

The Book of Acts as Church History  
Apostelgeschichte als Kirchengeschichte

Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die  
neutestamentliche Wissenschaft  
und die Kunde der älteren Kirche

In Verbindung mit  
James D. G. Dunn · Richard B. Hays  
Hermann Lichtenberger

herausgegeben von  
Michael Wolter

Band 120



Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York  
2003

# The Book of Acts as Church History Apostelgeschichte als Kirchengeschichte

Text, Textual Traditions and Ancient Interpretations  
Text, Texttraditionen und antike Auslegungen

Edited by  
Tobias Nicklas and Michael Tilly



Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

2003

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines of the ANSI  
to ensure permanence and durability

ISBN 3-11-017717-X

*Bibliographic information published by Die Deutsche Bibliothek*

Die Deutsche Bibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed  
bibliographic data is available in the Internet at <<http://dnb.ddb.de>>.

© Copyright 2003 by Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, D-10785 Berlin

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this book may  
be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including  
photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in  
writing from the publisher.

Printed in Germany

Cover design: Christopher Schneider, Berlin

## Vorwort

Der vorliegende Band enthält eine internationale, fach- und konfessionsübergreifende Zusammenstellung von wissenschaftlichen Aufsätzen zu unterschiedlichen Aspekten der Textgeschichte der Apostelgeschichte des Lukas. Verbunden sind die einzelnen Beiträge vor allem durch die Erkenntnis, dass nicht allein die Rekonstruktion des „Urtextes“, sondern auch die Frage nach den Trägern der frühchristlichen Textüberlieferung zu den zentralen Aufgaben neutestamentlicher Textkritik gehört.

Der Dank der Herausgeber und Autoren gilt Herrn Prof. Dr. Michael Wolter und den Mitherausgebern für die Bereitschaft, diesen Band in die Reihe »Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft« aufzunehmen. Herrn Dr. Claus-Jürgen Thornton und Herrn Klaus Otterburg vom Verlag Walter de Gruyter danken wir für die verlegerische Betreuung und für die freundliche Unterstützung bei der Textgestaltung, Frau Dr. Ann Graham Brock für die Übersetzung des Einleitungskapitels, Frau Diplomtheologin Anna Madsen für die Durchsicht der englischen Abstracts sowie Herrn Dr. Thomas Hieke und Frau Juniorprofessorin Dr. Heike Omerzu für die kompetente und prompte Lösung zahlreicher Probleme bei der Erstellung der Druckvorlage. Die sorgfältige Kontrolle der Belegstellen verdanken wir Herrn stud. theol. Thomas Lux.

Regensburg und Mainz im April 2003

Tobias Nicklas und Michael Tilly



## **Inhaltsverzeichnis**

TOBIAS NICKLAS – MICHAEL TILLY	
Vorwort .....	V

TOBIAS NICKLAS – MICHAEL TILLY	
Introduction: New Testament Textual Criticism at the Crossroads .....	1

### **I**

#### **Von der Vielfalt zur Einheit**

##### **Die Frage nach dem Urtext und der Entstehung der Textformen**

J. KEITH ELLIOTT	
An Eclectic Textual Study of the Book of Acts .....	9
STANLEY E. PORTER	
Developments in the Text of Acts before the Major Codices .....	31
CHRISTOPHER TUCKETT	
How early is the 'Western' Text of Acts? .....	69
MARCO FRENSCHKOWSKI	
Der Text der Apostelgeschichte und die Realien antiker Buchproduktion .....	87

### **II**

#### **Interpretation der Vielfalt**

##### **Textformen, Manuskripte und ihre Hintergründe**

ELDON JAY EPP	
Anti-Judaic Tendencies in the D-Text of Acts: Forty Years of Conversation .....	111
HEIKE OMERZU	
Die Darstellung der Römer in der Textüberlieferung der Apostelgeschichte .....	147

MICHAEL W. HOLMES Women and the 'Western' Text of Acts .....	183
ANN GRAHAM BROCK Appeasement, Authority, and the Role of Women in the D-Text of Acts.....	205
FRIEDRICH WILHELM HORN Apg 8,37, der Westliche Text und die frühchristliche Tauftheologie .....	225
PAUL METZGER Zeitspiegel: Neutestamentliche Handschriften als Zeugnisse der Kirchengeschichte. Die Frage nach einer Hoffnung für Israel bei Lukas.....	241
JENNY READ-HEIMERDINGER The Apostles in the Bezan Text of Acts.....	263
JOSEP RIUS-CAMPS The Gradual Awakening of Paul's Awareness of His Mission to the Gentiles .....	281
TOBIAS NICKLAS Vom Umgang mit der Schrift: Zeugen der Apostelgeschichte als Quellen christlichen Kultur- und Soziallebens in der Antike.....	297
MICHAEL TILLY Juden, Christen und Heiden im Actatext der Peschitto. Beobachtungen zu einer syrischen Übersetzung der Apostelgeschichte .....	321



### III Rezeption der Vielfalt Altkirchliche Auslegungen

SUSANNE MÜLLER-ABELS

Der Umgang mit „schwierigen“ Texten der  
Apostelgeschichte in der Alten Kirche..... 347

MARTIN MEISER

Texttraditionen des Aposteldekrets –  
Textkritik und Rezeptionsgeschichte..... 373

KATHARINA GRESCHAT

Taten und Verkündigung der zwölf Apostel.  
Zitation und Rezeption der Apostelgeschichte  
bei Aphrahat..... 399

Zusammenfassungen – Abstracts ..... 423

Autorinnen und Autoren ..... 435

Register

1. Stellen (in Auswahl)..... 437

2. Sachen ..... 443

3. Autorinnen und Autoren ..... 447



## Introduction: New Testament Textual Criticism at the Crossroads

(translated by Ann Graham Brock)

In his renowned apology against the *Alethes Logos* of the philosopher Celsus, Origen cites Celsus and his criticism of the opponents:

„After this he says that some believers, as though from a drinking bout, go so far as to oppose themselves and alter the original text of the gospel three or four or several times over, and they change its character to enable them to deny difficulties in face of criticism.“<sup>1</sup>

Origen could not completely contradict this accusation in his own response, although, according to him, such actions concerned only heretics, such as Marcion, Valentinus, and Lucanus, who actually “corrupted” the gospel by meddling with the text. In reality though, Origen himself made changes here or there in the text of the New Testament available to him. One of the most well-known examples is the variant in John 1,28 that mentions: “Bethabara on the other side of the Jordan” instead of “Bethany,” a change preserved in some textual witnesses of the New Testament, and one that probably originated with Origen himself, who on a trip through Palestine could find no “Bethany on the other side of the Jordan.”<sup>2</sup>

Origen is not the first Christian author we know to have been confronted with the problem of textual variety in the available manuscripts of what came to be recognized as the New Testament.<sup>3</sup> For example, Irenaeus of Lyon, in a well-known excerpt of his writing *Adversus haereses* (V 30,1), explains the textual problem in Rev 13,18, which describes the beast that will appear at the end of time as represented by the number 666 in “all of the most approved

---

1 Cels. II 27. The translation is cited from H. CHADWICK, *Origen, Contra Celsum translated with an Introduction and Notes*, Cambridge 1980, 90.

2 See T. NICKLAS, *Ablösung und Verstrickung. ‘Juden’ und Jünger gestalten als Charaktere der erzählten Welt des Johannesevangeliums und ihre Wirkung auf den impliziten Leser* (RStTh 60), Frankfurt/Main et al. 2001, 98-100, and the literature discussed there.

3 See D. LÜHRMANN, *Fragmente apokryph gewordener Evangelien in griechischer und lateinischer Sprache* (MThSt 59), Marburg 2000.

and ancient copies,”<sup>4</sup> whereas other manuscripts preserve the number 616. In this instance Irenaeus differentiates between unintended alterations in the text of the New Testament and those arising from a „vain addition to prestige.“<sup>5</sup> The issue raised by Irenaeus has a great deal to do with current questions within modern textual criticism. Like Irenaeus modern text-critics are confronted with a variety of different texts, and their task often involves attempting to reconstruct the original text. Irenaeus asserted the necessity of changing nothing of the original text lest one might otherwise fall „out of the truth,” a warning to anyone who dares to attempt to justify the text-critical reconstruction of a New Testament text.

(1) The more the various New Testament text-critical methods develop and the more fragmentary early witnesses of the New Testament writings come to light, the more light falls upon the historical and theological circumstances surrounding the formation of the canon, and the more problematic it becomes to speak of the “Urtext” of the New Testament. One must ask: does the problem revolve around the reconstruction of the original text of every individual writer? For instance in the Pauline case, do we reconstruct the text that would or could have appeared in the first collection of Paul’s epistles or do we construct the text that was received as canonical?<sup>6</sup> Ultimately how can we bridge the gap of approximately a hundred years between when the texts were first written to when they were transmitted and became New Testament texts when all we have are fragmentary remnants from a time span marked by a particularly high degree of fluidity? The conventional text-critical issue of attempting to find unity among the variants will thus remain an interesting and possibly volatile subject in the future.

(2) Already Irenaeus and Origen recognized the disturbing fact that at least some of the changes in the texts that were to become the New Testament occurred consciously – as their texts were not yet understood as unassailably “sacred writing.” On the other hand, others made changes in the texts precisely *because* they understood these texts to be sacred writing, which under no circumstance should provide possible substantiation for the heretics. By recognizing the logic behind the introduction of certain changes into the text, we gain a greater interest in the textual variants because they may have been

---

4 English translation: The Ante-Nicene Fathers, ed. by Alexander ROBERTS and James DONALDSON, repr. Peabody/Mass. 1994, 10 vols., 1:558. A German translation is available in: Irenaeus von Lyon, *Adversus haereses*, translated and introduced by N. BROX (Fontes Christiani 8,5), Freiburg i.Br. – Basel – Wien 2001, 223.

5 Ibid.

6 Concerning the problematic of the differentiated, developing discussion of the “original text” of New Testament writings, see, for example, E.J. EPP, The Multivalence of the Term ‘Original Text’ in New Testament Textual Criticism, in: HThR 92 (1999), 245-281; ID., Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism. Moving from the Nineteenth Century to the Twenty-First Century, in: D.A. BLACK (ed.), Rethinking Textual Criticism, Grand Rapids 2002, 17-76 (here: 70-75).

produced for theological reasons. Exegetical questions are thus taken seriously.<sup>7</sup> With respect to the variants in the textual traditions of the New Testament, the principle concern is not the contemplation of philological details without acknowledging the relevance for the meaning of the text, rather it concerns an *historical* question of extreme *theological* interest.<sup>8</sup> These issues allow themselves to be subdivided into two levels:

(2.1) A synchronic comparison of the different variants that have been preserved in the writings of the New Testament indicates theological as well as literary differences, the consideration of which is in and of itself interesting. From there it is at least hypothetically possible in many cases to ask the diachronically-oriented question concerning the relationship of different variants to each other. In many cases it is possible to establish connections between the variants within the individual New Testament manuscripts and translations on one side and the evolution of theological, historical, and social history of early Christianity on the other side. New Testament variants not only serve as resources for the reconstruction of the "Urtext" of respective writings, but they provide a reflection of the types of issues and problems that the early Christian communities confronted.<sup>9</sup> The contribution of Eldon Jay EPP in this volume, with its focus on the history of research, has shown that these issues have been the subject of research for multiple generations of scholars, so much so that in recent times the art of interpreting textual variants has developed and reached such an audience that this analysis has now even acquired its own name: *Narrative Textual Criticism*.<sup>10</sup>

(2.2) Not only are the larger textual traditions intriguing, but so, too, are the smaller details connected with the individual variants. For this reason F. BOVON urges biblical scholars to return once again to the original manuscripts rather than spending so much of their time working with the modern editions of the New Testament.<sup>11</sup> There are many codicological aspects that

7 For more on this issue, see, for example, B.D. EHRMAN, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture. The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*, New York – Oxford 1993.

8 Further thoughts and examples in T. NICKLAS, *Zur historischen und theologischen Bedeutung der Erforschung neutestamentlicher Textgeschichte*, in: NTS 48 (2002), 145–158.

9 See, for example, the programmatic article of B.D. EHRMAN, *The Text as Window: New Testament Manuscripts and the Social History of Early Christianity*, in: ID./M.W. HOLMES (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research. Essays on the Status Quaestionis. A Volume in Honor of Bruce M. METZGER* (StD 46), Grand Rapids 1995, 361–379.

10 This term first appears in D.C. PARKER, *Review of B.D. EHRMAN, The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture. The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*, New York – Oxford 1993", in: JThS n.s. 45 (1994), 704–708 (here: 704).

11 See F. BOVON, *The Synoptic Gospels and the Noncanonical Acts of the Apostles*, in: HThR 81 (1988), 19–36 (here: 21–22).

need to be taken into account concerning the relationship of material, the formation and content of the manuscripts, palaeographical information, as well as the transmission of individual manuscripts that could be collected in order to draw conclusions or to make claims concerning socio-cultural and theological-historical issues.<sup>12</sup> It is interesting to examine the research concerning the aforementioned related topics and the possibilities that these texts were used for magical purposes, ancient lessons, and other functions.

(3) The variety of transmitted New Testament texts points us in yet a third direction: every textual witness exists as part of the history of interpretation of the New Testament. At the same time, however, the variant marks the beginning point of a branching out to a broader interpretation that in many cases is still comprehensible. So the variant stands at the intersection of the previous textual tradition and the possibility of new interpretations. New Testament variants are a point of departure for the diverse interpretation and reception of these texts that themselves form their own lines of tradition, which should be pursued and considered, if modern exegetes want to claim their inheritance and return to their roots. Thus certain questions arise in close connection with the observable diversity of variants: To what extent does it matter that *none* of the Church Fathers had available to them the biblical text in its current form? What role did the interpretation of the New Testament play in the ancient Christian communities? Can connections be made between the form of the text that was available to the Church Fathers and specific interpretations of the text? Which parts of scripture allowed for a rich variety of interpretations and even stimulated such diversity, and which ones did not, and why?

The following volume seeks to examine all three paths. It starts with the textual tradition of a New Testament writing, specifically Acts, preserved in its many forms. This book of the New Testament provides especially fertile soil for investigating the issues mentioned above. The differences go so far as to make identifiable at least two rather clearly differentiated "editions." Such evidence raises the question whether it is even still possible to make the strict separation between the literary-critical questions and the text-critical ones.<sup>13</sup>

---

12 Fundamental for this is S.E. PORTER, *New Testament Studies and Papyrology. What Can We Learn from Each Other?*, in: *Akten des 23. Internationalen Kongresses für Papyrologie*, Wien, 22.-28. Juli 2001, Wien 2003 [in print]. For an exception see T.J. KRAUS, *Ad fontes: Gewinn durch die Konsultation von Originalhandschriften am Beispiel von P. Vindob. G 31974'*, in: *Bib.* 82 (2001), 1-16.

13 On the basis of the discoveries at Qumran this question occurs in the area concerning the transmission of the Hebrew Bible and its ancient translations. Tradition reaches back to the period of handwritten transmission, in which the texts were still shaped creatively. Today the parallel question regarding the transmission of New Testament texts arises more and more (cf. M. TILLY, *Jerusalem – Nabel der Welt*, Stuttgart 2002, 8-13). Compare also the example of the Gospel of John in the daring but not always compre-

The first part of this collection of essays begins with the variants that have been transmitted and seeks from there to trace back to the "Urtext," before the formation of the fourth-century codices and before the "fork in the road" between the Alexandrian and the so-called "Western" text of Acts. The second part brings together interpretations of the variety of texts that have been transmitted. Some essays focus upon different emphases within the Alexandrian and the "Western" texts, while others concentrate specifically upon Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis, the *Peshitto*, or the possibility that individual manuscripts allow theological and socio-historical issues to emerge. The last section examines the reception of the "texts" of Acts by significant ancient Christian authors.

What could in theory be described as three paths or strands that diverge from a common starting point, proves to be in the final examination inseparably woven into a cord. Each of these different issues leads to results that are relevant for the other aspects. Thus the individual contributions here are a part of an ongoing discussion that remains far from finished.





# **I**

## **Von der Vielfalt zur Einheit**

**Die Fragen nach dem Urtext und der Entstehung der Textformen**



J. Keith Elliott

## An Eclectic Textual Study of the Book of Acts

The distinctive characteristics of the transmission of the text of Acts are well-known, especially the longer 'Western' text and the alleged tendencies of its main representative, Codex Bezae, when compared with the shorter text in the so-called Alexandrian uncials (normally followed in modern editions and translations). The issues raised by these features, their resolution in terms of establishing a presumed 'original' text and the explanations proffered for the subsequent history of that text are usually readily available in introductions to the New Testament, in commentaries on the text of Acts (recently that by BARRETT in his ICC commentary<sup>1</sup> is most helpful in this regard), and, conveniently and succinctly, in METZGER's *Textual Commentary*.<sup>2</sup>

There is thus no need in the present article to rehearse all the differing views that have been expressed regarding the alleged superiority of one line of transmission to represent Luke's original text, the motives for adapting that text in later mutations of it, the possibility that Luke himself was responsible for *both* main textual forms, or that both main text types represent editions of a now lost original.

In this context 'original' means a form of the text as close as possible to that issued, 'published', by the author.<sup>3</sup>

ROPES set out two forms of the text as represented by B and D in *Beginnings of Christianity* III.<sup>4</sup> BOISMARD and LAMOUILLE printed their reconstructed *Texte Alexandrin* and *Texte Occidental* in parallel columns in *Le texte occidental des Actes des Apôtres*.<sup>5</sup>

---

1 C.K. BARRETT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, two volumes, Edinburgh 1994-1998.

2 B.M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart <sup>2</sup>1994.

3 For recent discussion on the term 'original text' see P. ELLINGWORTH, *Text, Translation and Theology. The New Testament in the Original Greek?*, in: *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 25-26 (2000), 61-74, and E.J. EPP, *The Multivalence of the Term 'Original Text' in New Testament Textual Criticism*, in: *HThR* 92 (1999), 245-281.

4 J.H. ROPES, in: F.J. FOAKES JACKSON/K. LAKE (eds.), *The Beginnings of Christianity I: The Acts of the Apostles III*, London 1926.

5 M.-É. BOISMARD/A. LAMOUILLE, *Le texte occidental des Actes des Apôtres. Reconstruction et réhabilitation. (Éditions recherches sur les civilisations. Synthèse 17)* two volumes, Paris 1984. A revised edition of the text may be seen in M.-É. BOISMARD, *Le texte occidental des Actes des Apôtres. Édition nouvelle. (ÉtB NS 40)*, Paris 2000.

The great diversity in the transmitted form of this Biblical book, when compared with that of the Gospels and Epistles may be due to the fact that Acts as a narrative and with comparatively less teaching lends itself to later editorial revision, expansion or contraction. In this respect the textual history of Acts invites comparison to the way in which the apocryphal Acts were treated.

But most commentators, certainly all translators and editors of a printed Greek testament, need to work on only one form, the presumed original from which all subsequent changes are based. They do not have the luxury of using two forms such as displayed by ROPES or by BOISMARD and LAMOUILLE, however much they choose to use their footnotes to tell us what 'other ancient manuscripts' add or subtract or change from the text they print above.

In choosing to print one and only one form of the text of Acts the editor, translator or commentator must make decisions at each point of textual variation in the manuscript tradition unless he is (rarely) deciding to work from the text of one manuscript only throughout. ROPES argued for the relative superiority of the Egyptian 'Old Uncial' text of Acts. Few now would agree with his view that the Western text is merely a later editor's logical expansion of the original text. Nor would many agree with A.C. CLARK<sup>6</sup> who maintained the superiority of the Western text-type. In practice we may see that ROPES was often prepared to desert B in favour of Western readings and CLARK asterisked readings which he accepted from outside the Western tradition.

Even the United Bible Societies' edition which may be seen as a clone of WESTCOTT and HORT's edition and thus heavily dependent on the readings of B adopts a less doctrinaire approach to textual variants when it discusses Acts. This change in policy is expressed by the spokesman for the UBS committee, B.M. METZGER, where he writes in the *Textual Commentary*<sup>2</sup>, p. 235:

Inasmuch as no hypothesis thus far proposed to explain the relation of the Western and the Alexandrian texts of Acts has gained anything like general assent, in its work of editing that book the United Bible Societies' Committee proceeded in an eclectic fashion, judging that neither the Alexandrian nor the Western group of witnesses always preserves the original text, but that in order to attain the earliest text one must compare the two divergent traditions point by point and in each case select the reading that commends itself in the light of transcriptional and intrinsic probabilities.

In practice we may see that the resultant text is less eclectic than that statement may lead us to expect but the 'thoroughgoing' text-critical approach espoused here strikes me as the best way – indeed the only way – to proceed with the editing of Acts, given its distinctive and complex textual history.

---

6 A.C. CLARK, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Oxford 1933.

This article will thus be concerned with how editors and readers may deal with the morass of variants found in a full *apparatus criticus* of Acts by suggesting how the consistent application of criteria concerning intrinsic probability cuts through barriers such as the Western text versus the Old Uncial text and may assist in determining the original text and in explaining (in a way not always commonplace in a discussion predetermined by a prejudice in favour of the Western, Egyptian or Majority text types) how and why the secondary readings arose. In many ways the principles applied below are compatible with many of those to which 'rational' text-critics at least pay lip service and which are set out in various places.<sup>7</sup> What a more consistent, that is a thoroughgoing, application of such principles can do is demonstrated in my sample below. Obviously in a short article only some examples can be covered, but it is to be hoped that the methodology demonstrated can be applied consistently throughout Acts (and indeed in the rest of the New Testament) to show that principles based on objectively agreed criteria, such as an awareness of the author's style, and of the distinctiveness of the first-century Koine Greek language and an alertness to palaeographical considerations, may enable a resolution of most of the problems caused by variant readings in the manuscripts. I shall not indulge in a discussion of alternative text-critical theories nor shall I review previous literature on the verse or variant currently under the microscope. Hence footnoting and cross-referencing will be substantially reduced.

To achieve a single version of the text of Acts most 'rational eclectic' textual critics and editors pick and choose among the extant manuscripts, with support from versions and, where available, Patristic citations. They then print what they consider to be the best reading, usually and especially from among the oldest witnesses and with regard to the widest geographical spread. Thoroughgoing eclectic critics are less inclined to be bound by issues concerning the number, weight or alleged quality of particular manuscripts, and thus feel less inhibited in selecting the original reading from among the whole gamut of available variation units, initially regardless of their manuscript attestation. This is the approach I shall adopt here.

For recent discussions of the role of thoroughgoing textual criticism compared to the principles and practice of reasoned eclecticism and other methodological approaches see the recent books edited by BLACK,<sup>8</sup> and by EHRMAN and HOLMES.<sup>9</sup>

---

7 For example, K. ALAND/B. ALAND, *The Text of the New Testament*, Grand Rapids – Leiden 1984, 280-282, or in METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, 11\*-14\*.

8 D.A. BLACK (ed.), *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism*, Grand Rapids 2002.

9 B.D. EHRMAN/M.W. HOLMES (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament in Recent Research. Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (StD 46), Grand Rapids 1995.

Even those who balk at the application of thoroughgoing eclecticism, claiming it is subjective, liable to support readings found in only a few, or late or potentially maverick witnesses, are in practice less than consistent to their own principles when it comes to readings in Acts. In even the UBS text, used also in the current NESTLE edition (hereafter = NA), we find at Acts 16,12 πρώτης μερίδος της which represents the Provençal and Old German versions only!

Such a genuinely eclectic approach to variants goes back to the earliest printed Greek testaments. Acts 9,5-6 in Greek was printed by Erasmus as a back translation from the Vulgate. His annotations have: *Durum est tibi. In graecis codicibus id non additur hoc loco, cum mox sequentur, Surge sed aliquanto inferius, cum narratur haec res.* Nevertheless he printed the longer reading. That reading even infiltrated the AV (KJV) and thus has influenced English theology since then.

Similarly Acts 8,37, discussed elsewhere in this volume, is not found in the Greek manuscript (now numbered 2816) used principally by Erasmus for Acts, but was nonetheless translated by him from Latin into Greek. He considered the verse to have been accidentally omitted by scribes (*arbitror omissionem librarium incuria*).

A gloss at Acts 10,6 in the Latin was also translated in Erasmus' Greek. The reading is found in the margin of the 15th-century manuscript 69 and itself may have been added after 1516; it is also in the 11th-century 1611, but that manuscript was not known to Erasmus. So, again, Erasmus was prepared to be swayed by his familiarity with the Vulgate and to include into his supposed original text, reconstructing Acts in Greek, a reading known to him outside his stock of available Greek manuscripts. [Erasmus was certainly alert to textual variation. In his Annotations of 1535 he discussed the reading Καυδα at Acts 27,16, known in his day only in B (recently arrived in the West), although his editions maintain the reading Χλαυδα.]

Let us now come to some examples where textual variation can be discussed not in relation to the manuscripts in support of the alternatives but in terms of which reading is primary (original) and why and how the secondary readings came about. Those who disagree with some of my arguments must either try to bolster those arguments with better or more convincing evidence or propose alternative arguments why X is right and Y and Z wrong. These examples are divided into several sections and subdivisions. The first concerns the language of the first century, mainly Hellenistic usage and Semitisms, including the use of diminutive forms. Secondly we turn to our author's style including his use of periphrastic tenses and his repetitive style, and then to certain distinctive grammatical and syntactical uses, including his practice with proper names, notably 'Jerusalem'. Under 3 we turn to palaeographical considerations, especially *homoiooteleuton* and under 4 certain orthographical features, concentrating on the augment with verbs with initial

diphthong. Section 5 covers the assimilation of Old Testament citations in the New Testament to the wording found in the Septuagint. 6 deals with a small and random selection of variants, on which modern editors need to reach a decision. Section 7 looks at some variants where Alexandrian witnesses are allied with the Byzantine text-type in certain, set expressions.

## *1. New Testament Usage*

### *1.1 First-Century Language*

#### *1.1.1 Atticism*

When we have a pronouncement from the Atticist grammarians like Phrynichus and Moeris on what was deemed to be good Attic Greek and what, in their day, was identified as Koine, we may often find that the feature commented on, be it vocabulary or syntax or stylistic usage, is subject to textual variation when it occurs in the New Testament. Our criterion for dealing with such variants is to argue for the originality in the New Testament of the non-Attic reading, it being reasonable to assume that scribes in later centuries, influenced by the grammarians' judgements would have altered (albeit not always in a thoroughgoing or exhaustive way) the offending term, and to argue that the direction of change would always be away from an original Hellenistic or Koine expression.

1. Thus Phrynichus CXXX and Moeris η2,<sup>10</sup> preferring the Attic declension ην ησθα ην ημεν ητε ησαν<sup>11</sup> over against the Hellenistic ημην ης ην ημεθα ητε ησαν condemn ημην in favour of the Classical ην. It is therefore not surprising to find variation in our New Testament manuscripts over such matters. In Acts 11,11 ημην ϑ<sup>45</sup> H L P S; ημεν ϑ<sup>74</sup> A B (cf. 10,30 ημην; εμμ Ψ 1838, and 27,37 ημεθα A B A; ημεν H L P 33 69 *maj.*). Our inclination here is to read the Koine form of the verb as original to our author and to argue that the Attic form is secondary. Note that D alone reads ην (1 p.s.) for εγενομεν at Acts 20,18.

2. Moeris α74 (cf. Phrynichus VI) condemns αχρις preferring only the form αχρι. Again there is variation in the New Testament manuscripts. In Acts the following are found:

---

10 References to Phrynichus' *Ecloga* are taken from W.S. RUTHERFORD, *The New Phrynichus*, London 1881, but see also (with differing paragraph numbering) E. FISCHER, *Die Ekloge des Phrynichos (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 1)*, Berlin – New York 1973. Citations from Moeris come from D.U. HANSEN, *Das attizistische Lexikon des Moeris (SGLG 9)*, Berlin – New York 1998.

11 As is usual in textual criticism accents and breathings are not printed.

Acts 11,5 *αχρι* ⲛ A B; *αχρις cett.*; 20,6 *αχρι* A B L P; *αχρις* H 049 056 69 614 etc.; 20,11 *αχρι* ϣ<sup>74</sup> ⲛ A B; *αχρις cett.*; 28,15 *αχρι* ⲛ A B; *αχρις maj.* Read *αχρις*.

3. By the same token we will prefer the Hellenistic form *χαριτα* to the Attic accusative *χαριν* because Moeris χ30 condemns the former. In Acts that means we shall read *χαριτα* at 24,27 against *χαριν* read by ⲛ<sup>c</sup> E L 614. Note here that ⲛ itself reveals the change, ⲛ\* *χαριτα*; ⲛ<sup>c</sup> *χαριν* thus showing such a change was deliberate, not accidental. At 25,9 A reads *χαριτα*; *χαριν cett.* In Paul *χαριν* occurs without *v.l.*

4. Moeris ε20 states that *ευλαβεισθαι* in the sense of *φοβεισθαι* is Hellenistic. It is therefore of no surprise to find the following *v.l.* at Acts 23,10: *ευλαβηθεις* H L P 1854 *maj*; *φοβηθεις* ϣ<sup>74</sup> A B C. We recommend printing the former as the original.

5. Phrynichus CLX tells us that *ουδεις* is Attic and therefore to be preferred, and that *ουθεις* is Koine. Not surprisingly variation over this orthography occurs in our manuscripts. In Acts the following variants are found: 15,9 *ουθεν* B H L P 049; *ουδεν cett.*; 19,27 *ουδεν* D L Ψ 33; *ουθεν* ϣ<sup>74</sup> ⲛ A B P; 20,33 *ουθενος* ϣ<sup>74</sup> ⲛ A E; *ουδενος cett.*; 26,26 *ουθεν* ⲛ\* B; *om.* ϣ<sup>74</sup> ⲛ<sup>c</sup> A33; *ουδεν cett.*; 27,34 *ουθενος* A; *ουδενος cett.*; cf. also 27,33 *μηθεν* ϣ<sup>74</sup> ⲛ A B; *μηδεν cett.* (UBS/NA follow their favourite manuscripts ⲛ B and thus print the only occurrence of this spelling in the New Testament!)

6. Away from orthography we see that a matter as significant as a change in gender was commented on by Phrynichus and possibly affected the textual tradition of the New Testament as a consequence of such a ruling. Phrynichus CLXIV tells us that *λιμος* is masculine in Attic usage. This will explain the reason for the changes to the Attic masculine in the following variant: at Acts 11,28 we read *μεγαν* ... *οστις* in D H L P but many manuscripts read *μεγαλην* ... *ητις* (but see E which reads *μεγαν* ... *ητις* !) (cf. Lk 4,25; 15,14).

7. *ερωταν* meant 'to request' in Hellenistic usage rather than 'to question'. (See Mk 7,26.) In Acts we find this verb with the meaning 'request' at 3,3; 18,20; 23,18.20 and that conforms too to Luke (where *επερωταν* is reserved for the meaning 'to question' and it occurs seventeen times. *επερωταν* is found at Acts 5,27 and cf. 23,34 (*v.l.* *επερωσης* L). At Acts 5,28 the sentence must be punctuated as a question: *ου παραγγελια* ... *τουτω*; In printed editions we find *ερωταν* in the sense 'to question' at Acts 1,6 but the variant *επερωτων* should be accepted as original with D E 33 etc. (against *ερωτων/ερωτων* in ⲛ A B C).<sup>12</sup> At 10,48 *ερωτησαν* in the sense of 'request' obviously caused problems. D here reads *παρεκαλεσαν* (cf. the longer addition by D at 16,39 which includes *παρεκαλεσαν*).

12 Support for this meaning comes from the noun. At 1 Peter 3,21 in the context of baptism the *hapax* *επερωτημα* seems to require the meaning 'a request (to God for a good conscience)', rather than, as is it often misunderstood, 'the pledge (of a good conscience)'.



### 1.1.2 Semitisms

At Acts 3,12 we find, ἀπεκρίνατο: ἀποκριθεις ειπεν D. Once we recall that the middle aorist is an Atticism and that the passive aorist of this verb is Hellenistic then this helps us resolve the problem. We should therefore accept ἀποκριθεις ... ειπεν as original. In Acts the passive aorist occurs some 19 times against this one disputed occurrence of the middle. The middle also occurs elsewhere in the New Testament six times (Mt 27,12; Mk 14,61; Lk 3,16; 23,9; John 5,17.19 and all are with *v.ll.* avoiding this tense).

The reading by D incidentally betrays a Semitism, which scribes also often tried to remove. The stylistic feature of this Semitism helps us at other places. In Acts 4,19 D reads ἀποκριθεις δε ... ειπον. Printed texts give us ἀποκριθεντες ... ειπον. Here the question of the agreement of the verb with the subject comes into play. As the subject of this verb is plural, ἀποκριθεντες is grammatically correct, but may be seen as an improvement. New Testament authors sometimes take the person of the verb from the nearest noun even if that is not the only subject. Thus ἀποκριθεις may be doubly right here.

In contrast to this variant at 4,19, at 16,33 D has αὐτος εἰσαπαισθη καὶ οἱ αὐτοὶ against the original εἰσαπαισθη αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ αὐτοὶ which makes the inconcinnity less pronounced; cf. 5,21 παραγενομενοι B\* against παραγενομενος, and 14,14 ακουσας δε Βαρναβας και Παυλος D against the grammatically correct (and expanded) plural subject ακουσαντες δε οἱ αποστολοι Βαρναβας και Παυλος.

### 1.2 Diminutive Forms

Diminutive forms of nouns are relatively common in the New Testament. Often the force is not that of a diminutive, and there are then variants removing the diminutive form. Our rule of thumb in such variation units is to maintain the diminutive as Koine and original and to explain the non-diminutive variant as secondary. There are several instances in Acts. For example, the non-Classical hapax νησιον at Acts 27,16 is avoided by 88 915 (νησον) which is clearly secondary. See also the *v.l.* νεανισκος at 20,9 (by 614 1505 1611 2412 2495 2147); 23,17 (by 2147); 23,18 (by κ A E 81 323 547 945 1245 1739 1891 2344); 23,22 (by ϣ<sup>74</sup> κ B E 33 2344) *contra* νεανιας. We do however note the firm instance of νεανιας at Acts 7,58. Nonetheless the direction of change seems to be away from the diminutive form.

Let us now select certain other diminutives forms from the manuscripts of Acts:

μνημα. Acts 2,29 D reads μνημειον.

αργυριον. Acts 17,29 αργυριω ϣ<sup>41</sup> ϣ<sup>74</sup> A E etc.; αργυρω *cett.* The same manuscripts alter χρυσιω to χρυσω and we see at Acts 3,6; 20,33 that the diminutive forms of αργυρον and χρυσον survive unaltered, thus revealing here

as elsewhere that change to the text was spasmodic, inconsistent and thus was incomplete.

κλιναριον. Acts 5,15 κλινاريων  $\Phi^{74}$   $\times$  A B D 1739; κλινων *cett.*

In each instance the variant giving the diminutive form is likely to be original.

## 2. Author's Style and Usage

Each author has his own distinctive fingerprints. C.H. TURNER helped us recognise Mark's characteristic use of Koine Greek. Other authors in the New Testament have not been subjected to such an intense scrutiny, but nonetheless readers can recognize and identify unique traits in all our authors. Assuming that for the most part authors are relatively consistent in their use of certain phrases, grammatical features and vocabulary, we may use such touchstones to recognize variants that conform to our author's known proclivities and to be able to separate these from readings that show a divergence from them. This section includes our author's use of periphrastic tenses, his repetitions, his treatment of certain grammatical features, and his habit with proper names (Jerusalem, Simon Peter, and the Land of Egypt are taken as samples).

### 2.1 Periphrastic Tenses

Mark TURNER<sup>13</sup> lists some twenty four examples of Mark's preference for the periphrastic tenses. Scribes often tried to eliminate that feature; as a consequence many of these twenty four are not textually secure in our manuscript tradition, there being many *v.ll.* In Acts too periphrastic tenses are found, again with *v.ll.*:

6,4 προσκαρτερησομεν: εσομεθα ... προσκαρτερουντες D.

10,6 ουτος ξενιζεται: και αυτος εστι ξενιζομενος 614 1611 2412 *d.* [Also here note that ουτος is better style than και αυτος and therefore is also likely to be secondary.]

14,4 εσχισθη: ην εσχισμενον D.

17,23 επεγεγραπτο: ην γεγραμμενον D.

Significantly we see at 10,30 the Hellenistic ημην ... προσευχομενος; at 20,8 ημεν (ησαν) συνηγμενοι; and at 21,3 ην ... αποφορτιζομενος (there are no *v.ll.* for these).

<sup>13</sup> Reprinted in J.K. ELLIOTT (ed.), *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark*. An Edition of C.H. Turner's 'Notes on Markan Usage' together with Other Comparable Studies (NT.S 71), Leiden 1993, 90-93.

The periphrastic tenses should be accepted as original in all the above variation units.

## 2.2 Repetition

The author of Luke-Acts (unlike Mark) seems impervious to repetition. Scribes often noticed such repetitiveness and occasionally tried to eliminate it. The following examples in Acts may be places where stylistically conscious scribes attempted to limit repetition:

1,10-11 εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν occurs four times but *v.l. om. εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν* (*sec.*) in v.11 by D 33 69\* 242 323 330 1270 may be seen as a way of reducing the occurrences.

4,34 ὑπῆρχεν  $\Phi^8$  D Byz; ἦν  $\Phi^{74}$   $\kappa$  B (= NA). ὑπαρχω occurs some forty times in Acts out of sixty occurrences in the New Testament as a whole. ὑπαρχω occurs three times in this immediate context and thus may have merited pruning by stylistically conscious scribes.

7,9-18 'Egypt' occurs six times. In v.15 B omits εἰς Αἴγυπτον; in v. 18 D E H P *pler. om. ἐπ Αἴγυπτον*.

9,12 *om. ἐν ὁραματι*  $\Phi^{74}$   $\kappa$  A. The expression is used in v.10.

13,41 *om. ἐργον* D L P 049 88 330 440 at the end of the citation. This is not in the LXX version of Hab 1,5. Assimilation to the LXX (see Section 5) may have encouraged the omission. The longer text also repeats the wording of the previous line and that too speaks in favour of this reading.

23,2 ἐκέλευσεν C 88 945 1739 1891; ἐπεταξεν *cett.*; παραγγειλεν  $\Phi^{74}$ . κελευειν occurs in 22,30; 23,3 so the avoidance of this repetition may have been a consideration here. ἐπιτασσω is not found elsewhere in Acts so is unlikely to have been original here. Scribes tended to avoid κελευειν followed by the dative. This usage seems to have offended some scribes' sense of grammatical correctness.

There are many other places where scribes avoided repetition. I note briefly some further examples where our author repeats the same word but where variants avoid the repetitiveness:

6,8 πιστεως *v.l. χαριτος*  $\Phi^{74}$   $\kappa$  A B (πιστει earlier)

7,49 ποιός D *v.l. τις cett.* (ποιον occurs earlier)

8,37 ευνοχος *v.l. om.* (ευνοχος occurs four times in vv. 36-39)

13,23 ηγειρεν E C D 104 614 1739 *v.l. ηγαγεν*  $\kappa$  B A (ηγειρεν occurs earlier).

The likelihood is that the repetition here, as elsewhere, is original, the reason throughout being that the author of Acts is prone to repetition.

### 2.3 Grammar

2.3.1 BDF<sup>14</sup> § 279 states that *ἐμε* after prepositions is emphatic in the New Testament as in Classical usage, but *προς* is an exception and *προς με* is normal (although *προς ἐμε* sometimes occurs in some manuscripts). When we examine our Greek testaments it seems that there are no undisputed examples of *προς ἐμε*. *προς με* is firm at Mt 3,14; 11,28; Lk 6,47; John 5,40; Acts 22,10; 26,14; Tit 3,12. At Mt 3,14 *προς με* is emphatic but not accented.

In Acts there are variants at the following verses where *ἐμε* is found in some manuscripts:

11,11 *κ\**; 22,8 *κ\** A B; 22,13 *κ\** A B (nb *κ<sup>c</sup>* has made the change deliberately); 22,21 C; 23,22 *κ* B; 24,19 *κ* A B C E 33 81 1739 2344.

NA at Acts 24,19 was swayed by the manuscript attestation and therefore prints *προς ἐμε* but that must strike its readers as most peculiar. At John 7,37 NA prints *προς με*. *ἐμε* is in its critical apparatus. NA prints *ἐμε* at Lk 1,43 (v.l. *με* in its apparatus); at 14,26 it prints *με* and ignores v.l. *ἐμε*; the same is true at 18,16; see also John 6,35 *ἐμε* (apparatus shows v.l. *με*); 6,37<sup>bis</sup> *ἐμε* (bizarrely only the second occurrence has v.l. *με* in the apparatus, even though the variant occurs both times!); 6,45 *ἐμε* v.l. *με* shown. [As another indicator of inconsistency in NA note that it prints *με* (v.l. *ἐμε* shown) in the previous verse (6,44) as at 6,65 (v.l. shown).]

2.3.2 Pronominal *ἐκεῖνος* occurs at Acts 3,13; 21,6 (cf. *κακεῖνος* at Acts 5,37; 15,11; 18,19) but at 10,9.10 there are v.l. At 10,9 *ἐκεῖνων* is omitted by *℣*<sup>74</sup> *κ* A E L 33 etc.; at 10,10 for *ἐκεῖνων* *℣*<sup>74</sup> *κ* A B C read *αὐτῶν*. *ἐκεῖνων* should be read at both places.

There are some fifteen adjectival uses of *ἐκεῖνος* in Acts, where it follows its noun. That seems normal in New Testament usage as at 2,18 (in the quotation from Joel 3,1-5) although here *om.* D; 7,41 (see further Section V below); 9,37 in the expression 'in those days' and cf. 12,6 'in that night'; 19,23 *ἐκεῖνος* follows *καίρος* but at 12,1 it precedes *καίρος* (no v.l.). The expression precedes the singular 'in that day' at 8,1 and in D (!) at 2,41. All other manuscripts at 2,41 have *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκεῖνη* cf. *ἐν ἐκεῖνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ* at 16,33 (no v.l.). That conforms to Lukan usage in his Gospel. There are some nineteen examples of *ἐκεῖνος* following its noun and six preceding the noun (when it is either *ἡμέρα* singular or plural or *ὥρα*: Lk 5,35; 6,23; 7,21; 9,36; 17,31; 21,23). Other examples of *ἐκεῖνος* preceding a noun that is not a time expression are at Lk 12,47; 13,4; 20,18 which are emphatic in their contexts. It is common in the other Gospels too for *ἐκεῖνος* to precede the noun in certain time expressions.

14 F. BLASS/A. DEBRUNNER, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 9<sup>th</sup> edition by R.W. FUNK, Cambridge – Chicago 1961.

2.3.3 Occasionally we find variation in a manuscript and indeed in our printed editions between differing forms of a third declension comparative adjective. Again Moeris may help resolve the variant. Moeris α75 states αμεινω Αττικοι αμεινονα Ελληνες cf. β8; η10; π8. (The New Testament significantly prefers μειζονα to the Classical μειζω. NA prints μειζω at John 1,50; 5,36 in both places showing as a variant the Hellenistic reading.)

Applying that information about the ‘contracted’ comparative forms to πολυς we find that πλειους is Classical, πλειονας Hellenistic. Given our previous examples we should accept πλειονας other things being equal at Acts 13,31 with D\* at 19,32 with 1175; at 25,6 with ϣ<sup>74</sup> B 1827; at 27,12 with κ A B; at 27,20 with all manuscripts except κ\* 049 056 1175. Our printed editions show their inconsistency in that πλειους occurs in all the above places except at 27,12.20 (πλειονες/-ας)! However, other things may not be equal here. At Acts 21,10; 23,13.21; 24,11; 25,14 πλειους is firm. At Acts 28,23 πλειονες is firmly attested. Other criteria need to be investigated. Possibly the presence of πλειους with (επι) ημερας at 13,31; 25,6; 27,20 is due to this being a set expression.

2.3.4 In Hellenistic Greek πληρης is indeclinable only when followed by a dependent genitive (BDF § 137). Otherwise it is declinable. Attic declined πληρης. The form πληρης has no *v.l.* at Acts 6,8; 7,55; 9,36; 11,24; 13,10 (cf. Lk 4,1; 5,12) but these are nominative singular masculine and feminine and so there is no problem. In the oblique cases we find Acts 6,3 πληρεις *v.l.* πληρης A E H P 88 431 915 *alii*. This is followed by a dependent genitive. At Acts 6,5 πληρης is read by most other manuscripts; πληρη B C<sup>e</sup> 583 623 etc., again followed by a dependent genitive. At Acts 19,28 indeclinable πληρης is read by A E L 33; the declinable form is read by most other manuscripts – this too is followed by a dependent genitive. Therefore we suggest that one should accept the indeclinable form as the original text in all three passages. NA reads πληρεις πνευματος at 6,3 but πληρης πνευματος at 6,5 (cf. 7,55; 11,24): what are its hapless readers to make of this?

## 2.4 Proper Names

### 2.4.1 Jerusalem

There is frequently textual variation over the two forms of this name (Ιεροσολυμα and Ιερουσαλημ) in manuscripts of the New Testament. In Acts editors need to resolve the issue. Most printed editions present a confused picture that renders it well nigh impossible for exegetes and commentators to explain why our author apparently capriciously flits from one to the other without any apparent logic. The confused picture is not resolved by a rigorous application of the cult of the ‘best’ manuscripts nor by a blind adherence to the majority text type, for all manuscripts seem prone to indiscriminate usage. Nor is an appeal to possible different sources helpful in explaining the

change from one name to the other. I have tried to resolve the issue by checking the firm instances of Ἱερουσόλυμα and the firm instances of Ἱερουσαλὴμ to see if a pattern emerges to enable a pronouncement at those places where the manuscripts divide. The sensitivity and self-conscious usage of place names that differ in different languages or among different cultural groups may have their modern-day counterparts in multilingual Switzerland or Belgium, where writers take care not to offend or cross linguistic boundaries by using the place name inappropriate to the context or audience. This methodology for the variants Ἱεροσόλυμα (Greek)/Ἱερουσαλὴμ (Hebrew) seems sound and, even if it does not meet with universal approval, it behoves detractors to come up with a comparable scheme that takes account of the undisputed instances and of the variants. (The examples below may be compared to the self-conscious use of the two forms in Paul's letter to the Galatians cf. Gal 1,17f.; 2,1 Ἱεροσόλυμα with 4,25f., concerning the Jewish tale of Hagar where the Hebrew form is found, as is to be expected). We recall Luke's self-conscious use of language for the opening two chapters of his Gospel.

The manuscript evidence summarized briefly below reveals that if one were to follow blindly the text as found in one's favoured manuscript then the resultant text printed would betray a confused and confusing picture. That is indeed the current situation felt by careful readers of our currently available printed editions. My own suggestion to resolve the difficulty is to discover, with the help of the firm examples, if Luke had a reason for using one form of Jerusalem in certain contexts and preferring the alternative in other contexts. ['Firm' here means examples for which no textual variant has been reported to my knowledge. The reading, collating and publishing of an increasingly larger number of cursives may result in some hitherto firm examples being disputed in the manuscript tradition, and we would then need to adjust these statistics accordingly. I suspect that few of the examples listed here will be affected.]

I note that Ἱεροσόλυμα occurs without variant at Acts 1,4; 13,13; 25,1.7.9.15; 26,4.10. In chapters 25-26 Festus would be expected to have used the Greek form (see v.//. below at 25,3.20.24). The name at 1,4 is in an editorial section, addressed to the Greek 'Theophilus'. 13,13, however, is geographical and in a context in which the Hebrew is expected.

Ἱερουσαλὴμ is firmly established at Acts 1,8.12b.19; 2,5.14; 4,5.16; 5,16.28; 6,7; 8,26; 9,2.13.21.26.28; 12,25; 13,27.31; 15,2b; 21,11.12.13.31; 22,5.17.18; 23,11; 24,11. Mainly the contexts here apply to Palestine (chapters 1-7) or in Jewish contexts (8-9). 13,27.31 takes place in a synagogue; 15,2 occurs in the reported speech between Paul and Barnabas where it may have been thought that the Hebrew form was natural; chapter 22 is also a special case, v. 2 tells us Hebrew was the language of the speech; 23,11 occurs in angelic speech, which often contains Semitic features (cf. 8,26). The

instances in chapter 21 occur in a 'We' section that may have originated with a Jewish diarist (but see below). In 24,11 the Jerusalem spoken of here is in the context of the city of the Temple hence the Hebrew form seems most appropriate – even in a speech attributed to the Roman Governor!

All the above suggestions may help us resolve the following places where there is variation:

1,12a. E alone reads *Ιεροσολυμα* but the Hebrew form, read by all other manuscripts, seems likeliest here in the context of a description of the Mount of Olives' being a sabbath day's journey from Jerusalem. Other geographical references where the Hebrew is found are Acts 2,5; 11,2 but against that see 13,31 above.

8,1 like 1,4 occurs as an editorial addition, and again 'Jerusalem' was presumably in Greek as this section tells of the spread of Christianity outside Palestine in chapters 8-15. (Manuscript 2344 reads *Ιερουσαλημ*.)

8,14 D reads *Ιερουσαλημ* *contra* *Ιεροσολυμοις* *cett.* Here the apostles from Jerusalem are likely to have been referred to using the Hebrew form (cf. apostles/disciples from Jerusalem at 2,42 D; 6,7 and see 15,4; 16,4 below). But at 11,27 the reference to the 'prophets from Jerusalem' has 'Jerusalem' in Greek in all manuscripts except 1175, which may then preserve the original form.

8,25 *Ιερουσαλημ* H L P against *κ* A B D. 8,27 Jerusalem here is the city of Jewish worship. Read the Hebrew form with all manuscripts (except 917). In 8,25-27 the Hebrew form should be read three times (the occurrence in v.26 is firm).

10,39 This occurs in Peter's speech. The Hebrew name is likely to be original and is found in all manuscripts except 33 489 623 927 1175 1270 1872 2344.

11,2 Read *Ιερουσαλημ* with *κ* A B against D *maj.* This is a geographical reference; see 1,12 above.

11,22 *ϣ*<sup>74</sup> *κ* B *Ιερουσαλημ* against E H L P 181. The context is geographical.

11,27 *Ιερουσαλημ* (the reading of *κ* C D) against *ϣ*<sup>74</sup> A B occurs in the context of 'prophets of Jerusalem' cf. 8,14.

15,4 *Ιερουσαλημ* *κ* C D against *ϣ*<sup>74</sup> A B 88. (See 8,14 above.)

16,4 *Ιερουσαλημ* *maj* against *κ* A B D! (Again, see 8,14.)

19,21 *Ιερουσαλημ* H L P against most manuscripts. The Hebrew is arguably original, as Paul's thoughts are being recorded here.

20,22 Paul addresses the Ephesians; many Christians there were Jewish (see Acts 18-19) and so the reading *Ιερουσαλημ* of most manuscripts should be read against D *Θ* 88 *Ιεροσολυμα*.

The following four variants occur in one of the so-called 'We' passages in Acts, which may be significant if we consider the source to have been from a Jewish diarist. The Hebrew form is found elsewhere in this section in this

chapter. 20,16 Ιερουσαλημ  $\Phi^{74}$   $\aleph$  A against B C D; 21,4 Ιερουσαλημ H L P against *maj.*; 21,15 Ιερουσαλημ H L P against *maj.* (Hellenistic form); 21,17 Ιερουσαλημ  $\Theta$  614 1505 *et al.* against the Hellenistic form in other manuscripts.

25,3 Ιερουσαλημ against E 618 927 1270 1738 (Ιεροσολυμα). The Hellenistic form is likely, given the context; 25,20 Ιερουσαλημ H L P 618 against the Hellenistic form found in other manuscripts. Again the Hellenistic form is likely. (See 25,1.7.9).

25,24 Ιερουσαλημ E (!) against the Hellenistic form in other manuscripts. Festus is speaking here as at 25,20; likewise in Paul's response the Hellenistic form occurs (26,4.10). Thus here and at 26,20 we should read Ιεροσολυμα, with all manuscripts except E (Ιερουσαλημ).

28,17 Here Paul is in Rome speaking to Jews as at 13,27.31. Ιερουσαλημ with  $\Theta$  614 1505 1518 1611 2138 2414 2495 is to be printed, against the Hellenistic form in other manuscripts.

We note that in the longer readings in D at 2,42; 8,1; 15,2 the 'correct', i.e. the Hebrew form appropriate to the context, is found, although on other grounds we may decide that the reading as a whole is secondary. At 18,21; 19,1; 20,23 the 'wrong' forms are found for the contexts at 18,21 in the speech to Jews in a synagogue the longer reading has the Greek form; at 19,1 the Greek would give a unique use of Ιεροσολυμα outside the Festus story in the later chapters; at 20,23 the same may be said.

The above survey shows how the manuscripts divide erratically over this variant. It will be seen how these manuscripts are confused and that it is they themselves who sow that confusion.

Some may disagree over some details in specific verses, but unless one can come up with a better and more convincing alternative reason why Luke uses these two forms deliberately one has to admit that there is anarchy.

#### 2.4.2 *Simon Peter*

Another proper name that caused scribal activity concerns 'Peter'. Acts names Peter some fifty-six times. In the Cornelius story and the following he is 'Simon called Peter' four times (10,5.18.32; 11,13). At 15,14 Peter is called Συμεων, possibly indicating a different source for James' speech and certainly one that gives the speech an appropriate Semitic flavour. Once again, we see that the author was sensitive to the form of proper names.

The concordance and apparatus reveal the following picture:

(a) Variants add the name Peter at 10,23 in C H L P 440 *pler.* and at 12,7 in 1243 2344 but see D (with 2344!) at 12,16 *om.* 'Peter'.

(b) Variation over the inclusion of the definite article with Πετρος occurs at the following places (the manuscripts bracketed add the article):

1,15 (D); 2,14 ( $\aleph$  A B D etc.); 3,4 (D); 3,6 (D); 3,12 ( $\aleph$  A B etc.); 4,8 (547 1636 ); 4,19 (D 0156 104); 5,3 ( $\aleph$  A B etc.); 5,8 ( $\Phi^8$  69 104 1739 etc.); 5,29



(056 33 88 429 915 etc.); 9,39 (C 431 440 614 etc.); 10,21 (D L 440 etc.); 10,34 (241 1646<sup>c</sup>); 10,46 (D Θ 326 915 2344 etc.); 11,4 (E H L Θ 522 1739 1891 etc.); 12,14 *sec.* (D).

The following show where the article is firm with 'Peter':

1,13; 5,9; 9,34.40; 10,14.17.26; 12,5.6.11.16.18 (nom.)

2,37; 3,11; 9,40; 10,25 (acc.)

4,13; 10,19.44; 12,7.14 (gen.)

but see the firm anarthrous instances at 2,38; 3,1; 8,20; 9,35; 10,9; 11,2; 15,7.

My inclination is to accept the arthrous instances as original and to explain that scribes were tempted to remove the article before the name Peter once its origin and meaning were no longer uppermost in readers' minds. In some verses that tendency was completely successful in eliminating the article from all extant manuscripts.

#### 2.4.3 *The Land of Egypt*

The issue here is how we decide between γη and τη (Αιγυπτ.). The following variants occur in Acts:

7,11 την Ϝ<sup>45</sup> Ϝ<sup>74</sup> & A B C; την γην E A P 056 69; της γης D<sup>c</sup>; γην 945 1505 1739 1891

7,36 γη Αιγυπτου Ϝ<sup>74</sup> D Θ 2412; γη Αιγυπτω & A E H P S; τη Αιγυπτω B C 69

7,40 γης Ϝ<sup>74</sup> etc.; της 209 242

13,17 τη Αιγυπτου Ϝ<sup>74</sup> & A B; γη Αιγυπτω C H L P; τη Αιγυπτω Ψ; τη γη Αιγυπτω D

cf. Heb 8,9 εκ της γης Αιγυπτου; Jude 5 εκ της γης Αιγυπτου.

The following verses are relevant: Acts 2,10; 7,9.10<sup>bis</sup>.12.15.17.18.34<sup>bis</sup>.39 cf. Mt 2,13.14.15.19; Heb 3,16; 11,26.27; Rev 11,8. An examination of the apparatus for these verses reveals that there is no firm example of the article with Αιγυπτος. The variant may be explained on palaeographical grounds, THN and ΓHN look similar – one could have been accidentally written for the other. Coupled with that, as γη Αιγυπτου is a fixed expression in the Old Testament the probability is that we should read γη above. The question about the dependent genitive Αιγυπτου or the apposition (Αιγυπτω) needs to be settled. In the Old Testament the dependent genitive is usual and that should help us to clinch the originality of Αιγυπτου in the passages identified above in Acts.

### 3. *Homoioteleuton*

Whenever we are confronted by a variant that gives a shorter reading we need to check from the context to see if palaeographical considerations can be le-

gitimately brought into play and ask if homoioteleuton or the like could have been encouraged an accidental shortening. Often the origin of a shorter text may be explained by parablepsis, that optical error where the scribe's eye has jumped forward accidentally from one group of letters to the same or similar set later in his exemplar. Once such an error has occurred, and as long as the shortened text makes sense, such a reading can be perpetuated thereafter. In so far as we are concerned in our earliest Christian centuries with manuscripts that are written in *scriptio continua* then the term *homoioteleuton* need not be applied in its literal meaning. A.C. CLARK coined the term *hom* for the phenomenon, because the like letter groups could come at the end, middle or beginning of words or even straddle words. *Hom* may well explain the *v.ll.* at Acts 2,37 *om.* λουΠΟΥΣ D (ΤΟΥΣ precedes); 10,5 *om.* τιΝΑ κ L P *maj* (ΣιμωνΑ precedes); 12,18 *om.* ουκ ολιγΟΣ D (because of παραχΟΣ); 22,9 *om.* και εμφοβοι εγενΟΝΤΟ κ A B (...ΟΝΤΟ precedes); 27,41 *om.* των κυμαΤΩΝ κ\* A B (...ΤΩΝ ). It will be seen that even D, identified as a manuscript prone to longer readings, sometimes accidentally shortened its exemplar! Other examples, chosen at random are: 17,13 *om.* και ταρασσΟΝΤΕΣ ϐ<sup>45</sup> Byz. (...ΟΝΤΕΣ precedes); 5,32 *om.* B; ο ϐ<sup>45</sup> κ A D<sup>c</sup>; ον D\*, possibly a correction *ad sensum* (cf. αις 15,36 *ad sensum*, although there D reads οις to refer to αδελφους!) If *hom* is not applicable here at 5,32 then deliberate change on grammatical grounds is a possibility. [Further on Byz-ϐ<sup>45</sup> alliances see Section 7 below.]

#### 4. Orthography

The issue of variants related to orthography has been referred to in several examples discussed above. The special case of the temporal augment in verses with initial diphthong merits special mention here. I take just a few examples:

##### 4.1 ευρισκω

There are no firm instances of ηυ- but *v.ll.* occur at Acts 7,11 ηυ- B E P 921 1241 2412 only (= NA); ευ- *cett.*; 8,40 ηυ- E only; *v.l.* ευρεθη *cett.* as read by NA. These two variants show the inconsistency of NA in this matter. Read ευ-.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>15</sup> This issue is discussed in BDF § 67.

4.2 *ευχομαι*

ηυ- Acts 27,29 in NA with  $\mathfrak{P}^{74}$  & B<sup>c</sup> *maj* but ευ- B\* C 049. The deliberate change in B is noteworthy.

26,29 ηυξαμην P. All other manuscripts read ευξα(ι)μην.

Read ευ- in both verses.

4.3 *ευφραινω*

Examples at 2,26 and 7,41 again show that the printed editions are inconsistent:

2,26 ηυ- & A B C (= NA); ευ- *cett.*

7,41 ηυ- D P Θ; ευ- *cett.* (= NA).

4.4 *ευκαιρεω*

Acts 17,21 ηυ- (= NA); ευ- H L P *maj.* Read ευ-.

4.5 *ευχαριστεω*

27,35 ηυ- P Θ 69 etc.; ευ- *cett.* (= NA) (and see printed editions including NA at Rom 1,21 (ηυ- *v.l.* ευ-))! Note ευ- at John 6,11 (*v.l.* ηυ- D only).

4.6 *οικοδομεω*<sup>16</sup>

7,47 οι- with B\* D Θ and in the printed editions. ω- *cett.*

4.7 *ανοιγω*

5,19 ανοιξας  $\mathfrak{P}^{74}$  & A; ηνοιξεν *cett.*; ανεωξεν D<sup>c</sup>; ανεωξαν D\*

16,26 ανεωχθησαν H L P Θ; ηνοιχθησαν  $\mathfrak{P}^{74}$  & A E 33 81; ηνεωχθησαν *cett.* (= NA).

No variation concerning the augment occurs at 9,40; 12,10.14; 14,27. All read ηνοι-. We conclude that, as there are no firm examples of ηνεω-/ανεω- and that as there are many firm instances of ηνοι-, therefore ηνοι- is to be printed. The NA text needs to be changed at 16,26. Certainly the issue of the augments needs to be decided if one is to print a consistent and responsible text.

5. *The Septuagint*

Just as in the Gospels variants that make the synoptic (and other) parallels more dissimilar are likely to be original, it being probable that the readings that harmonise the parallels came from later copyists who tried to assimilate

16 We may refer again to the Atticist Phrynichus, who advised (§ CXXXI) that this verb should not be augmented as οι-.

the differing accounts, so too variants that make Old Testament quotations in the New Testament dissimilar to the wording of the LXX are likely to be original. If we apply that to the long quotation from Joel in Acts 2,16-21 we see that several variants do indeed agree with the wording that has come down to us independently as the LXX form. The alternative giving a form different to that known in manuscripts of the Greek Old Testament seems to be original. Often, supplementary arguments can buttress a mechanical application of the principle of dissimilarity.

At 2,16 D omits 'Joel'. In other comparable examples in the New Testament the preferred order is name + prophet. To accept the reading with Joel here gives an order inconsistent with New Testament (and, as it happens, Hebrew) usage. In addition, 'Joel' not looks like a scribal explanatory addition. D, therefore, may uniquely preserve the original reading.

The following are also to be noted:

2,17 *εν ταις εσχαις ημεραις* *κ* A D *maj.*; *εν ταις ημεραις εσχαις* 1175; *μετα ταυτα* B (= LXX); *μετα ταυτα εν ταις εσχαις ημεραις* C 467 1319 and 2,17 *κυριος* D E; *θεος* *cett.*: *κυριος* is ambiguous, capable in many contexts of referring to God or to Jesus. Scribes often avoid the ambiguity. [Many variants concern *Κυριος* when copyists have tried to be precise by altering this to *Ιησους* or to *θεος* as appropriate.] Here, as so often elsewhere, *κυριος* is preferable. The LXX does not have this clause. cf. 2,18 *om.* *εν ταις ημεραις εκειναις* D: LXX has the words. The reading of *κ* A D etc. at v.17 (*εν ταις ημεραις εκειναις*) fits its new context better, allowing the citation to stand away from its original context. The reading *μετα ταυτα* conforms the passage to the LXX. Similar motives may lie behind the reading concerning the pronoun in v. 17. *υμων*<sup>1,2</sup>: *αυτων*<sup>1,2</sup> D; *υμων*<sup>3,4</sup>: *om.* D; *υμων*<sup>4</sup>: *om.* C\* E. *υμων*, although conforming to the LXX, is likely to be original at all four places. The 'Western' changes could have been theologically motivated to enhance the universality of the extent of salvation (cf. the changing of *κατα σαρκα* to *κατα σαρκας* by D earlier in this verse).

2,18 *om.* *και προφητευσουσιν* D. Here this shorter reading by D conforms the citation to that in the LXX.

2,19 *om.* *αιμα ... καρπου* D. The longer reading conforms to the LXX but here we ought also reckon with the possibility that the longer text was original and was reduced accidentally through *hom* (KAT ... ΚΑΠινου).

2,20 *και επιφανη*. These words are as in the LXX. v.l. *om.* *κ* D. Again we need to weigh up arguments based on assimilation with arguments about *hom*. Here *hom* seems to have been responsible for the accidental shortening: *μεγαληνΚΑΙΕπιφανηΚΑΙΕ...*

cf. 7,18 *ος ουκ ηδει τον Ιωσηφ* = LXX Ex 1,8; *ος ουκ εμνησθη τον Ιωσηφ* D E. There BARRETT (Commentary *ad loc.*) favours the Western reading, arguing that the alternative is due to assimilation to the LXX. BARRETT is also

sympathetic to the variants in Acts 2,17ff. that depart from the wording of Joel in the LXX.

Thoroughgoing eclectic principles need to be carefully evaluated. Occasionally, competing criteria come into the picture. (In some ways we may compare this dilemma with similar problems faced by those who find that their favoured manuscripts, say  $\aleph$  and B, go differing ways at a particular variant.) But textual criticism often involves the evaluation of criteria, and it ought not be concerned with the wholesale application of principles mechanically.

## 6. *Varia*

Here follows a small selection of variants where modern editors ought to reach a decision.

### 6.1 *Acts 3,21*

At 3,21 there are four variants in Greek:

των αγιων αυτου των προφητων D

των αγιων απ αιωνος αυτου προφητων  $\Phi$ <sup>74</sup>  $\aleph$  A B\*

παντων των αγιων αυτου προφητων απ αιωνος P

παντων των προφητων αγιων αυτου απ αιωνος 614 2412

απ αιωνος seems to have been added from Lk 1,70 although (less probably) the words could have been omitted if the question was raised whether prophets had indeed existed from the beginning. των αγιων was sometimes taken as a noun followed by an appositive, and that may have been the cause of some of the other changes. The Western text seems original.

### 6.2 *Acts 10,30*

The longer reading νηστευων και seems original. A shorter reading, omitting the words, makes no sense. The omission may have been occasioned because fasting was not mentioned in vv. 2-3. The meaning seems to be: "Four days ago I was fasting until this hour", in other words Cornelius' piety led him to a requisite period of fasting prior to baptism. A full discussion of this intriguing variant is found in BARRETT, Commentary *ad loc.* and cf. Acts 9,9 and *Did.* 7,4.

### 6.3 *Acts 13,33*

πρωτω D; δευτερω *cett.* (but in differing positions, a phenomenon that often indicates textual uncertainty); *om.* 1175. In so far as the Psalm from which the quotation comes is always now numbered as the second, πρωτω is the harder reading, and is the one likely to have been altered and therefore is the

original. The reading may reflect a time when our first two Psalms were reckoned as one. (There exists some Rabbinic and Patristic evidence to that effect.)  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  seems to read  $\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \psi\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma$  here!

#### 6.4 Acts 13,34

Our printed texts at Acts 13,34 begin with the sentence  $\sigma\tau\iota$ . This may strike the perceptive reader as strange, because causal  $\sigma\tau\iota$  follows the main clause in Mt, Mk, Eph, Pastorals, Heb, James, 1 Peter, 1&2 John. (There are no instances in 3 Jn or 2 Peter) There are exceptions in Jn and two exceptions in Paul out of fifty (Rom 9,7; Gal 4,6), where causal  $\sigma\tau\iota$  precedes its main clause. There are exceptions too in Rev (3,10.16.17; 18,7) but all, apart from 3,16, may be punctuated to conform to the norm. As far as Luke-Acts is concerned, the apparent exception (at Lk 19,17) may be avoided. If it is to be read with the preceding then there is no exception. The servant is praised as 'good' because of his fidelity. (The asyndeton with  $\iota\sigma\theta\iota$  is normal.) At Acts 13,34 the variant  $\sigma\tau\epsilon$  read by D 255 614 1175 2412 *gig* Hil merits attention.  $\sigma\tau\epsilon$  is the more difficult reading and may well be original here. If so, then there is no exception in Luke-Acts. (If  $\sigma\tau\epsilon$  is accepted, then the quotation from Is 55,3 is more closely connected with the resurrection.)

### 7. Readings with Significant Byzantine Support

7.1 There is an apparent lack of concord at Acts 10,37 if we accept the originality of the *nominativus pendens*  $\alpha\rho\chi\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  with  $\kappa\ B$  and our printed editions. But we note the existence of the variant  $\alpha\rho\chi\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$  in  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  Byz that removes the difficulty, but, as a consequence, may therefore be the secondary reading.

Other examples of appositional phrases and circumstantial participles in the narrative in Luke-Acts are at Lk 21,6 and Acts 7,40. There are *v.l.* over such features at Mt 10,11; Lk 20,27; 24,47; 2 Thess 1,5 and note the readings by D at Mt 4,10; 5,40; 7,2.9.14.

Here at 10,37 we argue that the reading  $\alpha\rho\chi\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$  seems to be a grammatical improvement. It is remarkable that the manuscript attestation combines  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}$  and the Byzantine text type.

7.2 Other examples of this are in the following set expressions:

#### 7.2.1 Holy Spirit

The expression 'Holy Spirit' is firm at 8,15.17.19 but at 8,18 we have the *v.l.*  $+ \tau\omicron\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$  (Alexandrian/Byzantine)  $\mathfrak{P}^{45}\ \mathfrak{P}^{74}$  Byz; *om.*  $\kappa\ B$  alone (and that is the text printed in NA). The longer text is likely to be original. The deletion

was possibly to avoid repetition (see 1.1.2 above for this motive for removing text).

### 7.2.2 *Grace of God*

The expression is firm at 11,23; 13,43; 14,26. At 15,40 *θεου* (Alexandrian/Byzantine)  $\Phi^{45}$  C Byz; *κυριου*  $\Phi^{74}$   $\kappa$  B D cf. 20,24 *κυριου*  $\Psi$ ; *θεου* *cett.* 'The Grace of the/our Lord (Jesus Christ)' is common in doxologies; liturgical practice may have encouraged scribes to alter the reading in this direction.

### 7.2.3 *Word of God/Lord*

Given the alleged ambiguity of *κυριος*, we would be inclined to accept the *v.l.* *κυριου* in the following places, were it not for the fact that *λογος θεου* is firmly established, as will be seen below. No firm example of *λογος κυριου* is found in Acts. Therefore *θεου* is preferred as the original in all the variants:

4,31; 6,2; 8,14; 11,1; 13,46; 17,13 *θεου* is firm; 6,7 *θεου v.l. κυριου* D E  $\Psi$  614; 8,25 *κυριου* B C D *v.l. θεου*  $\Phi^{74}$  A; 21,24 *θεου*  $\kappa$  D<sup>c</sup> H L P 33 *v.l. κυριου* B 1837; 13,5 *θεου v.l. κυριου* D 1270; 13,7 *θεου v.l. κυριου* 1739 1891; 13,44 *θεου* B\* C E L P  $\Psi$  049 056 *v.l. κυριου*  $\Phi^{74}$   $\kappa$  A B<sup>c</sup> D 33 81 2344; 13,48 *θεου* B D E 049 etc. *v.l. κυριου* *cett.*; 13,49 *κυριου v.l. om.*  $\Phi^{45}$ ; *θεου* 927 1270; 15,35 *κυριου v.l. θεου* 88; 15,36 *θεου* 1505 2495 *v.l. κυριου* *cett.*; 16,32 *κυριου* (Alexandrian/Byzantine)  $\Phi^{45}$   $\Phi^{74}$   $\kappa$  Byz *v.l. θεου*  $\kappa$ \* B (= NA). 'Lord' may have been introduced by scribes from v.31; 18,11 *θεου v.l. κυριου* 104; 19,20 *κυριου*  $\kappa$  A B *v.l. θεου* E 88 927. Probably *κυριου* here belongs with *κρατος* but *another v.l.* with a changed word order makes *κυριου* belong with *λογος*. (At 19,10 and 20,35 *κυριου* is followed by *Ιησου* but *v.l. om. Ιησου*  $\kappa$  A B D<sup>c</sup>.) For the interchanging of *κυριος* and *θεος* in the manuscripts see also 10,33; 17,27.

### 7.2.4 *Church of God*

The famous example is at Acts 20,28, where the following *v.ll.* are related to the meaning of *ιδιος* at the end of the verse: *θεου*  $\kappa$   $\Theta$  B; *κυριου*  $\Phi^{74}$  A D; *κυριου και θεου* C H L P Byz, an 'obvious conflate' declares METZGER in the *Textual Commentary*. *εκκλησια του θεου* occurs eleven times in Paul; *εκκλησια κυριου* occurs seven times in the LXX but never without *v.l. θεου* in the New Testament.

### 7.2.5 *Son of God*

G..D. KILPATRICK<sup>17</sup> championed the reading *θεου* at Acts 7,56. *θεου* is read by  $\Phi^{74}$  491 614 Gg boh (2 manuscripts) Macarius (c. 400) and in Latin in the

17 G.D. KILPATRICK, Acts vii. 56: Son of Man?, in: TZ 21 (1965), 14, ID., Again Acts vii.56: Son of Man?, in: TZ 34 (1978), 232. Both are reprinted in J.K. ELLIOTT (ed.),

*Vita Patricii*. Thus there is ancient and geographically varied testimony. Given the uniqueness of the term 'Son of Man' (especially the *standing* Son of Man) applied to Jesus outside the Gospels, it is improbable that it is original in Acts 7,56. The variant could have been occasioned by scribes sensitive to repetition (θεός occurs three other times in the immediate context [vv. 55-56]); they then assimilated the passage to Lk 22,69-70 which identifies Jesus, the Son of Man, as the Son of God).

### 8. Conclusion

This very small selection of variants demonstrates how, by applying (thoroughgoing) eclectic principles of textual criticism, conclusions about the likeliest direction of scribal alterations and the likeliest original text can be arrived at. Obviously the study of the textual tradition as a whole needs to be undertaken by editors of a critical edition of the text of Acts. That would require a full *apparatus criticus*, such as we may expect to find in a future fascicule of the ongoing series *Editio Critica Maior*. Certainly a new edition cannot be created from the woefully inadequate apparatus found, inevitably, in a hand edition of the Greek New Testament. But such work, painstaking and long winded though it may be, is necessary if we are to arrive at a satisfactory and satisfying text of Acts.

A preliminary analysis of the way the manuscripts behave may be made from the conclusions reached above, and it will readily been seen just how erratic our extant manuscripts can be: at one point we may be printing the original text with D, at other times with the Byzantine witnesses, while another variant selected as representing the original text may be found in the Alexandrian uncials. But if we are to produce a text that is truly and honestly eclectic then such conclusions are only to be expected.



*Stanley E. Porter*

## Developments in the Text of Acts before the Major Codices

### *1. Introduction*

The text of Acts has probably been studied more than that of any other New Testament book, no doubt because of the issues surrounding the relationship of the so-called Western textual tradition to the so-called Alexandrian textual tradition. There has been long-standing dispute over the relation between the two traditions, and the texts in which they are found, with the Western text recently generating renewed interest in a number of circles.<sup>1</sup> One of the major findings of such recent study has been that it is a misconception to try to draw too firm a line between the two traditions, because in a very real sense the Western tradition is defined as being that which is not identified within the Alexandrian tradition.<sup>2</sup> Others in this volume are addressing specific and broader questions regarding the Western textual tradition. In this paper, I would like to concentrate on another but closely related issue, and that is the development of the text of the book of Acts as revealed in the papyri and parchments that predate the major codex tradition, in particular the codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus, and, of course, Bezae. There has been much study of the issue of the Western text, especially as it is found in Codex Bezae (in fact, 'among the so-called Western witnesses, [it] is the only MS in Greek to

---

1 See, for example, M.-E. BOISMARD/A. LAMOUILLE, *Le texte occidental des Actes des Apôtres: Reconstitution et réhabilitation* (2 vols.), Paris 1984; J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism* (JSNT.S 236), Sheffield 2002.

2 See READ-HEIMERDINGER, *Bezan Text*, 3. She also cites as acknowledging this position D.C. PARKER, *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript*, Cambridge 1992, 284; W.A. STRANGE, *The Problem of the Text of Acts* (MSSNTS 71), Cambridge 1992, 35-38; and L. VAGANAY/C.-B. AMPHOUX, *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*, trans. by J. HEIMERDINGER, Cambridge 1991, 110. In a very real sense, the Western tradition is misnamed, since it is not particular to 'the West', nor is it seen to be a fixed tradition.

have a text that differs consistently from the Alexandrian text'),<sup>3</sup> and there has been some comparison of the individual papyri and parchments with the major codices in some of the editions of these manuscripts. However, there has been relatively little detailed comparison and analysis in recent times of the texts found in these particular early papyri and parchments, and their bearing upon text-critical issues, such as the development of what has come to be called the Alexandrian and Western traditions.<sup>4</sup> A study such as this is limited, of course, by the decision not to take into account books other than Acts, but this is a useful starting point for the discussion in any case. Most commentaries or articles that involve text-critical questions, if they treat the manuscripts at all, are content to leave comments at the level of generalities.<sup>5</sup> This paper examines each of the early manuscripts, and notes its relationship to the major codex tradition as found in the three mentioned above, in order to glimpse the early textual tendencies of the book of Acts. I will be examining the individual manuscripts from their published editions, and comparing them to standard editions of the codices.<sup>6</sup> Accommodation to conventions of editing, such as spelling regularization, etc., are not uniform, and so are not represented systematically in this study.

## *2. Importance of the Study*

The controversy over the origin of the so-called Western textual tradition of Acts has generated a number of different solutions. Much recent discussion

---

3 READ-HEIMERDINGER, *Bezan Text*, 4.

4 Two studies worth noting are B. ALAND, *Entstehung, Charakter und Herkunft des sogenannten westlichen Texts. Untersucht an der Apostelgeschichte*, in: *ETHL* 62 (1986), 5-65, but who only treats the Western papyri, along with 614 (13th century); and J.K. ELLIOTT, *Codex Bezae and the Earliest Greek Papyri*, in: D.C. PARKER/C.-B. AMPHOUX (eds.), *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium June 1994* (NTTS 22), Leiden 1996, 161-182 (here: 178-181). I have compiled my data independent of these studies. There are, of course, many others as well.

5 Those that are the most helpful include: C.K. BARRETT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (2 vols.; ICC), Edinburgh 1994-1998, I, 2-29 (but who does not treat two manuscripts, 057 and 0189), and J.A. FITZMYER, *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31), New York 1997, 66-72.

6 For the sake of comparison, I use the following editions of the codices: A.F.C. TISCHENDORF, *Novum Testamentum Sinaiticum sive Novum Testamentum*, Leipzig 1863; J.H. ROPES, *The Beginnings of Christianity Part I The Acts of the Apostles. III. The Text of Acts*, London 1926; F.H. SCRIVENER, *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis*, Cambridge 1864; and for those places where Bezae is not extant but where reference to the Western tradition is necessary: A.C. CLARK, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Critical Edition with Introduction and Notes on Selected Passages*, Oxford 1933.

wishes to focus study more particularly on the text of Codex Bezae, since this is the only and earliest extant manuscript that consistently represents this Western tradition.<sup>7</sup> Nevertheless, the size of the text of Bezae for Acts has been variously estimated, but seems to be roughly 6,24% to 8,5% longer than the Alexandrian text, depending on how one reconstructs the entire text of Bezae (which is not complete – see below).<sup>8</sup> The differences warrant consideration of the origins of the two distinctly different texts. The origins of this tradition have generated a number of hypotheses. These are worth recounting here, if only briefly, so that the importance of study of the early manuscripts can be more readily seen. There are four positions worth recounting.<sup>9</sup>

(1) The author of the book of Acts produced two different but related editions of the work. Although a number of scholars have traditionally held to this view,<sup>10</sup> BLASS's argument for it has become the most widely known, until recently, when it has again been revived.<sup>11</sup> BLASS argued that Luke wrote a first, rough draft, but then went back and wrote out a final copy for his patron, Theophilus. In the course of this re-writing, he made necessary changes to revise and improve it especially by deleting superfluous wording. Copies were later made of both of these manuscripts, and thus the Western and the Alexandrian versions were promulgated. The major argument against this po-

7 Besides READ-HEIMERDINGER, *Bezan Text* (and her work cited there), see J. RIUS-CAMPS, *De Jerusalem a Antioquia: Genesis de la Iglesia Cristiana*, Córdoba 1989; ID., *Comentari als Fets dels Apòstols* (4 vols.), Barcelona 1991-2000; M.-E. BOISMARD/A. LAMOUILLE, *Les actes des deux apôtres* (ÉtB 12-14), Paris 1990; J. TAYLOR, *Les Actes des deux Apôtres* (ÉtB 23.30), Paris 1994-1996.

8 See READ-HEIMERDINGER, *Bezan Text*, 7, citing STRANGE, *Problem*, 213 and F. KENYON, *The Western Text in the Gospels and Acts*, London [1939], 26.

9 There are several recent chronicles that I have found particularly helpful in formulating this summary. They include: B.M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, London 1971, 259-272; STRANGE, *Problem*, 1-34; BARRETT, *Acts*, I, 22-26.

10 E.g. J.B. LIGHTFOOT, *On a Fresh Revision of the English New Testament*, London 1871, 29.

11 F. BLASS, *Acta apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter*, Göttingen 1895, 24-32; ID., *Philology of the Gospels*, London 1898, 96-137, where he responds to trenchant criticism in the review of T.E. PAGE, *Blass' Edition of Acts*, in: *Classical Review* 11 (1897), 317-320; T. ZAHN, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (2 vols.), Leipzig 1900, II, 339-360; E. NESTLE, *Einführung in das Griechische Neue Testament*, Göttingen 1899, 188-191; J.M. WILSON, *The Acts of the Apostles*, London 1923, 25f.; BOISMARD/LAMOUILLE, *Le texte occidental*, I, ix. A variation on this view has it that the author, Luke, read out his work in Rome, and it was written down with questions and answers included – the origin of the Western text. See G. SALMON, *Some Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, London 1897, 140.

sition has been that it has not always been clear why the author made the changes that he did, since not all of the changes appear for the better.<sup>12</sup>

(2) A second view to consider is that, again, the author of the book of Acts produced two different but related editions of the work, except that the Alexandrian text was produced before the Western one. Most scholars have not considered such a position, because it does not at first make sense that an author would take the more refined and polished Alexandrian version and then add the kinds of things found in the Western text. However, the kind of case that could be made for adding the kinds of things found in the Western text by the same author could have come about through new information being provided, such as by Paul or one of his followers, at the end of the events recounted in Acts 28.<sup>13</sup> Recently, without necessarily arguing for a clear theory of origins, several interpreters of Acts have emphasized the theological tendencies of the Western text as distinct from the interests of the Alexandrian text.<sup>14</sup>

(3) The interpolation or revision theory is probably the most widely held theory. This position has traditionally been held by the major figures in New Testament textual criticism, such as WESTCOTT and HORT, KENYON, DIBELIUS, and ROPES.<sup>15</sup> The argument is that the early period of textual transmission was more fluid, and this resulted in a number of interpolations being added to the text, possibly by revisers. The date often given to these is the early second century. One recent modification of this position is that Luke left his work unfinished, and after his death what were originally marginal notations were in the second century incorporated into the work, thus result-

---

12 Major critics have been PAGE (see a summary of his review in METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, 262f.), F. KENYON, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, London 1912 (1901), 341-354, and ROPES, *Text*, ccxxvii-ccxxix.

13 É. DELEBECQUE, *Les deux Actes des Apôtres* (ÉtB 6), Paris 1986.

14 Besides those who have concentrated upon the Western text in recent times, see E. HAENCHEN, *The Acts of the Apostles* (trans. B. NOBLE and B. SHINN), Philadelphia 1971, 50-60; P.-H. MENOUD, *The Western Text and the Theology of Acts* (1951), repr. in: ID., *Jesus Christ and the Faith*, Pittsburgh 1978, 61-83; E.J. EPP, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigensis* (MSSNTS 3), Cambridge 1966; C.S.C. WILLIAMS, *Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, Oxford 1951, 54-82; P. HEAD, *Acts and the Problem of its Texts*, in: B.W. WINTER/A.D. CLARKE (eds.), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting. I. Ancient Literary Setting*, Grand Rapids 1993, 415-444 (here: 428-444) (Head also provides a history of discussion).

15 B.F. WESTCOTT/F.J.A. HORT, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, II, Cambridge 1882, 122-126; KENYON, *Western Text*, passim; M. DIBELIUS, *The Text of Acts: An Urgent Critical Task*, in: JR 21 (1941), 421-431; repr. in ID., *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, ed. H. GREEVEN, New York 1956, 84-92; and ROPES, *Text*, ccxxxi-ii.

ing in the longer Western text, while at the same time another editor polished the text into the other recension, the Alexandrian text.<sup>16</sup>

(4) The opposite of the interpolation theory is that the Western text is the original, and the Alexandrian text is a revised form. CLARK originally had argued that the stichometric arrangement of the Western text had been abbreviated through inadvertant mistakes.<sup>17</sup> However, when it was shown that many of the differences seem to be of several common types, CLARK modified his position to argue that there was a conscious editorial effort by the person who created the Alexandrian text – even if it was difficult to account for the basis of some of the editorial decisions.<sup>18</sup>

(5) There have also been a number of Semitic theories connected with the book of Acts that have also been drawn into discussion of the two different versions. Besides those who simply have noted what they contend are Semitic influences on the Greek of Bezae, some have thought that the longer text as found in Bezae reflected the influence of attempting to make the text to conform to some form of Semitic language, such as Syriac or Aramaic.<sup>19</sup> It has also been thought that the Western text was the product of retranslation into Greek of an earlier Greek text that had been translated into a Semitic language.<sup>20</sup> This translational retroversion would purportedly account for its growth in length.

Acts study is currently undergoing something of a revival, as well as discussion of its textual history.<sup>21</sup> No doubt as new methods are brought to bear, further refinements and developments in the theories will emerge. However, it is fair to say that right now the majority of scholars appear to accept the priority of the Alexandrian text, and would account for the Western text as a later product of editorial activity.<sup>22</sup> Nevertheless, throughout this discussion, apart from a few short comments, there remains little detailed study of the individual early manuscripts that might have bearing on this issue of the early stages of the text of Acts.

---

16 STRANGE, *Problem*, 167-190. For a critique of this position, see HEAD, *Acts and the Problem of its Texts*, 428-433.

17 A.C. CLARK, *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*, Oxford 1914.

18 CLARK, *Acts*. See also M. BLACK, *Notes on the Longer and the Shorter Text of Acts*, in: M. BLACK/W.A. SMALLEY (eds.), *On Language, Culture, and Religion*. In Honor of Eugene A. Nida, The Hague 1974, 119-131.

19 E.g. M. BLACK, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, Oxford 1946; M. WILCOX, *The Semitisms of Acts*, Oxford 1965.

20 C.C. TORREY, *The Composition and Date of Acts* (HTHS 1), Cambridge/MS 1916; ID., *The Origin of the "Western" Text*, in: ID., *Documents of the Primitive Church*, New York 1941, 112-148.

21 A number of commentaries have been recently written, and a number of major critical commentaries are being prepared in English (NICNT, WBC, NIGTC).

22 See HEAD, *Acts and the Problem of its Texts*, 419, for a list of commentators.

### 3. General Observations regarding the Textual Tradition of Acts in the Early Papyri and Parchments

There are a number of general comments that should be made regarding these manuscripts, before entering into specific analysis. The first is that there is some controversy regarding the dating of several of these manuscripts. In the specific examination below, I will draw attention to this. Although the controversy does not at this point significantly alter the results, it does leave open the possibility that some of these manuscripts – as well as others not being examined here – have been misdated. This would have the effect of altering the number of manuscripts to be taken into consideration in this analysis. A recent volume by COMFORT and BARRETT purports to treat the *Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts*.<sup>23</sup> Not all of the manuscripts treated in this paper are to be found discussed in that volume, with the editors of that volume considering some of them to be too late for inclusion (their range is c. A.D. 100-300, with the beginning of the fourth century marking a turning point in manuscript production). Some others could arguably have been considered here, such as parchment 0165 (4th-6th century).<sup>24</sup> If the major codices are dated later, as they sometimes have been, for example Sinaiticus dated to the fifth century,<sup>25</sup> and Bezae to the sixth century,<sup>26</sup> then this would have the effect of opening up the window of texts for consideration.

A second observation is that the size, condition and amount of text of each of these manuscripts varies greatly. The result is that in some ways we are not comparing like with like. For example, P<sup>45</sup> consists of 13 folios, while P<sup>8</sup> consists of five lines of text, yet each has a GREGORY-ALAND number and is treated as a separate manuscript. Whereas P<sup>8</sup> may not have any noteworthy variants that point to a relationship with the Western text, one must wonder whether the sample is simply too small to make such an observation (but see below where such statements are made on the basis of no evidence, an equally suspect comment).

A third observation concerns what exactly is being compared. Comparisons have usually been made on the basis of what is described as a textual tradition, such as the Alexandrian or Western. The result has been that in many instances there is not comparison with a particular manuscript, but with a set of readings that are thought to represent that tradition. One often reads

23 P.W. COMFORT/D.P. BARRETT (eds.), *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, Wheaton/IL 2001.

24 *P.Berol. inv. 13271*. A.H. SALONIUS, *Die griechischen Handschriftenfragmente des Neuen Testaments in den Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin*, in: ZNW 26 (1927), 97-119 (here: 110-115). On p. 110 he notes that he thinks that it is 5th or 6th century, but that GREGORY thought 4th or 5th.

25 E.g. ROPES, *Text*, xviii.

26 See PARKER, *Codex Bezae*, 261-278, regarding revised theories of dating.

that a particular reading is a Western-type reading, even if the reading is not found in, for example, Codex Bezae, the major true representative of that tradition. The fact that Bezae is not extant for all of Acts adds to the difficulty. Recently, READ-HEIMERDINGER has made a convincing case for the comparison of actual manuscripts. There is much in favor of this approach, since it forces the critic to come to terms with manuscripts in all of their ugly peculiarities, including especially their particular readings, whether these are thought to be typical of a given tradition or not. One cannot gloss over such peculiar readings so easily when they are confronted in direct comparison with another manuscript. However, such an effort also ends up accumulating a wealth of data that may not be relevant, since one encounters not only readings distinctive for a tradition, but other kinds of variants that may be nothing more than mistakes, or even phonetic variations. One encounters this in virtually all manuscripts, with many scholars drawing attention to what they consider sloppy and careless mistakes in Sinaiticus. There is the further problem, however, that often manuscripts do not have what is required to make a comparison. Both Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are complete for Acts, but Bezae is not. Bezae lacks 8,29 – 10,14; 21,2-10.16-18; 22,10-20 and 22,29 – 28,31. If the earlier papyrus being analyzed falls into one of these categories, the textual critic has to make a decision whether simply not to compare the texts involved or to utilize other means of comparison, such as a representative of the tradition. In this case, I have made use of CLARK's reconstructed Western textual tradition.<sup>27</sup>

A fourth observation to make is that each of these manuscripts has a variety of individual characteristics that are not actually germane to this kind of exercise. What is being analyzed in this paper is what kind of relationship the earlier manuscripts have before the time of the emergence of the major codex tradition. I am not concerned here with providing a facsimile of each manuscript, or the kind of diplomatic text that is often useful in coming to terms with the characteristics of a given manuscript.<sup>28</sup> What I am attempting to determine is the individual readings in each manuscript so that useful comparison can be made so as to determine the nature of the text of Acts before the codices emerged. Therefore, in many instances such things as misspelled or phonetically spelled words will be ignored (e.g. itacism). However, incomplete words where enough can be deciphered to provide a certain reading, and similar kinds of features, will be utilized, often without comment. One must always pay attention to the fragmentary nature of the manuscripts involved. One does not want to fall into the trap of arguing for the firm basis of a par-

27 See CLARK, Acts, xi, where he explains the conventions of his text.

28 For defense of such an approach, see S.E. PORTER/W.J. PORTER, *New Testament Greek Papyri and Parchments: New Editions* (MPER NS 28), Vienna [forthcoming], introduction.