "And I will say to my soul: Thou hast much goods, be merry"; why should any scribe mutilate this fine passage, supposing that the MS. which he was copying gave the fuller form which we find in our Bibles?

One other instance of omission must suffice here. The note in the margin of the Revised Version on St. Luke xxiv. 52 tells us that some ancient authorities omit, in the account of Christ's parting with the disciples, the clauses—"and was carried up into heaven" and "they worshipped Him." The "ancient authorities" are those for the Western text, which thus has no mention at all of the Ascension, and gives no reason why "the disciples returned to Jerusalem with great joy." Is it likely that any copyist would deliberately make such an omission as this?

We see, then, that we are face to face with a strange phenomenon—a text of the writings of St. Luke which differs very widely from that of ℵ B, and which at first sight certainly seems entitled to more respect. If the famous dictum of Vincent of Lerins ("quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus") could be used for deciding between conflicting types of text, certainly the Western text more nearly satisfies it, and would take the higher place. It is admitted, even by WH, its bitter opponents, to be the form in which St. Luke's writings were read far and wide in the second

[1] Scrivener, Bezæ Codex, p. liv.

and third centuries, two hundred years before ℵ and B were written, and they acknowledge that the earliest quotations which we can fix chronologically belong to it.[1] Scrivener says that it is the text largely received by the holiest men in the best ages of the Primitive Church. Irenæus in France, Cyprian in Africa use this form. The two Syriac versions of the Gospels discovered by Cureton and Mrs. Lewis within the last sixty years are very markedly Western in type. And Mr. Burkitt has shown in his examination of Clement of Alexandria's Biblical Text that even this Father, who might have been expected to be the faithful ally of ℵ B, is not so, but rather sides with D and the Old Latin. In his words:[2] "The result is that the only channel by which we might have thought to connect the non-Western text as an organic whole with Apostolic times is cut off. With Clement's evidence before us we must recognise that the earliest texts of the Gospels are fundamentally Western in every country of which we have knowledge, even in Egypt."

And yet, if it were a question of choosing between the Western and non-Western texts, we could have no hesitation in taking the non-Western—at least, in Acts, where, as a finished piece of literary work, it is much superior to the other.

Can any satisfactory explanation, then, be given of this strange phenomenon? How can such early and widespread acceptance of this form of text be accounted for if it did not come from St. Luke himself?

One main test must be laid down and applied to any explanation offered; it must be comprehensive enough to cover all the ground. We have seen that the Gospel and the Acts go together; therefore if a theory is to be satisfactory it must be applicable to both. Again, it is not enough to form a theory which will explain peculiarities of Codex Bezæ or its archetype. It must also explain the variants in the Old Latin text used by Cyprian, which Corssen has shown to be independent of Codex Bezæ, and probably a more ancient witness to the Western text. It must also account for the Syriac evidence.

The limits of this paper will not permit an examination of the various explanations which were put forward before that of Blass. Some of them only apply to Codex Bezæ or its archetype, and so fail to satisfy the test mentioned. Others are faulty in other respects, and have obtained no wide acceptance. A bare enumeration of them must now suffice.

Resch tries to account for the variants in D by saying that the persons who collected the Gospels, Acts, and Catholic Epistles into one volume, shortened and interpolated St. Luke's

[1] Introduction, p. 120. [2] P. xvii.

works with the greatest audacity, using a secondary translation of the original Hebrew Gospel, which he imagines to have existed before St. Mark and St. Luke.

Chase's theory is that all the variants in the Western text can be explained as the result of assimilation to a Syriac text, which was much given to filling up the narrative by means of fragments culled from other parts of the Bible.

Ramsay confines his attention to Codex Bezæ, and thinks it is the work of a second century reviser, who was a person of some authority and evidently a native of Asia Minor, since his variants show an accurate knowledge of the geography and traditions of that country.

Corssen believes he can prove that the Western text was the work of a Montanist reviser, and therefore later than the rise of that heresy.

Dobschutz's theory is that the Western text represents the original which was much corrupted and interpolated by the licence of scribes. He supposes that it was taken in hand by men of authority, who revised it and reduced it to the form which we find in ℵ B.

Lastly, Rendel Harris at one time thought that all the Western evidence could be resolved into one single primitive Western bilingual which was the remote ancestor of Codex Bezæ and was probably written before the time of Tatian (*c.* 160) who is supposed to have brought the Gospels and Acts to Syria from Rome. Harris's opinion was that the additions and changes all originated in the Latin of this primitive bilingual. But he has now laid aside this theory, and is very favourably inclined to that of Blass, which he says "is much easier than that of any reviser, since it throws back at all events a part 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 not be very remote from the actual sources."[1]

We pass, therefore, to the theory of Blass which at present holds the field, and of which Professor Ramsay says that it finds a growing number of adherents, and the list of scholars who support it becomes steadily "more imposing alike for numbers and high standing in the world of scholarship."

It has been pointed out by Goethe how much the knowledge of particular subjects is indebted to intelligent amateurs. For example, modern Old Testament criticism largely sprung from a suggestion of Astruc, a physician, who noticed the use of different Hebrew words for God in

[1] Four Lectures on the Western Text, p. 65.

Genesis, and inferred that this fact might indicate different sources of the narrative. The present theory is a case in point. Dr. Blass had long been known as a writer on classical philology as well as by his work on the Attic Orators. When he removed to Halle, a University where theological students predominate, he undertook to write a commentary on the Book of Acts, and while doing so he was led to form his theory about the Western text. Blass leads a conservative reaction in Germany; he comes to his task just as if he were about to edit a Greek classic. He has no preconceived notion that he is dealing with the product of a second century compiler. He assumes as a thing about which there can be no reasonable doubt, that St. Luke was the author, and that the traditional dates and places of composition are correct as regards both his works.

His theory in a few words is this: That St. Luke wrote the Gospel and the Acts twice, that both copies in each case got into circulation, and that thus all the striking peculiarities of the Western text may be accounted for.

This theory, as Blass himself points out, is not by any means new. It was first started by Johannes Clericus (or Jean le Clerc), who was born in Geneva in 1657 and lived in Holland. Little notice, however, seems to have been taken of it for over a century and a half. Scrivener approached somewhat nearly to it in his Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament.[1] Speaking of certain Western readings, he says: "It may be reasonably thought that a portion of these variants, and those among the most considerable, had their origin in the . . . changes gradually introduced after publication by the authors themselves into the various copies yet within their reach. These copies would circulate independently of those issued previously and now beyond the writer's control, and thus, becoming the parents of a new family of copies, would originate and keep up divergencies from the first edition without any fault on the part of the transcribers."

WH mentioned, when treating of the Western non-interpolations, the idea of two editions as one which would suit the purely documentary phenomena. But they set it aside, as they thought none of these Western non-interpolations would internally justify such a claim to originality.

Another great English scholar, Bishop Lightfoot, almost enunciated the theory in his "Fresh Revision of the English New Testament."[2] He is speaking of three notable additions in the Western text of the Gospel, all of which are found in the Authorized Version. The first is in St. Luke ix. 55, 56,

[1] P. 18, 3rd ed. [2] P. 29.

where James and John asked our Lord if He wished them to command fire to come down from heaven. Here the words "Even as Elias did," and "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them," are only found in Western and Syriac witnesses. Another Western addition was the well-known passage describing our Lord's Agony and Bloody Sweat, and the coming of an angel to strengthen Him. And the third was one of the seven words from the Cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Speaking of these, Bishop Lightfoot said: "It seems impossible to believe that these incidents are other than authentic, and the solution will suggest itself that the Evangelist himself may have issued two separate editions. This conjecture will be confirmed by observing that in the second treatise of St. Luke similar traces of two editions are seen, where the passages omitted in many MSS. texts, bear equal evidence of authenticity, and are entirely free from suspicion on the ground that they were inserted to serve any purpose, doctrinal or devotional."

Blass, then, was only following out an idea which had already commended itself to some great scholars. At first he applied the theory only to the Book of Acts, on which he was writing a commentary, but afterwards he extended it to the Gospel also, when critics pointed out that the two works should not be separated.

His theory, as now stated in full, is as follows:[1] When St. Luke came to Palestine with St. Paul, about 54 A.D., he found that all the Apostles had left Jerusalem, and instead of their *vivâ voce* teaching there were *writings* which contained what they had been accustomed to relate in the assemblies of Christians. Compare the prologue to the Gospel: "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative concerning those matters which have been fulfilled among us." By "us" St. Luke means the inhabitants of Palestine, where he had been living for two years. St. Luke wished that Theophilus (and his friends) might enjoy the same benefit as the Judæan Christians. *He* had only been *instructed* (κατηχήθης), while *to them eye-witnesses had delivered* (παρέδοσαν) what they had seen and heard. Therefore he wrote his Gospel, that Theophilus might have the same certainty (ἀσφάλειαν). Theophilus being a man of some importance, St. Luke would make a fair copy, probably on vellum, for him with his own hand, and would keep the original rough draft. Some time

[1] It is found in his "Acta Apostolorum" and "Evangelium secundum Lucam, secundum formam quæ videtur Romanam." See also his "Philology of the Gospels."

afterwards he went with St. Paul to Rome, and the Christians there, hearing that he had written a Life of Christ, and wishing to possess such a precious book, would ask him for a copy. This he also made from the rough draft, and introduced such changes as seemed good to him, omitting some things as unnecessary, and adding others which he had passed over when making the copy for Theophilus.

In the meantime he had formed the idea of writing a further account of the spread of Christianity; perhaps he had obtained a document telling of the early events in Judæa after the day of Pentecost; perhaps he had collected material during St. Paul's imprisonment at Cæsarea: possibly both these suppositions are true.

So he wrote the Book of Acts as it is found in the Western form for the Romans also, and in order to make it fit on to his former work he made certain changes in the end of his new copy of the Gospel; he cut out all mention of the Ascension of our Lord, because he was about to relate it in a much fuller form in the beginning of Acts.

Then, wishing that Theophilus should have all the information possible, he made a second copy of Acts also, and sent it to him in the East, where it became the parent of the MSS. which give the non-Western text.

Now, if this account be correct, one would expect to find that the first copy in each case is more prolix, and the second more concise and polished, since an author is at perfect liberty, in rewriting his work, to amend, add, condense, and generally improve his book. One would also expect to find that the language of the variants would show unmistakable signs of St. Luke's style. For both these points Blass has made out a very strong case. He has shown by a most minute examination that the words of the Western variations are such as St. Luke uses, and that the number of *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* is, if anything, less than in other parts of his works. It needed no demonstration to show that the non-Western text of Acts which is the second recension, is much more concise and finished than the Western. But some critics who agree with Blass on this point do not see their way to follow him when he says the non-Western is the first recension in the *Gospel*, and that the Western, being more concise and polished, is the later. He has certainly quoted some passages which seem to strongly support his contention. Take, for example, the account of the healing of the man with the withered hand. In the ordinary text there are four co-ordinate sentences joined by *καὶ* or *δέ*. In Codex Bezæ these are reduced to one principal sentence, the other three being changed into a genitive absolute and a relative sentence. The ordinary text gives vi. 6:

"*And* it came to pass on another Sabbath that He entered into the synagogue and taught; *and* there was a man there, *and* his right hand was withered, *and* the Scribes and Pharisees watched Him."

D has:

"And when He had again entered on the Sabbath into the synagogue, in which was a man having a withered hand, the Scribes and Pharisees watched Him."

Again, in xix. 35, speaking of the colt on which Jesus rode to Jerusalem, the ordinary text gives:

"And they brought him to Jesus, and having cast their garments upon the colt, they set Jesus thereon."

Here it was necessary to repeat "Jesus" twice, on account of the mention of the colt, and this mention was necessary because it would be ambiguous to say "they cast their garments upon *him*." In the Western text the whole sentence is recast and given in a smoother and more elegant form: "And having brought the colt, they cast their garments upon him and set Jesus thereon."

Blass says if such transformations are to be ascribed to copyists or readers, then he is afraid we shall get a kind of copyists or readers who are but the creations of our own fancy, without having had any existence in reality. He is not able to recognise anything here but the license of an author who is handling his own work, and the skill of a writer.

Let us now turn to the Book of Acts, and examine a few of the most interesting additions of the Western text. Many of these have such an appearance of genuineness that they are accepted as St. Luke's even by those who do not give their approval to Blass's theory.

There are a number of passages in which the Western text gives exact notes of time and place which are wanting in the ordinary text.

In the account of St. Peter's delivery from prison by the angel, it tells us that after the iron gate opened and they went out "*they went down the seven steps*." This remarkable addition could only come from someone who knew Jerusalem well. It is difficult to see why a scribe should insert it, but we can see how St. Luke might omit it in his second recension as an unnecessary detail.

When St. Paul withdrew from the synagogue at Ephesus, he took his disciples to the school of one Tyrannus, where he reasoned daily. Here the Western witnesses add a clause which Professor Ramsay says can hardly be explained, except as a deliberate impertinence, or as founded on actual tradition. They say that he taught "from the fifth to the tenth hour daily." We know from Martial and Juvenal that school-work

ordinarily began at daybreak, so it is not strange that school should be over by eleven o'clock, and thus leave the room free for St. Paul.

In the account of the riot in this same city there is greater vividness in the Western text. According to it, the meeting of silversmiths took place in the house or workshop of Demetrius, for it says that after they were filled with wrath "*they rushed out into the street.*"

The same text tells us that on the voyage to Jerusalem St. Paul and his companions stopped *in Trogyllium*, and that when sailing to Rome they were *fifteen days* crossing the sea of Cilicia and Pamphylia.

In xi. 28 there is an interesting insertion. After the mention of the prophets who came from Jerusalem to Antioch, we read: "There was great joy. And *when we were assembled together* one of them, by name Agabus, said," etc. If this is genuine, it agrees with the tradition given by Eusebius and Jerome that St. Luke was a member of the Church of Antioch. Blass points out its importance as showing that the use elsewhere of the first person "we" cannot be employed (as it frequently has been) for the purpose of dissecting the Acts into parts originally independent.

In the account of the persecution at Iconium, in the fourteenth chapter, the ordinary text reads thus:

"1. And it came to pass in Iconium that they went both together into the synagogue of the Jews, and so spake that a great multitude both of the Jews and also of the Greeks believed. 2. But the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their minds evil affected against the brethren. 3. Long time, therefore, abode they, speaking boldly in the Lord. . . ."

Now, this narrative seems to be wanting in coherence; the result of the action of the unbelieving Jews is not stated at all. The verbs used of them are aorists (ἐπήγειραν καὶ ἐκάκωσαν), and imply a successful attempt, which, if unchecked, would have ended in the expulsion of Paul and Barnabas by the combined Jews and Gentiles, as before at Antioch. So the force of the next clause, "Long time, therefore, abode they," is not apparent.

The Western text, however, is clear and coherent. It reads: "But the chiefs of the synagogues of the Jews and their magistrates directed a persecution against the just, and made the minds of the Gentiles evil affected against the brethren: *but the Lord soon gave peace.* Long time, therefore," etc. Then in the fifth verse it goes on: "The Jews a second time stirred up a persecution, and having stoned them, cast them out of the city."

The question will naturally occur to one: If the Western reading is so superior, why did St. Luke alter it for the worse in the ordinary text, which is the second recension? Blass says it is the result of his attempt to condense his narrative, and that here, as in other passages, he did not improve it by doing so.

But this passage raises another question, which I have not seen noticed anywhere, and it is this: Is the Western text not contradictory to or at least inconsistent with 2 Cor. xi. 25, where St. Paul says, "Once was I stoned"? The account in this passage was quoted by Paley as a proof of the accuracy of the New Testament, since a writer forging a letter or a piece of history might easily have gone wrong. But what becomes of this argument if the Western reading is from the pen of St. Luke?

In the story of the Philippian gaoler there is a curious insertion (xvi. 30), which brings out how the same critic may take totally different views of a Western reading at different times. It reads: "He brought them out, and *having secured the rest*, he came and said to them, Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" Professor Ramsay, in his "Church in the Roman Empire" (p. 160) said: "This clause has an almost comic effect. The gaoler carefully looked to his immediate interests before he attended to his future salvation." But in "St. Paul the Traveller" (p. 222) he gives his later opinion: "The Bezan text preserves, in verse 30, a little detail which is so suggestive of the orderly and well-disciplined character of the gaoler that we are prompted to accept it as genuine. The gaoler first attended to his proper work and secured all his prisoners, and thereafter he attended to Paul and Silas and brought them forth. It seems highly improbable that a Christian in later times would insert the gloss that the gaoler looked after his prisoners before he cared for his salvation; it is more the spirit of a later age to be offended with the statement that the gaoler did so, and to cut it out."

We next come to a very instructive passage, one which strongly confirms what we have already seen—viz., that the Western text does add to our knowledge.

In xxi. 15-17 the ordinary reading is:

"And after these days we took up our baggage and went up to Jerusalem. And there went with us also certain of the disciples from Cæsarea, bringing with them one, Mnason of Cyprus, an early disciple, with whom we should lodge. And when we were come to Jerusalem, the brethren received us gladly."

Now, this was generally taken to mean that Mnason had a house at Jerusalem, and went with St. Paul to entertain him

in that city. This raised a little difficulty. One would have thought that St. Paul would have been lodged by some private friends; we know, for instance, that his sister lived there, not to speak of "the brethren who received him gladly." Besides, it was about sixty-five miles from Cæsarea to Jerusalem, and the journey could not be made without a rest on the way.

Here also the reading of the Western text is fuller: "These brought us to certain with whom we should lodge, and when we got to *a certain village we stayed with Mnason*, an early disciple, and *departing thence* we came to Jerusalem."

Thus, it seems Mnason did not live at Jerusalem, but at a village on the way; and Professor Ramsay and others say that the ordinary text, when properly understood, implies this also. It means we set out for Jerusalem (*ἀνεβαίνομεν*), we lodged with Mnason (*ξενισθῶμεν*, aorist, a definite time on the way), we came to Jerusalem (*γενομένων δὲ ἡμῶν*).

Here, as before, Blass says the ordinary reading is the result of condensing what was told more fully in the first recension. That St. Paul lodged at a village might seem likely to have little interest for Theophilus, and so the details could be spared.

Dr. Salmon has a striking note[1] on the epithet "early" (*ἀρχαίῳ*) as applied to Mnason. We might ask when he was converted, and if we refer back to xi. 2 we find another addition of the Western text which throws light on the question. It says that when St. Peter was journeying along this same road from Cæsarea to Jerusalem, after the conversion of Cornelius, he "*preached the Gospel in the places through which he passed*" —that is, in the very country where Mnason lived. Here, then, is an undesigned coincidence, if, as is most likely, Mnason was one of his converts. We can also see a probable reason why this passage in xi. 2 might be inserted in the first recension and omitted in the second. St. Luke, when staying that night with Mnason, heard enough about St. Peter's preaching to lead him to make a note of it in his rough draft, and to copy it in the first recension. But he left it out in his second, when his mind was fully occupied with St. Paul's work.

Again, in xxviii. 16 there is a piece of information which would, no doubt, be very interesting to the Romans, but might be left out in the copy intended for Theophilus and the East. On their arrival at Rome, the Western text adds that "the centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard" (*τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῃ*). This title used to be interpreted as meaning the Prefect of the Prætorian Guard, but, as Professor Ramsay says,[2] it is not likely that the Prætorian

[1] "Hermathena," vol. ix. (as above).
[2] "St. Paul the Traveller," p. 347.

Prefect would be concerned with the humble duty of receiving and guarding prisoners. Mommsen, however, aided by a Latin version (*g*), which translates the word by "princeps peregrinorum," has explained who this officer really was. Augustus had made out a system for the maintenance of communications between the centre at Rome and the armies on the frontiers. Legionary centurions, called "frumentarii," went to and fro, acted as messengers and couriers, performed police duties, and conducted prisoners. While at Rome they resided in a camp on the Cœlian Hill, called Castra Peregrinorum. This camp was under the command of the Princeps Peregrinorum, and clearly "Stratopedarch" is the Greek name for that officer.

This instance, then, not merely proves the accuracy of the Western text, but also shows that it adds considerably to our knowledge.

In the case of the Gospel some of the important additions of the Western text have been already mentioned. Two of them, at least, are such that it would cause us much sorrow to lose them—the account of our Lord's Agony and Bloody Sweat, and His prayer for His executioners. There is an echo of the latter in the dying words of St. Stephen, and it seems impossible to believe they are not authentic.

Two of the omissions of the Western text have also been referred to—in the *words of our Lord to Martha*, and in the *soliloquy of the rich fool*. If space permitted, many others could be given.

But there are still two remarkable additions which ought to be mentioned. One is the passage inserted in chapter vi. about the man working on the Sabbath day: "On the same day He saw a man working on the Sabbath, and said unto Him: Man, if thou knowest what thou art doing, blessed art thou; but if thou dost not know it, thou art cursed and a transgressor of the law."

The words here are for the most part such as St. Luke would use, and Scrivener thinks that if the antithesis were less pointed it might be deemed not unworthy of the Divine Teacher. The spirit of the passage Blass shows to be quite Pauline (*cf.* Rom. xiv. 5, 23). He thinks it was left out of the recension sent to Theophilus, lest it should cause needless offence to the Jews, who were much more numerous in the East.

The other addition is found in the account of the burial of the Body of our Lord in xxiii. 53. The Western text gives: "And after it (the Body) had been laid there, he put against the sepulchre a stone which twenty men could scarce roll."

The stone is mentioned in xxiv. 2 as being there, and it must seem strange that it was not mentioned before, as in SS. Matthew and Mark. Dr. Harris found here in the Latin of Codex Bezæ a hexameter line: "Imposuit lapidem quem vix viginti movebant," and this he believed to be the source of the strange addition. He thought this line came from a translation of the "Odyssey," where Polyphemus is said to have closed his cave with a stone which two-and-twenty waggons could not stir. Blass quite agrees as to its Homeric origin, but says St. Luke must have learned Homer at school, and the comparison might occur to him as well as to anyone else.

In considering the theory of a double recension put forward by Blass, it is very important to remember that his reasoning is cumulative, and is based on the evidence taken as a whole. Separate cases of variation must be examined, and in each a different explanation may be possible; but the force of the argument grows if this one theory will account for most, if not all, of the variants. Further, whatever conclusion is adopted as to the Acts will largely decide the question in the Gospel, for the two go together. It is much easier to test additions than omissions; in Acts the Western text is chiefly marked by additions, and there is no danger here as in the Gospel of mixture with similar writings.

Investigation shows that the language of the Western text is quite that of St. Luke; the matter of the additions in many cases materially adds to our knowledge, and few or no contradictions to other passages can be discovered.

The question, then, is: Is all this consistent with the idea of an interpolator or reviser? Would such a person always succeed in reproducing St. Luke's style without overdoing it? Would he make no mistakes and fall into no errors? In this connection we must remember WH's dictum that "in literature of a high quality it is, as a rule, improbable that a change made by transcribers should improve an author's sense, or express his full and exact sense better than he has done himself."

Blass has stated that his theory rests on two bases: (1) That the Western additions are original: no stranger could add the many things which show actual and intimate knowledge, or, if he could, would not. (2) That the ordinary text must come from the author himself also, for no form not authentic could ever have acquired such universal acknowledgment.

A word must be said as to the criticism to which the theory has been subjected. No one seems to dispute its *à priori* probability; it is admitted to be in the nature of

things quite possible that St. Luke wrote his books twice, and those who disagree with Blass, deal rather with the hypothesis as applied to particular passages.

The strongest objection seems to be that drawn from the number of places, especially in Acts, where the Western reading is clear and easy to understand, while the supposed second revision becomes involved and obscure. Blass says one cannot always give the reasons why St. Luke made the change, and that occasionally he may have somewhat spoiled his work. Granting that this explanation may hold good in a few passages; yet if many such cases are found, of which no other account can be given, a certain amount of doubt must attend the theory.

However, Blass's hypothesis can claim a large and growing number of adherents, and commends itself as the most satisfactory yet offered, to such scholars as Dr. Salmon and Dr. Gwynn of Dublin, Dr. Harris of Cambridge, Nestle and Zahn in Germany, and many others.

Dr. Salmon, in his "Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," says: "If we had only to deal with the Acts, I should look for no other explanation of the facts; but if the fact of a double edition of the Acts is established, it becomes probable that the like may be true of the Gospel." As to the Gospel, it should be mentioned that Dr. Salmon inclines rather to the view that the Western variations there are owing to explanations of passages given by St. Luke himself in reply to questions at Rome; he thinks it likely that these explanations were written down, and afterwards read in the Church as authorized commentaries on his writings.

Since Blass's theory depends at present entirely on internal evidence, it is clear it cannot be proved with absolute certainty. I hope I have, however, succeeded in making the following points clear: (1) That the theory of a double recension is *à priori* probable; (2) that on the whole it suits the case, and goes much farther towards explaining the phenomena of the Western text than any other which has yet been advanced.

W. Harloe Dundas.