

# The Import of the Versions for the History of the Greek Text: Some Observations from the *ECM* of Acts<sup>1</sup>

Georg Gäbel

Akademie-Projekt “*Novum Testamentum Graecum–Editio Critica Maior*”

Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung

Evangelisch-theologische Fakultät, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität, Münster

Abstract: In this article, I discuss the relevance of the versions for Greek textual history, taking as my starting point the forthcoming *Editio Critica Maior* of Acts. After a brief introduction to the citation of versional material in the *ECM* of Acts, three groups of examples are presented: (1) examples where each versional variant is correlated with one Greek variant, (2) examples of variants found in versional witnesses belonging to the D-trajectory and believed to have existed in now lost Greek witnesses, and (3) examples for the mutual influence of Greek and versional texts. I conclude that (1) careful attention to the versions will benefit our understanding of Greek textual history, that (2) some variants of Greek origin not attested in the Greek manuscripts now known can be reconstructed on the basis of the versions, and that (3) in some cases, particularly in bilingual manuscripts, there is likely to have been versional influence on the Greek text.

## I. Introduction and Basics

### 1. Introduction

*Ut enim cuique primis fidei temporibus in manus venit codex graecus et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguae habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari.*

(For as soon as, in the early times of the faith, a Greek codex came into the hands of anyone who also believed to possess even a little grasp of both languages, he dared to translate.)

Augustine, *Doctr. chr.* II 11 (16)

This, at least, is what Augustine famously claims when he touches upon translations of biblical texts into Latin<sup>2</sup> in *De Doctrina Christiana*, his biblical hermeneutics (Latin is, of course,

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a revised and expanded version of a paper read in the program unit *Novum Testamentum Graecum – Editio Critica Maior* during the SBL Annual Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia, in November 2015. I wish to express my gratitude to my colleagues Andreas Juckel and Siegfried Richter who have given help with the Syriac and Coptic versions, respectively.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. R.S. Schirner, *Inspice Diligenter Codices*. Philologische Studien zu Augustins Umgang mit Bibelhandschriften und -übersetzungen (*Millenium-Studien/Millennium Studies* 49; Boston and Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015), 20–53, esp. 26f.

the other of the two languages mentioned).<sup>3</sup> Although one has to allow for rhetorical (over-) emphasis on Augustine's part,<sup>4</sup> the existing variety of Latin and other biblical texts may appear confusing,<sup>5</sup> and this is one reason why the early versions of the New Testament remain an important yet complex field of study.

As the Acts volume of the *Editio Critica Maior* (*ECM*) approaches completion, this article discusses some examples of textual variation found in the early versions of Acts with a view to the question what their place may be in a Greek critical edition, so as to help readers estimate what to expect from the next *ECM* volume and how it may be of service to the scholarly community. In so doing, this article also addresses the ongoing discussion about the import of the early versions for the textual history of the Greek New Testament.

## 2. Basics

### 2.1 Versions in the *ECM* of Acts

The versions<sup>6</sup> included in the *ECM* of Acts are Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Ethiopic, Armenian, Georgian, and Old Slavonic.<sup>7</sup> Some strands of these versional traditions are of particular interest for work on a Greek edition, whereas others recede in importance.

---

<sup>3</sup> On the question whether Augustine is referring here to Greek codices containing translations from the Hebrew or to copies of works originally written in Greek, or to both, see Schirner, *Inspice Diligenter Codices*, 26f n. 30. Houghton thinks that "In context, this refers to translations of the Old Testament, where Semitic idioms and points of obscurity may have resulted in greater confusion." H.A.G. Houghton, *The Latin New Testament. A Guide to its Early History, Texts, and Manuscripts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 11.

<sup>4</sup> E. Schulz-Flügel writes: "Die Urteile über die Vielzahl der Versionen enthalten sicher eine rhetorische Übertreibung; von so vielen Versionen wie Codices kann man wohl nur sprechen, wenn man die Schreibversehen in den einzelnen Codices mitberücksichtigt." E. Schulz-Flügel, "Der lateinische Bibeltext im 4. Jahrhundert," in: V.H. Drecoll (ed.), *Augustin Handbuch* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2007), 109–14, esp. 111; also quoted by Schirner, *Inspice Diligenter Codices*, 27. Houghton opines that Augustine's remarks have long been "over-applied" (id., *The Latin New Testament*, 11).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Schirner, *Inspice Diligenter Codices*, 27: "Bereits hier wird durch die Formulierung *aliquantum facultatis* zur Charakterisierung der Kompetenz der Übersetzer subtil auf die (mögliche) Fehlerhaftigkeit lateinischer Übersetzungen angespielt." She goes on to say: "Diese (scheinbare) Kritik an der Übersetzungsvielfalt wendet Augustin im Folgenden jedoch ins Gegenteil: Die Verschiedenheit der Übertragungen tue dem Verständnis eines gewissenhaften Lesers nämlich keinen Abbruch; vielmehr diene die Einsicht in mehrere Handschriften mit unterschiedlichen Übersetzungsversionen der Erhellung und Klärung dunkler Äusserungen."

<sup>6</sup> On the early versions, see the (somewhat outdated) monograph by B.M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977); for more recent secondary sources, see the pertinent articles in Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, eds., *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (NTTSD 42; 2d ed.; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2013); James C. Paget and Joachim Schaper, eds., *From the Beginnings to 600* (vol. 1 of *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*; ed. R. Marsden and E.A. Matter; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); further, on the Latin tradition, Houghton, *The Latin New Testament*.

<sup>7</sup> Material from the Ethiopic version will be prepared for the *ECM* of Acts by Curt Niccum (Abilene Christian University), and material from the Armenian, Georgian, and Old Slavonic versions, by Christian Hannick (University of Würzburg). Material from the Latin, Syriac and Coptic versions will be prepared by members of the INTF staff.

It has been widely assumed that a very early, perhaps the earliest, form of the Old Latin tradition originated in Africa in the early 3<sup>rd</sup> century.<sup>8</sup> The most important witness to this text form in Acts is the Fleury Palimpsest (Codex Floriacensis, Gryson 55).<sup>9</sup> It is of particular interest for Greek textual history since no manuscript evidence is extant of the Greek text which may have been its Vorlage.

In the Syriac tradition, the Peshitta is something like the “Vulgate”<sup>10</sup> of the Syrian church. It is understood to be the text form of the Syriac New Testament widely used since roughly 400 C.E.<sup>11</sup> Of particular interest here, however, is the Harclean version<sup>12</sup> which, together with its marginal notes, is treated as a trustworthy witness to the underlying Greek text forms which it is believed to represent with particular care. Differently from the Syriac Peshitta, a number of versional variants from the Harclean have been accepted into the apparatus of the *ECM* of Acts even if they consist in short, seemingly natural additions, or if they lack additional support from other versions. The Peshitta can also contribute pertinent information on the formerly so-called ‘Western’ text of Acts, as some of the following examples may illustrate.

While versional information in the *ECM* will draw on Coptic Sahidic, Bohairic, and Middle Egyptian manuscripts, it is the Middle Egyptian text, represented by Codex Glazier (copG67), which is of particular interest due to its real or purported affinity to variants found in Codex Bezae and its relatives, thus contributing to the perennial question of the formerly so-called ‘Western’ text of Acts.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>8</sup> The relationship (in Acts) between this text form and other Old Latin texts must await clarification until the publication of the *Vetus Latina* of Acts, currently under preparation at Mainz under the editorship of W. Blümer. Similarly, the value of the text type model for the reconstruction of Old Latin textual history should be a matter for future debate. For a view based on the Beuron text type model of Old Latin textual history, see B. Fischer, “Das Neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache. Der gegenwärtige Stand seiner Erforschung und seine Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte,” in: K. Aland (ed.), *Die alten Übersetzungen des neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare. Der gegenwärtige Stand ihrer Erforschung und ihre Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte* (ANTF 5; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1972), 1–92, esp. 28–30. Houghton, *The Latin New Testament*, 120, 167, also appears to be influenced by this current of scholarship.

<sup>9</sup> Old Latin manuscript numbers here and throughout this article refer to the list of Old Latin manuscripts by R. Gryson: *Altlateinische Handschriften/Manuscrits vieux latins*. Première partie: Mss 1–275 (d’après un manuscrit inachevé de Hermann Josef Frede †); Deuxième partie: Mss 300–485 (vol. 1/2 in: *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel*. Nach Petrus Sabatier neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der Erzabtei Beuron unter der Leitung von Roger Gryson; Freiburg et al.: Herder, 1999–2004). Cf. the list of Latin manuscripts in the appendix to the present article.

<sup>10</sup> D.C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 64 (cf. 64–6).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. R.B. ter Haar Romeny and C.E. Morrison, “Peshitta,” in: S.P. Brock, A.M. Butts, G.A. Kiraz, L. van Rompay (eds.), *Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2011), 326–31.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. A. Juckel, “Tumo of Ḥarqel,” in: Brock, Butts, Kiraz, van Rompay (eds.), *Gorgias Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Syriac Heritage*, 418.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. H.-M. Schenke (ed.), *Apostelgeschichte 1,1–15,3 im mittelägyptischen Dialekt des Koptischen (Codex Glazier)* (TU 137; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1991). For one assessment of the textual affinities of this manuscript, see E.J. Epp, “The Coptic Manuscript G67 and the Rôle of Codex Bezae as a Western Witness in Acts,” in: id., *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism. Collected Essays, 1962–2004* (NT.S 116; Leiden et al.: Brill, 2005), 15–39 (first published in *JBL* 85 [1966]: 197–212).

The Ethiopic version of Acts was translated from the Greek.<sup>14</sup> It seems highly questionable, however, that it can be used as a witness to what has been called the ‘Western’ textual tradition in Acts, as some have argued.<sup>15</sup>

Finally, the Armenian and Georgian versions, due to their unclear relationship with the Greek and their purportedly close connection with the Syriac, will only be included selectively, and so will the Old Slavonic, which is believed to be based on a comparatively late form of the Greek text.

## 2.2 Citing Versional Evidence in the *ECM*

In the *ECM* of the Catholic Epistles, versional evidence was cited for every variation unit. It was thus treated in much the same way as Greek biblical manuscripts. It was hoped that patterns would emerge in the way versional witnesses relate to Greek ones. This hope has hardly been fulfilled. In a monograph study on the relationship between the Sahidic and Greek texts, F.-J. Schmitz found that it is not possible in a majority of cases to align Coptic manuscripts with specific, extant Greek ones consistently.<sup>16</sup>

This has prompted a reorganization of the way in which versional information is presented in new *ECM* volumes. Versional information will be provided only for chosen variation units. The main criteria for selection are the importance of the Greek variants in a variation unit for Greek textual history, the quality and quantity of their Greek witnesses, the possibility of re-roverting distinctive features of versional variants into Greek, and, where applicable, their relevance for assessing what may be called the D- (or Bezan) trajectory of textual transmission.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>14</sup> See L.C. Niccum, *The Book of Acts in Ethiopic (with critical text and apparatus) and its relation to the Greek textual tradition*, Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 2003; now in revised form as: id., *The Bible in Ethiopia: The Book of Acts* (Cambridge: James Clark & Co., 2014).

<sup>15</sup> See L.C. Niccum, “The Ethiopic version and the ‘Western’ Text of Acts in *Le Texte Occidental des Actes des Apôtres*,” in: J.W. Childers and D.C. Parker (eds.), *Transmission and Reception: New Testament Textcritical and Exegetical Studies* (Texts and Studies, Third series 4; Piscataway: Gorgias, 2006), 69–88.

<sup>16</sup> F.-J. Schmitz, *Das Verhältnis der koptischen zur griechischen Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments. Dokumentation und Auswertung der Gesamtmaterialien beider Traditionen zum Jakobusbrief und den beiden Petrusbriefen* (ANTF 33; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2003). Of particular importance here is the summary of results, op. cit., 595, where Schmitz writes: “Die koptischen Übersetzungen galten bisher immer als Zeugen des griechischen sog. ‘alexandrinischen Textes’, diese Annahme muss nun revidiert werden. Die Vorlagentexte für die meisten koptischen Übersetzungen sind nicht etwa mehr oder minder ‘alexandrinisch’, sondern vielschichtiger, als bisher vermutet wurde. Die sahidischen (und noch mehr die bohairischen) Handschriften zeigen vielmehr Überlieferungsstränge, die auf mehrere verlorengegangene griechische Vorlagentexte hinweisen. Für die neutestamentliche Textkritik bedeutet dies, dass ein koptischer Textzeuge jetzt nicht mehr a priori als ein Vertreter des griechischen gemeinhin als ‘alexandrinisch’ bezeichneten Textes gewertet werden darf.” Schmitz somewhat qualifies this overall result, saying that “man auch einräumen muss, dass zumindest ein Strang der Überlieferung bei den beiden Petrusbriefen mit dem in Verbindung zu stehen scheint, was man gemeinhin als sogenannten ‘alexandrinischen’ Text bezeichnet hat” (from the foreword, p. V). Cf. the results for 1st and 2nd Peter, op. cit., 595.

<sup>17</sup> It has long been known that “Western text” is a misnomer, and scholars therefore often use circumlocutions such as “the so-called ‘Western’ text,” or something to that effect. Possible alternatives include “the D-text” and “the D-cluster.” While the former term seems to concentrate overly on one manuscript, the latter, suggested by E. Epp, draws attention to the fact that we are dealing with constellations of variants found in a group of witnesses. See E.J. Epp, “Textual Clusters: Their

### 2.3 Aims

The overall aim is to improve the way versional information is presented in the *ECM*, both by restricting it to the selected passages and by attending to versional peculiarities and to translation technique. This includes, not least, the exclusion from the apparatus of versional information which would be irrelevant or even misleading.<sup>18</sup> To exaggerate only a little, much work on the versions will lead to results which users of the *ECM* will not see. That is, it will lead to the exclusion of some versional material from the apparatus where it does not seem able to throw light on the history of the Greek text. There are many apparent similarities between versions or between a version and a Greek variant which, when studied closely, can hardly be said to point to a common Greek Vorlage. For assessments of these apparent similarities, translation technique and linguistic peculiarities have to be taken into account.

### 2.4 Versional Peculiarities

Editors of a Greek text encounter many traps and pitfalls in their work on versional evidence. It may suffice here to give a few examples chosen at random. Latin does not have articles, which means that Latin translations cannot as a rule tell us much about a very frequent kind of Greek variation. Latin translators also enjoy considerable freedom as they choose between participles and finite verb forms. This may result in the introduction of conjunctions between two finite verbs where there is no conjunction between a participle and a finite verb in the Greek. In Greek,  $\tau\acute{\epsilon}$  and  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  are easily exchanged one for the other; are -que, quidem, and autem, too? Different Greek prepositions may be rendered by one Latin preposition. As a rule, the use of prepositions, and of what are loosely called tenses, in a translation is a less than certain indicator (or none at all) of the presence of supposedly corresponding prepositions, or aspects/“tenses,” in the underlying Greek text. Some languages are much more flexible than others with regard to word order. Additions and omissions of articles, conjunctions, direct objects, personal or possessive pronouns abound. Honourific titles such as Lord, our Lord, our Lord Jesus, our Lord Jesus Christ, are easily multiplied and expanded, but sometimes shortened. Sometimes, words may be chosen to render Greek words which, on the basis of modern dictionaries, one might expect to see rendered rather differently.<sup>19</sup> These and similar questions have to be taken into account when attempting to correlate versional and Greek variants and in assessments of variants peculiar to one or more versions.

---

Past and Future in New Testament Textual Criticism,” in: M.J. Holmes and B.D. Ehrman (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research. Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Second Edition (NTTSD 42; ; Leiden etc.: Brill, 2013), 519–77. We are also dealing, however, with the dynamics of textual development over time. The term “D-trajectory” may help to keep in mind both the dynamic nature of the phenomenon and the fact that evidence for it may be found in groups of witnesses ‘clustering,’ as it were, round Codex Bezae.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. the instructive remarks on the importance of versional translation technique for evaluations of (apparent) similarities between versions: P.J. Williams, “‘Where Two or Three Are Gathered Together’: Evaluating Agreements between Two or More Early Versions,” in: C.E. Hill and M. Kruger (eds.), *The Early Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 239–58.

<sup>19</sup> For example, Parker draws attention to the various translations of  $\omicron\upsilon\nu$  in Old Latin Gospel manuscripts. See D.C. Parker, “The Translation of OYN in the Old Latin Gospels,” in: id., *Manuscripts, Texts, Theology*. Collected Papers 1977–2007 (ATNF 40; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2009), 167–95.



extant in no fewer than 22 Greek minuscules also.<sup>26</sup> Versional evidence, together with a new collation of Greek manuscripts, again helps to make a more adequate assessment of the textual history of the variant.

### 1.2 Versional evidence in agreement with a recent Greek manuscript publication

In Acts 16:35, the Syriac Peshitta reads an addition, in English translation: “to the prison warden” (ܩܘܪܝܢܐܝܘܬܐ). In Greek retroversion, this would be τῷ δεσμοφύλακι. This variant is not attested in other versions, and it remained otherwise unknown until recently. The Syriac Peshitta variant alone would not have prompted an entry in the *ECM* apparatus. But, due to the recent publication of an important manuscript, the variant is now known to be extant in one Greek papyrus also,  $\Psi^{127}$ .<sup>27</sup> This variant is typical of the paraphrasing character often attributed to many variants of the D-trajectory; it does not, strictly speaking, offer new insight, but explicitly clarifies what otherwise would have to be deduced from the context. This variant is not, however, found in Codex Bezae or in any known Greek manuscript other than  $\Psi^{127}$ . Once more, the combination of a new collation of Greek manuscripts and versional evidence helps to evaluate the import of each of them for textual history.

### 1.3 Correspondence between a Version and a Greek Manuscript—the Question of (Non-) Genealogical Correspondence

The next example, while of limited significance in terms of textual difference, is typical of the difficulties involved in correlating Greek and versional variants and the implications this may have.

According to Acts 19:30,

“Paul wished to go in among the crowd, but the disciples would not let him.”  
(Παύλου δὲ βουλομένου εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν δῆμον οὐκ εἶων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταί.)

The Greek and Latin texts of Codex Bezae, “the disciples hindered/the disciples did not allow” (οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐκωλον/*discipuli non sinebant*), do not include a direct object (αὐτόν/*eum*, “him”),<sup>28</sup> nor do a number of Latin manuscripts (Gryson 51, 54, 58, 189) and the Vulgate, which read

“not did permit the disciples”  
(*non permittunt discipuli / non sinebant discipuli*).

In comparison with the Latin text of Codex Bezae, the difference in word order seems negligible. A Greek variant οὐκ εἶων οἱ μαθηταί would certainly not have been postulated here on the strength of the Latin evidence. But collation results show that there is in fact one Greek

<sup>26</sup> These are G-A 180, 330, 424, 636, 886, 1003, 1243, 1270, 1297, 1409, 1501, 1563, 1595, 1609, 1751, 1827s, 1831s, 1842, 2495, 2652, 2718, 2774. Von Soden’s apparatus already notes a substantial (though smaller) number of Greek manuscripts reading this variant: von Soden (ed.), *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*, vol. 2, ad loc.

<sup>27</sup> The *editio princeps* of  $\Psi^{127}$  is: D.C. Parker and S.R. Pickering (eds.), “P.Oxy. 4968: Acta Apostolorum 10–12, 15–17,” in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 74 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2009), 1–45. Cf. G. Gäbel, “The Text of  $\Psi^{127}$  (P. Oxy. 4968) and its Relationship with the Text of Codex Bezae,” *NovT* 53 (2011): 107–52, esp. 109–11.

<sup>28</sup> Was the Greek variant of Codex Bezae consciously chosen due to a preference for the shorter phrase? Or, alternatively, is this text the result of two successive instances of variation, the first being the replacement of οὐκ εἶων by ἐκωλον, and the second, the mechanical omission of αὐτόν due to homoioteleuton (ἐκωλονον αὐτοον)?

manuscript (467\*) which reads precisely this text.<sup>29</sup> No doubt text forms without αὐτόν/*eum* could have arisen multiple times. An editor may therefore decide to correlate the Old Latin and Vulgate text to both the Greek text of Codex Bezae and the variant of G-A 467\*. It seems better, however, to correlate *non permittunt discipuli* to the Greek variant exactly matching it in wording and word order.

There is also limited agreement here between the Greek text of Codex Bezae (G-A 05) and the Syriac Peshitta, both of which read verbs meaning “to hinder” (ܥܘܕܘܘܢ in the Syriac, though this includes a suffix equivalent to αὐτόν).<sup>30</sup> In contrast, the Latin text of Codex Bezae (Gryson 5) agrees with the Greek majority text, reading *non sinebant* rather than, e.g., *prohibuerunt*. This indicates that the Greek and Latin texts of Codex Bezae at this point seem to represent two different Greek textual traditions. It may be best therefore to correlate this Latin text with Greek texts of both Codex Bezae and of G-A 467\*, a possibility which the *ECM* apparatus allows.

## 2. The D-Trajectory and ‘New’ Greek Variants Postulated on the basis of Versional Evidence

It will be of particular interest to see how a Greek critical edition deals with versional variants belonging to the D-trajectory which do not, however, have equivalents in Greek witnesses. The editors of the *ECM* of Acts have normally treated versional variants lacking Greek support very restrictively, but they have been more willing to include such variants into the apparatus where the D-trajectory is concerned.

### 2.1 Acts 3:8: A fractured textual trajectory and relationships between versions

Acts 3:8 says about a lame man healed by Peter:

“And leaping up he stood and began to walk, and entered the temple with them”  
(καὶ ἐξαλλόμενος ἔστη καὶ περιεπάτει καὶ εἰσῆλθεν σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν).<sup>31</sup>

Codex Laudianus (G-A 08) reads a variant, including “rejoicing” (8/11 χαίρων) after “he walked/began to walk,” and Codex Bezae (G-A 05) has a similar text (χαίρομενος).<sup>32</sup> Both variants are attested in both Greek and Latin. There is another Latin text form, however, in the Fleury palimpsest (Gryson 55), which reads,

“and he walked re[joicing] and leaping; he entered, however, with them into the temple”  
*et ambulabat g[audens] et exsultans introivit autem cum eis in tem[plum].*

This text form does not read equivalents of “he stood” (ἔστη), and there is a different word order, with *exsultans* (which may be taken here as an equivalent of ἐξαλλόμενος) in a position

<sup>29</sup> This was known to von Soden, whose apparatus cites G-A 467 at this point (he calls it manuscript α502 and counts it as part of his sub-text type *I*<sup>α2</sup>.) See von Soden (ed.), *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*, vol. 2, ad loc.

<sup>30</sup> See Kitchen and Kiraz (eds.), *The Syriac Peshitta Bible with English Translation. Acts*, XXVII.

<sup>31</sup> The verse then continues (8/26–38): walking and leaping and praising God (περιπατῶν καὶ ἀλλόμενος καὶ αἰνῶν τὸν θεόν).—Here and elsewhere in the present article, slashes and numbers following verse numbers refer to word-addresses as used in the *ECM*, i.e., every word of the reconstructed Initial Text has an even address number (counting from 2 at the beginning of each verse), every space between words has an uneven address number (counting from 1 at the beginning of each verse).

<sup>32</sup> Codex Bezae does not attest to the words περιπατῶν καὶ ἀλλόμενος καί, either.

before “he entered” (εἰσηλθεν). There also appears to be evidence for “he rejoiced” (*g[audens]*), which would agree with similar variants in Codices Laudianus and Bezae (although most of it is lost here due to a lacuna).

Another text form is found in the Middle Egyptian tradition:

ΝΑΦΡΕΩΕ ΔΕ ΠΕ ΕΦΧΙ ΦΔΘC· ΖΑΦΩΕ ΝΕΦ ΝΕΜΕΥ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΠΖΙΕΡΟΝ  
 “He, however, rejoiced, leaping. He went with them into the temple”

(Greek retroversion: ἔχαιρεν δὲ [ἐξ]αλλόμενος εἰσηλθεν σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν)

This is very similar to the text form of the Fleury Palimpsest, except that, in addition to “he stood,” “and he walked” (*et ambulabat*/καὶ περιεπάτει) is also unattested. These are, then, two text forms, each found in one versional manuscript, without Greek support, but more or less closely related to the text form already known from Codices Bezae and Laudianus.

One might argue that these text forms should be described as containing subvariants to what is found in the text of Codex Bezae. In this case, the evidence of the Fleury Palimpsest and of the Middle Egyptian would not be included in the apparatus, but would be provided as part of the additional material to be published in the commentary- or study volume (the *Kommentar*- or *Studienband*) which will be part of the *ECM* of Acts.<sup>33</sup> In many cases, this or a similar decision has indeed been taken, but not so here. Since the versional evidence here is clearly important for all those interested in the D-trajectory, the editors have decided to record the two additional text forms, on the basis of Codex Floriacensis and the Middle Egyptian, together with putative Greek retroversions. The result, at the present stage of editorial work, is as follows:<sup>34</sup>

a: καὶ ἐξαλλόμενος ἔστη καὶ περιεπάτει καὶ εἰσηλθεν σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν  
 A (Initial Text); similarly Gryson 51, 54; Vulgate

b: καὶ εξαλλομενος εστη καὶ περιεπατει χαιρων καὶ εισηλθεν συν αυτοις εἰς το ἱερον  
 G-A 08, 1884

c: καὶ εξαλλομενος εστη καὶ περιεπατει χαιρομενος καὶ εισηλθεν συν αυτοις εἰς το ἱερον  
 G-A 05

d: *et ambulabat g[audens] et exsultans introivit autem cum eis in tem[plum]*  
 Gryson 55

(Greek retroversion: καὶ περιεπάτει χ[αίρων] καὶ ἀγαλλιών/ἐξαλλόμενος εἰσηλθεν δὲ σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἱε[ρόν])

e: ΝΑΦΡΕΩΕ ΔΕ ΠΕ ΕΦΧΙ ΦΔΘC· ΖΑΦΩΕ ΝΕΦ ΝΕΜΕΥ ΕΖΟΥΝ ΕΠΖΙΕΡΟΝ  
 Middle Egyptian

(Greek retroversion: ἔχαιρεν δὲ [ἐξ]αλλόμενος εἰσηλθεν σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ ἱερόν)

Note the way in which one feature, the addition of *χαιρων/gaudens* (or similar words), is shared by some witnesses belonging to the D-trajectory and also by Codex Laudianus (very nearly identical, at this point, with Codex Bezae). At the same time, one Old Latin witness (Gryson 55) and the Middle Egyptian text differ in remarkably comparable ways from the two Greek-Latin diglots, sharing with them only the one characteristic mentioned above.

<sup>33</sup> On which see § II.4 below.

<sup>34</sup> What follows is the reconstructed Initial Text, together with the variants, for Acts 3:8/2–24. In the *ECM* of Acts, however, there will be a different variation unit, 3:8/2–32 (not 8/2–24). For the purposes of the present article, I have reproduced here the text and variants of variation unit 8/2–32, omitting, however, the text of word address 8/26–32 in variants a, b (περιπατῶν καὶ ἀλλόμενος καί). These words are not found in variants c, d, e in variation unit 8/2–32, either.

However, most Latin manuscripts, notably Codices Gigas and Perpinianus, together with the Vulgate, support the Greek initial text. This is yet another example of the fractured and multi-faceted character of the Bezan trajectory, which the witness of the versions further helps to appreciate.

## 2.2 Acts 2:41

Acts 2:41:

“So those who received his word were baptized, and there were added that day about three thousand souls.”

(οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀποδεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθησαν καὶ προσετέθησαν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ψυχαὶ ὡσεὶ τρισχίλια.)

Here, the Syriac Peshitta reads,

ܐܘܨܬܐ ܘܘܨܬܐ ܡܗܠܘ ܐܠܘ ܕܘܟܘܬܐ ܘܡܘܬܐ ܩܘܪܘܢܐ

“And some of them readily received his word and believed and were baptized.”<sup>35</sup>

The word here rendered “readily,” ܕܘܟܘܬܐ, equals the Greek ἀσμένως, which is found in the majority of Greek manuscripts, but not in the reconstructed Initial Text.

There is one text form, read by Codex Bezae, according to which

“those who believed his word”

(πιστευσαντες τον λογον αυτου)

were baptized, similarly to the Peshitta which also mentions believing. But the Bezan text does not combine this with “received.” This combination, however, is found in the Latin text of several witnesses, Codices Perpinianus (Gryson 54), Schlettstadtensis (Gryson 57) and Ardmachanus (Gryson 61), as well as in the Peshitta, and also in the Middle Egyptian:

*at (...) recepto verbo eius crediderunt et (...)*

Gryson 54 (Perpinianus)

*itaque hoc acceptum verbum eius crediderunt et (...)*

Gryson 57 (Schlettstadtensis)

*ergo receperunt et crediderunt sermonem eius et (...)*

Gryson 61 (Ardmachanus)

ΟΥΝ ΖΑΥΩΟΠ ΕΡΑΥ ΜΠΣΕΧΕ ΖΝ ΟΥΕΡΟΥΑΤ’ ΑΥΩ ΖΑΥΠΙΣΤΕΥΕ

“so they accepted the word with joy and believed”

Middle Egyptian (Greek retroversion: οὖν ἀσμένως ἀποδεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον καὶ ἐπίστευσαν)

ܘܘܨܬܐ ܡܗܠܘ ܐܠܘ ܕܘܟܘܬܐ

[they] “readily received his word and believed”

Syriac Peshitta (Greek retroversion: ἀσμένως ἀποδεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπίστευσαν)

It will be seen that the Middle Egyptian is very nearly identical with the Peshitta, except that the former has no equivalent of “his”, whereas the latter has no introductory particle such as ΟΥΝ (“now, so”). What is also remarkable is that the Middle Egyptian and the Peshitta (but not Codex Ardmachanus and the other Latin witnesses mentioned above) have equivalents of ἀσμένως, “readily,” which is found in the Latin tradition only in one manuscript, Codex

<sup>35</sup> Translation by Kitchen and Kiraz, *The Syriac Peshitta Bible with English Translation*. Acts, XXVI.

Laudianus (Gryson 50).<sup>36</sup> This latter manuscript, as so often in Acts, agrees with the Greek majority text, but not with Codex Bezae and its relatives.<sup>37</sup>

From a text historical perspective, this is another instructive example of the way in which witnesses often considered as belonging to one trajectory come together in changing constellations, sharing some similarities with some of their relatives and others, with others. This is all the more remarkable since witnesses such as Codices Schlettstadtensis (Gryson 57) and Ardmachanus (Gryson 61) are not normally mentioned in enumerations of the more prominent members of the D-trajectory, although they (as well as Perpinianus/Gryson 54) are known to contain old variants.<sup>38</sup>

In this case, the editors of the *ECM* of Acts have decided to include in the apparatus a variant which is a Greek retroversion of the Middle Egyptian text (Acts 2:41/6–14c), whereas other versional text forms will not be noted in the apparatus at this point.<sup>39</sup>

### 2.3 ‘New’ Greek Variants Postulated on the Basis of Versional Evidence

Normally, variants not extant in Greek biblical manuscripts will be introduced into the *ECM*-apparatus only if at least two or more versions or early Christian authors agree on them. In this respect, the above examples are exceptional. At the same time, where there is such agreement, this does not necessarily mean that a variant will indeed be included in the apparatus.

The editors and other members of the Münster INTF staff working on the *ECM* assume that a versional variant is likely to have had a Greek *Vorlage* if it cannot easily be explained as a mere inner-versional variation (such as a simplification or a an apparently natural expansion or explanation) or as a different way of rendering the text(s) already found in the Greek tradition. That is, they search for variants which have their own, distinct text forms—not only an alternative wording of what is said in texts found in the Greek manuscript tradition. The other main criterion is attestation. There should ideally be attestation in more than one source, e.g.,

<sup>36</sup> The Venerable Bede quotes the Latin text of Acts 2:41/2–16 as known from the Vulgate, *qui ergo receperunt sermonem eius baptizati sunt*, but then adds: *hunc locum alia translatio iuxta proprietatem graecae veritatis ita habet: illi quidem libenter recipientes verbum eius baptizati sunt*. See Beda, *Retractatio in Acta Apostolorum* (MPL 92), 1004D. It is well known that Bede knew a number of different Latin and even Greek text forms, including the text form(s) also found in Codex Laudianus. See further M.L.W. Laistner, “The Latin Versions of Acts Known to the Venerable Bede,” *HTR* 30 (1937): 37–50, and (very briefly) Houghton, *The Latin New Testament*, 72.

<sup>37</sup> On these changing constellations of witnesses, cf. already *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. The Text revised by B.F. Westcott and F.J.A. Hort. Introduction. Appendix (Cambridge and London: Macmillan, 1882), 122. In the Greek manuscript tradition, ἀσμένως is read by the majority of witnesses (including G-A 08), though that word has been inserted in different places.

<sup>38</sup> Admittedly, Morin, the first editor of Codex Schlettstadtensis, ascribed to it a markedly ‘Western’ character. See G. Morin, “Le lectionnaire mérovingien de Schlettstadt, avec fragments du texte occidental des Actes,” *Revue Bénédictine* 25 (1908): 161–66; id., “Les fragments du texte occidental des actes dans le Lectionnaire de Schlettstadt,” in id., *Études, Textes, Découvertes*. Contributions à la littérature et à l’histoire des douzes premiers siècles, vol. 1 (Anecdota Maredsolana, 2nd series; Maredsous and Paris: Abbaye de Maredsous and Picard, 1913), 49–50; id., “Le lectionnaire mérovingien de Schlettstadt et son texte occidental des Actes,” in id., *Études, Textes, Découvertes*, 1: 440–56. Similarly, for Codex Ardmachanus, it would be interesting to collect variants appearing to be affiliated with witnesses such as Codices Bezae, Floriacensis, and the Middle Egyptian text, though these are few and far between (the text of Ardmachanus/Gryson 61 mainly follows the Vulgate).

<sup>39</sup> See § II.4 below for alternative ways of including versional information in the *ECM*.

in several versions or in versions and in patristic citations, or at least in several strands of one versional tradition. The better the attestation and the more distinct the text form, the more likely is a Greek *Vorlage*.

### 3. Mutual Influence of Greek and Versional Texts

#### 3.1 Misspelling and Translation

According to Acts 5:36, a certain Theudas said about himself that

“he was someone”  
(εἶναί τινα ἑαυτόν).

This may be rendered in Latin as *esse se aliquem*, as in the Vulgate. There is a variant, εἶναί τινα ἑαυτον μεγαυ, he said “that he was someone great” (Laudianus, G-A 08). This is rendered (unsurprisingly) as *esse aliquem se magnum* in the Latin text of Laudianus (Gryson 50).<sup>40</sup>

The Latin text of Codex Bezae (Gryson 5), however, reads, *esse quendam magnum ipsorum*. Why *ipsorum* (“of themselves”)? And who are “they?” This is easily explained, however, once one considers the Greek text of that diglot (G-A 05), which, with a different word order than Laudianus, reads: εἶναί τινα μεγαυ ἑαυτον. This would only have to be misspelled (or misapprehended) as εἶναί τινα μεγαυ ἑαυτων to lead to the precise, yet nonsensical Latin word-for-word translation, *esse quendam magnum ipsorum*, the last word being the rendering of ἑαυτων. This may illustrate both the translator’s intention to remain faithful to the Greek text even in details and the limitations of his or her proficiency in Greek and/or Latin.<sup>41</sup>

#### 3.2 Versional influence on the Greek text? An Example from Codex Laudianus

Acts 1:15:

“and there was a group of people in one place, roughly hundred and twenty.”  
(ἦν τε ὄχλος ὀνομάτων ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ὡσεὶ ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι).

The Greek rendered here as “people,” ὀνομάτων, literally means “names.” There is a variant at this point, “men” (ανδρων), but only two manuscripts (G-A 08 [i.e. Codex Laudianus] and minuscule G-A 1884) read this variant.

In Latin, one would expect *nominum* as the translation of ὀνομάτων. In fact, Coptic manuscripts and the Syriac Harclensis read equivalents of “names.” This is not the text of most of the Latin tradition, however. Codices Gigas and Perpinianus, Wernigerodensis, Ardmachanus and Cavensis as well as a group of Spanish lectionary manuscripts all read *hominum* (Gryson 51, 54, 56, 58, 61, 70, 73, 189). This is obviously a very old Latin text, which has survived even in some later manuscripts. Parts of the Vulgate tradition read *nominum*,<sup>42</sup> the translation of

<sup>40</sup> This addition appears to have been caused by the parallel in Acts 8:9, where we learn that Simon the magician said about himself “that he was someone great” (εἶναί τινα ἑαυτὸν μέγαυ).

<sup>41</sup> For a similarly precise, yet unsuccessful word-for-word translation in the same manuscript, but (presumably) from Latin into Greek, see § 3.3.2 below.

<sup>42</sup> This is the edited text of the so-called Stuttgart Vulgate: R. Weber (ed.), *Biblia Sacra Vulgata*, vol. 2, *Proverbia – Apocalypsis. Appendix* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt), 1969; cf. R. Weber and R. Gryson (eds.), *Biblia Sacra Vulgata. Editio quinta* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft), 2007. The so-called Oxford Vulgate reads *hominum*: J. Wordsworth and H.J. White (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi*, vol. 3, *Actus Apostolorum – Epistulae Canonicae – Apocalypsis Iohannis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), 1954.

ὀνομάτων. This is probably the result of an emendation of the Old Latin text on the basis of a Greek text.

Is *hominum* a translation of ὀνομάτων, then, taken to mean “people?” This is possible, and the fact that the Syriac Peshitta reads a similar text, ܡܘܬܝܢܐ (“[a multitude] of people/human beings”), may underscore this possibility. Alternatively, the agreement between the two versions could indicate that a Greek variant ἀνθρώπων (now unattested) may have existed. Such assumptions, however, are probably unnecessary: Given the similarity of the two Latin words *nominum* and *hominum*, it seems more likely that ὀνομάτων was translated as *nominum* and that this was then misread or misspelled, creating the versional variant *hominum*. In this case, the Old Latin and Peshitta texts originated independently, and the text of the Peshitta seems to be a result of what might be called ‘dynamic’ translating.

Ἄνδρῶν may be straightforwardly translated as *virorum* or vice versa. In fact, the Latin text of Codex Laudianus (Gryson 50) does read *virorum*. A look at the manuscripts involved is instructive. As mentioned before, only two Greek manuscripts, G-A 08 and 1884, read the Greek variant ἀνδρῶν. In fact, however, 1884 is so faithful a shadow of 08 as to be an almost exact copy of it. 1884 simply has another instance of the same Greek text as 08.<sup>43</sup> Both variants seem to be completely isolated in the Greek and Latin traditions. Since there is no additional evidence, it stands to reason that *virorum* is either the translation of ἀνδρῶν or vice versa.<sup>44</sup> Which came first?

If a Greek variant ἀνθρώπων existed, this could have led to another variant ἀνδρῶν. Alternatively, ἀνδρῶν may have originated as a contextual variant clarifying the meaning of ὀνομάτων.<sup>45</sup> While this may be possible, Latin versional influence behind ἀνδρῶν seems at

<sup>43</sup> R. van der Bergh argues that minuscule 1884 is in fact a direct copy of the Greek text of Laudianus (08): See id., “The Influence of the Greek OT Traditions on the Explicit Quotations in Codex E08,” in: M. Karrer and J. de Vries (eds.), *Textual History and the Reception of Scripture in Early Christianity. Textgeschichte und Schriftrezeption im frühen Christentum* (SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 60; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 131–50. He writes: “The case of 1884 warrants special attention. The present author is of the opinion that 1884, a sixteenth century manuscript, was copied directly from the Greek text of E08 [...]” “The manuscript does not only agree remarkably with the text of E08—in fact, almost invariably—but the text of 1884 stops abruptly at exactly the word where E08’s missing folios break off in Acts 26:29 (Ο ΔΕ ΠΑΥΛΟΣ) and resumes with exactly the same word with which the extant text of E08 begins (ΠΟΡΕΥΘΗΤΙ). In a case such as E08’s ΕΠΙΣΤΡΕΨΟΥ[CIN] in Acts 26:27, the scribe of 1884 could clearly also not see the missing text and ended up copying the nonsense reading επιστρεψουζ” (van der Bergh, op. cit., 135 n. 21). I am grateful to van der Bergh for bringing his article to my attention.

<sup>44</sup> Notwithstanding the fact that *vir* and *homo*, ἀνὴρ and ἄνθρωπος frequently seem to be used with some imprecision. Cf. Acts 9:13, where most Old Latin manuscripts have forms of *vir* to render forms of ἀνὴρ, while two Latin manuscripts, Gryson 54 and 55, read forms of *homo*. A Greek text reading περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου is found in a quotation in John Chrysostom’s Homilies on Acts, 20.1 (*MPG* 60, 157). The import of this variant seems most doubtful, however, since the same preacher repeats the quotation, now reading περὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου, only a few lines later. It remains unclear whether *homo* in Gryson 54 and 55 goes back at this point to a hypothetical variant in the Greek manuscript tradition. Another example: In Acts 9:12, most Greek witnesses read ἄνδρα, but one minuscule, G-A 1509, reads ἀνθρωπον. The Latin manuscript tradition is unanimous in reading *virum* at this point.

<sup>45</sup> It would be desirable to know more about scribal habits of Codex Laudianus, specifically with a view to the likelihood of (apparently) ‘singular’ contextual variants such as this one. Walther does not comment on this passage (fol. 4v, l. 11) in his work on Codex Laudianus, which is basically a new critical edition of that manuscript: O.K. Walther, *Codex Laudianus G35. A Re-Examination of the Manuscript: A Reproduction of the Text and Accompanying Commentary*, unpublished Ph.D.

least equally plausible because (1) no Greek variant ἀνθρώπων is known, (2) the Old Latin and Peshitta texts can easily be explained otherwise, and (3) ἀνδρων is unattested outside G-A 08 and 1884. *Hominum* may have been retroverted into Greek, resulting in the variant ἀνδρων, and this may have been translated into Latin again as *virorum*. Alternatively, *virorum* may have arisen in the Latin tradition, and this may have led to ἀνδρων.

Finally, there is still another Latin variant. The Latin text of Codex Bezae (Gryson 5) reads *non omnium*, which appears to be another blunder for *nominum*.<sup>46</sup> The Greek text of Bezae (G-A 05) has ονοματων, making this one of those places where the Greek and Latin texts of Bezae differ.<sup>47</sup>

### 3.3 Versional Influence on the Greek Text: Two Examples from Codex Bezae

The question of possible versional influence on the Greek textual tradition is an open one. Therefore two more examples, taken from Codex Bezae, may be in order.

#### 3.3.1 According to Acts 8:13,

“Even Simon himself believed, and after being baptized he continued with Philip [...]”  
(ὁ δὲ Σίμων καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπίστευσεν καὶ βαπτισθεὶς ἦν προσκαρτερῶν τῷ Φιλίππῳ [...]).

G-A 05\* reads another καὶ before προσκαρτερῶν. It is the only Greek manuscript to do so, and this additional καὶ, which hardly seems to make sense syntactically, was subsequently (very nearly) deleted by a corrector. In the Latin tradition, however, several manuscripts (Gryson 5, 51, 57) read *et adhaerebat*. These same witnesses also read *et baptizatus est*. Perhaps the translator(s) responsible for this Latin text failed to understand that βαπτισθεὶς replaces a subordinate clause (and perhaps even that ἦν belongs to προσκαρτερῶν: Could *baptizatus est* be a failed attempt at translating βαπτισθεὶς ἦν?). At any rate, the wording *baptizatus est* in this Latin text form makes the addition of *et* between *baptizatus est* and *adhaerebat* syntactically unavoidable. No such addition is required in the Vulgate and others which instead read *et cum baptizatus esset, adhaerebat* or *et baptizatus adhaerebat*. In sum, the addition of *et* is plausibly motivated in one part of the Latin tradition, whereas the corresponding addition of καὶ appears unmotivated in the Greek, and Codex Bezae, the only Greek witness to read this text form, is a diglot also reading the Latin text which provides a plausible motif for the addition.

---

thesis, 3 vols., University of St. Andrews, 1980. Walther concludes: “Codex Laudianus is a highly mixed and distinctive Old Latin text with many unique readings. [...] However, on a number of occasions the scribe completely departed from any recognized standard Old Latin text or texts and has preserved archaic expressions curiously similar to Perpinianus and Floriacensis.” (Walther, *op. cit.*, 1: 59.) This does not account, however, for the variant under discussion here.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Latin textual development in Acts 1:24, where πάντων is rendered *omnium* in Latin, but some manuscripts (Gryson 56, 70, 189) read what must be a result of misspelling of that word, *hominum*.

<sup>47</sup> Since the Greek text of Codex Bezae (G-A 05) reads ονοματων in Acts 1:15, it does not follow (though it is possible) that the Latin text at this point is a distorted form of an Old Latin text reading *nominum*.—On differences between the Greek and Latin texts of Codex Bezae in Acts, see D.C. Parker, *Codex Bezae. An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1992, 228–49. Parker suggests that the Latin text of Acts in Codex Bezae is the result of an accommodation of an earlier Old Latin text to the Greek text of Acts used in this diglot.

3.3.2 According to Acts 17:27, Paul said on the Areopagus that God has determined “that they” (i.e. humans) should

“seek God”  
(ζητεῖν τὸν θεόν).

Instead of τὸν θεόν, some Greek witnesses read θεον or τον κυριον. Codex Bezae (G-A 05) is the only Greek witness to read το θειον εστιν instead. While this way of referring to the divine is syntactically incorrect, similar, but correct text forms may be found in two Latin manuscripts: Codex Gigas (Gryson 51) reads *illud divinum*, and the Latin text of Codex Bezae (Gryson 5) circumscribes the same concept, using the words *quod divinum est*. The agreement between Codices Bezae and Gigas indicates that a Greek text form such as τὸ θεῖον may have existed. This may even have been the text of the Greek *Vorlage* (or of an earlier ancestor) of the Greek text in Codex Bezae. In this case, το θειον εστιν would seem to be a text form created by one copyist who mistakenly wished to ‘rectify’ the supposed omission of the Greek equivalent of *est*. In sum, το θειον εστιν appears to be an unsuccessful word-for-word retroversion of *quod divinum est* in the Latin text of the same manuscript.<sup>48</sup>

### 3.4 Mutual Influence of Greek and Versional Texts in Diglots

Looking back at the three examples from Codex Bezae discussed in this article (Acts 5:36, 8:13, and 17:27), they seem to have in common an underlying intention to increase correspondence between the Greek and Latin texts of that diglot. This seems to have led to changes which, remarkably, could be made both to the Latin text on the basis of the Greek and to the Greek text on the basis of the Latin. The same apparent intention would also help to explain the example from Codex Laudianus in Acts 1:15 mentioned above.<sup>49</sup> Finally, the same intention may even have influenced the way the Greek and Latin texts are laid out in Codex Laudianus—not facing each other on opposite pages at each opening, as in Codex Bezae, but in two columns on each page, where each line of Latin text seems to have been paired carefully with each corresponding line of Greek text.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>48</sup> This example has been previously cited by J.H. Ropes, *The Text of Acts* (vol. 3 in: *The Acts of the Apostles*, part I of: *The Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. F.J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake; London: Macmillan, 1926), LXXII.—A similar example from Codex Laudianus: In Acts 12:3, ὅτι ἀρεστόν ἐστιν is rendered as *quod/quia placeret/placuisset* in Latin manuscripts except Laudianus (Gryson 50), which reads *quia placitum est* in what appears to be an attempt at adapting the Latin text to the Greek.

<sup>49</sup> The same intention also appears to have led to one detail of the Latin text of Laudianus in Acts 10:41, where other Latin manuscripts render μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι αὐτόν as *postquam surrexit*, whereas Laudianus has *postquam surrexit eum*, where *eum* appears to be the supposed equivalent of αὐτόν. (The influence here is, of course, from the Greek on the Latin rather than vice versa.) Similar claims have been made before. Commenting on Acts 8:37, another verse where influence from the Latin text of Laudianus on the Greek of the same manuscript seems likely, Ropes goes so far as to say: “The text of E is, as usual, a retranslation from e.” (“E” denotes the Greek text of Laudianus, “e” the Latin.). Ropes, *The Text of Acts*, 83. This is probably an exaggeration. Cf. further J.H. Ropes, “The Greek Text of Codex Laudianus,” pp. 175–86 in: id., “Three Papers on the Text of Acts,” *HTR* 16 (1923): 163–86, esp. 178–81.

<sup>50</sup> In this context, it is also remarkable that, unusually, in Codex Laudianus, the Latin column, which is on the left side, is thereby given precedence over the Greek column. Cf. further Ropes, “The Greek Text of Codex Laudianus,” 176f; Walther, *Codex Laudianus G35. A Re-Examination of the Manuscript: A Reproduction of the Text and Accompanying Commentary*, 1: 36.

It is a widely shared assumption that the Latin texts of the Greek-Latin diglots have been heavily influenced by the Greek texts of these same manuscripts.<sup>51</sup> The above examples, among others, seem to show that the Greek textual tradition has been influenced by the versions also.<sup>52</sup>

#### 4. Versional Information Within and Beyond the Apparatus

Versional information and information related to the versions may be offered in the *ECM* in the following four ways:

(1) Versional information in the apparatus, even where it is correlated with one Greek variant, may require comment or qualification. The text volume of the *ECM* comes with a booklet called supplementary material, or *Begleitende Materialien*. A comment, or remark, on a variation unit may be added there, such as that the relationship between the versional and Greek variant at this point is not straightforward, or that there is a small difference between the two which, however, would not justify the treatment of the versional text as a variant in its own right.

(2) A variant found in one or more versions, but not in the Greek textual tradition, may be included in the apparatus, together with a Greek retroversion, thus indicating that, in the view of the editors, it seems highly likely that this variant once existed in Greek.

(3) Some versional variants, while not sufficiently well attested or too easily explained as inner-versional to include them in the apparatus, may nevertheless be sufficiently interesting to mention them elsewhere. This kind of material will be presented (as mentioned above) in an additional volume, called commentary volume or study volume (*Kommentar-* or *Studienband*).

(4) The commentary volume will also contain more extended commentary and studies on the Greek text and on the versions. In it, members of the *ECM* team will publish their own research and comment on individual variants. For example, the possible explanation offered above for the origin of the variants *hominum* and ἀνθρώπων in Acts 1:15 will not be part of the apparatus. It goes beyond comment on existing variants. It should be offered as a contribution to the analysis and interpretation of the evidence. There will also be more extensive studies on problems of the textual tradition of Acts such as, e.g., on the D-trajectory and on the relationship between variants in the Coptic text, particularly the Middle Egyptian, and the other versions.

### III. Conclusion

This study has discussed examples of variation in early versions of Acts and their place in a Greek critical edition. It has described principles and limits of inclusion of versional information in the critical apparatus of the *Editio Critica Maior*. Moreover, it has attempted to show that careful attention to the versions will benefit the study of Greek textual history. Specifically, it has argued that, in some cases, particularly in bilingual manuscripts, there is likely to have been versional influence on the Greek text. It is to be hoped that the *ECM* may help to strengthen interest in, and to foster continuing engagement with, the relationship between the Greek and versional textual traditions of New Testament texts.

<sup>51</sup> See Fischer, "Das Neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache," 29.

<sup>52</sup> This is not an entirely new, but perhaps a more or less forgotten insight. In his edition of Acts, Ropes devotes a paragraph to "Influence of the Latin on Greek" in Codex Bezae: Ropes, *The Text of Acts*, LXXII–LXXIII. I have already mentioned what the same author has to say about influence on the Greek text of Codex Laudianus from the Latin (see n. 49 above).

**Appendix: Latin Manuscripts cited**

Ms.-Name (L = Lectionary)	Ms.-No. (Gryson)	Abbreviation used in Nestle-Aland, NT Graece
Codex Bezae	5	d
Codex Laudianus	50	e
Codex Gigas	51	gig
Codex Perpinianus	54	p
Codex Floriacensis	55	h
Liber Comicus Silensis (L)	56	t
Codex Schlettstadtensis (L)	57	r
Codex Wernigerodensis	58	w
Codex Ardmachanus	61	ar
Liber Comicus Aemilianus (L)	70	–
Liber misticus (Toledo, Bibl. del Cabildo 35-4) (L)	72	–
Liber misticus (Oxford, BL MS Add. 30864) (L)	73	–
Codex Cavensis	189	–