

Bangor University

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

The contribution of discourse analysis to textual criticism : a study of the Bezan text of acts.

Heimerdinger, J G.

Award date:
1994

Awarding institution:
Bangor University

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

Variable print quality

THE CONTRIBUTION OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS TO TEXTUAL CRITICISM:


A STUDY OF THE BEZAN TEXT OF ACTS

PhD Thesis University of Wales

March 1994

J.G. Heimerdinger

TW DDEFNYDDIO YN Y
LLYFRGELL YN UNIG
—
TO BE CONSULTED IN THE
LIBRARY ONLY



SUMMARY

This study of the Greek text of Acts in Codex Bezae seeks to demonstrate how the practice of textual criticism can be helped by the application of discourse analysis to internal linguistic criticism. In so doing, it aims to throw light on the origin and purpose of the Bezan text.

The text of Codex Bezae is compared with that of Codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus. After an initial section explaining the method used and outlining the principles of discourse analysis, a selection of the types of variant readings is examined exhaustively: connectives, word order, prepositions, divine names and the spelling of Jerusalem. Grammatical and pragmatic features (particularly the context and the writer/recipient relationship) are considered. In the final section, consecutive variants in extended portions of text (1:15-26; 12:1-12,18-25; 18:1-18) are the object of exegetical study.

The findings of the analyses challenge the traditional view of the Bezan text as a late and wayward text, the work of a slipshod and fanciful scribe. It emerges, on the contrary, as a careful and deliberate work, displaying a high degree of inner coherence and remarkably close to the linguistic patterns which can be discerned in the text which is common to all three manuscripts.

The results further suggest that the text peculiar to Codex Bezae was the work of an early Christian editor familiar with the Jewish background of the Church. Its purpose seems to have been to amplify and enhance the first text of Acts for the benefit of Jewish recipients in order to demonstrate the continuity between Judaism and Christianity and especially the divine endorsement of the openness of the new movement to the Gentiles.

The Bezan revision of the original is, thus, a valuable witness to the life of the early Church and a demonstration of the acceptable fluidity of the pre-canonical text.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	i
<i>Author's Declaration</i>	ii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	iii
<u>GENERAL INTRODUCTION</u>	1
<u>Section I: Theoretical Framework</u>	
Chapter 1 <u>The Method of Studying the Variant Readings</u>	21
Chapter 2 <u>Discourse Analysis</u>	
Introduction	27
I. <u>Discourse Analysis and Textual Criticism</u>	31
I.1 Style	31
I.2 The use of manuscripts	33
I.3 Significant variants	34
I.4 Audience awareness	35
I.5 The telling of a story	36
II. Terminology	39
II.1 Speaker/hearer	39
II.2 Participants	40
II.3 Theatre terms	41
II.4 Cohesion	41
II.5 Marked/unmarked	41
II.6 Topic/comment	42
II.7 Given/new	42
II.8 Salience	43
II.9 Fronting	43
<u>Section II: Linguistic Analysis</u>	
Introduction	47
Chapter 3 <u>Word Order</u>	49
A. General Remarks	
I. The Importance of Studying Word Order	49
II. Reasons for Word Order Variation	54
II.1 Word order variation is secondary	54
II.2 Word order variation is primary	55
III. Methodology	57
B. Variation not Altering the Position of the Verb	
I. Variation Within the Noun Phrase	
I.1 Pairs of words	59
I.2 Words in apposition	60
I.3 <i>ὁὐκ</i>	64
I.4 Adjective and noun/noun phrase	65
II. Variation Involving Other Clause Constituents	
II.1 Adverbs	87
II.2 Emphatic <i>καί</i>	92
II.3 Direct and indirect objects	93
II.4 Subject and indirect object	95
III. Conclusions	96

Chapter 4	<u>Connectives</u>	99
A.	Preliminary Remarks	99
I.	δέ / καί / τέ	101
I.1	δέ	101
I.2	καί	102
I.3	τέ	102
I.4	Variant readings	103
B.	τότε	
	Introduction	106
I.1	The meaning of τότε as a conjunction	107
I.2	Occurrences of τότε common to both texts	108
II.	τότε as a Variant Reading	108
II.1	τότε in place of δε	109
II.2	τότε. in place of καί	115
II.3	τότε in place of τέ	116
II.4	τότε. in place of οὖν	117
II.5	τότε in a different sentence structure	120
III.	τότε as an Adverb	121
IV.	Erroneous τότε in Codex Bezae	122
V.	Conclusions	125
C.	οὖν / μὲν / μὲν οὖν	127
I.	οὖν	127
II.	μὲν	139
III.	μὲν οὖν	145
D.	γάρ	150
I.	Supplementary γάρ in Speech	152
I.1	Preaching	152
I.2	Conversation	153
II.	Supplementary γάρ in Narrative	155
Chapter 5	<u>Prepositions</u>	161
I.	ἀπό	161
I.1	ἀπό-ὑπό	162
I.2	ἀπό-ἐκ	164
II.	εἰς-ἐν	168
III.	ἐπί	171
IV.	Other Pairs of Prepositions	173
V.	Conclusions	173
Chapter 6	<u>Divine Names and Titles</u>	
A.	κύριος and θεός	175
I.	Variant Readings Concerning	
I.1	κύριος or θεός	175
I.2	The definite article before κύριος	178
I.3	Conclusions	181
II.	The Word of God: The Word of the Lord	182
II.1	Readings common to S01, B03 and D05	184
II.2	Variant readings	185
II.3	Conclusions	190
B.	Jesus	191
I.	Forms in the Text Common to S01.B03 and D05	192
II.	Readings in D05 which Diverge from Those in S01/B03	196
III.	The Pattern in the Bezan Text	201
IV.	Conclusions	203

C. The Holy Spirit	
Introduction	206
I. Identification of Expressions Used	211
I.1 Variant readings	212
II. The Spirit of God in Other Biblical Books	
II.1 Expressions used in the Gospel of Luke	216
II.2 Expressions used in the Old Testament	216
III. The Role of the Definite Article	221
IV. An Analysis of the Expressions Used in Acts	224
IV.1 Common text and additional Bezan readings	225
IV.2 Variant readings concerning the form of the expression for the Spirit	237
V. Conclusions	241
Chapter 7 <u>The Spelling of Jerusalem</u>	
Introduction	247
I. Chapters 1-15	
I.1 Hebrew spelling	252
I.2 Hellenistic spelling	254
II. Chapters 16-22	
II.1 Hebrew spelling	260
II.2 Hellenistic spelling	261
Conclusions to Section II	267
<u>Section III: Exegetical Studies</u>	
Introduction	272
Chapter 8 <u>Acts 1:15-26: The Replacement of Judas.</u>	
Introduction	273
Analysis of the Text	277
Conclusions	290
Chapter 9 <u>Acts 12:1-12, 18-25: Peter and Herod.</u>	
Introduction	294
Analysis of the Text	294
Conclusions	337
Chapter 10 <u>Acts 18:1-18: Paul in Corinth.</u>	
Introduction	341
Analysis of the Text	343
Conclusions	376
<u>GENERAL CONCLUSIONS</u>	381
Appendix I: The Distribution of Variant Readings	392
Appendix II: Grammatical Points	403
Appendix III: Theological Themes	406
Bibliography	408
Index of References to the Book of Acts	419

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.

The writing of this thesis has been so intertwined with other events and occupations that there are inevitably a great many people who, knowingly or unknowingly, have played a part in its formation. To all of them I am immensely grateful.

My first introduction to textual criticism was in 1982 from lectures given in Lyons, France by Monsieur C.-B. Amphoux, Director of the Centre Jean Duplacy in Montpellier with which I have had the privilege of being associated over the last ten years. Christian Amphoux's spirit of enquiry and openness to new ideas have been a source of much inspiration and encouragement. I would like to express my warm appreciation to him for the opportunities he has given me to meet other people working in the field of textual criticism; and to try out my ideas both in private discussion and in public debate.

I should like to thank London Bible College for the possibility to pursue further study through their MA programme in 'Aspects of Biblical Interpretation', and for the subsequent use of the Library facilities.

I am thankful to Professor J.N. Birdsall of the University of Birmingham for his initial encouragement to embark on doctoral research and for his continued support and interest. The help of Professor M. Wilcox when he was at the University of Wales in Bangor, in my early days of studying Codex Bezae, was also much appreciated, not least his counsel to 'trust in hunches'.

For the first three years of PhD study, I received a grant for part-time study from Tyndale House, Cambridge for which I am grateful as it enabled me to devote more time to research than would have otherwise been possible.

On the linguistic aspects of the thesis, I have been greatly helped by the facilities at the Summer Institute of Linguistics, Buckinghamshire, and by the kindness of Dr J. and Mrs K. Callow, Dr I. Lowe and Dr S. Levinsohn who over many years have shared their time and knowledge in teaching and in talking through specific issues. My special thanks are due to Dr Levinsohn for his checking of some of the linguistic chapters.

I am above all deeply grateful to Dr J.K. Elliott, Reader in the New Testament at the University of Leeds, whose assistance up to the time of the completion of this thesis has made a large contribution to its being completed at all. I would like to thank him for his advice and guidance at each stage, from the first to the final draft. I have benefited from his extensive and expert knowledge of the diverse field of New Testament Textual Criticism, far beyond the confines of his guidance on my work on Codex Bezae.

My thanks are also due to Dr E.W. Davies of the University of Wales in Bangor for his checking of the penultimate draft of the thesis and for his practical help in preparing it for submission.

Throughout the duration of my research, it has been a source of incalculable encouragement to have the support and understanding of my family. My children, Clara and David, have been wonderful in making sure that things academic never took over completely. A large measure of my appreciation goes to my husband, Jean-Marc, not only for his patient organizing of family life but also for his indefatigable help and skill in locating information on the Jewish background to the New Testament and in evaluating its significance for Codex Bezae.

All of these people are some of the many who have, in one way or another, made the writing of this thesis not only possible but also enjoyable.

ABBREVIATIONS

In the Text (full details are given in the Bibliography):

A-G	Arndt-Gingrich: <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.</i>
B-L	Boismard-Lamouille: <i>Le texte occidental des Actes des Apôtres, reconstitution et réhabilitation Vol II Apparat critique.</i>
BI-D	Blass-Debrunner: <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.</i>
M-M	Moulton-Milligan: <i>Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament.</i>
N-A ²⁵ , N-A ²⁶	Nestle-Aland: <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> 1975, 1979.
UBS ³	Aland-Black-Martini-Metzger-Wikgren: <i>The Greek New Testament</i> , United Bible Societies.

In the Bibliography:

BETL	<i>Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium</i>
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
ETL	<i>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</i>
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
OPTAT	<i>Occasional Papers in Translation and Textlinguistics</i>
NOT	<i>Notes on Translation</i>
Nov Test	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
HTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
RB	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
RSPT	<i>Revue des Sciences philosophiques et théologiques</i>
SBL	<i>Society of Biblical Literature</i>
SNTS	<i>Society for New Testament Studies</i>
START	<i>Selected Technical Articles Relating to Textlinguistics</i>

Erratum Throughout the text and footnotes, Epp 1966 should be 1966a.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

This study of the text of the book of Acts in Codex Bezae, one of its major witnesses, seeks to demonstrate how the practice of textual criticism can be helped and enriched by an important new branch of linguistic science, discourse analysis. By applying the tools of discourse analysis to a particular Greek manuscript of Acts, it further aims to elucidate questions concerning the origin and the purpose of the text transmitted by the manuscript.

The purpose of this Introduction is to present the background to the issues explored and to explain some of the underlying assumptions.

Reasons for the Use of Discourse Analysis.

New Testament textual criticism and the study of Koine Greek are, inevitably, complementary disciplines, mutually dependent at the same time as mutually enhancing. Even though this close association has not always been acknowledged, it is evident that the establishing of the text of the New Testament has something to do with the way in which the language in which it is written functions; and the description of New Testament Greek depends in turn on knowing what the text actually says.

Linguistic analysis is an essential part of that aspect of textual criticism known as 'internal criticism'. It is usually associated with the eclectic method whereby readings are evaluated

according to how well they match an author's habitual use of the language. This is seen, for example, in a general way in the writings of G.D. Kilpatrick, a leading exponent of the eclectic method whose work demonstrates how considerations of what constituted good or bad Greek could affect the style of an author and also cause scribes to modify texts in order that they should conform to the accepted standards should they not do so already.¹ It is also seen with specific reference to the text of Acts in the numerous studies which focus on the linguistic features of the writings of Luke in order to assess the considerable amount of variation which exists in the manuscripts.²

Much of the linguistic analysis which has been carried out in the field of textual criticism during the last fifty years or so sets a high standard of rigorous methodology and meticulous care which is especially indispensable for an effective treatment of the complex problems involved in the study of an ancient language from a period in time for which there is only a limited amount and type of data available. This is, indeed, a chief difficulty in the processing of Koine Greek, that the corpus of material should be relatively small and mainly from the New Testament. It is for that reason that the existence of different manuscripts can be of the greatest value for providing documents which can be used for comparing parallel texts of a writing. It is important, therefore, that for linguistic purposes an open mind should be kept as to the value of a manuscript. Putting aside the readings of some text types as of little interest because they appear to be 'secondary' is to discard a precious aid to the understanding of the factors which cause, or which permit, variation within the Greek of the New Testament. In this sense, textual criticism can be of service to linguistics.

It is precisely the relatively new linguistic development of

discourse analysis which brings a fresh approach to dealing with the way in which language works and which depends to a large extent on the availability of comparable material. It has had a strong impact on the study of New Testament Greek and has tended to change radically many of the traditional views of the language. Consequently, in so far as textual criticism follows a linguistic approach, it is essential that the implications of the recent changes be considered and the new methods be adopted as appropriate if the linguistic descriptions of textual critics are not to appear old-fashioned. 'Today any work on New Testament Greek that ignores these new findings will not easily escape the charge of obscurantism' (BlackD1992, p.11).³

The Text of Acts.

The text of Acts has been chosen for this study for several reasons. There is still a great deal of uncertainty about the original form of Acts and about the significance of the variation attested by the manuscripts. If most editors agree about the necessity to establish an eclectic text, there is rather less agreement about the finished product as the current printed editions and translations testify.⁴ The differences in the manuscripts of Acts have been the subject of renewed interest in recent years, with particular attention being paid to the so-called 'Western' text.⁵ Codex Bezae is taken as the main representative of this text type, one of the two distinctive traditions apparent in the textual transmission of Acts, the other tradition being displayed by all the types except the 'Western' but most uniformly by the Alexandrian type of text.

In 1966, E.J. Epp produced a work on the text of Acts in Codex Bezae, claiming that its readings illustrated a distinctive anti-

Judaic tendency. The reaction to his thesis has, on the whole, been to say that such a tendency is evident in the other text of Acts and is a characteristic of Luke rather than specifically of Codex Bezae.⁶ Despite these criticisms, Epp had nevertheless demonstrated the theological nature of many of the Bezan readings which could not be easily ascribed to scribal habits or errors. Even if the interpretation of his findings is disputed, his work is valuable for identifying the presence of a concern with Jewish matters in Codex Bezae. This concern is examined in detail in the course of this study of the Bezan text of Acts.

M. Wilcox (1979) was especially interested in the style displayed by some of the variants put forward by Epp which he compared with the style of Luke as it could be determined from other sections of Acts and the Gospel. His conclusion was striking in that he found that, on the basis of his comparison, Codex Bezae was 'more Lukan than Luke'.

Sustained investigations into the style of the 'Western' readings of Acts have more recently been produced by three French scholars. In 1984, M.-E. Boismard and A. Lamouille published a critical edition of Acts with a more comprehensive apparatus than had been provided before. It was accompanied by an exhaustive analysis of an extensive range of the linguistic features of the variant readings. These are classified into those which are deemed to be typical of the 'Western' text ('texte occidental' TO) on the one hand, and the Alexandrian text ('texte alexandrin' TA) on the other. The criteria which led to the distinguishing of the two types are unfortunately not always clearly stated and it often seems that the arguments are circular - that a feature is 'TO', for example, because it is displayed by a manuscript which has already been labelled 'occidental'. Boismard and Lamouille regard the TO as the closest to

the original text, which is reconstructed as much by procedures of literary criticism ⁷ as of linguistic analysis. The resultant text is truly eclectic with some 'original' readings supported only by one manuscript of an early version or one citation of a Church Father. Since Codex Bezae frequently departs from their TO, it is considered to be a very distorted version of the original text, a 'texte abâtardi'. While the stylistic analyses must be approached with a fair degree of caution ⁸, the edition remains very useful for the wide range of witnesses cited, especially the versions. The critical apparatus of Boismard-Lamouille (B-L) is the one generally consulted for the present work.

E. Delebecque, a classical scholar, brought out in 1986 a translation in French of the two texts of Acts, with Codex Bezae mainly, but not always, providing the 'Western' version. The conclusions of his analysis of the Bezan language and idiom, in the accompanying discussion as well as in separate studies (1982a, 1982b, 1982c) concur with those of Wilcox. He furthermore finds a significant proportion of words which are typical of the usage of Paul in his letters. The work of Delebecque is important not least because of his extensive knowledge of ancient Greek; and also because his French translation renders so accurately and so clearly some of the subtle differences between the two texts.

Both these works adduce evidence which, on linguistic grounds, contradicts the generally accepted idea that the 'Western' text is a late revision of the original text. The evidence was taken up in a work published in 1992 by W. Strange who put forward the theory that the 'Western' readings were marginal annotations made by Luke in his original copy. His examination of both texts of Acts leads him to believe that neither text was, in fact, published until the second century when two separate editors produced their own version of Acts,

one of them incorporating the marginal annotations. The theory of a dual version by Luke follows lines similar to those proposed by Blass (1895) whose name is commonly associated with the idea. While the second century date for a first publication may be questioned, there is at least, in the situation imagined by Strange, an explanation not only for the linguistic similarities of the two texts but also, at the same time, for their separateness, an explanation which takes into account the theological differences. What will be sought in this study of Acts, is a more fully developed definition of the theological purpose behind the 'Western' readings and of the place which that purpose has in the Church of the first century.

The theological interest of so much of the diversity between the texts of Acts has tended to be overlooked in favour of the linguistic considerations (Stagg 1977). It is the combination of the linguistic interest of the variant readings and the theological nature of many of them which makes discourse analysis an appropriate tool for investigating them further. As is explained in the chapter which describes the procedures followed by discourse analysis (ch.2), there are many aspects of what is traditionally termed style which have been found, according to the principles of discourse analysis, to be governed by firmer rules than have formerly been envisaged. Moreover, much of the variation between the manuscripts of Acts which is usually disregarded consists in slight rewording or small additions and omissions to do with such things as word order, connectives, names of people or definite articles - small, apparently insignificant changes which are traditionally ascribed to a slipshod scribe who cared more for embellishing and padding out his text in order to make it conform to contemporary church practice and doctrine than for respecting the form which had been transmitted to him. The features affected by alteration are exactly the type of features in which discourse

analysis is interested and the second section of the thesis, after the preliminary discussion of the theoretical framework in Section I, is made up of an analysis of some of these features. In the third and final section, they are examined within extended passages of text in order to investigate how the variant readings fit together.

In addition, it is an integral principle of discourse analysis to take account of the pragmatic factors surrounding the creation of a text - the context, the identity of the writer and his relationship with his addressees. Applying the methods of discourse analysis, therefore, to an examination of the diversity in the text of Acts should allow something to be said about the situation in which it arose and the circumstances which prompted the 'Jewish' variants; it should also help to identify the writers and the recipients of the texts.

Codex Bezae.

In all the works described above on the 'Western' text of Acts, the text examined has almost always been of a composite nature. This is true even of the treatise on Codex Bezae by Epp (1966) who uses other 'Western' manuscripts to make a point when the reading of Codex Bezae does not fit with the argument in hand. Delebecque is the writer who adheres the most consistently to the text of Codex Bezae, bringing out an inner coherence which other studies tend to miss. There is, indeed, such a diversity among the 'Western' manuscripts that referring to them in an eclectic fashion to prove theological points is liable to be misleading, at least until such time as some of the major representatives of the 'Western' text type have been examined individually and exhaustively.

Epp (1992) describes a text type as 'an established textual cluster or constellation with a distinctive character or complexion that differentiates it from other textual constellations' (p.431). The distinctive feature of the 'Western' text in Acts is that its readings are different from those of all the other text types but that, at the same time, there is a great variety of readings scattered throughout the various manuscripts. The 'Western' text type is characterized by its diversity, with some textual critics restricting the number of its true members to a very few.⁹

It may well be this variety which is preventing any definitive account of the origin of the two texts of Acts from being produced, and that the way forward is, in the first instance, to take one manuscript and painstakingly analyze it in isolation. If eclecticism means judging readings on their own merit (Kilpatrick 1963, pp.64f), then the first step must be to establish what the merit of the individual readings is. As far as the text of Acts is concerned, some of the criteria for deciding the intrinsic worth of readings still require defining. For a final edition of Acts, an eclectic text may well be appropriate (Kilpatrick 1986) but, in order to establish such a text, the independent examination of some manuscripts in their own right could prove to be an indispensable prerequisite.

The Greek text of Codex Bezae (D05 ¹⁰), a bilingual Greek and Latin manuscript of around 400 AD ¹¹, is a useful subject for such an examination because it is the only consistent Greek representative of the 'Western' text. Furthermore, it has a text all of its own, not only in the contents of some of its more remarkable singular readings, but also in the more basic linguistic structure of some passages and in other grammatical aspects. One of its most striking features is the similarity with the individual manuscripts of certain early versions at places where those versions provide the only support for the Bezan

reading. Some of this support has only recently come to light, in the Coptic Codex Glazier (mae or G⁶⁷) (Petersen 1964); and the Syro-Palestinian fragment (syp⁶¹) (Perrot 1963). The significance of the support from the versions has not, as yet, been fully explored.

The principal representatives of the Alexandrian text are Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus - S01 and B03 (otherwise referred to as *N* and B, see note 10). For the purposes of this thesis, the text of Codex Bezae will be compared against that of these two manuscripts. There are occasional differences between S01 and B03 which are noted in passing, as explained in ch.1 which describes in detail the method adopted for analyzing the variant readings.

The manuscript of Codex Bezae was the object of a detailed study by D.C. Parker in 1992. This work is an excellent treatment of the paleographical aspects of the manuscript, and of its scribe and correctors. Suggestions are made as to the date and place of origin of the manuscript (see note 11). There is also a thorough treatment of the relationship between the Greek and the Latin pages. Parker's work is often referred to in the course of this thesis for questions relating to the actual manuscript of Codex Bezae.

The difference between the date of a manuscript and the date of the text it represents is an important one and it is essential not to confuse the two. In the case of Codex Bezae, even though it is the earliest representative of the text it transmits in many places, there is much to suggest on internal considerations that its text dates from before 200 AD, that is before the time of the major recensions (Vaganay-Amphoux 1991, pp.106-9); and before the time of the canon. In so far as the examination of the style of the language, described above, relates to Codex Bezae, a date in the early second or even the first century is indicated.

The Theological Variants.

The way in which Epp (1966) describes the anti-Judaic thrust of some of the Bezan readings leads to the view, prevalent in commentaries on Acts and in the textual commentary which accompanies UBS³ (Metzger 1975), that the text of Acts in Codex Bezae is the work of the established, predominantly Gentile Church anxious to prove the 'superiority of Christianity' over Judaism. Such an interpretation of the facts is, however, by no means inevitable. Although there are, indeed, many places of variant reading to do with the distinction between Jews and Christians, with the conditions of the admission of the Gentiles into the Church, or with the responsibility of the Jews for the death of Jesus, all of these issues were important for early Jewish Christians as well as for Gentiles - they were, it could be said, even more important. They characterize the writings of Paul who, whilst ever conscious of being an apostle to the Gentiles, was himself a Jew and addressed the problems involved in the formation of the Church from a characteristically Jewish point of view. As for the hostility against the Jews which is assumed to be the motive behind the enhanced criticism of them in some Bezan readings, it is not unlike the feelings expressed by some of the Old Testament prophets against their own people in denouncing wrong-doing - anger and disappointment, arising from a yearning for the Jews to live according to their calling to be the People of God. To Epp's conclusion: 'In short, the Jews come out rather poorly in the D-text' (p.166) it may be replied that they do not emerge very splendidly in the Old Testament prophets, either.

There are, then, good linguistic and theological reasons for asking the question whether the formation of the text of Acts in Codex Bezae could not date from a time when the Jewish-Gentile conflict was

a matter of relevance to the Jews, that is, in the relatively early days of the Church¹². This will be a question which is kept in mind in the examination of the Bezan text and to which particular attention is paid in chs.6 and 7 of Section II as well as in the exegetical studies of continuous portions of text in Section III of the thesis.

A Pre-Canonical Text.

While the answer to that question is being sought, it will meanwhile be legitimate, and sufficient, to adopt as a working hypothesis that the Bezan text of Acts dates from sometime before 200 AD. This hypothesis is given credence by the theological nature of the variants on which Epp (1966) chose to focus, which would have been difficult to envisage once the text had been fixed by the Church. It is reinforced by the studies of the style which frequently agree that it is similar, if not identical, to that of Luke. Until the time of the canon, it is quite feasible that the text of Acts enjoyed considerable freedom according to the view of Scripture which had been prevalent in pre-Christian Judaism and which appears to have continued to exist for some time among Christians to judge by the liberty which the New Testament authors and the early Church Fathers took in citing the Old Testament¹³.

It could be said that the textual criticism of Acts (and the Gospels) as conceived as the search for the original text, cannot go back beyond the time when the text was settled, when it reached the end of its literary growth. In the textual criticism of the Old Testament, such a position has been advocated¹⁴. With regard to Acts, where the attestation of the manuscripts is so much stronger than for any part of the Old Testament, it is unnecessary to deny the

validity of the textual criticism of the pre-canonical text as long as certain differences of approach are maintained.

During the period of the formation of Acts, alterations can be considered to be a legitimate part of the development of the text, the work not so much of scribes as of editors. In other words, it was 'a literary text before it became a canonical Church book' (Dibelius 1956, p.89). Of course, even in the early stages, slips may have occurred, causing non-intentional variants and the likelihood of these arising should not be altogether excluded. On the whole, however, it may be considered that most of the variation between witnesses to a text in the course of its formation are intentional rather than accidental. Such a perspective is derived from the view of Scripture which characterized Judaism and Christianity at least in the first century AD.

A regard for the literal meaning of Scripture and for one fixed form corresponds more to post-Reformation interpretation of the Bible than to the reality of the first century. The situation with respect to the Jewish Scriptures is illustrated by the acceptance of texts which differed markedly from what was to become the standard Hebrew text, and which included both the Greek Septuagint and the Aramaic paraphrases, the targums.

These latter are translations of the Old Testament which existed alongside the Hebrew text, created for the non-Hebrew speaking people of Palestine. More than strict translations, they were paraphrases which included comments on and explanations of the Hebrew text, spoken in the synagogues and forming part of the traditional Jewish liturgy. The targums were of a popular rather than a scholarly character and would represent the only knowledge most ordinary people in Palestine in the first century had of the Old Testament. Jesus himself quoted from them on occasion as well as from the Hebrew Old

Testament (Chilton 1984). Scholars who have studied the targums closely agree that they are essentially, both in their texts and in their theology, the Scriptural link between the Old and the New Testaments¹⁵.

Several inherent features of the targumic tradition are of interest for the way in which they reflect a view of Scripture. The targums were not fixed interpretations, composed by one person or at one time. They represented a living, spoken tradition, altered during the course of time as they were adapted to meet the changing requirements of different groups of people. The targums as they have come down to us, therefore, do not constitute a homogeneous tradition, nor does the text of any one targum belong in its entirety to one period of time. Bowker (1969, p.15) speaks of the surviving texts transmitting 'isolated moments extracted from a continuous process'. It is frequently difficult to be sure of the source or date of any particular expression or passage. That being so, any evidence of reference to them in the text of the New Testament is all the more valuable¹⁶.

A test study of Peter's speech in the Bezan text of Acts 3 (Heimerdinger 1988) suggested that there were words and ideas to be found in that version which echoed the Isaiah Targum. If such findings could be confirmed by the study of other passages in Acts, they would provide further evidence that the Bezan text had its origins in a Jewish rather than a Gentile setting.

There is an essential process of methodology to be defined. It is usual to seek to explain the theological or doctrinal alterations of a text by looking ahead of the time of the first writing of the document to consider what developments in the Church could have caused such variations to arise. This is a perfectly valid perspective when considering the post-canonical text of Acts or the text of any

document which can be expected to have been fixed from its first writing (the Epistles, for example, are of this latter category). If, however, it is a form of the pre-canonical text of Acts which is the object of enquiry it is at least as appropriate to ask questions about where Christianity had come, the nature of the religious context in which it had its roots and which could have produced such variants. Further implications of this approach, and the usefulness of discourse analysis for its implementation, are discussed in ch.2 in the first section of the thesis on the theoretical framework.

Some of the discussion on the language and text of Acts has been concerned with the question of Semitisms¹⁷. A difficulty in the discussion of the possible foreign influence on the language of Luke, or of a particular text of Acts, is that there are new developments in the study of the Semitic languages, as there are in Koine Greek, which are challenging some of the notions to do with borrowing from one language to another. Another problem is the disagreement which exists as to what exactly constitutes a 'Semitism'. In the analysis of the language of Codex Bezae here, the question of Semitisms will be examined only in passing but it is to be hoped that some of the conclusions reached will further progress on the debate.

First-Century Judaism.

Since the publication of Epp's monograph in 1966, there has been a great deal written, particularly with respect to Luke-Acts and Paul, on the Jewish heritage of the Church. Christianity was traditionally viewed as a religious system which made a radical break with its Jewish origins from the beginning and as primarily a Gentile religion, in opposition to Judaism, from a very early date. A change

in perspective has been brought about largely by studies of the first century religious situation prompted initially by Jewish scholars (notably J. Neusner and G. Vermes)¹⁸ and followed by others writing from a Christian viewpoint (R. L. Brawley, J. D. G. Dunn, J. Jervell, Sanders E. P., Sanders J. T.)¹⁹. The shift is chiefly in the revision of the notion of first century Judaism as a monolithic religion, equated with 'Rabbinic Judaism' which would now be seen as belonging to the second century. A more accurate picture is rather of 'many Judaisms' (Neusner) of which Christianity was initially but one. The absence of a normative Judaism at the time of Jesus and the early Church made it entirely possible for Christianity to remain essentially as part of Judaism at least up to 70 AD and perhaps even up to 135 AD. The publication of J. D. G. Dunn's *The Partings of the Ways* in 1991 has provided an excellent investigation into the background of this scholarship and makes a more developed account here unnecessary.

A crucial point in the recent definition of first century Judaism is that the first generation of Christians, both Jews and Gentiles, were regarded, and regarded themselves, as belonging to Judaism. Within the context of the book of Acts, the main Christian belief which distinguished it from other Judaisms and which caused conflict with some groups was to do with the conditions for the admission of the Gentiles into the community of the People of God. Most Jews held with more or less strictness to the requirement of at least circumcision but the new Christian teaching was that circumcision was no longer necessary because it is the Holy Spirit who brings salvation to the Gentiles.²⁰ It is highly probable that the significance of the addition of a baptismal 'confession of faith' by the Ethiopian eunuch at 8:37 in some manuscripts has to do with this conflict rather than a later ecclesiastical practice (Heimerdinger 1991).

The Messiahship of Jesus, the centrality of Jerusalem, the importance of the Temple, are other issues on which the Christians disagree with some groups of Jews in Acts but none is so extensively presented as the matter of the entry of the Gentiles into the Christian community.²¹ On all these points, the concern is to show the continuity between the new teaching and the religion of Israel, and to set it in its historical context of the Old Testament. The identification of this perspective as central to Acts has led to the revision of the traditional view of Luke as a Gentile author. The many allusions in Acts to the Old Testament and to Jewish teachings, some of them subtle and all of them demanding a close familiarity with Jewish traditions, are signs for some scholars that the author must have himself been a Jew ²². In this thesis, the question of the identity of the author of the first writing of Acts is not discussed. The identity of the Bezan author is, however, a central concern and the discussion on that issue may be found to contribute to the identification of the original author of Acts.

If the enquiry into the origin of the variant readings in the text of Acts is to take account of the context out of which the Church developed, it will be necessary to watch out for the smallest clues and to dismiss nothing as irrelevant without first checking it with reference to the sources of information on both Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism²³. In addition to the importance of the Scriptural background, careful account must be taken of what is known about Jewish exegetical practices in the first century and also of liturgical traditions²⁴. It may well happen that some things cannot be traced in the existing literature; rather than discarding them as scribal errors or cataloguing them as late alterations, they should be carefully set on one side for the time being and kept in mind lest something eventually reveals their significance. This may perhaps

occur when more passages can be analyzed than is possible within the limits of a thesis. In the scope of the present work, three passages with their consecutive variant readings have been examined for exegetical study and are presented in the final section of the thesis.

NOTA BENE

References in Greek do not include accents and breathings when they are citations from a manuscript.

NOTES TO THE GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

1. Many of the articles in his *Collected Essays* (Kilpatrick 1990, Elliott J.K. ed) contain discussion of linguistic points. For a theoretical presentation, see especially Section A, 2,3,5,6.
2. See notably the works on the text of Acts by Boismard-Lamouille, Delebecque, Neiryck-Van Segbroeck and Wilcox.
3. The observation that the linguistic approach of some textual criticism was out of date was being made as early as 1979 by Barr in his review (*JTS* 30, pp.290-303) of Metzger B.M. *Early Versions of the New Testament: their Origin, Transmission and Limitations* Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.
4. This was a point made by Klijn as long ago as 1966.
5. For a useful summary, and his own contribution to the subject, see Strange 1992.
6. For example, Barrett 1979; Wilcox 1979a.
7. This is particularly evident in the latest three-volume work brought out in 1990, 'Les Actes des Deux Apotres'.
8. Corrections to their lists, using the same statistical methods, are to be found in Neiryck-Van Segbroeck 1985.
9. Vaganay-Amphoux 1991, p.96.
10. The designation of an uncial by its number preceded by a 0 replaces the old Gregory system and is slowly entering into use as the revised Gregory system (Epp 1992, p.419; Vaganay-Amphoux 1991, p.14). It avoids the potential (and on occasions actual) confusion between D05 containing the Gospels, Acts and (originally) the Catholic Epistles = Codex Bezae, and D06 containing the Pauline Epistles = Codex Claromontanus. Codex Sinaiticus (formerly \aleph) is known as S01 under the new system and Codex Vaticanus (B) as B03.
11. This date is advanced by Parker 1992, p.30; he argues for Berytus as the most likely place of origin, pp.261-78. Cf. Birdsall 1986 for a summary of some of the theories concerning place and date of origin.
12. Amphoux (Vaganay-Amphoux 1991, pp.95-7) suggests that the date which best fits the nature of the Bezan text (which he considers to represent the original text) on the one hand and the facts of Jewish history on the other, is before 135 AD, that is before the revolt of Bar-Kokhba. He attributes the creation of the alternative (non-Bezan) text to the radical cultural split which occurred between Christians and Jews after 135.
13. Deist 1992; Vaganay-Amphoux 1991, pp.91-2.
14. Tov 1982, pp.431-2. He speaks of the fixed, canonical form of a book as the 'Urtext' (p.431, n.6) and his aim as a textual critic is to reconstruct that text rather than any of the forms which may have existed prior to it. Cf. Deist 1992 for a different view.
15. Le Déaut 1982, p.27.

16. Chilton 1984, 1988; Forestell 1979; Le Déaut 1963, 1982, 1974; McNamara 1966; Nickels 1967; Wilcox 1965, 1979, all demonstrate ways in which the teaching of the targums was incorporated into the writings of the New Testament.

17. Black M 1965-6; Chase 1893; Payne 1970; Torrey 1916; Wensinck 1937; Wilcox 1965; Yoder 1959.

18. Most works by these writers consistently display their characteristic understanding of first century Judaism but see especially Neusner 1971, 1984; Vermes 1961, 1973, 1983.

19. Brawley 1988; Dunn 1991; Jervell 1972, 1984; Sanders E.P. 1992; Sanders J.T. 1987, 1993; Schiffman L.H. 1985. It is interesting that Sanders J.T., even though his reading of Acts leads him to consider the account to be the (historically inaccurate) work of Gentiles in the second century, nevertheless emphasizes that the evidence outside the New Testament is that Christianity was a kind of Judaism and that the relationship between Jews and Christians was one of continuity rather than schism in the first century. See also the articles in Shanks (ed) 1993, including the Introduction by Vermes; and Vanhoye 1991.

20. Jervell 1972, p.66; and see especially 1984, ch.1, for a clear exposition of these matters; Tiede 1986, 1988.

21. The question of how far and in what way the interpretation of the law was a point of conflict between Jews and Christians is open to debate, with varying positions being adopted by contemporary scholars such as J.D.G. Dunn, E.P. Sanders and S. Westerholm. As the matter of the law does not seem to be directly in question in the longer passages studied in this thesis (Section III), the problems which surround it are not discussed here. For a more extensive exegetical treatment of the Bezan text of Acts, however, they may require detailed examination.

22. For a scholar who upholds the traditional position, and for a summary of the debate, see Bovon 1992.

23. An excellent source is the two-volume work by S. Safrai and M. Stern (1974). See also Feldman 1993; Hengel 1980; Leaney 1985; and the Jewish encyclopaedic works. The effects of the Hellenistic culture on Judaism is sometimes exaggerated. The evidence is that strong Jewish characteristics were retained even by the most Hellenized Jews, see Lieu et al (eds) 1992.

24. On the exegetical and liturgical traditions, see Le Déaut 1965; Mann 1940, 1966; Patte 1975; Perrot 1973.

SECTION I: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

CHAPTER ONE

The Method of Studying the Variant Readings: Analysis and Presentation.

The Greek text of Acts as it has been preserved by Codex Bezae (D05) was compared with that of Codex Sinaiticus (S01) and Codex Vaticanus (B03). There are lacunae in the Bezan text at 8:29-10:14; 21:2-10, 16-18; 22:10-20; 22:29-28:31. Most of the time, S01 and B03 agree with each other in supporting D05 or not; where they do not, it is usual for one of them to agree with Codex Bezae. The text used for Codex Bezae was the transcription by Scrivener (reprint 1978). This was found to be highly accurate when work was subsequently carried out on the text; such errors as there were, were written onto the transcription as they were found. The photographic edition of the actual manuscript (1899) was examined where there was doubt about the text, with the study of the manuscript published by Parker (1992) acting as a double check, especially at the places where letters have been partially erased from the manuscript.

Initially, a current printed edition of the Greek New Testament was sufficient to determine the S01/B03 text since it is essentially that text which is printed in, for example, Nestle-Aland²⁶. Where it is not, this is so exceptional that almost all the variants of S01 and B03 are noted in the critical apparatus. At a later stage, Eberhard Nestle's collation of Codex Bezae against Tischendorf's edition of the Greek New Testament (1896) was an invaluable aid for checking for variant readings which may have been previously missed. The apparatus of Boismard-Lamouille's edition of Acts (1984) was also consulted but the citation of actual manuscripts in that edition is very uneven; it was more useful when working on an

analysis of the text for discovering rare or unusual support for certain readings. Finally, Ropes' edition of Codex Vaticanus (1926) was used to verify specifically the text of B03 as and when any questions arose.

Within Codex Bezae itself, although the Greek side was the chief object of interest, variation with the Latin side was noted but this was not specifically compared with the readings of the other manuscripts in the first instance. Only later was agreement between d and S01/B03 noted as a matter of interest.

It soon became apparent that there was such a large number of words affected by variation (the total number was in the end found to be approaching 4,000), that something had to be done to break this number down into more workable material. After comparison of some sample chapters, therefore, four categories of variation were identified and the variant readings were classified accordingly. For practical purposes, the categories took Codex Bezae as their starting point; that was a pragmatic decision which was not intended to be a statement about the primary or secondary nature of one text or the other. The four categories were:

- 1) additional - present in D05, absent in S01/B03
- 2) alternative - same material in a different form in S01/B03
(but excluding word order difference)
- 3) word order - same words in a different order
- 4) omission - absent in D05, present in S01/B03

The first category of variants represents material (which can be anything from a definite article to several verses) which is found in Codex Bezae but not in the other text.

The second is more diverse: it groups together words, phrases or sentences which are essentially present in both texts but not in identical form. The difference may be lexical (i.e. synonyms are used) or grammatical (eg. tense or number vary) or syntactical (the sentence is constructed differently). Orthographical differences which reflect simply a difference in pronunciation were noted but were not included in any grouping.¹ The only variation in spelling which was counted in this second group was that of Jerusalem since it is evident that the variation involves more than a difference in pronunciation.

The third category is specific to variation in word order where identical words are used. The final category consists of material found in S01/B03 but not in D05, in a sense creating a category the reverse of the first.

Where the syntax of alternative material produced a different number of words (e.g. ΤΙΝΕΣ ἔξ αὐτῶν for ΤΙΝΕΣ αὐτῶν), the additional words were ignored and the variant words were classified in category 2 only. Very occasionally, alternative words (category 2) are found in a different place in the sentence (category 3): such words were counted for both categories.²

The different types of variation were compared within each chapter and throughout the book of Acts in order to see if there were any pattern in the amount or the kind of variation which occurs. The results are displayed in Appendix I.

It was essential for this classification to be of the maximum benefit that it could be displayed clearly on the printed transcribed text of Codex Bezae. This was achieved by highlighting the variant readings in the first three categories according to different colours (pink, blue and green were the arbitrary choice); those in the fourth category were written in the margin in red at the appropriate place of 'omission'. The result was a 'colour-coded' display which had two

distinct advantages over either a descriptive list of variants or a separate apparatus. It showed at a glance the passages where there was more or less variation and of what kind it was. It also enabled detailed analysis of specific passages to proceed with a clear view of all the variation within that passage, variation which was often found to hold together as linked units rather than representing independent variant readings.³

The highlighting of variants between D05 and S01/B03 was done only on the Greek text of the transcript of Codex Bezae. Notes in the margin indicated where there was partial support from either of the Alexandrian manuscripts under consideration; there were few cases and their occurrence was spasmodic. An examination of the places where only one of S01 or B03 is in occasional agreement with D05 would be a useful study, but it is outside the scope of the present work.

On the Latin side of the transcript, colour was used in a similar way to mark independently the variation between it and the Greek side whenever it was relevant to the linguistic or exegetical analyses carried out in the course of the study of the Greek text. A complete comparison of the two sides has been made by Parker in his work on Codex Bezae (1992).

Where the colour-coding system cannot be easily reproduced in a printed work, another system of devices could be used such as the one displayed in the sample, p. 25 - brackets for additional material, underlining for alternative material and the inversion sign (┌ ┐) for word order differences. Omission is indicated by the insertion of words in the margin. For greater ease of use, such a printed text could be highlighted in colour by the individual reader.

Codex Bezae:

ACTS 12:20-13:3 showing the variant readings of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus.

- και πεισαιτες βλαστον τον επι του κοιτωνος αυτου
ητουντο ειρηνην
δια το τρεφεισθαι απο χωρασβαιτων κκτησ βασιλικησ
τακτη δε ημερα 12: 21
- = S [θηρωδησ ενδυσαμενος αισθητα βασιλικην
και καθισασ επι του βηματος
εδημειγορει προσ αυτους
[καταλλαγεντοσ δε αυτου τοισ τυριοισ]
ο δε δημοσ επεφωνει 22
- = S^c + θω φωναι και ουκ ανθρωπου
β παραχρημα δε αυτον επαταξεν αγγελοσ κυ 23
- LTIV ανθων ουκ εδωκεν / δοξαν τω θω
και [καταβασ απο του βηματος]
γενομενος κωληκοβρωτοσ
[ετι ζων και ουτωσ] εξειψυξεν
- = S Ο δε λογοσ του θω ευξανε και επληθυνετο 24
βαρναβασ δε και σαυλοσ 25
απεστρεψεν απο ιερουσαλημ
πληρωσαντεσ την διακονιαν
συνπαραλαβοντεσ [τοι] ιωαννην
= β τον επικληθεντα μαρκον
ησαν δε εν αντιοχεια 13: 1
κατα την ουσαν εκκλησιαν
προφηται και διδασκαλοι
[εν οισ] βαρναβασ και συμεων
ο επικαλουμενοσ νιγερ
- Lo και λουκειοσ / κυρηναιοσ ματθαν τε ηρωδου
[του] [και] τετραρχου συντροφουσ και σαυλοσ
λειτουρگوιντων δε αυτων τω κω 2
και νηστευοντων ειπεν το πνα το αγιον
αφορισατε δη μοι τον βαρναβαν και σαυλον
εισ το εργον ο προσκεκλημαι αυτους
τοτε νηστευσαντεσ 3

NOTES TO CHAPTER ONE.

1. The spelling differences are so numerous that they would distort the overall picture formed by the comparison of the different types of variants. They include changes of vowels/diphthongs and single/double consonants. Moulton (1929, pp.40-6) gives a summary of the shifts which occurred in pronunciation in the first centuries AD and essentially finds that there was a great deal of fluidity and that the situation varied very much according to locality as much as to social class, the same class adopting different standards at different periods. His conclusion is that 'A history of Greek pronunciation in the Hellenistic period is greatly needed, showing both when and where the various developments first appeared ... Such a history would have an important bearing on textual questions' (p.46). Although among the manuscripts generally there is a great deal of variation and inconsistency, a fair degree of consistency can be observed within Codex Bezae itself with regard to such things as reading ϵ for ε , υ for \omicron , ν for $\nu\nu$. Given the unusual extent of consistency, a history of pronunciation could possibly be of value for determining with some precision the date of the Bezan text.

2. Wilcox (1979, p.448) also identifies four categories which he labels a) additions, b) omissions, c) substitutions and d) alterations to sense. In effect, in this grouping the alternative material includes word order change and is divided into two groups of variants: those which affect the meaning (alterations to sense) and those which do not (substitutions). The problem with this sub-division is that it is often not apparent which variants do or do not affect the meaning until the whole passage in which they are found is analysed both linguistically and exegetically, and even then some decisions are necessarily tentative.

3. This is a concept insisted on by Colwell (1969) who also coined the phrase 'variation units'.

CHAPTER TWO

Discourse Analysis.

INTRODUCTION.

Discourse analysis is a branch of linguistic science and as such is a formal discipline. Another name by which it is known is 'textlinguistics'. It is as rigorous in its operation as is traditional linguistic analysis. In order to differentiate between the two, in a very general sense it can be said that whereas the latter concentrates on establishing rules which govern the working of language on the level of the sentence or below, discourse analysis looks at the rules which operate from beyond the level of the sentence - at the level of sentence groups, paragraphs, chapters or a whole text.

It is difficult to determine the origins of discourse analysis in the history of linguistics because different aspects of it have appeared separately, some of them as early as the ancient classical schools of rhetoric.¹ As an integrated linguistic discipline, however, it has developed particularly since the middle of this century and since the 1960's has been consistently applied to the Biblical languages, notably by English or American linguists working in the field of Biblical translation (see, for example, Black D. (ed) 1992; Callow K. 1974 + forthcoming; Grimes 1976; Levinsohn 1987, 1992; Longacre 1983). Most work has been done on the Greek of the New Testament, initially focussed on the narrative texts (Gospels and Acts) but more recently on the Epistles.

The theory of discourse analysis has developed partly through

the familiarity of many of its exponents (especially the Bible translators) with a diversity of languages, often minority, tribal dialects rather than world languages. It is not a theory which has arisen, therefore, with respect to New Testament Greek, even less English. In its principles, it is applicable to any language.

Within the field of discourse analysis, there are a number of theoretical approaches and a variety of methods, even more of terminology. Introductory textbooks on discourse analysis provide excellent detailed presentation of the theory and of the methods used.² What will be given here is a summary of some of the aspects of discourse analysis which are of particular relevance to the comparison of New Testament manuscripts.

Generally speaking all discourse analysis involves looking at the function of words to explain grammatical arrangements (a functionalist approach). All discourse analysis also depends on taking the text as the starting point for the theory, examining things as they stand rather than formulating abstract rules which decree how things should stand.

Through systematic and methodical analysis, it has been found that there are factors discernible at the level of language beyond the sentence which are commonly in operation. These factors can be identified and classified, although the list is by no means a closed one and new factors are being determined all the time. Some of them resemble the recognizable features of rhetoric or poetics: parallelism, chiasmus, repetition, for example, which have long been identified as important in the structure of a text. There are other less familiar and less contrived features which involve such concepts as what is central or peripheral to the main idea of the text, the specific theme of a given paragraph, the identification of characters as primary or secondary, the change of time or place in the course of

a story, the climax of a story or the leading up to or down from it.

Some factors involve the situation outside the text, the context in which the text was created. They are known as 'pragmatic' factors. They have to do with the author and his purpose in speaking/ writing, his perspective on the subject matter, the context (social, religious, cultural) in which he speaks or writes. Of great importance is his audience and his relationship with them. All of these things tend to affect the way in which a text is put together and can cause an identical story (a Gospel parable, for example) to be told in different ways not only by different story-tellers but also to different audiences. The story is not thereby rendered untrue, nor is it necessarily the case that one version is more or less authentic than another.

The aspects of a text affected by the factors described are very varied. They include the way in which sentences are linked together, the order of words, the means by which characters are referred to or the distribution of old (anaphoric) and new information. In a more general way, they also include the overall structure of a text or the means by which it holds together as a unit.

Through a study of these various factors and of their effect on the formation of discourse, it is possible to establish rules and patterns which govern a language in much the same way as there are rules and patterns on the level of the sentence. They are rules which often vary from one language to another, and where there are similarities between languages these are frequently unpredictable. In the language to which they apply, they operate as constraints and restrictions. Apart from the more artificial devices of rhetoric, they are not normally consciously referred to by the author as he constructs his text; rather they are followed as naturally and as spontaneously as are grammatical rules.

This means that for linguistic features which are variable - that is, which are commonly understood as not fixed by the grammatical requirements of a language in a traditional sense - when explanations for a particular choice of form cannot be found on the level of the grammar or syntax of the sentence, they can be sought beyond the immediate context of the sentence in a wider span of text or even outside the text. In the case of New Testament Greek, for such things as word order or the use of the definite article, regular rules based on traditional linguistic concepts have proved elusive, but when the problem is approached using discourse analysis methods it emerges that there are quite firm rules which have to do with factors as diverse as the place of the characters in the story or which element in the sentence is being presented as the most important one.

Different types of writing are found to apply the rules in different ways and one type of discourse may even have rules which are not shared by other types. The principal categories of discourse which can be distinguished from one another and which are found in the New Testament are narrative texts (the Gospels and Acts) on the one hand and discursive texts (the Epistles) on the other. In the former, a story is told with the main concerns being events or people. In the latter, reasoned arguments are presented with the central concerns being ideas and opinions.

I. DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND TEXTUAL CRITICISM.

The study of a text using methods of discourse analysis impinges on the examination and evaluation of variant readings in a number of important ways.

I.1 Style.

The study of style belongs to the domain of internal criticism. Its contribution to the evaluation of variant readings is to enable comparison to be made between specific readings and what is considered to be the author's style or characteristic linguistic habits. Internal criticism is preferred especially by critics who follow the eclectic method of reconstructing a text³ as being more reliable than external criticism which entails looking at the age, nature or origin of the manuscripts in which the readings are found. It is also widely appealed to by the defendants of the authenticity of one type of text over against another.⁴

By 'style' a variety of things is meant. Generally speaking, the label refers to a distinctive way of writing, one which marks an author out from other authors. Different features are looked for and identified as typical. They tend to be of a grammatical/syntactical or a lexical nature. Much of this kind of analysis which has been carried out by textual critics and linguists is impressive in its range and thoroughness and it has yielded a wealth of information and insight which is still of great value today.⁵

Style, of course, is not just of interest to textual critics. A writer's style is likewise considered as a determining factor in various other forms of New Testament study, notably redaction criticism, as an indication of the origin or authenticity of smaller

or larger portions of text.

The New Testament Greek Grammars, too, base much of their discussion on a descriptive analysis of 'style' seeking to elucidate rules from the particular features apparently preferred by different New Testament authors.

The method used in these various disciplines for defining style is essentially statistical. A feature which recurs frequently in an author's writing is thought of as typifying that author's style. A rarely present feature would not be viewed as characteristic of his style unless he were the only (or almost) New Testament author to use it. It is assumed that the recurring features are what an author personally prefers, that he chooses them to suit his purpose or his preferred manner of expression against other possibilities.

With the advent of computer programmes, the compiling of lists and the analysis of grammatical and stylistic forms has become more and more sophisticated. In the area of the New Testament, increasing use is being made of computer packages such as the *GRANCORD* project which have been developed as databases and accompanying retrieval systems to provide the basic information necessary for accurate and exhaustive treatment of the Greek of the New Testament.⁴

Despite all the true usefulness of this research it is, however, becoming apparent through the application of discourse analysis methods to the text of the New Testament that it is only of limited validity in defining what characterizes an author's style. The first drawback, pointed out by Botha (1991), is that many discussions on style omit to study the literary features such as irony, misunderstanding, double meaning or to take into account the pragmatic aspects of a piece of writing such as the context or the recipients.

A more serious problem which affects directly the textual criticism of Acts is that many of the grammatical and syntactical features previously attributed to style (because no or few firm rules governing their use had been identified) are now being found not to be dependent on personal preference at all but on rules and constraints which operate with a fair degree of rigidity.

Such a development has certain fundamental consequences for the way in which variant readings are to be evaluated. It means that a good deal of what has been attributed to style, whim, carelessness or ignorance on the part of an author or scribe may well have nothing to do with such things at all. Rather it could be the result of the correct functioning of rules of discourse, of the following of constraints imposed on a language by factors beyond the level of the sentence. There is a need to be discerning in considering textual criticism which bases its judgements on the assumption that it is one of the other factors just mentioned which is at work. To be discerning is, of course, not the same as to reject and there is a great deal in the work of textual critics who have followed the criteria of traditional linguistics which is worthy of attention and which serves as a sound foundation, both by its method as by its results, which can be profitably built on. There are, moreover, insights in some of earlier research which anticipate conclusions of later discourse analysis theory.⁷

1.2 The use of manuscripts.

A further implication of discourse analysis for textual criticism is that linguistic analysis has to be based, in the first instance at least, on actual manuscripts rather than on an eclectic text which may never have existed in the exact form in which it is

edited. Discourse rules are based on what has been said or written: they are descriptive rather than prescriptive.

In practice, linguists have tended to use the current UBS edition of the Greek New Testament which, although eclectic in theory, in actual fact represents fairly closely the text of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus.⁸ Linguistic theory constructed on such a text is therefore unlikely to be in error in so far as it relates to the text of S01/B03, and with the proviso that those manuscripts show evidence of being consciously altered to conform to a literary style. What is found in this thesis, in the course of comparing that text with the text of Codex Bezae, is that some rules can be refined, exceptions accounted for and slight modification brought to the exact formulation of certain statements. The very existence of variant readings can be of help because they provide material for comparison which is otherwise lacking in such a small corpus of data as the New Testament.

Once rules have been elucidated, then they can indeed be appealed to as sound criteria for producing an eclectic text.

1.3 Significant variants.

Editors of popular editions of the Greek New Testament have to take decisions about what to include in the apparatus and what to leave out. Reference is sometimes made to insignificant variants which are omitted.⁹ Discourse analysis narrows the field of these variants because it has something to say about some variant readings which are generally relegated to the insignificant. That is not to say that error and deliberate modification for doctrinal purposes are excluded as possible causes of variation but rather that linguistic reasons for divergence should be sought in the first instance.

I.4 Audience awareness.

The importance of the audience is axiomatic for discourse analysis and the consideration of the part played by the addressees on the formation of a text is of the greatest significance for textual criticism. Traditionally, even if authors have been granted the existence of a real audience, scribes have often been thought of as writing in a vacuum, governed by their own literary and cultural background and circumstances, reproducing their text according to their preferences, their understanding, their shortcomings. This may well be a true representation of the situation of a formal school of manuscript copying (the 'scriptorium' ¹⁰) but it does not seem to describe accurately the activity of those who were responsible for the first modifications of the text of Acts, and the same is likely to be true of the text of at least the Gospels. The importance of the audience, in other words, is paramount in a consideration of variant readings which may date from before the time at which the text of Acts was fixed or incorporated into the canon (as discussed in the General Introduction).

Acts is a type of historical narrative written for people who were familiar with some of the characters and the events of the narration.¹¹ In such a historical narrative, the author can disguise, for whatever reason, his real relationship with the characters and events of the story - as a literary convention, to conceal his identity, or for a particular dramatic effect. Likewise, he may present incidents in the story or the relationships between the characters in a certain way according to his perspective of the story which he is telling. If he is hostile towards one character, for example, this attitude could colour his account of events.

But there is one thing which the author cannot change. He cannot modify or conceal the way in which his original, intended audience (the addressees) relates to the characters or events of the story and it is not possible for him to ignore this relationship. The importance of the audience in affecting linguistic choices has generally been underestimated in traditional linguistic analysis. Discourse analysis recognizes the significance of the hearers of a story in dictating a number of linguistic factors. Account needs to be taken of their role when problems of textual criticism are being tackled. It is common to consider the identity of the author or the scribe as relevant to the choice of words, for example, or the selection of information, and as possibly thereby causing variant readings to occur. In the early stages of the formation of a text, the intended recipients could well have even more influence than the scribe or author.¹²

1.5 The telling of a story: several accounts.

The aim of textual criticism, in principle, is to retrieve the original version of a text by a process of selecting, at places of divergence, the variant reading which is most likely to represent the original author's reading.¹³ Some textual critics are sceptical about the possibility of the original text of the New Testament being retrieved;¹⁴ others have a greater interest in specific manuscripts or periods in the history of the transmission of the text. The general consensus is nonetheless that the readings which are of the greatest value *per se* are the original ones; secondary readings are on the whole to be discarded as not having any authenticity.

Once again, although this attitude may be entirely appropriate to the study of the transmission of the text after the fixing of the

canon, it does not do justice to the way in which the text of Acts (at least) seems to have been regarded in the early days of its formation, a period for which the designations 'original' and 'secondary' cannot therefore have the same meaning as for later periods.

Discourse analysis studies of narratives have paid much attention to the way in which stories are told with particular interest devoted by some linguists to the oral stage of their telling.¹⁵ These studies make clear what is commonly understood about the informal relating of stories, accounts, reports and so on, but which has tended to be ignored with respect to what have come down to us as literary texts. That is, that the same story is told in different ways not only by different speakers, but that it is told in different ways by the same speaker in different circumstances or to different hearers. None of the versions of the story is necessarily less authentic or acceptable; it is not the first version of the story which has any particular claim to being the best. On the contrary, for a later hearer the first version may be very unsatisfactory.¹⁶

The exact factors which cause a story to be altered vary greatly as a contemporary example can demonstrate. I may wish to relate an incident which happened recently at a local school with which I am personally connected. The first time I tell my story, it is to a teacher who was absent on the day of the incident. I select the details, refer to people in a certain way, include or omit certain information according to what my listener knows already about the situation, to the response I expect to elicit, to what I believe will make my story most easily understood. Later, and it may be seconds, days, or years later, I relate the same incident to another teacher I know who has no connections with the school. I will include details which I had been able to omit in my previous account because some

additional information is essential in order for my story to be comprehensible. I will refer to some people by different names because the ones I used for my first listener are not known outside the school. I will leave out certain details because they are meaningless or irrelevant to someone who does not know the inside picture. Nothing of the second version will be inaccurate, embellished simply for the sake of making a more graphic account, or inauthentic. My 'original' version would have been fairly useless for my second listener.

The versions of my story could go on almost indefinitely according to the circumstances in which I tell it, to whom I tell it, the purpose for which I tell it. A non-teacher hearer will cause modifications of another kind to be introduced; a police officer of yet another. Of course, in time, I may forget some details and make modifications to compensate but initially I may have good reason to tell the story in different ways. It would be foolish and impractical not to do so.

In turn, each of my hearers may pass on my account and it may well be passed on exactly as I have told it. If one day, however, all my different accounts were gathered together, whether told by me or at second hand, it might not be possible to explain the causes of all the differences. Some would have to be guessed at; others could be retrieved by examining the versions in detail. A comparison between the various accounts would be a very valuable aid to reconstructing the original situation which prompted their separate creation.

This example is not intended to reproduce the situation of the creation of the versions of Acts nor to pre-empt the conclusions of the studies which follow but to show one way in which a story can exist quite legitimately in differing versions without any differing value being conferred on one or the other. The model will need to be kept in mind as the two versions of Acts which have been selected for

study are examined because some of the differences which are commonly observed to exist between the two texts suggest a scenario which is not entirely unlike it. Detailed examination should enable more definite statements to be made and a more exact description of the circumstances which produced the two versions to be presented.

II. TERMINOLOGY.

Because of the flexibility and sometimes confusion in the meaning of technical terms adopted by different linguistic schools, their use in this thesis has been kept to a minimum. Some general concepts are most easily referred to, however, by means of a label and the common ones used in the thesis are defined here. It should be noted that these definitions are given in relation to Acts which is a narrative text and that in relation to expository material the terms may acquire a different significance.

II.1. Speaker/hearer.

'Speaker' is the term used to refer to the person who creates the discourse, whatever the mode of communication. When 'speaker' is used in this thesis, therefore, it is not intended to imply that the text of Acts was designed to be spoken rather than read; the fact that many of its sources were probably oral is a matter of not a little interest but one which is not addressed directly here. For the purposes of the book of Acts in its form as a consecutive narrative, rather than in the form of its sources whatever they were, the speaker can be identified as the narrator. With reference to the Bezan text in particular, the speaker is identical with the author of that text.

'Hearer' is the corresponding term to designate the one/s who are on the receiving end of the discourse. 'Audience' is a term used with the same meaning, usually in a collective sense, and again has nothing to do with the mode of discourse.

II.2 Participants.

There are two main features of narrative, events and characters. 'Participants' is the technical name given to the characters who take part in a story. Their respective roles in a narrative can have an effect on a variety of linguistic features (eg. the use of pronouns, proper names, or the definite article). In Acts, four kinds of participants can be distinguished:

1. The hero or the main character - Peter, Philip or Stephen in turn in part I; Paul in part II.
2. Participants who relate to and interact with the hero, or secondary characters - e.g. Ananias, James, Barnabas.
3. Participants who are independent of the hero - e.g. Jesus, Herod.
4. Participants who act as 'props' - e.g. Peter's guards, Paul's fellow-passengers.

Three groups of people relate to the participants and to the events of a story as it is originally told, and affect the way in which they are presented:

1. The participants among themselves.
2. The speaker.
3. The addressees, that is the intended hearers.

II.3 Theatre terms.

Because of this interaction, it can be helpful to compare a narrative text to a stage play and to use the vocabulary of the theatre to refer to the way in which a story is presented. Terms such as 'on stage', 'off stage', 'spot-light' or 'audience' are used in the course of the linguistic analysis chapters and explained as they occur.

II.4 Cohesion.

The ways in which a text holds together to form a unified whole are very important. Some of these are easily observable - the use of synonyms, the linking together of episodes or ideas, or repetition for example. Others are more difficult to identify, especially when separated by culture or by time from the context of a story. An example would be a series of devices employed in a speech in Acts which specifically recall an Old Testament event or lesson but whose effect, in part or in total, is lost to a modern, non-Jewish audience.

A text cannot be consistently cohesive by accident. The more cohesive a text is, the more it is likely to be the result of deliberate composition and correspondingly less of sporadic modification, haphazard correcting or scribal mistakes.

II.5 Marked/unmarked.

Where alternatives exist in linguistic form, it is frequently possible to describe one form as 'unmarked' and the other(s) in comparison as 'marked'. The former is the more usual form (although

not necessarily the more frequent in any given discourse); the latter stands in contrast to it to convey specific information.¹⁷ Examples in the Greek of Acts would be: the presence (unmarked) versus the absence (marked) of the definite article before proper names (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992); the position of the adjective after the noun (unmarked) versus before the noun (marked) (see ch.3); καί (unmarked) versus δέ (marked) as connecting particles (Levinsohn 1992, p.31).

The concept may be compared to the default setting in computers. 'Unmarked' does not imply insignificant or with no function (any more than the default setting does), for even typical and expected forms carry meaning and have a function.¹⁸ On the other hand, a disruption of the expected (for that writing) pattern stands in contrast to the usual order and is referred to as 'marked'.

II.6 Topic/comment.

Most utterances can be divided into two parts. One, which usually comes first, is what the utterance is about and is called the 'topic'. The other says something about the topic and is referred to as the 'comment'.

II.7 Given/new.

These terms are closely related to the previous ones; it is a feature of most utterances that they contain both given and new information. 'Given' information refers to what has already been communicated - it is anaphoric, and usually occurs first in the sentence. 'New' information, in contrast, is introduced for the first time and broadly corresponds to the comment part of a sentence.

II.8 Saliency.

Saliency has to do with attention being drawn to a specific participant (or sometimes an event) at a given point in the narrative.¹⁹ During the course of a narrative, it is natural for different characters to be highlighted in turn (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, pp.20-8) and as they are, they can be described as 'salient'. There are various devices, such as the means of reference or the position in the sentence, which are used to indicate saliency of a participant.

Saliency also has to do with the highlighting of one constituent in a clause or sentence. It usually happens that there is one element on which attention is focussed more than on the others and that element is described as 'salient'. Saliency on sentence level is commonly marked by means of moving an element from its usual position nearer to the front of the clause.

II.9 Fronting.

When an element in a clause is moved from its normal position to stand nearer the front of the clause, it is said to be 'fronted' or sometimes 'front-shifted'. This is an almost universal device in languages to draw attention to a part of the sentence. With reference to left-right languages like Greek, fronting can also be described as 'movement to the left'.

'Fore-fronting' is a particular type of fronting which consists in moving an element in front of the verb.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TWO.

1. A clear summary is to be found in Snyman 1991, pp. 83-9).
2. Useful textbooks are Brown-Yule 1983; McCarthy 1991.
3. In this country, eclectic (or 'rational') criticism has been strongly advocated by G.D. Kilpatrick and J.K.Elliott. A clear exposition of the approach can be found in Elliott 1990, pp.27-37. With regards to Acts in particular see Kilpatrick 1963.
4. As far as the text of Acts is concerned, this can be seen in the critical edition and accompanying studies by M.-E. Boismard and A.Lamouille (1984, 1990) and E. Delebecque (1986). The concern with the style of Luke and its use as a criterion for evaluating variant readings of Acts also appears in the ongoing debate about the presence of 'Lucanisms' in the Western text of Acts (Geer 1990; Hull 1988; Mackenzie 1985; Nierynck-Van Segbroeck 1985; Strange 1992, pp.27-32; Wilcox 1979a).
5. See notably recent editions by Elliott of such work: Kilpatrick 1990; Elliott 1992,1993.
6. A brief description of the creation and use of GRAMCORD, based at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Illinois, can be found in Porter 1983, p.3. In his more recent work on New Testament Greek (1992), Porter acknowledges the importance of discourse analysis. Despite his claim 'this entire grammar has been written with the principles of discourse analysis firmly in mind' (p.298), it could be shown that the treatment of some aspects lacks a discourse analysis perspective.
7. This can be seen, for example, in the recognition of the importance of context for the spelling of Jerusalem in Elliott's study (1977); or in the awareness of the function of $\delta\epsilon$ in Kilpatrick's analysis of particles (Elliott 1993, pp.181-2).
8. This fact is underlined by Elliott 1993, pp. 189-201.
9. The Introduction to the UBS (third) edition describes the variant readings cited in the critical apparatus as 'primarily those which are significant for translators or necessary for establishing the text' (p.xii). They represent a selection of the variant readings cited in N-A²⁶. For that edition, the criteria of selection are not described; despite its greater comprehensiveness, it is by no means exhaustive especially so far as singular or purely so-called 'Western' readings are concerned. The most complete apparatus to the text of Acts at present is that of Boismard-Lamouille 1984. Mention must also be made of the International Project on the Text of Acts which, under the direction of C. Osburn, is aiming to produce a new critical edition of Acts based on a fresh collation of practically every known Greek manuscript of the book (Osburn 1991).
10. For an interesting and perceptive account of the work and conditions of professional scribes, see Dain 1975, ch.1.
11. This position has been strongly contested at various times and continues to be by some scholars in the present, see notably Sanders J.T. (1993) who argues for a second century date. The view of Acts as a first century document is nevertheless upheld by a large

number of scholars. For a well-defended statement of the conservative position see Hemer 1989.

12. Informative discussions on the contribution of the audience to the formation of a text can be found in Baird 1969; Goodwin 1986. The monitoring of the audience by the speaker forms an important part of K. Callow's forthcoming book 'Man and Message'.

13. Elliott 1990, p.37; Klijn 1966, p.103; Vaganay-Amphoux 1991, p.1.

14. E.g. Duplacy 1973, p.128. Cf. the solution posited by Amphoux (Vaganay-Amphoux 1991, pp.93-7). For a discussion of other possible aims of textual criticism, see Stagg 1977.

15. Labov-Waletzky 1967. For evidence of oral traditions in the New Testament and their effect on the creation of the text see, for example, Achtemeier 1990; Alexander 1990.

16. On the function and importance of the context for discourse formation see Brown-Yule 1983, pp.27-67.

17. On the concept of unmarked/marked, Lyons (1968, p.79) says: 'the unmarked term has a more general sense, neutral with respect to a certain contrast; its more specific, negative sense is derivative and secondary, being a consequence of its contextual opposition with the positive (non-neutral i.e. marked) term'

18. It is for this reason that some linguists (for example, Callow J., in personal communication) find the use of the distinction of unmarked/marked to be potentially misleading. It has given rise to some unsound advice with reference to word order, for example: '*In analysis of a given biblical writer, it is not incumbent upon the exegete to explain the normal patterns of usage, but to explain the instances which depart from these patterns (that is, the "marked" instances)*' (italics original) Porter 1992, p.295.

19. As Comrie (1989) defines it: 'Salience relates to the way in which certain actants present in a situation are seized upon by humans as foci of attention' (p.199).

SECTION II: LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS

SECTION II: LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

In the chapters which follow, selected topics of discourse analysis are considered with respect to the variant readings which exist between the texts of S01/B03 and D05. The choice of the topics has been determined to a large extent by the nature of the variant readings. They cover types of divergence which recur often throughout the book of Acts or which are important for the interpretation of the text. The list of topics is by no means exhaustive and suggestions are made at various points as to other useful and potentially fruitful areas of discourse study.

The first three chapters (2,3 + 4) are of a mainly technical nature. The chapters on word order and connectives adopt the same method as that used in a previous study of the definite article before the names of persons (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992), which is to say that they first seek to establish and verify rules which operate for the text where there are no variant readings in S01, B03 and D05 and then to evaluate the variant readings in the light of those findings.

The question of the variant readings involving prepositions (ch.4) was examined from a discourse point of view but variation was found not to depend on discourse considerations. The chapter on prepositions illustrates therefore an aspect of linguistic variation for which the tools of discourse analysis are not directly applicable. It has a further importance which is to provide something of an independent test of the linguistic consistency of Codex Bezae and also of the date of its text which tends to be suggested by the discourse studies.

Chapters 6 + 7 examine matters of a more theological nature and involve semantic and pragmatic principles more than syntactical or grammatical ones. They address issues which frequently occur in discussion of the Bezan text of Acts and seek to shed light on them by taking account of the context of the narrative as well as of speaker/hearer relationships.

CHAPTER THREE

Word Order.

Part A: GENERAL REMARKS.

I. THE IMPORTANCE OF STUDYING WORD ORDER.

Some languages have a word order which is said to be 'fixed', in other words which is determined by grammatical or syntactical rules which cannot be altered. Typically, languages with a fixed word order do not have case-markings and so word order is used to show the grammatical relations, for example between subject and object (Comrie 1988, p.455). Where case-markings are present, word order plays a lesser role in indicating grammatical relations and is not so rigidly determined by them. This has led to the description of such word order as 'free'.

Koine Greek is said to have a 'free' word order with only a few aspects determined by grammatical or syntactical considerations. For example, $\delta\epsilon$ cannot stand first in a sentence; the relative pronoun is always first in the clause it links to the main clause. Apart from constraints such as these which are recognized as inviolable, it is usually assumed that word order is a matter of an author's choice.

Differences are observed in the word order preferred by different authors in the New Testament, or in different books and even in different manuscripts. It is supposed that the choice depends on such things as personal style, foreign influence (Semitic in particular), or rhetorical effect. However, as the varied reasons for

one order of words being chosen in preference to another are being studied by modern linguists, two things are becoming apparent with reference to languages generally.

Firstly, it is clear that the notion of free is only relative. Even in a language with so-called free word order there are, in fact, constraints which every author is bound by; he cannot move words around just as he pleases (Friberg 1982, pp.6-7). Secondly, the nature of these constraints operating on sentence word order is semantic and pragmatic rather than grammatical (Cervin 1993, pp.76-7). In other words, the constraints are connected with the function within the discourse of the words and the sentences in which the words are found, rather than with the grammatical relations which exist between the words or the sentences. They operate on a deep-level rather than a surface level. They have to do, amongst other things, with such purposes as signalling which part of the sentence is the most important, introducing a new idea, indicating a contrast or conflict, or differentiating between an event and its result (Cervin 1993, pp.57-9; Comrie 1988, pp.455-8).

The typical or most common word order for different types of discourse is thus liable to vary from one type to another because of their different purposes and intentions. This is indeed seen to be the case in the New Testament when the Gospels (narrative) are compared with the Epistles (discursive), for example. In New Testament narrative, events and people are essentially what the writing is about; in the discursive sections, it is ideas, reasoned argument and exhortation which are prominent. So in establishing what the rules are which govern word order in the books of the New Testament, it is important, in the initial stages at least, to take one book at a time and to work out the principles specific to that book before moving on to make comparisons with other books.

It is imperative to base the analysis of word order on an appreciation of how the language functions on the level beyond the sentence since there are so many factors operating on that level which affect the order of words. The use of statistical analyses consisting of a numerical count of word order patterns which occur in a book is not a reliable tool when it comes to the issue of deciding which is the original reading among one or more variants. Whilst the relative frequency of a certain pattern (say, the order of noun-adjective in Acts) shows that this was the usual order, it does not mean that the reversal of the usual order was erroneous. Each instance of variation from the usual order - in the firm text and within the particular manuscripts being examined - needs to be analyzed and the reasons for its existence looked for within the surrounding context. In order to understand variation between the manuscripts, variation by any one author within one book must be allowed for. To impose one order on a book because it is the most common is, as Winer has said in another context, 'empirical pedantry' ¹. Research into varying word orders in Greek as in other languages demonstrates that variation, on the whole, arises neither for its own sake nor because of a writer's/scribe's fancy or carelessness but as a device which aids the communication of the message. Only if no explanation of that kind is possible in a particular instance should style or error be brought in to account for word order variation.²

Foreign influence is frequently appealed to as a cause of word order variation.³ In first-century Palestine, there was indeed a great mixture of languages, namely Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic as well as local dialects, whose importance varied according to geographical location, social class, racial group, and even the purpose of communication.⁴ Certainly, languages are known to bring about changes in one another in some respects and foreign influence can be detected in the Greek

of the New Testament in the borrowing of fixed idioms, of lexical items or of spelling from Semitic languages (less frequently from Syriac) (see e.g. Black M. 1967³, Payne 1970, Wilcox 1965). When it comes to seeing foreign influence on word order, however, problems arise.

The first difficulty is that not only do the patterns of word order vary from one language to another but so do the constraints which determine the order of words. For a language to use, therefore, the word order of another language, even intermittently, it is these constraints which would have to be violated in addition to the pattern of word order having to be altered in the receptor language. It is not too surprising, therefore, that studies of bilingual cultures and of inter-language contamination indicate that the influences which can be detected with certainty are very largely in the semantic field and do not affect the structure of the receptor language (Porter 1992, p.13; Silva 1980, especially pp. 216-9).

There is another problem which is one of methodology. To detect Semitic word order in Koine Greek is to run ahead of linguistic research for, as yet, no systematic analysis of the word order patterns or the factors affecting them in the Semitic languages (which also have a relatively free word order) has been carried out. The point was made by Wilcox (1965, pp.112-3) and is summarized thus: 'It is ... difficult to determine with precision "what is not idiomatic Greek order", but also to be dogmatic about what is "Semitic" and more especially Aramaic and Hebrew order'. He was able to propose two word order variants only as possibly exemplifying Semitic influence and made the clear concession that other explanations for the variants were available. The difficulty of defining the rules governing the word order of New Testament Greek or the Semitic languages has been attenuated to some extent by some of the linguistic studies over the

last twenty-five years but the question is by no means yet settled for any of the languages concerned.

Among the foreign influences supposed to be acting on the Greek text of Codex Bezae, the Latin side of the manuscript is appealed to. The suggestion has often been made ⁵ that the peculiarities of the Greek text derive in part from the Latin, assuming that the Latin preceded and acted as a model for the Greek. As far as word order is concerned, there are, it is true, similarities between the two columns at some of the places where the Greek of Codex Bezae varies from that of the Alexandrian textual tradition. The use of the Latin side as a model for the Greek is, however, a matter which is open to a great deal of question. Parker (1992) has made a thorough investigation of the bilingual tradition and his conclusions would indicate that the influence of the Latin text on the word order of the Greek column is unlikely: 'The chief influence was of the Greek on the Latin. Examples of the reverse are very rare' (p.193).

Much caution must therefore be exercised when considering the validity of explanations of word order variations between manuscripts which depend on seeing the influence of Hebrew, Aramaic or any other language. This does not mean that any possibility of foreign influence must categorically and definitively be ruled out but that in the present circumstances it should be viewed as an unlikely cause of word order variation, and one almost impossible to determine in any case given the present level of linguistic knowledge and research in the area.

II. REASONS FOR WORD ORDER VARIATION.

II.1. Word order variation is secondary.

Some instances of variation in word order are brought about indirectly by modification to some other aspect, including the meaning, of the sentence or paragraph which necessitates a change in the order of words. Such instances do not contribute to the establishing of the rules which govern word order and are consequently not included in the analysis. They are briefly described in this section.

II.1.a. Word order affected by the occurrence of other types of variation.

Where a variation in word order is accompanied by one or more of the other three types of variation (see p.57) it is clear in some cases that the change in word order has been incurred by other changes existing in the immediate vicinity of the words in question (e.g. when the definite article is added before $\pi\rho\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ at the beginning of a sentence $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is displaced, as at 15:35a c.f.12:5). Such instances of word order variation are therefore secondary and will not be considered further in this analysis. There are 12 of them as follows:

10:33; 12:5,20a; 15:2,35a; 16:3,35,36,40; 18:4; 19:20; 21:18.

II.1.b. Word order difference involves a difference in sentence meaning.

Combinations of the various types of variation, including word order, may involve an alteration to the overall meaning of a sentence in some of the references listed above (II.1.a, e.g. 19:20). There are 10 further places of word order variation where an obvious change of sentence meaning is involved:

1:9; 4:33,36; 5:29; 7:31/33; 8:23; 12:11; 16:18; 17:12; 19:40.

It would be unwise to prejudge at this point whether it was an intentional change in meaning (on the part of a reviser or scribe) which necessitated a word order change or whether, on the contrary, it was a word order change (e.g. for stylistic reasons, or because of scribal error) which had a secondary effect on the sense of the sentence. But because there is a possibility of the word order variation being secondary in these verses, they will also be left to one side for the purposes of this analysis.

II.2. Word order variation is primary.

There are some 150 remaining variation units concerning word order which are neither dependent on the presence of other types of variation occurring in the same context nor do they involve a change in the meaning of the sentence. That is not to say that the meaning of individual words or phrases is always unaffected but that the overall sentence is not altered.

Some of the factors affecting word order have already been mentioned in passing in this chapter (#1). In the New Testament, it is

the genre of the writing in the first place which tends to determine the usual pattern of word order within a sentence. This usual pattern, or expected one, for a particular kind of writing is referred to by some linguists as 'unmarked'. Most commonly, a simple, general principle can be seen to be at work whenever a marked word order is preferred to the unmarked one. Essentially, word order patterns are altered by the speaker in order to draw the addressee's attention to something in the text. In Koine Greek the way to do this (and a common device in most languages) is to shift the element to be highlighted forward, to occur sooner (more to the left) in the phrase or sentence in which it belongs.

Three common reasons for this front-shifting have been elucidated:⁴

- i) to underline a contrast
- ii) to emphasize
- iii) to indicate a change in the topic (what is being talked about) from that of the previous sentence.

The last reason for front-shifting has been discussed in detail by Levinsohn (1987, pp.61-82) who extends the notion of change to apply to time and location in addition to topic and uses the term 'change of basis' to cover all three.

Very occasionally, a particular choice of unusual word order does seem to be due to personal habit and examples will be pointed out in the course of the analysis.

III. METHODOLOGY.

In this study of word order in the text of Codex Bezae (D05) comparison is made with the texts of Codex Sinaiticus (S01) and Codex Vaticanus (B03). As D05 has lacunae at 8:29 - 10:14; 21:2-10,16-18; 22:2-20; and 22:29 to the end of the book, these passages have not been included in the analysis.

The category of variants grouped together as representing differences in word order consists of those variant readings where the same words occur in both texts but arranged in different orders. It is usually a matter of the order varying within the same sentence; only occasionally is a reading displaced into another sentence (5:29 and 7:31/33). The form of the displaced words is generally the same, except where a change in the syntactical structure of the sentence resulting from the word order variation demands a grammatical modification (e.g. 16:3).

Variation in word order between D05 and S01/B03 is one of the four types of variation which exist in the wording of these MSS. (The other three classes of variation are: 1) material absent in D05, present in S01/B03 2) material present in D05, absent in S01/B03 3) material present in D05 and S01/B03 but with lexical or grammatical differences.) The relative frequency of the four types of variation has been examined for each chapter of Acts as well as for the book as a whole, as discussed in Chapter I (and see Appendix I). When measured against the other types of variation, word order differences were seen to be the type which affects the smallest number of words overall. They are none the less important for that and the study of them reveals some valuable clues as to the motives behind the creation of the Bezan text.

Word order variation in Greek can take place on the level of the sentence within two spans of text. On the one hand, the position of the verb can vary - that is, elements such as the subject or the object can be moved to the left or right of it. In addition, within more restricted units on either side of the verb, the order of the components (noun/adjective, direct/indirect object, for example) can vary. Even in this second category the verb sometimes plays an important role in determining the order of words before or after it (as, for example, with constituents which are typically attracted to a position adjacent to the verb), but the position of the verb itself is unaltered by changes which are limited to either side of it.

In the following study of word order in the Bezan text of Acts it is the second class of variation, that which does not alter the position of the verb in the sentence, which has been selected for detailed examination. For each type of phrase, unmarked and marked word order patterns are first established with reference to the text common to both the manuscript traditions being considered in this study. Next, the variants are examined and particular attention is paid to their significance in the Bezan text and their place in the overall Bezan word order system.

Word Order.

Part B: WORD ORDER VARIATION NOT ALTERING THE POSITION OF THE VERB.

This group of variation units represents a little less than half of the total 150 units where word order variation is primary. The word order change generally, but not always, affects words adjacent to each other. The first section groups variant readings which occur within the noun phrase; the second groups variant readings of other clause constituents.

I. VARIATION WITHIN THE NOUN PHRASE.

I.1 Pairs of words.

D05

14:19 ΑΠΟ ΙΚΟΝΙΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΤΙΟΧΕΙΑΣ

17:8 ΤΟΥΣ ΠΟΛΙΤΑΡΧΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΟΧΛΟΥ

18:26 ΑΚΟΥΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΙΣΚΙΛΛΑ

19:26 ΑΚΟΥΣΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΘΕΩΡΕΙΤΕ

20:20 ΚΑΤ ΟΙΚΟΥΣ ΚΑΙ ΔΗΜΟΣΙΑ

The words are found in this order in D05 and the other way round in S01/B03. These pairs of words are of equal syntactical value and there is no grammatical reason for one order being more usual than the other. The particular order in the different manuscripts may perhaps reflect a certain preoccupation or custom of the speaker, or his

sensitivity to the preoccupation or custom of his audience. 'Speaker' in this case could refer to the author of the text or a later copyist. (On 18:26, see ch.10.)

1.2 Words in apposition.

An examination of the text common to the two manuscript traditions reveals that where a noun or phrase is placed in apposition to a name, it is the element of greater importance which is set first. Generally, this is the name of the person because this is the more important piece of information to be communicated. For example:

4:25 δαυειδ παιδος σου

5:1 σου σαπφιρη τη γυναικι

10:6 παρκ τινι βλωνι βυρσει

Sometimes, however, it is not the name but the phrase in apposition which is more important, as in the following example:

4:27 επι του αγιον παιδα σου ιησου

(repeated v.30)

This order does not mean that the name of Jesus is insignificant but that, in the situation in question, the speaker wished to underline his attribute or function.

There are three places where the order of name/noun phrase in apposition varies and a fourth where the order of two nouns in apposition to a name varies. They are precisely the kind of variant readings which are easily overlooked or dismissed because their

significance is not immediately obvious. A close study of them, however, yields some interesting clues as to the factors affecting the manuscripts traditions.

Joppa 11:5.

S01/B03: εν πολει ιοπη

D05: εν ιοπη πολει

The context of the reference needs to be carefully considered in order to determine the significance of a reversal of order.

When Peter meets the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem (11:2), he is challenged by a group of them: *οι εκ περιτομης*, which is foregrounded in D05 so underlining the importance of their role (see ch.7 on the Spelling of Jerusalem). There may have been various reasons at this stage for their disapproval of Peter's visit to Gentiles (v.3): their concern to adhere strictly to the Jewish law on the matter may have arisen on the one hand from a desire to protect their own community from contamination and, on the other, from a fear of the non-Christian Jews who could turn against them, as indeed happened later to Paul (Acts 21:27 onwards). Whatever the exact reasons for the questioning by the circumcision party, it was necessary for Peter to state clearly how his visit to Gentiles in Caesarea had happened. He explains *in order* (v.4), because that was important, that he was initially praying in Joppa. Joppa was a Jewish town with at least some Jewish-Christian believers (cf. v.12 and 10:23,45). Throughout its history, the town had been a town for Jews: over the previous two hundred years, they had struggled to retain Joppa as their town, not always successfully but as fortunes and the political situation changed it was the one town that was given back to them by new

invaders of Palestine. The villages which surrounded it were likewise Jewish .⁷ It was of strategic importance to the Jewish community (Schürer 1979, pp.110-14) because it was the nearest seaport to Jerusalem and their principal access to the sea for trade and voyages (Applebaum 1989, p. 20). The term πόλις indicates that, under Roman rule of the country, the town had achieved city status * for which there must have been at least some element of Greek population. The Greek inhabitants that there were, were probably a minority and almost certainly separately governed by their own authorities (Applebaum 1989, p.83). Hebrew or Aramaic appears to have been the language used by the Jewish population for when Greek was used, by craftsmen or tradesmen for example, it was 'excruciatingly bad' (Applebaum 1989, p.165).

Caesarea, in contrast, was a Roman town. It was built by the Romans around 10 B.C. and later was enlarged and fortified in the first century by the Romans. It had a Roman name and, as long as the country was under Roman rule, was occupied by a Roman garrison.

In the text of S01/B03, the name of the town is not underlined, no more, for example, than that of Lasea in 27:8 (D05 lacuna). In D05, the name of Joppa is given prominence as if Peter wished to insist that he had not deliberately gone to a Gentile town and that his visit to Caesarea had been at God's initiative, not his. Such a claim is consistent with what can be seen to be a Bezan preoccupation in other ways.

Herod 12:1

S01: επεβαλεν ο βασιλευς ηρωδης τας χειρας
 B03: επεβαλεν ηρωδης ο βασιλευς τας χειρας
 D05: επεβαλεν τας χειρας ηρωδης ο βασιλευς

The text of Codex Sinaiticus focuses on the function of Herod as king by placing ο βασιλευς before his name. The other two texts place less emphasis on his function by retaining the more usual order of name before title. The text of Codex Bezae draws less attention still to his person, and more to his actions, by placing the object, τας χειρας, before the subject. This verse is examined in detail in the exegetical analysis of Acts 12.

Crispus 18:8

S01/B03: κρισπος ο αρχισυναγωγος

D05: ο αρχισυναγωγος κρισπος

It is the text of Codex Bezae in this instance which focuses on the function rather than the name of the person mentioned, the ruler of the synagogue, Crispus.

This focus is in keeping with the main interest of the episode, which is the impact of Paul's preaching on the Jews in Corinth as discussed in the exegetical analysis of Acts 18.

Barnabas 4:36.

S01/B03: λευιτης κυπριος τω γενει

D05: κυπριος λευιτης τω γενει

In the first case, the race of Barnabas is seen as Cypriot, in the second as Levite. The exact significance of the variation may be too much a part of the local cultural situation to be recoverable today but whatever the point of it one thing is apparent: there are in all

only four variants to do with the order of nouns in apposition and all four, this one no less than the others, are associated with a Jewish concern of some kind.

1.3 ὄνόματι.

A common formula found in Acts to introduce a person by name consists of ὄνόματι followed by the name of the person. The phrase is often:

ἄνθρωπος τις + ὄνόματι + name

In the firm text, as in the Bezan addition at 13:7, the order is always ὄνόματι + name. At two places, the Alexandrian text reads the order name + ὄνόματι.

5:1; 18:24

5:1 The person in question is Ananias. Attention is drawn to his name by mentioning it before ὄνόματι since the usual order is thereby disrupted. Thereafter in the Alexandrian text attention is focused on events rather than on people (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, p.27). It looks as if the name Ananias is a signal which reminds the hearers of an incident rather than being an important person in his own right. In contrast, the Bezan text introduces Ananias with the usual formula and thereafter maintains attention on the participants of the story.

18:24 includes a second description of Apollos which is likewise found with the adjective first in S01/B03 αλεξανδρεως τω γενει, and second in D05 γενει αλεξανδρεως.

In this introduction of a new participant, Apollos is presented by name and by race. As with Ananias, the text of S01/B03 underlines both by displacing them to first position whereas that of D05 does not draw attention to the man in that way. The Bezan text has some further information about him in vv.26+7 which, if authentic, reveals a closer familiarity with Apollos than that which appears in the other shorter text (cf. comments on this verse in the exegetical study, ch.10). A noteworthy feature of both texts, however, is that the first word of introduction is $\iota\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$. Whatever the reason for underlining Apollos' name and race, (and it may well not be possible to ascertain it) it is striking that yet again a word order change occurs in the context of the mention of a Jewish person.

I.4 Adjective and noun/noun phrase.

An exhaustive analysis of the occurrences of adjacent adjective and noun or noun phrases in the common text of Acts shows that $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, numbers and demonstratives need to be dealt with separately thus isolating a category of adjectives of a general nature to be examined in the first instance.

I.4.a General adjectives.

i) With the definite article: There are only fifteen occurrences in the text of Acts common to S01, B03 and D05 of an arthrous noun qualified by an adjective (3:7,10; 11:17; 12:10; 13:46; 17:18; 19:12,13,15,16; 20:28; 21:26,27,40; 22:25) and there are no variants involving change of word order. (These comments do not take account of references to the Holy Spirit which are dealt with in a separate chapter (ch.6, Part C) because of the special nature of the phrase).

The data is therefore somewhat limited and conclusions about word order are difficult to establish. The more frequent order is article-adjective-noun; it may express a familiar association of the adjective and the noun it qualifies (e.g. 3:7 'the right hand' - της δεξιάς χειρός; 3:10 'the Beautiful Gate' - τη ωραία πύλη; 13:46 'the eternal life' - της αιωνίου ζωής) or it may convey emphasis or contrast of the adjective (11:17 'the equal gift' - την ίσην δωρεάν; 21:40+22:2 'the Hebrew language' - τη εβραϊκή διαλέκτω) or it may accord equal attention to the adjective and the noun (22:25 'the standing-by centurion' - τον εστῶτα εκατοντάρχου).

When the adjective follows the noun (and the article is thereby repeated), the context is sometimes explanatory - explanatory rather than emphatic (this is noticeably true of τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον). The repetition of the article and the separation of the adjective from the noun it qualifies seem to be factors which achieve this purpose. One example can be seen at 12:10 ἐπὶ τὴν πύλην τὴν σιδηρᾶν 'the-gate-the-iron', where the situation is one of defining which gate rather than simply naming it as 'the Beautiful Gate' at 3:10. Again at 20:28, 'his own blood' δικαίου αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου occurs as an integral part of an explanation about the sacrifice of Jesus, made all the clearer in the Bezan text with the additional εἰς τὴν and κυρίου in place of θεοῦ earlier in the verse.⁷ On the other hand, the references to the evil spirits at 19:12,13,15,16 are not set in the context of explanation. Other than at the initial reference where the epithet 'evil' is not necessarily the expected one, it is not obvious why the adjective should be set apart.

ii) Without the definite article: Here the picture is much easier to see, there being a greater number of examples and some variation. When the adjective is adding more detail to the noun, the noun being the

more important of the two elements, then the adjective follows the noun (Larsen 1991, p.30). This is especially the case in any kind of standard epithet accompanying a noun such as 5:12 'many signs and wonders' - *σημειαι και τερατα πολλα*; 8:1 'great persecution' - *διωγμος μεγας*; 13:48 'eternal life' - *ζωην αιωνιον* (cf. 13:46 where the adjective precedes the noun in the arthrous phrase); 18:14 'evil villainy' - *ραδιουργημα πονηρον*. The adjective in these cases is often the expected one. It is not of special importance or it may even be redundant. No contrast or emphasis is implied.

When the adjective is placed before the noun, the epithet is usually more carefully chosen than when it is in post position. This may be because it is significant in itself or because special emphasis is being given to it and attention is being focused on it. Examples occur at 2:4 'other tongues' - *ετεραις γλωσσαις*; 4:16 'a notable sign' - *γνωστον σημειον*; 12:21 'an appointed day' - *τακτη ημερα*; 14:10 'a loud voice' - *μεγκλη φωνη*; 17:23 'an unknown god' - *αγνωστω θεω*; 19:26 'a considerable crowd' - *ικανον οχλον*.

In summary, when the adjective is found before the noun without the article the adjective is being highlighted; when the article is present this is not necessarily the case but it may be. When the adjective is found after the noun without the article the adjective is not of special importance; when the article is present, the adjective in post-position may be being underlined as part of an explanation.¹⁰

iii) Variant readings: There are only five variant readings affecting the position of the adjective with respect to the noun and none of these involve the definite article.

On four occasions the order noun-adjective in S01/B03 is reversed in D05 which reads as follows:

D05

2:2 βιαίας πνοῆς

2:5b εὐλαβεῖς ἄνδρες

13:32 γενόμενην ἐπαγγελίαν

22:3a Ἰουδαίος ἀνὴρ

The fronting of the adjective in these phrases suggests that the adjective is recognised as being in some way of particular importance. It is interesting to note that in each of the examples there is something of special significance to a Jewish audience.

2:2 God's speaking by means of a violent wind was a fact familiar to Jews from the Old Testament (I Ki 19:11) and drawing attention to it may be understood as a way of underlining that it was indeed God who intervened through the Pentecost drama.

2:5 In v.5, the men who witnessed the event are emphasised as being devout men. This is the more important that in the Bezan text Jerusalem is also given prominence by being shifted before the verb to the first place in the sentence. Placing the location at the front of the sentence indicates that Jerusalem is the basis on which the sentence is linked to its context (Levinsohn 1987, pp.61-5). The significance of Jerusalem is discussed in ch.7.

13:32 An additional ἦν in the Bezan text firmly sets the scene as Jewish in a speech in which Paul the Jew preaches the good news of Jesus to Jews; the effect of placing γενόμενην before ἐπαγγελίαν is to emphasise the divine action of the promise being made to their forefathers.

22:3a It is Paul again who is speaking here as he introduces

himself as a Jewish man. At all except two occurrences of *ἄνθρωπος* in Acts (that is eight times, the exceptions being 15:22+25) the adjective is found after *ἄνθρωπος*, even though it is the adjective which is important. Presumably, the adjective does not usually need to be fronted in order to insist on its importance because *ἄνθρωπος* is in any case an almost redundant noun in Greek. In the Bezan text, *Ιουδαίος* is not only emphatic but it is also closely associated with Tarsus in Cilicia as Paul's birthplace which the Bezan text places before the verb in the next phrase. Both emphases serve to establish Paul's credentials of identity.

At one place, the adjective is before the noun in S01/B03 but after the noun in D05:

16:28D05 φωνη μεγαλη

When 'a loud voice' occurs at other places, the order in both texts is *φωνη μεγαλη* at 7:57 and *μεγαλη φωνη* at 14:10. With other nouns, *μέγας* is read after the noun except at 19:27 where the greatness of Artemis is focused upon as being in question (especially in the Alexandrian text *και καθικρεισθαι της μεγαλειότητος αυτής*). Looking at the picture overall, it is noticeable that *μέγας* is placed after the noun unless there is a reason for drawing special attention to the quality of greatness. Thus, Paul's 'loud voice' as he addresses the lame man in Lystra (14:10) is significant because it would have been heard by the crowds standing around. The 'loud voice' of the enraged crowd as they attack Stephen (7:57) is not surprising. It seems that Paul's call to the jailor in prison here at 16:28 is likewise viewed by Codex Bezae as not unnaturally 'in a loud voice', the adjective thus occurring in second position.

iv) Additional readings: The same kind of pattern as has so far been detected is also visible in the additional material in Codex Bezae.

When a noun is qualified by an adjective not present in the S01/B03 text it is always found before the noun. This suggests that the adjective was not present when the Bezan editor read the text but it was felt to be needed. The adjective was thus likely to be prominent and naturally occurs before the noun. Examples of additional adjectives qualifying nouns are to be found at:

D05

12:5 πολλή προσευχή

17:5 αι απειθουντες ιουδαιοι

16:22 πολυς οχλος

When an adjective occurs in a whole phrase which is additional in D05, its position varies according to its significance, as expected:

D05 adjective pre-noun: 8:24; 11:2a,2b,27; 12:20; 18:6,27

D05 adjective post-noun: 15:30; 16:39a,39b; 19:8

There is one instance of an adjective in the S01/B03 text being absent in the D05 text:

15:32 S01/B03 λογου πολλου

It is possible that the adjective dropped out through haplography, the next word beginning also with π.

I.4.b Numbers.

i) Cardinal numbers: In the text of Acts common to S01/B03 and D05, the practice is for cardinal numbers to be placed before a noun with the definite article which is to be expected: 'the fact that a specific number is even mentioned normally gives a degree of emphasis to that number' (Larsen 1991, p.31). This is true also of the two additional occurrences of a number before an anarthrous noun at 2:14D05; 12:10D05. There are no variant readings involving the place of a cardinal number before an anarthrous noun.

Without the article, the order varies in the common text. For lengths of time, the adjective usually comes second (5:7; 7:30,36,42; 13:20,22; 19:8,10; 20:3,6), with only one departure from this order (see on 7:23 below). In all such cases, the number is not apparently of particular significance. The same can be said of the other places where the adjective follows the noun (1:10; 7:29; 12:10; 21:33). Where the adjective comes first, the explanations which were found to account for this order with the general nouns may be appealed to. Either the fronting of the adjective expresses an intrinsic quality (11:5 - 'four corners'; 12:6 - Peter was sleeping between 'two soldiers'); or it is possibly emphatic: 11:11 - 'three men' suddenly appeared at the house where Peter was staying (introduced as they are by *καὶ ἰδοὺ* and *εἰξαυτην*); 12:4 - Peter was guarded by 'four quaternions of soldiers', a number of guards which may be presumed to be unusually large.

There is one additional Bezan reading of a cardinal number with an anarthrous noun where the number is placed last:

10:41D05 *πεντακ.*

Codex Bezae mentions 'forty days' in Peter's speech to Cornelius where, in referring to the appearances of Jesus after his death, the Bezan text specifies that this happened over a forty day period. The adjective follows the noun. This order is followed by all of the other time phrases in both texts in question including 'forty years' (7:30,36,42; 13:22) as noted above, except for one significant instance. At 7:23, 'forty' is read before 'years', *π. ετης* D05 / *ΤΕΣΣΕΡΑΚΟΝΤΑΕΤΗΣ* S01/B03, and at the same time is highlighted by its unusual position next to the verb before the pronoun *αυτω* (see II.3+4 below). It can be presumed that there is a reason within the tradition of the Joseph story for prominence being given to the number, although that reason may not be recoverable any longer. It may possibly have something to do with its being the first mention of 'forty years' in the story.

The usual order of noun then number is likewise reversed in the one variant reading involving a cardinal number which occurs in ch.1 where Luke introduces his book and describes Jesus as appearing over a period of forty days:

1:3D05 *ΤΕΣΣΕΡΑΚΟΝΤΑ ΗΜΕΡΩΝ* 1:3S01/B03 *ΗΜΕΡΩΝ ΤΕΣΣΕΡΑΚΟΝΤΑ*

Whereas all the references to 'forty years' occur in the context of the telling of a traditional story, the mention of forty days in this summary of Jesus' resurrection appearances is introduced in the narrative of Acts for the first time here. In the Old Testament, forty was a figure of special significance to the Jews and it was a point of some importance to the first Christians that Jesus was seen as following an Old Testament pattern. In the relating of the story to Cornelius, as was mentioned above, Codex Bezae (10:41) introduces the important detail of the number of days, but does not draw particular

attention to it, suggesting that it was thought that Cornelius would not appreciate its significance. The readings with cardinal numbers which are peculiar to the Bezan text thus display yet again, like so many of the variant readings involving adjectives, a preoccupation with a Jewish concern.

ii) Ordinal numbers: Ordinal numbers function as ordinary adjectives. In Acts, they give rise to two variant readings of a special nature which require particular attention.

At the beginning of chapter 3, Luke mentions the time at which Peter and John went to the temple:

3:1D05 ΕΠΙ ΤΗΝ ΩΡΑΝ ΕΝΚΤΗΝ ΤΗΣ ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΗΣ

3:1S01/B03 ΕΠΙ ΤΗΝ ΩΡΑΝ ΤΗΣ ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΗΣ ΤΗΝ ΕΝΑΤΗΝ

The Bezan text mentions the hour of prayer without particular emphasis whereas the other text, with its double repetition of the article, uses the more explanatory form (cf. # I.4.a.i above). The implication is that for the Bezan author, being of Jewish background, the reference was a familiar and self-explanatory one.

In the account of Peter's miraculous escape from prison in chapter 12, the angel is described as leading him through two prisons:

12:10D05 ΠΡΩΤΗΝ ΚΑΙ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΑΝ ΦΥΛΑΚΗΝ

12:10S01/B03 ΠΡΩΤΗΝ ΦΥΛΑΚΗΝ ΚΑΙ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΑΝ

The Bezan order has both 'first' and 'second' highlighted in front position. The Alexandrian text underlines further the existence of a second prison: by separating ΔΕΥΤΕΡΑΝ off and removing it further from the noun it qualifies, attention is thereby drawn to the second

prison. The Bezan text appears to be treating the existence of the two prisons more as an acknowledged fact while at the same time giving them prominence in the sentence. This is in accordance with the overall symbolic meaning attributed to the account of Peter's escape from prison by Codex Bezae (see the exegetical study of Acts 12).

I.4.c $\pi\alpha\tilde{\varsigma}$.

$\pi\alpha\tilde{\varsigma}$ is always read before the noun in the common text, and in the additional Bezan occurrences. This order is to be expected in view of the emphatic implications of 'all' (Larsen 1991, p.30).

In four instances, D05 has this order where S01/B03 read $\pi\alpha\tilde{\varsigma}$ after the noun:

2:14; 4:29; 7:50; 15:36

Since none of these variants involve the position of $\pi\alpha\tilde{\varsigma}$ in relation to the definite article, they do not involve a change of meaning from 'all' to 'the whole'.¹¹

2:14 By placing $\pi\alpha\tilde{\varsigma}$ at the front of the phrase, D05 apparently treats the phrase 'all the people living in Jerusalem' as referring to those not included in the initial $\alpha\nu\delta\rho\epsilon\varsigma \text{ } \iota\omega\upsilon\delta\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$. In S01/B03 (with some support from the versions, B-L *ad loc*), the two phrases can be co-referential, the one being parallel to the other. Codex Bezae thus displays an awareness of an application of Peter's message which extends beyond the Jewish people. Strange (1992, p.153) believes that the displacement of $\pi\alpha\tilde{\nu}\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ from the end of one line to the end of the previous one in D05 is a typical Bezan error. Whilst an accidental slip cannot be definitely ruled out here, the alteration to the

meaning is nonetheless significant and since it is in keeping with the overall thrust of the Bezan text it is legitimate to suppose that the change was intentional.¹²

4:29 The order of D05 *πάσης παρρησίας* is more emphatic although the context here renders the inversion less significant and the meaning is not altered.

7:50 In quoting the passage from the beginning of Isaiah 66, D05 has the order of the Septuagint version which accords even greater emphasis to 'all' - (*πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα ἐποίησεν ἡ χερμω*). Winer (1882, p.686) observes that there is a difference between *πάντα ταῦτα* meaning 'all these things' and *ταῦτα πάντα* meaning 'these things all taken together'. In the Septuagint (like the Massoretic text), there is a clear focus on 'all these things' which is maintained by the Bezan order in Acts 7:50.¹³

15:36b As at 4:29, there is a shift of emphasis in the D05 order *πᾶσιν πολλοῖς* but it does not bring about an alteration in the sense.

1.4.d *τις*.

τις is more often than not placed after the noun in the common text. This usual order is to be expected for by its very indefiniteness *τις* is not emphatic. Exceptions arise at:

3:2; 16:14; 17:34.

At 3:2 *τις* *αἰψοῦ* introduces the lame man as a new participant at the beginning of the episode with Peter and John in the Temple. Codex Bezae draws particular attention to this introduction with an additional *σου*. In this instance of *τις* with a person, the name of the person is not mentioned. A similar absence of a name occurs in an

introduction at 16:16 where $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ follows the noun ($\pi\alpha\iota\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\iota\upsilon\kappa$). The difference between the two sentences is that in the latter case it is 'we', not the servant girl, who is the focus of attention. It may be, therefore, that the fronting of $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ is a device of salience which underlines the importance of the introduction in the absence of an anarthrous proper name (Heimerdinger - Levinsohn 1992, p. 20).

16:14 $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ precedes $\gamma\upsilon\upsilon\eta$ in the introduction of Lydia when she is singled out from the group of women mentioned in the previous line. This would seem to confirm the suggestion above that $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ before the noun is a way of focussing attention on the person.

17:34 There is a switch of focus in this parenthetical sentence from Paul to $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\delta\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ who became believers (cf. ch. 10 on 18:1). The order of words may be compared to that of the Bezan text in 17:5+18:26 (see below). $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ here may convey not so much indefiniteness as a limitation of Paul's influence.

There are two variant readings involving the position of $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$

17:5,28

17:5 D05 places $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ before the noun. The reading is part of a variation unit spanning several lines of text:

17:5D05 $\text{οι δε απειθουντες ιουδαιοι}$
 $\text{συνετραψκντες τινας ανδρας}$
 $\text{των αγοραιων πονηρους}$
 εθορυβουσκν

17:5501/B03 ἤλωσαντες δε οἱ ἰουδαῖοι καὶ προσλαβόμενοι
τῶν ἀγοραίων ἀνδρας τινος πονηροῦς
καὶ οὐλοποιήσαντες ἐθορυβούν

In the Bezan text, ἀνδρας is in focus as being the only group mentioned to be gathered by the Jews to stir up the city. ΤΙΝΕΣ ἀνδρας is placed in front of τῶν ἀγοραίων, reinforcing their importance. It is the more prominent position of ἀνδρας which probably accounts for the placing of ΤΙΝΟΣ before the noun. The context of the whole variation unit is important in this case.

17:28 τίς is displaced and the noun it qualifies is omitted in Codex Bezae:

17:28D05 ὡςπερ καὶ τῶν καθ' ἑμᾶς ΤΙΝΕΣ εἰρηκασίη
S01/B03 ὡς καὶ ΤΙΝΕΣ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς ποιητῶν

The omission of ποιητῶν in D05 may well be the cause of τῶν καθ' ἑμᾶς being placed in first position before ΤΙΝΕΣ. In the S01/B03 order of words, τῶν καθ' ἑμᾶς is highlighted by being placed between the indefinite pronoun and the noun; D05 maintains the focus in the absence of the noun by keeping it before the pronoun.

There are ten additional occurrences of adjectival τίς in Codex Bezae:

7:58; 8:27; 10:22; 14:19; 17:19,34; 18:26; 19:9; 20:16; 21:15

In five of these places (10:22; 14:19; 17:34; 18:26; 21:15), it is found before the noun:

10:22; 17:34 $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ occurs in an appositional phrase in which the person introduced (Cornelius, Dionysius) is salient and $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ is placed before the complement. They may be compared with the mention of Candace, Queen of Ethiopia at 8:27 where D05 adds $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ after the complement because she is not salient.

14:19 The subject of the sentence $\iota\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$ is read after the adverbial phrase of place in S01/B03 whereas D05 gives it prominence by placing it before this phrase and adding $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ before it.

18:26 The subject of the verb $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ $\kappa\omicron\rho\iota\nu\theta\iota\omicron\iota$ is again given prominence by being placed before the main verb.

21:15 While S01/B03 have $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$ $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma$ $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma$, D05 reads $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\varsigma$ $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma$. The word order of the former is entirely usual. The Bezan text appears to want to draw attention to the length of time; the verse can be compared with 17:19 D05 where the additional reference to time has the usual order of $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$ $\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\varsigma$.

At the other places of additional $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ in Codex Bezae, where the pronoun follows the noun, the noun is not salient. 8:27 + 17:19 have already been mentioned in the preceding discussion.

7:58; 19:9 The addition of $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ($\pi\alpha\rho\alpha$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\pi\omicron\delta\alpha\varsigma$ $\nu\epsilon\kappa\upsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\varsigma$, $\epsilon\nu$ $\tau\eta$ $\sigma\chi\omicron\lambda\eta$ $\tau\upsilon\rho\iota\kappa\nu\nu\iota\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\varsigma$) draws attention to both the person in question but in an understated way. It is understandable that interest should focus on Saul in this way since this is the first mention of someone who is subsequently to become the central character of the narrative. At 19:9 the importance of Tyrannus is less clear but the very addition of $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ coupled with the curious additional time phrase $\alpha\pi\omicron$ $\omega\rho\alpha\varsigma$ $\cdot\tilde{\epsilon}\cdot$ $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\varsigma$ in this verse is strongly suggestive of some underlying (and concealed) significance (cf. the significance of the seven steps 12:10 discussed in the exegetical study, ch.10).

20:16 Paul is the indirect object of an impersonal verb in the Bezan text *μηποτε γενηθη αυτω κατασχεσις τις* and it is not the subject which is in focus. Indeed, the Alexandrian text uses an active verb *χρονοτριβησκι* in place of the Bezan clause, thus equally maintaining focus on Paul.

I.4.e. Demonstratives.

i) Following the noun: By far the most usual order of demonstrative adjective and noun in the text common to S01/B03 and D05 is for the adjective to be placed after the noun (39 times to eight times when the adjective is placed before the noun). This order is also found to be the more usual one in Biblical Greek generally (Turner 1963, pp.193+349; Winer 1882, p.686). In these instances, 'this' and 'that', *οὗτος* and *ἐκεῖνος*, are a way of indicating which is the noun in question, and that it is known because it has just been referred to (19:16), or is about to be (2:22), or can be pointed to (22:26) as the speaker talks.

There are seven additional occurrences of a demonstrative adjective after a noun in the Bezan text:

2:1; 3:1; 4:1; 5:39; 6:5; 17:30.

Three of them (6:5; 17:30; 19:38) are found after an existing noun and two (4:1; 5:39) are part of a whole phrase which is additional. Two more (2:1; 3:1) are part of an additional phrase of time and are discussed in section iv) below. They are all, as are the examples in the common text, instances of simple deixis.

ii) Preceding the noun: When the demonstrative precedes the noun, on

the other hand, it has an emphatic value and implies something of 'this rather than another' or 'this very person'. An example can be seen at 19:25 where in *ἐκ ταύτης τῆς ἐργασίας* the importance to the people of the trade which is being threatened is underlined (doubly, in fact, because it is also placed at the front of the clause). As the subject of the sentence, *οὗτοι οἱ κύνθρωποι* at 16:20 is also given prominence by being placed at the beginning of the clause before the verb and by the demonstrative being in first position; the emphasis is echoed by the end of the clause *ἰουδαῖοι ὑπάρχοντες*. In a similar way, Jesus is proclaimed as the focus of attention at 1:11 and 2:36: *αὐτός ο ἰησούς*.

iii) Variant readings: There are only three instances where the position of the demonstrative adjective varies. Codex Bezae has the adjective before the noun in two expressions of time (2:41; 6:1) which are discussed in section iv) below. It also has the adjective before the noun at 7:60. Codex Vaticanus shares the reading but not Codex Sinaiticus. The context is Stephen's cry to God before his death:

7:60B03/D05 *ταύτην τὴν κρυπτικὴν*

The implication of the emphatic position of the demonstrative is that Stephen is referring only to the particular sin of killing him. There are potential theological difficulties in stressing the plea for mercy for only one wrongdoing which may have caused the *ταύτην* to be placed in simple deictic position in the Sinaiticus text.

iv) Time expressions: The expressions denoting the time of an event and which include a demonstrative (e.g. 'in those days', 'at that time') require careful examination.

Some time expressions occur as straightforward references to a time whereas others move the story on to new events. Of the former, there are five such references and no variant readings (demonstrative pre-noun: 1:5; 5:36; 21:38; post-noun: 1:6; 12:6). Where the demonstrative is before the noun, the reference in each case is to the present time with no anaphoric mention; the pre-noun position serves to make it clear that 'these days' means the present. At 1:6, the disciples enquire of Jesus whether the time when the Holy Spirit will come (1:5) is also the time $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omega\ \chi\rho\omicron\nu\omega\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$ when the kingdom of Israel will be restored. $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$ could have been expected before $\chi\rho\omicron\nu\omega$ since it is the purpose of the question and as such emphatic. Displacement of the demonstrative, however, could have signified 'this present time' as at 1:5; 5:36 + 21:38 which is not meant here. Another explanation, suggested for other occurrences of 'this time' by Turner (1963, p.193), is that the expression is reminiscent of a familiar expression in Hebrew עוֹלָם הַדָּה meaning 'world-time' and in which the demonstrative obligatorily follows the noun.

Apart from these simple time references, most time phrases with a demonstrative occur in a summary of events, or at the beginning of a new episode, and serve the purpose of helping the development of the story. When the demonstrative is placed after the noun (1:15; 2:41S01/B03; 6:1S01/B03; 7:41; 19:23; in an additional phrase 2:1D05; 3:1D05) it is usually the straight forward sequence of events which is being described. There is no need to emphasize the particular time since it is not of special significance nor is there any possibility of confusion. This is especially true of the references in the first three chapters where the events are painted on a broad canvas and the time scale is large. Only in the summary describing the great number of conversions following Peter's speech does the Bezan text of 2:41 stress that this happened on that very day, the day of Pentecost, by

placing the demonstrative before the noun.

When, in contrast, the new event is very important or represents something very different from the event just related, the demonstrative is found before the time noun. The chronology is thus underlined, there is an insistence on the particular time at which things happened. This is the case at 6:1D05 (not d); 8:1; 11:27; 12:1. At 6:1 and 12:1, totally new subjects are introduced and the author is careful to underline their situation in the sequence of events. The persecution at 8:1 represents a major shift of direction in the activities of the Church and again requires to be carefully situated in time. The arrival of the prophets from Jerusalem in Antioch (11:27) may seem less momentous but if the explanation for the displacement of the demonstrative in the other three examples is correct then there is an indication in its displacement here that there is a reason to insist on the timing of their visit. Certainly, the church in Antioch had reached a noteworthy stage in its development with the arrival of Paul and Barnabas, described in greater detail in the Bezan text (11:25-6). Codex Bezae adds a comment, too, on the joy of the occasion, indicating thereby that it was a particularly memorable one.

To summarise the picture of the variant readings involving the demonstrative adjective, it can be observed that on the occasions when the Bezan text reads an additional example, either simply of the demonstrative adjective or of a phrase containing one, the adjective is always in the usual non-emphatic position. On the three occasions the texts differ as to the position of the adjective, it is always in the emphatic position in D05. This is indicative, on the one hand, of an inner coherence of Codex Bezae which analysis of other linguistic aspects shows to be characteristic of that text; and, on the other, of a close enough knowledge of events to be able to underline their connectedness.

1.4.f Possessive or partitive genitive.

The genitive, be it possessive or partitive, usually follows the noun it qualifies in both the common text and the Bezan additions. 'It is generally agreed that the form τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ πατρὸς is the predominant form in the New Testament' (Porter 1983, p.5). This would seem to be because it is the noun which is the chief element, the noun or pronoun in the genitive being dependent on it. When the genitive is placed before the noun, it is a means of drawing attention to that element, either because there is a reason to emphasise it or because, as Winer puts it, it 'contains the principal notion' (1882 p.240).¹⁴

i) Personal pronouns in the genitive: There are 5 instances of variation. In contrast to S01/B03, D05 reads the personal pronoun following the noun at the following three places:

2:26; 3:19; 12:20b

and the pronoun before the noun at two places:

3:7; 4:27.

2:26 The variant occurs in a quotation from the LXX and the Bezan word order follows the LXX text. When μου is placed after καρδικ, the phrase is aligned with all the others of the quotation which contain a possessive genitive, including that with the additional μου in v.25 of D05/S01. Any highlighting of 'me' in v.26, appropriate enough in the context of this description of intense personal feeling, is thus absent in D05.

3:19 The Old Testament background of 3:19 may likewise account for the Bezan word order. The context is Peter's explanation to his Jewish audience about the fulfilment in Jesus of prophecies concerning the Messiah. The speech draws extensively on Jewish scriptural traditions of which a number of factors are more prominent in the Bezan text (see Heimerdinger 1988). This may account for the position of *μου* after *της ομαρτίας* which would be the familiar word order in either Hebrew or Aramaic. Although there are dangers in basing explanations of features of the Greek of Acts on Semitic influences (see ch.3, #A), there is a case for arguing for such an influence here where the contents of Peter's speech is so thoroughly grounded in Jewish scriptural tradition.

12:20b In the Alexandrian text, the country of the Tyrians and the Sidonians is viewed as one country which is set in antithesis to the king's country by the highlighting of the genitive pronoun in the construction *αυτων τη ν χωραν απο της βασιλικης*. The antithesis is less apparent in the Bezan text where the people of Tyre and Sidon are viewed as coming from two countries: *οι ... εξ κυφοτερων των παλαιων* (v.20a) and *της χωρας αυτων* in the final clause with the word order variation. (For further discussion of this verse, see ch.9).

3:7 Where the pronoun is found in front of the nouns at 3:7, attention could be seen as being drawn to the healing of the lame man rather than specifically to his feet and ankles. Alternatively, the genitive could be before the nouns because it is governed by both of them (cf. 21:11).¹⁵

4:27 The pronoun *σου* is found between the attribute and the noun in D05: *τον αγιον σου πατριδα ιησου*. There are no other instances in Acts of an articular noun with an adjective and a personal pronoun in the genitive with which this construction may be compared but since it

appears to occur normally in this order elsewhere in the New Testament (see the examples given by Turner 1963, p. 190 and Winer 1882, p.194) it is perhaps unwarranted to see in the Bezan positioning of σου any particular focus on God (c f. the Latin side which has the usual order).

Codex Bezae frequently adds the personal pronoun in the genitive to a noun (1 or 2 instances in most chapters), chiefly 3rd person, where none is specified in the S01/B03 text. It is always placed following the noun, as in the common text, except at 6:3 where the variant occurs within a larger variation unit. In the Bezan text, *κωρω* is before *κωδρα* and is rendered emphatic by the adjacent additional *εξου*. On its own, the additional *κωρω* could be seen as a rather unnecessary attempt to clarify the shorter text but it needs to be considered in the context of the whole variation unit which, with the variant in the previous line, gives to the Bezan text a natural spontaneity and directness, which it is difficult to dismiss as a scribal invention. The importance accorded to *κωρω* in the Bezan text echoes the additional comment *εν τη δικονικ των εβραιων* in v.1/line 7 to which it stands in contrast.

ii) Nouns in the genitive: Out of seven variants, Codex Bezae has the usual order noun+genitive on six occasions:

4:33(+S01); 5:13,36; 17:5; 19:27b; 21:14

and the reverse order on one occasion:

17:28

The majority of these variants occur within a wider variation unit and sometimes at places where the text is uncertain.

4:33 In speaking of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, S01/D05 use a set phrase with only the order of words of the personal title varying (see ch.6, Part B). B03 has the title *του κυριου ιησου* without *Χριστου* and places it before *της αναστασεως*. The Vaticanus order is unusual and B-L *ad loc* suggest that the pre-Alexandrian text omitted the mention of the resurrection altogether.

5:13 The text is confused. The meaning of *των λοιπων* has been much debated (see B-L *ad loc* and Appendix III). In the Bezan text, *και* instead of *δε* gives a continuity with the previous verse (see ch.4, Part A) in which the Christians mentioned are the apostles, and it may be that 'the rest' refers to the other Christians rather than to anyone of 'the people' mentioned in v.13 or of the eventual converts in v.14. Alternatively, another interpretation of the Bezan reading may be proposed. If *οι λοιποι* was a Jewish 'code-word' with the meaning of 'the Gentiles', a meaning which the Bezan text wishes here to avoid (Appendix III), that would account for the replacement of *δε* by *και* (to eliminate the idea of contrast) as well as the removal of *των λοιπων* from a position of contrast.

5:36 *κριθων* is placed before *ανδρων* in the Bezan text and may belong to a wider variation unit which emphasizes the size of the threat posed by Theudas. Firstly, in the previous line, *μεγαν* adds to the notion of his power and secondly, an additional emphatic *και* stresses the presence of the large number of followers. *κριθων* is probably placed after the genitive in the S01/B03 text to be nearer the number quoted rather than with the purpose of giving prominence to 'the men'.

17:5,28 The Bezan readings have both been discussed in the section

on $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ since that is the noun on which the genitive is dependent in each case.

19:27. The text is again confused. The word order variation occurs in a sentence described as 'monstrous' in S01/B03 by Ropes (1926, p.186 n.27) and with accidentally omitted words in D05. Placing the noun $\tau\epsilon\rho\upsilon\varsigma$ before rather than after the name $\kappa\rho\tau\epsilon\rho\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$ which is in apposition to the dependent genitive $\tau\eta\varsigma \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\eta\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ would not seem in itself to involve a question of emphasis.¹⁴

21:14 As at 4:33, the Bezan word order removes an emphasis on the noun in the genitive. It thereby weakens a meaningful contrast between the fear of Paul's friends concerning his journey to Jerusalem and their decision to accept the will of God.

Where D05 has additional instances of a possessive or partitive genitive, all but one of the 25 occurrences have the unmarked order noun+genitive. The exception at 4:24 gives clear prominence in its additional reading to the noun $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ already present in the following line and further highlighted in D05 by a second additional mention later in the same verse. When Codex Bezae specifies elsewhere God (or Jesus, or Lord) as the possessor, the usual order of noun+genitive is followed: 16:6; 18:25; 20:25.

II. VARIATION INVOLVING OTHER CLAUSE CONSTITUENTS.

II.1 Adverbs.

The usual position of the adverb in Acts is next to the verb it qualifies. When it is detached from the verb, it is highlighted (cf. Turner 1963, pp.227-9).

There are six variant readings which involve the position of the adverb:

5:8,19,34; 13:31; 18:9,12

In each case, the variant concerning the adverb is located within a longer variation unit which is responsible, in part at least, for the movement of the adverb. Except for 18:9, the variation is related to the positions of the adverb and the verb it qualifies. At 18:9, the variation involves the order of two adverbs in relation to each other.

5:8 After the death of Ananias in chapter 5, Peter asks Sapphira if she sold the field for a certain sum (v.8):

5:8D05(not d) *ΕΙ ΑΡΧ ΤΟ ΧΩΡΙΟΝ ΤΟΣΟΥΤΟΥ ΑΠΕΔΟΣΘΕ*

5:8S01/B03(+d) *ΕΙΤΕ ΜΟΙ ΕΙ ΤΟΣΟΥΤΟΥ ΤΟ ΧΩΡΙΟΝ ΑΠΕΔΟΣΘΕ*

In the S01/B03 text the whole sentence is more concise than in the D05 text. The verse provides a relatively rare example of the Latin side of Codex Bezae following the wording of the Alexandrian text rather than that of its own corresponding Greek column. ΤΟΣΟΥΤΟΥ is emphatic because it indicates the significance of the question which is the exact amount of money for which the couple had sold their field. It is therefore detached from the verb and placed at the front of the clause, before the direct object. In the Bezan text, the addition of *αρχ* confers emphasis without the displacing of the adverb. There are a number of other differences between the two texts in this passage.

It was already noticed when examining the role of the definite article before proper names in this passage (Heimerdinger - Levinsohn 1992, p.27) that in the telling of the Ananias story the Alexandrian text seems to be more interested in the events for their own sake than in the characters involved. This perspective was confirmed by observations that could be made about the position of ὄνοματι in v.1 (#I.3 above). The more specific and detailed report of Peter's words in v.8D05 further tallies with the interest shown by the Bezan text in the people as people rather than as representing an event.

5:19 The word order variation at 5:19 provides the only instance of word order variation between the S01/B03 and D05 texts of Acts which affects the initial element of a sentence.

5:19D05 δὲ νυκτὸς δε ἀγγελὸς κυρίου

5:19S01/B03 ἀγγελοῦ δε κυρίου δὲ νυκτὸς

In #A of this chapter, it was pointed out that a principal reason for placing an element other than the verb at the front of a sentence is to indicate the way in which the sentence relates to what has gone before it in the text - such an element is referred to as the 'basis': 'The majority of references to time or place which begin a sentence provide the basis for relating the sentence to its context' (Levinsohn 1987, p.1).¹⁷

In the Alexandrian text of 5:19 the subject of the verb, the angel of the Lord, is the first element of the sentence. On Levinsohn's analysis, the reason for the fore-fronting of the subject on this occasion is that the angel is not the main character but

intervenes briefly in a way which affects the main character, in this case the apostles collectively: 'When a participant appears temporarily to perform a significant action, and then disappears from the scene, reference to him is forefronted' (1987, p.17).

In the Bezan text, the word order indicates that the primary relationship of the sentence at 5:19 to the previous sentence is that there is a change in the time. Not only does *ἄρα νυκτός* occur before the subject but *τότε* is the conjunction used in preference to *δέ*. Further discussion on the force of *τότε* in this verse can be found in ch.4, Part B where it is seen that *τότε* signifies that the next event took place without undue hesitation or diversion. There is no difference in the meaning of the two texts but a certain focus in the Bezan text on the temporal sequence of events.

5:34 As at v.8, it is again the order of the direct object and the adverb which varies. S01/B03 detach the adverb from the verb it qualifies, placing it before the direct object. In D05, the adverb follows the direct object. The effect of the displacement of *ἐξω βραχί* in the former word order is to draw attention to the men being put 'outside'. The Bezan text refers to them as 'the apostles' and it could be the choice of the stronger term which affects the word order in this example.

13:31 The variation here is in the position of the adverbial phrase of time *εφ' ἡμέρας πλείονος* D05/ *ἐπι ἡμέρας πλείους* S01/B03. Whereas the S01/B03 text places it immediately following the verb and before the indirect object phrase, that of D05 places it after the indirect object and after the prepositional phrase of location, at the end of the clause.

The question of the varying positions of prepositional phrases in a sentence in New Testament Greek has been the object of some exploratory research but there are as yet few definite conclusions on

the factors which cause elements to be moved around (Levinsohn 1992, pp.76-7). Whatever the reason for the time phrase being placed before the indirect object in S01/B03, its position in D05 may well have something to do with the additional *ἄχρι νῦν* in the following line. In order to determine what the connection is, a full examination of the variant readings in at least vv.30+31 would be necessary and it is possible that, in fact, the cause is located in the wider context still.

18:9 The order of the adverbs in D05 (the first of manner *δι' ὀργάνου τῷ Παύλῳ* and the second of time *ἐν νυκτί*), is reversed in the S01/B03 text which is that found in all other Greek manuscripts where the two adverbs are read (B-L *ad loc*). By placing *δι' ὀργάνου τῷ Παύλῳ* first, it could be argued that the Bezan text keeps Paul more clearly in focus than the other text: he has never ceased to be the central character of the episode but there has temporarily been a secondary interest in the household of Crispus and the other Corinthians who became Christians. Furthermore, there appears to be an awareness in the Bezan text of the prophetic resonance of the verse which is examined in detail in the exegetical study of Acts 18.

18:12 The text of S01 agrees with that of D05 against that of B03. The word order of the former is verb-adverb-subject whereas in the latter it is verb-subject-adverb. It is not at all easy to establish the relationship between the texts because other variables intervene with varying manuscript support for each one. In particular, Codex Bezae has two additional subordinate clauses before the main verb (and is the only Greek manuscript to have them, see B-L *ad loc*). To examine the complex picture of the manuscript tradition at this point would be to sidetrack, though it could potentially be a valuable exercise. The verse is discussed in more detail in the exegetical study of Acts 18. It is sufficient to say here that in the Bezan text the position of the

adverb *προθυμῶς* before the subject and next to the verb it qualifies avoids the possible ambiguity of taking the adverb with the following subordinate verb.

II.2 Emphatic κἄι.

In the text common to S01, B03 and D05, when κἄι is emphatic meaning 'indeed' or 'namely' it precedes the element which is being so emphasized (2:26; 5:2; 11:1,18; 13:1,9; 15:32; 17:28). Where such an element is a prepositional phrase, κἄι precedes the preposition (10:45; 19:12). It is further found between a relative pronoun, referring back to a noun about which some further comment is made, and the verb which makes that comment (1:3,11; 10:39; 11:30; 13:22). Elsewhere, it is found in a participial clause which adds a comment to the main verb between the participle and the noun (16:14; 19:19). Similar patterns of word order are found in the additional references:

D05: 3:10(?, = τῶι); 5:36; 8:19; 11:2,23

S01/B03: 5:39; 12:4; 19:25; 22:5

There are two places of variant reading:

15:35; 19:38

15:35 In D05, κἄι is read before, rather than after, the preposition in the phrase *καὶ μετὰ στερῶν πολλῶν*. This phrase is found between the verb *εὐκγγελιζομενκί* and the object *τον λογον*. The variation in the position of κἄι would appear to cause no alteration to the sense.

19:38 In the order of words in S01/B03, κἄι simply conjoins οἱ

σου αὐτῶ τεχνίτη and Demetrius. In the D05 text, on the other hand, the craftsmen who accompany Demetrius are envisaged as independent in a parenthetical phrase οἱ καὶ σου αὐτῶ τεχνεῖτε . Demetrius is further set apart by the addition of οὗτος after his name in the previous line so that the opening lines of v.38 could be translated 'If this Demetrius - or indeed the craftsmen with him - have a complaint...'

Sections II.3 + II.4: In the following sections account needs to be taken of a general principle elucidated by Comrie and known as the 'Principle of Natural Information Flow' (Comrie 1989, 127f). According to this principle, which is considered by Comrie to be universally applicable, there is a natural order taken by constituents dependent on a verb:

1/2 pronoun / 3 pronoun / proper / human / animate / inanimate

A reason for pronouns coming first is that they are inevitably anaphoric and in languages generally sentences tend to present the factors which have already been referred to before introducing new information (Chafe 1976). If the new information is presented first, it may be considered as being highlighted. Following the pronoun, the order of the constituents is determined, according to Comrie's principle, by their degree of animacy, more animate nouns preceding less animate ones.¹⁰

II.3 Direct and indirect objects.

There are four instances of variation in the order of direct and indirect objects after the verb:

7:5,10,23; 13:15

7:5,10,23 The three instances in chapter 7 occur within a speech based on an exposition of Old Testament history. It may be observed that all three examples involve the indirect pronoun $\alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$ (Abraham, Joseph and Moses respectively). As a part of speech, pronouns may have as much to do with the chosen word order as the fact that there is a combination of direct and indirect objects (see Comrie's Principle above). It is not really possible to make further analysis of the reasons for the variation without undertaking a thorough exegetical study of the passages in question. Some comment on v.23 has already been made in #1.4.b,i above.

It is of interest, meanwhile, to note that in v.5 D05 agrees with B03 against S01 and d; in vv.10+23 D05 stands alone against S01, B03 and d. These facts, together with other curious aspects of the variant readings in the Old Testament speeches which are noted in this thesis in passing, are justification for studying the Latin and the Greek texts of the Old Testament speeches in Codex Bezae separately and in detail.

13:15 The text is not clear in Codex Bezae:

$\alpha\upsilon\delta\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota$ $\epsilon\iota$ $\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\upsilon$ $\sigma\omicron\phi\iota\kappa\varsigma$
 $\epsilon\nu$ $\upsilon\mu\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$

$\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\upsilon$ is read by the original and is corrected to $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ by Corrector A (Nestle Eb. 1896). $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ may have been left in the text by mistake if it was intended that $\sigma\omicron\phi\iota\kappa\varsigma$ should replace it. (Delebecque 1986, p.86). The Latin side (and mae, see B-L ad loc) makes sense of the words by putting both 'word' and 'wisdom' in the nominative. According to the Principle of Natural Information Flow, the pronoun $\epsilon\nu$

ὕψιν should normally come before the nouns. The fact that the nouns come first in D05 suggests that the editor wanted to highlight them.

II.4 Subject and indirect object.

There are two instances of variation in the word order of subject and indirect object

10:19; 20:3a

10:19 B03 omits *αὐτῶ* and S01 places it after *τὸ πνεῦμα*. In this case, the tendency for pronouns to come first when there is more than one constituent dependent on the verb conflicts with the same tendency applying to the agent of the verb. Indeed, it is rare for the object to precede the subject of a verb (Levinsohn 1992, p.75). This being so, in this verse it may well be the conflict of tendencies which is reflected in the variant readings rather than any particular attempt to focus on either the Spirit or Peter. The verse may be compared with the Bezan addition at 20:3b: *εἶπεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῶ* where there is an implicit contrast between Paul's wishes which have just been stated and the command of the Spirit.

20:3a The indirect pronoun *αὐτῶ*, again referring to Paul, is read before the object *ἐπιβουλῆς* in D05. That a noun should be placed before the pronoun goes against Comrie's Principle and is an indication that attention is being drawn to it. This is one instance where the hostility of the Jews is not underlined in the Bezan text as it sometimes is (cf. comments on 18:12, ch.10).

III. CONCLUSIONS.

The text of Codex Bezae shows a high degree of consistency in following the rules which can be established by an analysis of readings common to S01, B03 and D05. It tends overall to use a marked word order with more frequency than the Alexandrian text and in most cases reasons can be discerned for the marked order which are often suggestive of an underlying concern with Jewish people and traditions. Indeed, many of the variant readings are directly concerned with people or events or ideas which are distinctly Jewish. There are some further indications of a certain closeness of the Bezan text to the people in the story of the Church in Acts.

These factors tend to point to a speaker who, although thoroughly at ease with the Greek language, was Jewish himself and familiar with the first generation of Christians. In this respect, the conclusions of this chapter confirm the findings of the analysis of the definite article before the names of persons (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992).

NOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

NOTES to Part A.

1. Winer 1882, p. 686, in speaking of the various possible ways of referring to the Spirit of God and the dangers of imposing one particular way on an author.
2. With that in mind, it would be interesting and worthwhile to re-examine the examples of the verb-final sentences in the Gospel of Mark which C.H. Turner adduces as evidence of a Latin influence on Mark's style (1928, pp. 352-6; Elliott 1993, pp. 126-30).
3. For example, the various possible strands of Semitic influence form much of the discussion on the style of Luke-Acts in Turner N. 1976, pp. 45-63.
4. See Barr 1989 for a comprehensive study of the situation. Cf. Hengel 1989; Lifschitz 1965.
5. It is discussed in detail by Parker 1992, pp. 183-93.
6. See the summary given by Friberg 1982, pp. 335-40.

NOTES to Part B.

7. The whole of the group composed of the town and villages was probably one of the toparchies of Judaea: Schürer 1979, pp. 190-6.
8. Schürer argues that Πόλις does not necessarily have this force in Jewish usage in 1 AD (1979, pp. 196-7, cf. p. 114).
9. Dunn 1991, p. 59, overstates the textual difficulty in this verse (20:28) when he speaks of it as one of 'the most difficult textual questions in (Luke-) Acts'.
10. This conclusion is similar to that of Winer 1882, p. 657 + n. 2.
11. On πᾶς and the definite article see Moule 1977, pp. 93-4; Zerwick 1963, #188-90.
12. B-L *ad loc* indicate that the position of πάντες following the noun is 'anormale' by which is meant that it is statistically infrequent.
13. The same order of πᾶς - noun is found in 5:32D05 with the addition of πᾶτων and 21:20D05 with the addition of τοῦτοι.
14. Porter 1983, pp. 8-11; Turner 1963, pp. 189-90 and Winer 1882, p. 192 cite occurrences in the New Testament (none in Acts) of a genitive before the noun where there is no particular cause to underline the first word.
15. This explanation is given by Turner 1963, p. 190 and Winer 1882, p. 239.

16. Porter 1983, pp.8-9, argues that *ἱερόν* is emphatic in which case the variant reading is likely to reflect a conflict between emphasis on the goddess and emphasis on the temple.

17. For a fuller discussion of 'basis' see Levinsohn 1987, pp.61ff.

18. For a more developed presentation of these points, see Levinsohn 1992, pp. 74-8.

CHAPTER FOUR

Connectives.

Part A: PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

For the purposes of this study, a connective is understood to be a means of linking together two sentences where 'sentence' means a clause with a main verb together with any phrases or clauses dependent on it. In New Testament Greek, most connectives are one word (δέ, καί, for example) or two (μέν οὖν). Relative pronouns can be used or there can also be an absence of any connecting word - asyndeton.

The subject of sentence connections in Acts has been studied in depth in a doctoral thesis by Stephen Levinsohn (published as *Textual Connections in Acts*, 1987). (Additional points are made in a later coursebook of 1992.) He examines in turn the different means of linking sentences and defines how each functions in a different way in order to link together separate elements of the narrative. In addition to the words signifying simple differences of meaning roughly similar to differences in English (as, for example, between 'and' and 'therefore'), they are also found to indicate differences at a deeper level of how the sentences fit into the wider narrative beyond the sentence. The connectives are, as it were, the joints and hinges of a text which hold a story together and allow it to articulate not just between sentences but between paragraphs or sections of the narrative.

Levinsohn restricts his analysis to the Greek text as printed by UBS³ and bases his conclusions on that text. There exists a great deal of variation in the choice of connectives throughout the manuscripts of Acts not least between the ones selected for study in

this thesis, S01, B03 and D05. *δέ/τε* and *δέ/καί* are frequently alternatives as demonstrated in #I.4 below. Variant readings are also associated with *οὖν*, *τότε*, *μέν οὖν*, *γάρ*, *ἀλλά*, the relative pronoun and asyndeton. Variation, of course, exists too with the versions and, in view of Levinsohn's conclusions about the Greek connectives expressing ideas beyond straightforward ones of meaning, it must not be assumed too readily that there is, or can be, a strict correspondence between any two languages.¹

Differences in the manuscripts relating to connections between sentences have often been ignored, probably because their importance has not been apparent from the role attributed to them in the Grammars, or treated as evidence of stylistic preference or foreign influence. Without excluding the influence of an author/scribe's habits altogether, the patterns in the use of connectives which are emerging from the studies of discourse analysts provide valuable indications of linguistic reasons for divergence.

It would be a very profitable exercise indeed to examine the reasons behind each instance of variation in all the connectives in the manuscripts under consideration here. It most likely would allow more precise definition to be given to some of the 'rules'. The amount of variation, however, would require a separate thesis to deal with the subject in depth especially as so many of the instances of divergence do not represent isolated variation but are rather part of a wider variation unit and frequently reveal an underlying difference in the way the writer perceives the articulation of the story - how episodes relate to each other, who the main character is at any given time and what is the relative significance of his actions.

What will be undertaken here, therefore, is a detailed analysis of some of the less frequent connectives *τότε*, *οὖν*, *μέν οὖν* and *γάρ*, using Levinsohn's conclusions as a starting point and

refining or modifying them according to the findings contributed by a consideration of the variants. For the more frequent connectives $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$ and $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ a summary will be given of Levinsohn's conclusions so that reference can be made to them in passing. In Section III of the thesis which focuses on individual chapters of Acts in detail, variants involving $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$ and $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ will be examined more closely and it will be possible to comment more specifically on the reasons and justification for the variation.

I. SUMMARY OF THE FUNCTION IN ACTS OF $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$ and $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$.

The following comments apply specifically to Acts. They are generally true of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, too, but should not be taken as necessarily valid for any other writing.

The remarks in this summary are of a very general nature. There are exceptions, attenuations and qualifications all along the line which can be discovered by consulting the specialist works on the subject.² The summary is given in order to provide a broad picture of what is said to be the function of the principal conjunctions used in Acts so that it can be referred to in discussion of other connectives in this chapter and of specific variant readings in the exegetical chapters.

I.1. $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$

Stories do not usually progress by means of single sentences; rather they advance by 'chunks' made up of groups of sentences. Each chunk causes the story to move on and its onset can be recognized by the existence of some new and distinctive information which occurs in the form of a change in the time or setting of the story, a change in

the subject, or a change from or to a parenthetical comment. At such points, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is used.³ If the information in a sentence is seen (by the writer) as contributing to moving the story on, then $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is used. It almost always is found marking the boundary between incidents but it can also occur within incidents when different elements describe the development of an episode. As such, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ reflects something of the author's purpose as he tells his story. It indicates what he considers to be the elements which constitute the next development in his story.

1.2. $\kappa\acute{\kappa}\acute{\iota}$

In contrast, $\kappa\acute{\kappa}\acute{\iota}$ links units which do not constitute a new development. If $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ separates sentences by signalling something new, $\kappa\acute{\kappa}\acute{\iota}$ groups sentences as belonging to the same unit of development. They concern the same topic. To use a comparison imagined by Brown (1982, p.25), $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ ties together the ropes of the narrative with knots whereas $\kappa\acute{\kappa}\acute{\iota}$ joins them by splicing the ropes together. $\kappa\acute{\kappa}\acute{\iota}$ is not found joining paragraphs together but occurs within a paragraph linking contiguous elements one with another. It tends to connect sentences of equal importance.

1.3. $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$

$\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ is similar to $\kappa\acute{\kappa}\acute{\iota}$ rather than to $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$. It also conjoins sentences within the same unit of development rather than across the boundaries of such units. Compared with $\kappa\acute{\kappa}\acute{\iota}$, sometimes the elements $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ connects are of unequal importance; or sometimes, the elements it connects have a very close affinity with each other because they are very similar. It is used to introduce an additional statement about

the event which has just been mentioned or to link similar events with the same basic subject.

The resemblance between $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ is phonological and not grammatical. The characteristic function of $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ in Acts is a useful criterion when evaluating variant readings of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ because $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ will very rarely be appropriate at the same place as $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$.

1.4. Variant readings.

The following figures show the number of instances of variation involving pairs of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}/\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}/\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$ (S01 and B03 are grouped together although there are in fact some differences - see on $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ below):

<u>D05</u>	<u>S01/B03</u>	
$\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$	$\delta\acute{\epsilon}$	25
$\delta\acute{\epsilon}$	$\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$	8
$\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$	$\tau\acute{\epsilon}$	7
$\tau\acute{\epsilon}$	$\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$	0
$\delta\acute{\epsilon}$	$\tau\acute{\epsilon}$	25
$\tau\acute{\epsilon}$	$\delta\acute{\epsilon}$	10

In addition to the large number of $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$ readings in Codex Bezae as an alternative to $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ or $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$, this manuscript displays the frequent peculiarity of inserting $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$ before the main verb after a participial construction (2:1; 3:4; 4:3; 5:21; 7:4; 8:2; 12:16; 13:7, 29; 14:6,14; 16:17; 17:1; 18:4; 20:10; and cf. 10:27; and also 17:13 $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ +verb+ $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$). There are also several instances of $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\iota$ being read in error at the beginning of a line where there is a verb beginning with K (4:15) or which is in the perfect (20:16), or in confusion with $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}$

(4:2; 13:17), or in addition to $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ (21:40). It is tempting in these circumstances to speak of a 'scribal preference' for $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$. Detailed exegesis of the passages in which the variant readings are found would show how far this is true but in the chapters examined in depth in the course of this thesis it has been found that differences between $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ are almost always justifiable from different perceptions of the development of the narrative. In the additional Bezan material (i.e. not in S01 or B03) $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ is very common but its use is in keeping with the nature of the additional comments (for example, a second piece of information of an equivalent status to what has been said already). Other connectives are used as appropriate in the additional material, as the analysis of some of the less frequent connectives demonstrates.

It also can be seen from the above table that $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ occurs with much greater frequency in S01/B03 than in D05. In fact, Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus are often divided in their choice of $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ or $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}/\delta\acute{\epsilon}$. The distribution of $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ where there is disagreement between S01 and B03 is as follows:

<u>$\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$</u>	<u>$\delta\acute{\epsilon}$</u>	<u>$\tau\acute{\epsilon}$</u>	
B03/D05		S01	x1
	B03	S01/D05	x2
	S01/D05	B03	x3
	B03/D05	S01	x2

$\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ has been described (N. Turner 1963, p. 338) as declining in use in Koine Greek but as being revived as an Atticism. This development in the language probably accounts for a proportion of the variant readings of $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ especially as examination of some of the occurrences

of $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ (see on 12:8, ch.9, for example) shows that its use cannot be justified from the context.

Connectives.

Part B: ΤΟΤΕ.

INTRODUCTION

'The use of ΤΟΤΕ to link sentences is not classical', as N. Turner states (1963, p. 341), pointing out that ΤΟΤΕ is, in contrast, used in that way in the New Testament.⁴ The most thorough treatment of ΤΟΤΕ in Acts is that of Levinsohn (1987, pp.151-3; and 1992, pp. 49-54).

The first thing to note from Levinsohn's work is that ΤΟΤΕ can be used either as an adverb or as a conjunction (1992, p.49). In Matthew, both uses are common, whereas in the Gospels of Mark and John it is only used as an adverb; in Luke, it occasionally occurs as a conjunction. Acts presents a different picture again, for in the firm text ΤΟΤΕ is only found as a conjunction; on the two occasions on which it occurs as an adverb in the manuscripts which concern this study, there are variant readings (see #III below).⁵

This study will be limited to the use of ΤΟΤΕ in Acts, where there is a high degree of variation with Codex Bezae reading 28 occurrences of ΤΟΤΕ in the extant chapters to the 15 of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus in the same material. In this study, we shall aim to establish, firstly, to what factors the increased frequency of ΤΟΤΕ in D05 can be attributed, and secondly, how far the variation can be ascribed to the interference of scribes.

I.1 The meaning of $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ as a conjunction.

Levinsohn (1992, p.50) defines two purposes of $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ as a connective or conjunction. The first is to link two units of narrative which belong to the same episode; there is continuity of time and of some other feature such as the same topic or main character, but also some aspect of discontinuity such as a partial change in the people present or in the topic. The second purpose is to introduce a concluding unit of narrative which represents the goal or outcome of the episode. This definition is based on an examination of the occurrence of $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ in Matthew's Gospel. When applied to Acts, Levinsohn concludes that $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ mainly occurs there with its second function of introducing the concluding element of an episode.

The definition is somewhat broader than that given in his *Textual Connections in Acts* (1987) where it was suggested that $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ always meant 'forthwith' or 'thereupon' and always implied change of subject of the main verb. Certainly in Acts, when $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ indicates continuity of time, the second event takes place without any further impediment or deliberation. It is also true in Acts that after $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ there is almost always a change of subject from that of the previous clause. This can often be explained by the fact that when the concluding unit of an episode is introduced by $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ it is equally a response to a previous speech or actions made by another participant, a response which finally ties up or rounds off an episode.⁴

In $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ then, there is the notion of time ('then', in English) and there can also be the notion of response ('and so'). It is very close to the French 'alors' which carries a similar double sense of time and response. As introducing a response, however, $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ always operates within the same story or episode (linking what Levinsohn terms 'low-level narrative units' (1992, p.50), unlike $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$

which can introduce a response which forms a new episode. When looking at examples of TOTE in Acts, there are thus four features to be aware of. The first condition is always true and occurs in the presence of one or more of the others:

- a) the clauses it links are situated within the same episode
- b) the second action takes place 'forthwith'
- c) the second action may be a response
- d) the second action may conclude an episode

I.2. Occurrences of TOTE common to both texts.⁷

There are eleven such examples of TOTE :

1:12; 4:8; 5:26; 6:11; 7:4; 8:17; 10:48b; 13:3; 15:22; 21:26,33

II. TOTE AS A VARIANT READING.

In addition to the eleven common occurrences of TOTE listed above, there are seventeen more in the text of D05 and two more in that of S01/B03.⁸ Of the Bezan supplementary occurrences, some are errors (meaning grammatically incorrect rather than textual alterations) and one is not a conjunction but an adverb (11:26). One supplementary occurrence in S01/B03 is likewise an adverb (17:14). The errors and the adverbs are dealt with after the examination of TOTE as a connective. The genuine occurrences of variant TOTE as a connective are examined in turn, grouped according to the alternative reading which they stand in place of.

II.1 TÓTE in place of ΔΕ.

Levinsohn states (1987, p.150) that 'It (TÓTE) is a frequent variant to ΔΕ in D'. This does not present an entirely accurate picture. Only six out of Codex Bezae's seventeen additional readings of TÓTE are variants to ΔΕ - see 2:37; 5:19; 10:21,48a; 19:15; 22:27, examined in this section - and half of those six arise out of other variation in the text. There are also three other occasions where it is D05 which does not have TÓTE but ΔΕ - see 10:46b; 13:12; 21:13 in this section.

II.1.a Involving no other variation.

2:14; 10:21,48a; 22:27

At these places, there is a straightforward alternative reading of TÓTE or ΔΕ and no other variation.

2:14 The occurrence of TÓTE in Codex Bezae at 2:14 is included in this section because although it is, in fact, read in addition to the ΔΕ of the other text, it is clear that ΔΕ has been left in error and TÓTE is intended to replace ΔΕ. It is found before the sentence as it stands elsewhere in the Greek manuscripts: *σταθεις δε ο τετρος.* TÓTE and ΔΕ are not both possible since ΔΕ should be in second place and, unless TÓTE is a mistake, ΔΕ must be assumed to have been retained in error.

TÓTE here introduces the reply of Peter to the questioning and the taunts of the crowd, a response made without intervening deliberation. A similar formula introduces the speech of Peter at 4:8 (both texts) and also that of Paul at 27:21S01/B03 (lacuna D05). It is interesting to compare the word order in these three examples. 2:14

and 27:21 have *τοτε - σταθεις - ο - πειρος/παυλος*, that is, present participle-article-name. The definite article is used with the name because the person has been established as the central character in the narrative at that point (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, pp.20-1). At 4:8, however, the Jewish authorities address their question to the apostles as a whole and it is Peter who is detached from the group to give an answer - the singling out is marked by the omission of the definite article (*ibid* pp.27-8). The salience of Peter at this point is further indicated by the name being placed immediately after *τοτε* before the participle. It is a general pattern in the Bezan text of Acts that whenever the named person is anarthrous, the proper noun occurs always immediately after *τοτε*, that is before the verb - see 7:4D05; 15:39D05; 18:5D05; 19:21D05; 21:26D05. That is because the name of the person is fore-fronted (brought forward before the verb, see #II.9 in Discourse Analysis, chapter 2) for the purposes of highlighting. S01/B03 do not follow this rule on two occasions when, at 10:46, the anarthrous name is placed after the verb (*τοτε απεκριθη πετρος*) where D05 reads *ειπεν δε ο πετρος*. and, at 21:26, the name is arthrous before the verb (*τοτε ο παυλος παρκλαβαν...*) but anarthrous in D05.*

10:21 S01/B03 reads *δε*, D05 *τοτε*. The sentence describes Peter's response to the Spirit's command. *τοτε* reinforces the notion of response and indicates that Peter obeyed without delay; it is entirely appropriate in the context. It also gives a cohesion to the episode, further strengthened in D05 by the definite article before Peter which has the effect of underscoring the anaphoricity of the reference (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992). The second additional *τοτε* at v.23D05, again with *ο πετρος*, adds yet another element to the overall picture in this episode of Peter's readiness to respond to the new teaching he has just received (cf. 10:23 in #II.4 below).

10:48a $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ in D05 again introduces the response of Peter where S01/B03 have $\delta\epsilon$. Here, Peter responds without further prevarication to his own rhetorical question by commanding the people to be baptized. In the second half of the verse, $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ is read by both texts, introducing a sentence which concludes the episode. In verse 48D05, there are thus two consecutive $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ clauses, a feature which occurs elsewhere in Acts, particularly in the Bezan text (cf. 10:21+23D05; 10:46+48bS01/B03; 22:27+29D05). The second $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ prefaces the invitation given by Cornelius' household to Peter; and it is interesting to observe a number of differences in the sentence as it is worded in the two texts. In Codex Bezae, the unusual nature of the invitation (a feature characterizing other $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ -concluding clauses) is particularly striking: they besought him to stay with them, rather than the more neutral 'they asked him to stay' of the other text. Given the religious background, the invitation is not simply a normal demonstration of hospitality for, under Jewish law, Peter was forbidden from staying in a Gentile's house and also from eating his food. Peter's acceptance is subsequently criticized by the circumcision party (11:3). There is thus good reason for the Bezan text to present the invitation as being given with some insistence.

22:27 provides a final example of a straightforward $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ / $\delta\epsilon$ alternative. It is again the Bezan text which has $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ to introduce the response of the tribune to the centurion's information that Paul was a Roman citizen. $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ is appropriate in view of the tribune's anxiety to verify the information. It further adds cohesion to the episode because of its retrospective nature which indicates the link between what has just happened and the next sentence. Other elements of the same verse in the Bezan text also serve to strengthen the cohesion: - the additional $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ referring back to Paul's comment; the repetition of Paul's words $\sigma\tau\iota$ $\rho\omega\mu\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma$ $\epsilon\kappa\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota$; the 3

person pronoun *αὐτῷ* to specify the tribune; the additional *οὐα* inviting the tribune to re-consider the action which he had ordered (v.24). See below #II.4 on 22:29 for further comments on this passage.

II.1.b In conjunction with other variation

5:19; 10:46b; 13:12; 19:15; 21:13

5:19 There has already been discussion of the variant readings in 5:19 in the chapter on word order (ch.3, #II.1). There it was found that the Bezan text displays a greater interest in the sequence of events in this passage (cf. the additional *εἰσέρχονται τὸ πρῶτον* in v.21). In v.18D05, an additional comment marks the finality of the action of the Jewish authorities in that, once the apostles were securely in prison, they all went back to their homes *επορεύθη εἰς ἕκαστος εἰς τὰ ἴδια*.¹⁰ *Τότε* in the next sentence in Greek (the Latin side has *vero*=*δέ* like the text of most of the other manuscripts) introduces the immediate response of God to counter the evil intention and which thwarts the plan of the authorities without delay. As soon as the Jewish authorities put the apostles in prison and leave them for the night, God intervenes. Epp (1966, p.129-30) sees in the Bezan text a deliberate attempt to show the Jewish authorities in a bad light; it may be more precise to say that the Bezan text stresses the difference between the treatment of the apostles by the Jewish leaders and the providential care of God which denoted his approval of them. God's approval of the apostles was a vital concern as a demonstration of the validity of their new teaching.

10:46b; 21:13 The readings of *Τότε* in the Alexandrian text at 10:46b and 21:13 occur in similar circumstances and with similar wording:

10:46b D05 ΕΙΠΕΝ ΔΕ Ο ΠΕΤΡΟΣ
S01/B03 ΤΟΤΕ ΑΠΕΚΡΙΘΗ ΠΕΤΡΟΣ

21:13 D05 ΕΙΠΕΝ ΔΕ ΠΡΟΣ ΗΜΑΣ Ο ΠΑΥΛΟΣ
S01/B03 ΤΟΤΕ ΑΠΕΚΡΙΘΗ Ο ΠΑΥΛΟΣ

Both sentences introduce a speech which at the same time is a response to what has gone before and also leads the episode to a conclusion. ΤΟΤΕ in those respects is appropriate. Peter's remarks are furthermore of crucial importance and, as was seen when looking at the role of the definite article (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, #II.2.d), it is a feature of S01/B03, but not of D05, to draw attention to key speeches by omitting the definite article before the name of the speaker in such cases.

13:12 This is a third instance of ΤΟΤΕ found in the Alexandrian text but not in the Bezan' text which here reads ΔΕ. In this case, there is a good reason for the absence of ΤΟΤΕ. In the Alexandrian text, the proconsul believed when he saw what happened to Elymas, that is, his faith followed 'forthwith' ΤΟΤΕ. In the Bezan text, when the proconsul saw what happened, he marvelled and believed in God. There is no cause for underlining that the marvelling occurred without delay nor was it in itself a conclusive response and ΔΕ is therefore the appropriate conjunction.

19:15 ΤΟΤΕ in D05 follows directly from supplementary material in the previous verse. As it is told in the short text, the story of the sons of Sceva does not flow easily and contains several incongruities.¹¹ The text in Codex Bezae contains a number of modifications at the beginning of the story and in v.14 specifies a particular incident in which the exorcists attempt to cast out the

evil spirit from a demon-possessed man. When they have given the command, the evil spirit responds with a question followed by violent action. The sentence begins appropriately enough with *ΤΟΤΕ*: the spirit immediately dominates the situation by answering back and attacking the men so that the exorcism attempt comes to a rapid end. Delebecque, writing from a literary criticism point of view rather than a strictly linguistic one, points out the function of *ΤΟΤΕ* to introduce the peak of the episode: 'On a l'impression que l'auteur veut attirer l'attention sur un moment jugé important de l'action' (1982, p.231).

There is, nonetheless, a difficulty with *ΤΟΤΕ* at this point in D05. In the original hand, two main verbs follow without a conjunction which Corrector D (Parker 1992, p.153f) has put right by adding *καί* before the second verb. This then creates a construction which exists nowhere else in Acts after *ΤΟΤΕ*, of main verb-subject-*καί*-main verb. In every other place where there are two verbs following *ΤΟΤΕ*, the first is always a participle (5:26; 7:4; 10:21D05; 10:23D05; 13:3S01/B03, 12S01/B03; 16:22D05; 19:9D05; 21:33; 22:27D05).

II.1.c In an additional clause.

2:37

2:37 S01/B03 links the end of Peter's speech and the reaction of those hearing it with *δε*. D05 has an additional phrase describing the hearers as *ΠΑΝΤΕΣ ΟΙ ΣΥΝΕΛΘΟΝΤΕΣ*, prefaced by *ΤΟΤΕ*. This has the dual effect of underlining a) the immediate response of b) all the crowd, thus insisting on its striking quality. As so often, Codex Bezae thus draws the audience that much closer than the alternative

text to participating in the actual events.

11.2 ΤΟΤΕ in place of ΚΑΙ.

16:22; 18:17

16:22 The Bezan text has ΤΟΤΕ where all the other Greek manuscripts (and almost all the versions - B-L *ad loc*) have ΚΑΙ. There are a number of other differences in the first part of the verse which account for the different conjunctions used.

In the non-Bezan text, when the owners complain about Paul and Silas to the magistrates, a crowd joins in attacking them and the magistrates have the offenders stripped and flogged. The two sets of actions, linked by ΚΑΙ, are presented as separate, not interdependent. The Bezan text firstly heightens the importance of the crowd which sides with the accusers and, secondly, presents the magistrates as responding to the situation as a whole. This effect is achieved by all the variants in v.22 which function as one variation unit:

- the crowd is large ΠΟΛΥΣ
- ΟΧΛΟΣ is placed before the verb in a position of prominence
- the verb is plural, portraying the crowd as many people rather than as a single mass
- the people shout out ΚΡΑΓΟΥΝΤΕΣ
- ΤΟΤΕ introduces the action of the magistrates as a response to both the complaints of the owners and the agitation of the crowd

The crowd is referred to a second time in the Bezan text at the end of the chapter, v.39:

16:39 D05 μηποτε παλιν συν στραφωσιν ηρειν
επικραβοντες καθ υμων

18:17 The text of the Greek side in Codex Bezae is almost erased. The reconstruction which best fits the few letters which remain visible is:

ΤΟΤΕ ΟΥΔΕΝ ΤΟΥΤΩΝ ΤΩ ΥΚΛΙΩΝΙ ΕΝΕΛΕΝ

which is identical to the S01/B03 reading apart from the initial conjunction where καί is read (for detailed discussion of this reconstruction see the exegetical study on this passage, ch.10).

ΤΟΤΕ is not read by any other manuscript although the Latin d has tunc. It introduces the concluding sentence of the episode concerning the accusations of Paul by the Jews. The comment rounds off the episode, and thus clearly emerges as the point to be retained from the telling of the incident. Attention subsequently switches back in v.18 to Paul as forefronted subject. ΤΟΤΕ is appropriate and fulfils the necessary conditions for its presence: it introduces a response which entails a switch of subject from the previous clause and which concludes the episode. καί on the other hand simply conjoins the two sentences and does not comment on Gallio's attitude so much as simply state it.

11.3 ΤΟΤΕ in place of ΤΕ.

15:39

15:39 The Greek side of Codex Bezae is alone here in reading ΤΟΤΕ (B-L ad loc). The Alexandrian text has Barnabas in the accusative with the article, followed by the verb in the infinitive: it thus

begins the sentence $\tau\omicron\nu\ \tau\epsilon\ \beta\alpha\rho\nu\alpha\beta\alpha\nu$, the $\tau\epsilon$ introducing additional information about the event just mentioned as well as providing the lead-in to the next event (Levinsohn 1987, p.127-30). $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ in D05, on the other hand, presents Barnabas' decision to go away with Mark as the concluding event of the episode and as his response to the dispute with Paul. The absence of the article before Barnabas, as before Paul in the next verse, underlines the opposition between the two men. (cf. the omission of the article before the same names vv.37+8; and the discussion on the function of the absence of the definite article to indicate contrast in Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, pp.24-5).

II.4 $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ in place of $\omicron\tilde{\nu}$.

10:23; 22:29;

At both these places, most manuscripts have $\omicron\tilde{\nu}$ whereas Codex Bezae reads $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ with support almost wholly from the versions. The function of $\omicron\tilde{\nu}$ in the narrative sections of Acts is discussed in detail in Part C of this chapter. In summary, as most Grammars would agree, $\omicron\tilde{\nu}$ indicates a consequential relationship between two sentences or, more specifically, 'the second event is the direct result of the first and closely conforms with its demands and expectations' (Levinsohn 1987, p.139). To some extent, there is clearly an overlap with the function of $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ which also signals a retrospective relationship with the previous sentence and introduces a response to it. The difference seems to be that whereas the event introduced by $\omicron\tilde{\nu}$ follows naturally from the previous one, the $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ event is by no means the expected one.

10:23 The text of 10:23 varies not only in the choice of conjunction but in a number of other respects, too:

10:23D05 . ΤΟΤΕ ΕΙΣΚΥΚΩΝ Ο ΠΕΤΡΟΣ ΕΞΕΝΙΣΕΝ ΚΥΤΟΥΣ

10:23S01/B03 ΕΙΣΚΚΛΕΣΑΜΕΝΟΥΣ ΟΥΝ ΚΥΤΟΥΣ ΕΞΕΝΙΣΕΝ

(The Latin side of Codex Bezae reads *tunc ergo*). In the second Greek version, ΟΥΝ suggests that Peter called inside the men sent by Cornelius and put them up because that is what the situation demanded. On the face of it, it might seem the natural thing to do - the men have been sent to fetch him (vv.5-9, lacunae D05) and they are not going to set off until the following day (v.23b). In the context, however, of Peter's previous attitude to Gentiles and in view of the very recent nature of the new teaching he had just received on the status of Gentiles in the eyes of God, his response is not so natural. The Bezan wording indicates that there was something remarkable about Peter's readiness to receive them. He is mentioned by name, although there can be no ambiguity, which has the effect of maintaining Peter as the main centre of attention (see Appendix II Participant Reference); he acts forthwith ΤΟΤΕ ; and he leads the men inside ΕΙΣΚΥΚΩΝ, a verb which elsewhere in Luke indicates a determined strength of purpose (cf. Lk22:54; Ac 21:28). When the text of v.23 is considered in the light of v.21 (cf. #II.1.a above), the variant readings illustrate how the Bezan version builds up a cohesive picture with Peter at the centre, consistently portrayed as responding promptly and boldly.

22:29 In chapter 22, the text of Codex Bezae is unfortunately missing after the first line of v.29 and there is therefore limited evidence to explain the preference for ΤΟΤΕ rather than ΕΥΘΕΩΣ ΟΥΝ. From what has been deduced so far about the meaning of the two conjunctions, it can be said that the former views the withdrawal of Paul's interrogators as an immediate response to the tribune's

conversation with the prisoner whereas the latter sees it as conforming to the demands and implications of the conversation. Levinsohn (1987, p.140) suggests that οὐδὲν is necessary to make explicit the consequential relationship to an audience who were not familiar with the rights of Roman citizens (cf. the additional information provided in S01/B03 on Tarsus, 21:39).

The difference inherent in the connectives is possibly backed up by an underlying difference in the way in which the story is told in the two texts at this point in the narrative. It was observed (#II.[a] above) that there is a greater cohesion to the text of v.26 as it stands in Codex Bezae, with words and references repeated and links between clauses spelt out. A similar texture is found in the Bezan text in the exchange between the tribune and Paul which follows (vv.27-8) where a series of variants combine to make the account less 'matter of fact' and to give more depth to the character of the tribune. In particular, when Paul counters the tribune's claim to have paid for his Roman citizenship with a large sum of money (οὐδὲν τι οὐδὲν in D05) with the statement that he was born a citizen, there is a contrast indicated in the Bezan text by the omission of the definite article before Paul (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, p.25). In the text of S01/B03, there is less of a case for indicating contrast because the tribune has never really been brought into focus. What is more, in the S01/B03 text, Paul has remained very much as the only centre of attention, being mentioned by name during the course of the whole episode an additional twice compared with Codex Bezae (21:37; 22:25).¹² This difference between the two texts may account, in part at least, for the different conjunctions in the next sentence, v.29. In cinematographic terms, the Alexandrian text shows the exchange between Paul and the tribune in a long shot as part of the dealings of the Roman authorities with Paul. The telling of the exchange in that

text brings out the general implications of the political 'faux pas', that is, the immediate withdrawal of those about to examine Paul, introduced by εὐθὺς οὖν. In the Bezan text, the camera zooms in on the tribune as he talks with Paul, displaying more of a personal interest in him. The withdrawal of the interrogators is therefore certainly a response to that conversation but not a natural consequence in so far as the Bezan text does not view the report of the conversation itself as being simply for the purpose of accounting for their action.

11.5. ΤΟΤΕ in a different sentence structure.

19:9b

19:9b At v.9, the Greek page of Codex Bezae has two separate sentences (and appears to stand alone in doing so - see B-L *ad loc*). The first sentence is linked to the previous context by μὲν οὖν which is examined in detail in Part C of this chapter. It is seen there that μὲν is prospective and in this case it looks ahead to Paul's withdrawal from the synagogue in Ephesus following criticism by 'some of them' (presumably Jews from the synagogue). Paul's response is introduced by ΤΟΤΕ.

The other text has the first clause as a subordinate clause of time ὡς δὲ dependent on the main verb ἀφωρισέν. As the discussion of μὲν οὖν brings out, the overall effect of the Bezan text when compared with the Alexandrian text at this point is to heighten the conflict between the Jews and Paul - the latter is mentioned by name at two additional places in vv.8+9 and his moving out of the synagogue is not just 'when' some people criticized the new teaching, it is in response to their speaking ill of it to the Gentiles.

III. ΤΟΤΕ AS AN ADVERB.

11:26; 17:14

11:26 ΤΟΤΕ is found in a passage of D05 which has a different wording compared with the same passage in S01/B03, though the meaning is similar. ΤΟΤΕ follows the conjunction καὶ as an adverb together with another adverb πρῶτον, indicating 'at that time, for the first time'.

17:14 It is the Alexandrian text which reads ΤΟΤΕ as an adverb following εὐθὺς δέ in a sentence which describes the immediate action taken by the brethren to protect Paul when Jews from Thessalonica came to stir up trouble in Beroea. The account of Paul's preaching in Beroea and its consequences is fuller in Codex Bezae and the reaction of the brethren is introduced with μὲν οὖν (Greek side only - the Latin has *statimque*). As the discussion in Part C, #II on μὲν οὖν shows, the sending away of Paul is thus spelt out as being a consequence of the disturbances, more explicitly than it is by εὐθὺς... ΤΟΤΕ; but, μὲν οὖν being also prospective, the sentence looks forward at the same time to a corresponding δέ clause, found here at the end of the verse ὑπεμείνεν δὲ ὁ σείλας, which is a τέ clause in the Alexandrian text. The δέ clause represents a second element which is a consequence of the disturbance in Beroea, that is that Silas and Timothy were left there when Paul went away. The close association between the two consequences is reflected in the choice of ΤΕ in the other text to indicate an additional point being made about the same event (thus Levinsohn 1987, p.128-9).

IV. ERRONEOUS ΤΟΤΕ IN CODEX BEZAE.

7:26, 18:5, 19:21+26

ΤΟΤΕ appears to be written in the manuscript by error, so producing some difficult or nonsense readings.

7:26 ΤΟΤΕ is a confusion of ΤΗ ΤΕ found in all other Greek manuscripts (B-L *ad loc*); although ΤΟΤΕ is possible according to the sense, and is rendered as such by the Latin page, it would create the only instance in Acts of ΤΟΤΕ coupled with another indication of time.

18:5 The Greek text is difficult:

18:5D05 ΠΑΡΕΓΕΝΟΝΤΟ ΔΕ ΑΠΟ ΤΗΣ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΑΣ
ΤΟΤΕ ΣΙΛΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΣ ΣΥΝΕΙΧΕΤΟ ΤΩ ΛΟΓΩ
ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ΔΙΑΜΚΡΤΟΥΡΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ ΤΟΙΣ ΙΟΥΔΑΙΟΙΣ

It is not at all clear how these clauses should fit together. The aorist of *παράγινωμι* is used in the first clause for Silas and Timothy arriving from Macedonia, in place of the subordinate time clause of the other Greek text, and indeed of the Latin side of Codex Bezae. The problem is that the subject is not specified until the next sentence beginning with ΤΟΤΕ. If *συνείχετο* belongs to the ΤΟΤΕ clause, a singular verb is used for a plural subject; the Latin side understands the sense in this way and makes the verb plural to accord with the subject. Alternatively, ΤΟΤΕ is mistaken for ὅ ΤΕ and Silas and Timothy are the named subjects of the first sentence; in this case, *συνείχετο* begins a new sentence of which Paul is the subject, and a connective such as *καί* has been accidentally omitted.¹³ From a discourse point of view, it is difficult to justify

τότε: there is no need to indicate continuity of time between the two clauses, nor is there any element of discontinuity usually implied by τότε. It does not introduce a concluding unit of the episode or indicate a response of anyone.

19:21 Following the incident with the Jewish exorcists and the subsequent renunciation by many new converts of their previous occult practices, Paul decides to make his way back to Jerusalem. Here, the Alexandrian text (shared by all the other manuscripts except Codex Bezae - B-L ad loc) begins the new section with a subordinate time clause ως δε followed by the main verb εθετο of which Paul is the subject. The previous sentence is also worded differently:

19:20-1005 ΟΥΤΟΣ ΚΑΤΑ ΚΡΑΤΟΣ ΕΝΙΣΧΥΣΕΝ
ΚΑΙ Η ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΗΥΞΑΝΕ ΚΑΙ ΕΠΛΗΘΥΝΕ
ΤΟΤΕ ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ΕΘΕΤΟ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ

19:20-1501/803 ΟΥΤΩΣ ΚΑΤΑ ΚΡΑΤΟΣ
ΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ Ο ΛΟΓΟΣ ΕΥΞΑΝΕΝ ΚΑΙ ΙΣΧΥΕΝ
ΩΣ ΔΕ ΕΠΛΗΡΩΘΗ ΤΑΥΤΑ
ΕΘΕΤΟ Ο ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ

v.20 in both texts represents a statement summarizing the growth of the Church in Ephesus. Codex Bezae has a modified and expanded version, using a verb ἐνισχύω only found in Luke's writings in the New Testament (Lk 22:43, Ac 9:19; see Delebecque 1982, pp.231-2) and repeating a phrase found in another summary statement in Acts 12:24; it also has an unusual instance of asyndeton before the final pair of verbs: ηυξανε και πληθυνε.¹⁴

In the next verse, the Bezan text omits the subordinate clause in v.21 and introduces Paul's decision with τότε, placing the named

subject before the verb without the definite article. ΤΟΤΕ may appear simply to introduce the next stage in Paul's journey, but there are two problems:

1) ΤΟΤΕ elsewhere always connects elements of the same episode. The next stage of Paul's journey could conceivably be thought of as essentially part of the same episode except that there has been a very clear summary statement bringing the episode at Ephesus to a close, albeit a temporary one. The modifications in the Bezan text only reinforce the nature of the statement in v.20 as being a narrator's summarizing comment on the progress of the gospel. In terms of the narrative of Acts, an episode indisputably ends at v.20, as indeed the Alexandrian text indicates with *ως δε επληρωθη ταυτα*, even though the next episode proper does not begin until v.23, the intervening verses representing an explanation of Paul's intentions for the future.

2) In the Bezan text, Paul is commonly anarthrous at the start of a new episode, even when the other text highlights his presence with the omission of the article (cf. 19:1 for example). Here, however, the article is omitted.

ΤΟΤΕ and the absence of the article look suspiciously like an error. It is worth noticing that in the original hand of the manuscript -ΤΟ has been omitted from the end of the previous line which might have had an effect on the creation of ΤΟΤΕ. Is there evidence here of a tired or distracted scribe, as there would seem to be later in the verse in *ιεροσολυσολυμικsic*? Should v.21 perhaps begin *ο τε παυλος*, which would be appropriate both as to the article and as to the connective? The questions remain as questions in the absence of any other evidence but are necessary in view of the odd use of ΤΟΤΕ in this instance.

19:26 ΤΟΤΕ is not used as a conjunction. Metzger (1975, p.472)

suggests that $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ has been mistaken for $\pi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$, on the basis of the reading of Old Latin *g nescio que*.

V. CONCLUSIONS.

Where $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ occurs as a variant in either the Alexandrian text or the Bezan text, it usually has its *raison d'être*. In most cases, it fulfils the conditions which have been deduced from previous examination of $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ in Acts, of introducing a sentence which is part of the same episode as the previous sentence and which takes place either next in time or as a response to what has happened before or in concluding an episode. Sometimes $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ occurs because one text brings out that particular relationship whereas the other text does not, or brings out a different relationship. At other times, $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ occurs in the presence of other variation which excludes its use in the other text. Its more frequent use in Codex Bezae tends to make of this text a writing which is more cohesive and more concerned with the way events are linked together; it does not acquire this function in isolation but rather in conjunction with other cohesive devices.

There are some instances of $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ being written in error in Codex Bezae, most of them being obvious slips producing nonsensical readings. There is one which results in a sentence which makes superficial sense but which is difficult from a deep-level grammar point of view, that is in terms of what has been defined as the underlying function of $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$.

Overall, neither the use or non-use of $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ can be satisfactorily ascribed to the whim or personal style of a scribe or editor.¹⁵ In view of its function at a discourse level, it can be seen rather to communicate a way of perceiving how the story fits together.

The examination of ΤΟΤΕ in Codex Bezae provides further indications which suggest that the editor of that text was familiar with Jewish preoccupations, and that he brings the audience closer to the events and people of the narrative than does the S01/803 text.

Connectives.

Part C: οὖν, μὲν and μὲν οὖν.

There is a sufficient number of variant readings involving these three particles to warrant a close examination of their occurrence in the manuscripts with which this present study is concerned (S01, B03 and D05). Sometimes, they occur in an additional phrase which is not read by all three manuscripts. At other times, an alternative structure or conjunction (principally δέ or τότε) is found in one or two of the three manuscripts. When attention is paid to the circumstances of their presence or absence, interesting observations can be made. A general feature is that where variation occurs it is due to differences in the surrounding text (re-wording or additional material) rather than a straightforward choice of an alternative particle. Hence it would be misleading to conclude that the frequency with which a particle occurs in one or the other manuscript is due to the personal preference of a scribe or author. In reality it is more likely to be due to a different way of telling the story.

I. οὖν

οὖν is read eleven times by Codex Bezae but not the other two manuscripts:

2:32,37; 4:17; 5:39; 6:3; 7:12; 13:23,39; 16:10; 20:4,26

It is not read four times by Codex Bezae when Codex Sinaiticus and/or Codex Vaticanus do read it:

10:23; 10:33; 16:11B03; 22:29

The number of additional occurrences of οὕτω in the Bezan text is striking in view of the relatively few occurrences in the text of Acts generally. Most of them, however, are found in direct speech rather than in the narrative sections of the book and the two which arise within the narrative (16:10; 20:4) belong to 'we' sections. This is also true of οὕτω at 10:33 S01/B03, and at 16:11B03 which the Bezan text substitutes with the 16:10 occurrence. The references at 10:23 and 22:29 are situated at the juncture of speech and narrative as the story is taken up after speech is reported; οὕτω is replaced in the Bezan text by τότε , in the midst of other variants. These two verses have been examined in the section on τότε (Part B, #II.4) where discussion of οὕτω in the alternative text can be found.

The function of οὕτω has been described as being much the same in reported speech and in narrative (Levinsohn 1987, pp.137-41; cf. Winer 1882, p.555). In reported speech, it serves 'to introduce a new assertion or exhortation which is to be inferred from the last premise' (Levinsohn, p. 137). In narrative, 'the second event is the direct result of the first, and closely conforms with its demands and implications' (Levinsohn, p. 139). It is always retrospective and in order to understand the clause it introduces reference must be made to what has just gone before. Although English translations often render οὕτω by 'therefore', it does not always convey the idea of 'consequence' as such (Winer, p. 555, n.4); it can mean simply 'in accordance with' rather than 'as a consequence'. This is noticed in

particular in the course of a reasoned argument where $\text{ο}\tilde{\text{υ}}\text{ν}$ expresses a logical relationship; it can either lead on to the next point inferred from the argument so far or, as an exhortation builds on the argument, it can present a consequence. These definitions need to be borne in mind as the references are examined in turn.

The Latin side of Codex Bezae reads *ergo* for $\text{ο}\tilde{\text{υ}}\text{ν}$ at each additional occurrence except 7:12; 13:23,39; 20:4,26. Comment is made on the exceptions below but closer study of the Latin text would be necessary for a fuller understanding of the reasons lying behind the differences between the two sides of the Bezan text.¹⁴

2:32 It was suggested in the analysis of the definite article (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, p.30) that $\text{ο}\text{υ}\text{ν}$ here could be an error, the alternative reading $\text{τ}\text{ο}\text{υ}$ having the same number of letters of which two are the same. On the other hand, $\text{ο}\text{υ}\text{ν}$ has its place in the development of Peter's demonstration of how the prophecies made by David were fulfilled through the resurrection of Jesus by God. It is already found as a similar aid to the unfolding of the argument at v.30. It is also used in the same way in the course of Paul's preaching in chapter 13 (on two occasions, only by the Bezan (Greek) text): vv.23D05,38,39D05.¹⁷ This does not provide proof that $\text{ο}\text{υ}\text{ν}$ at 2:32 is the original reading, only that it is not necessary to view it as an error.

2:37 The consequential nature of $\text{ο}\tilde{\text{υ}}\text{ν}$ is apparent in the way Codex Bezae uses it to introduce the reaction of Peter's audience to his preaching: in view of what Peter has explained - $\text{ο}\text{υ}\text{ν}$, what shall they do? If the vowel difference in the verb - 'ο'D05,'ω'S01/B03- is more than a phonetic confusion without grammatical significance, then Codex Bezae has a future indicative as opposed to an aorist subjunctive (as in the same expression at 4:16 and cf. 4:17). Together with $\text{ο}\text{υ}\text{ν}$, the

indicative confers on the question a deliberateness and an urgency which are reflected in the Bezan addition in the next line, *ὑποδείξατε μὲν*. The reaction is not just 'what might we do?' but 'what shall we do in view of what you have said? Show us'.

4:17 *οὐκ* is found in the Bezan version of the deliberations of the Sanhedrin over the action to be taken concerning Peter and John. The reaction of the council to Peter's explanation of the healing of the lame man begins at v.13 and goes through to the end of v.22. The first part of the passage especially, vv.13-19, has been handed down in a multiplicity of texts, with major divergences not only among many of the Greek witnesses apart from D05 and S01/B03 but also between the Greek text of Codex Bezae and its Latin side (d), and between both Bezan texts and the Old Latin h (B-L *ad loc* and Epp 1966, pp. 121-8). Many of the differences relate to the way the story is told and even involve the ordering of events. As far as D05 and S01/B03 are concerned, there are variant readings affecting the connectives at v.13/line 4, v.15/line 1, v.17/lines 1+2 and v.18/line 1. It is unusual for so much structural reworking to be apparent between these two texts in Acts; it is an indication, along with the general complexity of the textual picture of this passage, that at some point in the history of its transmission it has posed some important problems. It looks as if somebody somewhere has had a particular interest in just what went on in the Sanhedrin when Peter and John were questioned. In the following chapter, a similar interest in the Sanhedrin proceedings emerges in the Bezan text (see below 5:39).

With respect to the passage in Codex Bezae, a troubled history is suggested by a string of grammatical and orthographical errors which exist alongside some very interesting readings.¹⁰ As for the report of the Sanhedrin's discussion concerning the miracle accomplished by Peter and John, the Bezan version reflects stronger

feeling and a more decisive tone than that conveyed by the speech in the S01/B03 text. This is in part due to the comparative φανεροτερον εστιν. It is also created by the modifications to the beginning of v.17 where ουν is read. Where the S01/B03 text begins a new sentence with αλλα before the purpose clause to read: 'but so that it spreads no further among the people let us warn them not to speak...', D05 makes several modifications. It omits αλλα and adds τι; the future indicative is then used instead of the subjunctive (cf. comments on this at 2:37 above); ουν is added; αυτοις becomes ουτοις.

Two interpretations of the resultant sentences are possible. If ιν α μη goes with the clause which follows, the text reads: 'So that nothing spreads any further among the people, we shall therefore warn these men not to speak...', with an absence of connecting word at the beginning. Alternatively, ιν α μη could go with the preceding clause ¹⁹ to produce the translation 'And we cannot deny it lest it spread further among the people. We shall therefore warn these men not to speak...'. Either way, the decision taken by the Sanhedrin is clear and definite. The firmness of the decision is restated in an additional comment at the beginning of v.18D05 'When they had agreed to this decision...'.
 19

5:39 ουν is found in the second of two additional lines in the Bezan version of Gamaliel's warning to the Sanhedrin. The first expands on the previous line; the second reinforces the Bezan text of v.38. There is an insistence in that verse in Codex Bezae on keeping well clear of the apostles for fear of being defiled (εαδατε for αφετε; +μη μιαναντες τας χειρας). This is echoed in the additional exhortation in v. 39 to 'keep away from these men' using the verb απεχεσθαι which is the verb used in legal requirements for abstaining from certain things (cf. Ac 15:20). ουν looks back on the reasoning of Gamaliel's speech which precedes and presents it as the

basis for the exhortation. Nothing new as such is added in the Bezan version by the supplementary two lines but they are contributing elements to the overall effect of a more carefully constructed and rounded argument than in the S01/B03 text.

This glance at the variant readings which occur in the description of the two occasions (4:13-21; 5:33-40) on which the Sanhedrin is reported as discussing the apostles and their actions has revealed that the D05 text presents a more developed and cohesive account of the speeches. This is a characteristic of the Bezan text of other speeches and one which is brought about by other connectives examined in this chapter. The explanation that a later scribe has thought it desirable to neaten, fill out and embellish the original report ²⁰ does not account for the many peculiarly Jewish concerns which the modifications reflect.

6:3 As the twelve apostles propose arrangements to ensure fair treatment of the Hellenist widows, a reported speech is once more given in a slightly fuller and less summarized form in D05 than in S01/B03. Corresponding attention is drawn to the speech in the Bezan text by the additional οὗτος after ο λόγος v.5. οὖν is found in the amplification of v.3 as part of a question which spells out the reasoning of the apostles: they do not want to abandon preaching for table service, τί οὖν ἐστὶν ἀδελφοί. οὖν here serves the purpose of indicating what follows from the argument so far. There is further amplification and word order change in the answer given to the question which is discussed in the chapter on word order (ch.3 B, #1.5.a).²¹

7:12 οὖν occurs in the Greek text only of Codex Bezae, in the course of Stephen's speech which relates the history of Israel from a very particular point of view.²² The period concerning Joseph in Egypt

is given detailed attention from vv.6-16 and it is within that episode that οὐν occurs, to introduce Jacob's response to hearing that there was corn in Egypt at the time of a general famine. It specifies the close relationship between the lack of food in Canaan and the sending of Jacob's sons to Egypt - one leads to the other. The relationship of consequence may be obvious enough with δε as the connecting particle as in all other manuscripts except the Old Latin g; what οὐν does is to keep the interest on how Jacob comes to be in Egypt rather than causing attention to be switched to Jacob as a character in his own right.

There has previously been a long series of καί sentences beginning at v.6 when God is reported as speaking to Abraham about his descendants being slaves in a foreign country (Egypt); v.11 introduces with δε (no variant) what is in effect an aside presenting information about the famine by which the patriarchs in Canaan were affected. V.12 then moves back to Egypt. Jacob's dealings with Egypt can be seen as representing a new development (δε) in the story, or as an integral part of the longer section vv.6-16 which is unified by its focus on Egypt (οὐν).

Levinsohn notes a similar use of ὅτι in the Gospel of John (1992, p.44) when there is 'a return to the storyline following a parenthetical comment'. It has not been found as a function of ὅτι elsewhere in Acts. The similarity between this use in John and in the Bezan text of Stephen's speech is worth noting for further study.

It would indeed be a worthwhile task to examine in detail all the differences of the Bezan text of Stephen's speech in Acts 7, some of them subtle and apparently slight but which alter the perspective of the speaker (Stephen). That is outside the scope of the present work but what can be noticed from a rapid comparison of the text of the section referring to Egypt in D05 and S01/B03 is that there are

variant readings concerning Egypt itself at v.11, v.12 and v.15.²³ Underlying these differences there seems to be in Codex Bezae, for some reason, a special interest in Egypt and this is indicated by οὐ itself in v.12. The theme of the narrative in this section is Abraham's descendants in Egypt and the main concern at vv.11+12 is to get Jacob and his sons into that setting. The way in which the Bezan text achieves this is to follow the background comment on the famine (v.11) by a specific presentation of Jacob's resulting action as it relates to Egypt.

10:33 $\nu\nu\delta\omega$ of D05 ('i'omitted; d = ergo) is found elsewhere in the text common to S01, B03 and D05 at 13:11; 20:22,25. $\delta\omega$ is read in D05 at 2:2 (not d); 3:2 and 13:47 in addition to numerous occurrences in all three manuscripts.

$\omega\nu$ in S01/B03 produces two consecutive occurrences of the particle (cf.v.33a). $\delta\omega$ on the other hand adds a note reminiscent of Old Testament stories (e.g. the call of Samuel in I Kg 3:4) which underlines the readiness of Cornelius and his household to hear Peter.

13:23 Both this reference and the following one occur in Paul's preaching to the congregation in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia. They help the development of the argument in clarifying the relationship between points which Paul makes. In this way, their function is similar to that which it was observed as having in Peter's speech at 2:32 (see above).

At v.23, $\omega\nu$ shows how the words spoken to David v.22 were accomplished by God in Jesus. $\omega\nu$, in fact, works in combination with the other variants (only partially shared by the Latin side d) in this verse the effect of which, when compared with the word order and choice of words in the S01/B03 text, make prominent the actions of God:

13:23D05 ο θεος ουν απο του σπερματος αυτου

S01/B03 τουτου ο θεος απο του σπερματος

D05 κατ επικγγελειαν

S01/B03 κατ επαγγελιαν

D05 ηγειρεν τω ισραηλ σωτηρα τον ιησουν

S01/B03 ηγειρεν τω ισραηλ σωτηρα ιησουν

Codex Bezae has God, rather than David (τουτου) in first position, indicating a focus on God as subject; ουν in the Greek Bezan text then replaces the link provided by the relative pronoun by the other Greek text; the verb is the verb of resurrecting instead of simply leading, evoking God's act in raising Jesus from the dead; Jesus is referred to with the definite article, showing that it is not so much Jesus who is salient (as being the so far un-named fulfilment of the promise made to David) as the actions of God.

The number and the nature of the variations which exist on this verse among the witnesses (B-L *ad loc*) suggest that the text of neither D05 nor S01/B03 represents the original wording. But the theological preoccupation in the Bezan text, of demonstrating how God has acted in fulfilment of prophecies made to Israel's king, David, is consistent with a wish to insist to a Jewish audience that Jesus is part of God's plan for Israel as it was conceived from the early days of the nation's history.

13:39 At v.39, Paul continues to present arguments to show how Jesus fits into the plan of God for Israel by being the one foreshadowed by David. On those grounds, ουν v.38, forgiveness of sins is announced through him. The S01/B03 text continues: 'and from all things from which you could not be freed by the law of Moses, by

this man every one that believes is freed'. The verb $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\theta\eta\upsilon\mu\iota$, translated here as 'to be freed', is used with $\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron$ and an indirect object to mean 'to be freed from something'. The verb can also be used in an absolute sense with the meaning of 'to be justified' or 'vindicated' (A-G). The double meaning is apparent in the Bezan text which contains several modifications. Firstly, by the addition of the word $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\upsilon\omicron\iota\kappa$ after $\kappa\alpha\iota$ at the beginning of v.39 the text of D05 alters the sentence structure in this verse so that the first sentence continues from the previous verse: '(forgiveness of sins is announced) and repentance from all things from which you could not be freed by the law of Moses'. It is the forgiveness of sins and repentance announced through Jesus which constitute a freedom from all the things from which the law of Moses could not offer freedom. That in turn leads to 'justification' before God: $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\ \omicron\upsilon\upsilon\tau\ \pi\alpha\varsigma\ \omicron\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. There are exegetical issues involved in this version to do with the force of the preposition $\epsilon\upsilon$ with Jesus which cannot be tackled here, but the function of $\omicron\upsilon\upsilon$ is nevertheless clear: it presents the next step in the argument which follows on from what has previously been claimed.

As in 13:23, there is once more in the Bezan text of this verse a more apparent concern with the purpose of God as part of the preaching about Jesus. The Bezan editor seems to be anxious to demonstrate that the God of Israel, known to Jews through the revelation of the Old Testament and his intervention in the history of Israel, is the same God of the new teaching about the Messiah, Jesus. If this continuity can be convincingly communicated, then the new teaching can be accepted by Jews. The careful and generally subtle nature of the various modifications in the Bezan text of Paul's speech in ch.13 which have been studied here suggests an editor who is not only sensitive to the Jewish viewpoint but who is moreover

sufficiently familiar with it to be able to render an exposition of Christianity favourable to a Jewish audience by contributing slight alterations to the presentation. This is hardly the work of a late, over-zealous scribe who felt it was his job to help his readers understand more easily the flow of Paul's arguments.

16:10 $\omega\upsilon\tilde{\nu}$ occurs here in Codex Bezae in the account of what happened after Paul had seen the vision of the man from Macedonia pleading for help. The version in D05 is expanded compared with that of S01/B03 in such a way that by the use of $\omega\tilde{\nu}$ and additional detail it spells out how the vision led Paul and his company to leave Troas for Macedonia. It involves Paul's company more closely in the weighing up of the significance of the vision; this is interesting because it is at this point that (in both texts) the author begins to speak in the first person. So although the passage is narrative rather than speech, $\omega\upsilon\tilde{\nu}$ occurs at the point at which the narrator comes into the story as one of the participants. B03 has $\omega\upsilon\tilde{\nu}$ in v.11 to indicate the action taken to realise the decision to go to Macedonia.

20:4 The texts of S01/B03 and D05 at the beginning of $\text{Ac } 20$ contain a high number of divergences with the result that Codex Bezae not only has an amplified version but in effect a different account of the happenings. Paul is somewhere in Greece when there is an uprising by the Jews. The story, according to most manuscripts but not D05 and SyrH^m (B-L *ad loc*), is that the uprising occurred just as Paul was about to set sail for Syria and that the trouble prompted him to go back through Macedonia (from where he had come three months previously, 20:1-3) instead. It is not clear why this particular, indirect route was preferable. The logic of the version of the Bezan text is easier to follow. There, it was the Jewish plot which made Paul want to set sail for Syria (cf. 17:4) but the Spirit told him to return via Macedonia. As Paul was going to set out in accordance with

this instruction, οὐ (not d), there were some men who were to accompany him as far as Asia and others who went ahead to wait for him in Troas.²⁴ It is interesting to note that in the Bezan Greek text οὐτοὺς replaces ἡμᾶς in the first line of v.5; any consideration of what the significance of this change of pronoun might be needs to be held in balance with the additional 'we' material of the Bezan text elsewhere (11:27).

20:26 D05 reads οὐ instead of διότι with a change of sentence structure. S01/B03 have Paul testifying on this day, on account of (διότι) his proclaiming the kingdom, that he is innocent of the blood of all. D05 (supported by Ephraem, see B-L *ad loc*) begins a new sentence v.26 and has Paul simply stating that until this day he is innocent of the blood of all; οὐ which links the sentence back to what he has claimed about proclaiming the kingdom (of Jesus D05) shows the consequential relationship, perhaps in a way less precise than διότι. The Bezan Latin side has a mixture of both texts, reading 'propter quod' for οὐ and then continuing like the Greek Bezan text.

Conclusions

The additional readings of οὐ in Codex Bezae exist to indicate inferences and connections with what has been said previously. οὐ is never read as a simple addition but occurs as part of a wider variation unit which may span several lines. The indications are, from an examination of the occurrences, that these larger units arise from a wish to make a specific point more clearly, often apparently with the intention of making things more acceptable to a Jewish audience.

Several of the variant readings with οὐ occur in speeches on

the Old Testament. Their occurrence shows up reasons for studying these speeches in more detail especially as the divergences may well enable the particular type of Judaism or Jewish background which is behind the Bezan text to be identified.

II. μέν

If οὖν looks back to the previous clause, μέν on the contrary has a prospective function and anticipates a second contrastive clause, often beginning with δέ; the anticipated contrast may, however, be implied rather than actually stated. When it looks ahead to a second sentence, the μέν clause is downgraded compared with the δέ one. These rules which are deduced from an analysis of the New Testament generally ²⁵ are borne out by a study of those places in the Bezan text of Acts where that of S01/B03 differs. μέν is read by only one or two of the manuscripts in question at the following places:

3:13S01/B03, 3:17D05;

13:29D05, 13:36S01/B03;

19:15S01Corr/B03

3:13 μέν, of not only S01/B03 but of most manuscripts, indicates that a contrast with υμεις παρεδωκετε is anticipated. Since μέν is prospective, the contrast cannot be with the action of God which precedes the μέν clause, but it is to follow. There is no contrastive δέ clause corresponding to the μέν clause since the next δε v.14 continues to speak of the hostility of υμεις against Jesus just as in v.13. There is a contrast, however, within the μέν clause itself

which is found in the action of Pilate: 'you handed Jesus over and denied him before Pilate, Pilate having decided to release him'. The implication of the aorist participle is that the denying went on even after Pilate's decision to let Jesus go. The sentence in both texts, but especially that of S01/B03, is very condensed. D05 text opens it out somewhat and, having introduced *εἰς κρίσιν*, modifies the meaning of *κρίναυτος* from 'decided' to 'judged'. The contrast between the intention of the Jews and Pilate's inclinations is then not simultaneous and *μέν* is not used: 'you handed over Jesus for judgement and you denied him before Pilate, Pilate who, having judged, was wanting to release him'. (*ἤθελεις* in the first line of this sentence in Codex Bezae (Greek text) is apparently not intended since the verb is in the second person; its presence is probably due to the similarity of vowel sounds 'ῆ' and 'υ'. Cf. the reverse error in v.15).

3:17 Here, the Bezan text introduces a clear contrast between the action of the Jews and the intentions of God. The contrast is presented by the use of the emphatic pronoun *ὑμεῖς* followed by *μέν* and is further intensified by the description of the Jews' action as *πονηρον*. God, on the other side of the contrast, is forefronted as the subject of the *δέ* clause: whereas the Jews, in ignorance, did a wicked thing, God used their evil deed to fulfil a prophecy which he had communicated many times in the past. In the exegetical study of Acts 3:12-26 (Heimerdinger 1988), it was pointed out that 'in ignorance' is not an excuse for sin, in Jewish theological understanding, but an explanation for how it occurred. There is no question, not even in the non-Bezan text, of God repairing, or overlooking, the damage because it was done in ignorance. Epp's contention (1966, p.48ff) that the Bezan text displays a harshness towards the Jews in cancelling out the excuse and in underlining the contrast between their evil deed and the goodness of God, misses the

point. The effect of bringing out the contrast is to underline the triumph of the plan of God in the end. This is in keeping with the emphasis on the presence and work of the God with whom the Jews were familiar, an emphasis which exists for their benefit and one which has been noted in this study as being enhanced in Codex Bezae in a number of places elsewhere (cf. 13:23+39, #I above).

13:29 *μεν* is found in additional material in the Bezan text, material which exists in differing forms in other manuscripts (B-L ad loc). D05 (and not d) is alone in reading *μεν*; it is also alone in expressing a twofold request to Pilate, the first part of which is presented with *μεν* and the second implied by *παλιν*:

ηΓΟΥΝΤΟ ΤΟΝ ΠΕΙΛΑΚΤΟΝ ΤΟΥΤΟΝ *μεν* ΣΤΑΥΡΩΘΑΙ
ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙΤΥΧΟΝΤΕΣ *παλιν*
ΚΑΙ...

The contrast is difficult to determine, there being no corresponding *δέ* clause and no exactly equivalent text in any other manuscript. Several suggestions can be made.

It is first of all possible, as Clark believes (1933, p.356), that a *δέ* clause referring to the release of Barabbas has been omitted. This would account for the use of *τούτου* to refer to Jesus, the demonstrative signalling a contrast with Barabbas. As this involves supplying a conjectural reading, however, it should only be accepted if there is no convincing alternative.²⁶ Such a reading would not support the view that the *μεν* clause is less important than the subsequent *δέ* clause since the information that Jesus was crucified is the main point of interest here.

It is more likely that a contrast is being made between the two requests: first, for Jesus to be crucified and then for his body to be taken down from the cross. *καί* is not the usual connective to introduce the contrasting clause but it does happen elsewhere in Luke (A-G *μέν*2d).²⁷ On this understanding, the opposition is between the cruelty of having Jesus killed and the more humane act of obtaining his body in order to lay it to rest. The opposition is, in fact, present in the other text (S01/B03) though it is relatively discreet: there, the Jews have Jesus killed and then, once they have completed the fulfilment of the Scriptures concerning him, they proceed to remove the body from the cross. The fulfilment in the (Greek) Bezan text is still continuing (*ετελουν* not *ετελεσαν*) at least at the point at which the crucifixion is asked for. In that version, all the actions of the Jews are reported as taking place following authorization from Pilate but there seems to be some irony in the insistence that the proper procedures were respected. That may well have been the case but only as a means of obtaining what the Jews wanted.

A third possibility is that the contrast intended is the raising of Jesus by God, referred to in the following verse. With the non-Bezan text of v.30, this would be plausible since the wording *ο δε θεος ηγειρεν αυτον* provides a *δε* clause to correspond to the previous *μεν*. Since, however, the Greek Bezan text specifically rewords this verse to read *ον ο θεος ηγειρεν*, it is less likely that this is the contrast anticipated by v.29. Unless, therefore, *μεν* represents an earlier stage of the text before v.30 was rewritten which, following modification to v.30, was accidentally left unaltered, then the second suggestion above as to the contrast intended by *μεν* in v.29 is preferable.

13:36 Still in the context of Paul's speech, the text of most manuscripts including S01/B03 sets David who died in contrast to Jesus, 'the one whom God raised'. There is no doubt that the contrast also exists in the Bezan text since it is the very point which Paul is making, but the force of the contrast is lessened by a consistent heightened presence of the person of Jesus throughout Paul's speech. This has already been noticed in the discussion of the additional occurrence of *οὗτος* at v.39 where it was observed that Jesus is presented more as a known character than as one about whom new teaching has to be given. He is a known character and at the same time one about whom the facts are spelled out in order for their significance to be grasped, not in order to impart unfamiliar information. This presentation of Jesus can be seen in the Bezan text in other ways, too:

- v.23 + *τοῦ* before the name of Jesus (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, pp.22-3)
- vv.28-9 extra information given about the trial and death of Jesus
- vv.29,30+38 the demonstrative pronoun to refer to Jesus
- v.31 the addition of *αὐτοῦ*, suggesting that the author and the recipients of this text of Acts were familiar with the circle of people which included both the apostles and Paul within it. That indicates a time close to the time of Jesus.
- v.32 full title with the name of Jesus. Though this may not mean a date close to the time of Jesus, it does mean that he is referred to here as 'given' rather than 'new' information.
- v.33 quotation from the Psalm extended to bring out its application to Jesus.

Concurrently, the importance of the role of David is downplayed in the Bezan version of Paul's speech (unlike in Peter's speech in Acts 2 where, vv.29-30, the role of David is carefully explained, cf. #1 on 2:32). This has been seen at 13:23 in examining the function of οὗ (#1). There, αὐτοῦ is read for τούτου and does not stand in first position; and οὗ leads on from prophecies given about David to focus on their outcome in Jesus. In the Bezan text, that focus remains on Jesus for the rest of the speech, on Jesus as the means whereby God has been seen to act for his people.

19:15 Codex Vaticanus, and a correction to Codex Sinaiticus, have *μεν* before Jesus, underlining the contrast which the evil spirit makes between Jesus (and Paul) and the Jewish exorcists *μεν δε*. It is a natural enough contrast to underline since the opposition is clearly intended but one which only some manuscripts apparently feel the necessity to reinforce.

Conclusions.

The variation in the presence or absence of *μεν* in the manuscripts studied here can be accounted for by the context. The variation on the whole reveals differences of emphasis and preoccupation rather than a scribal preference or custom.

The Bezan text in particular appears to be constructed from a Jewish-Christian vantage point at a time when it was relevant and appropriate to demonstrate that Jesus was a fulfilment, and not an abrogation, of Judaism.

III. *μὲν οὖν*

μὲν οὖν incorporates in a way some of the separate functions of both *μὲν* and *οὖν* in looking back to the previous event and forward to the next *δέ* clause (Levinsohn 1987, pp.138-50; 1992, pp.167-8). Just as *οὖν* indicates a close consequential relationship between the clause it introduces and the previous one, so *μὲν οὖν* also signals something which is in accordance with what has gone before or, in a weaker sense, which is not in contradiction with it. *μὲν οὖν* in fact signals that there are two things which follow from what has gone before, the second being found in the subsequent *δέ* clause which presents the more significant effect and leads events on to a determined goal or to the next development.

On three occasions, Codex Bezae has *μὲν οὖν* where it is not read by S01/B03:

11:2; 17:14; 19:9

11:2 The Bezan text at the beginning of Acts 11 is not only considerably amplified in comparison with the text of the other manuscripts being studied, the material surrounding the additional clauses is also rephrased. Thus, in Codex Bezae, v.1 is impersonal, 'it became heard...'. The arrival of the news of the conversion of some Gentiles at the church in Judaea has a twofold outcome, *μὲν οὖν* v.2. Firstly, Peter wants to make the journey to Jerusalem, which he does. Secondly, this in turn leads to the more significant event which is the dispute amongst the brethren, *δέ* v.2/line 8. The importance of the circumcision party as opponents to Peter is shown by their standing in first position in the new sentence and by the addition of *ἀδελφοί*. *μὲν οὖν* is entirely in place in the way in which the Bezan

text presents the events which follow from the news of the Gentile conversions reaching Judaea, anticipating by the use of $\mu\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$ that Peter's arrival in Jerusalem will have further consequences to do with what the church there has heard. In the alternative version, Peter's journey is not specifically linked with the Judaeans brethren's learning of the news and $\sigma\tau\epsilon\ \delta\epsilon$ takes the place of $\mu\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$.

17:14 $\mu\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$ is again found in a passage full of re-wording, re-ordering, addition and omission. The setting is Beroea where Paul and Silas have been preaching the gospel. $\mu\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$ at v. 12 in both texts introduces the twofold effect of the eagerness of the Bereans to study the gospel message against the Scriptures. The first consequence was that many people believed the word of God, the Bezan text giving a slightly more nuanced picture of the situation (the additional $\delta\epsilon$ clause $\tau\iota\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \eta\pi\iota\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ is to be read as a background comment not as the $\delta\epsilon$ clause corresponding to $\mu\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$). The second event that then happened (v.13 $\delta\epsilon$) was that Jews from Thessalonica, hearing of the conversions, came to Beroea to stir up trouble. The strength of their attempts to create trouble is intensified in the Bezan text ($\alpha\upsilon\ \delta\iota\epsilon\lambda\iota\psi\tau\iota\kappa\alpha\upsilon\alpha$) which also underlines the cause of their anger as the preaching of the word of God (in first position v.13) and the resulting belief (additional comment v.13).

Having reinforced the description of the Thessalonians' anger, the Bezan text then presents in two stages ($\mu\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$ v.14) the event which is the outcome of their attempts to stir up trouble. Firstly, the brethren send Paul away to sea, Silas and Timothy remaining in Beroea - $\delta\epsilon$ introduces this background comment. Then, v.15 $\delta\epsilon$ Paul is taken on to Athens which represents the goal of his journey at this point for he stays there for some time. There is even an additional comment v.15 which explains why Athens turned out to be the goal.

The overall result is that the Bezan text explains in more exact detail the events in Beroea which led to Paul's departure from there. $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\omega\varsigma \delta\epsilon \tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ of the alternative text records the speedy response of the brethren to get Paul out of the way but without making the particular connections which are made by the Bezan text. (Further discussion on this variant can be found in the section on $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$, Part B, #III).

19:9 S01/B03 use $\omega\varsigma \delta\epsilon$ to explain how Paul came to move out of the synagogue where he had been preaching to the Ephesians to the school of Tyrannus - it was when some people did not accept his teaching and were criticizing it to the crowds. D05 uses $\mu\epsilon\nu \omicron\upsilon\nu$ at this point to present the two-stage outcome of Paul's preaching in the synagogue. A series of additional words and phrases in vv.8+9 serve to portray a more detailed picture of Paul both in the synagogue and in the school of Tyrannus and thereby give support to $\mu\epsilon\nu \omicron\upsilon\nu$ as a stronger connective than simply $\omega\varsigma \delta\epsilon$.

Paul is described as speaking in the synagogue 'in great power'. The use of his name instead of the singular verb in the third person may indicate that the Bezan text considers this to be the beginning of a new unit (Levinsohn 1992, p.116 and cf. Appendix II on Participant Reference) which extends from v.8 to v.20 thus separating the initial work of Paul among the disciples in Ephesus (vv.1-7) from the preaching, miracles and signs among a wider audience. In this case, a certain narrative importance is thereby ascribed to this group of sentences vv.8+9 which is absent from the other text.

In v.9, $\mu\epsilon\nu \omicron\upsilon\nu$ shows that the first outcome of his teaching in the synagogue was the hostility of some of the audience who disparaged it specifically in front of the Gentiles. That in turn led to Paul leaving the synagogue and teaching in another place. Paul's response to the Jews' work of opposition is accorded a certain

dramatic status by a) the use of $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ and b) the use of Paul's name again (cf. v.8). ($\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ is a marked form of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ but this is the only instance in the manuscripts under consideration of $\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon$ in place of the expected $\delta\epsilon$ following $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$). The conflict between Paul and the Jews which arose because they were trying to undo his work is something which Codex Bezae appears to have a particular interest in. It has been noticed as a feature which is highlighted elsewhere by the use of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$ (cf. 17:14 above).

Paul's lecturing in the school of Tyrannus is qualified in Codex Bezae by the mention of the times 'from the fifth hour to the tenth'. If it is meant to be of literal significance, the inclusion of this detail concords with the other variants in vv.8+9 which together provide a fuller picture of Paul's teaching and its initial effect in Ephesus. The time reference may, on the other hand, be of symbolic, theological significance (cf. ch.3 B, #1.4.d).

Conclusions.

In the three additional occurrences of $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$ in Codex Bezae, the conjunction operates in the same way as it is observed to function generally in Acts, that is it introduces a two-stage response to, or outcome of, the previous event. In the alternative form of the text (S01/B03), the two-fold nature of a development in the story is either not present or is not made obvious. The Bezan text uses $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$ to make more clear how events and actions are linked together but does not simply add it in to the other form of the text. On the contrary, the text surrounding its occurrence is also seen to be modified in such a way that $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$ is entirely appropriate and contributes to a greater degree of narrative cohesion.

The supplementary occurrences of $\mu\epsilon\nu \tilde{\sigma}\nu$ in Codex Bezae are also illustrative of a more careful account of events involving Peter and Paul and of their relationships with their respective opponents.

Connectives.

Part D: γάρ

γάρ is used in Acts to introduce an explanatory sentence looking back on what has just been said. It may provide a reason or cause for what has gone before, or it may provide an amplified explanation.²⁰ Sometimes γάρ occurs as part of a logical argument; at others, it presents a parenthetical comment. In its first use, its function overlaps with that of ὅτι; in its second, it parallels one of the uses of δέ. An examination of the variant readings of γάρ can help to identify more closely its purpose.

This chapter by necessity largely describes the situation rather than attempts to account for it. In the more detailed exegetical studies (chs.8-10), it will be seen that behind some of the occurrences of γάρ where there are variant readings there are reasons of a theological nature which only become apparent when the passage as a whole is examined in depth, an examination which is too lengthy to be possible here.

Variant readings of γάρ arise in the manuscripts being studied (S01/B03/D05) as follows:

	<u>ἄρα</u>	<u>asyndeton</u>
7:34;10:36,37	D05	S01/B03
8:21;22:26	S01/B03	D05
		<u>δέ</u>
2:34;12:9,20	D05	S01/B03
		<u>τέ</u>
1:15	D05	S01/B03
		<u>ὡς καί</u>
13:33	D05	S01/B03
2:15	S01/B03	<u>genitive absolute</u>
		D05
		<u>sentence omitted</u>
5:15;15:2; 17:15;	D05	S01/B03
21:22,25		
18:3	S01/B03	D05

There are in all seventeen supplementary readings of which thirteen are found in Codex Bezae (the places where support from d is lacking are pointed out in the discussion). Some occur in place of an alternative connective or asyndeton to make clear the connection between two sentences; others (the last category in the table above) arise in a separate additional comment. Variant readings are found in both speech and narrative with the difference that in the former they

exist to make a step in a logical argument whereas in the latter they serve to present a parenthetical aside.

I. SUPPLEMENTARY γάρ IN SPEECH.

γάρ is inserted in a speech passage as follows:

D05 2:34; 7:34; 10:36,37; 13:33; 21:22,25

S01/B03 2:15; 8:21; 22:26.

I.1 Preaching.

γάρ occurs notably in Codex Bezae in a major speech which is a presentation of the gospel to a Jewish audience.

2:34 A second γάρ in this verse produces two successive γάρ clauses whose purpose is to make explicit the logical connections in Peter's demonstration of the fulfilment of prophetic words spoken by David. The meaning itself is not affected by the alternative reading of δε .

7:34 Two successive γάρ clauses again result from the additional connective at this point in Stephen's speech but the new one is not without difficulty. While the explanatory role of the first is clear, the function of the second is less obvious. γάρ appears to be answering the unspoken question as to why God has come to speak to Moses but it is unusual in Acts for an implicit question to provoke γάρ . Moreover, και is also added (not in d) to produce a strange sentence in Greek:

και ιδων γαρ ιδον

It is possible in view of the context that the form of this structure is due to some foreign influence although it does not seem to be known in any of the major Semitic languages.

10:36,37 In the S01/B03 text there is a series of sentences with no connecting word from v.36 through to the end of v.38. Asyndeton is common where there is a close connection between information given (Levinsohn 1992, pp.62-4) which is the case here. The D05 text (not supported by d at v.37) supplies $\gamma\alpha\rho$ to express firstly the connection of explanation and secondly that of expansion, 'that is...'.
.

It is not that the Bezan text avoids asyndeton as such; on the contrary, asyndeton is more frequent in this text than in the other.²⁷ The picture is rather that when asyndeton expresses an explanatory relation between sentences, as opposed to a conjoining or a contrasting one, for example ³⁰, then $\gamma\alpha\rho$ tends to be used by Codex Bezae.

13:33 Paul is explaining here events concerning Jesus, arguing from Scripture. As at 2:34, $\gamma\alpha\rho$ is used to introduce a quotation from the Old Testament together with $\text{o}\text{u}\text{t}\omega\text{s}$ which replaces $\omega\text{s}\ \text{k}\alpha\text{i}$ of the other text. Once more, the meaning is not affected.

1.2 Conversation.

$\gamma\alpha\rho$ is also found in the course of short exchanges.

2:15 The genitive absolute construction in D05 (d reads *enim*) is not used elsewhere in Acts for a parenthetical reason clause although the genitive absolute construction as such is very common in Codex Bezae (see Appendix II).

8:21 The omission of $\gamma\alpha\rho$ from the Bezan text is possibly due to

haplography before καρδία. It is supplied by Corrector C who paid particular attention to correcting small omissions such as missing syllables (Parker 1992, p.139).

21:22,25 The double inclusion of γαρ in the course of the conversation of the Jerusalem elders with Paul is important because it arises on each occasion from the addition of information which puts a different slant on the situation facing Paul. In the first case (v.22/line 3), an extra sentence is added in the previous line and is found in many manuscripts including S01 but in a different order (B-L 1984, *ad loc*). γαρ arises in line 3 from the addition (but is omitted by S01). The resulting difference in sense is that it is not just that people will hear that Paul has arrived in Jerusalem but that hearing of his presence will cause a crowd to gather. A concern with the crowd in opposition to Paul can be noticed in other places in Codex Bezae (cf. 16:22, in the section on τότε, Part B, #II.2).

At v.25, it emerges from the extra information given in the Bezan text (some of it supported by other manuscripts, B-L *ad loc*) that the elders in Jerusalem have prevented accusations being made by Jewish believers against Paul on account of his teaching to converted Gentiles τῶν πεπιστευκῶν ἔθνων: they have pre-empted them by sending instructions that they are not to be bound by any of the Jewish legal requirements except for those which were decided on at the Apostolic Council (Acts 15:20,29). This is in contrast to the strict observance of the Jewish Law which is maintained among believers in Judaea (v1 v.20D05).

The additional information of both these verses has the effect of demonstrating the protection and defence provided for Paul by the Jerusalem church authorities who were keenly aware of the potential for trouble to break out. Epp contends (1966, pp.111-12) that the Bezan text minimizes the Judaizing controversy by drawing attention to

the role of Paul. Given the importance for Paul of the trouble caused by the circumcision party (see his letter to the Galatians for example), any special attention paid to him can, on the contrary, be taken as evidence that the controversy is understood from his point of view and is a more, not a less, significant issue. The additional sentence at 15:2 (see #II below) supports this interpretation.

22:26 It is the S01/B03 text which reads $\gamma\alpha\rho$ in the report of the centurion to the tribune concerning Paul. There are a number of other differences in this episode which have been discussed in some detail in the section on $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ (Part B, #II.1.a). The report in D05 (d missing) which lacks $\gamma\alpha\rho$ and includes $\omicron\rho\alpha$ is more direct and urgent for reasons which have to do with the presentation of the event overall.

II. SUPPLEMENTARY $\gamma\alpha\rho$ IN NARRATIVE.

$\gamma\alpha\rho$ is inserted in narrative as follows:

D05 1:15; 5:15; 12:9,20; 15:2; 17:15

S01/B03 18:3

1:15 $\gamma\alpha\rho$ makes explicit the connection between Peter's speech and the number of people present. The reading is discussed in detail in the exegesis of Acts 1 (ch.8 below) where the comment was made that as $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ read by S01/B03 is unusual to introduce a parenthetical remark it may be that $\delta\epsilon$, as in the correction to D05, is the original particle.

5:15 An extra sentence is read by Codex Bezae and indeed a varied selection of Latin manuscripts and other versions (partial support in

E08, see B-L 1984, *ad loc*) but the Greek D05 is alone in reading $\gamma\alpha\rho$ rather than $\kappa\alpha\iota$ /et (as in d). With $\gamma\alpha\rho$, the sentence gives a justification (being healed) for the people trying to come under Peter's shadow, rather than being simply a conjoining statement that people were healed of their diseases. Boismard-Lamouille (1984 *ad loc*) suggest that haplography has caused the sentence to drop out of the other Greek manuscripts $\tau\omega\upsilon \dots \tau\omega\upsilon$. If this is the reason, it is surprising that it should affect so much (almost all) of the Greek tradition and simultaneously so little of the Latin tradition.

12:9,20 In these two places in the story about Peter and Herod, what is otherwise a descriptive aside introduced by $\delta\epsilon$ is linked to the preceding narrative in Codex Bezae by $\gamma\alpha\rho$, specifying a relationship of reason with the previous clause. An awareness of this relationship demands an understanding of the theological and historical background underlying this episode which the discussion on Acts 12 (see ch.10 below) shows to be present in Codex Bezae more than in the other text.

15:2 The context of an additional explanatory sentence in Codex Bezae is the same as that of Acts 21 (see #1.2 above). $\gamma\alpha\rho$ (not d) explains the reason for the disagreement between Paul and the circumcision party. This is clearly an important issue for Codex Bezae which is highlighted in so many ways throughout the manuscript.

17:15 The $\gamma\alpha\rho$ clause in Codex Bezae provides an insight into the impulses behind Paul's itinerary in a supplementary piece of information of a kind common in this manuscript.³¹

18:3 The information that the reason for Paul working with Aquila and Priscilla was that the trade they shared was tentmaking is omitted by Codex Bezae (supported only by g). The omission can be compared to the omission by the Greek Bezan text of the information about Tarsus at 21:39. They appear to confirm other indications which have emerged

in the course of this study of the Bezan text that Paul was better known to the recipients of Codex Bezae than to those of the other text (see especially ch.10 on Acts 18). Metzger's explanation (1975 *ad loc*) that the omission is accidental is the less probable for that.

Conclusions.

There is a consistency in the additional occurrences of $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ in Codex Bezae in that they chiefly serve the purpose of defining steps in a logical argument about the Old Testament in the course of a message announcing the gospel to a Jewish audience. Elsewhere, they aid careful explanation about the conflict between Paul and the circumcision party. Overall, they constitute yet more evidence of an awareness of Jewish concerns about receiving the new Christian teaching - concerns to do with the fulfilment of Scripture and with the observance of the Law. The impression is of a text which is familiar with the Jewish position and which supports the stand of Paul from his Jewish Christian, not a Gentile Christian, perspective.

From a linguistic viewpoint, many of the passages in which additional $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ is found are rendered more cohesive by its use: either it strengthens an existing weaker connecting device or it adds in new links between ideas or events. The high number of the supplementary readings in Codex Bezae thus contributes to a greater degree of cohesiveness in the text overall. It cannot be said that the smaller number of instances of additional $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ in the S01/B03 text, with a variety of functions, has the same general effect.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FOUR.

NOTES to Part A.

1. Parker's examination of the translation of οὐ in the Old Latin Gospels (1985) tends to overlook this cause of variation. He chiefly attributes the variation between the two sides of Codex Bezae to the Latin side being based on a different exemplar to that used by the Greek side.
2. In addition to the studies by Levinsohn (1987, 1991) see the articles by Buth, Callow K., and Titrud in Black D. (ed) 1992.
3. On the function of $\delta\epsilon$ in Mark's Gospel, Kilpatrick (1993, pp.181-2) makes the comments 'We may ... regard Mark's use of $\delta\epsilon$ with a nominative as bringing the change of subject clearly before the reader's notice'; and 'Conjoined with verbs it often seems to introduce a fresh event or circumstance'. These are precisely the kind of considerations taken into account by discourse analysis.

NOTES to Part B.

4. Turner comments on the relative frequency with which τότε occurs in the Gospels and Acts, but without apparently distinguishing between its use as an adverb and that as a conjunction. Matthew scores way beyond the others with 90 occurrences (Mark 6, Luke 15, John 10, Acts 21; Turner does not specify which MSS he follows). He accounts for the high score in Matthew by suggesting an Aramaic influence, adding the comment 'Scribes have sought to reduce the exuberance of τότε in Mt'.
5. Levinsohn (1987, p.151; 1992, p.49) arbitrarily defines τότε as an adverb when there are other conjunctions present which explains his inclusion of 11:26D05 and 17:14S01/B03 among the occurrences of τότε as a conjunction.
6. Delebecque (1986, pp.228-30) remarks that τότε in the common text simply introduces a new scene of an episode but that in the Bezan additions it always creates a pause before the important point of an episode.
7. Levinsohn (1987, p.151) mistakenly includes 13:12 in his list of non-variant occurrences of τότε - D05, in fact, has $\delta\epsilon$. He also speaks of τότε being the 'preferred reading' at various places where D05 does not have it. 'Preferred' refers to N-A²⁶ (Levinsohn 1987, p.xvii).
8. Lake and Cadbury's figures (1933, p.123) do not tally with the ones given here, probably because they have used the 'Western' text rather than Codex Bezae and included the whole of Acts.
9. Whenever the named subject is arthrous after τότε in Codex Bezae, the verb always comes before the subject, that is the subject is not fore-fronted and there is no need to underline it by omitting the article - 2:14; 10:21; 10:23; 19:19. At these places, S01/B03 do not have τότε . The regularity in the D05 text is striking.

10. From among the possibilities, Epp (1966, pp.129-30) opts for the meaning of $\sigma\tau\omicron\pi\epsilon\upsilon\theta\eta$ εἰς ἑκάστος εἰς τὰ ἰδία as referring to the apostles each going to their own cell in solitary confinement. This is not, however, the usual meaning of the expression εἰς τὰ ἰδία nor its meaning elsewhere in Acts.

11. Delebecque 1982b, pp.225-32 examines in detail the differences between the long and the short texts of this episode, concluding that the author of the long version is familiar with the style and vocabulary of Luke and has a thorough understanding of Paul's faith.

12. It is typical of Codex Bezae not to highlight participants as they prepare to speak, see Appendix II on Participant Reference.

13. Some of these comments, and others, are made by Delebecque 1986, p.110 and B-L 1984, II, p.126.

14. Metzger 1975 *ad loc* suggests another interpretation.

15. Metzger 1975, p.404, implies that the use of τότε does depend on personal style.

NOTES to Part C.

16. Detailed study of the translation of $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ in the Old Latin Gospels has been made by Parker 1985. He focuses on the different exemplars as a cause of differences between D05 and d but it is possible that there are other linguistic causes as suggested in Part A, note 1).

17. $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ which is read at 13:40 (reading common to S01/B03 and D05) has a slightly different force in that it serves not so much to lead on to an inference of the argument so far as to introduce a consequence of what has been said.

18. The readings which are viewed as errors rather than as possibly deliberate alterations are: v.15/line 1 και replaces δε but the first letters κε of the verb are then omitted; v.16/line 4 γεγονενκαι should be γεγονεν after οτι ; v.17/line 2 the prefix επι should be απει ; v.18/lines 2-3 the final letters of line 2 το belong to the expression το καθόλου 'absolutely' (which S01/B03 omit), το κειν το making no sense here; v.20/line 2 ηη is omitted. See Delebecque 1986, pp.42-3 for further comments.

19. ἵνα μή meaning 'lest' is a typically Pauline (and Markan) construction - see Turner N. 1976, p.13.

20. See, for example, Metzger 1975, the final comment on 5:39.

21. Some manuscripts have $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ in the following line as a consequential particle (N-A²⁶).

22. Dunn 1992, ch.4, has a detailed discussion of this speech.

23. See Kilpatrick 1992, pp. 167-8 for an examination of one aspect of the NT variant readings concerning the land of Egypt.

24. The text is confused in v.4 because there appears to be an accidental omission of a verb to go with the list of names given. Compare Delebecque 1986, p.120, who gives a very clear French translation of this passage, with B-L *ad loc.*

25. Levinsohn 1993, p.167; his analysis is based on what N-A²⁶ indicates as being without variant.

26. Cf. Epp 1966, p.57.

27. Cf. Luke 8:5+6 where *μév* is also used with a first and a second (type of seed).

NOTES to Part D.

28. Larsen 1991b, pp.36-8; Levinsohn 1992, pp. 57-9 and see the bibliography cited p.59.

29. There are twenty extra occurrences of asyndeton in D05 where S01/B03 read a connecting word, and six extra occurrences in S01/B03, with no variation on this point between S01 and B03. The full list is given in Appendix II.

30. E.g. 2:14,43; 4:17; 5:28; 6:2,3.

31. Other supplementary information about Paul's movements is found in Codex Bezae at 11:25; 14:7,19; 16:9; 19:1; 20:3-4,15; 21:16. Cf. comments on this aspect of the text in the conclusions on Acts 18 (ch.10 below).

CHAPTER FIVE

Prepositions.

The question of the change in the use of prepositions in Koine Greek has been addressed by a number of grammarians.¹ Strict rules in Classical Greek about the functions of prepositions and the cases they governed were gradually eroded as a tendency towards simplification had its effect on the language. The state of flux is clearly visible in a comparison of parallel passages in the Synoptic Gospels.² Something of the same variation is apparent within the firm text of Acts and, as might be expected, even more so between the different manuscripts. Variation between S01 and B03 is rare on the issue of prepositions but rather more frequent between S01/B03 and D05. In the following analyses, the pairs of prepositions which most commonly display variation in these three manuscripts are examined.

I. ἀπό

In Koine Greek, there was a gradual modification of the function of ἀπό as it was in Classical Greek so that ἀπό tended to replace both ὑπό (in its causative sense) and ἐκ (Turner N. 1963, pp.251-2, 259).

In the text of Acts which is shared by S01, B03 and D05, ἀπό occurs some 65 times to convey the idea of separation, movement away from somebody or something with a recognizable point of departure. It is never used simply to designate the agent of a passive verb. That said, on two occasions (2:22; 15:33), ἀπό is used with a

passive verb to express movement 'away from' the agent, where in English the most natural translation is 'by'. This use of ἀπό before the agent of verbs to do with 'sending' for example is not uncommon in both secular and New Testament Greek writers (see Winer 1882, pp.463-4, especially n.2). Of the two occasions cited above, at 2:2205 further variation (different verb, placed after ἀπο του θεου) allows the translation 'a man from God'. At 15:33, in order to appreciate the force of ἀπό, the verse may be compared with 13:4 where Barnabas and Saul are sent out 'by' ὑπό the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is the agent but not the point of departure, unlike the brothers of Antioch in 15:33 who not only dismiss Paul and his companions but send them away from Antioch back to Jerusalem (cf. 15:3 below).

There are in addition several instances of ἀπό to express the partitive genitive, 'some of ἀπό the people', a function shared by ἐκ (see below on ἐκ and cf. Turner N. 1963, p.208). Finally, there is one use of ἀπό in a causative sense, 'from ἀπό joy', where ὑπό would have been used in Classical Greek (Turner N 1963, p.258).

Disagreement between the manuscripts concerning the choice of ἀπό arises in some places (but by no means all possible ones) where ὑπό or ἐκ has become a permissible alternative in Koine Greek.

1.1 ἀπό - ὑπό.

ὑπό is used in the firm text of Acts either to mean 'under' or to designate the agent of a passive verb. In the text of the three manuscripts examined for this study, only once is the verb one of sending (15:3) where the reason for the choice of ὑπό rather than ἀπό (see previous paragraph) could well be that ὑπό expresses unequivocally that Paul and Barnabas were sent to Jerusalem not by the brethren who had come from Judaea (15:1 and cf. 15:2005) but by (and

not just away from) the church in Antioch (cf. the distinction made by Winer p.463, n.1).

In Koine Greek, ἀπό tended to supplant ὑπό in its causative sense (agent of the passive verb). It is on this point that disagreement among the manuscripts occurs as follows:

Reference	ἀπό	ὑπό
4:36	S01/B03	D05
5:16	D05	S01/B03
10:17	D05	S01/B03
10:33	D05	S01/B03
12:5	D05	S01/B03
15:4	B03	S01/D05
15:40	D05	S01/B03
20:9	S01/B03	D05

At all these places, the verb is a passive verb and the preposition relates to the agent. The variant readings mainly occur in isolation, that is they are not determined by variation in the surrounding context. This is important to note because it means that the issue is a true issue concerning prepositions.

Where D05 reads ἀπό in the above references, except at 5:16 where the verb is an ordinary passive ('tormented by unclean spirits'), the action is always one of sending or expressing some kind of movement away from A to B. The choice of preposition thus conforms with the practice of the shared text noticed above of using ὑπό where there is a passive verb indicating separation³.

Where S01/B03 reads ἀπό against D05's ὑπό, the verb is not

one of sending nor is there any notion of separation or point of departure. In using ἄπό to express a straightforward passive, these manuscripts do not therefore follow the practice found in the shared text. Commenting on ἄπό at 15:4B03, Metzger (1975, p.428) describes it as 'Semitic' and compares its use with other occasions of ἄπό as the agent without however observing the difference made by verbs of separation among the references he cites. It is not clear in what way ἄπό can be defined as 'Semitic' (passive constructions with prepositional marking of agency being rare in Hebrew and Aramaic), but if a claim is going to be maintained that ἄπό has arisen here in B03 (but not in S01) as a Semitism, it needs to be held against the other disagreement of B03 with S01 in the previous line where B03 has the Hellenistic spelling of Jerusalem in a Jewish context which would point to a Greek and not a Jewish background (cf. ch.7 on the reasons for the variation in the spelling of Jerusalem).

Finally, in the Bezan material not found in the other two manuscripts, ὑπό is always used before the agent of a passive verb and ἄπό always means 'from', except at 4:9 where ἀφ ὑμῶν is added after ἀνακρινόμεθα instead of the expected ὑφ ὑμῶν (found at I Cor 2:15; 14:24).

1.2 ἄπό - ἐκ.

There is an overlap in meaning between ἄπό and ἐκ in that both can express separation (the same word שָׁמַח in Hebrew does for the two in Greek) but ἐκ specifically means 'out of'. This distinction is not rigidly maintained in Acts, however, for in two places (12:7; 15:21 - no v11) ἐκ is used to mean 'from'.⁴ ἐκ is also used in Acts for the partitive genitive, τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν, in the same way as ἄπό is (see above).

Out of the 62 occurrences of ἐκ in the text of Acts common to S01, B03 and D05 (i.e. not counting those passages where Codex Bezae is missing), ten have a variant reading between S01/B03 and D05 (S01/B03 do not differ between themselves on this point). The following table shows the distribution of the prepositions ἀπό and ἐκ where there is variation:

Reference	ἀπό	ἐκ
3:26	S01/B03	D05
5:2	S01/B03	D05
7:3	D05	S01/B03
12:20	S01/B03	D05
15:29	D05	S01/B03
16:39	S01/B03	D05
16:40	S01/B03	D05
17:2	S01/B03	D05
18:1	D05	S01/B03
22:6	D05	S01/B03

Codex Bezae has more frequently ἐκ than ἀπό where there is variation. Since it has been observed that in his Gospel Luke often uses ἀπό in preference to ἐκ where a choice is possible (see note 4 above), the Bezan tendency looks unlike what could be expected from the hand of Luke. Indeed, an examination of the readings confirms that the use of ἐκ in the Bezan text more often than not does not conform to the usual practice of the firm text of Acts.

3:26 The reference occurs in the last line of Peter's speech when

he proclaims to his Jewish audience the blessing of God as they turn away $\alpha\pi\sigma\tau\rho\epsilon\phi\epsilon\iota\nu$ $\alpha\pi\omicron/\epsilon\kappa$ $\tau\omega\nu$ $\pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\iota\omega\nu$ (+ $\psi\rho\omega\nu$ D05). Elsewhere in Acts (8:22; 13:39), $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ is used for repentance from sins with $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\kappa$. There is no New Testament parallel with $\acute{\alpha}\pi\sigma\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\phi\omega$ in the sense of repentance but in Revelation $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ is used with $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$.

5:2 $\epsilon\kappa$ after $\epsilon\nu\omicron\sigma\phi\iota\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron\iota\nu$ D05, without support, is curious because all manuscripts agree on $\alpha\pi\omicron$ after the same verb in an identical phrase in the following verse. $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ is not unknown in 1st century Greek outside the New Testament (A-G *ad loc*) but it is odd that it should not be repeated in v.3 by D05. The Latin d also has different prepositions (v.2 *de*; v.3 *ex*) but at the same time has different verbs which justify the change.

7:3 $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ is the usual preposition to describe movement out of a country in the speeches which draw on the history of the Old Testament (cf. 13:17). It appears to be the firm reading in v.4. Codex Bezae uses $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ to speak not only of Abraham's leaving his country but also his people. $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ is typically the preposition used in the narrative in Acts for movement from a country and is commonly used by Luke after $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ (cf. note 4 above). $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ is found in the parallel passage in the LXX but it is not unusual for the Bezan text to depart from the LXX text.

12:20 Disagreement arises again with reference to a country. In using $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$, the S01/B03 text follows the pattern noticed in Acts (see under $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ above) of selecting $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ rather than $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron$ to follow a passive verb involving movement from the place of origin. D05's $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ is more unusual.

15:29 Both $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ can follow $\delta\iota\alpha\tau\eta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (A-G) though the verb is not sufficiently common in Biblical writings for any regularity to be established. When $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ is found (Prov 21:23) the meaning is 'to keep out of trouble' whereas here the sense is 'to keep away from'.

16:39+40 Twice Codex Bezae uses ἐκ following ἐξέρχουσι for leaving the city and leaving the prison, in passages which are heavily reworded and amplified compared with the S01/B03 text. This is unlike Luke's practice in the Gospel (see note 4 above).

17:2 Though the phrase 'to teach from the Scriptures' is common enough in Jewish writings, it does not help with the choice of preposition since there is only one word (מִן 'min') in Hebrew. It is again D05 which has ἐκ.

18:1 ἀπό is the word regularly used for leaving a town in Acts. The text of S01/B03 with ἐκ following a different verb, χωρίζω, to that of D05 is read by all the Greek witnesses except D05. And yet in the next verse, when χωρίζω is found a second time, it is followed by ἀπό in all manuscripts.

22:6 The usual word for something coming out of heaven is ἐκ cf. 2:2; 11:5,9, and the passage parallel to this account of Paul's conversion in 9:35 S01/B03 (D05 lacunae). ἀπό in D05 is not found elsewhere in Acts in a similar expression; in Revelation the preposition is ἐκ.

There are only two additional occurrences of ἐκ in D05; at 7:24, ἐκ τοῦ γένους is found in similar phrases in Acts (e.g. 13:21) but ἀπό is found in the S01/B03 text of comparable phrases to ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν πόλεων at 12:20 D05 (e.g. 16:39, ἐκ D05).

An examination of these references shows a number of places in both texts where the choice of preposition is unusual or even not able to be accounted for. This is particularly the case in the Bezan text which for the majority of the variant readings (6/10) does not follow the usual practice of Luke nor of the firm text of Acts. On the other hand, in frequently preferring ἐκ to ἀπό it displays a tendency to

follow the older pattern of use of the prepositions and also that of Mark in his Gospel.

II. εἰς - ἐν

In Classical Greek, εἰς expresses movement whereas ἐν is static. This distinction becomes blurred in Hellenistic Greek with εἰς supplanting ἐν and eventually ἐν disappearing altogether.³ In the text of Acts common to S01, B03 and D05, the difference is on the whole maintained and there is a surprisingly small number of variant readings with S01 and B03 rarely disagreeing. Although N. Turner (1963, p.254) speaks of Luke-Acts as containing the greatest number in the New Testament of examples of εἰς written in place of ἐν, almost all of the references he cites for Acts have a variant reading in D05 of ἐν or are justifiable with εἰς. C.H. Turner's analysis of parallel passages in the Synoptic Gospels (1924) reveals that of all the New Testament writings it is in Mark's Gospel that εἰς takes over from ἐν the most frequently. Luke is noticeably more conservative. In that respect, Codex Bezae is typical of Luke, and the non-variant text of Acts, in preferring the older usage. This is apparent from the table of variation below and also from the additional Bezan material which is discussed later.

Reference	εἰς	ἐν
2:5 (J)	S01*	S01Corr/B03/D05
4:5 (J)	S01	B03/D05
7:12	S01/B03	D05
8:23	S01/B03	D05
14:25	S01*	S01Corr/B03/D05
17:13	D05	S01/B03
18:4	D05	S01/B03
19:22	S01/B03	D05
20:16 (J)	S01/B03	D05
21:11 (J)	D05	S01/B03
22:5 (J)	S01/B03	D05

Most of the places of disagreement concern towns, notably Jerusalem (J), rather than a metaphorical phrase on which the manuscripts agree. It is D05 which systematically uses εἰς for movement and ἐν for static 'in' except at three places: 17:13; 21:11; 22:5.

17:13 The re-ordering of the sentence in Codex Bezae and the additional material do not affect the force of the preposition. The situation is that Paul left Thessalonica following the trouble from the Jews there (v.10) and went to preach in Beroea where many were converted (v.12). In v.13, 'When the Jews from Thessalonica knew that the word of God was announced (by Paul, not D05) in Beroea, they went there (εἰς αὐτήν D05)...' According to classical usage, it is possible for εἰς to have a latent force of motion * and εἰς could be justified in this way here especially with the addition by D05 of εἰς αὐτήν: the preaching of Paul has gone from Thessalonica to Beroea.

This 'pregnant' use of εἰς is seen on a number of occasions in Codex Bezae (see additional material below and possibly the next two examples).

21:11 While D05 has so far observed the strict use of εἰς and ἐν before Jerusalem, these last two examples pose problems. With ἐν the phrase 'in Jerusalem' can refer to the Jews there or to the action of Paul being bound there. With εἰς, if the preposition stands for ἐν it refers to the Jews; if it refers to the binding of Paul, there could be the condensed sense of 'they will bind him when he gets to Jerusalem'. εἰς is used with Jerusalem at 21:13 (both texts) in precisely this way. This may be an occasion, however, when Codex Bezae is as inconsistent as the other manuscripts and substitutes εἰς for ἐν.

22:5 The reverse problem occurs here with D05 reading ἐν for an apparently ^{non-}static 'in'. The situation is again one of movement towards Jerusalem as well as something happening once there and this double aspect of 'in' could account for the variation. Again, that is not to say that inconsistency should be ruled out as a possible cause.

When εἰς or ἐν is found in supplementary Bezan material not found in the other two manuscripts, when the meaning is local rather than figurative, there is once more a high degree of regularity in clearly restricting the sense of εἰς to movement towards a place except at 11:25, and at 18:21+27 where there is some ambiguity.

11:25 εἰς is read in a shorter phrase in S01/B03 to speak of Barnabas going to Tarsus to look for Saul. In the expanded D05 sentence, however, Saul is referred to as εστιν εἰς θαρσον where εἰς no longer indicates movement. This looks as if D05 is the secondary text which has retained εἰς against its usual practice.

18:21 Paul's explanation about wanting to be in Jerusalem for the approaching festival is similar to the sentence at 21:11 examined above with the same reasons applying in justification of εἰς.

18:27 Vv.26+27D05 contain no less than five additional prepositions of εἰς or ἐν. Every one is used strictly according to its force of motion or rest except possibly εἰς before Achaia. εἰς is present in the alternative text indicating Apollos' wish to cross over from Ephesus to Achaia. In the Bezan version, εἰς Ἀχαίαν occurs later in the account of Apollos' move from Ephesus and follows the verb ἐπιδημέω which is used in the previous verse to mean 'to stay' with ἐν before Ephesus. ἐπιδημέω is occasionally followed by εἰς to indicate movement towards a place (A-G) and that may be what is intended here; alternatively, there could be the condensed meaning of 'when he had gone and stayed in Achaia' as in 18:21D05, 21:11D05; or εἰς has been retained in error from the original text as was suggested for 11:25.

III. ἐπί

ἐπί has a wide variety of functions in New Testament Greek, both local and metaphorical (see Winer 1882, pp. 488-92). Many times ἐπί occurs in fixed expressions some of which may derive from a Semitic phrase. The range of meaning is reflected in the number and variety of variant readings concerning ἐπί. The complexity of its use, including the nuances associated with the different cases it can govern, is such that an understanding of the variant readings in Acts demands a thorough and exact study of the use of the preposition in writings outside Acts to provide points of comparison. Within Acts itself the data is insufficient to allow detailed discussion of the

question. The variant readings in S01, B03 and D05 are therefore given here for the sake of information without further comment.

Reference	ἐπί	ἐν
2:38	S01/B03	D05
3:11	S01/B03	D05
7:13	D05	S01/B03
		<u>ἐπί</u>
11:19	S01/B03	D05
20:18	D05	S01/B03
21:23	D05	S01/B03
		<u>εἰς</u>
20:13 (x2)	S01/B03	D05
21:24	S01/B03	D05
21:35	S01/B03	D05

Although the figures from the above table suggest that Codex Bezae shies away from ἐπί (7/10 times), there are sufficient supplementary occurrences of ἐπί in the additional Bezan material, both local and metaphorical, to prevent the conclusion that the manuscript deliberately seeks to avoid the use of ἐπί (2:12; 6:10; 7:35; 11:17; 12:3; 15:8).

IV. OTHER PAIRS OF PREPOSITIONS where variation exists.

D05	S01/B03
εἰς	πρός (1)
ἐκ	ἐν (1)
περί	ὑπέρ (1)
ἐν	κατά (1)
ἄχρι	ἐν (1)

V. CONCLUSIONS.

From an examination of the five principal prepositions in Acts, ἀπό, ὑπό, ἐκ, εἰς, ἐν, and of their variant readings in S01, B03 and D05, it emerges that Codex Bezae displays a marked tendency to follow the older pattern of usage. For ἀπό, ὑπό, εἰς and ἐν that is the pattern of the shared material as well as generally being that of Luke in his Gospel. For ἐκ, Codex Bezae tends to be more conservative. Overall, the distribution of prepositions in the Bezan text is closer to the older, classical usage than to that which was becoming more common in Hellenistic Greek.

NOTES TO CHAPTER FIVE.

1. See e.g. Turner N. 1963, pp. 249-80 *passim*; Winer 1882, pp. 453-4, 512-21.
2. See Turner C.H. 1924; 1928.
3. Cf. Foakes-Jackson - Lake, 1922, pp.48-50.
4. Turner C.H. (1928, pp.281-2) comments that the greater frequency of $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ in the Gospel of Mark compared with that of Luke reflects 'the Semitic atmosphere' of Mark. It is not clear, however, in what way $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ is more Semitic than $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omicron}$ since Semitic languages do not make any distinction. Of the examples which he gives of parallel passages, Mk 16:3/Lk 24:2 does not really demonstrate Luke's preference for $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omicron}$ because it is required by other modifications in the verse. Turner N. 1963, p.259, also mentions the preference for $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omicron}$ by Luke in his Gospel in place of $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ by Mark and points out especially Luke's use of $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omicron}$ following $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\chi\omicron\upsilon\kappa\iota$.
5. See Turner C.H. 1924, p.14) for a bibliography on this subject.
6. See Turner N. 1963, p.254 and the examples he gives.

Divine Names and Titles.

Part A: κύριος and θεός

κύριος is the term used in the LXX to translate יהוה , the Hebrew name for God arrived at by using the vowels of the noun יהוה which allowed the unspeakable divine name to be pronounced. In Acts, κυριός is again used to refer to God who is sometimes the God of the Old Testament (e.g. 2:20; 4:26;), sometimes Jesus (e.g. 2:36; 14:3). Much of the time, however, κυριός in Acts does not make a clear distinction between God and Jesus, an indication of the recognition of Jesus' divinity from the beginning of the early Church.¹

I. VARIANT READINGS CONCERNING κύριος.

I.1 κύριος or θεός.

In the manuscripts S01, B03 and D05, θεός is occasionally read for κύριος as a variant reading. In Codex Bezae κύριος predominates where divergence occurs. It is found as an alternative to θεός at the following places:²

2:17; 6:7; 13:5; 16:10,32; 20:28; 21:20

On three occasions, θεός is read by D05 in place of κύριος :

8:24S01/B03; 10:33S01/B03; 20:32B03

There are further additional references to κύριος in D05:

7:30,55; 14:2; 16:40

The references at 6:7; 13:5; 16:32 are in the context of the word of the Lord/God and are discussed in detail below together with supplementary references to the word of the Lord at 12:24B03; 13:48S01/B03; 18:25D05.

When κύριος is preferred or added by Codex Bezae the context is almost always a Jewish one:

2:17 A quotation from an Old Testament prophecy.

7:30 The 'angel of the Lord' is typically an Old Testament expression and is also found in Acts at 8:26 + 12:23.

7:55 Jesus is identified as the Lord in Stephen's vision of God in heaven.

14:2 The purpose of this additional comment is not obvious and it is likely to belong to a wider variation unit. Superficially, it would have been equally appropriate to use ὁ θεός but the reading may well have something to do with other additional material earlier in the verse which would need to be carefully evaluated in order to appreciate the force of κύριος in the final line.

16:10 It is the Lord in the Old Testament who gives visions. Cf. Paul's vision 18:9 and see comments on this passage in the exegetical study, ch.10.

16:40 Recounting the deeds of the Lord to the brethren is a typical response throughout the Old Testament (especially in the Psalms e.g. Ps 22:22; 52:9; 66:16;) to divine acts of deliverance.

20:28 The term ἡ ἐκκλησία is used in the LXX to refer to 'the assembly' of the people of Israel. The assembly is often mentioned in association with 'the Lord' as for example when the people gather in the presence of the Lord to hear the Law (Dt 4:9), or to seek the Lord (I Ch 1:5), or to bless the Lord (Ps 26:12); and occasionally, the phrase ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ κυρίου is found (eg. Dt 23:1,2,3; I Ch 28:8; Mi 2:5). ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ is not found in the LXX. Such references are sufficient to suggest that the expression chosen by Codex Bezae in Ac 20:28 has clear Jewish resonances and that the choice is deliberate. Furthermore, the purpose of the addition of the reflexive pronoun ἐαυτῷ in the following line in that text would seem to be to identify 'the Lord' as Jesus, for if κύριος does not designate Jesus but more generally 'God' (as in the alternative reading) there is little point in specifying that he acquired the church 'for himself'.

21:20 The situation is specifically one of Jewish-Christians praising the Lord for what God did among the Gentiles. The distinction may be quite conscious.

When θεός is preferred by Codex Bezae, the context is different. The observation has been made by Epp (1966, pp.88-90) that when θεός is found as the object of πιστεύω then the believers are usually Gentiles (Lydia at 16:15 is a difficulty). To some extent, the text of Codex Bezae extends the distinction to other contexts when God is referred to from the point of view of a particular person. Thus, κύριος is not attributed by D05 to non-Jews (10:33 Cornelius) or when the Lordship of God is not acknowledged (8:24 Simon Magus). By contrast, κύριος is used for Jewish-Christians in Jerusalem 21:20,

see above.

This does not explain why $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ should be preferred at 20:23 when Paul commends the Ephesian church elders to 'God' rather than to the 'Lord'. It is possible that the distinction reflects Paul's own terminology, for in his letters there is a clear differentiation between God the Father and the Lord Jesus, and that here he meant God the Father not the Lord Jesus of v.35 and, if our interpretation of the 'church of the Lord' is correct (see above), of v.28.

The implication of the frequency of $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ in Codex Bezae is that its editor, and the community for which he was writing, were at home with the term $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ and were able to extend the scope of reference to include Jesus with relative ease. In the light of evidence adduced elsewhere for the Jewish background of both the Bezan writer and his audience, the frequency with which $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is used can be taken as pointing to the same background.

1.2. The definite article before $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$.

The variation in the use of the definite article before $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ is yet another suggestive indication of a Jewish background of Codex Bezae. References which are anarthrous in the manuscripts of S01/B03 and D05 can be classified as:

- a) a term of address to Jesus in the vocative 1:6,24; 4:29; 7:60; 11:8, 22:10.
- b) a declaration that God has made Jesus, or that Jesus is, Lord 2:36; 10:36.
- c) words introducing a divine declaration 2:34; 7:49; 15:17.

d) genitival phrases in what are familiar Old Testament expressions
2:20; 5:19; 7:30, 31S01/B03=33D05; 8:26; 11:21; 12:7,23; 13:11; 17:24.

e) recollections, explicit or implicit, of ways in which God acted
in the Old Testament 2:39; 12:11(not B03).

In the first two categories, the article would not be expected as *κύριος* is used as a title. The absence of the article in the context of a declaration as in c) is typical of the pattern which was observed to function in the S01/B03 text, although not necessarily in D05, before proper names in an initial introduction to speech (see Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, #II.d). While salience cannot be excluded as a factor which determines the absence of the article³, such phrases as occur in these examples (e.g. *λέγει κύριος*) have definite resonances of the Old Testament.

This is also the case in group d) in which any call for the article in Greek is overridden by the familiarity of the phrase in the LXX, where initially *κύριος* had no article because it was written for the tetragrammaton. It would seem that the Old Testament recollection is the influencing factor in these examples rather than other factors of case or governing prepositions.⁴ Thus, in genitival phrases which are not set expressions such as *ἡ διδαχὴ τοῦ κυρίου* at 13:12, the article is retained. *ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου* retains the article throughout Acts suggesting that the meaning of the phrase is not that of a specific prophetic word as in the Old Testament, an interpretation borne out by the absence of the article before *κυρίου* at 16:32D05 where the word does, in contrast to the other arthrous references, seem to be understood as prophetic (= τοῦ θεοῦ S01/B03 - see discussion on this verse in #II below.).

The two references in group e) contain allusions to the Lord acting for Israel in the Old Testament; at 12:11, it is the absence of

the article before $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ which gives a possible clue that Peter's deliverance is viewed as an enactment of the Passover story, an interpretation which is borne out by analysis of the story as a whole (see exegetical study on Acts 12, ch.9). As in group d), in other places where $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ refers to God acting in the Church but not specifically recalling an intervention in the Old Testament the article is retained (eg. 2:47; 12:17).

It is in references which are of the type of the latter three categories, c), d) and e), that there are variant readings concerning the article. In addition to the references given in the lists above the article is omitted before $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ at the following places:

c) 18:9D05

d) 2:21S01/B03; 5:9S01/B03; 13:10D05;

If there is any room for the claim (see note 4 above) that $\acute{\omicron}\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ refers to Jesus rather than to God ($\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$), then it is possible that some editors have interpreted $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ in these instances as meaning Jesus and have thus included the article.

Codex Bezae mentions $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ as an additional reference at five further places where the pattern of the article established so far can largely be discerned:

D05	S01/B03	type of reference
2:17 λέγει κυριος	ο θεος	c)
7:30 αγγελος κυριου	ο αγγελος	d)
7:55 ιησουν τον κυριον	ιησουν	function, not title
14:2 ο κυριος εδωκεν ειρηνην	sentence omitted	not O.T.?
16:40 εποιησεν κυριος αυτοις	" "	e)
19:10 ο κυριος ειπεν	ο	non-initial speech

A query remains over the purpose of 14:2 (see #1.1 above) and whether it alludes to the Old Testament or not; the presence of the article may show that it does not.

1.3 Conclusions

The overall picture in Codex Bezae is that (ὁ) κύριος is used there with more ease than in the text of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus. Not only is the word used in preference to θεός but when it is used it is often in a way which is reminiscent of Old Testament usage. These conclusions tend to be confirmed by the analysis which follows of the phrases ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου and ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ in the three manuscripts.

II. THE WORD OF GOD ; THE WORD OF THE LORD

Both phrases are found in the firm text of Acts and there are a number of additional occurrences which do not occur in all manuscripts. In many places, there are variant readings involving *θεός* and *κύριος* as well as the article.

It is to be expected that there should be a certain interchangeability of these two terms and that the picture in the text of Acts, in so far as it reflects the situation in the early Church at various stages, should present a degree of fluctuation. The situation arises partly out of the new revelation of the God of Israel through Jesus and partly out of the twofold nature of the word in the beginning of the Church.

In the Hebrew Old Testament, in speaking of the word of God, God is referred to by name as 'Yahweh'. The Hebrew term for 'word' is *דָבָר* - 'dabhar'. 'The word of Yahweh' almost always has a prophetic force, referring to God's plans or intentions or to his judgement. It is not so much a static, fixed message as a living power. In the targumic traditions of the Prophets, the word of God takes on an increased importance and is often designated by the term 'memra' which comes to mean not only the words or actions but even the presence of God (Chilton 1982, pp.59-69). By the time of Jesus and of the New Testament the concept of the word of God is a well-developed one, rich in association and meaning. There is a danger today of wanting always to understand 'the word' with its contemporary meaning of a fixed doctrinal message or the written Scriptures but this would be to miss a large and important part of its meaning in the first century.

In the LXX, the name 'Yahweh' is rendered by *κύριος*. 'The word of Yahweh' is translated *λόγος κυρίου* with no article or, more rarely, *ῥῆμα κυρίου*.

In the Christian community, Jesus becomes ὁ κύριος ; ὁ θεός is the term available to designate 'God' as distinct from Jesus. Since Jesus is God, it is inevitable that 'the word of God' can either be attributed to θεός or κύριος . Ambiguity can also arise when the word in question is a prophetic word, calling for κύριος in alignment with the LXX or θεός to designate God rather than more particularly the Lord Jesus.

In the Gospel of Luke, Jesus uses the phrase ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ for the word of God, except when the word means specific word(s) when ῥῆμα is used. In Acts, ἡ ῥῆμα τοῦ κυρίου is found once when Peter recalls Jesus's words about the baptism of the Holy Spirit (11:16; cf. Luke 22:61 not D05!). Apart from this instance, the two terms found in Acts are ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ and ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου which occur in the manuscripts S01, B03 and D05 as follows:

ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ	ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου
4:31	
6:2,7S01/B03	6:7D05
8:14;	8:25
11:1	
12:24S01/D05	12:24B03
13:5S01/B03/d,7,44B03/(D05),	13:5D05,44S01/(d),
46(not d),48B03/D05	46d,48:S01/d,49
14:4D05	14:25S01
	15:35,36
16:32S01/B03	16:32D05 (-τοῦ)
17:13 (-ὁ, -τοῦ D05)	
18:11	18:25D05
(19:20S01/B03)	19:10S01/B03/(D05)

As is clear from this table, there are few readings without variation. It is very difficult to establish any regular pattern of usage and even the references which are common to Codex Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and Bezae all have the alternative reading in at least one other manuscript, especially the versions (B-L *ad loc*). This variety of textual attestation no doubt reflects the rapidly evolving situation and probably, too, local custom and preference. *κύριος* used to mean the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; now it also means, or especially means, Jesus, the Christ sent by God and who is/was the man Jesus from Nazareth. *θεός* can be used instead but sometimes the word concerns precisely the *κύριος*, Jesus; and in the Old Testament (LXX), the word of God was of *κύριος*.

II.1 Readings common to S01, B03 and D05.

Taking those readings which are common to all three manuscripts in question in this study, some tentative comments can be made concerning an apparent difference in the application of the two expressions. It is not a distinction rigidly maintained but one which is discernible nonetheless. When *ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ* is used the idea seems to be one of a message spoken with a specific content, namely the gospel, sometimes on a specific occasion (4:31; 6:2; 8:14; 11:1; 13:7,46 where only d disagrees; 17:13; 18:11). *ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου*, on the other hand, is used in situations where, in the light of the Old Testament use of the phrase, the word could be said to be directly fulfilling God's purpose in the development of the Church (8:25; 13:49; 15:36).⁵

If 4:31 is compared with 8:25, for example, on the former occasion the word refers to the preaching of the gospel (4:29) with boldness; on the latter it also refers in a general way to the proclamation of the gospel but specifically as Peter and John testified to the people of Samaria which was in fulfilment of the commandment of Jesus (1:1).

In chapter 15, it is Paul and Barnabas who speak the word of the Lord, firstly (v.35) with reference to the people in Antioch and secondly (v.36) with reference to the people in the cities (of Asia Minor) visited on their first journey. The proclamation carried out in the course of the journey, v.36, resembles the proclamation to Samaria as part of the fulfilment of the divine plan for the gospel to be taken 'to the ends of the earth'. The choice of 'the word of the Lord' at v.35 is less explicable, the verb used being *εὐκγγελίσω* which would seem to mean that the 'word' on this occasion was the gospel; there are manuscripts (none of the three chosen for this study) which have *θεός* here and *κύριος* in the following verse.

11.2 Variant readings.

When the places in the three manuscripts with variant readings are considered, the distinction defined so far continues to function.

6:7 In 6:2 (all manuscripts), *θεός* is used - the word refers to the activity of preaching in a non-specified context (cf.4:31). At v.7, however, 'the word' is mentioned for its effect and growth in Jerusalem and the Bezan text reads *του κυριου*.

12:24 A similar phrase is encountered at 12:24 where there is no call for *θεός* in order to designate an occasion of preaching activity. The reference is a general one to the growth and effect of

'the word' at a point in the narrative which marks a movement away from the activity of the Church in Jerusalem to the expansion of the Church through the mission from Antioch. The verbs used in conjunction here are identical to those read in 19:20D05; the same combination is first found in Exodus (1:7) of the people of Israel, a phrase taken up by Stephen in his speech in chapter 7 (v.17). It is reasonable to suppose that in the application of the verbs to development of 'the word' in the early Church there is an awareness of their associations which would require *κύριος* rather than *θεός* as the author of 'the word'. On this occasion, therefore, there is good reason to view *κύριος* of Codex Vaticanus as retaining a trace of an original distinction between *ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ* and *ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου*.

13:5 'Lord' is read only by the Greek side of Codex Bezae with slight support from a few manuscripts of early versions. Its use in this context reflects its use at 15:36 (all three manuscripts, see above) and in both instances can be understood as the proclamation which advances the divine plan in taking the good news out beyond Judaea. In support of the alternative reading, it may be said that since here as elsewhere the word refers to the preaching of the gospel, then *ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ* is also appropriate. In choosing *τοῦ κυρίου*, however, Codex Bezae demonstrates a certain sensitivity to the Jewish-Christian perspective.

13:44,46 The successive references in chapter 13 produce an interesting mixture of attestation, with d preferring *κύριος* throughout and Codex Sinaiticus reading *κύριος* against the other two manuscripts twice. The sequence begins with 'the word' mentioned as being preached in the city of Antioch of Pisidia at a certain time. On the basis of the distinction observed so far, *θεός* would be the appropriate term here (B03/D05). The Bezan text re-words the verse with an additional two lines describing the word of God going through

the whole city but the context remains the same. (The text then goes on to say that the whole city gathered to hear Paul speaking 'about the Lord' which is also appropriate as signifying Jesus). It is the contents of the word of God as the gospel which is again intended by Paul in v.46.⁷

13:48 At v.48, S01 and B03 have 'glorified' rather than D05's 'received'. The expression 'glorified the word' whether 'of God' (B03) or 'of the Lord' (S01) is an unusual one and in the absence of any available comparison it is difficult to decide in favour of one or the other. Indeed, some manuscripts omit τὸν λόγον to read simply 'glorifying God/the Lord'; yet others combine the two verbs 'received' and 'glorified'. The variety of divergence reflects a widespread difficulty with the original expression whatever it was. It is possible that the Bezan text has opted for τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ as being appropriate to the context of the Gentiles receiving the word (see #I.1 above).

13:49 The spread of the word at v.49 is more easily classified as requiring κυρίου, the sense of the accomplishment of the plan of God being present as in other occurrences of a similar statement (cf.6:7).

14:4D05 In this additional mention of ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ the expression is apparently used almost as a technical term for 'the gospel' on account of which some people in Iconium sided with Paul and Barnabas. The situation is one of sharp division among the people with some of the Jews turning the Gentiles away from the apostles' preaching. In a series of amendments and amplifications, the Bezan text stresses the role of the Jewish synagogue leaders in stirring up persecution, and it is to them that 'the word of God' is set in opposition.

14:25 Codex Sinaiticus adds τοῦ κυρίου, which is surprising since the reference appears to be to the preaching of the Gospel, as in the

additional comment of Codex Bezae two lines later.

16:32 In chapter 16, Paul and Silas speak the word to the Philippian jailor and his household. The most obvious sense is that they told him the gospel, expanding on what they had just said about believing in the Lord Jesus (v.31). If that is what is meant by the word here, *ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ* would seem to be the appropriate expression but this is only read by S01/B03 and very few others. The small amount of support does not in itself preclude the possibility of the reading being original but the wide support for what appears to be the more unlikely name in this context suggests that something else could be understood by 'the word' which was spoken to Cornelius. It may be that the word spoken by Paul and Silas could be understood as encompassing more than the contents of the gospel, to include personal words of reassurance and comfort from the Lord in view of the situation: a violent earthquake, all the prisoners' chains loosened, the jailor prepared to kill himself and shaking with fear. Codex Bezae not only has *κυρίου* but omits the article so using, if the omission is deliberate, an expression evocative of the Old Testament prophetic word.

18:25 Most manuscripts read *ῥῶν* for *λόγον*. In the Bezan reading, *τοῦ κυρίου* is appropriate because the reference is probably to the Jewish Scriptural teaching rather than to the Christian gospel (which in fact Apollos does not know very well - see end of v.25 and v.26).

19:10 *κυρίου* is again found in almost all witnesses at 19:10. Codex Bezae makes it clear that it is not simply 'the gospel message' which is intended in this instance by having 'the word' in the plural to read *τους λόγους του κυριου*.

19:20 This verse is full of difficulty in both texts though only S01/B03 have mention of 'the word'. If *του κυριου* goes with *ο λογος* in S01/B03 that is the only occasion on which the usual order is

reversed, with no apparent reason for wanting to draw attention to ὁ κύριος by fronting the genitival noun (see ch.3, part B, #1.4.f). Whenever ἰσχύω is used elsewhere, it is accompanied by an infinitive (B-L *ad loc*). Otherwise, the statement is reminiscent of that of 12:24 as it is read in S01/B03. Following as it does the account of the demonstration of the power of God through various miraculous happenings in Ephesus which culminate in the burning of the occult books by the believers (or new believers D05)^a, the statement in 19:20 stands as a comment on the power of the word of the Lord in its active sense. It was being (imperfect tenses S01/B03) effective in leading to belief and repentance. The comment marks another stage in the development of the Church.

Alternatively, it is possible to take τοῦ κυρίου with καὶ κρῆτος, leaving ὁ λόγος unspecified which happens elsewhere (17:11) (Delebecque 1982, p.231).

The Bezan text of vv.20-21 has been discussed previously (in the chapter on τότε, ch.4, Part B, #II.5) where there was seen to be some evidence of a confused and/or distracted scribe. What is strange is that by using ἐπληθύνε(το), the Bezan text is also reminiscent of 12:24 but avoids not only ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου again, but even omits mention of ὁ λόγος altogether, replacing it with ἡ πίστις. The subject of the first verb ἐνίσχυσεν in the aorist is either lacking (Metzger 1975 *ad loc*) or is to be taken as faith in God, underlined with κκ(and followed by asyndeton (Delebecque 1982, p.231). The final two verbs in the imperfect reproduce the verbs of 12:24 (see comments at 12:24 above).

II.3 Conclusions

The distinction initially proposed, that ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ applies to the preaching of the gospel in a usually localized context, and that ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου encompasses a more general message and has a wider application, is borne out by an examination of the variant readings; but a degree of inconsistency is apparent. Both Codex Bezae and Codex Vaticanus are more consistent in following the distinction than is Codex Sinaiticus but the text of all three manuscripts looks secondary on some occasions.

Both phrases reflect a stereotyped expression, the former being the one commonly used in Luke's Gospel and the latter being already a fixed phrase in the Greek Old Testament albeit without the article. The editor of Codex Bezae is less bound by the stereotyped phrases, creating his own expression on three occasions (13:44; 19:10,20).

A familiarity on the part of Codex Bezae with the Jewish background of the Old Testament continues to be evident in this analysis. In identifying Jesus with the κύριος of the Old Testament more consistently than does the text of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus, there is apparent the same concern to demonstrate the continuity between Judaism and Christianity as has been observed in the earlier chapters of this thesis.

Divine Names and Titles.

Part B: JESUS

It is a popular belief that Codex Bezae, as the chief representative of the 'Western' text, generally adds to any incomplete form of the name or title of Jesus in order to give a fuller form. This is assumed to be the work of a later scribe who wished to make the text which he produced conform to what had become the established practice in the Church of his time.⁹ This examination of the titles and names of Jesus in the Bezan text aims to establish the precise practice in that text and to discover some of the reasons behind it.¹⁰

As usual in this thesis, the text of Codex Bezae is compared with that of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus; reference is made only in passing to other Greek manuscripts and the versions in which a large amount of variation on this issue abounds. Comparison refers therefore specifically to the text of S01/B03. Where the texts of these two manuscripts disagree, note will be made.

I. FORMS IN THE TEXT COMMON TO S01, B03 AND D05.

The following forms are found (the same form with and without the article is counted as one for the purpose of this analysis):

ἰησοῦς	1:1,11,16; 2:32,36b; 4:2,13; 5:30,40; 13:23; 17:7; 19:13
ἰησοῦς ὁ ναζωραῖος	2:22; 6:14; 10:38; 22:8
ὁ παῖς ἰησοῦς	4:27,30
ἰησοῦς χριστός	2:31,36a; 3:18; 4:26; 8:5; 17:3
χριστός ἰησοῦς	3:20b; 17:3
ἰησοῦς χριστός	8:12; 10:36; 16:18
ἰησοῦς χριστός ὁ ναζωραῖος	3:6; 4:10
ἰησοῦς κύριος	1:6; 2:36a,47; 5:14; 10:36; 11:16,21,24; 13:12; 14:3; 22:10
ἰησοῦς κύριος ἰησοῦς	7:59; 19:13,17; 20:24,35
ὁ κύριος ἰησοῦς χριστός	11:17; 15:26

ἰησοῦς refers to Jesus the man, as the person known to at least some of the characters in the story of Acts, or as the subject of the new teaching. It is used notably by those who are familiar with the name or person of Jesus but who do not accept his special status.

ἰησοῦς ὁ ναζωραῖος is used in the same way with the place of origin apparently serving as a familiar mark of identification.

ὁ ἅγιος παῖς σου ἰησοῦς is used only by members of the early Church in Jerusalem in speaking of Jesus in relation to the God of the Jews.

ὁ Χριστός on its own appears to have the function of a technical term with its literal meaning of 'the anointed' although it is impossible to rule out that it also carried some sense of the name which it became within a short time of the beginnings of the Church (cf. Paul's use of Christ as a name in his letters).¹¹ In the references cited above, Χριστός is used in an apologetic sense in a speech announcing the gospel or in referring to preaching and, except at 8:5, is found in conjunction with proving that Jesus was the Christ or the other way round. (There are variations on precisely the order at 17:3+18:26).

Χριστός Ἰησοῦς occurs with the two terms in conjunction precisely in the context of demonstrating that the one is the other. Χριστός and Ἰησοῦς do not appear as a name or title in this order but stand in apposition to each other or with the verb 'to be'.

Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is found as a kind of theological formula. It is twice combined with 'the name of' (8:12; 16:18), as the subject of preaching and in an exorcism command. It is once spoken by Peter (10:36) in what appears to become a standard phrase in the Christian theological explanation of the work of Jesus in bringing Gentiles and Jews together: 'preached peace through Jesus Christ' (cf. Eph 2:11-18). (At v.36, Peter is not speaking to Cornelius but to himself or at most to the Christians who have accompanied him to Caesarea. He goes on in v.37 to explain the gospel to Cornelius, his first mention of Jesus being Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ ναζαρεθ .)

Ἰησοῦς Χριστός ὁ ναζωραῖος is likewise a formula-type appellation, much more so than the same phrase without Χριστός, and it belongs to the phrase 'in the name of...' in the context of the healing of the lame man at the Temple. It is not found subsequently in Acts.

ὁ Κύριος on its own in Acts frequently refers to God as revealed through the Old Testament rather than to Jesus in particular (e.g. 3:20a; 4:26). Through the events of the incarnation, death and resurrection of Jesus, Peter declares that Jesus has been made Lord by God (2:36a; cf. 10:36) and on a number of occasions in Acts after Peter's first speech of proclamation Κύριος could refer to either God or Jesus or both.¹² The context is sometimes one of believers being added to or by the Lord (2:47; 5:14; 11:24) but ambiguity chiefly arises in the phrase 'the word of the Lord'. In that phrase as elsewhere (2:17; 8:24; 16:10; 20:28; 21:20), θεός and κύριος are sometimes alternative readings with κύριος predominating in Codex Bezae. This question is discussed in more detail in Part A of this chapter. It is overwhelmingly in Acts 9 (D05 lacuna) that κύριος is used plainly of Jesus in the story of Paul's conversion.¹³ It is used unambiguously of Jesus in addressing him (1:6; 22:10), just as κύριε is also found in prayer addressed to God (cf. 4:29; 7:60); and in phrases such as 'turned to the Lord' (11:21), 'the teaching of the Lord' (13:12) and 'speaking about the Lord' (14:3).

Only once is Κύριος followed by Χριστός (2:36a) to affirm that Jesus has been made both Lord and Christ by God but the two terms are never found combined as one title.

ὁ κύριος ἰησοῦς is the term used by Stephen and Paul in referring to Jesus in a personal relationship. It is also used in Ac. 19 in the phrase 'the name of...' but only when the phrase is not a formal pronouncement. That the phrase τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἰησοῦ was to some extent a set expression, however, is evident from the absence of the article before κύριος in Codex Bezae at 19:13+17 (cf. Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, pp.29-30 on the absence of the definite article in some set phrases).

ὁ κύριος ἰησοῦς χριστός is the fullest title and is found only twice as a non-variant reading, on each occasion spoken by Christians to other Christians in a formal context. At 11:17, Peter argues the case for the Gentiles receiving the Holy Spirit in the same way as the Jewish believers: πιστεύσασι ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον ἰησοῦν χριστόν. At 15:26, the Jerusalem apostles recommend Barnabas and Paul as men who have given up their lives ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. This is the only example in the text common to S01/B03 and D05 of the possessive ἡμῶν qualifying ὁ κύριος.

The functions of each appellation can be grouped as follows:

- the person: ἰησοῦς, or especially ὁ κύριος ἰησοῦς by Christians.
- 'in the name of': ἰησοῦς by non-believers; ὁ κύριος ἰησοῦς at Ephesus ch.19; ὁ ἰησοῦς χριστός (ὁ νεβραῖος) in a set phrase.
- the Messiah: ὁ χριστός as the one anointed by God. χριστός is never used on its own as a name in the way that ἰησοῦς is.
- theological concept: ὁ ἰησοῦς χριστός or, more formally, ὁ κύριος ἰησοῦς χριστός.

There are no baptismal declarations which include the name of Jesus in any of the references examined in this section; all such declarations in Acts have variant readings and are examined in the next section.

II. READINGS IN D05 WHICH DIVERGE FROM THOSE IN S01/B03

There are many instances where the form of the name or title of Jesus is longer in the text of D05; it is never shorter. When these cases are examined carefully it is clear that in order to understand how they have arisen they need to be considered alongside the instances when no attempt is made to add to or to complete a shorter form (i.e. the references in the previous section). Indeed, the Bezan editor does not complete the names of Jesus indiscriminately but does so when a reason is perceived to require it.

In the analysis of the variant readings which follows, the text of D05 is described in comparison with that of S01 and B03 but it is worth underlining at this point that this comparison is made, as always, without any intention of suggesting that either text is dependent on the other.

The references to Jesus in the Bezan text are longer than those in the other text in one of the following ways:

supplementary Ἰησοῦς 4:18; 17:31; 20:25
supplementary Χριστός 1:21; 3:13; 4:33(=S01); 8:16; 11:20; 15:11;
16:31; 19:5; 20:21(=S01); 21:13
supplementary κύριος 2:38; 5:42; 7:55; 10:48; 18:5
supplementary κύριος
+ Χριστός 13:33

supplementary Ἰησοῦς is supplied where it is not already specified to make clear that the name, man or kingdom referred to is Jesus. In the case of 'the name of Jesus' at 4:18, the usage conforms to that of the shared text in similar circumstances at 5:40 in that it is spoken by non-believing Jews.

supplementary Χριστός is only found in addition to ὁ κύριος ἰησοῦς or, once, ὁ παῖς ἰησοῦς. Χριστός is never added to ἰησοῦς or κύριος on their own. This is important because it illustrates how the completion of the name of Jesus is by no means indiscriminate in the way that could be expected if it were due to a later scribe's unease with what he deemed to be an irreverently, or incorrectly, incomplete title.

παῖς

3:13 Χριστός is added to παῖς at 3:13, but not at 4:27 or 4:30 where the phrase occurs in a direct address to God. This suggests that it is more than a pious addition devoid of meaning. In the context of Peter's speech in Ac.3, especially in its Bezan form, the mention of Χριστός is in fact highly significant as a reference to the Messiah for the speech sets out the treatment by the Jewish people of Jesus as the one sent by God. The Bezan text draws more closely on the Jewish theological and historical background than does the other text to demonstrate the importance of their rejection of Jesus as the Messiah (cf. the exegetical study of Acts 3, Heimerdinger 1988).

'In the name of...'

8:16; 19:5 Χριστός completes a baptismal formula, 'in the name of...' (in the same way that the addition of κύριος does so in the references below).

21:13 It also completes 'in the name of...' at 21:13 which speaks of Paul being willing to die for the name of Jesus, thus bringing that phrase into line with a similar one in the shared text at 15:26 (except for the presence of ἡμῶν in that instance).

The resurrection

4:33 The resurrection is the context of the full title at 4:33 where the word order (της αναστασεως before the name) and the inclusion of Χριστός in S01 and D05 make the phrase more of a fixed expression than in B03. Whereas S01 has ιησου χριστου του κυριου, D05 has του κυριου ιησου χριστου, the former order being an unusual one. Χριστός is used in speaking of the resurrection elsewhere in Acts (2:30D05+31); at the only other reference to the resurrection of Jesus (13:33), Codex Bezae adds both κύριος and χριστός so bringing the wording into line with 4:33D05. This suggests that 'the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ' became something of a stereotyped expression at some point in the early Church.

A theological formula

15:11; 16:31; 20:21 As a theological formula, ὁ κύριος ἰησοῦς is transformed into the full title several times, whether it be saved by the grace of (15:11), or belief/faith in (16:31, 20:21) the Lord Jesus Christ. In this way, these references conform to wording of the full title spoken by Peter in the formal setting of his speech at Jerusalem (11:17). Both the references at 15:11 and 16:31 are comments very similar to that of 11:17 for they all refer to Gentiles who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. At 20:21, Paul speaks to the Ephesian Christians of 'our' Lord Jesus Christ which is appropriate enough in view of the nature of the conversation (cf. 15:26, the only other occasion on which ἡμῶν is found qualifying ὁ κύριος in S01/B03/D05).

11:20 The subject of preaching the gospel to Gentiles is also the occasion for the full title at 11:20.

A formal occasion

11:21 Χριστός completes 'the Lord Jesus' in Peter's speech to the other ten apostles. Since Peter speaks of Jesus in addressing the apostles as the person whom they have known, ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς of the other text is not out of place. It may well be the official nature of the occasion, the choosing of the twelfth apostle, of which Codex Bezae appears to be particularly conscious (cf. ch.8 on Acts 1), which calls for the more formal title.

supplementary κύριος is another means used by Codex Bezae to complete a reference to Jesus in order to provide the full title.

Baptism

2:38; 10:48 At both places, the context is one of baptism and thus in the Bezan text of Acts the baptismal formula on all occasions is 'in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ' (cf. 8:16; 19:5 above, and 18:8 in #III below).

Jesus is the Christ

5:42 501/B03 read εὐαγγελισμένοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ which is an order of names not found elsewhere in Acts unless εἰναι can be supplied: 'announcing that the Christ was Jesus' (cf. 18:28). The Bezan text turns it into a stereotyped expression εὐαγγελισμένοι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, similar to that which was seen at 11:20D05 above.

18:5 The context here is also one of proving Christ and Jesus to be the same, where D05 adds κύριος to Ἰησοῦς: εἰναι τοῦ Χριστοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.

Jewish context

7:55 κύριος is once more added to ἰησοῦς in the description of Stephen's vision at 7:55. There, ὁ κύριος is not simply added as a familiar form of address but as a deliberate designation following ἰησοῦς. The context of Jesus standing in heaven at the right hand of God, as well as the intensively Jewish nature of Stephen's speech, make it likely that the addition of κύριος in this case has a Jewish theological reason.

supplementary Χριστός and κύριος

The resurrection

13:33 This verse has been mentioned above (see 4:33, #II) as a reference to the resurrection of Jesus which, like all other references in the Bezan text to the resurrection, contains the full title as opposed to simply ἰησοῦς.

Variation between θεός and κύριος has been mentioned in #I; D05 uses κύριος as an alternative to θεός rather more frequently than does the S01/B03 text, as discussed in Part A.

Variation exists on one other occasion at 19:4 between ἰησοῦς and Χριστός. The context of Paul explaining to the Jewish converts in Ephesus the function of John the Baptist as a precursor of another person allows Χριστόν in the Bezan text to be understood as a Messianic designation rather than a name. It produces nevertheless a phrase 'believe in Christ', which is found nowhere else in Acts.

III. THE PATTERN IN THE BEZAN TEXT

There are the following mentions of Jesus in material which is peculiar to Codex Bezae:

ἰησοῦς	19:14
ὁ Χριστός	2:30
ὁ κύριος	14:2
ὁ κύριος ἰησοῦς	18:4
ὁ κύριος ἰησοῦς Χριστός	6:8; 14:10; 16:4; 18:8

19:14 In this considerably reworded passage, the command to the demon is given ἐν ἰησοῦ just as in the firm wording of the previous verse.

2:30 A supplementary comment on the resurrection uses τὸν Χριστόν and so resembles the mention of the resurrection in the following verse. Χριστός is always associated with mention the resurrection in the Bezan text (cf. 4:33D05 and 13:33D05 #11).

14:2 The designation of 'the Lord' in this verse need not be restricted to Jesus, there being ambiguity on many occasions in Acts (cf. #1 above on Κύριος). Since κύριος in the following verse refers to Jesus, however, it is reasonable to understand that meaning here. The idea of 'the Lord' intervening in the lives of the people becomes more common in Acts as the narrative progresses.

18:4 The short form 'the Lord Jesus' may at first sight seem surprising because it is coupled with 'the name of'. This though is precisely an occasion when the name of Jesus is not used in a formal expression and the full title is not used (cf. 19:13+17 #1).

6:8; 14:10; 18:8 These occurrences of the full title of Jesus arise in a comment added to specify 'the name of the Lord Jesus Christ'.

Thus, Stephen did wonders and signs, Paul commanded the lame man to walk, and many Corinthians were baptized believing in God, all in or through the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. All three occurrences involve a speech act, as opposed to being simply part of the descriptive narrative text and can therefore be understood as reflecting an actual practice. Comparable occasions in the Bezan text of Acts have similarly formal wording.

Where the lame man is commanded to walk by Peter in ch.3 (v.6, cf. 4:10 #1), the phrase is 'Jesus Christ of Nazareth', also a fixed expression but not appropriate in the setting outside Palestine at 14:10 when Paul addresses the lame man at Lystra. At 18:8, the full title of Jesus is associated, though not directly, with baptism. It is like the other references to believing in or through the Lord Jesus Christ which, in Codex Bezae, usually use the full title (11:17; 16:31D05; 20:21D05; but cf. 19:4D05 *Χριστός* in place of *Ἰησοῦς* S01/B03). A more personal note is included at 18:8 with the use of *ἡμῶν*, so making a statement identical to that of Paul at 20:21D05 in a similar context. The reason for the personal note here has to do with the Bezan account of Paul's ministry in ch.18 overall (cf. the exegetical study on Acts 18, ch.10).

16:4 Here, a comment is added to the account of Paul and Silas passing on the instructions from the Jerusalem leaders, to the effect that at the same time 'they preached with all boldness the Lord Jesus Christ'. The use of the full title in speaking of preaching occurs on several occasions in the Bezan text (5:42D05; 11:20D05) although not at all mentions of preaching (cf. Philip 8:5+12).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

It is evident from this examination of the names and titles of Jesus in Codex Bezae that there is a clear tendency to use the full name/title but only in certain situations. When spoken by non-believers or mentioned by the narrator from their point of view, 'Jesus' is left on its own where it is present in the other text, or even added on its own to make an allusion specific. 'Lord Jesus' is found without the addition of 'Christ' when the phrase is used informally by Christians. In other words, D05 does not use *Χριστός*, or create the full title, when the setting is not formal or liturgical. When the context is an official one, then *ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* is found almost systematically.

The occasions on which the name of Jesus is given in its fuller form, and the ways in which it is done, together suggest that the Bezan text is amplifying an earlier, shorter text. To conclude, on the basis of the liturgical pattern in the Bezan text, that the additions to the name of Jesus are of a date much later than that of the original text¹⁴ is to overlook two important considerations.

The first is that Paul, who belongs to the time of the action of Acts let alone the time of the writing of the book, uses the forms of the name of Jesus in a less personal and more stylized way than does even the Bezan text of Acts.¹⁵ Unlike the writings of Paul, the Bezan text uses *ὁ Ἰησοῦς* in preference to *ὁ Χριστός* to refer to the person of Jesus, and does not use *ὁ Χριστός Ἰησοῦς* at all. *ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* is common in Paul's letters but in a greater number of fixed expressions than are present in the Bezan text. *ὁ κύριος* is typical of Paul and in this respect resembles Codex Bezae, which uses *ὁ κύριος* with greater frequency than the other text.

The second point is that liturgical expressions are by no

means necessarily evidence of a late date, especially not when coupled, as they are in Codex Bezae, with a more extensive presentation of Jesus as a person known to the narrator of Acts and his audience (cf. pp.22-3 on the definite article before Jesus, Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992). It is the fact that the set formula for the name of Jesus is almost wholly restricted to formal or liturgical use, and that otherwise the familiar, personal names are used, which is an indication that its source is not likely to be an established ecclesiastical milieu.

A more probable source for the Bezan names of Jesus than the practice of the later established (Gentile) Church is the Jewish liturgical milieu of the early converts to Christianity. It is in keeping with the evidence which points to a Jewish background for the origin of the text of Acts in Codex Bezae to suggest that it is within this context that the name of Jesus became more stylized, at the same time as a personal knowledge of the man Jesus existed alongside that stylization. Seen in this way, it is not necessary to allow time for a Christian liturgy proper to develop (whenever that may be supposed to be ¹⁶), by which period Jesus would have ceased to be a familiar figure. There are, in any case, other indications in the New Testament that the Christian liturgy did in fact grow out of the Jewish liturgy rather than develop as a new and independent creation of the Christian communities.¹⁷

An observation can be made which lends support to the idea that the full name of Jesus is associated with a Jewish setting. Twice, at 1:21 and 3:13, the context for a completed name is a speech of which the Bezan text has a number of modifications that reveal an unmistakable Jewish understanding and perspective of the subject matter (see the exegetical study of Acts 1 in ch.8, and Heimerdinger 1988 on Acts 3). It would be strange to find in the midst of this

material an isolated intrusion from a later period, but it would be entirely consistent with the overall thrust of Codex Bezae to find there terminology belonging to Jewish Christians attached to their religious traditions.

In the course of this study on the names of Jesus it has become apparent that, in those places where there is disagreement between S01/B03 and D05, it is the latter which always has the longer reading and that there are sound reasons for believing this longer reading to be a secondary one. Nevertheless, it should not be concluded that the text of D05 is directly dependent on that of S01/B03 for, however satisfactorily that hypothesis may account for the variation in the names of Jesus, it is apparent from the analyses of other subjects that it is generally an untenable one. A more accurate description of the relationship between the two texts is likely to be that both are linked independently, in differing degrees of directness, to the original text, both of them varying from the original version but the S01/B03 text rather less so than that of D05. This possible schema can be tested out as further analyses of the Bezan text are carried out.

Divine Names and Titles.

Part C: THE HOLY SPIRIT.

INTRODUCTION

A study of the terms used in the text of Acts to refer to the Holy Spirit draws in part on the findings noted in the chapter on word order (ch.3, Part B, #I.4.a) because of the variations in the position of the adjective. There are, however, further differences which exist between the two textual traditions under consideration (S01/B03 and D05) in the precise wording used to designate the Holy Spirit. They involve firstly the presence or absence of the adjective 'holy' and secondly the use of the definite article.

Exegetical issues are inevitably bound up with some of the linguistic questions. That said, this is not the place to enter into the debate over the precise theological significance of the Holy Spirit in the experience of the New Testament Church, a controversy to which many scholars have contributed and continue to do so.¹⁰ The discussions concerning the theology of the Holy Spirit rarely, in fact, treat the subject of the different forms of expression used in Acts to allude to the Spirit, or the question of the variant readings, although mention is occasionally made of the significance of the definite article (see Hull 1967).

The different terms used to refer to the Holy Spirit, and the variant readings, are a phenomenon more often alluded to in textual

discussions of the book of Acts.¹⁹ Matthew Black notably has devoted one study entirely to an examination of the Western readings concerning the Holy Spirit in Acts (1981). Despite a diversity of scholarly opinion and comment, certain recurring ideas can be detected in the popular understanding of the matter. These are principally that the 'Western' text (in which is included Codex Bezae) has a tendency to add 'holy' to the mention of the Spirit and that this tendency reflects a late ecclesiastical tradition rather than the original text.

The situation is, in fact, far from being as settled as is often implied. In order to arrive at a clear picture of what exactly the situation is, it will be helpful to bear in mind two points. The first is that the 'Western' text represents much too diverse a tradition for the label to be interchangeable with any one manuscript. Codex Bezae, for one, has a text unlike that of any other manuscript and stands as a text in its own right. It does not, as the analysis which follows shows, demonstrate a preference for the use of 'holy' with 'Spirit'. The second point is that just because a term came to be part of the established vocabulary of the Church it does not mean that the frequent use of this term in a manuscript indicates a late date for the text of that manuscript. The same point is made in examining the name 'Jesus Christ' in Part B of this chapter. It will be seen here that the factors which influence the inclusion of 'holy' with the mention of the Spirit are, in fact, more likely to be pre-Christian than to derive from the practice of the later established Church.

Table to show expressions used.

An indispensable task before any analysis of the problem can be successfully attempted is to set out exactly the references to the Holy Spirit in the book of Acts, as they stand in the common text as well as the variant readings.²⁰ The study here is based on a comparison of the text of Codex Bezae with the texts of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus. It is important to make note of who makes the mention within the story of Acts and to whom, and also of the context of the mention. These are two factors which are often seen to have an influence on linguistic choices (see ch.2 on Discourse Analysis). In the table which follows, at places of variant reading the S01/B03 text is given first with the D05 reading underneath it. Where a mention of the Spirit occurs only in the D05 text, the verse reference is given followed by D05. Any English text in brackets indicates that it is not shared by all three manuscripts.

TABLE 1

A list of all the references to the Spirit in Acts (S01/B03 and D05).

Ref.	Greek	Speaker-Addressee	Context
1:2	δix πνευματος αγιου	narrative	Jesus instructed the disciples through H.S. baptism in H.S.
5	εν πνευματι αγιω	Jesus-apostles	when H.S. comes you will receive power
8	του αγιου πνευματος	" "	H.S. foretold Scripture all were filled
16	το πνευμα το αγιον	Peter-120	Quote Joel: God pours out his Spirit
2:4	πνευματος αγιου	narrative	Jesus received H.S.
17	του πνευματος μου	Peter-Jews	gift of H.S. after repentance and baptism
18	του πνευματος μου	" "	Peter filled
33	του πνευματος του αγου	" "	David spoke thro' H.S. apostles filled
D05	του αγιου πνευματος	" "	he deceives H.S.
38	του αγιου πνευματος	" "	she tempts Sp. of Lord
4:8	πνευματος αγιου	narrative	God gave H.S.
25	δix πνευματος αγιου	Apostles-God	7 men full of Spirit
31	του αγιου πνευματος	narrative	Stephen, full of faith and H.S.
5:3	το πνευμα το αγιον	Peter-Ananias	(H.) Spirit with which Stephen spoke
D05	το αγιον πνευμα	" -Sapphira	they resist H.S.
9	το πνευμα (του δοσ) κυριου	" -Priests	Stephen full of H.S. that those baptised might receive H.S.
32	το πνευμα το αγιον	"	they did receive H.S. Simon saw that (H.) Spirit was given
6:3	πνευματος	the 12-the others	anyone on whom I lay hands might receive H.S. Spirit spoke to Philip
5	πνευματος αγιου	narrative	Spirit spoke to Peter
10	τω πνευματι	"	Jesus anointed with H.S.
D05	τω πνευματι τω κυιω	Stephen-Jews	H.S. fell
7:51	τω πνευματι τω κυιω	narrative	gift of H.S. poured out
55	πνευματος αγιου	"	can anyone forbid baptism of those who have received H.S.?
8:15	πνευμα αγιον	"	
17	πνευμα αγιον	"	
18	το πνευμα	"	
D05	το πνευμα το αγιον	Simon-Peter	
19	πνευμα κυριου	narrative	
29	το πνευμα	"	
10:19	το πνευμα	"	
38	πνευματι αγιω	Peter-Cornelius	
D05	αγιω πνευματι	narrative	
44	το πνευμα το αγιον	"	
45	του αγιου πνευματος	"	
D05	του πνευματος αγιου	Peter-Christians	
47	το πνευμα το αγιον	"	

Ref.	Greek	Speaker-Addressee	Context
11:12	ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ	Peter-Jer.Church	Quote 10:19
15	ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΤΟ ΑΓΙΟΝ	" "	H.S. fell
16	ΕΝ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ (ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ) ΑΓΙΩ	" "	baptism in H.S.
17D05	ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΑΓΙΟΝ	" "	he could not hinder God from giving H.S.
24	ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ ΚΥΙΟΥ	narrative	Barnabas, full of H.S.
28	ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ	"	Agabus foretold by the Spirit
13:2	ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΤΟ ΑΓΙΟΝ	"	H.S. gave instructions
4	ΥΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ	"	Barnabas and Saul sent out by H.S.
D05	ΥΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ ΑΓΙΟΥ	"	Paul filled with H.S.
9	ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ ΑΓΙΟΥ	"	disciples filled with joy and H.S.
52	ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ ΑΓΙΟΥ	"	
15:7D05	ΕΝ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ	"	Peter spoke in Spirit
8	ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΤΟ ΑΓΙΟΝ	Peter-Jer.Church	God gave H.S.
28	ΤΩ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ ΤΩ ΑΓΙΩ	Apostles' letter } to Ant. Church }	it seemed good to H.S.
D05	ΤΩ ΑΓΙΩ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ	"	sustained in H.S.
29D05	ΕΝ ΤΩ ΑΓΙΩ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ	"	Judas and Silas full of H.S.
32D05	ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ ΑΓΙΟΥ	narrative	
16:6	ΥΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ	"	Paul and Silas prevented by H.S.
7	ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ	"	Spirit of Jesus stopped them
19:1D05	ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ	"	Spirit spoke to Paul
2a	ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΑΓΙΟΝ	Paul-Eph.Church	did they receive H.S.?
2b	ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΑΓΙΟΝ	" "	we haven't heard that some received H.S. (D05 there was H.S.)
6	ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΤΟ ΑΓΙΟΝ	narrative	H.S. fell
21	ΕΝ ΤΩ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ	"	Paul purposed in Spirit
20:3D05	ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ	"	Spirit spoke to Paul
22	ΤΩ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ	Paul-Eph.elders	he is bound by Spirit
23	ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΤΟ ΑΓΙΟΝ	" "	H.S. testifies
D05	ΤΟ ΑΓΙΟΝ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ	" "	
28	ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΤΟ ΑΓΙΟΝ	" "	H.S. has made them overseers of the flock
D05	ΤΟ ΑΓΙΟΝ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ	" "	
21:11	ΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ ΤΟ ΑΓΙΟΝ	Agabus-Paul	'Thus says H.S.'..."

I. IDENTIFICATION OF EXPRESSIONS USED.

It can be seen from this list of references to the Spirit in Acts that there are chiefly four expressions which recur. There are, in addition, two isolated expressions shared by both texts: τὸ πνεῦμα (τοῦ θεοῦ) κυρίου at 5:9 and τὸ πνεῦμα ἰησοῦ at 16:7. They are not included in the counts in the table below which shows the four recurring expressions and their frequency because, while not including ἅγιον like form A, they are a more expanded form than simply τὸ πνεῦμα.

TABLE 2

The four expressions used to refer to the Spirit.

		<u>Number of readings</u> <u>common to both texts</u>
A	τὸ πνεῦμα	9
B	πνεῦμα ἅγιον	16
C	τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον	10
D	τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα	4
		--
	<u>Total</u>	39
		+ 2 (5:9; 16:7) with a unique form
		= 41 (see §1 above)

In seeking for some kind of rationale behind the choice of expression on each particular occasion, there are three matters which require consideration, as mentioned in the Introduction to this chapter. One is the use of the definite article; another is the presence of the adjective 'holy'; and yet another is the place of the adjective in relation to the noun. These are the three factors which vary from one form of expression to another and which are also the variable factors in the variant readings.

I.1 Variant readings.

Also noted in the Introduction to this chapter was the existence of a popular belief about the variant readings involving the Holy Spirit, namely that the Western text has a marked preference for the inclusion of 'holy' and that Codex Bezae is one manuscript in particular which displays this characteristic. Though qualified and variously interpreted, such generalisations are expressed in the specialist studies on the subject. Thus Epp states that 'D shows preference for the formal expression "the Holy Spirit"' (1966, p.116). Black speaks of the 'D text ... employing its usual fuller expression "Holy Spirit"' (1981, p.161). Boismard and Lamouille (1984) have a rather different perspective on the matter (p.107). Their interpretation of the manuscript evidence is that the purest (earliest) form of what they reconstruct as the 'Western' text never reads 'holy' before Spirit; those manuscripts like Codex Bezae which are usually labelled as 'Western' display a mixed text in this respect, heavily influenced by the Alexandrian tradition. The result of this thinking is that for every mention of the Spirit in Acts, where there is one witness in the whole of the manuscript tradition which omits 'holy', then that witness is declared to be the 'Western'

(original) text. On this question, as indeed on others, the critical apparatus of Boismard-Lamouille is of great value but the analysis of the witnesses and the ensuing interpretation must be regarded with caution because they are based on essentially circular arguments for which justification is not provided.

Generalised statements on the question of the terms used for the Holy Spirit are unfortunately misleading and sometimes inaccurate, as will be seen. It is for this reason that a detailed list is essential in order to obtain a clear picture of the situation as it really is. In considering the variant readings concerning the Holy Spirit in Codex Bezae, it must first of all be pointed out that, for all that the texts of the two manuscript traditions vary in a number of places, as Table 1 demonstrates, the similarity between the two texts is striking. There is a total number of 57 references to the Spirit in the Alexandrian and/or Bezan text of Acts of which 41 are identical in both texts with regard to the form of expression used (that is, ignoring the variant involving the article with κυρίου at 5:9 and the grammatical error of πνευρα at 11:16D05) - see Table 2 above. Only ten references contain differences and are examined in detail below. The final six of the 57 references occur only in Codex Bezae and take the form A, B or C:

A 15:7; 19:1; 20:3

B 11:17; 15:32

C 15:29

From these additional mentions, it is clear that the Bezan text does not display a particular preference for the inclusion of 'holy' for there are as many references without the adjective (form A) as with (forms B + C).

The same observation may be made when it comes to looking at the ten remaining divergent forms of readings present in both texts. The situation is the following:

TABLE 3

Variant readings.

<u>S01/B03</u>	<u>D05</u>	<u>Reference</u>	<u>Observations</u>
A	C	6:10, 8:18	D05 reads 'holy', not S01/B03
B	D	10:38	inversion of noun/adjective
C	D	2:33; 5:3; 15:28; 20:23,28	inversion of noun/adjective
D	C	10:45; 13:4	inversion of noun/adjective; second article omitted D05

Several comments can be made about the differences between the two texts:

- Codex Bezae reads an additional 'holy' at two places. At least as significant as these additions are the nine mentions of 'Spirit' on its own (common to both texts, see Table 2) which the Bezan text does

not see a need to add to.

- most variants concern the place of the adjective. If it is appropriate to talk about a 'trend' in such a limited amount of data, then it could be said that the Bezan variations tend to place the adjective before the noun rather than after it. That is not to say that the Bezan text as a whole displays this tendency (it does not) but that the displacement of the adjective in front of the noun is the most frequently occurring feature in its differences with the Alexandrian text.

- the variants occurring over the use of the definite article are to do with the repetition of the article before the adjective in post-position. No variants arise over the presence of the article as such.

It will be useful in order to understand more clearly the significance of the various forms of expression available, and of the choice made at each point, to make a comparison with the forms used elsewhere. The books which are of most immediate relevance for such a comparison are, on the one hand, Luke's other writing, his Gospel, and on the other hand, the Old Testament.

II. THE SPIRIT OF GOD IN OTHER BIBLICAL BOOKS

II.1 Expressions used in the Gospel of Luke.

TABLE 4.

References to the Spirit in Luke's Gospel.

A	ὁ πνεῦμα	2:25D1/B03; 2:27
B	πνεῦμα ἁγίου	1:15,35,41,67; 2:25D05; 4:1
C	τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον	2:26; 3:22; 10:21; 12:10D05
D	τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα	12:10S01/B03; 12:12

II.2 Expressions used in the Old Testament.

In the Hebrew Old Testament, 'Spirit' is used on its own to designate the Spirit of God except for three occasions when the word 'holy' is used in conjunction with it: Ps 50:13 (51:11); Is 63:10,11.

In the LXX, the situation is identical, with the expression for the Holy Spirit taking the form τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον (C in Table 2 above) at each of these same three occurrences.

II.2.a 'Holy' used in conjunction with the Spirit of God.

The question may legitimately be asked as to when and where 'holy' became associated with 'Spirit' with more frequency than in the Old Testament for, as Table 4 above shows, by the time of the writing of Luke's Gospel the expression is attributed to the angels announcing

the births of John the Baptist and of Jesus, it is used of the Temple figures Zechariah and Simeon, and it is used of Jesus as well as by him. The context each time is singularly Jewish, even when it is used in Jesus' own teaching. It may be thought that the inclusion of 'holy' could reflect a later Christian understanding or way of referring to the Spirit of God deriving from the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost and attributed anachronistically by Luke to the time of the Gospel. We may have had to settle for some such supposition were not another possible explanation to hand.

II.2 b The Holy Spirit in the Isaiah Targum.

The importance of the targums to the formation of the New Testament has been underlined in a number of studies and is discussed in the General Introduction to this thesis. It is the Isaiah Targum which is of particular relevance to this present study of the Holy Spirit. Bruce Chilton, who has made the Targum available in English (Chilton 1987), stresses the strength in the Isaiah Targum of the positive theology of divine revelation (pp.xvf). This theme is not, of course, absent from the Hebrew text of Isaiah but in the Targum it is reinforced and developed. In particular, in the Book of Isaiah God communicates his will, his word, even his presence, to the people of Israel and does this through his Spirit who in this context, in the targumic tradition of Isaiah, is referred to as the *Holy Spirit*. The Holy Spirit represents God taking action in relation to man, action which is conveyed by means of the Holy Spirit and through the prophets. 'Holy Spirit is always that which permits a person to act or speak in the Lord's name' (Chilton 1982, p.49). The presence of the Holy Spirit with the prophets is an expression of their relationship to God, not their own personal relationship but that relationship

which places them between God and the people to whom they are to convey God's message. The prophet is further empowered by God through the Holy Spirit to carry out his prophetic task.

When Spirit is used without 'holy' in the Isaiah Targum, the reference is interpreted as being more simply to an aspect of God rather than to the relationship between God and his chosen prophets. It is important to understand 'prophet' in the Biblical sense of one acting or speaking on God's behalf; the prophetic role is by no means limited to foretelling the future. Furthermore, within the prophetic function, special revelation and inspired speech are but two aspects of the one activity.

The Isaiah Targum is not alone in presenting the Spirit of God as the Spirit of prophecy. As many scholars have demonstrated²¹, in the Old Testament generally the Spirit can be identified as the Spirit of prophecy. The interesting characteristic of the Isaiah Targum is the inclusion of 'holy' with Spirit on occasions when the context of the mention is that of prophecy.

The identification of the Holy Spirit as the Spirit of revelation or prophecy is illustrated most clearly by a comparison of the texts of the two Old Testament traditions in question at those places in Isaiah where the Spirit of God is mentioned. Two verses from Isaiah were cited above (#II.2) where, in the Hebrew Massoretic (and Greek LXX text), 'holy' is used in conjunction with 'Spirit':

Is 63:10 '...they rebelled and grieved his Holy Spirit...'

11 'Where is he who put in the midst of them his Holy Spirit?'

In the Isaiah Targum, 'holy' is absent but the nature of the prophetic action is highlighted:

Is 63:10 '...they provoked the words of his holy prophets...'

11 'Where is he who made the Memra of his holy prophets dwell among them?'

(See Chilton 1982, pp.59-69 for the meaning of 'Memra' as the word of God.)

At four other places, 'holy' is added to the mention of Spirit. It is worth comparing the references in full in order to appreciate the amplification of the prophetic thrust in the targumic text:

Is 40:13a

MT 'Who has established the Spirit of the Lord?'

Tg 'Who has established the Holy Spirit in the mouth of all the prophets, is it not the Lord?'

Is 42:1b

MT 'I will place my Spirit upon him; judgement to the nations he will bring forth.'

Tg 'I will place my Holy Spirit upon him; my judgement to the nations he will reveal.'

Is 44:3b

MT 'I will pour my Spirit on your seed'

Tg 'I will bestow my Holy Spirit on your sons'

MT 'And as for me, this is my covenant with them, says the Lord, my Spirit which is upon you and my words which I put in your mouth.'

Tg 'And as for me, this is my covenant with them, says the Lord, my Holy Spirit which is upon you and the words of my prophecy which I put in your mouth.'

There are other references to the Spirit of God in the Book of Isaiah where the context is similarly prophetic (30:1; 34:16; 48:16; 63:24) and where 'holy' is not added but the phrase 'of my Memra' is found, a description which Chilton comments on in detail (see 1982, pp.56-69). The declaration of 61:1, taken up by Jesus in Luke's Gospel ('The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me') and where 'holy' might have been expected because the context is so obviously prophetic, is modified in the Targum to become: 'A spirit of prophecy before the Lord God is upon me'.

The lack of rigid consistency in the way in which the references to the Spirit of God are qualified in the Isaiah Targum is accounted for by the fluidity and mixture of the targumic tradition. In particular, there are strands in the Isaiah Targum which can be dated as reflecting the political and religious situation after 70 AD interwoven with much earlier strands from the intertestamental period (Chilton 1987, pp. xx-xxv; see also Le Déaut 1982, p.25). In the case of the addition of 'holy' to the reference to the Spirit of God, it is its presence in the New Testament which acts as a witness to its appearance at an earlier date in the Isaiah Targum. It is hardly likely that the Christian Church would have borrowed the expression from the Jewish writings in a later period, just as it is unlikely that the Jewish community would have borrowed it from the language of

the Christian Church. It may confidently be concluded, therefore, that when the writers of the New Testament used the expression 'Holy Spirit' they were using an expression which was familiar within Jewish circles in Israel, not only at the time at which they were writing but also at the time about which they were writing.

A consideration of the terms used for the Spirit of God in some of the other biblical writings demonstrates how the expressions were not rigidly fixed but changed over time and from one religious culture to another and, perhaps chiefly, according to the progressive revelation of the Spirit. As this revelation develops further in the course of the story of the New Testament, with the coming of the Son of God and sending of the Spirit in a new way at Pentecost, it may be expected that terms and forms of expression will undergo further modification with possible indications in the written texts of varying degrees of conservatism in adapting to the changing language.

III. THE ROLE OF THE DEFINITE ARTICLE.

The presence versus the absence of the definite article before the Holy Spirit in the New Testament has been the subject of some discussion with the suggestions put forward as to its relevance tending to attribute a theological function to its role. It has been suggested that when the article is used, as in category C and also in category D discussed below (IV.1.c+d), the Holy Spirit is active as a person and that without the article it is rather the effects of the activity of the Holy Spirit which are being referred to. Winer (1882) quotes Westcott: "When the term occurs in this form" (i.e. without the article) "it marks an operation, or manifestation,

or gift of the Spirit, and not the personal Spirit" (p.151). Similarly, Turner N. concludes his consideration of the matter of the article with the Holy Spirit by saying: "...it is not the personal Holy Spirit, but the influence of a divine spirit which is intended, if St Luke omits the article" (1963, p.176).²² Turner's conclusions have more recently been adopted by Swarz (1993) with the modification that the article with $\tau\upsilon\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha$ in an anaphoric reference may also denote the Spirit as power.

This distinction between person and power is tempting in view of the more general nature of the references to the Holy Spirit which do not have the article (see IV.1.b). It is difficult to see, however, how 'God gave the Holy Spirit' (5:32, 15:8) refers to the Spirit as a person in a way that 'receiving Holy Spirit' (8:15,17,19; 19:2a,2bD05) does not. It is also doubtful whether any New Testament writer could consider the Holy Spirit to be an indeterminate divine spirit, some 'unknown power' as Turner expresses it.²³ There is, moreover, every reason to expect the definite article to operate as a linguistic rather than a theological device since in other cases the article has been seen to play an active linguistic role (cf. Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992; see also Levinsohn 1989; 1992, pp.97-111). In the analysis of the definite article with names of persons, it was argued that the unmarked pattern was for the article to be present; the absence of the article (in cases when the person was known and particular) indicated, in contrast, that the mention was being highlighted, that the person was in some way salient.

This definition of the role of the article has been extended by Levinsohn (1993) to reference to the Spirit. Thus he argues that it is 'normal' for the article to be present with $\tau\upsilon\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha$ meaning the Spirit of God; when it is not present, it is because the mention of the Spirit is the salient information in the sentence. There are

various specific means by which information can be rendered salient which need not be detailed here;²⁴ in general terms, the Spirit is salient when the focus of the sentence is on the mention, when the mention of the Spirit is in the comment part not the topic part of the sentence, or the Spirit is introduced as new information.

On this understanding, an anarthrous reference to the Spirit or to the Holy Spirit by no means signals a vague, unidentified spirit. The reference is as definite as with the article and furthermore is being highlighted.

Two qualifying comments need to be made. Firstly, although absence of the article signifies salience, Levinsohn would not claim that the opposite is necessarily true, that is, it should not be maintained that when the article is present before πνεῦμα the noun is never salient: 'the absence of the article, when the referent is clearly a particular individual, is the marked form. One never HAS to have it; omission indicates marked salience, but the expression can still enjoy natural salience, with the article present'.²⁵ It will be seen in the analysis which follows that it sometimes does.

Secondly, even though salience may be the chief reason for omitting the article before πνεῦμα, it need not be the only one (just as it is not the only factor in the omission of the article before proper names). πνεῦμα ἁγίου without the article can also be observed when the mention of the Spirit occurs in what was to become among the Christians a stereotyped expression, as the following analysis demonstrates.

It is now time to return to the forms of the expressions used in the book of Acts to refer to the Spirit of God and to consider the similarity between the significance of the presence of 'holy' in those forms and the prophetic significance it bears in the Isaiah Targum. In addition to evaluating the force of 'holy', it will also be necessary to assess the function of the definite article and the place of the adjective.

IV. AN ANALYSIS OF THE EXPRESSIONS USED IN ACTS.

In this section, the four forms of expression will be considered in turn, examining first the references common to both texts and then those found only in the Bezan text. When all four forms have been studied, the variant readings will be considered in the light of what has been found.

As each expression is considered, the limits of the field of its meaning will be traced by means of the context of its occurrence. These limits will become more clearly defined for each expression as the alternatives are considered and as successive expressions are compared with the former ones. As with all componential analysis, some overlap between the various fields is to be expected and it may well be impossible to define clearly the nuances of meaning within the area of overlap in the absence of a native speaker.

IV.1 Common text and additional Bezan readings.

IV.1.a) A. Τὸ Πνεῦμα.

9 common readings.

2:17,18; 6:3(-τό); 8:29; 10:19; 11:12,28; 19:21; 20:22

These references to the Spirit occur in narrative as well as in direct speech. The definite article is present on all occasions except 6:3. The absence at 6:3 is accounted for by the theory of salience presented above (#III) on the grounds that 'full of the Spirit' is salient information - it is one of the conditions which is spelt out as of decisive importance in selecting the seven men. In all the other references, τὸ πνεῦμα is not the salient information.

In all but the first two references which are discussed below, the presence or activity of the Spirit is mentioned in connection with Christians. Either he directs them or they act in association with him. The context of these references is not generally prophetic; the person in communication with the Spirit is not required nor empowered to transmit in God's name what they receive.

There are some apparent exceptions:

2:17+18 The references are to the Old Testament prophecy of Joel 2:28+29 (3:1+2 in MT and LXX) where the context is very clearly prophetic in the same sense that the pouring out of the Holy Spirit is prophetic throughout the Book of Acts. Targum Joel 3:1+2 reads 'Holy Spirit' but it would seem to be a standard written text which is being quoted here.

6:3 is a second difficulty: the expression 'full of' in every other case in Acts is followed by πνεύματος ἁγίου (c.f. v.5).²⁶

11:28 The context is one of prophecy, which is problematic in view of the absence of 'holy' and the conclusions below (#IV.1.b) concerning the prophetic force of the adjective; it is possible that the nature of the prophecy in this case, a straightforward foretelling of a natural event rather than a revelation of the will of God, has something to do with the absence.

18:25 The reference to Apollos Ἰέων τῷ πνεύματι is not included in the list because it is doubtful whether it is the Spirit of God who is intended here. If it were, 'holy' could have been expected since Apollos is teaching, accurately what is more, about Jesus. He only understands, however, about the baptism of John which indicates that, for all his fervour, he himself has not received the Holy Spirit (cf. 19:6). The question then arises as to what exactly is the meaning of τῷ πνεύματι : if it is not the 'Holy' Spirit it is unlikely to mean God's Spirit at all but rather Apollos' own spirit. 'Burning in spirit' expresses his eager enthusiasm which was sufficiently remarkable to comment on twice more (he 'speaks boldly' v.26 and confutes the Jews 'vehemently' v.28).

3 Bezan additional readings.

15:7; 19:1; 20:3

The references at 19:1 and 20:3 are similar to those found in the common text where the Spirit gives instructions to Christians (cf. 8:29, 10:19).

15:7 Peter stands to address the Jerusalem Christians; the Bezan text reads ἐν πνεύματι after the verb 'stand'. There is no other reference like this one (no article, no 'holy', prefaced by ἐν) but

it shares general features inherent in references in the common text to τὸ πνεῦμα without 'holy': firstly, Peter addresses Christians and secondly, his message is not prophetic but is rather an exposition of what he understands to be the position of the Gentiles. The absence of the article can be taken as indicating that the information that Peter acted in the Spirit is highlighted.

IV.1.b Β. Πνεῦμα ἅγιον.

16 common readings.

1:2,5; 2:4; 4:8,25; 6:5; 7:55; 8:15,17,19; 11:16,24; 13:9,52; 19:2a+b

In this form of the expression, there is no article and the adjective always follows the noun.

Seven of the references are to being filled with, or full of, the Holy Spirit; two are to baptism in the Holy Spirit; five are to receiving the Holy Spirit; and two are to Jesus/God speaking through the Holy Spirit. Whenever the Spirit of God is mentioned in any of these ways, the expression always takes the form πνεῦμα ἅγιον (with the sole exception of 6:3 discussed above (#IV.1.a) which omits 'holy' in speaking of Stephen as 'full of' the Spirit).

In all cases, the Holy Spirit is referred to in a general way, in what seem to be stereotyped expressions. The Holy Spirit is not specifically active or present for a definite action but is rather God's means of self-revelation, very much in the sense of the promises of the Isaiah Targum (see #II.2.b above).

The absence of the article can often be accounted for by the salience of the clause in which it is found. The mention of the Holy Spirit is sometimes the main point of the sentence: 2:4; 8:15+17 (cf.

v.18 where it is the laying on of the apostles' hands which is the important factor for Simon); 13:52; 19:2a. At 1:2, $\delta\iota\kappa\ \pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$ is given prominence by its position between 'the apostles' and the relative clause which qualifies them. At several other places, the phrase with the Holy Spirit is placed before the main verb and so highlighted: 1:5; 4:8,25; 7:55; 13:9. It is also sometimes part of a contrast: 1:5; 11:16. Many of the expressions used, however, are by their frequency stereotyped phrases and it is possible that at some point this has had an influence on the article (see eg. 8:19 where it could be argued that the salient part of the sentence is the laying on of hands by Simon (+ $\kappa\alpha\gamma\omega\delta\omicron\varsigma$)).

The position of the adjective after the noun is the non-emphatic position for anarthrous nouns (see ch.3, Part B, #1.4.a on word order). This is an indication that the focus is on the presence of the Spirit as Spirit and reinforces the idea of a fixed expression being used.

The force of 'holy' is best seen in comparing the references which have simply $\tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$ with those which use $\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$. In the former case, the interaction which takes place between the Spirit and people is of a short-term, punctual nature, for a specific purpose which is generally limited to the person with whom the Spirit communicates. In the latter case, the interaction between the Spirit and people is of a different nature and on a different scale: it is a declaration or fulfilment of promises made to Israel in the Old Testament and, more recently, by Jesus during his lifetime. It signals the arrival of a new era. Its effect is to bring about a change in people and is frequently accompanied by a demonstration of God's power. People themselves are empowered to act or speak on God's behalf.²⁷ This includes witnessing to the Messiah as an extension, arising only after Pentecost, of the contents of Old Testament

prophetic preaching.

The same action of the Holy Spirit as signalling the fulfilment of God's promises to send his Spirit is evident already in the references in Luke's Gospel which use the adjective ἅγιον (Table 4); they are all connected with the birth of either John the Baptist or Jesus, or with the outset of Jesus' ministry. They all speak of being filled with the Holy Spirit or of the Holy Spirit coming/being on a person.

On two occasions in Acts, the references are to words spoken through the Holy Spirit (Jesus 1:2; God/David 4:25). In the Isaiah Targum, the Holy Spirit is the vehicle by which God himself communicates prophecy or teaching, particularly concerning the development of history, and the expression πνεῦμα ἅγιον is quite in place here.²⁰

Of all the four forms (A, B, C, and D), this is the one which appears to be the most securely established for there is only one place of disagreement over its use (10:38 - discussed #IV.2.b below). This fact can be taken as a further indication that πνεῦμα ἅγιον became part of set phrases whereas, in comparison, the other forms of expression were used more spontaneously, leaving them thereby more open to variation.

2 additional Bezan readings.

11:17; 15:32

11:17 Peter is referring to the giving of the Spirit of God to the Gentiles and it is the main point of his question; the use of πνεῦμα ἅγιον is thus in line with its use in the instances already discussed above.

15:32 The Bezan text makes a point of adding that the prophets were 'full of the Holy Spirit'. The very fact that it was felt necessary to mention it is a sign of its importance in the sentence. The expression is thus used as would be expected from similar examples in the common text.

IV.1.c Γ. Τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.

10 common readings.

1:16; 5:32; 7:51; 10:44,47; 11:15; 13:2; 15:8; 19:6; 21:11

Most of these references fall into three categories: the Holy Spirit falls on people, speaks about the future or is given by God as a witness.

What is immediately striking about this form of expression is that in most of its occurrences the Holy Spirit is directly active. He is the subject of the verb in all the references except 7:51, 10:47 and 15:8. The context is frequently one of explanation, expounding a teaching which is new to the hearers (e.g. 5:32, 15:8) and which requires careful introduction. More often than not, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον occurs in direct speech during the course of an evangelistic proclamation or a speech of defence.

The context is always prophetic in the sense that the Holy Spirit acts through people to communicate the words or power of God. This is true even at 7:51 where the Holy Spirit is not the subject: 'you always resist the Holy Spirit' is a reference to the rejection by the Jews of the activity of the Holy Spirit communicated through the prophets, from the prophets of the Old Testament to the 'Righteous One', Jesus. τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον is likewise found in the LXX at

Isaiah 63:10 (see above on the Isaiah Targum) in a context of rejecting the prophets, and also in the Bezan text of Luke 12:10 where it is a matter of blaspheming against the Holy Spirit himself.

A comparison of 13:2 with what appear at first sight to be similar mentions of the Holy Spirit is illuminating. When the Spirit gives instructions to Christians at 13:2 'holy' is included whereas elsewhere (8:29, 10:19, for example) it is simply 'the Spirit' who gives instructions. There is a difference, however, in the nature of the instructions given in each case. Where 'holy' is used (cf. below, 16:6 #IV.1.d and 13:4 #IV.2.d) the Spirit gives directions concerning the sending out of Christian leaders to preach, about who should go and to whom they should speak, as part of the broad plan of the church's mission to evangelise; where 'holy' is omitted, the instructions are to do with a more immediate situation, they are concerned with a practical detail on a smaller scale than the general direction of the Church's mission.

There are two references in Luke's Gospel which have the expression $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \hbar\gamma\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$: they are of a similar character to the ones in Acts in so far as 2:26 describes a revelation made by the Holy Spirit to Simeon, and 3:22 the falling of the Holy Spirit on Jesus.

It is the direct, specific action of the Spirit in these references which may partially account for the use of the definite article. There is often here a definiteness about the presence and activity of the Spirit which, by comparison, is absent in the mentions of the Spirit without the article.

The explanatory nature of the references explains the position of the adjective after the noun. In examining the function of the position of the adjective in the chapter on word order (Part B, #I.4.a) it was noticed that there are few occurrences in Acts of

adjectives placed after the noun when the definite article is used with the noun. This can be accounted for by the lack of occasions in Acts when an adjective-noun association is important in the course of an explanation.

The occurrence of τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον at 10:47 illustrates the qualities of specificity and explanation inherent in the expression. It was noted at #IV.1.b above, in discussing the force of πνεῦμα ἅγιον without the article, that 'receiving the Holy Spirit' does not normally call for the article (8:15,17,19; 19:2a,2bD05). When Peter, however, asks his fellow-Christians 'Can anyone forbid water for baptizing these people who have received the Holy Spirit just as we have?' he is first of all referring to a specific manifestation of the Holy Spirit which has just occurred in front of their eyes, and secondly he is spelling out what has happened in order to cause questions to be asked and answers provided. In other words, he is using the phrase 'receive the Holy Spirit' as more than a customary, fixed expression; he is drawing attention to its implications in the present situation.²⁹

There are no additional Bezan readings of τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον although there are many variant readings which arise over its use which is not surprising since it is not being used as a set phrase but spontaneously, and with deliberate care being attached to the weight of its connotations. The variants are examined below in #IV.2.

IV.1.d Δ. Τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα.

4 common readings.

1:8; 2:38; 4:31; 16:6

This is the most difficult category of references to explain; fortunately, the variant readings make a most useful contribution to establishing the boundaries of its use as will be seen when they are examined below. Meanwhile, some tentative remarks may be made. It can be observed that all four references have distinct prophetic connotations in so far as the Holy Spirit is mentioned either as the fulfilment of God's promises (1:8, 2:38) or as directly associated with the preaching of the gospel (4:31, 16:6). Thus, the presence of 'holy' is in line with what has already been observed about the force of its meaning when allied with 'Spirit'.

The definite article can be accounted for at 1:8 and 16:6 by the fact that the mention of the Holy Spirit is not salient, being contained in a participial clause. The action of the Holy Spirit is also specific in each case. Levinsohn (1993, p.142) explains the presence of the article in the clause referring to the apostles being 'filled with the Holy Spirit' at 4:31 by describing it as a 'supportive' event of the more salient 'they spoke the word of God with boldness'. The verse can be compared with 2:4 where the article is omitted in a very similar phrase referring to the filling of the apostles at Pentecost. On that occasion, the filling of the Holy Spirit was the salient event.

At 2:38, Peter mentions τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα as the goal of his explanation to the Jews about the gospel message; in this case, it would seem that the reason for retaining the article (explanation) is

stronger than that (saliency) for omitting it.

It remains to find the reason for the placing of the adjective before the noun. Πνεῦμα ἅγιον was found to be to a large extent a fixed, stereotyped description with the focus on the presence of the Spirit and no particular emphasis on the quality of 'holy' (#IV.1.b). τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον was seen, in contrast, not to be a fixed expression but to be used spontaneously, often within the context of an explanation or declaration about the coming of the Holy Spirit who was portrayed as acting as an agent without an intermediary (#IV.1.c).

The direct intervention of the Holy Spirit also characterises the references which use the expression τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα at 1:8 and 16:6. An important difference, however, can be detected in comparing these two verses with the τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον references and that is that the context is not one of explanation. In Jesus' teaching at 1:8, at the point at which he mentions the Holy Spirit he is explaining that the disciples will receive power when the Holy Spirit comes, having already spoken about baptism in the Holy Spirit (ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, a set phrase) at v.5. That is to say that his explanation is not about the Holy Spirit when he refers to him in v.8. Similarly, the reference at 16:6 is not specifically an explanation about the Holy Spirit nor an account of his coming. The same can be said of 4:31.

The reference at 2:38 is, on the other hand, problematic. Here, Peter speaks of the Jews receiving 'the gift of the Holy Spirit' after repentance and baptism in the course of an explanation to the Jews about the fulfilment of God's promises to Israel. It was seen in the previous section that explanatory discourse, especially about the fulfilment of God's purposes in history, usually called for the article and for the adjective to be placed in post-position. It would seem, therefore, that this should be a case for using τὸ πνεῦμα

τὸ ἅγιον and the placing of the adjective before the noun is difficult to explain. Levinsohn ³⁰ suggests that the writer may have wanted to avoid a phrase with three articles in it, an explanation which would possibly account for the Bezan reading of 10:45 (cf. IV.2.d below).

Where the Holy Spirit is mentioned in a non-explanatory context, the usual way of referring to him would seem to be with 'Holy' before 'Spirit', a conclusion further confirmed by some of the variant readings. This fits in with what has been identified as a typical feature of positioning the adjective in front of the arthrous noun, that is that the adjective can refer to an intrinsic quality, one which inherently belongs to the noun it qualifies (Levinsohn 1992, pp.95-6). This is indeed the case with the Holy Spirit whose very essence, as the Spirit of God, is to be holy. It is only when attention is being drawn to the activity of the Holy Spirit in the course of an unfamiliar teaching, within a declaration or explanation, that the adjective is separated from the noun and placed in post-position.

In summary: from the limited number of references examined so far, it may be suggested that τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα refers to the Holy Spirit as a known and familiar personal manifestation of God, in an active role. It is used in spontaneous reference to the Holy Spirit, but not only when that reference belongs to an explanation or a declaration about the activity or person of the Holy Spirit.

The forms of expression used to refer to the Holy Spirit elsewhere bear out this analysis. In Luke's Gospel, there is one firm reading at 12:12 with τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα where Jesus speaks of the Holy Spirit who will teach the disciples what to say to their accusers. In this case, it is a matter of the Holy Spirit taking an active role (hence the definite article) in a personal relationship with the believers (adjective before the noun); it is not a matter of

explanatory or declarative teaching about the Holy Spirit (thus there is no cause for the adjective to be placed after the noun). It is significant that in the Gospel, this form is used only by Jesus and in referring to a personal relationship which the Spirit will have with Christians after Pentecost.

There are a relatively large number of variant readings which have τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα and when these are examined in #IV.2.b,c, it will become possible to build up a more exact picture of the connotations of the expression. Meanwhile, an additional reading in Codex Bezae is illuminating.

1 Bezan additional reading.

15:29

This additional reference to the Holy Spirit occurs at the end of the apostolic letter to the Antioch church and speaks of the Christians being 'sustained in the Holy Spirit'. The mention of the Holy Spirit is not the salient part of the sentence; he is spoken of in a personal relationship with Christians, not within the context of an explanation or a declaration. All the conditions so far defined for choosing to use the phrase τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα are thus met.

IV.2 Variant readings concerning the form of the expression for the Spirit. (Cf. Table 3, #1.1)

IV.2.a A in S01/B03 is C in D05.

6:10; 8:18

The variant here involves the presence of the adjective 'holy' in the Bezan text but not in the Alexandrian text. In both cases, the Spirit is mentioned in a context where, in the common readings, 'holy' was seen to be present as an expression of the prophetic context of the mention of the Spirit, associated either with speech of a prophetic character or the presence of the Spirit with God's people as a fulfilment of his promises.

6:10 The reference is to the discourse of Stephen as he explained to the Jews the divine purpose behind the history of Israel; it is typical of Codex Bezae to stress the prophetic tradition within which the Christian leaders spoke and acted.

8:18 The reference is to the giving of the Spirit to believers. The presence of 'holy' in the Bezan text is therefore entirely in line with its use elsewhere in Acts. Its absence in the Alexandrian text is perhaps due to the matter being viewed through Simon's eyes. When Simon speaks of the 'Holy Spirit' in the following verse (v.19) it is in a set phrase which he would have heard used by the apostles.

It is important to underline that these are the only two instances where the Bezan text adds 'holy' to the mention of the Spirit, although there would have been at least one other place (6:3, see #IV.1.a above) where the omission of 'holy' with Spirit could have been felt to be incomplete and where the adjective might have been added if it were a desire to make the text complete that were the

motivation guiding the Bezan editor.

IV.2.b B in S01/B03 is D in D05.

10:38

The expression in the Alexandrian text is entirely in accordance with its use elsewhere. The reference to the Holy Spirit is salient which accounts for the absence of the article; he is not referred to as directly active but in the same way as in the other occurrences of the phrase where it is a question of being baptized in or filled with, for example, the Holy Spirit. Here it is Jesus who was anointed by God with the Holy Spirit and with power.

In the Bezan text, the structure of the sentence is altered by virtue of the clause in which the Spirit is mentioned being introduced by a relative pronoun, $\acute{\omicron}\nu$, and secondly by the replacement of the following relative pronoun, $\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, by the emphatic $\acute{\omicron}\tau\omicron\varsigma$. Focus is thus maintained on the person of Jesus but the salience of the Holy Spirit as the new element is not affected. The effect of the inversion of the noun and the adjective is to draw attention to the adjective. From the context of Peter's speech to Cornelius it is not obvious why Peter would wish to underline 'holy' at this point. The result is a form of expression which is found only in this place within Acts or Luke's Gospel.

IV.2.c C in S01/B03 is D in D05.

2:33; 5:3; 15:28; 20:23,28

The divergence on the position of the adjective in these

variant readings throws some light on the significance of the form τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα which was seen previously (#IV.1.d) to be the most difficult to set the limits for.

In all the variants on this point, the Holy Spirit is mentioned in close relation to Christians or Jesus himself. Except at 2:33, the mention is not in the context of an explanation or a declaration. The context of 2:33 is that Jesus receives the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father, the mark of a special relationship. In the Bezan text, this factor may have more influence over the word order at this point than the context of explanation. At 5:3, Ananias deceives the Holy Spirit; this takes place within the newly formed Christian community which enjoys a certain intimacy in its relationship with the Holy Spirit (unlike that of those who resisted the Holy Spirit τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον for example, see #IV.1.c above). Likewise the occurrence at 15:28 is part of a letter from Christians in Jerusalem to Christians in Antioch, the writers indicating their being guided by the Holy Spirit in their decisions concerning regulations they have to pass on to the recipients. Finally, in his discourse with the Ephesian elders Paul mentions twice, at 20:23 and 28, activities of the Holy Spirit which are closely related to himself or to the church and the familiar, intimate expression is quite appropriate.

In the alternative readings of the Alexandrian text, the portrayal of the Holy Spirit is by comparison one of a less intimate presence. The effect of this difference is all the stronger for the relatively high number of variants on this particular divergence, to which may be added the one extra reading in Codex Bezae with τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα at 15:29 (cf. #IV.1.d above).

From the additional occurrences of this form of expression in Codex Bezae it may be inferred that the prophetic force of 'holy' is

tending to lessen in strength in the use of what appears to be the newest term to refer to the Holy Spirit. In the references which use $\piνεῦμα ἅγιον$ and $τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον$ the prophetic aspect is generally much more marked than in the references with $τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα$ which mention the Holy Spirit in relation to the Christian Church.

IV.2.d D in S01 or B03 is C in D05.

10:45; 13:4

At both these places, the Bezan text reads 'holy' after 'Spirit' and omits the second article. A corrector (Parker 1992, pp. 137,138,139) adds in the omitted article at 10:45 thus bringing the text into line with Codex Vaticanus. Codex Sinaiticus reads $αγιου$ before $πνευματος$ in this verse. D05's reading at 13:4 is shared by the Byzantine text whereas both S01 and B03 read the adjective before the noun.

Leaving aside the problem of the second article, the reasons for the diverging positions of the adjective need to be considered. At 10:45, it is a question of the amazement of Peter's companions that 'the gift of the Holy Spirit should be poured out even on the Gentiles'. On the only other occurrence of the expression 'the gift of the Holy Spirit', the term used is $τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα$ (2:38). This has already been discussed at #IV.1.d above where the use of the term was felt to be a problem because it occurs in the course of an explanation. There is clearly some reason for the expression to be chosen at 2:38 just as Codex Sinaiticus, along with many other manuscripts (P⁷⁴, A Ee Byz.), does not find a difficulty here at 10:45; the reason may be nothing more complex, as suggested for 2:38

(#IV.1.d), than the avoidance of three articles, which the Bezan text achieves in its own way by the omission of the article before ἁγίου.

At 13:4, Barnabas and Saul are sent out by the Holy Spirit. The non-salience of the Holy Spirit in this instance accounts for the article. The setting of the gathering of the Christians of the Antioch church could, on the basis of what has been said about the intimacy of situations using τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, explain the choice of this term by the Alexandrian text. The Bezan text in comparison seems to bring the incident out into the wider context of the church's mission, leaving behind the closeness of the immediate church setting.

V. CONCLUSIONS.

The forms of expression are changing as the revelation of the Holy Spirit progresses from the prophecy of the Old Testament and the promises of a new manifestation of the Holy Spirit in future times, to the Holy Spirit as talked about and manifested through Jesus, to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost and his subsequent presence with the Christian Church. Fluctuation and variation in the use of terms is to be expected in such conditions.

On the whole, reasons can be put forward to account satisfactorily for the choice of expression by both texts. That is because the variation in exact meaning or connotation of each expression is to some extent dependent on emphasis, or on how the incident or situation in question is being viewed or portrayed. These are factors which are not absolute or rigidly fixed but depend on the author and his hearers/readers.

At the two places that D05 adds 'holy', the addition is entirely in keeping with practice elsewhere where 'holy' is read by

both the S01/B03 and the D05 texts. There is no need to see in its additions the influence of later established Church practice since the influence could very well be targumic. The absence of the adjective in S01/B03 is the more difficult reading. Should this be regarded as a case of *difficilior lectio potior*? It might be a reason for accepting it as the original reading but that does not make the Bezan reading an 'error' so much as a difference. Account has to be taken of all the occasions that D05 does not add 'holy' to the mention of Spirit on its own; as also of the cultural, religious, and thus inevitably textual, fluidity of the situation in the early Church.

Two terms are the most frequently interchangeable: τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον and τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. Overall, Codex Bezae displays a 'preference' for the latter expression which seems to become the usual one among Christians, one not used before the time of Jesus but inaugurated by him in both Luke's Gospel and Acts. This could be interpreted as indicating a later date for the text of Acts in Codex Bezae, a date when the newer, Christian term had become established. The evidence for such an interpretation, however, is far from conclusive. On the contrary, from the references to the Holy Spirit in the New Testament writings examined in this chapter, it is clear that factors other than familiarity with a term or the length of time it had been in use cause different expressions to be selected on different occasions. One of the factors identified is the awareness of the writer of the Christian community he is writing about. A hypothesis may be advanced on that basis to account for the different selection of terms. The author of the Bezan text, in using the phrase which was more commonly used to speak about the Holy Spirit in association with the Christian believers, demonstrates perhaps a greater awareness of addressing Christian believers through the book of Acts. This suggestion is substantiated by the evidence for a

greater awareness of the Church community which can be found in Acts 18 (see exegetical study, ch.10). The author of the Alexandrian text, in contrast, is more conscious of writing a treatise in defence of Christianity. Neither of these positions should, however, be thought of as exclusive or as rigid.

NOTES TO CHAPTER SIX.

NOTES to Part A.

1. For interesting discussion on the use of κύριος to refer to Jesus in the Gospels see Kilpatrick 1968, 1970, 1973 (Elliott ed. 1992, pp.207-22).
2. The indication in the apparatus to N-A²⁶ that D05 reads κυριον for θεov at 16:14 is an error.
3. Saliency was seen to be a significant factor in the omission of the article before names of persons in Acts (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992). In the case of the Holy Spirit, the Old Testament background and the formulation of set phrases are further contributing factors to the absence of the article (see ch.6, Part C).
4. See Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, pp.30-31 on the articular genitive of proper names. Cf. Kilpatrick 1973 who argues that such things as case do have an effect on the article before κύριος because they would have had in Hebrew (p.215). In fact, the function of the article before names in Hebrew is far from certain. Kilpatrick also contends that in the Gospels κύριος refers to God and ὁ κύριος to Jesus. In Acts, many of the references are too ambiguous to be able to establish such a distinction there with certainty.
5. Metzger (1975, p.401) appeals to the greater frequency of ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ as proof of its earlier origin calling ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου 'the Christianization of the traditional experience'. This is to ignore underlying differences between the two expressions cf. on 13:44, p.418.
6. The suggestion offered by Metzger (1975, ad loc), that B03 has been influenced by ἄγγελος κυρίου in the previous verse is made without supporting evidence.
7. B-L ad loc give no indication of an alternative reading to θεοῦ on this occasion, perhaps ignoring d (and others?) because θεοῦ is sufficiently well-attested in the two forms of the verse cited by the early Fathers.
8. Delebecque (1982, p.230) explains thus the force of the present participle in v.18.

NOTES to Part B.

9. See e.g. B-L 1984, vol I, p.110: 'Le T0 (= Western text but not D05 in this respect) ...a tendance à supprimer les titres christologiques, alors que la tendance des copistes est manifestement à les multiplier'. Cf. Elliott 1993, p.210: 'The expansion of divine names is a characteristic of scribal activity'; and Metzger 1975, p.479: 'scribal expansion of the names of the Lord is of frequent occurrence'.
10. Moule 1968, O'Neill 1961 and Taylor 1954 all have valuable discussion on the subject of the names of Jesus but do not examine the variant readings in Acts.

11. See Moule 1968 and Taylor 1954 for more detailed comparison between Acts and Paul.
12. The lists of references given for each in Taylor 1954, p.44 is open to debate.
13. Cf. the discussion by Taylor 1954, p.43-4.
14. Metzger 1975, p.262, quoting T.E. Page.
15. Moule 1968, pp.174-5.
16. Evidence outside the New Testament for a Christian baptismal liturgy is surprisingly late, see Kelly 1972, ch.2.
17. E.g. the use of the Passover ritual in the Gospels for the liturgy of the 'Communion' service, cf. I Co 11:23-26.

NOTES to Part C.

18. See notably e.g. Dunn 1970 and for an opposing view Turner MMB. 1980. Menzies 1991 (part I) provides a summary of the debate.
19. See e.g. Boismard-Lamouille 1984, Vol I Introduction; Epp 1966, pp. 115-8; Kilpatrick 1964; Lagrange 1935, pp. 389-94; Metzger 1975, in the Textual Commentary at the relevant verses.
20. Hull 1967, pp. 189-93, presents an analysis (based on the N-A²⁵ text) which shows the presence or absence of the article but not the position of the adjective.
21. For a summary of the discussions see Menzies 1991, Part I and for his own contribution chapters 2-5, Part II, especially pp.99-104 on the targums.
22. Turner would further see a preposition or a dependent genitive as liable to cause the omission of the article and thus to override his rule (p.175). The difficulty with this view is that there are many instances of the article being retained in the presence of both prepositions and dependent genitives.
23. Cf. Moule 1977, pp.112-3, who disagrees with Turner for this reason.
24. A full discussion can be found in Levinsohn 1993. Levinsohn does not distinguish between $\tau\iota\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\kappa$ with and without the adjective $\kappa\upsilon\iota\omicron\nu$, nor does he discuss the place of the adjective when it is present.
25. S.H. Levinsohn, personal communication 1994.
26. B-L *ad loc* cite Old Latin h as reading 'holy' (*plenos spū scō et sapientia dñi*) but posit as original the conjectural reading of $\tau\iota\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\upsilon\pi\iota\omicron\nu$ based on the Peshitta reading of *plenos spiritu domini et sapientia*. No justification is offered for this hypothesis.

27. In the debate among theologians as to the exact function of the Holy Spirit in Acts (cf. note 18 above), a distinction is often drawn between the primary and secondary effects of the work of the Spirit arguing, for example, over whether the filling and the empowering by the Spirit is one operation or not. It is not necessary to enter into that debate in order to define the force of the adjective 'holy' when it is added to the mention of the Spirit; the contributions themselves to the debate tend to ignore the linguistic variation in the forms of expression used.

28. Metzger 1975, on 4:25, asks: 'Where else does God speak through the Holy Spirit?', to which question one may suggest the answer: 'In the Isaiah Targum'.

29. Levinsohn (1993, p.142) explains the presence of the article by describing the relative clause which includes the reference to the Holy Spirit as 'supportive material' and therefore not salient.

30. Personal communication 1994.

CHAPTER SEVEN

The Spelling of Jerusalem.

INTRODUCTION.

The variation in the spelling of the name 'Jerusalem' provides a well-defined example of how audience awareness affects the language of a text. In considering this example, it needs to be remembered that in a narrative like Acts there is, in fact, more than one audience: there is first of all the narrator and his intended audience, and secondly, within the story, there are speakers and their hearers. Both these narrative contexts provide a situation in which audience awareness is required to operate and, as will be seen, affects the spelling of Jerusalem.

In the Greek New Testament there are two spellings of Jerusalem which occur. There is the declinable Hellenistic form Ἱεροσόλυμα, and the indeclinable form Ἱερουσαλήμ derived from the Hebrew. Some authors show a preference for one form rather than the other but even so, both forms are found in each of the Gospels and in Acts. At some places there exists variation among the manuscripts; this is especially true of Acts where Codex Bezae also has some additional readings.

In an essay on the spelling of Jerusalem in Acts and the Gospels by J.K. Elliott (1977), a rule is identified which causes the spelling of Jerusalem to vary according to either the speaker or the context or the addressee at the point in question. The isolation of this rule is important. It allows for the same speaker's (for example, Paul's) use of the two forms, just as it also allows for the existence

of the two forms in close proximity, without having to speak of an author's (or editor's) inconsistency or the tampering with manuscripts by incompetent scribes. This is a clear case of linguistic variation being due not, as is so often thought, exclusively to the background of the speaker but much more to his sensitivity to the situation about which he is speaking and also to the background of those he is addressing.

Elliott elucidates the basic rule from those occurrences of Jerusalem where there is no known variation in the spelling, that is where the text is firm. He concludes that the pattern which emerges in the firm text indicates that the Hellenistic form of the name is used either when the narrator is specifically addressing his hearers in some kind of editorial comment, or in a non-Jewish context. The Hebrew spelling, in contrast, is used when a speaker is addressing Jews or when Jerusalem is mentioned within the context of Palestine, particularly to refer to the apostolic Church there.

Applying the principles of the eclectic method of textual criticism, Elliott uses this rule to determine the original reading at each point of variation. The original reading is deemed to be that which obeys the rule at work in the firm text. The Bezan variants and additions¹ are sometimes found to follow the rule but there are a number of occurrences of Hellenistic spelling (some shared by one or both of S01 and B03) which occur in an apparently Jewish context and which are thus accounted for by Elliott as later Hellenistic insertions.

The study here defines the essential criteria for the choice of one form or the other as both cultural and theological. The Semitic name is used chiefly by Jews of Palestine and to refer to Jerusalem as the Holy City, whereas the Hellenistic name is devoid of any religious significance. This is the pattern which certainly appears to be

followed by Codex Bezae and one which has been adopted from the original text where, at places of divergence from the Bezan text, a different perspective rather than a different rule is apparent.²

For the purposes of this study, the Bezan readings will be examined in detail, and compared with those of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus which are not always in agreement with each other. It will be seen that the Hellenistic readings which appear to contravene the rules deduced from the firm text can be understood by taking further the notion of the influence of the context and the addressee on linguistic form. Some valuable clues about the original readership of Codex Bezae will emerge in the process.

Table 1 shows the readings common to both traditions. Table 2 shows the variations between S01, B03 and D05 and the additional Bezan readings. It can be seen that there are five places where there is a difference in the spelling and that at two of those the division in the manuscripts is not the usual S01/B03 versus D05 (15:4; 20:16). No clear preference can be detected.³ There are six additional references to Jerusalem in the Bezan text, three with the Hellenistic spelling and three with the Hebrew. Overall, the Bezan picture is of five mentions of Jerusalem with the Hebrew spelling and six with the Hellenistic spelling. From this, it can seem an inevitable conclusion that the slight tendency of Codex Bezae towards a Hellenistic spelling shows that the text of this manuscript, in part at least, is likely to be the later product of a non-Jewish background. As has often been found throughout this thesis, however, using a numerical count to discern a tendency is not often a reliable method of interpreting the evidence in linguistic studies and it must first of all be considered whether there could be another reason to account for the particular readings than the personal usage of a scribe or editor.

Table 1.

Occurrences of Jerusalem where the spelling is the same in both texts.

Hellenistic: ἱεροσόλυμα	Hebrew: ἱερουσαλήμ
1:4	1:8,12a,12b,19 2:5,14 4:5,16 5:16,28 6:7
8:1a,25	8:26,27 10:39
11:27	11:22 12:25
13:13	13:27,31 15:2b
16:4	
19:21	
21:(4=d),15,17	21:11,12,13,31 22:5,(17,18=d)

Some of the above readings common to S01, B03 and D05 are found with variants in other manuscripts and should therefore not be considered as firm readings (1:12a; 6:7; 8:25,27; 10:39; 11:22; 16:4; 19:21; 21:4,15,17). As the Greek side of the Bezan manuscript is missing at 21:4 and 22:17,18, the references are supplied from the Latin side since at all other places D05 and d agree on the spelling of Jerusalem.

Table 2.

Occurrences of Jerusalem where the spelling varies, or which are Bezan additions (+D).

Hellenistic: ἱεροσόλυμα	Hebrew: ἱερουσαλήμ
	+2:42D
8:14SB	+ 8:1bD, 8:14D
11:2D	11:2SB
15:4B	+15:2aD, 15:4SD
+18:21D	
+19:1D	
20:16BD, 20:22D,	20:16S, 20:22SB,
+20:23D	

It may be noted in passing that the spelling on the Latin side of Codex Bezae is identical with that of the Greek column at every point.

There is a marked break in both Tables 1 and 2 at chapter 15 after which the Hebrew spelling is noticeably less frequent. This concords with the way in which the narrative centres on Jerusalem and the Jewish believers in the first fifteen chapters of Acts and subsequently follows the travels of Paul into the countries around Palestine. The division at chapter 15 is by no means sudden, however, for there has been a gradual movement away from Jerusalem since the stoning of Stephen in chapter 7. The break is not final either for activity is centred back on Jerusalem again by chapter 21 when the

Hebrew spelling of Jerusalem becomes common again. In order to elucidate the boundaries of usage of both spellings, it will be helpful first to consider the references in chapters 1 to 15 and then to examine the remaining references, checking any principles which can be discerned in the first half of the book and allowing them to be modified if need be.

I. CHAPTERS 1-15.

I.1. Hebrew spelling.

In the first fifteen chapters, Jerusalem remains as the centre of the new Christian Church, despite the development in interest in the countries beyond Judaea and eventually Palestine. This is inevitable considering the initial perception of Christianity as evolving from Judaism for which Jerusalem was not only the spiritual centre but also the seat of all religious authority. Even for the Jews of the Diaspora, Jerusalem retained its importance, direction and control being exercised by a careful system of organised supervision.⁴ From chapter 8 onwards, the notion of the Church develops and expands to include various categories of outcasts but this early missionary activity is seen as emanating from the Jerusalem church.

Wherever the Hebrew-derived spelling of Jerusalem occurs in these chapters, in either textual tradition and including the additional mentions in Codex Bezae, the context is always a thoroughly Jewish one referring, for example, to the Jewish inhabitants of the city or to the Jewish religious activities there. Jerusalem is seen as the centre from which the narrative looks out to view the countries around. In other words, the narrative is situated in the context of

Jerusalem seen from within. In linguistic terms, it can be said that Jerusalem is assigned as the deictic centre (Fillmore 1975, p.67). That does not imply that either the narrator or his audience is in Jerusalem, neither at the time of writing or at the time of receiving the text. It is a purely narrative device which consists in taking Jerusalem as the centre in order to show, by inference, its significance at this stage of events. In the course of the narrative, the deictic centre will be seen to change at various points. In chapters 1-15, it is largely Jerusalem. Thus the Ethiopian eunuch (8:27) . . . ἐλθὺθαι προσκυνησῶν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ. . . . Other journeys are made to Jerusalem from nearby (1:12a; 5:16) or have Jerusalem as their starting point (1:12b; 8:26; 12:25).

Even at the beginning of chapter 15, although on the surface it looks as if the action is rooted within the context of the church in Antioch, there are clues, in the Bezan text particularly, which reveal that the situation is still being viewed from within the Jerusalem perspective and not from Antioch's point of view. Both texts explain that it is because men come down from Judaea (v.1) that Paul and Barnabas go up to see the apostles and elders in Jerusalem (v.2; Hellenistic spelling in B03) and when they arrive there the focus is on the reception given to them by the church in Jerusalem (v.4). The journey to Jerusalem is not undertaken at the initiative of the Antioch church nor of Paul and Barnabas. In the Bezan text, it is specifically those who came from Jerusalem who order Paul and Barnabas to go to be judged by the Jerusalem authorities; on arrival, the church gives them a grand welcome. The cumulative effect of these supplementary details (underlined in the sentence above) is to reinforce the impression of the presence of the Jerusalem church in its role of overseeing the development of the Christian faith.

It should not be supposed that Luke actually wrote from Jerusalem as he compiled chapters 1-15 or that that was his base during the events he describes in these chapters. What is happening is that the narrator adopts an imaginary location for himself as he addresses his reader who is also invited to assume implicitly this location. The technique is commonly used in storytelling and indeed in everyday speaking⁹. It reinforces, in the first part of Acts, the importance of the Jerusalem perspective in the early days of the Christian Church.

The use of the Hebrew spelling of Jerusalem in Acts is thus seen to be very limited: it is not just confined to Jews or a Jewish context but to Jews in Jerusalem and to the city as seen through their eyes.

I.2. Hellenistic spelling.

The first reference to Jerusalem with the Hellenistic spelling at 1:4 gives some indication as to the reasons for its being selected here and elsewhere. The context is the preface to the book which is addressed by Luke to Theophilus so that, although Jerusalem is mentioned in a reported speech by Jesus, the story in these opening lines is being viewed from a wider perspective. Since it is assumed that Theophilus is a Greek the Hellenistic spelling is natural for him to hear; Luke is likely to be a Jew * but not from Jerusalem or even Palestine. He is a Diaspora Jew and it will be seen as other references are examined that in the Diaspora the Hellenistic form appears to have been predominantly, if not exclusively, used.

The 'we' passage references in chapter 21 which could be interpreted as indicating, on the contrary, Luke's preference for the Hebrew form will be discussed in due course. Meanwhile, two more

references with the Hellenistic spelling at 8:1a and 11:27 also belong to Luke as he introduces a new episode. The second mention of Jerusalem in the Bezan text of this verse (8:1b), with the Hebrew form, could arguably be considered as belonging to the same editorial framework and is therefore incongruous. On the other hand, the Christians are described as being scattered, a dispersion which occurs from Jerusalem outwards and so the viewpoint could be said to have reverted back to the city itself and the church there. Furthermore, in the Bezan text there is a clearer separation of the comment about the dispersion from the earlier part of the sentence as a new sentence is begun with the introduction of *δε* after *παντες*.

At 11:27 the presence of Luke the narrator is also marked more clearly in the Bezan text with the additional 'we' allusion: *συνεστραφημενων δε ημων*. The setting of this passage may be compared with the situation at 15:1-4. There, the focus was seen to be on the actions of the Jerusalem church seen from within whereas in 11:27-30 the place of action is firmly established in Antioch.

The importance of the place of action can again be shown from the choice of the Hellenistic spelling at 13:13. Paul and his company are in Pamphilia when John leaves them to go back to Jerusalem. His departure is seen from the point of view of those remaining as the account of their travels among the synagogues of the Diaspora is continued in the following sentence. This needs to be underlined. Even though Paul and his friends were Jews and were involved in speaking with Jews, their own background was the Diaspora where their native language would almost certainly have been Greek. 'As far as the first century C.E. is concerned, it cannot be doubted that in the major centres where Diaspora Jews had settled, Greek was written and spoken' (Safrai and Stern 1974, Vol 2, p.1052). Within Palestine in the first century, Aramaic was spoken but even the extent of that may have been

limited by the nature of the Hellenising influence on Judaism⁷. The widespread use of Greek in the Diaspora, however 'bad' that Greek was, means that except for the Jews of the Jewish towns of Palestine, notably Jerusalem itself, the Hellenistic form of the Jewish capital was probably natural. This probability will have to be borne in mind as the occurrences of the Hellenistic spelling of Jerusalem in particular are examined.

At 8:25 all three of the manuscripts considered in this study have the Hellenistic spelling despite variants elsewhere and despite the Hebrew spelling in vv.26+27. 8:25 contains a summary statement on the evangelisation of Samaria and as an instance therefore of editorial intrusion the Hellenistic spelling is in keeping with Luke's personal practice. There is a further reason for this form within the text itself⁸. At 8:25, the Christians return to Jerusalem from Samaria but the focus of the narrative remains very firmly on the mission of the Church to regions beyond Judaea. In other words, the standpoint of the narrator at this point in his story is outside Jerusalem, not inside, and he implicitly invites his hearers to take up that position with him. Jerusalem and its strict orthodox Jewish doctrines and practices is losing its hold on Christianity for the first time.

The same reasoning may lie behind the choice of the Hellenistic spelling at 8:14 in S01/B03 if it was felt that the action had not moved away from Samaria. The case is made less strong by the apostles being the active subject of the sentence (cf. 11:1D05 and comments on that verse below). In speaking of 'reasoning', however, it should not be thought that the decision of the narrator, or of a subsequent editor, about which narrative standpoint to adopt is a carefully thought-out, conscious decision. It is rather an intuitive process whereby a narrator tells his story according to his perception

of the events which he is relating.

There is a final occurrence of the Hellenistic form in Codex Bezae at 11:2. The Hebrew form in the Alexandrian text is entirely in keeping with the principles which have so far been established as governing its use: the episode is introduced from the point of view of the church in Judaea and Peter, a Jew from Jerusalem goes there to meet them and to be confronted by them. The choice of the Hellenistic spelling in the Bezan text is accounted for by various factors in the surrounding material of the Bezan text at this point:

11:1 D05

ακουστον δε εγενετο

τοis αποστολοis και τοis αδελφοis

οι εν τη Ιουδαικα

οτι και τα εθνη εδεξατο τον λογον του θεου

2. ο μεν ουν Πητρος δικακου του χρόνου

ηθησεν πορευθηναι εις Ιεροσολυμα

και προσφωνησας τους αδελφους

και επιστηριξας αυτους πολον λογον

ποιουμενος δικα των χωρων

διδασκων αυτους ος και καθηνησεν αυτοis

και απηγγιλεν αυτοis την χαριν του θεου

οι δε εκ περιτομης αδελφοi διεκρινοντο

3. προς αυτον λεγοντες . . .

The readings of this long text are found only as such in D05 with partial support in the early Coptic manuscript G⁴⁷ (mae) and a few other manuscripts (B-L ad loc). A number of differences from the short text are relevant to the spelling of Jerusalem. At the beginning of the chapter, the Christians in Judaea are introduced indirectly; they are brought to the fore only at the end of v.2 where they are mentioned as the subject of the verb, specifically as 'brethren' of

the circumcision party and in initial position in a new sentence (*δέ*) thereby highlighting their disagreement with Peter, about whom extra information has just been provided. When Peter was last mentioned at 10:48, he was with the new converts in Caesarea. It was his own wish to go to Jerusalem and he was wanting to go for some time. Before he went (or as he travelled), he arranged for the brethren to come to see him - apart from the recent converts in Caesarea, this could refer to the Christians who had come from Joppa with Peter and who go to Jerusalem with him (10:23; 11:12); it could also refer to the other Christians whom Peter knew from his travels in the area between Lydda, Joppa and Caesarea (9:32-43). Peter strengthened them and also spent time in the villages, talking with and teaching the Christians there. The people whom Peter met and told about the grace of God at the end of the sentence could be either the Christians in the villages or in Jerusalem.

His arrival in Jerusalem is not actually recorded as it is in the short text, so it would seem right to understand the series of sentences from *ο μὲν οὖν Πέτρος* to *καὶ ἀπεγγίλεν αὐτοῖς* as representing one continuous movement which brings Peter from Caesarea to Jerusalem. The *δέ* clause at the end of the verse, which introduces Peter's opponents, is anticipated by *μὲν οὖν* (see ch.4, Part C) and contains the event that the *μὲν οὖν* clause specifically leads up to. The implication of presenting the circumcision party in this way is that Peter was well received until he met them. In other words, they are highlighted as being in disagreement with Peter and at the same time are set in contrast with the other brethren to whom Peter has been announcing the grace of God and who are not recorded as objecting.

Since Peter was a Jew from Jerusalem and, what is more, was going to meet the authorities there about a problem central to Jewish religious beliefs and practice, the expected form of Jerusalem here, of all places, would be the Hebrew one. The Bezan text even presents Peter's journey as being undertaken at his own initiative and yet the spelling is Hellenistic. The Hellenistic spelling is an indication that Peter's journey to Jerusalem is not being viewed from his perspective but from the perspective of the locality he is leaving. The insistence of the Bezan text on Peter's concern to spend time meeting with and teaching the Christians before arriving at Jerusalem reveals a certain preoccupation on the part of Peter with the brethren in the region he has been visiting. There is no reason to doubt the reality of his concern but as it is recorded here it looks as if it is mentioned because of a certain sympathy with the very people who were affected by it, Christians away from the Jerusalem area.

This passage thus provides a very important clue as to the origin of the text of Codex Bezae. It reveals inside information about Peter's intentions and activities and presents that information from the point of view of onlookers, not from Peter's own point of view. Those onlookers are Christians away from Jerusalem, who use the Hellenistic form of the name when referring to the city. That does not necessarily make them Greeks. It may well make them Diaspora Jews. This conclusion is the more likely in view of the preoccupation with Jewish issues so noticeable in other features of Codex Bezae.

II. CHAPTERS 16-22

II.1. Hebrew spelling.

The first occurrence of the Hebrew spelling after chapter 15 is in the Alexandrian text in chapter 20 (vv.16+22). This will be commented on when looking at the alternative form in the Bezan text (#II.2 below). Meanwhile, in the text common to both traditions, the Hebrew spelling is found in a series of references at 21:11,12+13. Although this passage is written in the first person, it is not the direct involvement of the author which causes the Hebrew form to be used for it has been seen that Luke of his own accord uses the Hellenistic spelling consistent with his origin as a Jew of the Diaspora. Within the Bezan 'we' passage in chapter 11, the Hellenistic spelling is used, as it is also by both the Alexandrian and the Bezan texts in vv. 4,15 +17 of chapter 21.

There is a good reason for the use of the Hebrew form of Jerusalem in vv. 11, 12+13 and that is the presence of Agabus, the prophet who came from Judaea (v.10). It is he who initially mentions Jerusalem in the context of his prophecy concerning Paul. As a Jew from Judaea, the Hebrew form would be the one natural for him to use and equally natural for the other Christians (v.12) and Paul (v.13) to use in conversation in his presence and in response to what he has said.

At 21:31, the disturbance in Jerusalem is reported to the tribune of the cohort. The Hebrew spelling possibly indicates that word was brought by Jews although the Jewish context of the episode together with the fact that it is observed from within Jerusalem may well be considerations which over/ride the identity of the speaker in this case.

The three mentions of Jerusalem in chapter 22 occur in the course of Paul's speech to the Jews, made τῇ ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ. He is speaking in Jerusalem and is presenting the account of his life and calling by God to be the apostle to the Gentiles from the point of view of orthodox Judaism in Jerusalem. The two latter points are probably as significant as the language he is speaking in. In his letter to the Galatians, as he relates the same events to the Galatian Christians (1:17,18;2:1) from a position strongly opposed to the orthodox Jewish point of view, Paul uses the Hellenistic form.⁹

II.2. Hellenistic spelling.

In most of the references to Jerusalem with the Hellenistic spelling after chapter 15, Jerusalem is being viewed from the outside, specifically from the Diaspora. Although the speakers are chiefly of Jewish origin, they are not from Jerusalem or Judaea.¹⁰

At 16:4, Jerusalem is mentioned by the narrator in speaking of the decisions of the apostolic council which Paul and Timothy pass on to the churches which they visit in the region beyond Derbe and Lystra. The setting is very firmly away from Jerusalem and, although the narrator, Paul, Timothy and some of the Christians in the churches are of Jewish origin, the authorities in Jerusalem are being viewed from the Diaspora standpoint.

It is Paul's own intentions about going to Jerusalem which are recorded at 18:21D05, 19:1D05, 19:21, 20:16,22 and 20:23D05, with comments revealing inside information similar to the additional information given about Peter at the beginning of chapter 11 in the Bezan text. Although Paul was of Jewish origin and had spent some time in Jerusalem, he was a Diaspora Jew and his present journey is to be made from the Diaspora. There is therefore every reason for Jerusalem

to be referred to with the Hellenistic form. S01 and B03 have Paul use the Hebrew form in addressing the elders of the Ephesus church at 20:22; this is the only instance in the Alexandrian text of Paul's actual words and it may be that this is a factor influencing the choice of form here. Elsewhere, where Paul's words are not directly reported (19:21, 20:16) the Hellenistic form is used in the Alexandrian text, though not consistently for 20:16 S01 has the Hebrew form. 20:16 mentions Jerusalem in a narrative aside in which the identity of the narrator is sufficient cause in itself for the Hellenistic form to be chosen.

At 18:21 D05, Paul refers to Jerusalem as he addresses the Jews in their synagogue at Ephesus and he uses the Hellenistic form because they are Diaspora Jews. When he uses the Hebrew form elsewhere to address Jews in the synagogue (13:27,31; 22: 5,17,18), he is speaking of Jerusalem in the course of recounting Jewish history up to and including the death and resurrection of the Messiah, Jesus. In that context, the Hebrew form is expected.

The three references to Jerusalem which occur in chapter 21 are made by the narrator in a 'we' section¹². The reasons for Luke's own use of this form have already been considered above. There are no contrary reasons within the context of the references which would render the Hebrew form more appropriate. In v.4, it is the disciples in Tyre who urge Paul not to go to Jerusalem (contrast a similar incident in v.12 which takes place in the presence of Agabus from Judaea). In v.15, the party leave Caesarea for Jerusalem where they stay with an early disciple from Cyprus: the setting remains that of the Diaspora even in Jerusalem. The account of what transpires once they have arrived in Jerusalem (v.17) is furthermore related as issuing from Paul's initiative (vv.18+19). Paul has by this stage established himself as independent of the Jerusalem church and his

relations with the elders are very different from his position in chapter 15 or Peter's in chapter 11. Although the discussion with the Jerusalem elders has to do with Jewish problems of acceptance of the Gentiles into the Church, there is no disagreement with Paul and no opposition on Jewish legal grounds to his mission among the Gentiles. It is therefore natural for Luke to continue to use the Hellenistic form in v.17 because although the context is similar to that of 11:29-31/30-32 and 15:2-4, the relationships between the different Christian groups have undergone a considerable amount of change.

CONCLUSION.

The spelling of Jerusalem varies within Acts according to the standpoint from which the city is being viewed. This may be the narrator's standpoint, the speaker's standpoint, the hearer's standpoint, or a standpoint adopted for the purposes of the telling of the story. When these are considered, it is found that the Hebrew spelling is used when Jerusalem is being referred to by Hebrew (more precisely, Aramaic) speaking Jews, that is Jews in the Jerusalem area; or when the story is being told from the point of view of Jerusalem. When the speaker is not from Jerusalem, or when the story is being viewed from elsewhere, the Hellenistic spelling is used even though the speaker (for example, the narrator) is a Jew or the events reflect a Jewish concern. This use is consistent with what is known about the language spoken by Jews in the Diaspora, both inside and outside of Palestine.

There is very little variation in the spelling of Jerusalem between the two textual traditions under consideration. There are a few instances where the choice of the Alexandrian text is not easy to

understand. The spelling of the additional references to Jerusalem in the Bezan text is in line with the pattern which can be discerned elsewhere.

That there should be variation over such a question is natural. The 'rules' which control the spelling, such as they are, are not rigid but depend very much on the person telling the story. It is this very flexibility which has provided a valuable and unexpected clue as to the origin of the text of Codex Bezae, for the material which is peculiarly Bezan reveals a certain identification with the Diaspora point of view. Thus, the additional 'we' passage in chapter 11 uses the Hellenistic spelling; Paul uses it and it is used of him except when he speaks 'in Hebrew'; it is used of Peter in chapter 11. That the Hellenistic spelling be associated with Luke and Paul is not surprising for they were Diaspora Jews. That it should be associated with Peter is surprising because it is unlikely to reflect his own usage. A probable explanation of its occurrence in 11:2 is that, in recounting Peter's journey from Caesarea to Jerusalem, the author of Codex Bezae is situating himself in one of the places Peter is leaving to go to Jerusalem because he has a reason for identifying with the people there.

NOTES TO CHAPTER SEVEN.

1. There are some inaccuracies in the Bezan readings as given by Elliott (1977). Codex Bezae should not be included in the list of MSS with the Greek form at 11:22; nor with the Hebrew form at 19:21. ἱεροσόλυμα is read at 16:4 not just by AB but also by C^v and D. D could be added to the group of MSS reading ἱεροσόλυμα at 20:16. Finally at Luke 18:31, Codex Bezae does have the Hebrew form and should not be cited as an exception.
2. De la Potterie 1982 also proposes a theological solution with respect to what he defines as the original text of Acts, and indeed of the Gospel of Luke. That the solution corresponds so well to the peculiarly Bezan view of Jerusalem and of its significance for the early Church can be seen as lending support both to De la Potterie's solution and the interpretation of the Bezan text of Acts proposed in this thesis.
3. Some scholars give the impression that Codex Bezae frequently reads the Hellenistic spelling as a variant reading, see De la Potterie 1982, p.178, n.56.
4. Safrai and Stern 1974, see especially Vol I, ch.4 .
5. Fillmore 1975, 'Coming and Going' pp.50-70, has many examples which illustrate this.
6. The view that Luke was a Jew has been increasingly advocated in recent years. See especially Jervell 1972, 1984; cf. Bovon 1992; Kilpatrick 1965.
7. For an extreme view of the strength of this influence on the language see Hengel 1974, Vol I, pp.58-61 and 1989, ch.2; for a more conservative position cf. Lifschitz 1965 and Safrai and Stern 1974, Vol I, chs.21-2.
8. Elliott 1977 argues for the Hebrew form on the grounds of similarity of context with Lk 9:51-3 and 17:11 where the Hebrew form is used. However, although the situation in Luke is also that of a journey from Samaria to Jerusalem, stopping at Samaritan villages along the way, the significance of Jerusalem in Luke is that of the city of Messianic destiny, an idea which is quite absent from the context in Acts.
9. The Hebrew form is used in Gal 4:25,26 in telling the allegorical story of Abraham's sons, which is to be expected since it is a traditional Jewish story. The Hebrew spelling at Paul's other references to Jerusalem in his letters (Rom 15:19,25,26,31; I Cor16:3), in every manuscript except D06 (Codex Claromontanus), is problematic for even though some of the recipients are Jews they are Diaspora Jews and the context does not require the Hebrew spelling. There may be a case here for the correctness of D06's reading.
10. Elliott rejects every one of the occurrences of the Hellenistic spellings between chapters 15 and 21 (1977) mainly because he focuses on the Jewish identity of the speaker and not the location of the Diaspora.

11. Part of the page (fol.504) containing vv.16-18 in Greek is now missing from the manuscript of Codex Bezae but a transcript made in the 17th century when the page was still complete provides the missing text - see Scrivener 1978, p.x and pp. 446-7. The Latin page has not been lost and confirms the Hellenistic spelling of Jerusalem in these two verses.

SECTION II

CONCLUSIONS

At the end of this section of linguistic analysis, the various conclusions which have been drawn along the way can be brought together and synthesized.

Perhaps the most remarkable linguistic feature of the text of Codex Bezae is its consistency. When the Bezan text is taken on its own, a high degree of regularity with regard to every point examined can be observed. The patterns of usage which emerge are for the most part identical to those which can be identified in the text common to all three manuscripts under consideration. Occasionally, though, the pattern varies slightly, suggesting on the one hand that the editor of the Bezan text was not the same as that of the common text and yet, on the other, that he was of a linguistic milieu not very far removed from the milieu of the writer of the common text. A comparison with other Greek literature using the tools of discourse analysis to look at the same features as are examined here, as well as additional aspects such as those summarized in Appendix II, would potentially enable the time and the place of writing to be ascertained with more precision.

In comparison with Codex Bezae, the text of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus is more erratic. It may have its own inner consistency following rules which have not been detected in these studies; but there is a more apparent tendency to depart from the patterns of the common text than is manifested by Codex Bezae. Overall, the narrator of the S01/B03 text intervenes in a less conspicuous way than in the D05 text.

The Bezan editor knows Greek well enough to be able to make use of the slightest alteration to words to achieve a subtle difference in meaning or emphasis. The nature of the differences between the two texts in question would suggest that Codex Bezae is secondary in so far as its divergent readings are often a matter of making a point a little more exactly or bringing out a meaning more clearly. These are not generally the kind of details which, if original, would require modification. Some instances of a double reading have also been noticed where what looks like the reading of the exemplar has been accidentally left in the Bezan text in addition to a new reading.

An examination of the D05 text as a text in its own right further reveals a work which displays marked features of discourse cohesion. Word order, connectives and recurring lexical items all combine with a clear, inner perspective and awareness of the audience to produce a text which fits together well. As far as can be judged from the results of the different studies carried out in this section, from a discourse point of view the narrator in Codex Bezae is a better story teller than the narrator in the other text. He skilfully uses devices of cohesion to achieve a sustained impression of attentiveness to the way in which his story is being heard. It is extremely unlikely that such cohesion could have been obtained accidentally by a haphazard mixture of such things as error, scribal whim and a desire to conform to ecclesiastical practices, as the popular view of the Bezan text tends to presume. In view of these findings, it would be worthwhile pursuing an more extensive examination of textual cohesion by a study of other cohesive relations within the text.¹

Cohesion is enhanced by a unity of purpose apparent in the Bezan text, that of relating the narrative to the backcloth of the writings of the Old Testament and of setting it within the religious

context of Judaism. This is seen not only in the frequency of the use of lexical items with Old Testament resonances; it is seen in the very nature of many of the readings affected by divergence which are specifically to do with things Jewish. It is this detail which gives away the identity of the editor as almost certainly Jewish; it reveals a sensitivity to a Jewish viewpoint and a familiarity with Jewish ways of thinking and understanding.

The preoccupation with Jewish matters may place a limit on the date of the text. For the conflict between Judaism and Christianity to have had an effect on the way in which the story of the early Church was told, it was likely to have been at the time when it was at its most intense, that is, among the first generations of Christians. That the text of Codex Bezae belongs to this period is also suggested by the indications that the editor was familiar at first hand with some of the characters of the story of Acts.

Two particular issues seem most susceptible to the creation of variant readings: the inclusion of the Gentiles in the Church and the continuity between Judaism and Christianity. The emphatically positive treatment of both these issues in Codex Bezae closely resembles the concerns of Paul as they can be observed partly in his speeches in Acts and more especially in his letters. Despite similarities between the language of Codex Bezae and that of Paul which other studies have sought to demonstrate², evidence is lacking to state that the Bezan editor was in fact Paul. The most that can be advanced at this stage is that it looks as if he were a first century Jewish Christian from the Diaspora, with a good knowledge of Greek and an understanding of Christianity very much in line with the expositions of Paul. There exists one clue from the Bezan version of Acts 11:2 which points to a geographical location around Caesarea for the origin of its text. That clue would need to be confirmed before being allowed as firm

evidence.

In order to clarify and check these conclusions, it will be helpful to consider longer portions of Acts where all the variant readings which occur in a passage can be examined in relation to one another rather than in isolation. This will be the aim of the studies in the next section.

NOTES.

1. There is a variety of other types of cohesive relations in a text, of which participant reference, briefly described in Appendix II, is an important one. For a good outline of the aspects of a text which provide cohesive ties, see Brown and Yule 1983, pp.190-222.

2. Notably Delebecque 1986, pp.177-8.

SECTION III, EXEGETICAL STUDIES.

SECTION III: EXEGETICAL STUDIES

INTRODUCTION

The three studies presented in this section have been selected to illustrate a variety of types of discourse from different parts of the book of Acts. The first is a speech by Peter made before Pentecost; the second is a portrayal of relations between the early Church and King Herod; the third is an account of Paul's missionary activity in Corinth.

The immediate objective of these chapters is to draw on the conclusions of the linguistic section in order to examine a series of variant readings in an extended portion of the text of Acts. The focus of the enquiry will be on the text of Codex Bezae, comparison being made with that of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus.

The purpose is to see how a series of readings works together and in what ways the variants contribute to the meaning of the passage. By 'meaning' is understood the sense intended by the writer for his recipients (as opposed to any meaning or application, however legitimate, that can be derived by later readers).

The results of such an examination should enable earlier conclusions to be tested and more definite statements on the nature and origin of the Bezan text of Acts to be made.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Acts 1:15-26: The Replacement of Judas.

INTRODUCTION.

This passage describes in some detail the process of finding a replacement for Judas who had been one of the twelve disciples of Jesus and who had betrayed him (cf. Mt 26:14-16, 20-5, 47-50; 27:3-10; Mk 14:10-11, 17-21, 43-6; Lk 22:3-6, 21-3, 47-8; Jn 18:1-3). Despite suggestions to the contrary¹, the story of Judas' betrayal of the Messiah appears to have belonged to the earliest Aramaic Christian traditions, and its interpretation to have been an integral part of Jewish-Christian understanding. The Aramaic sources of the account in Acts have been studied by M. Wilcox (1973) following an earlier (unpublished) note by A.J. Wensinck. His conclusion is that Luke has woven, somewhat awkwardly, Peter's speech around a pre-existing story about Judas and that together they have become part of the overall account of how a replacement for Judas was found in order to make up the number of the twelve disciples.

It is clear from the sources which Wilcox brings to light (summarized in the next paragraph) that they cannot be guessed at by anyone unfamiliar with them. What is remarkable about the Bezan text of the passage is that, once the Aramaic sources have been pointed out, then it becomes evident that in Codex Bezae the links between the events related by Acts and the Aramaic traditions are made more explicit. This could only be done by someone who was familiar with the

sources and who furthermore understood how the recent events related, according to Jewish consciousness, to them. The signs point strongly to an editor of Jewish identity. Even if the explicit links are seen as amendments to an original (made because it was felt to be insufficiently clear, for example), those amendments can only have been made by a reader who understood the implicit connections. The implication of that is that the Bezan text of the passage is situated at a date fairly close to the original and, indeed, to the events related. Of course, it is possible in theory that, being 'more Jewish', the Bezan text is the original of which the other text is a revision which ceased to see the links with Aramaic sources and therefore dropped them. As will be seen, however, they are not, on the whole, of a kind which would pose a problem if they were not understood for the links which they are, and therefore would not need to be omitted.

The Wilcox thesis: Wilcox is concerned with the composition of Peter's speech in chapter 1. He seeks to untangle three main strands: Lucan redactional material, words which can be attributed to Peter as his own and finally, traditions older than either of those strands. It is the identification and use of those traditions which is of main interest to the history of the transmission of the text in this instance.

Wilcox understands the citation of the Scripture referred to in v.16 as the contents of v.17, and not as the quotation from the Psalms (69:25; 109:8) in v.20. (The difficulties with the latter understanding are commonly recognized - on the one hand an apparent digression which separates the quotation from the Psalms from the initial mention of the Scripture, and on the other the conflation of two distinct elements (Judas' fate and his replacement) without

explicit explanation). ⁴On does not then mean 'because' but 'that'. He believes that whatever is cited is intended to relate to the privileged place Judas occupied among the twelve rather than to his fate as such. The specific Scripture identified in v. 17 is not from the Hebrew Old Testament but belongs to the Palestinian Targumim to Gen 44:18. At that point in the Joseph story, Benjamin has been found with the silver cup in his sack and Judah, the eldest brother and guarantor of Benjamin, speaks to Joseph. In the targumic version of the passage, Judah vows to avenge the humiliation of Benjamin who 'was numbered with us among (lit, 'from') the tribes and will receive a portion and share with us in the division of the land'.

This description of Benjamin becomes, in the Jewish haggadah tradition, a definition of a member of the Twelve Patriarchs. Both elements are found in the description of Judas in Acts 1:17. Thus the role of Judas as 'one of the twelve' (repeated several times in the accounts of his betrayal in the Gospels, especially Matthew and Mark) is understood by the early followers of Jesus as of crucial significance. It heightens the sin of Judas as well as the need for a speedy God-chosen replacement.

Furthermore, in Aramaic, the word for 'portion' (or 'lot' - the Greek has the same word, cf. v.26) is $\rho\lambda\pi$ (h₁lq) and is sometimes confused with the word $\lambda\rho\pi$ (h₁ql) meaning 'field'. This is the word which is the first part of the transliterated word in the Greek of v.19 (Akeldamach) 'Akeldamach'. Wilcox argues for a deliberate play on words in the Aramaic which is lost in the Greek but which connects vv. 16-17 with vv.18-19 which thus in turn no longer constitutes a digression. Judas loses his share in the land of Israel for a field of death.

Once this material became incorporated into the Greek-speaking Christian tradition, there was clearly a problem of making sense of

the apparent lack of connection between elements of the Judas story. Wilcox suggests that Luke, not recognizing the Scriptural allusion in v.17, inserted *διὰ στόματος Δαυὶδ* in v.16 and the quotation from the Psalms v.20; and that he added the detail that everyone in Jerusalem heard about Judas' gruesome death as well as explaining the Aramaic origin of 'Akeldamach' - *τῆ (ἰδία) διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν*.

This summarizes the theory of Wilcox which is all the more plausible for the existence of other targumic elements which have been identified in other speeches in Acts (Heimerdinger 1988). The understanding proposed by Wilcox of Judas' deeds and the replacement of his presence among the twelve apostles is not an anti-Semitic interpretation, still less a Gentile Christian invention, as some contemporary Jewish writers have argued.² It represents, on the contrary, a thoroughly Jewish perspective which is entirely in line with the prophetic tradition of the Jewish Scriptures.

The line of reasoning about targumic and haggadic sources could be pursued further to include the traditional grouping together of passages from various parts of the Jewish Bible for the purposes of exposition and synagogue readings, an established process which is well-recognized (Mann 1940; Perrot 1973). The attributing of the references to the Psalms to Luke is then not necessary as it is possible that somewhere in Jewish tradition the extracts from Psalms 69 and 109 were already connected to the targumim of Gen 44:18ff³. In any case, there is evidence in Matthew's Gospel (27:9-10) of Jewish Scriptures being applied to the betrayal of Judas in the days of the early Church.

It could also be added that *μὲν οὖν* (v.18) is not a connective used elsewhere in Acts to introduce a digression (see ch.4, Part C) as several commentaries regard vv.18+19. Rather it indicates continuity with the previous sentence at the same time as it looks

forward to a main point which is going to be made subsequently. From that point of view, vv.18+19 show why Judas is mentioned in the context of the Scripture of v.17. He, the betrayer, who was one of the chosen disciples bought a field in which he died a gruesome death so that both he and his property were, so to speak, forever wiped out. This is the crux. And since he was one of the chosen twelve, he needs replacing. These are the points picked up by the references to the Psalms v.20, the latter one being finally developed from v.21 onwards.

ANALYSIS OF THE TEXT.

(Line references refer to Codex Bezae.)

Verse 15

15/line 1

Σε D05 : κκ S01/B03

In S01/B03, there are no clauses introduced by Σε in the early part of Acts, from 1:1 to 2:4, despite a succession of separate events leading up to the Pentecost narrative. Levinsohn interprets this as an indication that the 'events are viewed as being of a preliminary nature' (1987, p. 105). The presence of Σε in D05 at the beginning of the account concerning the replacement of Judas would suggest, therefore, that in that text at least the event is viewed as marking a distinct progression in the narrative, as being an event in its own right and not just part of the preparation for the next development at Pentecost. The election of Judas' replacement is thus accorded an importance which is absent from the other text. Its importance is confirmed in the Bezan text by the addition at the beginning of chapter 2 of the words ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΕΝ ΤΑΙΣ ΗΜΕΡΑΙΣ ΕΚΕΙΝΑΙΣ which

situate the Pentecost event in relation to the election of the twelfth apostle.

+ 0 D05 : - 0 S01/B03

The definite article is omitted before Peter in S01/B03 as he is singled out from the previous list of apostles (v.13) and stands to make an important speech. This is typical of the pattern followed by the text of S01/B03 with respect to the definite article before names of persons (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, p.26). In respect of omitting the article when a person is singled out to make a speech, D05 does not follow this pattern, even though in most other instances of a named person being isolated from a group it is highly regular in omitting the article. The implication may be that the Bezan editor regards Peter as the expected person to speak at this point because he was the established leader of the group. There is therefore no reason to underline that it was he rather than another who stood up to speak about Judas and, since the reference to Peter at v.15 is anaphoric, the article is retained. The accepted understanding of Peter's leading role is further apparent in the singular verb v.23.

15/line 2

μαθητων D05 : αδελφων S01/B03

αδελφός was a general term for members of the Jewish community and is used in Acts to mean 'Christians'.⁴ It is a vaguer term than μαθητής, and also a later one as a designation of the followers of Jesus. By choosing to refer to the gathering addressed by Peter specifically as 'disciples' there could be a conscious recollection of 'the twelve disciples' who, as becomes apparent through the account concerning

Judas, represent the twelve tribes of Israel. This is the more probable in view of the insistence on their number being 120 (12 x 10 - see line 3 below). 'Brethren' are undefined; 'disciples' in contrast are known and recognized.

15/line 3

γὰρ D05 : δε D05CorrG : praeterea d : τε S01/B03

This line stands as a parenthetical comment after the introduction of Peter as he is about to speak to the disciples/brethren. There is a significance about the number of people present (about 120) for various Jewish documents (Wilcox p.440) stipulate that the minimum number of people needed to form a community with its own sanhedrin is 120; at one place, this is explained as representing 10 persons to each tribe. In so far as the twelve apostles stand for the twelve tribes of Israel and Peter's speech prepares for the election of an apostle to replace Judas, then it looks as if the mention of the number 120 is a deliberate indication that the legal conditions for holding a meeting of such immense importance were met. The election which is about to be made will be valid.

There are further echoes of a formal gathering in the term ὄχλος ὀνομάτων, reminiscent of the 'number of names' in Numbers 1 (see next variant); and also in ἐπὶ τὸ κῦτὸν which Wilcox (1965, pp.93-100) describes as a quasi-technical term meaning 'in union' in a formal meeting, not simply 'together' as an informal gathering. All of these factors need to be borne in mind as the various connectives are considered.

τέ does not normally introduce an aside (see Levinsohn 1987, pp. 121-36). τε can, however, introduce a sentence which is an additional comment on what has just been said and which is the

specific lead-in to the next sentence. In that sense, $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ could have the meaning of 'furthermore' ³, and be taken as indicating that the number of the people gathered being about 120 was of special significance to what Peter is about to say.

In the first hand of Codex Bezae, $\gamma\alpha\rho$ is found. When the verb is the first element in a sentence linked by $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ to the previous one, as it is here, $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ is always causal in Acts (Levinsohn 1987, p.14). That means that the Bezan editor understood that Peter's address was in some way brought about by the presence of the 120. In other words, in the light of what has been said about the importance of the 120 for the election of the new apostle to take place, he sees that Peter was able to make the speech which he did because there were 120 people present. This is made more clear by the definite article before $\acute{\omicron}\chi\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ - see below. The implication is that the Bezan editor understood the point about the number of people present and wanted to make it explicit.

$\delta\epsilon$ is a correction made to the original of Codex Bezae by Corrector G (Parker 1992, pp.125-30). It is a function of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ to introduce a background comment which supplies parenthetical information or which is of relevance to the next development in the narrative (Levinsohn 1987, p.91). The exact relationship is not however specified. The Latin side of Bezae with *praeterea*, 'besides, moreover', may reflect the Greek reading of $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$.

In an analysis of the work of Corrector G, Parker concludes that he made his amendments from what would have been the exemplar of Codex Bezae and that 'when his corrections are not stylistic, they are to be regarded as a more authoritative witness to tradition than are those of the first hand' (pp.129-30). In other words, the person responsible for the first hand of Codex Bezae would have found $\delta\epsilon$ in the copy in front of him and altered it to $\gamma\alpha\rho$.

What γὰρ does is to make the relationship clear; it explains an assumption contained in the previous sentence (Larsen 1991, p.36). Even if γὰρ is secondary, being an amendment by the original Bezan editor to clarify the point of the aside, he shows that he knew the significance of it and demonstrates not only that he was familiar with Jewish legal requirements but also that he expected his audience to be so. There would be no point in making explicit that Peter's raising of the matter of Judas' replacement was possible because there were a certain number of people present unless the hearers themselves knew the significance of that number. This perspective situates the Bezan text at a time of the development of the early Church when Judaism was still relevant to Christianity.

+ O D05 : - O S01/B03

Without the article, this sentence can be construed as 'there was a large number of names gathered, about 120'. With the article, the sentence reads 'the (large) number of names gathered was about 120'. The difference is perhaps slight but in combination with the difference in connectives (τέ: γάρ) the effect of the Bezan form is to focus on the number of names, on the fact that it was about 120. The article also expresses the idea that the number was an expected, and relevant, piece of information. ὁ ὄχλος ὀνομαζέτων is a curious expression. There is no problem with the association of ὄχλος with the disciples as the term is used elsewhere by Luke to refer to the disciples (Lk 6:17).⁴ It is rather that ὄχλος with the article does not directly describe the disciples but the 'names' in what looks like a fixed expression of the kind repeated throughout the instructions for the census in Numbers (chapter 1). This confirms that the Bezan editor was aware of the Jewish significance of this aside.

WS D05/B03 : WGEI S01

The Bezan text reads ὡς on a number of occasions in place of ὡσεὶ (Yoder 1961), although ὡσεὶ is a particularly Lukan term (Metzger 1975, p. 285).

Verse 16

16/line 1

DEI D05 : EDEI S01/B03

The difference in grammatical form is between past or present: 'it was fitting' or 'it is fitting'. In terms of meaning, the difference is that either the Scripture concerning Judas has been fulfilled, or is to be so. If the former, the fulfilment is only partial i.e. the Field of Blood which corresponds to the quotation in v.20a from Ps.69. If the latter, the fulfilment refers to the present action i.e. of electing a replacement. As has already been pointed out above in presenting Wilcox's theory, in the first case the way in which Scripture has been fulfilled is not immediately obvious because the passage keeps digressing and when it gets to the Scriptural quotation, only part of it refers to the past. The difficulty could be seen as an explanation for the Bezan DEI which avoids ambiguity by using the present tense and thereby referring to the present replacement of Judas. Alternatively, the choice of the present tense can be seen as reflecting the Bezan understanding of the passage as being essentially about the election of the twelfth apostle rather than about the fate of Judas (cf. on Wilcox above). (In that sense, it is an element which adds weight to Wilcox's argument that the Scripture meant by γραφήν

v.16 is the contents of v.17 rather than v.20.) This interpretation would seem to be confirmed by the next variant.

16/line 2

+ $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu$ D05 : - $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu$ S01/B03

If $\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\eta\nu$ refers to the quotation from the Psalms in v.20 then $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu$ does indeed seem odd and its removal justified. The question is 'what was it intended to signify?' Wilcox's suggestion would supply the answer in acknowledging a Scriptural reference in v.17. The problem which remains at that point is the $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$ $\sigma\tau\acute{o}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\delta\alpha\upsilon\delta$ which Wilcox sees as being added by Luke to his source because he did not recognize the quotation from the Palestinian Targum of Gen 44:18 and inserted the citations from the Psalms. This explanation would still hold even if, as suggested above, the Psalms quotation was already in the source available to Luke - he could have felt it necessary to indicate which Scripture was being referred to.⁷

16/line 5

+ $\tau\omicron\nu$ D05 : - $\tau\omicron\nu$ S01/B03

The study on the definite article before names of persons revealed that in several ways Codex Bezae appeared to speak more of Jesus as a known person than the other text by retaining the article before mention of his name even when the mention was not anaphoric (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, pp.22-3). The suggestion put forward in that article is that the text of the manuscript reflects a familiarity with Jesus as a person during his lifetime.

verse 17

17/line 2

ος D05 : et d : καὶ S01/B03

The Latin side of Codex Bezae in fact has a relative pronoun at the beginning of the previous line which excludes its being used again here. The Greek side reinforces the importance of Judas being 'numbered among us' by linking the two parts of the description by a relative pronoun: 'he was counted as one of our number, the one who received the share of this ministry'. The link of καί, on the other hand, maintains the two ideas as of equal importance. This is another small indication that the Bezan text perceives the significance of this incident as the making up of the twelve.

Verse 18

18/line 2

+ αὐτου D05 : - αὐτου S01/B03

Codex Bezae commonly specifies the possessive genitive (Appendix II, Participant Reference).

Verse 19

19/line 1

+ ο S01/D05 : - ο d/B03

Codex Bezae typically reinforces links between sentences to give greater cohesion to the text (cf. on τότε ch.4, Part B).

Verse 20

20/line 3

η D05 : εστω S01/B03

Neither of the texts of the manuscripts S01/B03 or D05 reproduces the exact wording of the text of the LXX (although that of other manuscripts is closer to it (B-L *ad loc*)). Of the variant readings, εστω (from ἴσθημι) is the LXX reading whereas D05 uses the verb 'to be'. At other places in Acts where the Old Testament is quoted (cf. 2:34-5), Codex Bezae tends to be the least like the LXX text compared with the other two manuscripts in question, although not invariably so.

Verse 22

22/line 1

+ Χριστος D05 : - Χριστος S01/B03

The full title is given to the mention of Jesus. This was found (ch.6, Part B) to be typical of Bezan practice when the context was a formal one. It may be that in its use here there is reflected an awareness of the solemnity and formality of the occasion of replacing the twelfth apostle which the Bezan text displays in other ways in this passage.

Verse 23

23/line 1

ΕΣΤΗΘΕΝ ΔΟΥ : ΕΣΤΗΘΑΝ ΣΟΙ/ΒΟ3

It is a reasonable assumption that by the singular verb Codex Bezae is referring to Peter as the one who put forward Joseph and Matthias as candidates for the apostleship. It is a somewhat greater step to infer, as many commentators have, that the Bezan text thereby states that Peter acted independently of the other apostles, taking all authority upon himself.

There are other occasions in this thesis when it is noticed that the role of Peter as leader of the apostles is more apparent in the Bezan text than in the other one. An example has been pointed out at v.15 above. Again, throughout chapter 12, Peter is brought more sharply into focus. Another striking instance is the Bezan version of the beginning of chapter 11 where inside information about the intentions of Peter is given. As was remarked in examining that passage (ch.7 on the Spelling of Jerusalem), the curious fact is that the information is not provided from the point of view of Peter but rather from that of those he visited on his journey from Caesarea to Jerusalem. This may tell us something about where Peter's greater importance, if that is really what it is, is coming from.

Epp (1966) makes a good deal of the fact that the role of Peter is enhanced in Codex Bezae. He believes that the deliberate intention is to raise Peter to the status of Paul so that together they represent the leaders of the Christian Church, in opposition to the leaders of the Jews (pp.157-64). He sees this as the work of Gentile Christians who wish to set Christianity against Judaism because they want to underline its superiority. The text expressing

these intentions would have been created in the second century (p.27).

The difficulty with this reasoning, in view of what has been emerging from the analyses in this present study of Codex Bezae, is that there are a number of factors which suggest firstly, that the Bezan text was written in and for a Jewish-Christian milieu and secondly, that it was written during the lifetime of people who remembered some of the people or incidents which are recounted in Acts. If that is indeed the context within which Peter's position as leader of the Church is given greater acknowledgement, a plausible conclusion is that in the milieu of the text of Codex Bezae Peter was more well-known and his role as leader more familiar from first-hand experience.

Another problem, for which Epp is not directly responsible, is that some commentators and textual critics have developed his view of the enhanced Bezan Peter and supposed that it dates from a time in the history of the Church when Peter was accredited with special status as the bishop of Rome. Hence Metzger's comment (Metzger 1975, p. 288), 'Here and elsewhere in the Western text, one recognizes clearly the later point of view, according to which Peter rules the church with the authority of the monarchical episcopate'.

Verse 25

25/line 1

· αὐλαβεῖν D05 : εὐα λαβεῖν S01/B03/D05CorrD/d

There is no obvious significance in the variant reading of the Bezan first hand here. The correction is made according to an S01/B03 type manuscript (Parker 1992, p.154). It is possible that the initial α occurred in error by alignment with the line above which begins αὐα -

δειξον. Further comments follow in connection with the next variant.

Τοπov Τov D05 : Τov Τoπov B03 : Τov κληρον S01

Taking first the question of the lexical difference, *τοπov* creates a verbal link with *Τov Τoπov Τov ιδιον* which Judas went to (last line v.25). It may or may not be intentional that there is a resultant play on words exactly parallel to that found between the Aramaic (h̄lq) = 'portion' and (h̄ql) = 'field' in vv. 17-19 (see Introduction above) in so far as the first 'place' refers to the place in the ministry and the second, the place of death. *Τov κληρον της διακονιας ταυτης*, on the other hand, mirrors the same expression found in v.17.

If the verb is to be read as *ἀναλαβεῖν* then *τόπος* would seem more appropriate because of the active sense of the verb. *κληρος* as the portion given to someone, especially to one of the twelve apostles, is not something taken up actively but rather received by divine appointment (A-G; cf. *ελαχε* = *λαγχάνω* with precisely this meaning in v.17).

The position of *Τov* after the noun in D05 is doubtful because there is not another instance in the New Testament of the articular genitive following an anarthrous *nomen regens* except when the anarthrous noun is a name. Even in classical Greek it is a rare construction.⁹ It could either be that there has been a confusion of letters (as happens between *π* and *τ* elsewhere in Codex Bezae, cf. 19:26 discussed in the chapter on *τότε*, 4, Part B) or that the first *Τov* has been omitted through haplography, *τόπον* beginning with the same first two letters. Both of these explanations require *τόπος* to be the noun in the exemplar of Codex Bezae and suggest therefore that it is not a Bezan error.

Verse 26

26/line 1

αυτων D05 : αυτοις S01/B03/D05CorrB

The usual way of referring to lots in the LXX is to speak of throwing lots 'for someone' (e.g. Jos.18:8,10). This is presumably what is meant by the dative αυτοις whereas the unusual genitive expresses rather that 'their lots' were thrown (given). This is an occasion, among others, on which the Bezan text does not conform to standard phraseology.

26/line 2

- O D05 : + O S01/B03

The omission of the article in D05 looks like an error. Anarthrous nouns which are 'known' and 'particular' are typically salient (Levinsohn 1992, pp.97-8). That is not the case for κληρος in this sentence which was salient in the previous sentence but now gives way to Matthias as the new information (cf. Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, p.23).

26/line3

συψηφισθη D05 : συνεψηφισθη D05Corr 1st hand :
συκκατεψηφισθη S01/B03

The first hand of Codex Bezae has apparently omitted some letters after the first syllable and has subsequently added √ε over the line to give the passive of the verb συψηφίω meaning 'to be counted'.
συκκατεψηφίσθη in the S01/B03 text is a rare verb meaning 'to be

chosen (by a vote) together with' (A-G).¹⁰ Some commentators see the change of verb as necessitated by the figure 12 replacing 11 at the end of the verse as if *συγκκτκψηφίρωαι* could only mean 'with' in the sense of 'added to' (see next variant for further comments on 'with') but that is not certain. If the verb could have been used in the inclusive sense ('with' meaning 'among') it may be surmised that the editor of Codex Bezae accidentally omitted the second syllable when copying from his exemplar and put it right at a later stage, using a common verb without consulting the exemplar. Alternatively, the amendment can be interpreted as indicating that the Bezan editor had some hesitation or difficulty over the choice of word without any more specific comment being possible.

1b = δωδεκκ D05 : ενδεκκ S01/B03

Codex Bezae views Matthias as one of the twelve whereas the other text sees him as one in addition to the eleven. *μετ'α* will allow of either sense.¹¹ By choosing to mention Matthias as one of the twelve the Bezan text gives another indication of its awareness of the fundamental importance of the replacement of Judas as a matter which concerns the completeness of 'the twelve'.

CONCLUSIONS.

None of the Bezan variants examined in this passage is sufficient of itself to make a claim about the understanding reflected by them of the Judas/Matthias story. Taken together, on the other hand, they point with a high degree of consistency to an understanding which is derived from an awareness of its significance for and place in the development of Jewish history. That understanding is not absent

from the other manuscripts looked at here but Codex Bezae reveals more clearly that it perceives the importance of the story from a Jewish point of view, and that it knows the theological and Scriptural traditions on which it draws.

The variants of the Bezan text are not, on the whole, of the kind to cause problems and to require modification in consequence. On the other hand, an editor who saw the relevance of implicit connections between sentences or who grasped the significance of a point made in passing may well have felt that it was useful to make those things clearer. This supposes an audience who would know their significance if it was pointed out. The peculiarly Jewish background and relevance of the betrayal of Judas and his replacement among the twelve apostles indicates a Jewish-Christian editor and a Jewish-Christian audience for Codex Bezae - both more familiar and concerned with Jewish history and theology than either editor or audience of the other text. Thus, even though on this reasoning the text of Codex Bezae would be a re-writing of the original, it must date from a time when there were still Jewish-Christians in the Church who were very conscious of the Jewish background and origins of Christianity.

In consequence, the conclusion is that Codex Bezae represents a secondary text modified for and by Jewish Christians not long after the first writing of the Book of Acts. The conclusion is strengthened considerably by the evidence brought to light by the exegesis of the Bezan text of other passages which indicates precisely the same origins. That does not make the text inferior or even inauthentic. Quite the opposite is true, for Codex Bezae preserves an authentic understanding by early Jewish-Christians of the beginnings and growth of the early Church, an understanding such as is implied in the other text but which there is lost to view. In other words, for New Testament readers and scholars in the twentieth century, the Bezan

text offers an historical and theological perspective which can only enrich our understanding.

NOTES TO CHAPTER EIGHT.

1. Maccoby 1992.
2. This point of view was the contention of a Channel Four television programme, 'Sorry, Judas', presented by Howard Jakobsen ('Without Walls', April 1993).
3. The connection was perhaps made via Jer 30:21 ('Their prince shall be one of themselves, their ruler shall come forth from their midst'), a passage which Mann (1940, p.392f) cites as being associated with Gen 44:18 in the synagogue lectionary groupings.
4. Wilcox assimilates its use here to that in the previous verse. The more obvious sense in v.14 would seem to be the (natural) brothers of Jesus.
5. This interpretation was pointed out to me by S.H. Levinsohn, in personal communication.
6. ὄχλος is not used by Mark with the disciples, as Turner 1925, pp.237-8, points out.
7. One Ethiopic manuscript used by Boismard-Lamouille (1984 *ad loc*) omits mention of David v.16.
8. Porter 1983 discusses this form of the attributive genitive pp.4,15-17.
9. D.C. Parker (personal communication) confirms that the correction was made by the first hand of D05.
10. A-G says that in 1:26 it has a more general sense of 'to be added to' but it is not obvious why the more specific meaning is not acceptable here.
11. Just as 'with' in English can mean 'included as one of' (e.g. 'He has gone to camp with the Scouts') or 'in addition to' (e.g. 'He has gone with John').

CHAPTER NINE

Acts 12:1-12; 18-25; Peter and Herod.

INTRODUCTION.

The action in this chapter involves Peter as a leader of the emerging Church and King Herod as the persecutor of the Church. Although Peter is potentially of more interest to the story because he is a Christian apostle, it is in fact Herod who gives unity to the chapter.

The chapter opens in the reign of the Roman Emperor Claudius, probably in 44 AD, with Herod killing James and then putting Peter in prison (vv.1-4). An angel helps Peter to escape and to rejoin the Christian community (vv.5-17). On discovering the escape, Herod has the guards killed and goes to Caesarea where he holds an audience with the people of Tyre and Sidon with whom there has been some conflict (vv.18-21). Following his speech, the crowd acclaim him as a god. Because he accepts their praise, he is struck by an angel and dies (vv.22-3).

An explicit connection is apparently not made but most commentators deduce an intended connection between Herod's ill-treatment of the Church and his sudden death, and view the account of the latter as an implied statement about the consequences of Herod's attitude to the Christians. In point of fact, detailed examination of the text with its variant readings shows that the connection is indeed deliberately made, more clearly in the Bezan text than elsewhere, and

that the punishment of Herod for his persecution of God's People is the theme of the chapter overall.¹ The verses selected for study here have been chosen for the way in which they illustrate this point.

It has been noticed elsewhere in this thesis (see comments on Ac 1:23/line 1, in ch.8) that Peter is generally a more prominent character in the Bezan text than in the text of S01/B03. The indications are that in the milieu of the Bezan text this increased prominence arises from a greater familiarity with Peter, concurrent with a sharper perception of his role in the history of the Church. Far from representing the perspective of a later Church for whom Peter had become a legendary figurehead (cf. comments by Metzger 1975, on 1:23), the enhanced portrayal of Peter is more likely to reflect the first hand knowledge of a community in which the man was familiar as a leader of the Church. The picture as it has emerged so far needs to be borne in mind when considering the part played by Peter in Acts 12 and modified if necessary according to the additional information found there.

Some introduction to Herod is useful in order to situate him in his historical and religious context. The Herod in question is Agrippa I, grandson of Herod the Great. He was made king over areas in north east Palestine, Galilee and Perea, by the Roman Emperor Caligula in 37-8 AD. In 41 AD, Caligula's successor, Claudius, added to his kingdom Judaea and Samaria which had previously been Roman provinces. Herod Agrippa died 3 years later in 44 AD.²

Herod was partly of Jewish descent on his mother's side. It appears from a story in the Mishnah (Sotah 7:8) concerning his presence at the Feast of the Tabernacles in Jerusalem in 41 AD that he was publicly received by the Jews as a brother. To the Jewish population elsewhere he was also rather more than a representative of the Roman government and there is evidence that non-Jews had some

doubts over the strength of his allegiance to the Roman Emperor (Feldmann 1993, p.25). The picture which emerges in Acts is of a king who, although ruling on behalf of Rome, was acknowledged as a Jewish king and of one who worked hard to gain his subjects' approval by persecuting the members of the Christian sect who were a growing problem to the Jewish authorities by this time. Even though he died after only 3 years as king of Judaea, he must have made a strong impact on the Jewish inhabitants during his short reign. As determined persecutor, he obviously had a lasting place in the history of the Christian Church too. In the text of Codex Bezae, special attention is accorded to his personal role in the story of the developing Church, and in the history of Judaism in its wider dimension.

A close examination of the variant readings which occur in the passages selected of chapter 12 will show how the various differences in the telling of the story occur. Most of the Bezan readings are consistently supported by the Middle Coptic manuscript G⁴⁷ (mae) and sporadically by other versions or Church Fathers; very few readings have support from the Greek manuscripts.

Verses 1-4.

There are two features of the narrative which are brought into sharper focus in the Bezan text: 1) the actions of Herod 2) the person of Peter.

Verse 1

1/line 1

τας χειρας ηρωδης ο βασιλευς D05 :
ο βασιλευς ηρωδης τας χειρας S01:
ηρωδης ο βασιλευς τας χειρας B03

The name, Herod, before the title, king, as in D01 and B03, is the more usual order in Acts whereby the focus is on the name rather than the function of the person (cf. ch.3 on Word Order, Part B, #I.2). Codex Sinaiticus has the focus on the status of the king rather than on Herod as such. This suggests a lesser interest in Herod as an individual in the latter text and a correspondingly closer interest in the other text.

The Bezan text also places the object τας χειρας immediately following the verb and before any element of the subject thus paying greatest attention to the actions of Herod.

1/line 3

+ εν τη ιουδαικη D05 : - εν τη ιουδαικη S01/B03

The location of the church persecuted by Herod is specified by the Bezan text as being 'Judaea'. This detail will be seen (in subsequent verses) to be far from superfluous. The church in Judaea was still the centre of Christian activity at this stage, the seat of apostolic authority and the base for missionary activity, even though Antioch was beginning to acquire a certain independence (cf. Acts 11). The specific mention of Judaea indicates a certain historical precision for Herod was king of Judaea only between 41 and 44 AD; the intention of the reading is, however, as will be seen, as likely to be

theological as historical.

Verse 2

2/line 1

καὶ D05 : δε S01/B03

The same variant occurs at the beginning of the next verse and the two need to be considered together. It was seen (ch.4, Part A) that δε in Acts can be taken as indicating that some new and distinctive information is introduced, information which may well be a development from what has gone previously. καί, on the other hand, links together sentences as representing one unit of development. καί is not used to mark boundaries between paragraphs whereas δε does have this function.

On this basis, it can be said that for the section of text from v.1-v.4 the Bezan text reads one group of sentences, one 'chunk' of narrative, one paragraph. The paragraph opens at v.1 with δε and the next paragraph begins at v.5 with μέν οὖν introducing the account of Peter's escape from prison. Herod's ill-treatment of some of the members in the Judaeian church, including first James and then Peter, is viewed as one single action. The δε at the end of v.3 indicates a background comment, a typical function of δε (ch.4, Part D; and cf. 12:9+20 S01/B03,). In the other text, δε is used to introduce both the killing of James and the arrest of Peter which are thus viewed more as separate developments than as integral parts of an overall scheme. The relative pronoun at v.4/line 1 also indicates a development from the previous information.

2/line 2

μαχαίρα D05 : μαχαίρη S01/B03

The Bezan ending is that of the LXX but not of the rest of the New Testament (A-G). A later hand of B03 follows D05 as indeed do many other Greek manuscripts. Bezan Corrector D, with his concern to follow the 'more widely attested text' (Parker 1992, p.154) amends it to imitate S01/B03.³

Verse 3

3/line 1

και D05 : δε S01/B03

See comments on the same variants v.2 above.

3/line 2

+ η επιχειρησεις αυτου επι τους ιουδαιου D05 :
-(...) S01/B03

This clarification in the Bezan text, supported only by a few versions, spells out exactly what it was which pleased the Jews and summarizes the theme of the paragraph. This is in line with the emphasis on the action v.1/line 1, and the use of και to group together the incidents of persecution v.2/line 1 and v.3/line 1.

3/line 4

+ αι D05 : - αι S01/B03

This line gives background information in a parenthetical comment

specifying that the arrest of Peter took place during the days of Unleavened Bread, that is the week of the celebration of the Passover, referred to again v.4. The definite article before *ἡμεραι* may indicate that the days of the Feast of Unleavened Bread were specific and known days (see before v.5 below). It is more usual in this presentative type of sentence construction for the 'presented' noun *ἡμεραι* to be anarthrous as in the S01/B03 reading (Levinsohn 1993, pp.140-1).

Verse 4

4/line 1

ΤΟΥΤΟΥ D05 : ΟΥ ΚΑΙ S01/B03

The demonstrative underlines the identity of Peter as the one arrested and marks a definite switch of attention to Peter from Herod. The use of the relative pronoun in S01/B03, by which v.4 develops the information concerning Peter given in v.3 (Levinsohn 1992, pp.185-6), is consistent with a text which divides itself into various units (see comments on *καί* vv.2+3). It is consistent with the general tendency of Codex Bezae to emphasize his importance.

4/line 3

- ΑΥΤΟΥ D05 : + ΚΟΥΤΟΥ S01/B03

The pronoun may have dropped out in the Bezan text in view of *ΤΟΥΤΟΥ* in line 1 above.

Verses 5-12

There is an obvious possibility that the timing of Peter's arrest has a theological significance, as if his arrest were being compared to that of Jesus or his escape paralleled to the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt. Conzelmann (1963) is dismissive but the idea of a Passover parallel is tentatively welcomed by such diverse scholars as Ropes (1926, *ad loc*) and Dupont (1984, pp.336-41). It is more positively advocated by Le Déaut who adduces a wealth of documentary evidence to support his case (1963, pp.279-91 *passim*).

Le Déaut (1963) has demonstrated from an examination of Jewish literary traditions the importance of the theme of the Passover throughout the understanding and interpretation of Jewish history. The targumic and Rabbinic literature shows that some time before the first century AD the Passover night was incorporated into a number of stories as the time of deliverance and was already anticipated as the time of the arrival of the Messiah before the crucifixion and subsequent resurrection of Jesus (pp.279ff). Le Déaut draws particular attention to a second-century Jewish-Christian community in Asia Minor known as the Quartodecimans for whom the celebration of the Passover in accordance with old Jewish traditions was especially important. A writing of this community, the *Epistola Apostolorum*, dating from 150-160 AD makes specific mention of the escape of Peter from prison in terminology derived from the Passover story (Le Déaut, pp.292f).⁴

In Acts 12, there are a number of factors which together constitute strong evidence that from the beginning there was an intended parallel with the first Passover and Exodus out of Egypt: the release happens at night (v.6; = Exod 12:29-31); for the brethren, it was a night of praying to the Lord (v.5, v.12; cf.Exod 12:42); an angel of the Lord delivers Peter (v.7; cf.Exod 12:23); a light

accompanies the angel (v.7; cf. Exod 13:21); Peter is told to act quickly (v.7; = Exod 12:11), to gird himself and put on his sandals (v.8; = Exod 12:11) and to wrap his cloak round him (v.8; cf. Exod 12:34). Finally, Peter's words on realizing what had happened are reminiscent of those of Jethro on hearing from Moses about the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt (v.11; cf. Exod 18:10-11).

Some of the allusions may seem tenuous to a modern reader who is accustomed to thinking within a logical and literal framework and who has only the canonical text of Exodus to refer to. An audience of Acts who were of a Jewish background would have a great deal more in terms of oral and written tradition to draw on. Much of this (and just how much is uncertain) is irretrievable but from what is known about first-century Jewish traditions there are several sources which provide evidence that some of the elements of the Passover story were far more developed than they are in the Exodus text which is read today.⁵ Concerning the theme of light for example, the Targums (to Exodus but also to the prophets such as Isaiah) demonstrate how the theme is expanded and becomes synonymous with the presence of God and ultimately with salvation. Similarly, the cycle of synagogal readings sets the text of Exodus 12 as a parallel to that of the creation story in Genesis 1, again enhancing the theme of light (God, freedom, purity) and underlining the contrast with the darkness (Egypt, sin, bondage).

The night of watching (Exod 12:42) is extensively developed in Jewish tradition as a time of Messianic expectation. It is invested with a particular importance in the Quartodeciman community for whom the whole period of Unleavened Bread was to be a time of watching while the Jews celebrated the Passover (Le Déaut 1963, p.292; p.296 especially n.116).

A Rabbinic Midrash on Exodus 12 speaks of the celebration of the Passover as comparable to a reminder of the day on which 'a king set free his son from prison' because when the People of Israel escaped from Egypt 'God brought Israel out of prison...'.⁶ This is another aspect of the development of the Passover story which facilitates the comparison of the deliverance of Peter with the Exodus event.

There is a final element of the Passover celebration discernible in the narrative of Acts 12 which is absent from the Exodus account but recorded by Josephus (*Ant. Jud.*, XVIII 2,2 par 29).⁷ He speaks of the doors of the Temple being opened at midnight on the night of the Passover. In various passages in the prophets (e.g. Ezek 44:2, Mal 1:10) mention is also made of the opening or closing of the Temple door(s) either to protect the holiness of the Temple or in order for God to enter. The Passover ritual of the opening of the Temple door would seem to be connected to the idea of the arrival of the Messiah in the Passover night. When Acts 12:10 is examined at the end of this study, it will be seen that the 'door' referred to there could well be an allusion to the Temple door.

An examination of the variants in vv.5-12 reveals some interesting differences in the use made of the Passover typology with a clear increased consciousness of the allusions in the Bezan text. It also brings to light the use of another Scriptural tradition in vv.9-10.

Verse 5

5/line 2,3

πολλη δε προσευχη ην εν εκτενεικ ----- περι αυτου D05:
----- προσευχη δε ην εκτενωσ γινουμενη ----- S01/B03

5/line 4

υπο της εκκλησιας προς τον θεον περι αυτου D05:
υπο της εκκλησιας προς τον θεον περι αυτου S01:
υπο της εκκλησιας ----- περι αυτου B03

This sentence is the *δέ* sentence corresponding to and anticipated by *μέν οὖν* in the previous line (see ch.4, Part C). They are both consequences of Herod's intention to bring Peter to the people after the Passover. Codex Bezae reinforces the statement about the church praying on Peter's behalf by the addition of *πολλη*. It looks as if the position of *περι αυτου* as the first of the three prepositional phrases qualifying the prayer indicates a deliberate wish to displace the subject of the prayer from its position at the end of the sentence to bring it closer to the adverb (see next paragraph). The original position was repeated probably accidentally.

έν εκτενεικ and *εκτενωσ* look like synonyms but cannot simply be dismissed as such. If there were no difference, in connotation if not in meaning, there would be no point in an editor changing the word(s) he found in his exemplar. Connotations are, of course, frequently impossible to establish especially nineteen hundred years on in time, but some comments can be made which could be relevant. *έν εκτενεικ* is found again in Paul's speech to Agrippa II in Ac 26:7: 'the twelve tribes worship in earnest night and day' (without *νll*, except for its omission in some versions). In Judith, it is used in a

context similar to that of the church in Ac 12, of Israel pleading for deliverance. ἔκτενω̃ς, on the other hand, is not used by Luke other than here. In the LXX, it is found twice but specifically in a context of repentance. The expression used by Codex Bezae (alone) may therefore have a certain Jewish-salvation resonance absent from the alternative adverb.

The use of ἀπό in an instrumental sense is found elsewhere as a variant of ὑπό in Acts, not always in the same manuscripts. These prepositions are discussed in ch.5 where it is observed that the variation reflects a tendency in Greek to replace instrumental ὑπό with ἀπό. In this verse, ἀπό may be being contrasted with πρὸς : prayer from the Church to God.

The overall result of the Bezan text is to paint a stronger picture of the church at prayer for Peter (cf.v.12). In view of the other Bezan variants which touch on the presentation of the Passover theme in this passage, it is highly probable that this represents a conscious reinforcement of the allusion to the 'night of watching'. This is the more significant that there is evidence of at least one Jewish-Christian community for whom the 'night of watching' was of particular importance (see introduction to vv.5-12 above).

Verse 6

6/line 1

εμελλεν D05 : ημελλεν S01/B03

The augment η - represents 'good Attic Greek' (Elliott 1992, p.91). Codex Bezae has ε - each time that ημελλω with the augment occurs in its text of Acts (here and 16:27).⁹ This makes the Bezan text of a less polished Greek in this respect.

ΠΡΟΚΥΕΙΝ D05 : ΠΡΟΣΚΥΕΙΝ S01 : ΠΡΟΣΚΥΚΥΕΙΝ B03

The present infinitive is read by D05/S01 and the aorist by B03, reflecting a more general division among the manuscripts. There is likewise widespread disagreement over the choice of verb, *πρόκειν* and *προσκύνειν* being very close in meaning. In 1st century Greek *πρόκειν* is used of bringing someone forward in a law-court (A-G) as in Ac 25:26 and may have that connotation here. (It is substituted by Codex Bezae with *ἐξέκειν* at 17:5 where the potential confrontation in question is not a formal one).

6/line 2

- o D05 : + o S01/B03

The absence of the article before Herod in Codex Bezae (alone) marks his plan as particularly salient. Peter, who is anarthrous in v.6 (cf. his introduction v.3 (anarthrous)), is an established character in the story. Herod will be brought back on stage v.19 (anarthrous) from which point the narrative focuses on events concerning him, indicated in S01/D05 by the article before the other mention of him by name at v.21 (cf. Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, p.25).

6/line 6

δε D05 : τε S01/B03

τέ in all the Greek MSS except D05 links the prison guards closely with the chains as two associated means of guarding Peter; it is difficult to say whether the latter is being viewed by this text as of greater importance (see ch.4, Part A on τέ). δε presents the

information about the guards as a separate element, perhaps thereby making more apparent the thoroughness and intensity of the guard mounted by Herod and to be overcome by divine intervention.

Verse 7

7/line 1

+ ΤΩ ΠΕΤΡΩ D05 : - ΤΩ ΠΕΤΡΩ S01/B03

Since it is not necessary for the sake of clarity to specify that the angel suddenly appeared to Peter, this detail in Codex Bezae can be taken as another sign of the Bezan text's preoccupation with keeping Peter well in focus. It is typical of D05 to repeat the name of Peter and Paul after the introduction of a new participant into an episode, here signalled by καὶ ἰδοὺ (Appendix II, Participant Reference).

7/line 2

ΕΤΕΛΑΜΥΕΝ -- D05 : ΕΛΑΜΥΕΝ ΕΝ S01/B03

The compound verb used by Codex Bezae suggests that the light emanated from the angel, a detail which is spelled out in some versions (B-L 1984, *ad loc*). The word is used only once in the LXX in Isaiah (4:2) to refer to God shining forth in the context of the sanctification of Jerusalem after which there will be over the city a cloud by day and the light of fire by night. There is no available evidence that this passage was associated with Passover or Passover texts at the time of the early Church but there are obvious parallels which are likely to have been incorporated into Passover traditions. *κερω* on the other hand is found four times in the LXX but never of God. The initial καὶ ἰδοὺ at the beginning of this sentence, a common Old Testament

expression , sets the tone of the scene as one with Old Testament resonances.

ἐν has probably dropped out of the Bezan text by haplography.

7/line 3

νύξας D05 : πατήξας S01/B03

The verb πατήξω chosen by all the Greek manuscripts except D05 can imply not only to give a light push but also a heavy blow and even to kill. It is used with the meaning 'to slay' specifically, and repeatedly, in the narrative of Exodus 12 referring to the killing of the first-born of Egypt on the night of the Passover. It is also used of the angel killing Herod Ac 12:23. In view of these associations, it is legitimate to imagine that Codex Bezae has preferred to avoid the word by replacing it with νύσσω (which can also have the stronger meaning than 'to nudge' or 'to stab' (A-G) but it is not used in that way in the Old Testament and especially not of the killing of the Egyptian first-born at the Passover).

7/line 5

ἐξεπέσεν ----- αι αλυσεις εκ των χειρων αυτου D05:
ἐξεπέσεν αυτου κι αλυσεις εκ των χειρων ----- S01/B03

The position of αυτου before the noun in all the Greek manuscripts except D05 is the fronted position (cf. ch.3, part B, #1.5.a, on the word order of possessive pronouns), which can be explained as wishing to make clear that it was Peter's chains which fell off, not the guards' to whom the chains must have remained attached. The displacement of the possessive in Codex Bezae to refer to Peter's hands rather than to his chains makes an identical point in a way

which is perhaps clearer still.

Verse 8

8/line 1

ⲩⲉ D05/B03 : TⲈ S01

This is the second time in this chapter that D05 has preferred ⲩⲉ to TⲈ (cf. v.6/line 6). TⲈ in S01 is difficult to account for because although it introduces a further instruction from the angel following on from the first in v.7/line 4, the usual circumstances in which TⲈ is found are not present (see Levinsohn 1987, pp. 121-36; and ch.4, Part A). The previous sentence cannot be considered to be preliminary nor does the TⲈ sentence introduce a lead-in to the next significant development which does not occur until v.9 when Peter follows the angel out of the prison. Other possible conditions for the use of TⲈ are not met either.

N.Turner speaks of the declining use of TⲈ in Koine Greek, and of its revival as an Atticism (1963, p.338). The pattern of usage in Acts established by Levinsohn (see above) is based on an analysis of the occurrences without variant (the list, however, is compiled from the critical apparatus of N-A²⁶ which does not note all the Bezan variants). The description may need to be modified to some extent when taking account of the variants but the rules elucidated by Levinsohn are not likely to be altered significantly and are useful for assessing the value of variant readings.⁹ On that basis, it can be said that TⲈ of S01 looks like the work of a later editor rather than its being the original particle.

Verse 9

9/line 4

γάρ D05 : δε 501/B03

γάρ makes explicit the causal link with the previous phrase. One of the functions of δε is to indicate a background comment but not as an explanation (ch.4, Part D); what Codex Bezae does is to use this background information to make clear that the reason Peter did not know that the angel's provision of escape was real was that he actually thought he was seeing a vision. This is saying more than simply that Peter thought he was dreaming in the way that it might be said in English of someone experiencing a strange or marvellous happening. The force of the Bezan explanation is reflected in the position of αληθως in D05 v.11/line 2, see below. It should be remembered that Peter had previously had at least one literal vision from God whilst in Joppa (Acts 10) which makes it the more true-to-life that he should think that the angel and the escape are also occurring in a vision.

Verse 10

A new development occurs in this verse introduced by δε after a string of και sentences in vv.8+9 and the background comment in the last line. In order to better assess the importance of the word order variation in line 2 and the nature of the additional material in lines 6-7, it is first of all necessary to establish the theological and exegetical context of the chapter as a whole. This can be done with more precision in the light of the final section of the chapter, vv.18-25. These two variant readings will therefore be returned to

after v.25 to be considered as part of vv.9+10.

10/line 3

ἦλθον D05 : ἦλθον S01/B03

That the 1st and 2nd aorists of ἔρχομαι were used interchangeably over a relatively long period of time (Moulton 1929, Pt.11, p.51) is borne out by the variation within the same manuscripts in this one verse (cf. line 7).

10/line 5

ἦνοιγῃ D05 : ἦνοιγῃ S01/B03

There are various possible combinations of vowel changes of ἀνοίγω in the aorist tense.¹⁰ Codex Bezae prefers 'υ' to 'οι' here and at v.14 and again at 14:27 ('εω' at 5:19 and 16:26). In so far as a detailed study of particular vowel changes could allow them to be precisely dated and located, this variation could contribute to fixing the time and place of the manuscript, or of its text (see Moulton 1929, Pt.1, pp.82-3).

10/line 7

προσηλθον D05 : προηλθον S01/B03

The latter means that they went on forward one street after going through the gate (using the 2nd aorist). The verb προσέρχομαι (1st aorist) is difficult to account for here with its meaning of 'to approach' (A-G) and usually followed by the dative. The same confusion of verbs is found at 12:13 with προελθεν read by S01/B03Corr and προσελθεν by B03*D05 but there the meaning of both verbs is in fact

appropriate (unlike at 20:5 where προσελθόντες of S01/B03 (προελθόντες D05) is less suitable. It is possible that the two verbs were confused in popular speech. The 1st and 2nd aorist are both common in the manuscripts of Acts (cf. line 3).

Verse 11

11/line 2

νυν οἶδα ὅτι ἀληθῶς D05 : νυν οἶδα ἀληθῶς ὅτι S01/B03

When ἀληθῶς qualifies the verb οἶδα, it is answering the question 'did this really happen or not?'. The implication is that Peter was not sure before (v.9/line 4) but now is sure. In the Bezan-text, the concern is slightly different. It was seen that the editor of Codex Bezae, in v.9/line 4 above, understood that Peter literally thought he was seeing a vision. Now, in v.11, he realizes that it was not a vision but that the Lord had truly sent an angel to free him. The difference between the two texts may appear to be minimal but in fact it betrays a difference between an author who can put himself in Peter's shoes and identify closely with a man who sees, or who has seen, visions from God; and an author who does not make this step of identification but who takes the talk of a vision as a way of expressing the sense of unreality experienced because of the miraculous nature of the escape.

- 0 D05 : + 0 S01/B03

This is one of a number of occasions on which Codex Bezae omits the article before κύριος (ch.6, Part A). It may reflect the use of κύριος as a name as much as a title, in the same way as it translates

Yahweh as a name for God in the Old Testament. This is seen, for example, at 2:17D05 where Codex Bezae introduces the citation from the prophet (Joel) with λέγει κυριος rather than λέγει ο κυριος of other manuscripts.¹¹

Verse 12

12/line 1

κκι D05 : Tε 501/B03

This is yet another instance of the Bezan text replacing Tε with another connective (see list ch.4, Part A). The use of Tε in this case follows the normal pattern: it introduces a sentence which is the specific lead-in to the next event (going to the house of Mary, which prepares the way for the encounter with the fellow-Christians there). From that point of view, the previous sentence about Peter's realization that God has delivered him from his persecutors is preliminary material. Tε in such circumstances can be expected to give prominence to the lead-in sentence (Levinsohn 1987, pp.129-32).

If, as the text suggests, the Bezan editor attaches rather more importance than the other text to the reality of Peter's belief that he was seeing a vision and therefore to his subsequent realization that it was not a vision; and if, furthermore, he perceives Peter's deliverance as a fundamental theological (and historical) statement about King Herod, the Jews, Jerusalem, and the People of God, then he is going to be unwilling to imply that Peter's words in v.11 are preliminary material by giving prominence to his arrival at Mary's house. One could even expect a δε in v.12, to begin a new development, as indeed a number of manuscripts read (B-L ad loc). D05 alone has κκι creating a string of κκι clauses from v.10 to

v.13. This takes in the whole journey from the prison gate to the door of Mary's house and is significant in so far as it incorporates the praying church into the narrative section concerning God's deliverance of Peter.

Verses 18-25.

This passage brings the story back to the scene of the prison with first the guards discovering that Peter has disappeared and next Herod confirming his escape. The narrative then moves on to events in Caesarea where Herod is struck dead by the intervention of God following his meeting with the Tyrians and Sidonians.

There is a striking parallel in this passage with chapters 26-9 of Ezekiel which concern the punishment of the city of Tyre for its treatment of the people of Jerusalem, and in particular the ruler of Tyre for his part in the persecution and for his setting himself up as a god (28:2ff). The parallel has been discussed in some detail in an article by Mark Strom (1986).¹²

The point of the parallel, which as Strom argues can hardly be accidental, is that Herod is assimilated with the ruler of Tyre. The story in Acts is thus as much a theological comment as it is an historical account, if not more so. In Ezekiel, the nations who had opposed the Jews must be destroyed before Israel can be restored. Israel's enemies include Tyre, a powerful and wealthy coastal city, whose sin was to gloat over Jerusalem's misfortune (26:2); furthermore the king in his arrogance considered himself to be a god (28:2+6). There are several indications that the story of the Prince of Tyre and of his fate was well-known in first-century Judaism and was regarded as the example of what happens to those who set themselves up as gods (Ginzberg 1982, Vol IV, pp.335-6). In Rabbinic legend, the ruler

of Tyre is embodied in the person of Hiram who supplied Solomon with cedar wood for the building of the first Temple (I Kg 5:1-12). One story is that Hiram became so proud because of his contribution that God destroyed the Temple in order to humble him.¹³

Although such typology is perhaps contrary to Western literalistic and rationalistic ways of thinking, at the time of the New Testament assimilation of historical characters was a common way of interpreting the development of Israel's history and a perfectly valid one within the Jewish exegetical framework¹⁴. That Herod Agrippa I should therefore become one with the ruler of Tyre in the history of the early Church is not an odd procedure; it is typical of Jewish methods of understanding and explaining history.

In the book of Acts, Herod is presented as a determined persecutor of the Church which represents the newly-extended People of God. In chapter 12, he not only kills James but looks set to do the same to Peter, the main leader up to that point of the group of Christians. The scene is set in Jerusalem (cf. 'in Judaea' 12:1005) which is still the location for the centre of the new Church at this stage (cf. ch.7 on the Spelling of Jerusalem). Herod was by all accounts a proud and boastful king who liked to make a display of his wealth and royal status (Feldman 1993, p.25). In considering the similarities with the Prince of Tyre, the legend concerning Hiram and the Temple is strangely relevant in that it was Herod's own family, from the time of his grandfather, Herod the Great, who had been responsible for the building of the second Temple in Jerusalem. The second Temple will be destroyed in 70 AD during the time that his son, Agrippa II is tetrarch of the northern territory.

The tragedy is that Herod is a Jew and his hostility is increased by the encouragement of the Jews (12:3, especially D05). Likewise, when God delivers Peter from prison it is not from the

threat of Pharaoh and the Egyptians, as at the original Passover, but from the plans of Herod and the Jews (12:11).

Herod is not to escape unpunished, no more than the Prince of Tyre did. Just as Israel/the Church is protected by God so the persecutor incurs judgement and is killed by God. The narrative of Acts makes use of the meeting between Herod and the people of Tyre and Sidon to draw the parallel with Ezekiel's prophecies concerning the Prince of Tyre. Herod is not literally King of Tyre but within the context of the story he assumes that role for the people depend on 'the king's country' (v.20) for food. When he meets them, he is dressed in his regal garments and takes his seat on a throne. He accepts the praise of the crowd that he has spoken with the voice of a god not a man.

There are elements in the Targum as we have it today which strengthen the parallel between the Prince of Tyre and King Herod in Acts 12. It is unlikely that the writer of Acts had the Targum of Ezekiel as his source because it is not thought to have existed as such before 70 AD (Levey 1987, pp.2,4). Because so much of the prophecy of Ezekiel is esoteric and mystical in nature, there seems to have been a corresponding wariness, certainly on the part of the later Rabbis, about making it available to the ordinary people. When the Targum was created, however, it would have drawn to some extent on existing traditions.

Two comments in particular which are made concerning the Prince of Tyre in Targum Ezekiel 28 may have been known to the early Church and to the writer of Acts. In v.14, the description of the ruler of Tyre is amplified in the following terms: 'You are a king anointed for the kingdom and I have given you greatness, but you looked with contempt on the holy mountain of the Lord, and you planned to exercise dominion over the holy people'.¹⁵ The latter comment

especially could be applied to Herod and his attitude towards the Christians. In the previous verse 13, the account of the beauty of the Prince of Tyre is contrasted with a comment which was traditionally interpreted as a statement of his mortality: 'However, you did not reflect wisely on your body, which consists of orifices and organs, of which you have need for it is impossible to survive without them'.¹⁴ This too may indicate a similarity with King Herod whose body, despite all the regal splendour, was eaten by worms.

By a series of emendations to the text of Acts 12:18-25, Codex Bezae brings out the parallel with Ezekiel 28 even more clearly than do Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus so that a reader who knows Ezekiel's account of the Prince of Tyre can be in no doubt as to the significance of the story about the death of King Herod.

Verse 18

18/line 2

- ουκ ολιγος D05 : + ουκ ολιγος S01/B03

There is no obvious reason for either the deliberate omission or addition of this typically Lucan figure of speech. The suggestion (B-L *ad loc*; Kilpatrick 1963, p.72) that its omission arises accidentally through homoeoteleuton is perhaps the most likely explanation.

Verse 19

19/line 3

απε(ε)κτενθησει D05 : απεχθησει S01/B03/d

While the idea of execution is implied by the order for the guards to

be 'led away' (ἀπαχθῆναι - α4ω A-G 2c), it is made quite explicit by the Greek text ^(as reconstructed) of Codex Bezae. The intention may be to insist on the harshness of Herod. There is at the same time a possible wish to avoid using a verb which is used by Luke (23:26) of Jesus' execution and which finds an echo in the Bezan rendering of the Sanhedrin's treatment of the apostles (4:15) where a parallel with Jesus may well be intended.

Verse 20

20/line 1

γὰρ D05 : δε S01/B03

δε introduces a background comment without specifying its relationship with the previous sentence. Most translations treat the problem with the Tyrians and Sidonians as coincidental to Herod's journeying to Caesarea. It is worth noticing that in all texts Herod's departure from Jerusalem is linked to the incident with the prison guards with καί rather than δε indicating that the journey is not being viewed as a new development but all part of the same narrative sequence as the one dealing with Herod's reaction on discovering the escape of Peter from prison. In view of his carefully thought out plan with regard to Peter, his hope of winning favour with the Jews and the meticulous arrangements for the guard of his prize prisoner, Herod must have been extremely angry about his escape, as indeed his orders for the guards to be killed demonstrate. His anger is not spelled out but presumably does not need to be. His going to Caesarea in such a frame of mind, and all in the same breath as it were, is explicable if, as the Bezan text says with γὰρ, he went because he was very angry with the Tyrians and Sidonians. From a psychological point of

view, it would be a typical procedure of transferring the expression of his rage to do with Peter onto someone else.

Josephus also records the death of Herod in Caesarea, accounting for his presence there by the occasion of the games held in honour of Caesar. Acts makes no mention of such a motive; Josephus on the other hand makes no mention of Peter's escape from prison. Whatever is the historical situation, in Acts and in the Bezan text especially, Herod went to Caesarea on the rebound of his fury at Peter's escape.

20/line 2-6

2. οι δε θυμικδον εξ κρυφτερων D05:

-- θυμικδον δε -- ----- S01/B03

3. των πολων παρησαν προς τον βασιλεα D05:

--- ----- παρησαν προς αυτου S01/B03

4. και πεισαντες βλαστον τον επι του κοιτωνου αυτου D05:

και πεισαντες βλαστον τον επι του κοιτωνου του βασιλεως S01/B03

5.....

....

i

6. δικ το τρεφεισθαι της χωρης αυτων εκ της βασιλικης D05:

δικ το τρεφεισθαι αυτων την χωρην απο της βασιλικης S01/B03

In the Alexandrian text, read by almost all the manuscripts, Tyre and Sidon are treated collectively as one country (lines 2+6). The Bezan text, with consistent support of Cop G*7 and partial support from other versions and Greek minuscules, regards them as two separate

places represented by two separate groups of people (lines 2,3+6). This perception is reflected in the supplementary comment about the Tyrians in v.21/line 5 (see below). The placing of οἱ in first position further indicates a switch of attention from Herod to the people.

A second modification in these lines concerns the importance of the king. In the Bezan text, βασιλεύς is read at line 3 instead of line 4 with the effect that it is stated that the people came to 'the king'. Of course, this is also said in the alternative text but Codex Bezae is careful to draw attention to the fact. This is unlikely to be accidental in view of the importance of the relationship between the people and Herod in the exegesis proposed in this study of the passage.

The examination of the use of prepositions in the Bezan text of Acts (ch.5, cf.v.5/line 4), shows how the Bezan text tends to use ἐκ in preference to ἀπό reflecting an earlier rather than a later use. V.20/line 6 provides one such instance of the preference.

Verse 21

21/line 2

+ 0 S01/D05 : - 0 B03

The use of the definite article before Herod is consistent with the general pattern of the article before names in Acts (cf. v.6). At this point in the story, Herod is sufficiently established as a character for the article to be retained even after a shift in focus in v.20 to the Tyrians and Sidonians. The omission of the article in Codex Vaticanus marks Herod's action as salient.

21/line3

+ κκ D05 : - κκ S01/B03

The omission of κκί between the two participles is supported by a few of the minuscules and some Latin manuscripts (N-A²⁴). It could be accidental as it would appear to serve no purpose.

21/line 5

+ κκτκλλκγευτος δε αυτου τοις τυριοις D05 (- δε in d):

-(...) S01/B03

This line is widely attested by the versions (B-L *ad loc*) with some variation: some, like d, have no connective and some read κυτοις in place of τοις τυριοις or κκι σιδωνιοις in addition to it.

δε is a difficulty because there is no main verb before the next sentence, also introduced with δε, in the following line. It looks as if there was no connective in the exemplar used by the Bezan editor and it is possible that on using the genitive absolute construction (more common in Codex Bezae than in the other text, see Appendix II) he accidentally inserted δε because such constructions are usually found at the beginning of a sentence.

Whatever the wording of the exemplar, it is in accordance with the purpose of the Bezan editor to specify the Tyrians at this point. He has taken care since v.20 to refer to the Tyrians and the Sidonians as separate groups. If Herod is being likened to Ezekiel's Prince of Tyre, then this is a way of pointing to the parallel: it was the people of Tyre in particular who made peace with King Herod.

Verse 22

22/line2

θεου φωναι και ουκ ανθρωπου D05:

θεου φωνη και ουκ ανθρωπον S01:

θεου φωνη και ουκ ανθρωπου S01=/B03/D05CorrH

The original reading of D05 cannot be dismissed as an accidental error because it may reflect a local custom which can perhaps be more clearly identified when other variant readings elsewhere in Acts have been examined.

Verse 23

23/line 1

αυτον επαταξεν D05 : επαταξεν αυτον S01/B03

In the D05 text, αυτον referring to Herod is found before the verb. The significance of this would probably be made apparent from a detailed study of the position of pronouns in Acts.

The verb here is the verb which is avoided by the Bezan text in speaking of the angel waking Peter v.7.

23/line 2

- την D05 : + την S01/B03

The presence of the article in S01/B03 indicates that the 'glory' referred to is known and particular. The omission then shows that δόξαν is the salient element of the sentence and attention is thereby drawn to it.

23/line 3,5

+ καταβας κ πο του βρυκτος ... επι των και ουτως D05 :

-(...) S01/B03

It has been pointed out (e.g. Metzger 1975, *ad loc*) that this detail has the merit of making the Acts account of Herod's death more in line with that of Josephus who records that Herod died five days after being taken ill as opposed to immediately. Bringing the text into line with what actually happened may be the result of adding in the detail, but a concern for historical accuracy on this count can hardly have been the intention behind the comment in Codex Bezae for there would have been more straightforward ways of expressing that Herod did not die immediately. That it is also more than a colourful detail is probable in the light of the background of Ezekiel 28 with the several references there to the Prince of Tyre being dethroned (28:8 cf.2:17). The obvious significance, here spelt out, of the death of the king is that he is removed from his throne.

It is in Ezekiel, too, that the death of the Prince of Tyre is described as a horrific one in terms such as 'I brought fire from the midst of you, it consumed you ... all who know you among the peoples are appalled at you, you have come to a dreadful end' (28:18-19). The details of the Bezan text in Ac 12:23 paint a more graphic picture of Herod's ignoble and humiliating death. Being eaten alive by worms was a punishment in Jewish tradition for blasphemers and slanderers (cf. 2 Macc 9:9; Ginzberg 1982, Vol VI, p.213, n.136).

Verse 24

Θεῶν 501/005 : κυρίου 803

This verse in the English translations is taken as a contrastive comment, with 'the word of God' apparently being understood as meaning 'the gospel' which was spreading and bearing fruit in contrast to Herod's ignominious end. $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, though, is by no means necessarily contrastive, although this may be in practice one of its functions. Indeed, v.25 is also introduced with $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ and cannot be contrastive if v.24 already is read that way.

One possibility, the most straightforward one, is that $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ indicates a switch of attention from the story of Herod, and the comment is a transitional sentence leading in to the next part of the story of Acts. The difficulty with that understanding of the verse is that the departure of Barnabas and Saul from Jerusalem in v.25 is still part of the metaphorical meaning, as described in this exegesis of Acts 12, of the persecution by Herod.

Another interpretation can be suggested depending on the intended meaning of $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ λόγος . $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ generally means 'the gospel'. 'The word of the Lord', on the other hand, refers not so much to the message of the gospel but rather to the intentions of God in an Old Testament sense. As an expression of his purposes, God's word is communicated through the prophets and accomplished in and through situations and events. What can be derived from a close examination of the account of Herod's death is that it is an outworking of Old Testament prophecy spoken through the prophet Ezekiel. In other words, God has now put into action his purposes in fulfilment of prophetic words communicated and recorded a long time ago. There are other features of Acts 12 which indicate that behind

the narrative there is a conscious attempt to show how the events related are both directed by God and are an accomplishment of his plans on a larger scale still than the punishment of Herod. These are discussed before the variant readings of verse 25/line 2.

If that is the point of the comment in v.24, then the variant read by Codex Vaticanus fits better with the pattern of use of δ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ and δ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου which can be detected in Acts (ch.6, Part A). It is surprising that Codex Bezae, which appears to display a greater awareness of and sensitivity to the Old Testament background of the narrative of Acts, reads Θεοῦ here (and, indeed, loses all mention of 'the word of the Lord' in a similar comment at 19:20). On the matter of the use of Θεός and κύριος and other titles for Jesus, the Bezan text sometimes reveals what look like noticeably early variant readings compared with those of the other text (for example, κύριος without the article; Jesus with the article; 'the word of the Lord' when it is a question of fulfillment of God's plans). At the same time, it is generally less consistent in maintaining a pattern with regard to these features than it is in many other aspects of its text where a high degree of consistency can be observed in comparison with other manuscripts. This suggests that Codex Bezae, in its present form, is not the first edition of its text; it has retained a great deal of material which demands an awareness of Jewish matters but has adopted what may be speech customs of a later Christian community. (An almost identical conclusion came out of the study of the terms for 'the Holy Spirit').

εὐζάνε D05: ηὐζάνεν S01/B03

This is the only occurrence in the New Testament of an αὐ - verb augmented by 'ε' rather than 'η', and the reading is found only in D05*.

At 19:20, D05 reads $\eta\upsilon$ -but as a correction written in the manuscript over the original letter. It is unlikely to be original (Elliott 1992, p.96).

Verse 25

25/line 2

$\alpha\pi\epsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\psi\epsilon\nu$ $\alpha\pi\omicron$ D05: $\upsilon\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\psi\alpha\nu$ $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ S01/B03

In order to assess the value of the readings of this line, it is helpful to consider briefly the importance of Jerusalem at this point in the narrative of Acts (cf. ch.7 on the Spelling of Jerusalem). So far, the emergent Christian Church, as an essentially Jewish movement, has been centred in Jerusalem which has retained its importance as the seat of spiritual authority. Stephen's speech in chapter 7 has begun to make clear that the Temple, and therefore Jerusalem, is no longer of fundamental importance to the People of God and there has been a corresponding movement to take the good news of the gospel beyond Judaea to Samaria and even the Gentiles. The initial impetus for this movement was the persecution of the church in Jerusalem after Stephen's death (8:1, 11:19). A large church has been established in Antioch with a measure of independence but still under the oversight of the Jerusalem church (11:22).

It is after chapter 12 that a more definitive break with Jerusalem takes place with the mission of Paul and Barnabas radiating from Antioch and Paul increasingly taking authority. Not that the significance of Jerusalem is ever completely forgotten in Acts nor is its authority totally abandoned, for it is the leaders of the church there who assume the responsibility for the regulations to be followed by the Gentile converts (chapter 15) and it is to Jerusalem that Paul

insists on returning after his three journeys (chapters 19-21).

Chapter 12 also marks a stage in the persecution of the Jerusalem church, this time with divine judgement being passed on the persecutor. The relationship between the judgement on Herod and the prophecy of Ezekiel shows that Herod's violence against the church in a country under his jurisdiction was viewed, at least at some later date, as of fundamental significance to the (new) People of God. A statement is being made about the persecution of God's People by the Jews who did not accept Jesus as the Messiah. In Ezekiel's prophecies, the enemies of Israel, among whom Tyre is predominant, are first to be wiped out (chs.25-32) and then the people of Israel are to be restored and brought back to their own country and to the city of Jerusalem and to the new Temple (chs.34-48). 'And the name of the city henceforth will be, The Lord is there' (Ezek 48:35). In Acts 12, Herod (as representing the Prince of Tyre) is killed by God ostensibly for his acceptance of praise as divine but, in the wider context, for his treatment of the Church. And because Herod is also the king of Judaea and acts in order to win the favour of his own people, the Jews, Ezekiel's prophecy is reversed and the situation reverts to the earlier prophecies of Ezekiel concerning the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple because of its profanation. The Church expands out of Jerusalem, the centre for taking out the 'good news' is Antioch, and Paul, the new apostle to the Gentiles, works from there. Jerusalem is no longer to be the centre of God's People just as God himself is not to be confined there.

A somewhat enigmatic remark in Ac 12:17 lends additional force to this interpretation of the events recorded by Acts. Peter has just related to the church his miraculous escape and, leaving instructions for the story to be passed on to James and the brethren, 'he went to another place' ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον . This detail

raises questions such as 'where did he go?' and 'why did he go?'. The implication, suggested by many commentators¹⁷, may be that it was necessary for his safety for him to hide in a secret location which even at the time of the telling of the story is not revealed. The vagueness is uncharacteristic of Acts and the phrase ἕτερον τόπον is not used elsewhere by Luke nor indeed any other writer of the New Testament. The phrase is used once, however, in the Old Testament at LXX Ezek 12:3 where the occurrence could shed light on its use in Acts 12. In chapter 12 of Ezekiel, Ezekiel the prophet is instructed by God to perform a series of symbolic actions to illustrate to the people of Israel that because of their wickedness in Jerusalem they are going to be brought out of the city and scattered among the nations. He is to equip himself like an exile leaving a town and he is to 'go like an exile from your place to another place' (ἕτερον τόπον) (12:3). The chapter ends with God affirming that what he has spoken will indeed be accomplished with an emphatic declaration 'None of my words will be delayed any longer, but the word which I speak will be performed, says the Lord God' (12:28). It is possibly echoes of such a declaration as this which can be heard in Ac 12:24 (see on v.24 above).

If the book of Ezekiel had not already been demonstrated to be of direct relevance to Acts 12 then it would perhaps be too fanciful to suggest an allusion to Ezek 12:3 in the comment on Peter's departure to 'another place'. The more Acts 12 can be seen to be dependant on Ezekiel, the more it is plausible.

This Old Testament background is valuable in sorting out the variant readings of v.25 which involve three factors: the prefix to the verb, the number of the verb, the preposition before Jerusalem.

Codex Bezae seems (see B-L *ad loc*) to be the only manuscript which reads ἀποστρέφω and at some point the 'α' has been altered to 'υ' by being written over in the manuscript. ἀποστρέφω has the meaning of 'to turn away' as opposed to 'to return' ὑποστρέφω (A-G).

On a number of occasions in the New Testament, a singular verb is used, as here in D05, when it comes after two subjects (Turner N. 1963, p.314). ¹⁰ It underlines the unity of Barnabas and Saul but is more likely to be a stylistic custom than a deliberate effort to stress their common purpose which is not an issue in question at this point. It can be compared to the tendency observed to be at work in Codex Bezae (but not in the S01/B03 text) of using one definite article before two named persons where the two act together (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, p.29).

Following the verb ἀποστρέφω, ἀπό is the usual preposition. On the reading of D05, the verse signifies that Barnabas and Saul, having completed their mission of delivering money to the Jerusalem church (cf. 11:30), turned away from Jerusalem. This is a comment rich in theological meaning in the light of other indications which become apparent in Acts 12 that Jerusalem is no longer to be the centre of the Church (cf.v.10 below). It would account for the Hebrew-derived spelling of Jerusalem rather than the Hellenistic one: the city is being referred to as the place of religious importance and authority which is now being abandoned (see ch.7 on the Spelling of Jerusalem). As it stands, even if it does not represent the original text, the wording of the Bezan text contributes yet further to its own coherent theological presentation.

ὑποστρέφω... ἀπό is found in Ac 1:12; ὑποστρέφω... εἰς is not found elsewhere in Acts. This poses a problem for advocates of the S01/B03 text. Metzger insists that εἰς ἱερουσαλήμ is the best attested reading: 'all the canons of textual criticism favour the more

difficult reading εἰς, supported as it is by the earliest and the best witnesses' (1975 ad loc). The support is in fact S01/B03/Byz/SyrH^{ms}/Sah4/Eth1. This collection of manuscripts as a whole is not especially early; S01/B03 are typically considered to be 'the best' but the argument on which this judgement depends is a circular one. The suggestion that εἰς really means ἐν (Metzger 1975, p.399-400) concords with similar uses of εἰς by S01/B03 in Acts as demonstrated by the analysis of prepositions in Acts (ch.5).

25/line 4

+ τὸν (ιωκνήν) D05 : - τὸν (ιωκνήν) S01/B03

This is the second mention of John (Mark) in Acts, the first being an indirect mention at 12:12 where Peter arrives at τὴν οἰκίαν τῆς μητρὸς τῆς μητρὸς τοῦ ἰωκνοῦ τοῦ ἐπικαλουμένου (μ)άρκου (Bezan spelling). The absence of the article before John there is typical of a first mention (and not of a dependent genitive, see analysis #III.1.d in Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992). Its absence in the S01/B03 text of v.25 is in line with the rule that the article is omitted when the mention of a person has not been anticipated, for this is the first indication that John Mark accompanied Barnabas and Saul to Antioch (cf. 13:5 where the article is omitted by both texts in a similar context; and 15:37 where the Bezan text omits the article when it is said that Barnabas wanted John Mark to accompany him and Paul on their second journey). In retaining the article, the Bezan text suggests that the presence of John Mark with Barnabas and Saul on their return to Antioch was already a familiar fact to its readers and that the previous mention at 12:12 is sufficiently recent for him to be considered as established as a character in the narrative.

The spelling of ἰωκνήν with the single middle consonant is typical of Bezan practice (see Appendix II, Participant Reference). It

is an example of variation of which the location and origin could perhaps be traced along with other examples of spelling differences (cf. ἀνοίγω v.10 above).

25/line 5

ἐπικληθέντα D05/B03 : ἐπικκλωμένον S01

The latter form, the present passive participle, is the more common form used in Acts and it does not vary at other occurrences. It is possible that S01 uses it here because it is always used on other occasions when speaking of John Mark (cf. 12:12; 15:37). The other form, the aorist passive participle, occurs once more in Acts at 4:36 where it is without variation.

Verses 9-10

The two variants in v.10 which were put to one side before can now be investigated.

10/line 2

καὶ δευτέραν φυλακὴν D05 : φυλακὴν καὶ δευτέραν S01/B03

10/lines 6-7

+κατεβήσαν τοὺς ἵβανθους D05 :

-(...)S01/B03

Both references concern the layout of the prison. The first has to do with the existence of two prisons, one apparently adjacent to the other. The second makes mention of the steps leading down from the gate of the prison. These details, of which the latter is missing entirely in S01/B03, are in addition to the specification of the gate

as 'the iron gate'; the gate is the way out of the prison into the city and, on this occasion, it opened of its own accord. In both texts, some care has been given to describing the escape of Peter from prison under the guidance of the angel, with details provided which are not necessary in themselves. Codex Bezae modifies and amplifies them; this suggests that they have an importance beyond simply making the account more colourful and a significance beyond the indirect one of revealing local knowledge.

In order to grasp the significance of the prison in the story of Peter's escape, careful note must be taken of the overall story line and its application in the more than immediate context. Peter's deliverance from prison is related in chapter 12 as a deliverance from the persecution of the Jews led by King Herod. Peter stands for the Church, the People of God whom God sets free by the intermediary of his angel from their oppressors in an event parallel to the Passover deliverance from Egypt (v.11 and see introductory comments to vv.5-12). Whereas in the past, the People of God have been the Jews with their spiritual centre in Jerusalem, the Jews who have not accepted Jesus as the Messiah have become the enemies of God's people and Jerusalem is to be abandoned. In a kind of reverse-fulfilment of the prophecies of Ezekiel concerning the Prince of Tyre, it is Herod, King of the Jews, who is destroyed because of his spiritual pride and hostility to the Church. These are aspects of the narrative of Acts 12 which have emerged so far from an exegetical and textual study of the chapter.

In addition to what has already been said, there is another element common to much of the background material of the chapter, that is the Temple in Jerusalem. It is precisely the Temple which the literary background of Ezekiel, and also the historical situation of the early Church as it becomes distinguishable from Judaism, allow to

be viewed as metaphorically represented by the prison. The following factors are of relevance in this respect.

Ezekiel's descriptions of the ruler of Tyre make it plain, in what is perhaps an unexpected way, that he is identified with the priest of the Temple on Mount Zion in Jerusalem.¹⁷ In so far as Herod is assimilated with the Prince of Tyre, then he too is associated with the Temple. This is an association which has already been identified in pointing out the relationship between the Prince of Tyre and the destruction of the first Temple (see introductory comments to vv.18-25 above).

In the early chapters (8-11) of Ezekiel, the prophet describes how the profanation of the Temple caused God to remove his presence from the place and to destroy it along with the city. As part of the restoration of Israel in the latter chapters (34-48), Ezekiel recounts his visions of how the people are brought back to Jerusalem and the building of a new Temple.

The presence of the People of God in Jerusalem and the Temple are two very closely associated ideas in the history of Israel and specifically in the prophecies of Ezekiel. If, then, God is bringing his people out of Jerusalem in Acts 12, and especially if the Old Testament writing which is invoked is Ezekiel, the Temple is likely to be not far out of mind. And the significance of these two elements in combination is enormous from a Jewish point of view. The eventual abandonment by the Church of worship attached to the Temple and of the belief in the uniqueness of Jerusalem constitutes nothing less than the removal of what Dunn (1992) calls one of the 'four pillars' of Second Temple Judaism' (pp.31-6). Indeed, working from a thorough scrutiny of Biblical texts, Dunn stresses (pp.60-71) the overwhelming importance of the shift in focus created by the speech of Stephen away from the Temple and Judaism. Following the death of Stephen, he traces

(pp.71-3) the subtle marks of the subsequent break with the Temple through chs.8-11 where he says they are 'hidden, as not appearing on the surface of the narratives, but not at all difficult for those well-versed in Jewish tradition and history to discern' (p.71).²⁰ A study of the Bezan text of chapter 12 shows that such marks continue to be present in that chapter, too.

The diverse factors which up to chapter 11 point to a break with the Temple, create substantial grounds for seeing in the description of Peter's deliverance from the prison a carefully constructed reference to a divine action which brings the Church out from the Temple which will no longer be the centre of worship. If the reference is concealed in the S01/B03 text (and it may be that in that text the original reference has in fact not been recognized as such), in the text of D05 extra indications are given which partially remove the concealing cover.

A number of details in the account of Peter's exit from the prison in vv.9+10 contribute to the Temple metaphor. There are firstly the comments introducing the exit from the prison in v.9. Peter 'thought he was seeing a vision'. The Bezan text makes it clear in this verse and again in v.11 (see comments above) that the comment is intended to be a literal one. Against the visionary background of the book of Ezekiel and in particular of his vision of the Temple, this seems to be a quite deliberate pointer to the deeper meaning of the incident being related. The series of movements which take Peter out of the prison is initially experienced by Peter as a vision. Coupled with the details of the prison which are provided, the comment in v.9 can be interpreted as meaning that the situation is analogous to Ezekiel's vision of the Temple in Ezekiel 40-44. One almost expects an aside: 'let the reader understand'. In those chapters of Ezekiel, God brings his people back to Jerusalem and to the Temple. In

Acts, God removes his people from the Temple and from Jerusalem.

Following the introduction in v.9, the angel and Peter go through two prisons, a first and a second. The variant reading at this point was examined in the chapter on word order variation (ch.3, Part B, #1.4.b.ii) where it was seen that the S01/B03 text treats the two prisons as separate and as unexpected to some extent. The effect of the inversion of word order by D05 is to link the two prisons more closely together and to regard their dual existence as something expected. The very existence of two prisons is puzzling (which maybe explains why in many English translations φυλακῶν is rendered by 'guards'). Why there should be any reason to change the order of words is at least as strange unless, taking the setting of the Temple rather than the literal prison, there is an allusion here to the two courts of the Temple, the inner and the outer one, which would have to be gone through in order to leave the sanctuary and reach the gate leading to the city. In Ezekiel's vision, the two courts of the Temple are a frequently recurring feature of the repetitive descriptive vocabulary. On that interpretation, the Bezan order of words reflects a better understanding of the two courts/prisons in close relation to each other and of their existence as not surprising. There is little to go on to make a strong case here for a Temple analogy but the very fact that Codex Bezae sees a need to change the word order is a possible hint that something symbolic is being conveyed.

As the 'vision' continues, Peter arrives at an iron gate leading out into Jerusalem. In discussing the Passover material which seemed relevant to this chapter (in the introduction to vv.5-12 above), note was made of the significance of the opening of the door of the Temple. Not only was this a theme of Jewish Passover traditions but of Old Testament prophecies concerned with God's presence in the Temple and in particular it forms part of the instructions in

Ezekiel's vision of the Temple (ch.44). When the angel brings Peter out of the prison/Temple in Ac 12:10, the door opens of its own accord, that is by miraculous intervention. The significance of such a comment could hardly be missed by an audience familiar with Passover and Old Testament traditions to do with the Temple door and who understood the Temple to be referred to in this episode. Yahweh is leaving the Temple and is taking his people out, too.

In Codex Bezae, the angel then takes Peter down seven steps (the only manuscript to specify the number though a few mention the steps, B-L *ad loc*). Throughout Ezekiel's vision of the Temple a great many of the specifications given contain exact measurements and numbers concerning the dimensions and the layout of the Temple. Amongst these, in ch.40 there are two sets of instructions concerning numbers of steps and gates, those at the gates leading from the inner court to the sanctuary and those at the gates leading from the city to the outer court. At the former there are to be eight steps; at the latter, and only there, there are to be seven steps (40:22,26). When Codex Bezae adds this particular detail at the point that Peter comes out of the prison and into the city the editor gives the clearest indication yet that he understands the incident of Peter's escape from prison to be a mirror of a spiritual event and that the prison, for the space of these two verses, is the Temple.²¹

The seven steps are often taken in textual commentaries as pointing to local knowledge on the part of the Bezan editor which (contrary to what is perceived in Codex Bezae as so much evidence of a late text) is a rare good mark in his favour. On the interpretation proposed here, the seven steps do not so much reveal local geographical knowledge as local (to Judaism) theological awareness of an exceptional nature. The book of Ezekiel is an esoteric text for the scholarly elite yet the editor of Codex Bezae is sufficiently at

home with it not only to recognize the declaration in Acts 12 that the vision of Ezekiel has been reversed but to go further and boldly to underline it.

CONCLUSIONS

The emergence of complex Jewish traditions and intricate Jewish exegesis in chapter 12 provides some very valuable clues as to the origin of Codex Bezae, and to its relationship with a) the S01/B03 text and b) the original text. The following history of the text is suggested as being the one which, in view of all the other evidence in Codex Bezae of a Jewish milieu of origin for its text, most closely reconstructs the picture to which the various elements belong.

1. The original text of Acts 12, being neither that of D05 or S01/B03, contains discreet allusions to Ezekiel especially in the likening of Herod to the Prince of Tyre; it also draws on Ezekiel in reversing the prophecies and suggesting the exit of God's People from Jerusalem and even the removal of the presence of God from the Temple. The allusions are discreet possibly because the Temple was still standing and there were still Christians in Jerusalem; that is, things are still in the early days of the hypothetical and the spiritual rather than the concrete and the actual. That sets the date for the first text of Acts 12 before 66 AD by which time the Christians had had warning to flee the city (Feldman 1993).

2. This type of allusion cannot have been the work of any ordinary Christian, the less so that Ezekiel was not widely known as a Jewish writing. The interpretation of the story of Herod as an outworking, at the same time as a reversal, of Jewish prophecies requires someone

with a thoroughly Jewish cultural and theological background; more importantly, it requires someone with the authority to make this kind of interpretation about recent historical events. Someone of the education and standing of Paul (Paul himself?) would fit the bill. That does not mean that that he is the person who wrote Acts but that he had made known to the writer his thoughts and ideas.

3. The Bezan text makes the Ezekiel allusions that much more definite and reinforces them with extra detail. That this was possible or even desirable perhaps indicates a date after the destruction of the Temple when it was that much more obvious that the Temple was no longer to be the centre of God's presence or worship.

4. The Alexandrian text does not seem to appreciate fully the allusions to Ezekiel which Bezae strengthens rather than creates. This looks like a text which is not the original but also a later re-writing by an author who does not understand the Jewish background as well as the Bezan author does. He does not need to if he is writing for a church which is not particularly interested in nor close to Jewish background.

5. On this understanding, the texts of D05 and S01/B03 are parallel to each other rather than dependent one on the other. On a number of points outside this chapter, this relationship has been the one which most satisfactorily explains the variant readings between the two texts.

NOTES TO CHAPTER NINE.

1. Epp 1966, pp.145-6, comments on the Bezan text's accentuation of Herod's crime and his ghastly death, interpreting it as a sign of increased animosity towards the Jews. As the exegetical discussion which follows here shows, there is rather more to the Bezan variant text than simply anti-Judaic feeling.
2. For further details on this series of events, see Smallwood 1976, pp.187-200.
3. On the basis of the papyri, Moulton (1929, Pt II, pp. 38+48) points out that the ending in 'η' is more typical of Koine Greek from an early time. Practice seems to have varied from one place to another, however, and not to have been uniform. That the 'α' ending is found in the LXX is evidence of this.
4. Cf. Petersen 1992, pp.313-7, who presents the information on the Quartodecimans found in Eusebius.
5. For a full discussion see Le Déaut 1963, pp.218-37.
6. Cited by Le Déaut 1963, p.235. Although the Midrash cannot be dated, Le Déaut believes that it draws on traditional elements of a very early date.
7. Cited by Le Déaut 1963, p.288; cf. p.294 on the significance of the 'door' for the Quartodecimans.
8. In the Gospels, on the other hand, η- is almost always read.
9. Levinsohn suggests that his analysis can serve this purpose, 1987, p.123.
10. Elliott 1992, p.104, but the references to Codex Bezae require some correcting, thus: 5:19D05 ἀνέωξεν; 9:40D05 lacunae; 12:10D05 ἡνύγη; 12:14D05 + 14:27D05 ἡνύξεν.
11. The absence of the article at the same time marks the subject of the verb as salient just as ἀληθῶς in D05 is also marked as salient by its pre-verb position (Levinsohn, personal communication).
12. The parallel is not mentioned by the commentators on Acts or Ezekiel (except occasionally since 1986 in response to the article by Strom) but is indicated by N-A²⁶.
13. Midrash in Yalkut II, 367, cited by Ginzberg 1982, Vol IV, p.336 and cf. Levey 1987, p.83, n.12.
14. Much of the discussion in the Letter to the Hebrews, for example, depends on typology and the assimilation of historical characters.
15. This quotation and the following one from v.13 is taken from the English translation of the Targum of Ezekiel, Levey 1987.
16. See previous note, and especially Levey 1987 p.85, n.14.
17. Cf. Conzelmann 1987 ad loc.

18. This happens more frequently in D05 than in S01 or B03; see 13:46; 14:14; 16:7; 18:19.

19. See Newsom 1984, pp.161-4, who discusses this theme in detail.

20. Sanders J.T. 1993, pp.95-9, identifies criticism of the Temple as one of the causes of separation between Judaism and Christianity before 70 AD but misses much of the evidence in Acts. Unfortunately, this is one the things which causes him to treat Acts as an unreliable document.

21. Ropes 1923 *ad loc* believes that the reference to the seven steps of Ezekiel's Temple 'furnishes no satisfactory explanation'. The explanation becomes satisfactory if the other pointers to Ezekiel's vision are taken into account.

CHAPTER TEN

Acts 18:1-18: Paul in Corinth.

INTRODUCTION

An overall comparison of the text of Acts attested by Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus with that attested by Codex Bezae reveals a variety of differences in the presentation of Paul. They are to be found throughout the chapters of Acts which speak of Paul and which are extant in all three manuscripts. Some of them have come to light in the chapters which deal with linguistic points. They have to do with factors which affect the role of Paul in relation to the other characters, his missionary activity, his relationship with the churches (especially that of Jerusalem), and above all the issue which was of particular concern to him, that of the place of the Gentiles in the Christian community. A more sustained and comprehensive picture can be obtained by a detailed study of one of the sections of the narrative which describes Paul's activity.

Chapter 18 has been selected for closer examination for several reasons. There is a high proportion of additional material in this chapter, a proportion which in the remaining chapters diminishes markedly (see variation charts, Appendix I). There is comparatively little alternative material (that is, material which exists in the texts of S01/B03 and D05 but in different forms), again something which changes in the subsequent chapters. Codex Bezae stands practically as a lone witness among the Greek manuscripts to the text

it presents for chapter 18; there is frequently support from the Old Latin h for the general content of the Bezan variants if not for their exact form.¹

Paul's visit to Corinth represents an important stage in his journeys and indeed in his missionary activity generally. There are two extant letters addressed to the Corinthian church in addition to numerous references to Corinth in other letters. There is thus some helpful background information on the episodes covered by the narrative of chapter 18 which allows the variant readings to be weighed up and interpreted in the light of that outside information.²

The findings of the examination of chapter 18 here confirm the fragments of the fuller picture scattered throughout the linguistic analyses. In the text of Codex Bezae, Paul emerges as a more familiar figure than in the Alexandrian text. His problem with the Jews and his concern for the Gentiles are treated in more detail and in sympathy with Paul's point of view. At the same time there is evidence to indicate a closer knowledge of the local situation in Corinth and some of the people there.

In this study, the line numbers are based as usual on the text of Codex Bezae. Some Bezan readings in chapter 18, listed below, do not appear to contribute to the difference in presentation and are not included in this study of the chapter (as usual, orthographical variation is not indicated). They are as follows:

	<u>D05</u>	<u>S01/B03</u>
Verse 2/line 3	εληλυθα	εληλυθογα
line 5	τεταχενκι	διατεταχενκι
Verse 6/line 3	πτασσομενων	κντιπτασσομενων
Verse 7/line 3	ονοματις	ονοματι
Verse 9/line 2	σειωσης	σιωπησης
Verse 10/line 2	omit σοι	σοι
Verse 11/line 2	ενικυτον B03	ενικυτον ενκ S01
Verse 14/line 6	ησυχουην	κνεσχομην
Verse 18/line 3	επλευσεν	εξεπλει

Most of these readings would seem to be errors in Codex Bezae and some of them are corrected by later hands.

Verse 1

1/line 1

αναχωρησας δε απο των αθηνων D05:
μετα ταυτα χωρισθεις εκ των αθηνων S01/B03

The chapter opens with Paul leaving Athens and arriving in Corinth. His stay in Athens (17:15-34) has been difficult: his mind was very much on the situation he had had to leave behind in Macedonia (17:1-14; cf. I Thess 2:17-3:10, written probably from Corinth on his first visit); he was more than a little disturbed by the spiritual situation in Athens (17:16) and argued not only with the Jews in the synagogue but also in the Areopagus court at the demand of the Greek scholars of philosophy; he was without the help and companionship of Silas and Timothy for some (but probably not all) of the time (17:14-15; II Co

11:9; I Thess 3:1-5) and he left Athens without them (17:6).

Some comment has been made on this verse in the chapter on prepositions (ch.5) where it was observed that ἔκ to express movement from a town is unusual; in the following verse, χωρίσθη is followed by ἀπό without variant. μετὰ ταῦτα is unusual too, this being the only instance in Acts where it is used to introduce a new development in the story without another connective (Levinsohn 1987, p. 154).

Thus, the S01/B03 version, with its uncommon structure and preposition, does not look like an amended text. The unusual features would rather present a case for the wording being made more regular by later editors.

At first sight, the wording of the Bezan text looks like an attempt to do simply that. The choice of verb, however, reveals that the regularizing occurs in the course of describing more graphically, rather than for its own sake, Paul's departure from Athens. ἀναχωρέω has the same meaning as χωρίσω of 'to depart' but is always used in the LXX and the New Testament with the sense of 'to take refuge from some peril' (M+M). Paul then, according to the Bezan account, did not just 'leave' Athens at the end of his stay there; he got out as a matter of some urgency in order to reach a safer place. That would account for his leaving without waiting for Timothy and Silas to arrive from Macedonia. (The comment in 17:34 about the conversion of certain people is to be read as an aside rather than as a specifically consecutive development following Paul's withdrawal from the people in the Areopagus v.33).

Verse 2

2/line 5

+ κλαυδιος D05 κλαυδιον S01: - κλαυδιον B03

The omission of B03, supported by only one Greek minuscule (B-L ad loc), is probably accidental. The nominative ending in D05 should not be taken as intentional, being grammatically incorrect.

2/line 6

- τους D05: + τους S01/B03

Although it cannot categorically be stated that the omission of the definite article is not simply an accidental error, there are at least two reasons for supposing that it is intentional. Firstly, in the examination of the definite article before proper names (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992) variation concerning the article was rarely found to be without justification. It would be unwise to ascribe the omission of the article in the Bezan text to the carelessness of a scribe when on other matters concerning the article the scribe has proven to be thorough and systematic.

In this instance, the absence of the article can be justified from the sense. When the article is omitted after πάντες in the New Testament, the meaning is 'all, whatever they are' as opposed to 'all' as a definable category.³ As inhabitants of Rome, πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι would be an identifiable group of people. πάντες Ἰουδαῖα on the other hand does not convey the same sense of group identity. The same distinction is made in English between 'all the Jews' and 'all Jews'. It is reflected in the difference between the two statements: 'all the French people living in London (a known and

definable group) are encouraged to vote in the forthcoming elections' and 'all French people living in London (whoever and wherever they are) are encouraged to vote in the forthcoming elections'.

The reasons for the order given by the Emperor Claudius in 49 AD for all (the) Jews to leave Rome are not entirely certain but it is commonly supposed that it had something to do with disputes arising amongst the Jews over the new Christian teaching (Hemer 1989, pp.167-8; Tenney 1965, pp.221-3). Claudius was generally known for his religious tolerance but, already in 41 AD, he had written to the Jewish community in Alexandria forbidding them to invite Jews from Syria to visit them (Tenney pp.222-3). The problem, both in Alexandria and in Rome, is unlikely to have been Judaism as such but the divisions which were beginning to be created within Judaism. From the account in Acts, it is clear that when Jews accepted the new teaching, they aroused not a little hostility and rioting on the part of their fellow Jews opposed to the new teaching. Within the time of Claudius at least (41-54 AD), Christianity was not a separate religion from Judaism and Christians were still one kind of Jews. When, therefore, he ordered the Jews out of Rome it can be supposed that it was all Jews, of every kind and from every sect, whether orthodox, Christian or anything else, who had to go. $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$ $\iota\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ of the Bezan text expresses the universality of the decree, although the decision to omit the definite article may not necessarily have been any more conscious than it would be for an English person to do so in the corresponding example cited above concerning French people in London.

2/line 7

+ οἱ κἔ κκτωκησεν εἰς τὴν ἀχαίαν D05:

-(...) S01/B03

κἔ in D05, representing κἀί, arises from a similarity of sound between the vowels.⁴

There is presumably more to this comment than to repeat what has already been made perfectly clear i.e. that Aquila and Priscilla were living in Corinth. The implication seems to be that it was unusual for the Jews who had been sent out of Rome to come to Achaia.

2/line 8

κῶτω D05: κῶτοισ S01/B03/d

By the use of the singular, κῶτω⁵, D05 appears to ignore the presence of Priscilla, although in the next verse the plural is used when Paul stays with Aquila and Priscilla. This variant is sometimes taken as evidence of anti-feminist tendencies in Codex Bezae (see Epp 1966, p.75, n.3), to be considered along with the omission of Damaris (17:34) and the placing of Aquila before Priscilla at 18:26. A few early versions, including h (B-L ad loc), specify Aquila by name in this verse.

+ ο πῶλος D05: - ο πῶλος S01/B03

It is typical in the text of Acts for Paul to be referred to by name after the introduction of another character with whom he is about to interact (Appendix II, Participant Reference). The additional parenthetical information in the previous line of D05 creates something of a hiatus which may call for a more definite return to

Paul as protagonist. It has also been suggested (Delebecque 1986, p.324) that the name is necessary to avoid ambiguity - the singular pronoun αὐτῷ being used for the indirect object in D05, there could be confusion between Aquila and Paul. If this factor has any influence on the use of the name it is more likely to be of secondary importance for Paul, as the subject of the verb προσήλθεν, has already been anticipated by the nominative participle εὐρωτ in line 1. Further, it is part of the narrative understanding in this section of Acts which concerns the activities of Paul that the verb refers to Paul unless otherwise stated (Appendix II, Participant Reference).

Verse 3

3/line 2

πρὸς αὐτοὺς D05: παρ' αὐτοῖς S01/B03

Whereas παρὰ adequately conveys that Paul stayed with Aquila and Priscilla, πρὸς indicates a closer relationship (Winer 1882, p.504, esp. n.4). Delebecque (1984 *ad loc*) renders the difference in his French translation as *chez* for παρὰ and *attaché à* for πρὸς .

ἠργαζέτο D05: ἠργαζόντο S01/B03

The focus is on Paul in the use of the singular verb. It is apparent from Paul's letters, that it was a matter of the greatest importance to him that he did not demand or expect to live at the expense of those whom he was evangelizing (see I Co 4:12; 9:1-18; II Co 11:9; cf. Ac 20:34). The use of the singular instead of the plural to refer to Paul is found also at v.19 and elsewhere in Acts (13:45; 14:3,14; 16:7). He is thereby distinguished from a group or a companion.⁴

-(...) D05:

+ ἦσαν γὰρ σκηνοποιοὶ τῆ τέχνης S01/B03

The absence of the mention of Paul's trade in Codex Bezae has been explained as accidental (Metzger 1975 *ad loc*). Whilst that is not impossible, the omission in the Bezan text of other information concerning Paul's background (the description of Tarsus at 21:39) suggests that this detail was left out because the information was well-known in the milieu of that text.

Verse 4

4/lines1+2

ΕΙΣΠΟΡΕΥΟΜΕΝΟΣ ΔΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗΝ ΚΑΤΑ ΠΑΝ ΣΑΒΒΑΤΟΝ ΔΙΕΛΕΓΕΤΟ D05:
ΔΙΕΛΕΓΕΤΟ ΔΕ ΕΝ Τῇ ΣΥΝΚΥΩΓῃ ΚΑΤΑ ΠΑΝ ΣΑΒΒΑΤΟΝ S01/B03

The use of a participial clause at the beginning of a sentence, whether in the nominative as here or in the genitive as in v.6, is more frequent in D05 than in S01 and B03, which do not differ on this point (Appendix II). The structure of the sentence describing Paul's activity in the synagogue, with the inclusion of ΕΙΣΠΟΡΕΥΟΜΕΝΟΣ and the placing of the verb ΔΙΕΛΕΓΕΤΟ after the introductory participial clause, brings the sentence into line with the other references in Acts to Christians preaching in the synagogue (13:14; 14:1; 17:2; 18:19; 19:8).

The phrase ΕΙΣΠΟΡΕΥΟΜΕΝΟΣ Εἰς τὴν συνκυωγὴν ... ΔΙΕΛΕΓΕΤΟ resembles, by its frequency, a set expression the effect of which is to convey the impression of a pre-ordained pattern. The repetition of set expressions, together with the repetition of certain key themes,

occurs in both the texts of Acts under consideration but is noticeably more marked in the Bezan text. This was seen, for example, with the titles of Jesus, especially for baptism (ch.6, Part B); the terms used for the Holy Spirit (ch.6, Part C); the regularity of the omission of the definite article for the second name in the phrase 'ὁ παῖς καὶ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὁ πνεῦμα' (companion)' (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992, #III.1.a). It is apparent too, in the treatment of such themes as those of 'hearing' and 'silence' (Appendix III). In this respect, the language of the Bezan text can be compared with the repetitive style of the Gospel of Mark of which it has also been said that it reflects a theological perspective of divine control.⁷

It is possible that in the repetition of the phrase describing Paul's going into the synagogue to debate with the Jews, there is a conscious recollection of Jesus doing the same (cf. Mark 1:21 + Luke 4:16, and NB. similar variants there to those of Acts 18:4+11). A comparison between the Gospels and Acts with reference to the similarities between Jesus and Paul would be a worthwhile topic to investigate further. A similar likening between Jesus and Peter was observed in the study of chapter 12 (introduction to vv.5-12).

4/line 3

+ καὶ εὐτιθεῖς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἰησοῦ D05:

-(...) S01/B03

εὐτιθεῖς in this comment could refer, as Epp believes (1966, p.86), to the Jewish exegetical practice of updating Scriptural texts by 'inserting' names to replace original references. The Targum to Isaiah has many examples of the Messiah being specified where the older text is vague or refers to God. The passages are thus interpreted for contemporary readers in the light of newer teaching or a particular

school of exegesis. Alternatively, it may describe a less formal procedure adopted by Paul of 'introducing' the good news about Jesus into the discussion (cf. Philip in 8:35; Jesus in Luke 24:27).

ὁ κύριος ἰησοῦς is the term used in Acts by Christians within a Christian circle (see ch.6, Part B, #I). It is used again by D05 at v.5. The usage suggests a narrator who, identifying with the Christian community, describes the situation from the (subjective) point of view of his hearers, rather than providing a detached report. The comment thus draws together narrator, audience and Paul into a circle of like-minded people. In a formal setting, the name of Jesus is always τὸ ὄνομα (τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν) ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ (cf. v.8) in the Bezan text (*ibid*, #IV). That the formal expression should not be used here is an indication that there is not an echo of a liturgical formula in the comment in this verse even though the phrase used may be a standard one (cf. 19:13,17).

4/lines 4-5

καὶ ἐπιθεν δε ου μονον ιουδακιους D05:
---- ἐπιθεν τε ----- ιουδακιους S01/B03

αλλὰ καὶ ἑλληνας D05:
---- καὶ ἑλληνας S01/B03

The redundant καί following a participle (ἐπιθεν in the previous line D05) is a hallmark of the Bezan text (the list can be found in ch.4, Part A).

Evidence of the D05 text's being secondary is found in the erroneous retention of δέ when the connecting particle has been modified to καί. This happens elsewhere in the Bezan text (6:15; 13:6; 20:11; 21:40).

The S01/B03 text of v.4 conveys the same factual information as the other text (even the teaching about the name of the Lord Jesus in the context of Paul discussing in the synagogue can be assumed) but it is limited to being a bald statement of facts.

Where $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ in S01/B03 indicates that the most important part of the verse is considered to be the information that Jews and Greeks were persuaded by Paul (ch.4, Part A on $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$), the Bezan text says nothing different but it emphasizes the inclusion of the Greeks among those whom Paul convinced. Epp (1966, p.87) sees in this insistence on the Greeks an anti-Jewish feeling typical of Codex Bezae. Quoting Ropes (1926, p.lcxxxiii, n.2) he says: 'The D-text thus "betrays a Gentile's feeling that any statement is inadequate which implies that Christianity in the Apostolic age was limited to Jewry"'.

The feeling may be a Gentile's but in the New Testament Church it is a feeling taught, inspired and emphatically insisted upon by Paul who was, certainly, apostle to the Gentiles but first of all himself a Jew. The point is that the universality of Christianity is not a Gentile message but a fundamentally Christian one and Paul is not being pro-Gentile when he preaches it so much as thoroughly Christian. He insists on it in situations where there are Jewish Christians disturbing Gentile converts to Christianity (see Galatians, as a prime example; Ro 2+3, esp.3:29; and cf. I Co 1:24; 10:32; 12:13). He expects Jewish Christians as much as Gentiles to understand and feel that the limitation of Christianity to Jewry is not only inadequate but a complete falsification of the gospel message.

In several places in the Bezan text of Acts, the presence of Greeks in addition to Jews among those who believed is stressed (17:4 (narrator); 20:24 (Paul)); cf. the implication of 4:31+32). This emphasis is in keeping with what can be observed in other ways to be a preoccupation of the Bezan text with the question of the inclusion of

the Gentiles in the Church.

If there is a text of Acts which does not take the opportunity to underline the inclusion of the Gentiles in the Church, that is very likely to be because the addressees had no difficulty with the teaching. Conversely, if the Bezan text does need to insist on it, a probable reason is the problems of the (Jewish) addressees. The Bezan editor is clearly aware of their problems and equally aware of Paul's repeated message in response to the Jewish Christians who wished to exclude Gentiles from the Christian community or, at best, to include them on the old terms of the Jewish law: God is God of the Gentiles and the Jews (Ro 3:29).

Verse 5

5/lines 1-2

ΠΑΡΕΓΕΝΟΝΤΟ ΔΕ ΑΠΟ ΤΗΣ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΑΣ D05:
ΩΣ ΔΕ ΚΚΤΗΛΘΟΝ ΑΠΟ ΤΗΣ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΙΑΣ S01/B03

ΤΟΤΕ ΣΙΛΑΣ ΚΑΙ - ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΣ ΣΥΝΕΙΧΕΤΟ ΤΩ ΛΟΓΩ D05:
Ο ΤΕ ΣΙΛΑΣ ΚΑΙ Ο ΤΙΜΟΘΕΟΣ ΣΥΝΕΙΧΕΤΟ ΤΩ ΛΟΓΩ S01/B03

The text of S01/B03 has the merit of being clear and grammatically coherent! The grammatical problems of the text of D05 are best dealt with first before the nuances in meaning between the two texts are considered. The Latin side of Codex Bezae in v.5/lines 1-3 has its own variants which create a rather different meaning again.

The second line of 18:5D05 has been examined in the chapter on ΤΟΤΕ (ch.4, Part B, #IV) where it was concluded that ΤΟΤΕ is an error and should read Ο ΤΕ . The absence of the second article before Timothy is typical of the practice of the Bezan text (cf. on v.4/lines

1+2 above).

As the text stands there are two main verbs with no connecting particle. Asyndeton is not unknown in the text of Acts (Appendix II.) but in the firm text of the narrative complete asyndeton (as here) introduces 'a response by the undergoer of the last event' (Levinsohn 1987, p. 155). Although this is not necessarily the case in the additional occurrences of asyndeton in Codex Bezae (2:43; 8:2), in other instances the relationship between the two sentences is obvious. That is unfortunately not so here. Delebecque (1986 *ad loc*) suggests that $\omega\varsigma$ is intended in the Bezan text either before the first verb as in the S01/B03 text, or the second. The problem with supposing an omitted $\omega\varsigma$ before $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$ is that in that case $\delta\epsilon$ has also been moved. Above all, even a temporal link does not explain why the arrival of Silas and Timothy should have anything to do with Paul's being preoccupied with the word.

Taking account of Paul's practical situation in Corinth, the significance of the arrival of his companions can be presumed to be that they brought money with them from Macedonia (cf. II Co 11:9; cf. Phil 4:15). This then would free Paul to stop working and to concentrate on preaching. $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ in D05, compared to $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ in S01/B03, carries the fuller meaning of a person coming into the presence of another rather than coming to a place (cf. 10:25+32; 11:26 16:39 as additional Bezan occurrences of $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ with this fuller meaning). The Bezan text thus sets the coming of Silas and Timothy in relation to Paul rather than simply describing their geographical arrival in Corinth. It is typical of Luke as narrator of Acts to avoid giving details of the collection of money from the churches visited by Paul, either for his own needs or for those of the Jerusalem church. Details abound in Paul's letters causing Luke's silence to be all the more striking. For all that the Bezan text seems to be written from a

closer acquaintance with the church in Corinth, the same discretion is maintained concerning money.

In conclusion, if *asyndeton* is intended by the Bezan text, the purpose may be deliberately to leave the connection between the adjacent sentences unspoken. By placing the events side by side without explaining the relationship, the implicit connection is highlighted. Such underlining of implicit information has been observed on other occasions in Codex Bezae (cf. ch.9 on 12:9).

5/line 3

- ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ΔΙΑΚΡΥΤΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ D05:
ο ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ΔΙΑΚΡΥΤΟΥΜΕΝΟΣ S01/B03

The absence of the definite article in D05 further highlights Paul in relation to Silas and Timothy. It is typical of the Bezan text to distinguish Paul from other characters in this way (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992).

5/line 4

+ ΚΥΡΙΟΝ D05: - ΚΥΡΙΟΝ S01/B03

The expression *κύριος ἰησοῦς* is found for a second time in the D05 text of chapter 18 but here without the article. The omission of the article shows that Jesus is viewed as the unknown element in Paul's preaching to the Jews - he was proving who the Christ was. The proof formula can be compared with that found at 18:28 where, with reference to Apollos arguing with the Jews in Corinth, the Bezan text chooses the order *τον ἰησοῦν εἰναι χριστον* where Jesus is taken as known (but not Lord Jesus because the Jews do not know him as Lord) and is demonstrated to be the Messiah.

As in the previous verse, the use of κύριος suggests a closer identification of the narrator and audience with Paul than in the text which lacks it.

Verse 6

6/line 1-2

+ πολλοῦ δε λόγου γεινομένου
καὶ γραφῶν διερμηνευμένων D05:

- (...) S01/R03

Inserting a genitive absolute construction before the main verb in order to introduce an extra comment is characteristic of Codex Bezae (Appendix II). That it is an insertion by D05 rather than an omission by S01/R03 is apparent from the repeated genitive absolute with δέ in line 3 with no intervening finite clause. (The same lack of attention by the Bezan editor when additional material is inserted or where there is rewording can be seen at 12:21; 14:23; 15:2; 21:27.)

The erroneous grammar notwithstanding, the comment is full of importance. It brings the account of Paul's preaching in the synagogue in Corinth in line with the report concerning Thessalonica (17:2-3) and Berea (17:11). A possible reason for underlining debate and the interpretation of the Scriptures is that for Hellenist Jews the testimony of the Scriptures and the understanding of them was of particular importance. The additional sentence in Codex Bezae reflects a concern which is not so much a broadly Jewish one as one which characterizes Diaspora Judaism. Evidence for it is found, for example, at the turn of the first century in the writings of Ignatius of Antioch (Schoedel 1978; Trebilco 1991, pp.27-8). It is easy to see

why this should be so for Jews who were not in Jerusalem and who did not have access to the religious life of the Temple with its priests and teachers. Within the Bezan text of Acts, there are numerous additional allusions to the Scriptures, the word or teaching: 13:27,44a,44b,45; 14:4,7,19; 17:4; 20:24. Almost all of these references occur very specifically in relation to Paul in the Bezan text, reinforcing the role of Paul as divinely-appointed teacher and proclaimer of the word in a way that is not developed in the S01/B03 text.

6/line 5

ΕΚΤΙΝΑΞΑΜΕΝΟΣ Ο ΠΑΥΛΟΣ ΤΑ ΣΙΝΑΓΓΑΤΑ ΑΥΤΟΥ D05:..
 ΕΚΤΙΝΑΞΑΜΕΝΟΣ - ----- ΤΑ ΜΑΤΙΑ ----- S01/B03

The name of Paul is used typically before a speech in the common text of Acts; indeed, this is the only instance of the name not being used by the S01/B03 text before Paul speaks. The effect of the name here, together with the possessive pronoun (neither of which is necessary for the sense as the alternative reading of the line shows) is to create a more dramatic portrayal of Paul in opposition to the Jews. That the presentation of Paul should be stronger in D05 than in S01/B03 can be understood from the more forceful version of Paul's speech to the Jews in v.6 and from the sharper break which he is portrayed as making, v.7.

6/lines 8+9

καθαρὸς ἐγὼ ἀφ' ὑμῶν D05:

καθαρὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ S01/B03

νῦν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πορεύομαι D05:

νῦν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πορεύομαι S01/B03

The two differences involve the word qualified by ἀπὸ (ἀπὸ/τοῦ) and the tense of the second verb (present/future).

Whereas S01/B03 (with most witnesses) have the preposition ἀπὸ introducing an indication of time, 'from now on', D05 (with the principal support of Old Latin h) has it followed by 'you', meaning the Jews. This may look straightforward but there is some debate as to which verb ἀφ' ὑμῶν depends on.⁹ There are two possibilities of meaning: either 'I am clean from you. Now I am going to the Gentiles', or 'I am clean. Now I am going from you to the Gentiles'. Since Codex Bezae was written in sense lines, the former meaning is the natural one to infer. Old Latin h takes the second meaning but the strange place of *ab vobis* at the end of the sentence counts against its being original (B-L 1987 *ad loc*).

On either interpretation, Paul's rupture with the Jews is firmer in the Bezan text. There is either an insistence by Paul on his innocence with respect to their rejection of the gospel, or he is decisively withdrawing from them to go to the Gentiles. The present tense of the verb adds a further sense of immediacy to his declaration.

Verse 7

7/lines 1-2

μεταβας δε απο ακυλα D05:

και μεταβας εκειθεν S01/B03

--- ηλθεν εις τον οικον τινος D05:

εισηλθεν εις --- οικιαν τινος S01/B03

The manuscript of Codex Bezae at this place is partially illegible and the text is given here according to the apparatus of N-A²⁶. Examination of the manuscript by certain scholars has yielded different wording in the first two lines: μεταβας απο του ακυλα και ηλθεν... for which the evidence of the actual manuscript is good (Epp 1966, pp.91-2). From a linguistic point of view, this alternative Bezan reading is plausible: τοῦ is to be expected since Aquila has already been introduced in this episode; and καί following a participle and before the finite verb is characteristic of Bezan practice (see on v.4 above and ch.4, Part A). The absence of a connecting particle is more difficult to comment on since complete asyndeton is so rare in the text of Acts that there is a lack of examples with which this case may be compared. The witness of the Latin side d et (= h) is not decisive, for the practice of the Latin side where the Greek D05 has asyndeton varies between asyndeton and a connecting particle.

In favour of the N-A²⁶ reading, it may be said that δε' is consistent with the strong break which is marked by the Bezan version of Paul's speech and indicates that his departure from Aquila's house is a new development arising from his decision to go to the Gentiles.

Whatever the exact wording, the Bezan text makes the point that Paul moved out of Aquila's house, not just 'from there' (the synagogue?) as in the other text. There is no contradiction with Paul's continuing association with Aquila (v.18) since there is no suggestion of a quarrel with him personally.⁹ The deliberate move to the house of a non-Jew could well have been intended as a visible sign of Paul's turning his attention to the Gentiles without any hint of disagreement with Aquila himself.

As Epp points out (1966, p.93) οἶκος in D05 means the household, as opposed to οἶκός the building as in v.7/line 4 (and cf. 8/line 3; and 16:31-2 where the same distinction is made). The choice of the term could further reflect Paul's concern to be associated with the Gentiles - it is not so much that he moved his lodging from one place to another but from one household to another.

7/line 3

- ΤΙΤΟΥ/ΤΙΤΙΟΥ B03Corr/D05;

+ ΤΙΤΟΥ S01; + ΤΙΤΙΟΥ B03/D05Corr

A possible explanation for the absence of the name of Titus before Justus is that Titus was also the name of a Greek companion of Paul's, probably from Antioch (Ga 2:1-3). Titus was seemingly close to Paul and was well-known to the Corinthians, having brought a letter (not preserved) to them from Paul and taken back to him news of the church (II Co 7:5-8; cf. 2:12). This visit would have been some years after Paul's first visit of Acts 18, corresponding to the time Paul was in Macedonia in Ac 20:1-2 (cf. II Co 2:12-13 + 7:5) prior to his second visit to the Corinthians. It was the occasion of Titus' first acquaintance with the Corinthian church (II Co 7:13-15).

For all his importance to Paul in his journeys, Titus' name is

not mentioned at all in the account of Acts the reason for which, although not apparent, is not likely to be accidental. The omission of Titus before Justus in D05 (and h among many others) may have been intended to avoid any possible misunderstanding that Titus the companion of Paul was being referred to here.

Verse 8

B/line 1

ο δε αρχισυναγωγος κρισπος D05:
κρισπος δε ο αρχισυναγωγος S01/B03

By placing the function of Crispus before his name, the Bezan text focusses attention on his role as ruler of the synagogue. That focus is in keeping with the main interest of the chapter at this point, that is the effect of Paul's preaching on the Jews (see ch.3, Part B, #1.2).

B/line 2

επιστευσεν εις τον κυριον D05: ετιστευσεν τω κυριω S01/B03

This is the only place that a preposition is used with the verb πιστεύω and κύριος although εις is found after the noun πίστις in S01/B03 at 20:21 (D05 δικ). It is not used when θεός is the object of the verb of believing either except once by D05 (ἐπί at 16:34).

..... + ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΝΤΕΣ ΤΩ ΘΕΩ
 ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΗΜΩΝ ΙΗΣΟΥ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ D05:
 -(...) S01/B03

This supplementary comment on the many Corinthians who believed identifies them as Gentiles by the choice of θεός as opposed to κύριος (Epp 1966, pp.88-90; Strange 1992, p.156).

The resultant sentence in D05 is generally considered to be tautologous because of the repetition of πιστεύω as a present participle (see Strange, pp.155-6) but Delebecque (1986, p.197) argues that this paronomastic participle is, on the contrary, good Greek style. He points out the same phenomenon in the Gospel of Luke and in the Bezan text of Acts at 13:45.

The use of the full title of Jesus confers on the baptism and belief of the Corinthians a formality in line with what appears to have quickly become the accepted Christian baptismal declaration (ch.6, Part B). That the contents of their belief should be specified in this context emphasizes that the conditions for Christian baptism were considered to have been met. If such an emphasis were necessary, it suggests that some people, namely Jewish Christians, questioned their acceptance into the Christian community. It also appears from Paul's first letter to the Corinthians that within the church in Corinth, partisan groups were very quickly created and the underlining of the belief of the first converts as being in 'the name of our Lord Jesus Christ' is thoroughly in accordance with Paul's insistence in his letter (I Co 1, especially vv.1-13 in which the phrase '(our) Lord Jesus Christ' is found five times.

The possessive pronoun ἡμῶν with 'Lord Jesus Christ' is common in Paul's writings but only occurs once, at 15:26, without a

variant reading in the text of Acts (S01, B03, D05). There is one further occurrence in S01/D05 at 20:21, in the course of a speech by Paul and in a context very similar to that of 18:8: he speaks of witnessing to both Jews and Greeks of faith in (S01 D05) τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Every time this phrase is used, Christians are addressing Christians, with a shared knowledge and understanding. ἡμῶν confers a personal note which, in the Bezan text of chapter 18, is in keeping with the close identification by the narrator with Paul, a feature which has been noticed in other ways in this chapter (eg. vv.1,2,5).

Verse 9

9/line 1

Κυριος D05: ο κυριος S01/B03

It was seen in the examination of the article before κύριος (ch.6, Part B, #II) that in prefacing a speech spoken by κύριος, the article is typically omitted, following the pattern of the Old Testament. This is the only place of variation in S01, B03, D05. It may be that S01/B03 are less sensitive to the Old Testament overtones of the prophecy given to Paul; alternatively, or in addition, ὁ κύριος might be understood to refer specifically to Jesus rather than to God (cf. Kilpatrick 1973). Whatever the reasons for the presence of the article, its absence is evocative of the Lord speaking to his messengers in the Old Testament.

The structure of the rest of this sentence and the way in which it is linked to the next sentence at v.11 support this interpretation of the absence of ὁ, with vv.9-11 acting as a preliminary setting of the scene for the subsequent events.

δι οραματος τω παυλω εν νυκτι D05:
εν νυκτι δι οραματος τω παυλω S01/B03

In the discussion on this variation of word order (ch.3, Part B, #II.1), it was pointed out that the divergence may simply reflect a conflict of tendencies in the post-verb part of the sentence without any further significance. On the other hand, the placing of the manner of speaking (in a vision) and the indirect object (Paul) before the adverb of time in the Bezan text (alone - see B-L 1986 *ad loc*) is appropriate in view of the prefatory phrase chosen by D05 which is evocative of the Lord speaking to his messengers in the Old Testament (see above). It may also have the effect of bringing Paul back into focus after the account of the people who were converted in Corinth. The order of adverbs 'in a vision'- 'in the night' is also found at 16:9D05.

Verse 11

11/line 1

και D05: δε S01/B03

δε treats the statement about Paul's continued residence in Corinth as a new development following the vision of encouragement vv.9-10. και, in contrast, treats the vision and Paul's response as one unit, all of it in effect preparing the scene for the new episode beginning with v.12.

+ εἰς κορινθῶν D05: - εἰς κορινθῶν S01/B03

The addition of the location is not necessary for the sense of the passage but it acts as part of the preparation for the following episode, underlining the setting.

11/line 3

αὐτοῦς D05: εἰς αὐτοῖς S01/B03

The variant of the direct object could be considered without significance were it not firstly, that in a similar sentence describing Jesus teaching in the synagogue in Mark 1:21 (cf. v.4, this section) αὐτοῦς is added by D05; and secondly, that the theme of teaching is accorded greater importance in Codex Bezae. Apart from a more frequent association of the ideas of the word - hearing - Paul (eg. 13:44-5), there are additional specific mentions of Peter and Paul teaching 11:2; 14:7,19; 17:4. In view of this, the direct object may well reflect a deliberate intention to present Paul as purposefully teaching the people rather than more impersonally 'teaching among them'.

Verse 12

12/line 1

ΤΕ D05: δε S01/B03

Codex Bezae (Greek and Latin) is alone in reading ΤΕ and, in the Greek at least, it is out of place (ch.4, Part A). ΤΕ is not normally used to indicate the start of a new episode which is signalled by the fronting of Gallio who here provides the time of the incident and who

is later to play a major part in the events which follow.¹⁰

12/lines 2-6. 13/line 1

κατεπεστησαν ομοθυμαδον
οι ιουδαιοι συνκλησκυτες
μεθ εκυτων επι τον πκυλον
και επιθεντες της χειρας
ηγαγον αυτον επι το βημα
καταβωντες και λεγουτες D05:

κατεπεστησαν ομοθυμαδον
οι ιουδαιοι
τω πκυλω
και

ηγαγον αυτον επι το βημα
λεγουτες S01

κατεπεστησαν οι ιουδαιοι
ομοθυμαδον
τω πκυλω
και

ηγαγον αυτον επι το βημα
λεγουτες B03

The position of the adverb *ομοθυμαδον* in D05 makes clear which verb it qualifies, a problem which does not arise in the shorter text.

As often (cf. v.8 above), the additional Bezan information is introduced in a series of nominative participial clauses, dependent on the existing verbs (Appendix II). It spells out the contents of *κατεπεστησαν ομοθυμαδον*: they conferred amongst themselves against Paul, they laid hands on him and they brought charges against him.

The question arises as to who would wish to intensify the account of the hostility of the Jews against Paul in such a way. In fact, within the New Testament itself there are other accounts of Jewish hostility towards Christians with stronger denunciations than in Acts, and these are to be found in the letters of Paul (eg. II Co

11:24,26; Ga 5:11; 6:12; I Th 1:14-16; II Ti 3:11 -13). Paul does not, however, dwell on the details of the attacks on him by the Jews, as does the Bezan text of Acts, but concentrates instead on the judgement which the perpetrators are liable to incur. This counts against the hypothesis that Paul himself may have been responsible for the extra details in Acts 18, without necessarily disproving it altogether.

If the similarities with Paul's writings are not sufficient to claim that the intensified accounts of Jewish hostility in Codex Bezae are directly from Paul, they can at least be considered to come from someone who was contemporary with Paul and who shared Paul's attitudes towards the Jews. Any evaluation of those attitudes as anti-Judaic¹¹, would need careful definition in the light of the concern expressed by Paul for the salvation of his fellow-Jews, in particular in his letter to the Romans written (as seems likely) from Corinth on a later visit (Ro 10:1; 11:13-14).

The phrase *ἐπιθετες τας χειρας* is a curious one because elsewhere in Acts (indeed in the New Testament) it is only used of the laying on of hands in a beneficial sense, for dedication or receiving the Holy Spirit or healing. In the LXX, it is likewise used in the context of consecration, either of a person or of a sacrificial animal.¹² It is never used of an attack on someone (cf. the expression which is used elsewhere 12:3005; 21:28). No other Greek witnesses share this reading and the versions appear to translate another Greek word (B-L 1987, *ad loc*). The choice of verb may be influenced by the verb of v.10, the intention being to show that although the Jews did attack Paul it was not allowed to lead to harm. There may also be a deliberately ironical note here, suggesting that the action of the laying on of hands was carried out by the Jews for evil not for good, so underlining their wickedness, but the irony is

not typical of Luke in Acts. It is again, however, reminiscent of the irony found in Paul's letters. With Paul in mind, it is plausible that the expression was chosen as a conscious echo of the Old Testament use of the expression for the dedication of sacrifices before they were killed (Ex 29:10; Lev1:4), for the image of sacrifice was precisely one used by Paul of his own death when in prison in Rome (Ph 2:17; II Ti 4:6).

κκτξβῶω is a New Testament hapax but the insistence on the noise made by those opposing Paul is typical of Codex Bezae (16:22,39). Thus, the stereotype of the noisy crowd is more firmly established in that text (cf. 16:17; 17:6,13; 19:28,32,34; 20:1; 21:28) and something of an implicit contrast is created with the theme of silence (when people listen, see Appendix III), again reinforced in the Bezan text.

Verse 13

13/line 2

οὗτος κκτξβῶω D05: κκτξβῶω οὗτος S01/B03

οὗτος placed before the verb brings Paul into an emphatic position and also aligns him more closely with the charge that he acts πρὸς τὸν νόμον .

Verse 14

14/line 5

+ κνδρξ D05: - κνδρξ S01/B03

This form of address is found in many speeches in Acts and is perhaps

added here as a sign of respect which tempers any annoyance indicated by ὤ. An editor who was concerned to downgrade the Jews in his modification of the text would hardly bother to add such a detail (cf. the addition of ἀνδρες in Peter's speech to the Jews 3:17D05).

Verse 15

15/line 1

Ἰητηρικ εχεταιD05: Ἰητηρικα εστιν S01/B03/D05Corr

The D05 reading could have arisen out of the plural subject with a singular verb in the alternative reading (cf. d which retains est but has the singular noun). Whatever the cause, the effect of the verb εχεται is to make the appeal by the Jews for Gallio to intervene even more out of place because it makes the matter their responsibility.

15/line 3

θειω D05: βουλορικ S01/B03

These two verbs came to be interchangeable by the time of the New Testament although θειω is the more common in Koine Greek. If there is any difference in meaning it is that βουλορικ expresses more the idea of a deliberated decision and in that case θειω conveys with less vigour Gallio's refusal to intervene . (A-G; B1-D 5101).

Verse 16

16/line 1

απελυσεν D05: απηλασεν S01/B03

Gallio's annoyance or irritation is once again (cf. v.14) toned down in the Bezan text (Greek side only) so that instead of driving the Jews from the tribunal ἀπελύνω he less forcefully simply sends them away ἀπολύω.

Verse 17

17/line 1

-πολαβουνοι δε παντες οι ελληνες D05
επιλαβουμενα δε παντες -- ----- S01/B03

The point of the verb in D05, meaning 'to take back' or 'to take to one side' (A-G. Cf. Mark 7:33), depends not only on the agents being the Greeks but also on whom exactly they took. The Latin side d has the equivalent of the S01/B03 verb *adpraehedentes* but then reads *eu*, and before Sosthenes *cum* - 'they seized him (presumably Paul) with Sosthenes'. The Greek D05 has no equivalent to *eu* but there is a gap at the beginning of the second line where the missing word has been construed as *μετα* by some scholars.¹³

So far, Paul has been in the hands of the Jews (v.12) and brought by them to the tribunal. If it is Paul who is intended in v.17/line 1, then the sense in D05 seems to be that it is now the Greeks who take over in taking him away from them. If it is Sosthenes who is intended, ἐπιλαμβάνομαι is a more appropriate verb since no situation involving him has been mentioned from which he could be

taken aside.

The next urgent question is: who are the Greeks? It is often assumed that they are the Corinthian bystanders, the pagan Gentile community, already intended by $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ but made more unambiguous by οἱ Ἕλληνας .¹⁴ An important element which must be taken into account in defining the Greeks, or 'all' for that matter, is that the quarrels which are being described in this passage of Acts are quarrels between groups within the synagogue - as Delebecque points out, Gallio has dismissed an internal Jewish dispute not one between different (Jewish and Gentile) communities (Delebecque 1986 *ad loc*). The purpose of this episode is to demonstrate that Gallio would not intervene because the issue was purely a Jewish one: he would have been seriously wrong as Roman proconsul not to intervene had it turned into a Gentile attack on Jews. The Greeks then can be taken to be the Greeks of v.4, adherents of the synagogue if not actually proselytes, and not the Ἕθνη of v.7. If the texts which specify the Greeks are secondary, their authors appear to have understood $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ as drawing together at this point all the members of the synagogue, Jews and Greeks, but they have a reason for limiting the attackers to the Greeks only, those who were not born Jews but who had an interest in Judaism.¹⁵ What their reason was depends on the nature of Sosthenes' offence.

Taking first the reading of $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$, if Sosthenes is the object of the collective anger of all the synagogue, he can be presumed to have become a believer in Jesus, like the other ruler of the synagogue Crispus at v.8, (and possibly be the same Sosthenes as mentioned by Paul in 1 Co 1:1).¹⁶ The other explanation (Epp 1966, p.146) that the synagogue congregation should turn against their leader for the failure of the charges against Paul is highly unlikely; there is no other situation like it in the New Testament. The association of Sosthenes with Paul in the Bezan d text gives support

to the idea that the reason for his punishment was his conversion to Christianity.

It might, at first sight, look rather odd that the Greeks should be the ones to punish Sosthenes, and even Paul with him. In the New Testament it is the Jews who persecute the Christians because they view them as Jews who abandon the Jewish law and teach others to do the same (see e.g. Acts 21:20-25). There is evidence, however, in the writings of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch at the end of the first and the beginning of the second century, of Gentile upholders of Judaism troubling Christian believers for their departure from what they viewed as the inviolable tenets of Judaism.¹⁷ It is understandable that as long as Christianity was considered to be part of Judaism, the abandonment of anything which had previously been held as sacred was bound to cause offence to the very group who had had to make the greatest effort in learning and adopting the Jewish laws - the Gentile converts. Ignatius provides the earliest evidence of judaizing Gentiles criticizing Christians who do not practise the Jewish laws, although there is certainly the potential for such a situation within the church in Galatia in around 50 AD (see Paul's letter to the Galatians). Their emergence and the strength of their attacks were no doubt gradual and possibly only realized locally. Acknowledgement of their existence in the Bezan text of Acts 18:17, if such it is, suggests that the editor was personally familiar with the exact circumstances of the disputes in Corinth.

17/line 4

τ.....ω γαλλιω.....εν D05:

tunc gallio fingebat eum non videre d:

και ουδεν τουτον τω γαλλιωνι εμελεν S01 (εμελλεν)/B03/D05CorrD

The partially erased line in D05 has been completed by a later corrector D to resemble the B03 text (Parker 1992, p.152). Clark (quoted by Metzger 1975, *ad loc*) reconstructs the original as τότε ο γαλλιων προσποιετο μη ιδειν which corresponds to the Latin of d and h ¹⁹ but, apart from the initial τ, this sentence does not correspond to the letters which are visible in the manuscript of Codex Bezae. It is rather the correction of hand D which supplies the sentence from what is already there in the original and this is perhaps the reading which should be taken as original to D05 except for τότε in place of και for which there is space (the corrector's letters being somewhat more spaced out in this line than are those of the original script).

If Gallio turned a blind eye (as in d and h) to the beating of Sosthenes, the implication is that what was happening was wrong and that he should have intervened. As was discussed above, this indeed would be the case if the Corinthian community at large had set upon the Jewish leader.¹⁹ As long as the dispute remained an internal one, Gallio was not obliged to intervene and in saying that 'he took no notice' (S01/B03/D05Corr) the narrator is portraying him simply as maintaining his position outside the quarrel.

Verse 18

18/line 5+6

ΚΕΡΑΜΕΝΟΣ ΤΗΝ ΚΕΦΑΛΗΝ ΕΝ ΚΕΝΧΡΕΙΑΙΣ D05:

ΚΕΙΡΑΜΕΝΟΣ ΕΝ ΚΕΥΧΡΕΑΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΚΕΦΑΛΗΝ S01/B03

ΕΙΧΕΝ ΓΑΡ ΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΗΝ D05:

ΕΙΧΕΝ ΓΑΡ ΕΥΧΗΝ S01/B03

This verse has posed some serious difficulties for commentators (see Haenchen 1971 *ad loc*). The general supposition is that the 'vow' in question is a Nazarite vow, mentioned in the Old Testament in Num 6:1-21; and that it is the same as the vow referred to in Ac 21:23 in connection with the four men whom Paul was asked to accompany to the Temple. Although in the Mishnah (Nazir) various modifications of the instructions in Numbers are explained, there is apparently no information in the extant Jewish literature on the practice of taking a Nazirite vow when far from the Temple and in particular on the conditions which applied in the Diaspora in the first century.

There are several problems with assuming Acts 18:18 to refer to a Nazirite vow. In Num 6, the vow was terminated in the Temple with the cutting of the hair and the offering of sacrifice. It may be that Paul did go to the Temple in Jerusalem after arriving at Caesarea in v.22, an intention which is stated in the Bezan text of v. 21²⁰ but, in the documents available, the cutting of the hair and the sacrifice are all part of the same ritual.

More telling is the fact that the verb used in Num 6 as well as in Ac 21:24 is not the one found here (ξυράω 'to shave' not κείρω 'to shear/cut'). When κείρω is used of people in the LXX it is in the context of repentance or lamentation (e.g. Job 1).

This in turn raises the question of why Paul took a vow at all. In the absence of any explanation, it can be supposed that for the recipients of Acts the reason was clear. Certainly, the issue of the cutting of hair was one discussed by Paul with the Corinthians; in his first letter there are explicit references, using both verbs mentioned above (I Co 11:1-16) and arising in the context of traditions which Paul had delivered to them on his previous visit (I Co 11:2).

There is at present insufficient background information for more inferences to be drawn and for the exact resonances to be defined but the variant reading of D05 provides a reason for leaving the question open should any more information come to light. $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\chi\eta\nu$ in D05 with the meaning of 'prayer' may be an error as is usually supposed. $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\chi\eta$, however, was a common term used in the Diaspora to denote the synagogue, the house of prayer. It is found twice in ch.16 (vv.13+16), and often in inscriptions and in the writings of Josephus and Philo to refer to an actual building (Schürer 1987, pp. 439-45; Trebilco 1991, pp. 133-4; 136-7; 241-2; 249). On this understanding of the word, the verse can be translated 'he cut his hair in Cenchreae for it had a synagogue'.²¹ Since a synagogue would almost certainly be necessary for a ritual cutting of hair, such as that associated with a vow, it is obvious in view of the problems Paul had experienced with the synagogue community in Corinth why he should wait until he was in Cenchreae to take advantage of the existence of a synagogue there. The omission in D05 of any mention of the circumstances of Paul's action implies that the Bezan recipients were even more aware of the reason than were those of the other text; and that, furthermore, they would understand the point of a $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\upsilon\chi\eta$ being mentioned but that they would not necessarily know that there was one in Cenchreae.

This understanding of the Bezan reading is given support in the variation in word order in line 5. The variation is scarcely important on its own: the placing of Cenchreae between *κεραμειος* and *την κεφαλην* as in S01/B03 gives it some prominence which is natural in the sense that the mention of Cenchreae is not anticipated and there is no apparent reason to remove that prominence. On the other hand, the name of the town at the end of the clause in D05, just before the parenthetical clause, enables it to be taken with the verb *εἶχεν* to give the rendering 'for it (Cenchreae) had a synagogue'.

While the possibility of error should not be totally discounted, *προσευχην* is the kind of curious reading which may be illuminated by further exegetical study of other chapters in the Bezan text of Acts.

CONCLUSIONS.

When the variant readings of this section of chapter 18 are considered together, it can be seen how they combine in Codex Bezae to give a fuller picture of the situation in Corinth and in particular of the work of Paul. The picture is confirmed by other variants in the rest of the chapter as well as elsewhere in Acts.

Focus on Paul is seen in such examples as the use of his name vv.2+6, the singular verb in vv.3+19 and the position of *οὗτος* in v.13. His role as apostle to the Gentiles is emphasized by the additional reference to the Greeks (v.4) and their conversion (v.8) and by his stronger rupture with the synagogue (vv.6-7). There is a concern for his impact on the Jews as Jews (v.8). His function as teacher is clearer (v.11), with the stereotyped presentation (vv.4,8) echoing Jesus' ministry and thereby conferring added value on Paul's

own work. The Old Testament nature of the divine calling is seen particularly well in the Bezan version of v.9. The arrival of Silas and Timothy is seen in relation to Paul (v.5, cf. 17:15D05) and there are other indications of the narrator identifying with Paul in the use of ὁ Κύριος at vv.4+8 and the more descriptive verb in the opening verse which gives an insight into his response to the Athenian situation. Paul's intentions and movements are made more explicit in the Bezan text later in the chapter at v.21, as indeed frequently throughout Acts (11:25; 14:7,19; 16:9; 17:15; 20:3-4,15; 21:16).

The fierceness of the persecution of the Jews against Paul comes out more strongly because of the extra detail in Codex Bezae (vv.12+13) and their attacks appear all the more hostile for the way in which Gallio is seen to adopt a more disinterested attitude towards them. The modifications in Gallio's speech resemble the changes found in the exchange between Paul and the Roman tribune in 22:25-28D05 where it was noticed (ch.4, Part B, #II.4) that the conversation in Codex Bezae was more subtly observed.

The incident with the Jews and Gallio (vv.12-17) reveals a certain familiarity with the situation in Corinth, especially of the synagogue. On the interpretation given here of v.17, the Greeks are an integral part of the community and their relationship with Sosthenes is portrayed. The Scriptures are recognized as being of importance in v.6. Paul's departure from Aquila's house is specified in v. 7. More generally, the understanding of the expulsion of the Jews from Rome in v.2 is more nuanced, and Corinth is firmly established as the setting for the attempted trial in v.11.

The clearest evidence for the closer familiarity of Codex Bezae with the situation in Corinth comes at the end of the chapter with the introduction of Apollos (v.24) and the account of how he came to go to Corinth, vv.26-28.

The amount of variation which concurs in this chapter to provide a more detailed and more immediate account of events in Corinth is so diverse that it cannot be dismissed as a narrative technique which has been consciously used by the Bezan editor simply to make the story more interesting. It is rendered the more authentic that it mirrors so well the concerns and teaching of Paul, not least in his letters to the Corinthians. The question as to who could have been responsible for it is considered in the concluding chapter.

NOTES TO CHAPTER TEN.

1. B-L *ad loc* view h as more faithfully representing the Western (and therefore original) text, D05 being a degenerate form throughout much of this chapter, as indeed elsewhere in Acts. Ropes (1926) on this chapter shares the view that h is an older witness than D05 to the type of text that they display.
2. The matching up of the account in Acts of Paul's journeys and that which can be pieced together from his letters is notoriously beset with problems and the results of those who have attempted it tend to diverge on specific details at certain points. For a generally meticulous reconstruction which points out the discrepancies and the various possibilities where there is uncertainty see Bruce 1977, especially pp.248-79, and more recently Hemer 1989, pp.244-76. Boismard-Lamouille (1990) reject any attempt at reconciling the two accounts since they view Acts as a literary re-arrangement of the sources.
3. See Winer 1882, pp.137 for examples.
4. K ϵ is also read for k κ l̄ at 4:15 and 20:16. Scrivener cites K ϵ at 18:2 as a harsh itacism (1978, p.lxvi) but finds on the whole that there are fewer itacisms in D05 than in S01.
5. B-L *ad loc* erroneously show d as reading the singular.
6. This practice could be considered alongside a study of the practice in the different Gospels with regard to Jesus and the disciples, such as that made by Turner C.H. 1925 (1993, pp. 36-52).
7. Nigel Turner (1976) describes Mark's style as 'iconographic' saying 'Theologically and linguistically all is predetermined, nothing left to human device, all conforming to an iconographic pattern' (p.27).
8. For detailed discussion see Epp 1966, pp.87,93.
9. Cf. Epp 1966, p.92 and Metzger 1975, p. 462 who argue (following Bruce 1954) that the Bezan editor has missed the point in saying that Paul left Aquila's house.
10. See Levinsohn 1992, pp.17-8, on the fronting of participants to signal a new episode.
11. Epp (1966) demonstrates from numerous passages how the persecution of the apostles by the Jews is presented as particularly violent in the Bezan text and offers it as evidence of the text being deliberately modified to express anti-Judaic sentiments - see ch.2 especially pp.167-8 on 18:12-13.
12. The exact significance of the laying on of hands in the Old Testament is a matter of debate. Sansom 1982-3 argues that when it occurs in preparation for sacrifice, all the uses of the gesture cannot be explained as transference of guilt, as is commonly assumed, but that in some cases it is a means of self-identification of the donor with the sacrifice. He also points out one use of the term 'laying on of hands' in Lev 24 for the passing of sentence upon a blasphemer. The points raised in this discussion could well be of relevance for deciding the meaning of the reference in Ac 18:12D05.

13. Scrivener 1978, p.445, col.2. Ussher's $\sigma\kappa\nu$ does not appear to make sense.

14. Bruce 1977, p.254; Epp 1966, p.147; Marshall 1980, p.299; Metzger 1975 *ad loc.*

15. Old Latin h omits 'all' (B-L *ad loc.*), an indication that $\sigma\iota$ $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ has indeed at some stage replaced $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ rather than being added to it. Delebecque's suggestion (1986, p.366) that $\sigma\iota$ $\epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\nu\epsilon\varsigma$ means the Greek-speaking Jews is to overlook the fact that in the Diaspora Greek would be the normal language for Jews and that there was a term $\sigma\iota$ $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\eta\nu\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ for Greek-speaking Jews cf. $\delta:1$; $11:20B03/D05Corr.$

16. The exact role and authority of the $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\iota\sigma\upsilon\nu\acute{\kappa}\omega\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ has been the subject of some debate but there is good reason to suppose that, if he did not exercise spiritual leadership, yet the title was more than honorific, see Burtchael 1992, pp.240-44.

17. For a discussion of Ignatius' comments on the subject see Barrett 1976, especially pp. 230-44; Trebilco 1991, pp.27-9.

18. Cf. B-L's discussion on this reconstruction *ad loc.*

19. Epp 1966, p.148 interprets the Western reading in this way, taking it to mean that Gallio condoned rough treatment of the Jews whereas he was inclined to protect Paul. He takes it as evidence of a general tendency of the Western text to portray the Romans as more sympathetic to Christianity than were the Jews. His reasoning does not hold for Codex Bezae if a) the Greeks are adherents of the synagogue b) D05 does not have Gallio pretending not to see.

20. Boismard-Lamouille 1990, pp.252-3, have a complicated solution which involves seeing Ac 19+20 as an interpolation and the visit to Jerusalem in chapter 21 as the one corresponding to the termination of the vow of chapter 18.

21. The use of $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\omega$ with a town or city to mean that it possessed something occurs elsewhere in the New Testament, cf. Heb 11:10; Rev 21:14.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The analyses of extended portions of the Bezan text demonstrate the importance of taking variant readings together rather than in isolation. Considering them in this way often enables clearer justification for their existence to be given and also enables the significance of some of the variants to be better understood than when they are considered individually.

The picture of the Bezan editor which was obtained from the linguistic chapters in Section II, as a careful and knowledgeable reviser who had a specific purpose in mind, is amply confirmed by the exegetical studies. The evidence for his identity as a Jewish Christian is strong. His intention in producing his version of Acts emerges quite specifically as one of bringing out the continuity between Judaism and Christianity for the benefit of a Jewish audience.

A Secondary Text.

The text of Codex Bezae in Acts does not look as if it represents the original text. On the contrary, there are numerous indications that it is a rewriting of the original version for the purpose just mentioned. That in no way, however, detracts from its value. It provides a clear example of how much interpretation plays a part in historical narrative, however accurate a representation of history that narrative may intend to be. Narrative has been effectively described as a 'remaking of reality' (p.60, Lategan and

Vorster 1985) and it is evident, when the notion of the book of Acts as an objective, detached and factual account is seen as an illusion, that variation in the text is not only inevitable but a source of enrichment. Textual fluidity, far from testifying to error, carelessness and destructive alteration of the original form is, on the contrary, an acceptable sign of the text's development as a living witness to a thriving community. 'Narratives are not merely windows, nor are they purely mirrors: they are both' (p. 61 *ibid*) - the Bezan text of Acts could be said to provide more of both than the Alexandrian text in so far as it allows the modern reader to understand more of the spirit of the early Christian community at the same time as to learn new information.

A Jewish-Christian Text.

The indications of the Jewish identity of the Bezan editor and his audience are several. There is a preoccupation apparent in many variant readings with Jewish history, people, teaching and traditions; the problem to do with how the Church relates to such a background is viewed from a Jewish perspective, from an insider point of view. There are additional references or, more discreetly, allusions to passages of the Old Testament. Some of these relate to targumic texts and there are, too, some features which are not direct references but which are very similar in their emphasis to the teaching of the targums. The use of certain exegetical methods resembles practices which are found in the Old Testament, especially the prophetic books, and also in the New Testament writings of Paul.

In a variety of ways, the Bezan text appears to make use of the book of Acts as a conscious extension of the prophetic tradition.

On the one hand, it reveals a clear understanding of how the events and teachings concerning Jesus and the Church were a fulfilment of that tradition in the Jewish Scriptures: the appropriate use of *κύριος* and the Holy Spirit, or the emphasis on the work of God in the new movement. It sometimes goes further than that to display an awareness of contributing, in itself as a written document, to the prolongation of the Scriptural tradition. This aspect of self-awareness is seen particularly in chapter 12; it is also reflected, in the passages examined, in the stylized and repetitive use of language which echoes that of the Old Testament, or of the liturgy or, on occasions, of the Gospels.

The insistence on the way in which the the Church is an outworking of prophecy is further demonstrated by a heightened emphasis in the presentation of Paul as a teacher appointed by God. Paul is a more familiar figure in the Bezan text than in the Alexandrian text; he is, in addition, one with increased authority and responsibility.

The focus on Paul is one of the signs that the milieu of origin of this text is to be sought for in the Diaspora. Other factors tend to point in the same direction - the emphasis on the reading and exposition of Scripture or the ease with which Jerusalem is viewed from beyond the confines of the city.

Some preoccupations displayed by the Bezan text are not necessarily associated with the mainline teachings of Judaism. There is, for example, a certain interest in Egypt (Acts 7) and an exceptional understanding of the book of Ezekiel (Acts 12).

In so far as the Jewish background to Codex Bezae in Acts would seem to be confirmed by this study of its text, it could be profitable to re-open the debate on the presence of Semitisms, taking account, in the description both of the Greek and also of the Semitic

languages, of the linguistic developments of discourse analysis.

A Hidden Text.

At times, the allusions to the Jewish Scriptures or teachings seem to be almost concealed. That is possibly due in part to the present separation in time and culture from the original setting of the text. Compared with the Alexandrian text, there is undoubtedly in the Bezan text a rich texture of resonances and associations of which only a proportion can be captured by a modern reader, especially a non-Jewish one. The fact that the references to the Jewish background were not made more explicitly could simply reflect the fact that no more overt statement was necessary because writer and addressees belonged to the same circle with a common understanding.

In part, too, the concealment could be intentional. From a literary point of view, double meanings and undertones are a device of irony used to heighten the interest of a narrative, a device which has been noticed in some Gospel texts (Camery-Hoggatt 1992). From a theological point of view, there could also be the motive of allowing only 'those with ears to hear' to understand. Amphoux has put forward the suggestion that the text of Codex Bezae, in the Gospels as in Acts, is deliberately coded in order to be accessible only to an informed elite of initiates (Vaganay-Amphoux 1991, pp.95-7). Without necessarily endorsing that interpretation in all its implications, there does seem to be some element of a theological motive in not spelling out some of the allusions and in keeping them from the general understanding.

The religious connotations and implications of the text impose on the reader a close familiarity with the social and cultural, as well as religious, context in which it was formed in order to grasp its meaning. In the words of the Jewish scholar, Jacob Neusner:

'Even though, through philology, we understand every word of a text, and through history, we know just what happened in the event or time to which the text testifies, we still do not understand the text. A religious text serves not merely the purposes of philology or history. it demands its proper place as a statement of religion. Read as anything but a statement of religion it is misunderstood' (1983, p.143).

The Author of the Text.

On a number of occasions, in the exegetical studies especially, it has been natural to ask if Paul may have been the person responsible for the Bezan text of Acts. The additional details concerning him and his teaching, the close knowledge of Jewish traditions and history, the points of view apparent in Codex Bezae which mirror those of Paul in his letters, the authority with which the prophecy of Ezekiel is reinterpreted, all of these things (together with indications in the studies of Delebecque (1986) that some of the language is typically Pauline) combine to point to Paul as author.

On the other hand, other factors count against such a conclusion. The theme of persecution by the Jews, although present in Paul's writings, is developed with a precision of detail which is not

like Paul. The use of the names of Jesus in the Bezan text of Acts bears some similarities to that found in the writings of Paul but insufficient to signify the same author. Paul's concerns with the Gentiles and the reproach of the Jews are strongly conveyed but other Pauline themes, such as the role of the law, are not affected. Several New Testament scholars have contended that Paul of the Epistles is unlike the portrayal of Paul in Acts.¹ If Paul were responsible for the writing of the Bezan version of Acts, it could be expected that the differences which have been pointed out, especially with regards to the teaching on the law, would have been eliminated or, at least, diminished. Finally, the Bezan version of Acts 12 tends to indicate a date after 70 AD for its writing by which time nothing is known of Paul.

In the absence of firm evidence at present for any named author, the profile which has been formed so far can be summarized thus: the author was in all probability a Jewish-Christian, of the time and circle of Paul, familiar with his movements, his thoughts and his authority in the Church. At the same time, he seems to have been acquainted with Peter and the circle of the church in Jerusalem whilst being himself of the Diaspora². He had particular contact with churches where there was a strong Jewish-Christian element and was active among them after the departure of Paul for Rome.

The Alexandrian Text.

All the way through the different types of analysis carried out in this thesis, it has emerged that the Bezan and the Alexandrian texts do not look as if they are dependent on each other. Rather they are separate developments of the original form of the text, the one in a Jewish-Christian milieu, the other in a milieu with little awareness of the Jewish background to the text.

Several factors can be identified which make the Alexandrian text unlikely to represent the original form: the linguistically inconsistent use of such elements as the definite article before names of people or certain connectives; the later rather than earlier (compared with Bezae) form of certain prepositions and augments; the distance apparent in a variety of ways of the Alexandrian text from the characters in the story of Acts (Peter, Paul, Jesus); the apparent removal (by omission or correction) of small details in the original text which reflect a Jewish background but whose relevance or significance were not recognized.

The Date of the Text.

In so far as the main feature of the Bezan text is the interest in and focus on Jewish concerns, the question is raised as to whether the Bezan text could be associated with a second-century community like the Quartodecimans with their concern to maintain Jewish traditions (see ch.9 on Acts 12). However, there are some factors which count against a second-century date for the creation of the text.

These are linguistic factors such as the conformity of the

language of the Bezan variants to the usual style of the text (usual, that is, at places where there are no variant readings between S01, B03 and D05); the similarities with the Gospel of Mark in the use of stereotyped expressions; and the early rather than late (in the development of Koine Greek) pattern of the use of prepositions. These are features which are too much an integral part of the language of the text (unlike, for example, vocabulary) to be deliberately introduced at a later date in imitation of a first-century text.

There is, in addition, an absence of second-century concerns which characterize many of the Christian writings of the early Church Fathers. There are no signs of dispute over heretical or esoteric doctrines, for example or, indeed, of any contention beyond those which are visible in the non-Bezan text of Acts.

On the other hand, there are factors, especially the use of certain terms for the Holy Spirit and God/Jesus, which point to a church setting which has had the time to adopt its own formulae and develop its own liturgy, but as an extension of older Jewish practices rather than as something radically new. It is possible that the text of Codex Bezae as it stands today contains strands from two different dates, the latter perhaps belonging to a conservative Jewish-Christian community like the Quartodecimans. This means that it essentially transmits an early version of Acts which was the work of Christians of Jewish origin and which came into the hands of a later Christian community who continued to be familiar with Jewish oral and written traditions.

A dating of pronunciation and orthographical tendencies might enable approximations such as 'early' and 'late' to be more precisely defined.


The Original Text.

It has been a contention of this thesis that the original text of Acts is not of superior value in itself. The interest of searching for the text of which Codex Bezae is a revision is that it, too, can have something to say about the character and concerns of the early Church.

The quest for the original text of Acts is rendered a little more complicated by taking Codex Bezae as it now stands to be a second version of an early rewriting, but at the same time the path is clearer than it would be in trying to accommodate all the factors to one date. The secondary development reflected by the current Bezan text can be fairly easily distinguished and put to one side and 'proto-Bezae' becomes the working text³.

It would be instructive to examine in detail the text of Acts in the manuscripts which are more like the Bezan text than is the Alexandrian text, in particular the Greek Codex Laudianus, the Coptic G⁴⁷, the Syro-Palestinian and, in different places, some of the Old Latin manuscripts. The goal of that examination would be to look for a text which has understood and preserved the Jewish allusions better than the Alexandrian manuscripts but without the developments of Codex Bezae. It could be surmized that such a text is likely to be the closest one to the original.

The following schema summarizes the conclusions suggested by the analyses of this thesis:



(The line between the original and S01/B03 is broken because a closer examination specifically of the latter text would be needed to establish if its link with the original were as direct as this study suggests existed for 'proto-Bezae'.)

The Next Step.

Many questions are raised by the findings of the thesis which cannot be answered within the scope of the present work. An indispensable next step for the investigation of those issues would be the exegetical study of the whole of the Bezan text of Acts, comparing it variant by variant with the Alexandrian text, and also that of the versions as described above. Such a study would draw on the discourse studies of Section II as well as on additional discourse investigations, as suggested in the Conclusions to that Section. Given the clues provided by the examination of the three passages selected here, it is very probable that further exhaustive examination of the complete text would yield more clues which would allow more definitive statements to be made.

NOTES TO THE GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.

1. For this debate see Achtemeier 1986; Bruce 1976; Vielhauer 1968.
2. Boismard and Lamouille (1990, I, p.21) have advanced the hypothesis that the author of the 'Western' text was Silas - as a companion of Paul, he would match the description given here except that Silas was from Jerusalem (15:22) which is not the picture of the Bezan author obtained from this study.
3. Cf. the history of the text before 200 AD reconstructed by Amphoux (Vaganay-Amphoux 1991, pp.91-7). Amphoux posits the theory that the 'Western' text (essentially Codex Bezae and some of the earliest versions) existed, in a highly coded and Jewish-Christian form, up to 135 AD. He bases his reconstruction of the history of the text on his understanding that after the Bar-Kokhba revolt, the rupture of Christianity with Judaism was complete and all traces of Jewish concerns were eliminated from the New Testament text in the recensions which followed the split.

APPENDIX I

The Distribution of Variant Readings Between D05 and S01/B03.

A numerical count of the variant words and their classification.

The number of variant words in Codex Bezae were counted for each chapter and classified according to the four categories. The few words (about 5 a chapter on average) where only S01 or B03 diverges from D05 were included in the count.

Chart 1 shows the number of words in each category for the whole manuscript and expresses each of the four totals as a percentage of all the variation combined.

Chart 2a takes the same information as Chart 1 and shows what percentage of the combined variation is represented by the four types in each chapter.

Chart 2b and 2c separate out the variation in speech from the variation in narrative.

Chart 2d displays the additional and alternative categories of Chart 2a in graph form.

Chart 3a compares the total amount of variation in each chapter by calculating the number of variant words per 100 lines

Chart 3b takes the same information as Chart 3a and separates out the variation in speech from the variation in narrative.

Chart 4 compares the amount of word order variation in each chapter.

The results of themselves do not prove to be conclusive, with apparently few consistent factors affecting variation. Although some patterns can be discerned, they are not sufficiently informative to warrant more detailed or more precise calculations to be undertaken. One problem is that analysis by chapter does not allow the uneven distribution of variation within a chapter to show up. Furthermore, when the text itself is analyzed it becomes apparent that it is not necessarily the amount of variation which is interesting but rather the nature of it (Peter's speech in chapter 1, for example, has little variation of any kind but that which it has is of much significance - see ch.8 on Ac 1:15-26). There is a usefulness in reproducing them here, however, in order to avoid the making of false statements about the nature of the Bezan variation based on inexact or partial information.

CHART 1

Number of variant words in each category.

<u>Addition</u>	<u>Alternative</u>	<u>Word Order</u>	<u>Omission</u>	<u>Total</u>
1442	1387	263	596	3688
39.1%	37.6%	7.1%	16.2%	100%

Comments.

The highest proportion of variation is accounted for by additional words but there is almost as much in the form of alternative words.

Word order variation is comparatively small but cannot be ignored, for, as the study on word order variation (ch.3) demonstrates, the reasons for its occurrence are important.

Words omitted by Codex Bezae represent a perhaps surprising proportion of variation. Roughly for every three words added, one is omitted. Omission in speech accounts for well over half of the omitted words even though variation overall in speech is less than for narrative (cf. Chart 3b).

A comparison of the lengths of the Alexandrian and the Western texts undertaken by Kenyon (quoted by Metzger 1975, p.260), using the Westcott-Hort text and that of A.C.Clark respectively, produced the finding that the Western text was about 8.5% longer than the other text (about 1,500 words). Allowing for the fact that Clark's text is not exclusively that of Codex Bezae and that his 'Western' text included all 28 chapters of Acts, the figures correspond roughly to the figures of the additional less the omitted material cited above. The situation of the two texts is rather more complex, however, than one which can be reduced to a simple comparison of length because of the other types of variation involved. The use of the terms 'shorter' and 'longer' to describe the two texts is consequently somewhat misleading although it can be convenient when referring to specific variation units.

CHART 2

Proportion of types of variation, expressed as a percentage of the total number of variant words in each chapter.

2a) Speech and narrative combined

Chapter	Addition	Alternative	Word Order	Omission
1	39.5	35.5	7.9	17.1
2	27.6	35.5	8.2	28.6
3	42.2	35.6	5.9	16.3
4	35.4	38.0	6.6	20.0
5	42.8	31.2	11.7	14.3
6	58.6	28.0	6.1	7.3
7	31.2	50.0	6.0	12.8
8	37.0	38.5	7.0	17.5
9	----	----	----	----
10	39.4	38.8	9.0	12.8
11	42.2	36.2	3.6	18.0
12	43.6	35.9	11.1	9.4
13	44.8	35.5	4.4	15.3
14	47.0	34.8	5.5	12.7
15	53.1	29.6	7.1	10.2
16	45.9	32.7	6.8	14.6
17	28.6	39.0	10.5	21.9
18	50.7	25.3	8.9	15.1
19	36.6	41.9	6.0	15.5
20	31.3	49.0	4.5	15.2
21	26.0	47.4	4.0	22.6
22	14.0	57.0	9.7	19.3

2b) Speech


Chapter	Addition	Alternative	Word Order	Omission
1	53.1	28.1	3.1	15.7
2	17.0	36.0	10.0	37.0
3	40.6	42.2	4.7	12.5
4	28.9	35.6	8.9	26.6
5	41.5	28.1	12.4	18.0
6	21.4	35.7	28.6	14.3
7	30.4	50.5	5.8	13.3
8	36.4	45.5	4.5	13.3
9	----	----	----	----
10	37.9	41.0	9.5	11.6
11	31.9	31.9	2.2	34.0
12	0.0	77.8	11.1	11.1
13	42.9	30.9	6.7	19.5
14	51.6	35.4	6.5	6.5
15	45.6	31.1	12.2	11.1
16	56.5	34.8	2.2	6.5
17	16.4	52.0	6.9	24.7
18	50.0	41.0	4.5	4.5
19	25.0	48.4	9.4	17.2
20	31.1	50.0	6.7	12.2
21	36.6	40.8	0.0	22.6
22	12.5	54.7	14.0	18.8

2c) Narrative

Chapter	Addition	Alternative	Word Order	Omission
1	29.5	40.9	11.4	18.2
2	37.7	34.9	6.6	20.7
3	43.7	29.6	7.0	19.7
4	38.1	39.1	5.7	17.1
5	44.0	34.0	11.0	11.0
6	66.2	26.5	1.5	5.8
7	38.5	46.1	7.7	7.7
8	36.5	36.5	7.9	19.1
9	-----	-----	-----	-----
10	41.5	35.7	8.5	14.3
11	46.2	37.8	4.2	11.8
12	47.2	32.4	11.1	9.3
13	47.5	42.4	1.0	9.1
14	46.0	34.7	5.3	14.0
15	58.1	28.7	3.7	9.5
16	43.6	32.2	8.5	15.7
17	36.0	33.1	10.3	20.6
18	50.7	23.6	9.4	16.3
19	40.3	39.8	5.0	14.9
20	31.5	48.1	2.8	17.6
21	18.6	52.0	6.8	22.6
22	17.3	62.0	0.0	20.7

Chart
2d.

Proportion of additional and alternative words
expressed as a percentage of the total variation
in each chapter.



lacunae:
8:29-10:14

lacunae:
21:2-10, 16-18;
22:21-20;
22:29 - end of book.

CHARTS 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d.

The information is the same as for Chart 1, in that the number of variant words in the different categories of variation are calculated as a percentage of the total number of variant words, but here the results are broken down for each chapter and subsequently separated further into speech and narrative.

Comments.

Generally in narrative there is more additional material than alternative material. In speech, the contrary pattern prevails. Speech also has a considerable amount of omission in some chapters (2,4,11,17,21). There does not appear to be a consistent reason for this feature, the speeches in question being of a varied nature.


The fluctuation in the additional material is usually in indirect relation to that in the alternative material, notably in the last four extant chapters of D05. In those, there is a marked decrease in the number of additional words especially in chapters 21+22 and a correspondingly large increase in the number of alternative words. This can be seen clearly on the graph 2d. The phenomenon may well have something to do with the subject matter of the latter chapters which move on from Paul's missionary activities to focus on his journey to Jerusalem and his relations with the churches. This change in the pattern of variation would need to be taken into account when calculating the number of leaves which were taken up by the missing end chapters of Codex Bezae. If there continued to be a drop in the amount of additional material, Parker's calculations and his suggestion that 'the end was very compressed' (1992, p.8) are justified.

Chart

Comparison of amount of variation by chapters.

3a

Variant words
per 100
lines



Chapter

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

lacunae:
8:29-10:14


21:2-10, 16-18;
22:2-20;
22:29-end of book.

Chart 3b

Amount of variation in narrative compared with speech

Variation
words per
100 lines.

250
240
230
220
210
200
190
180
170
160
150
140
130
120
110
100
90
80
70
60
50
40
30
20
10



Narrative.

Speech.

lacunae:

*a 8:29-10:14

*b 21:1-10, 16-18;

22: 2-20

22: 29-end of book

Chapter 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 *a 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 *b

CHART 3a.

Comparison of the amount of variation by chapters.

Comments.

As the chapters are of unequal length (and in the case of chapters 8, 10, 21, 22 are incomplete), the chapters were first normalized by counting the number of extant lines in each chapter and then calculating the proportion of variation per 100 lines.

Chapter 1 shows relatively little variation which is possibly accounted for by the introductory nature of much of the chapter. There is a marked increase in the amount of variation firstly at chapter 11 but especially after chapter 14; there is a decrease in chapters 20-22. In terms of content, the increase in variation corresponds to the movements of Peter and Paul in chapter 11 and to Paul's journeys in chapters 14-19. The peak in chapter 19 is largely due to the differences in the account of the Jewish exorcists at Ephesus.

CHART 3b.

Amount of variation in narrative compared with speech.

Comments.

For each chapter, the separate lengths of the speech sections and the narrative sections continued to be normalized and the variation calculated per 100 lines.


There is markedly more variation in the narrative passages than in the speech portions of the text, except in chapters 5,7,8,13. In chapters 7+13, the speeches take up the greater part of the chapter which partially accounts for the higher figure in those cases, but only partially because the comparisons between speech and narrative in this chart are based on the number of variant readings for 100 lines of speech and narrative respectively for each chapter. In chapter 5, there are several key speeches of a varied nature (Peter and Ananias, Peter and Sapphira, Peter and the Sanhedrin, Gamaliel and the Sanhedrin) and the particular Bezan form of those speeches is a matter of some interest. In the extant verses of chapter 8, there is relatively little speech (Simon Magus to Peter, the angel to Philip) with a large amount of variation (and potentially even more if the text of Codex Bezae for vv.29-39 resembled other Western witnesses for the conversation between Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch!). It is worth noting that after chapter 13 the speeches of Paul do not contain as much variation as the speeches in the first part of Acts. It is the narrative for the later chapters which have an increased amount of variation.

Chart

Distribution of variation units involving word order.

4

Variation
units per
100 lines



Chapter

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

lacunae:
8:29-10:14

lacunae:
21:2-10; 16-18;
22:2-20;
22:29 - end of book.

CHART 4.

Distribution of variation units involving word order.

Comments.

In narrowing the study down to a detailed examination of word order variation on its own, it is more meaningful to consider each occurrence of word order variation as one unit regardless of how many words are affected on any one occasion. This is because it is not so much the number of words involved which is important but rather the frequency with which this type of variation occurs in each chapter. In order to evaluate the significance in the differing amounts of variation in each chapter, a comparison would need to be made of the factors prompting the changes in word order in the different chapters. Such a comparison could be possible once all the instances of variant readings involving word order have been examined and accounted for. (In this thesis, only those variants which do not affect the verb are considered in detail).

APPENDIX II

Grammatical Points.

This Appendix contains information on linguistic matters which arise several times in the course of the exegetical chapters but which are not covered in the linguistic analyses. They are potentially useful topics for further study.

I. GENITIVE ABSOLUTE

As an alternative reading in D05: 1:9; 2:1,15; 10:25; 13:6; 18:26 (error); 21:27.

As an alternative reading in S01/B03: 12:13; 14:20. On both occasions, D05 reads a nominative plural participle in error.

As an additional reading in D05: 3:11; 4:18; 11:27; 12:1; 15:11; 18:6,27; 19:1; 20:4,12,18.

II. NOMINATIVE PARTICIPLE

1. pre-verb

As an alternative reading in D05: 4:3; 5:21,26; 8:2,9,26,28; 10:15,34; 12:16; 13:4; 14:3,4; 16:4,30,36; 19:2; 21:1,37,40. At these places, S01/B03 has a main verb except at 10:15 (noun) and 19:2 (infinitive).

As an alternative reading in S01/B03: 5:29; 8:9; 15:7; 16:30; 17:34 (D05 error); 19:21. At these places, D05 has a main verb except at 19:21 (infinitive).

As an additional reading in D05: 2:23; 3:3; 4:23; 5:10,21,22; 10:25(x2); 11:25(x3); 12:23(x2); 13:27(x2); 15:24; 16:1,9,35,36; 18:4(x2),12,26(x2),27; 19:14,28; 20:15.

2. post verb

As an additional reading in D05: 3:8; 5:38; 6:10,15; 7:60; 8:19; 10:30,33; 11:2(x2),25; 13:46; 14:4,9,25; 15:29,38,41; 16:4,22,30,39 (x3); 17:6,19; 18:8,12,13,28; 19:14(x2); 21:39.

III. ASYNDETON.

The alternative readings are given in brackets.

1. in speech

As an alternative reading in D05: 2:14(καί), 17(καί); 4:17(αλλά); 5:28(καί); 6:3(δέ); 7:15(καί S01/δέ B03), 21(καί); 8:21(γάρ); 11:9(δέ), 12(δέ); 22:26(γάρ).

As an alternative reading in S01/B03: 7:34(καί γάρ); 10:36,37(γάρ x2); 15:16(δέ).

2. in narrative

As an alternative reading in D05: 2:5 (δε), 43 (δε); 8:2 (δε); 14:19 (δε); 17:2 (καί); 19:19 x2 (δε, καί); 20:3 (δε), 7 (τε).

As an alternative reading in S01/B03: 1:7 (καί); 8:1S01 (δε).

IV. PARTICIPANT REFERENCE.

The details assembled here all concern different aspects of the ways in which characters are referred to in Acts.

The means by which participants in a narrative are referred to play an important role in the telling of a story and make a large contribution to the overall cohesion of a text. Different languages have different patterns and rules for referring to participants and, in particular, equivalence between Greek and English should not be sought for.

There is a variety of devices available in Koine Greek to 'track' participants, from minimal reference (a verb, for example) to maximal reference (a name with a title, for example). Reference can be by means of such other things as a pronoun or a noun, a description or a proper name, a participle in the nominative or the genitive. It is even possible for reference to a participant to be omitted altogether, as when the person is the indirect object of a verb of speaking or giving, for example.

In order to ascertain the function and effect of each of the devices used in the narrative of Acts, a full analysis of the overall picture would be essential, using the variant readings to assist and clarify the definitions. The problems involved in the tracking of participants are linked to those to do with determining the structure of the book.

There are many variant readings associated with the way in which participants are referred to. The two most common affect the use of the proper name, and the use of the pronoun.

1. Additional proper name

D05

S01/B03

Stephen 7:1

Abraham 7:4

Peter 10:23; 12:7

12:16

Paul 13:44; 14:7,9;

17:13; 21:37; 22:25

15:2; 17:15; 18:2,6;

19:8,9,14; 21:12,35

It is usually thought that the central character of a narrative is minimally referred to and that full references to characters occur for two reasons (Levinsohn 1992, ch.8):

- a) to mark the beginning of a new episode
- b) as part of the highlighting of climactic key elements, especially speeches

Codex Bezae shows a tendency to refer to main characters, especially Paul, more frequently by name than in the Alexandrian text. At the same time, the Bezan text displays signs of being more conscious of the central role of these characters. An initial examination of the supplementary occurrences of proper names in D05 indicates that there is a tendency to use the name after the introduction of, or interaction with, secondary characters; the effect seems to be to maintain the focus on the central character. Concurrently, it can be said that there is a tendency not to use the name before speech (21:37; 22:25). This latter feature is in keeping with the pattern discerned in the use of the definite article before proper names (Heimerdinger-Levinsohn 1992).

2. Additional pronoun

D05 - 77 times
S01/B03 - 25 times

These figures in themselves do not say much because they do not differentiate between the different reasons for the presence or the absence of a pronoun. The references would need to be divided into the various types; for example, D05 often (but not always) uses a pronoun to indicate the addressee of speech or the possessor where the other text does not.

3. The spelling of John

The significance of the variation, which is also present in the Gospels (Blass 1898, cited by Parker 1985, p.267), has not been assessed in this thesis. In the S01/B03 text, ἰω^κκ^νν^ς is always spelt with a double middle consonant. Variation occurs in Codex Bezae as follows:

Single consonant: 3:1,3,4,11; 4:13; 10:37; 12:12,25; 13:13,24; 15:37.
Double consonant: 11:16; 13:5.

APPENDIX III

Theological Themes.

This Appendix brings together and summarizes information on themes which recur in Acts and which are of particular importance in Codex Bezae.

I. LISTENING/HEARING AND SILENCE

Codex Bezae accentuates the themes of 'listening', 'hearing' and 'silence' by the use of additional references or the re-wording of existing ones. Since no explicit explanation is given, it can be surmised that the themes were familiar ones to the audience of the Bezan text and that their significance would be clear to them from the teaching which they knew concerning the Old Testament. As far as Acts is concerned, the idea of listening, to a prophet from God or to the message he announces, seems to derive from teaching associated with Moses' words about a prophet who will follow him (Dt.18:15), for it is first introduced into Peter's speech (3:21) and is taken up in the Bezan text by Stephen (7:36). Thereafter, it is generally mentioned with reference to Paul and to his proclamation of 'the word'.

'Silence' is not unnaturally found in association with listening and hearing in Acts, either as preparation for a speech or in response to it. Yet, for all its obvious connection with listening to prophecy, silence is not an explicit theme in the Old Testament. The one place where it is commanded may, however, be significant. In Habakkuk 2:20, after an account of those who make idols in order to receive revelations from them, the prophet says:

'But the Lord is in his holy temple;
let all the earth keep silence before him'.

The presence of God in the Temple is specifically a sign of the arrival of the Messiah. It could well be that by the first century AD this text was assimilated with the coming of Jesus as the Messiah and that those who spoke of the gospel concerning him were seen as speaking on his behalf. Silence, then, would be expected as an appropriate response to those who listened to them.

Variant readings which accentuate the themes in Codex Bezae:

1. Listening/hearing

2:37; 3:22; 4:24;
7:37,54; 8:5; 10:33;
13:8,44; 18:26

2. Silence

12:17; 13:41; 15:11;
18:9; 21:14,40; 22:2

II. THE PEOPLE OF GOD AND 'THE REST'

The word $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\omicron\varsigma$ is often used in the New Testament to designate the People of God. The word refers primarily to Israel (e.g. Mt 2:6; Lk 1:68; 2:32; 7:16; Ro 15:10; Hb 11:25, and in Acts as discussed below) and by extension to Christians (e.g. Ac 15:14; 18:10; Ro 9:25; Hb 4:9; I Pt 2:10; Rv 18:4). In many instances, the application of the term to Christians is derived explicitly from an Old Testament prophecy which speaks of God taking a people for himself from among

the Gentiles (e.g. Hos 2:25).

In the Book of Acts, λαός appears as a semi-technical term to designate the People of God and is found more frequently there in that sense than in any other book of the New Testament. There is, however, a noticeable hesitation on the part of the Bezan text to use λαός with reference to the Jewish people, as if the editor were reluctant to continue to apply the name to them after the emergence of the Church as the People of God. The question requires an examination in depth in order to define precisely the point of view of Codex Bezae, for the elimination of λαός when it refers to Israel is far from systematic. The variation concerning the word functions in conjunction with other neighbouring variation and therefore needs to be studied in its context and to be accompanied by a thorough exegesis of the passages in which it occurs. What can, nevertheless, be said even without further investigation is that although the withdrawal of the term λαός from the Jews looks like an explicit favouring of the Gentiles, it is unlikely to be an expression of anti-Jewish hostility on the part of Gentile Christians. It is more likely to be the work of Jewish Christians because they were closely familiar with the connotations of the word with reference to Israel and because they were the more sensitive therefore to its new scope of meaning. It is not so much that the amendment is designed to denigrate the Jews as such but rather to reinforce the idea that the People of God is now the Church, comprising both Jews and Gentiles. This is precisely the point of James in Ac 15:14-15 and of Paul in Ro 9:24-5 and 15:10.

There is a very interesting detail in the Bezan variants which adds to the impression that the difficulty with λαός was a Jewish rather than a Gentile one. A term sometimes used in the New Testament to refer to Gentiles is οἱ λοιποί (Eph 2:3; 4:17; I Th 4:13. Cf. Lk 8:10; 18:9). There are 3 occasions of variant reading involving οἱ λοιποί, one of which at 5:13 also involves ὁ λαός. The significance of the Bezan reading at 5:13 is not obvious except when οἱ λοιποί is understood as referring to the Gentiles. The purpose of the Bezan reading at the other two places is less clear but the three variants taken together are strongly suggestive of a Bezan sensitivity to the phrase which it would be valuable to explore further.

Variant readings

1. ὁ λαός

3:11,12; 4:8,17; 5:13;
21:35,36,40

2. οἱ λοιποί

2:37; 5:13; 16:30

BIBLIOGRAPHY of WORKS CITED and SOURCES CONSULTED.

- Achtemeier P.J. 'An Elusive Unity: Paul, Acts and the Early Church'
 1986 CBQ 48, pp.1-26.
 1990 'OMNE VERBUM SONAT. The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity' JBL 109, pp.3-27.
- Alexander L. 'The Living Voice. Scepticism towards the Written Word in Early Christian and in Graeco-Roman Texts' in Clines D.J.A. - Fowl S.E. - Porter S.E. (eds), *The Bible in Three Dimensions* (JSOT Supplement Series 87), Sheffield: JSOT Press, pp.221-47.
- Applebaum S. *Judaea in Hellenistic and Roman Times* Leiden: Brill.
 1989
- Attridge H.W. 'Christianity from the Destruction of Jerusalem to Constantine's Adoption of the New Religion 70-312 C.E.' in Shanks (ed), pp.151-94.
 1993
- Attridge H.W. - Hata G. (eds)
 1992 *Eusebius, Christianity, and Judaism* Leiden: Brill.
- Baird J.A. *Audience Criticism and the Historical Jesus*
 1969 Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Barr J. 'Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek in the Hellenistic Age' in Davies W.D. - Finkelstein L. (eds) *The Cambridge History of Judaism* Cambridge: CUP, pp. 79-114.
 1989
- Barrett C.K. 'Is there a Theological Tendency in Codex Bezae?' in Best-Wilson (eds), pp.15-27.
 1979
- Berlin A. *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*
 1983 Sheffield: The Almond Press.
- Best E.- Wilson R.McL.
 1979 *Text and Interpretation. Studies in the New Testament presented to Matthew Black* Cambridge: CUP.
- Birdsall J.N. *The Geographical and Cultural Origin of the Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis: A Survey of the Status Quaestionis, Mainly from the Paleographical Standpoint* in Schrage (ed), pp. 102-14.
 1986
- Birdsall J.N. - Thomson R.W. (eds)
 1963 *Biblical and Patristic Studies, in Memory R.P. Casey* Freiburg-im-Breisgau: Herder.
- Black D.A. (ed) *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation. Essays on Discourse Analysis* Nashville: Broadman Press.
 1992
- Black M. 'Second Thoughts - The Semitic Element in the New Testament' *Expository Times* 77, pp. 20-3.
 1965-6
 1967² *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* Oxford: Clarendon Press (1946¹).
- 1974 'Notes on the Longer and Shorter Text of Acts' in *On Language, Culture and Religion: In Honour of Eugene A. Nida* Black M. - Smalley W.A. (eds), The Hague/Paris: Mouton, pp. 119-31.
- 1981 'The Holy Spirit in the Western Text of Acts' in Epp-Fee (eds), pp. 159-76.
- Blass F. *Acta Apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter: (Editio philologica apparatu critico, commentaria perpetuo, indice verborum illustrata)* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck + Ruprecht.
 1895
 1898 *Philology of the Gospels* London.
- Blood D.E. - Blood D.L.
 1979 'Overview of Acts' *NOT* 74, pp.2-36.
- Boismard M.-E. 'The Text of Acts: a Problem of Literary Criticism' in Epp-Fee (eds), pp. 147-57.
 1981

- Boismard M.-E. + Lamouille A.
 1984 *Le Texte occidental des Actes des Apôtres: reconstitution et réhabilitation* Vols I + II, Paris: Editions Recherches sur les Civilisations.
- 1990 *Les Actes des Deux Apôtres* (Etudes Bibliques Nouvelle Série 12) Vols I, II + III, Paris: Gabalda.
- Botha J.E.
 1991 'Style in the New Testament: the Need for Serious Reconsideration' *JSNT* 43, pp. 71-87.
- Bovon F.
 1992 'Studies in Luke-Acts: Retrospect and Prospect' *HTR* 85, pp. 175-96.
- Bowker J.
 1969 *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretation of Scripture* Cambridge: CUP.
- Brawley R.L.
 1988 *Luke-Acts and the Jews. Conflict, Apology and Conciliation* Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Brown D.R.
 1982 'Thematization in the Greek Narrative Sentences in Acts' *START* 6, pp. 14-27.
- Brown G. - Yule G.
 1983 *Discourse Analysis* Cambridge: CUP.
- Bruce F.F.
 1951 *The Acts of the Apostles: the Greek Text* London: Tyndale.
 1954 *Commentary on the Book of Acts* (New London Commentaries) London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott.
 1976 'Is the Paul of Acts the Real Paul?' Reprint from *The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 58, Manchester.
 1977 *Paul: Apostle of the Free Spirit* Exeter: Paternoster.
- Burtchaell J.T.
 1992 *From Synagogue to Church. Public Services and Offices in the Earliest Christian Communities* Cambridge: CUP.
- Buth R.
 1992 'οὐν, δέ, καί and Asyndeton in John's Gospel' in Black D. (ed), pp. 144-61.
- Callow K.
 1974 *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God* Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
 1992 'The Disappearing δέ in I Corinthians' in Black D. (ed), pp. 183-93.
 forthcoming *Man and Message*.
- Callow J.
 1983 'Word Order in New Testament Greek' Part I *START* 7, Part II *START* 8.
- Camery-Hoggatt J.
 1992 *Irony in Mark's Gospel* Cambridge: CUP.
- Cervin R.S.
 1993 'A Critique of Timothy Friberg's Dissertation: New Testament Word Order in Light of Discourse Considerations' *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 6, pp. 56-85.
- Chafe W.
 1976 'Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics and Points of View' in Li N.C (ed). *Subject and Topic* New York: Academic Press, pp. 25-56.
- Charlesworth J.H.
 1993 'Christians and Jews in the First Six Centuries' in Shanks (ed), pp. 305-25.
- Chase F.H.
 1893 *The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae* London.
- Chilton B.
 1982 *The Glory of Israel: the Theology and Provenience of the Isaiah Targum* (JSOT Supplement Series 23) Sheffield: JSOT Press.
 1984 *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible. Jesus' Own Interpretation of Isaiah* London: SPCK.
 1987 *The Isaiah Targum: Introduction, Translation, Apparatus, Notes* (The Aramaic Bible, Vol II) Edinburgh: T+T Clark.
 1988 'Shebna, Eliakim and the Promise to Peter' in Neusner et al (eds), pp. 311-26.

- Clark A.C. 1933 *The Acts of the Apostles* (repr.1970) Oxford: Clarendon.
- Colwell E.C. 1969 *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* Leiden: Brill.
- Comrie B. 1988 'Linguistic Typology' in Newmeyer F.J. (ed) *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey Vol I Linguistic Theory: Foundations* Cambridge: CUP, pp. 447-461.
- 1989 *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology* Oxford: Blackwell.
- Conzelmann H. 1987 *Acts of the Apostles* (E.T.; German edition 1963), Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Dain A. 1975³ *Les Manuscrits* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Deist F.E. 1992 '"Canonical Criticism", Reformed Theology and Developments in the Textual Criticism of the First Testament' *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 18, pp.37-47.
- De La Potterie I. 1982 'Les Deux Noms de Jérusalem dans les Actes des Apôtres' *Bib* 63, pp. 153-87.
- Delebecque E. 1982a 'La Montée de Pierre de Césarée à Jérusalem selon le Codex Bezae au chapitre 11 des Actes des Apôtres' *ETL* 58, pp.106-10.
- 1982b 'La mésaventure de Sceva selon les deux versions: Ac 19:13-30' *RSPT* 66, pp.225-32;
- 1982c 'Saul et Luc avant le premier voyage missionnaire: Ac 11:26-8' *ibid*, pp.551-9.
- 1986 *Les deux Actes des Apôtres* (Collection Etudes Bibliques) Paris: Gabalda.
- Dibelius M. 1956 *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (E.T.; German edition 1951) London: SCM.
- Dunn J.D.G. 1970 *Baptism in the Holy Spirit* London: SCM.
- 1991 *The Partings of the Ways Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* London: SCM.
- Duplacy J. 1973 'P⁷⁰ et les formes les plus anciennes du texte de Luc' in Neiryneck F. (ed) *L'Evangile de Luc, problèmes littéraires et théologiques. Mélanges Cerfaux* (BETL 32) Gembloux: Leuven University Press.
- Dupont J. 1984 *Nouvelles Etudes sur les Actes des Apôtres* (Lectio Divina 118) Paris: Le Cerf.
- Elliott J.K. 1972 'κῆθξ: ἔσωσεν Πέτρος : δ Πέτρος : An Examination of New Testament Usage' *Nov Test* 14, pp. 241-56 (1992, pp.125-38).
- 1977 'Jerusalem in Acts and the Gospels' *NTS* 23, pp.462-9 (1992, pp.113-20).
- 1990 (ed) *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism. Collected Essays of G.D. Kilpatrick* (BETL 96) Louvain: Leuven University Press.
- 1992 *Essays and Studies in New Testament Textual Criticism* (Estudios de Filologia Neotestamentaria 3) Cordoba: Ediciones el Almendro.
- 1993 (ed) *The Language and Style of the Gospel of Mark. An Edition of C.H. Turner's 'Notes on Marcan Usage' Together with Other Comparable Studies* Leiden: Brill.
- Epp E.J. 1966a *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* Cambridge: CUP.
- 1966b 'Coptic MS G67 and the Role of Codex Bezae as a Western Witness in Acts' *JBL* 85, pp. 197-212.

- 1992 'Textual Criticism. New Testament' *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (Freedman D.N. ed), New York: Doubleday, Vol VI, pp. 412-35.
- Epp E.J. + Fee G.D. (eds)
1981 *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honour of B.H. Metzger* Oxford: Clarendon.
- Fillmore C.J. *Santa Cruz Lectures on Deixis 1971* Indiana University Linguistics Club.
1975
- Feldman L.H. 'Palestinian and Diaspora Judaism in the First Century' in Shanks (ed), pp. 1-40.
1993
- Foakes-Jackson F.J. - Lake K.
1922-33 (eds) *The Beginnings of Christianity Part I The Acts of the Apostles Vols I-V*, London: Macmillan.
1922 *ibid* Vol II *Prolegomena II. Criticism*.
- Forestell J.T.
1979 *Targumic Traditions and the New Testament* Chico, California: Scholars Press.
- Friberg T.
1982 'New Testament Greek Word Order in Light of Discourse Considerations' PhD thesis, Univ. of Minnesota.
- Geer T.C.
1990 'The Presence and Significance of Lucanisms in the Western Text of Acts' *JSNT* 39, pp.59-76.
- Ginzberg L.
1982¹¹ *The Legends of the Jews Vols I-VII*, Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America (1907¹).
- Goodwin C.
1986 'Audience Diversity, Participation and Interpretation' *TEXT* 6, pp. 283-316.
- Grimes J.
1976 *The Thread of Discourse* (Janua Linguarum, Series Minor 207) The Hague: Mouton.
- Haenchen E.
1971 *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (E.T.) German 1965) Oxford: Blackwell.
- Haenchen E. - Weigandt P.
1968 'The Original Text of Acts?' *NTS* 14, pp. 469-81.
- Hartin P.J. - Petzer J.H. (eds)
1991 *Text and Interpretation. New Approaches in the Criticism of the New Testament* Leiden: Brill.
- Hawkins J.A.
1983 *Word Order Universals* (Quantitative Analyses of Linguistic Structure) New York: Academic Press.
- Healey P. - Healey A.
1990 'Greek Circumstantial Participles Tracking Participants with Participants in the Greek New Testament' *OPTAT* 4, pp.177-259.
- Heimerdinger J.
1988 'Anti-Semitism in Codex Bezae: A Study of Acts 3:11-27', *New Testament Study Group Paper*, Tyndale House, Cambridge.
1991 'Acts 8:37: A Textual and Exegetical Study' *The Bulletin of the Institute for Reformation Biblical Studies* 2, pp. 8-13.
- Heimerdinger J. - Levinsohn S.H.
1992 'The Use of the Definite Article Before Names of People in the Greek Text of Acts with Particular Reference to Codex Bezae' *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 5/9.
- Hemer C.J.
1989 *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 69) (Gempf C.H. ed) Tübingen: JCB Mohr.
- Hengel M.
1974 *Judaism and Hellenism Vol I Text* (Engl.ed.; German edition 1973²) London: SCM.
1979 *Acts and the Earliest History of Christianity* (E.T.; German edition 1979) London: SCM.

- 1980 *Jews, Greeks and Barbarians: Aspects of Judaism in the Pre-Christian Period* London: SCM.
- 1989 *The Hellenization of Judaea in the First Century* (E.T.; German edition 1989) London: SCM.
- 1992 'The Pre-Christian Paul' in Lieu, North, Rajak (eds), pp. 29-52.
- Hess H.H. 'Dynamics of the Greek Noun Phrase in Mark' *OPTAT* 1990 4, pp. 353-69.
- Hopper P.J. - Thompson S.A. 'The Discourse Basis for Lexical Categories in Universal Grammar' *Language* 60, pp. 703-52. 1984
- Hull J.H.E. *The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles* London: Lutterworth Press. 1967
- Hull R.F. '"Lucanisms" in the Western Text of Acts? A Reappraisal' *JTS* 107, pp. 695-707. 1988
- Jervell J. *Luke and the People of God. A New Look at Luke-Acts* Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House. 1972
- 1984 *The Unknown Paul. Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History* Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.
- Keck L.E. - Martyn J.L. (eds) *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honour of Paul Schubert* London: SPCK. 1968
- Kee H.C. 'After the Crucifixion - Christianity through Paul' in Shanks (ed), pp. 85-124. 1993
- Kelly J.N.D. *Early Christian Creeds* London: Longman. 1972³
- Kilpatrick G.D. 'Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels and Acts' *JTS* 44, pp.24-36. 1934
- 1963 'An Eclectic Study of the Text of Acts' in Birdsall-Thompson (eds), pp.64-77.
- 1964 'The Spirit, God and Jesus in Acts' *JTS* 25, p.63 (1990, p.400).
- 1965 'Ἄλλοι at Luke ii.31 and Acts iv.25,27' *JTS* n.s.xvi, p.27.
- 1968 'κύριος in the Gospels' in *L'Évangile hier et aujourd'hui: Mélanges offerts Professeur F.-J. Leenhardt* Geneva: Labor et Fides, pp.60-70 (1990, pp.207-12).
- 1969 'κύριος in the Gospels' *Δελτίον του ΕΦΣΑ*, Famagusta, pp. 163-5 (1990, pp. 212-5).
- 1973 'κύριος again' in Hoffmann P., Brox N., Pesch W. (eds) *Orientierung an Jesus* Freiburg/Basle/Geneva: Herder (1990, pp. 216-22).
- 1986 'The Two Texts of Acts' in Schrage (ed), pp. 186-95.
- 1990 *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism (Collected Essays)* (Elliott J.K. ed) Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Klijn A.F.J. 'In Search of the Original Text of Acts' in Keck - Martyn (eds), pp. 103-110. 1968
- Koet B.J. *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts* Leuven: Leuven University Press. 1989
- Kremer J. *Les Actes des Apôtres: tradition, rédaction, théologie* Gembloux: Leuven University Press. 1979
- Kurz W.S. 'Narrative Approaches to Luke-Acts' *Bib* 68, pp.195-220. 1987

- Labov W. - Waletzky J.
1967 'Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience' in Helm J. (ed) *Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts* Seattle: University of Washington Press, pp. 12-44.
- Lagrange M.-J. *Introduction à l'étude du Nouveau Testament: II: Critique Textuelle, II. La critique rationnelle* Paris: Gabalda.
1935
- Lake K. - Cadbury H.J.
1933 Vol IV *English Translation and Commentary* in Foakes-Jackson - Lake (eds).
- Larsen I.
1991 'Word Order and Relative Prominence in New Testament Greek' *NOT* 5, pp.29-34.
1991b 'Notes on the Function of γάρ, οὐρ, νέν, δέ, καί and τε in the Greek New Testament' *NOT* 5, pp.35-47.
- Lategan B.C. - Vorster W.S.
1985 *Text and Reality: Aspects of Reference in Biblical Texts* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Leaney A.R.C. *The Jewish and Christian World* Cambridge: CUP.
1985
- Le Déaut R. *La Nuit Pascale* (Analecta Biblica 22) Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
1963
1965 *Liturgie juive et Nouveau Testament* Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical.
1974 'Targumic Literature and New Testament Interpretation' *BTB* 4, pp.243-89.
1982 *The Message of the New Testament and the Aramaic Bible (Targum)* (E.T.; French edition 1965) Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Levey S.H. (ed) *The Targum of Ezekiel* (The Aramaic Bible, Vol XIII) Edinburgh: T+T Clark.
1987
- Levine L. *Caesarea under Roman Rule* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 7) Leiden: Brill.
1975
1993 'Judaism from the Destruction of the Temple to the End of the Second Jewish Revolt' in Shanks (ed), pp. 125-50.
- Levinsohn S.H. *Textual Connections in Acts* Atlanta: Scholars Press.
1987
1989 'Phrase Order and the Article in Galatians. (A Functional Sentence Perspective Approach)' *OPTAT* 3, pp. 44-64.
1992 *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek* Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
1993 'Anarthrous References to the Holy Spirit: Another Factor' *The Bible Translator* 44, pp. 138-44.
- Lieu J.-North J.-Rajak T. (eds)
1992 *The Jews Among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire* London/New York: Routledge.
- Lifschitz B.
1965 'L'hellénisation des juifs de la Palestine' *RB* 72, pp. 520-38.
- Luedemann G.
1988 'The Acts of the Apostles as a Historical Source' in Neusner et al (eds), pp. 109-25.
- Longacre R.E. *The Grammar of Discourse* New York/London: Plenum.
1983
1985 'Discourse Peak as Zone of Turbulence' in Wirth (ed), pp.81-105.
- Lyons J.
1968 *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* Cambridge:CUP.

- McCarthy M. 1991 *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers* Cambridge: CUP.
- Maccoby H. 1992 *Judas Iscariot and the Myth of Jewish Evil* New York: The Free Press.
- Mackenzie R.S. 1985 'The Western Text of Acts: Some Lucanisms in Selected Sermons' *JBL* 104, pp.637-50.
- McNamara M. 1966 *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (Analecta Biblica 27) Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Mann J. 1940 *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue* Vol I, New York: Ktav.
1966 *ibid* Vol II (ed.Sonne I.), Ohio: Hebrew Union College.
- Marshall I.H. 1980 *The Acts of the Apostles* London: IVP.
- Martini C.M. 1979 'La tradition textuelle des Actes des Apôtres et les tendances de l'église ancienne' in Kremer (ed), pp.21-35.
- Menoud P.H. 1951 'The Western Text and the Theology of Acts' *Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Bulletin* 2, pp. 19-32.
- Menzies R.P. 1991 *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts* (JSNT Supplement Series 54) Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Metzger B.M. 1975 *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (corrected edition) London/New York: United Bible Societies.
- Moule C.F.D. 1968 'The Christology of Acts' in Keck-Martyn (eds), pp. 159-85.
1977³ *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek* Cambridge: CUP.
- Moulton J.H. 1906² *A Grammar of New Testament Greek Vol I Prolegomena* Edinburgh: T+T Clark.
1929 *ibid*. Vol II.
- Neusner J. 1971 *The Rabbinic Tradition about the Pharisees before AD 70* Leiden: Brill.
1983 'Judaism Within the Disciplines of Religious Studies: Perspectives on Graduate Education' *The Council on the Study of Religion: Bulletin* 141, pp.143-5.
1984 *Judaism in the Beginning of Christianity* London: SPCK.
- Neusner J.- Borgen P.- Frerichs E.S.- Horsley R. (eds) 1988 *The Social World of Formative Christianity and Judaism. Essays in Tribute to Howard Clark Kee* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Newsom C.A. 1984 'A Maker of Metaphors - Ezekiel's Oracles Against Tyre' *Interpretation* 38, pp.151-64.
- Nickels P. 1967 *Targum and the New Testament. A Bibliography Together With a New Testament Index* Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Nierynck F.-Van Segbroeck F. 1984 *New Testament Vocabulary. A Companion Volume to the Concordance* (BETL 65) Leuven: Leuven University Press (Corrections in 1986 *ETL* 62, pp.134-40).
1985 'Le texte des Actes des Apôtres et les caractéristiques stylistiques lucaniennes' *ETL* 61, pp.304-39.
- O'Neill J.C. 1961 *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting* London: SPCK (1970²).
- Osburn C. 1991 'The Search for the Original Text of Acts - the International Project on the Text of Acts' *JSNT* 44, pp.39-55.

- Parker D.C. 'A Dictation Theory of Codex Bezae' JSNT 15, pp.97-112.
1982
1985 'The Translation of $\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\upsilon$ in the Old Latin Gospels' NTS 31, pp.252-76.
1992 *Codex Bezae. An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text* Cambridge: CUP.
- Patte D. *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine* Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
1975
- Payne D.F. 'Semitisms in the Book of Acts' in Gasque W.W. - Martin R.P. (eds) *Apostolic History and the Gospel* Exeter: Paternoster, pp. 134-50.
1970
- Perrot C. 'Un fragment christo-palestinien découvert à Khirbet-Mird' RB 70, pp.506-55,
1963
1973 *La Lecture de la Bible. Les anciennes lectures palestiniennes du Shabbat et des fêtes* Hildesheim: Verlag Dr. H.A. Gerstenberg.
- Petersen T. 'An Early Coptic Manuscript of Acts: An Un-Revised Version of the So-Called Western Text' CBQ 26, pp.225-41.
1964
- Petersen W.L. 'Eusebius and the Paschal Controversy' in Attridge-Hatai(eds), pp. 311-25.
1992
- Porter S.E. 'The Adjectival Attributive Genitive in the New Testament: a Grammatical Study' *Trinity Journal* 4, pp. 3-17.
1983
1992 *Idioms of New Testament Greek* (Biblical Languages: Greek Series 2) Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Radney J.R. 'Some Factors that Influence Fronting in Koine Clauses' *OPTAT* 2.
1988
- Riesenfeld H. 'The Text of Acts 10:36' in Best-Wilson (eds), pp.191-4.
1979
- Ropes J.H. *The Text of Acts Vol III*, in Foakes-Jackson - Lake (eds).
1926
- Sanders E.P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE - 66 CE* London: SCM.
1992
- Sanders J.T. *The Jews in Luke-Acts* London: SCM.
1987
1993 *Schismatics, Sectarians, Dissidents, Deviants. The First One Hundred Years of Jewish-Christian Relations* London: SCM.
- Sansom H.C. 'Laying on of Hands in the Old Testament' *Expository Times*, pp.323-6.
1982-3
- Schank R.C. - Abelson R.P. *Scripts, Goals, Plans and Understanding* Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
1977
- Schiffman L.H. *Who was a Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish-Christian Schism* Hoboken, N.Jersey: Ktav.
1985
- Schoedel W.R. 'Ignatius and the Archives' *Harvard Theological Review*, pp.97-106.
1978
1985 *Ignatius of Antioch. A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Schrage W. (ed) *Studien zum text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments (Festschrift Greeven)* Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
1986
- Schürer E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus-Christ 175 BC-AD 135* Vols I+II, (E.T., revised and ed. Vermes G. - Millar F. - Black M.; German edition 1885-1924) Edinburgh: T+T Clark.
1987
- Schwartz D.R. *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 60)* Tübingen: JCB Mohr.
1992

- Sefrid M.A. 'Jesus and the Law in Acts' *JSNT* 30, pp. 39-57.
1987
- Segal A.F. 'Jewish Christianity' in Attridge-Hata (eds), pp. 326-51.
1992
- Shanks H. (ed) *Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism* London: SPCK.
1993
- Sheeley S.M. 'Narrative Asides and Narrative Authority in Luke-Acts' *BTB* 18, pp. 102-7.
1988
- Silva M. 'Bilingualism and the Character of Palestinian Greek' *Bib* 61, pp. 198-219.
1980
- Smallwood E.M. *The Jews under Roman Rule* Leiden: Brill.
1976
- Snyman A.H. 'A Semantic Discourse Analysis of the Letter to Philemon' in Hartin-Petzer (eds), pp. 83-99.
1991
- Stagg F. 'Establishing a Text for Luke-Acts' *SBL Seminar Papers* (Achtmeier P.J. ed), Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, pp.45-58.
1977
- Strange W.A. *The Problem of the Text of Acts* (SNTS Monograph Series 71) Cambridge: CUP.
1992
- Strom M. 'An Old Testament Background to Ac 12:20;23' *NTS* 32, pp.289-92.
1986
- Swarz S. 'The Holy Spirit: Person and Power. The Greek Article and ΠΝΕΥΜΑ' *The Bible Translator* 44, pp. 124-38.
1993
- Taylor V. *The Names of Jesus* London: Macmillan.
1959³
- Teeple H.M. 'The Greek Article with Personal Names in the Synoptic Gospels' *NTS* 19, pp.302-17.
1972-3
- Tenney M.C. *New Testament Times* London: IVP.
1965
- Tiede D.L. '"Glory to Thy People Israel": Luke-Acts and the Jews' *SBL Seminar Papers Series* Richards K.H. (ed), Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, pp.142-51.
1986
- 1988 'Acts 11:1-18' *Interpretation* 42, pp. 175-80.
- Titrud K. 'The Function of καί in the Greek New Testament' in Black D. (ed), pp.240-70.
1992
- Torrey C.E. *The Composition and Date of Acts* (Harvard Theological Studies 1) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
1916
- Tov E. 'Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings' *HTR* pp. 429-48.
1982
- Trebilco P. *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor* (SNTS Monograph Series 69) Cambridge: CUP.
1991
- Turner C.H. 'Notes on Marcan Usage' III *JTS* 26, pp.14-20 (Elliott (ed) 1993, pp. 16-22).
1924
- 1925 *ibid* V *JTS* 26, pp. 225-40 (Elliott (ed) 1993, pp. 36-52).
1928 *ibid* IX *JTS* 29, pp. 275-89 (Elliott (ed) 1993, pp. 104-119); *ibid* X, *JTS* 29, pp.346-61 (Elliott (ed) 1993, pp. 120-36).
- Turner M.M.B. 'Luke and the Spirit: Studies in the Significance of Receiving the Spirit in Luke-Acts', PhD Dissertation, Cambridge.
1980
- Turner N. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek Vol III Syntax* Edinburgh: T+T Clark.
1963
- 1976 *ibid*. Vol IV Style.
- Vaganay L.- Amphoux C-B. *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (English edition, revised Amphoux C.-B. - Heimerdinger J.; French edition 1986) Cambridge: CUP.
1991
- Vanhoye A. 'Les juifs selon les Actes des Apôtres et les Epîtres du Nouveau Testament' *Bib* 72, pp.70-89.
1991

- Vermes G. *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (Studia Post-Biblica 4) Leiden: Brill.
 1961
 1973 *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels* London: Collins.
 1983 *Jesus and the World of Judaism* London: SCM.
- Vielhauer P. 'On the "Paulism" in Acts' in Keck and Martyn (eds),
 1968 pp.33-50.
- Wensinck A.J. 'The Semitisms of Codex Bezae and their Relation to
 1937 the Non-Western Text of the Gospel of St. Luke' *Bulletin of the Bezan Club* 12, pp.11-48.
The Semitisms of Acts Oxford: Clarendon.
- Wilcox M. *The Semitisms of Acts* Oxford: Clarendon.
 1965
 1973 'The Judas Tradition in Acts 1:15-26' *NTS* 19, pp.438-52.
 1979a 'Luke and the Bezan Text of Acts' in Kremer (ed),
 pp.447-55.
 1979b 'On Investigating the Use of the Old Testament in the
 New Testament' in Best-Wilson (eds), pp.231-43.
- Wirth J.R. *Beyond the Sentences: Discourse and Sentential Form* Ann
 1985 Arbor: Karoma Publishers, Inc..
- Yoder J.D. 'The Language of the Greek Variants of Codex Bezae'
 1959a *Nov. Test.* 3, pp. 241-8.
 1959b 'Semitisms in Codex Bezae' *JBL* 77, pp. 317-21.
- Zerwick M. *Biblical Greek* (E.T.; revised and ed. Smith J.; Latin
 1963 edition 1960*) Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti
 Biblici.
- Zimmerli W. *Ezekiel Vols I+II* (E.T.; German edition 1969),
 1983 Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Reference Works and Editions of the Text.

- Aland K. - Black M. - Martini C.M. - Metzger B.M. - Wikgren A. (eds)
 1975³ *The Greek New Testament* London: United Bible
 Societies (=UBS³).
- (Bauer W.) - Arndt W.F. - Gingrich F.W. (eds + E.T.)
 1979² *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other
 Early Christian Literature* Chicago: Chicago
 University Press (=A-G).
- Blass F. - Debrunner A.
 1976 *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early
 Christian Literature* (E.T.; revised Funk R.W.; ed.
 Rehkopf F.) Chicago: University of Chicago (=B1-D).
- Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*
 1899 *Quattuor Evangelia et Actus Apostularum complectens
 Graece et Latine, sumptibus Academiae phototypice
 repraesentatus Vols I+II, Cambridge.*
- Danby H. (E.T.)
 1933 *Mishnah* London: OUP.
- Mouton J.H. - Milligan G.
 1914-30 *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament Illustrated
 from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* Grand
 Rapids: Eerdmann (=M-M).
- Nestle Eb.
 1896 *Novi Testamenti Graeci supplementum editionibus de-
 Gebhardt-Tischendorfianis. Codex Cantabrigiensis
 Collatio* Leipzig: Tauchnitz.
- Nestle E.-Aland K. (eds)
 1979²⁴ *Novum Testamentum Graece* Stuttgart : Deutsche
 Bibelstiftung (=N-A²⁴) (1975²⁰ = N-A²⁰).

- Rahlfs A. (ed) *Septuaginta* Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung.
1935
- Robertson A.T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the light of Historical Research* London: Hodder and Stoughton.
1914
- Roth C. (ed) *Encyclopaedia Judaica* Vols I-III, Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House.
1974^s
- Safrai S.- Stern M. (eds)
1974 *The Jewish People in the First Century* Vols I+II, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Scrivener F.H. *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis* (repr.) Pittsburgh: Pickwick.
1978
- Singer I. (ed) *The Jewish Encyclopaedia. A Descriptive Record of the History, Religion, Literature and Customs of the Jewish People from the Earliest Times* Vols I-XII, New York: Ktav.
1901
- Winer G.B. (E.T. and ed)
1882^s *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek* Edinburgh: T+T Clark.
- Yoder J.D. *Concordance to the Distinctive Greek Text of Codex Bezae* Leiden: Brill.
1961

INDEX OF REFERENCES TO THE BOOK OF ACTS

Ref. Page

Chapter 1

1:1-2:4 277
 1 185,192
 2 209,227,228,229
 3 72,92
 4 250,254
 5 81,209,227,228,234
 6 81,178,192,194
 7 404
 8 209,233,234,250
 9 55
 10 71
 11 80,92,192
 12 108,250,253
 13 278
 14 293
 15-26 273-93
 16 192,209,230
 19 250
 21 196,199,204
 23 295
 24 178

Chapter 2

1 79,81,103,277,403
 2 68,134,167
 4 67,209,227,233
 5 68,169,250,404
 12 172
 14 71,74-5,109-10,158,160,250,
 403
 15 151,152,403
 17 175,176,181,194,209,225,313,
 403
 18 209,225
 20 175,179
 21 180
 22 79,161,192
 23 403
 25 83
 26 83,92
 29-30 144
 30 198,201
 31 192,198
 32 127,129,134,192
 33 209,214,238,239
 34 151,152,178
 36 80,175,178,192,194
 37 109,114-5,127,129-30,131,406,
 407

Ref. Page

Chapter 2

38 172,196,199,209,233-5,240-41
 39 179
 41 80,81-2
 42 251
 47 180,192,194

Chapter 3

1 73,79,81,405
 2 75-6,34
 3 403,405
 4 103,405
 6 192,202
 7 65-6,83,84
 8 403
 10 65-6
 11 172, 403,405,407
 12 197,407
 12-26 140
 13 139-40,196,197,204
 15 140
 17 139,140-41
 18 192
 19 83,84
 20 192,194
 21 406
 22 406
 26 165-6

Chapter 4

1 79
 2 104,192
 3 103,403
 5 169,250
 8 108,109,209,227,228,407
 9 164
 10 192,202
 13 192,405
 13-22 130
 15 103,318
 16 67,250
 17 127,130-31,160,403,407
 18 196,403
 23 403
 24 87,406
 25 60,209,227,228,229,246
 26 175,192,194
 27 60,83,84-5,192,197
 29 74,75,178,185,194
 30 60,192,197
 31 183,184,185,209,233,234,352

Ref. Page

Chapter 4

32 352
33 55,85,86,196,198
36 55,63-4,163,331

Chapter 5

1 60,64,89
2 92,165
2-3 166
6 71
8 88-9
9 180,209,211,213
10 403
12 67
13 85,86,407
14 192,194
15 151,155-6
16 163,250
19 88,89-90,109,112,179,311,339
21 103,403
22 403
26 108,114,403
28 160,250,403
29 55,57,403
30 192
32 97,209,222,230
33-40 132
34 88,89,90
36 81,85,86,92
38 403
39 79,92,127,130,159
40 192
42 196,199,202

Chapter 6

1 80,81,82
2 160,183,184,185
3 85,127,132,160,209,225,227,
 237,403
5 79,132,209,225,227
7 175,176,183,185,187,250
8 201-2
10 172,209,214,237,403
11 108
14 192
15 351,403

Chapter 7

1 404
3 165,166

Ref. Page

Chapter 7

4 108,110,114,404
5 94
6-16 133
10 94
12 127,129,169
13 172
15 403
17 186
21 403
23 72,94
24 167
26 122
29 71
30 71,72,176,179,181
31 55,57,179
33 55,57,179
34 151,152-3,403
35 172
36 71,72,406
37 406
41 81
42 71,72
49 178
50 74,75
51 209,230
54 406
55 176,181,196,200,209,227,228
57 69
58 77,78
59 192
60 80,178,194,403

Chapter 8

1 67,82,250,251,255,326,404
2 103,404
5 192,193,202,406
8 403
9 403
12 192,193,202
14 183,184,251,256
15 209,222,227,232
16 196,197,199
17 108,209,222,227,237
18 209,214,228,237
19 92,209,222,227,228,232,237,
 403
21 151,152,403
23 55,169
24 70,176,177,194
25 183,184,185,250,256

Ref. Page

Chapter 8

26 176,179,250,253,256,403
 27 77,78,250,253,256
 28 403
 29 209,225,226,231

Chapter 9

3 167
 19 123
 32-43 258
 40 339

Chapter 10

5-9 118
 6 60
 9-16 310
 15 403
 17 163
 19 95,209,225,226,231
 21 109,110,111,114,118,158
 22 77,78
 23 61,110,111,114,117-8,128,158,
 258,404
 25 354,403
 30 403
 32 354
 33 54,128,134,163,178,177,403,
 406
 34 403
 36 151,152,153,178,192,193,194,
 403
 37 151,152,153,193,403,405
 38 192,209,214,229,238
 39 92,250
 41 71-2
 44 209,230
 45 61,92,209,214,235,240
 46 109,111,112-3
 47 209,230,232
 48 108,109,111,196,199,258

CHAPTER 11

1 92,183,184,256
 1-2 145-6
 1-3 257-9,286
 2 61-2,70,92,251,263,264,365,
 403
 3 61,111
 4 61

Ref. Page

Chapter 11

5 61,71,167
 7 198
 8 178
 9 167,403
 11 71
 12 61,210,225,258,403
 15 210,230
 16 192,210,213,227,228,405
 17 65,172,192,195,202,210,213,
 229
 18 92
 19 172,326
 20 196,198,199,202
 21 179,192,194
 22 250,265,326
 23 92
 24 192,194,210,227
 25 160,170,171,377,403
 25-6 82
 26 108,121,158,354
 27 70,82,250,403
 27-30 255,260
 28 210,225,226
 30 92,329

Chapter 12

1 62-3,82,403
 1-12 294-340
 3 172,367
 4 71,92
 5 54,70,163
 6 71,81
 7 164,179,404
 8 105
 9 151,155,156
 10 65-6,71,73-4
 11 55,179-80
 12 405
 13 311-2,313-4,403
 16 103,403,404
 17 180,327-8,406
 18-25 294-340
 20 54,70,83,84,151,155,156,166,
 167
 21 67,352
 23 176,179,403
 24 123,176,183,185-6,189
 25 250,253,405

<u>Ref.</u>	<u>Page</u>
<u>Chapter 13</u>	
1	92
2	210,230,231
3	108,114
4	210,214,231,240,241,403
5	175,176,183,330,405
6	351,403
7	64,103,183,184
8	406
9	92,210,227,228
10	180
11	134,179
12	109,113,114,158,179,192,194
13	250,255,405
15	94-5
17	104,160
20	72
21	167
22	72,92
23	127,129,134-5,136,141,192
24	405
27	250,262,357,403
29	103,139,141
30	91,142
31	88,91-2,250,262
32	68,92
33	151,152,153,196,198,200
36	139,143-4
38	129,135
39	127,129,135-7,141
40	159
41	406
44	183,186-7,244,357,404,406
44-5	365
45	357
46	65-6,67,183,184,186-7,340,403
47	134
48	67,176,183,187
49	183,184,187
52	210,227,228

Chapter 14

2	176,181
3	175,192,194,403
6	103
7	160,357,365,377,404
9	403,404
10	67,69,201-2
14	103,340
19	59,77,78,160,357,365,377,404
20	403
23	352
25	169,183,187-8,403
27	311,339

<u>Ref.</u>	<u>Page</u>
<u>Chapter 15</u>	
1	162
1-2	253
1-4	255
2	54,151,155,156,162,250,251,356,404
2-4	263
3	163
4	163,164,251
7	210,213,336-7,403
8	172,210,222,230
11	196,198,403,406
14	406
14-15	406
16	403
17	178
20	131,154
21	164
22	69,108
24	403
25	69
26	192,195,197,198,362-3
28	210,214,238,239
29	154,165,166,210,213,236,239,403
30	70
32	70,92,210,213,229,230
33	161-2
35	54,92,183
35-6	185
36	74,75,183,184
37	117,330,331,405
38	117
39	110,116-7
40	163
41	403

Chapter 16

1	403
3	54,57
4	201,202,250,261,265,403
6	87,210,231,233,234
7	210,211,340
9	160,364,377,403
10	127,137,175,176,194
11	128
13	375
14	75,76,92
15	177,244
16	76,375
17	103
18	55,192,192
20	80
22	70,114,115-6,154,368,403

Ref. Page

Chapter 16

26 311
28 69
30 403,407
31 196,198,202
31-2 360
32 175,176,179,183,188
34 361
35 54,403
36 54,403
39 70,115-6,165,167,354,468,403
40 54,165,175,177,181

Chapter 17

1 103
2 165,167,404
2-3 356
4 137,352,357,365
5 70,75-7,85,86-7,306
6 344,368,403
7 192
8 59
10-13 169-70
11 189,356
12 55,
12-15 146-7
13 103,169,70,183,184,368,404
14 108,121,145,158
14-15 343
15 151,155,156,377,404
16 343
18 65
19 77,78,403
23 67
24 179
28 76,77,85,86-7,92
30 79
31 196
34 75,76,77,78,344,403

Chapter 18

1 165,167
1-18 341-380
2 404
3 151,155,156-7
4 54,103,169,201,403
5 110,122-3,196,199
6 70,403,404
8 63,199,201-2,403

Ref. Page

Chapter 18

9 88,91,176,180,406
10 406
11 183,184
12 88,91-2,95,403
13 403
14 67
17 115,116
19 340
21 170,251,261-2,374
22 374
24 64-5
25 87,176,183,188,226
26 59,77,78,188,193,226,406
26-7 65,171
27 70,170,403
28 199,226,403

Chapter 19

1 124,160,210,213,226,251,261-2,
 403
1-7 147
2 210,222,227,228,232,403
4 200,202
5 196,197,199
6 210,225,230
8 70,72,120,404
8-9 147-8
9 77,78,114,120,145,404
10 72,181,183,188
12 65-6
13 65-6,192,194
14 201,403,404
15 65-6,109,113-4,139,144
16 65-6
17 192,194
19 92,158,404
20 54,183,186,188-9,325,326
20-21 123-4,189
21 110,122,210,225,250,261-2,265,
 403
22 269
23 81,124
25 80,92
26 59,67,122,124-5,288
27 69,72,85,87
28 368,403
32 368
34 368
38 92-3
40 55

Ref. Page

Chapter 20

1 368
1-5 137-8
3 71,95,210,213,226,404
3-4 160,377
4 127,129,403
5 312
6 71
7 404
9 163
10 103
11 351
12 403
13 172
15 160,377
16 77,79,101,169,251,260,261-2,
 265
18 172,403
20 59
21 196,198,202,363
22 134,210,225,251,260,261-2
23 178,210,214,238,251-261-2
24 352,357
25 87,134,196
26 127,129,138
28 65-6,175,178,194,210,214,238,
 239
32 176
34 348
35 178

Chapter 21

1 403
4 250,260,262
10 260
11 84,167,170,171,210,230,250,
 260
11-13 254
12 250,260,262,404
13 109,112-3,170,196,197,250,260
14 72,85,87,406
15 77,78,250,260,262
16 160,377
16-18 266
17 250,260,262-3
18 54
18-19 262
20 97,175,177,194
20-25 154-5,156,372
22 151
23 172,374
24 172,374

Ref. Page

Chapter 21

25 151
26 65,108,110
27 61,65,356,403
28 118,367,368
31 250,260
33 77,108,114
35 172,407
36 407
37 403,404,405
38 81
39 156,403
40 65,104,351,403,406,407

Chapter 22

2 406
3 68-9
5 92,169,170,250,262
6 165,167
8 192
10 178,192,194
17 250,262
18 250,262
24 112
25 65,404,405
25-8 377
26 79,151,152,155,403
27 109,111-2,114
29 111,112,117,118-20,128

Chapter 25

26 306

Chapter 26

7 304

Chapter 27

21 109