

TRACING THE READINGS OF CODEX BEZAE IN THE POPYRI OF ACTS

I. PRELIMINARY COMMENTS

The aim of this study is to trace the readings of Acts in Codex Bezae (D05)¹ in the papyrus manuscripts of the book. It is not designed to be a definitive or conclusive study in itself, but rather an exploration of the topic that will provide a starting point for a subsequent inquiry into the development of the text of Acts in a wider context. Comparing the text of Codex Bezae with the papyrus witnesses is, to some extent, a rather arbitrary choice, since the uniform nature of the material on which manuscript were written does not mean a uniformity of text. Moreover, the papyri of Acts span several centuries (from the early 3rd to the 8th), with D05 being dated to around 400², so a variety of influences on and modifications to their text is to be expected. That said, the earliest Greek witnesses to Acts are to be found among the papyri and these have special value in consequence. In any case, even the later papyri cannot be simply disregarded as too late to be of interest, for the date of a manuscript is by no means necessarily the same as the date of its text. Furthermore, they were all found in Egypt and all therefore transmit a text known and read among the Egyptian communities, even if it did not originate there.

In comparing the papyri with the Bezan text, the other point of comparison will be the Alexandrian text, represented by Codex Vaticanus (B03) and Codex Sinaiticus (•01). Particular attention will be paid to the text of B03 because it is between this text and that of D05 that the difference is the greatest and the most consistent. The readings of •01 will nonetheless also be taken into account. By taking D05 and B03 as the two reference points with which to compare the papyri, we by no means intend to suggest that they represent two distinct traditions of Acts, two separate developments with which all other witnesses are to be assimilated and classified as having *either* a “D text” *or* a “B text”, *either* a “Western

1. Uncial manuscripts will be referred to by their letter and number, except in lists of witnesses where numbers would be cumbersome.

2. For discussion of the dating, see D.C. PARKER, *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and Its Text*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. 30.

text” or an “Alexandrian text”. Our analysis of the text of Acts³ leads us rather to the conclusion that the text of D05 and that of B03 stand at the two extremes of a period of development, a period in which changes were introduced progressively, and to some extent freely. The conclusion is somewhat tentative at this stage, since more detailed examination of the intermediate stages is needed in order to see if it can be confirmed. The picture that emerges from the study of the papyri tends, however, to point in that direction.

It is customary in studies of the history of the text of Acts to assume that D05 is a secondary text and that what Luke originally wrote was closer to that of B03 (which in Acts is usually the same as that of •01). The text of Acts in the editions of the Greek New Testament since at least Westcott and Hort at the end of the nineteenth century has thus been essentially that of •01/B03, and it is the one on which exegetical studies are generally based. While this choice may well reflect the most widely held opinion and, indeed, corresponds to the weight of the external evidence (notably the number of the witnesses), it ignores important internal evidence that points to the older nature of the D05 text: a) the cohesiveness of its language and the early grammatical or lexical forms it attests; b) the Jewish perspective of the author, who writes with a highly sophisticated knowledge of Jewish exegetical techniques and from within a Jewish understanding of the history of Israel; and c) the criticism made by the author of the apostles, including Paul, who are not regarded as infallible heroes but as people struggling (and often failing) to come to terms with the teaching of Jesus. Any one of these features is a challenge to the designation of D05 as “secondary”, just as their absence in •01/B03 is a challenge to the usual assumption that theirs is the earlier text; all three features together create a compelling enough reason for taking D05 as the starting point with which to compare other witnesses.

1. *The Nature of Codex Bezae*

The Greek text of Acts in D05 presents a large number and a wide variety of differences compared with the Alexandrian text, over one quarter of Acts being affected by variant readings⁴. On the one hand, the variation is of a formal nature, involving connectives between clauses,

3. See, in particular, J. RIUS-CAMPS – J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition*, 4 vols., London, T&T Clark International, 2004-2009.

4. This percentage is calculated on the basis of the text of Acts extant in D05; for details, see J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism* (SuplJISNT, 236), Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 2002, pp. 6-7.

the use of the article, word order, the choice of prepositions, the choice between κύριος and θεός⁵, the use of pronouns⁶, alternative forms such as ἄπας and πᾶς⁷ and ὡς and ὡσεὶ⁸ – all these features may seem to be of little importance as isolated *vll* but as part of a pattern within the respective manuscripts they are of great significance because they determine the articulation of the narrative and of the speeches within it. In these grammatical matters, the most frequent variation is between D05 and B03, •01 being closer to D05.

In addition, there are other kinds of *vll* that more obviously express a difference in content, as indicated above: first, readings that reflect a Jewish point of view, being allusions, often discreet and subtle, to traditions, teachings and scriptural interpretations known to have been current in 1st century Judaism; and secondly, readings that express critical evaluation of the apostles including, notably, Peter, and other church leaders such as Paul, James and Barnabas, expressed sometimes overtly (for example, by noting the intervention of the Holy Spirit to guide Paul away from his own plans, 17,15; 19,1; 20,3) but also by a diversity of narrative devices that convey the author's evaluation of his characters: the expression used for the Holy Spirit, the spelling of Jerusalem, the choice of vocabulary, the wording of speeches⁹.

2. Support for the Readings of Codex Bezae

There are, of course, other documents that offer a text that varies from the Alexandrian text in places. Some of the papyri are among them, notably

5. A systematic analysis of these features of the Greek text of Acts is presented by way of a comparison of D05 with •01 and B03 in *ibid*, chs. 3, 4, 6–9, where a bibliography of linguistic works informing the discussion may be found. Special mention should be made of S.H. LEVINSOHN, *Textual Connections in Acts*, Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1987, for his thorough and insightful treatment of many of these topics that goes well beyond that of the traditional grammars. They involve issues that continue to be actively debated and developed through, for example, the Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics seminar of the SBL Meetings.

6. J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Tracking of Participants with the Third Person Pronoun: A Study of the Text of Acts*, in *Revista Catalana de Teologia* 31 (2006) 439-455.

7. J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Distinction between ἄπας and πᾶς in the Work of Luke*, in CENTRE FOR THE DIALOGUE BETWEEN SCIENCE AND RELIGION (ed.), *Biblical Studies*, Craiova, Universitaria, 147-158.

8. J. READ-HEIMERDINGER, *Luke's Use of ὡς and ὡσεὶ: Comparison and Correspondence as a Means to Convey his Message*, in R. PIERRI (ed.), *Grammatica Intellectio Scripturae: Saggi filologici di Greco biblico in onore di padre Lino Cignelli, OFM* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Analecta, 68), Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 251-274.

9. On the first two points, see the detailed study in READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts* (n. 4) (chs. 5, 10); comments on these kinds of *vll* are made throughout RIUS-CAMPS – READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts* (n. 3).

the earliest ones; a collection of minuscules, most frequently 614 which is at times found with a group of others (1505, 1611, 2147, 2412, 2495) or with the mass of Byzantine manuscripts (M) more generally; the writings of some of the 2nd century Church Fathers, Tatian, Ireneus and Tertullian; and most of the first versions in Latin (of which the Greek uncial E08 is almost certainly a retroversion), Syriac, Aramaic (Syro-Palestinian) and Middle Egyptian. Although the readings of these witnesses are classified overall as the “Western text”, the label tends to mask a distinguishing feature, namely, that they not only differ from the Alexandrian text but they also differ among themselves, so any agreement with D05 is, on the whole, sporadic. It is clear that there was a fair degree of freedom in the transmission of Acts in the first centuries, more so it seems than for any other part of the New Testament. However, the freedom displayed was not an absolute freedom – as if each editor or scribe wrote his or her own version of the history of the early Church afresh – for there is, in each case, the same story with the same characters and the same events in the same order. Rather, the freedom must have been with respect to a base text. For the reasons explained above, in the present study we are taking this as the D05 text, and in so doing seek to examine the relationship to it of the papyri witnesses.

3. *The Value of the Papyri*

In view of the singular nature of the text of Acts in D05, its lacunae (8,29b–10,14a; 21,2b–10a; 22,10b–20a; 22,29b–28,31) are all the more regrettable and frustrating, especially since the key sections that speak about the lives of Peter and of Paul are missing. To some extent, the gaps can be filled by referring to the Latin text of the codex, d5, for which the pages corresponding to the Greek lacunae still exist at 10,4–14a; 21,2b–7a; 22,10b–20a. In spite of the considerable divergences between the Greek and Latin texts of Codex Bezae where both texts are extant, there are sufficient similarities to be able to identify the underlying Greek with a degree of confidence¹⁰.

In addition, appeal can be made to those witnesses that at times support D05 in its extant passages. This is especially viable when the variants attest either the language (the form) or the thought (the content) that

10. It is, of course, impossible to predict scribal errors in the lacunose passages that may have arisen from the copyist of D05, apparently a Latin speaker, introducing mistakes into the Greek text under the influence of the Latin text. Examples are suggested by M.-É. BOISMARD, *Le Codex de Bèze et le texte occidental des Actes*, in D.C. PARKER – C.-B. AMPHOUX (eds.), *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium June 1994*, Leiden, Brill, 1996, 257–270 (pp. 259–265).

characterize the Bezan text, as discussed above. The difficulty in this procedure, however, is that most of these witnesses are translations from which it is often not possible to reconstruct the Greek accurately.

It is here that the papyri have a special value for, despite their fragmentary nature, there are several that have passages missing from D05. Their content is set out in the table below, where the underlined passages represent lacunae in D05 (dates are based on the discussion set out in the work on early manuscripts by P.W Comfort and D.P. Barrett¹¹, on the one hand, and by K. Jaros on the other¹²):

Table 1. The Papyri of Acts

Papyrus	Date	Content
P ⁸	4 th	4,31-37; 5,2-9; 6,1-6.8-15
P ²⁹	early 3 rd	<u>26,7-8.20</u>
P ³³ (= P ⁵⁸)	6 th	7,6-10.13-18 (P ⁵⁸ : 15,21-24.26-32)
P ³⁸	early 3 rd	<u>18,27-19</u> ,6.12-16
P ⁴¹	8 th	17,28-18,2.17-18.22-25.27; 19,1-4.6-8.13-16.18-19; 20,9-13.15-16.22-24.26-38; <u>21,1.3-4.26-27</u> ; 22,11-14.16-17
P ⁴⁵	early 3 rd	4,27-36; 5,10-21.30-39; 6,7-7,2.10-21.32-41; 7,52-8,1.14-25; <u>8,34-9,6.16-27</u> ; <u>9,45-10,2.10-23.31-41</u> ; 11,2-14; 11,24-12,5.13-22; 13,6-16.25-36; 13,46-14,3.15-23; 15,2-7.19-27; 15,38-16,4.15-21.32-40; 17,9-17
P ⁴⁸	3 rd	<u>23,11b-17a.25-29a</u>
P ⁵⁰	late 3 rd -early 4 th	<u>8,26-32</u> ; 10,26-31
P ⁵³	mid 3 rd	<u>9,33-10,1</u>
P ⁵⁶	5 th -6 th	1,1.4-5.7.10-11
P ⁵⁷	4 th -5 th	4,36-5,2.8-10
P ⁵⁸ (= P ³³)	6 th	15,21-24.26-32 (P ³³ : 7,6-10.13-18)
P ⁷⁴	6 th -7 th	1,2-5.7-11.13-15.18-19.22-25; 2,2-4; 2,6-3,26; 4,2-6.8-27; <u>4,29-27.25</u> ; <u>27,27-28,31</u>
P ⁹¹	mid 3 rd	2,30-37; 2,46-3,2
P ¹¹²	5 th	<u>26,31-32</u> ; <u>27,6-7</u>
P ¹²⁷	5 th	10,32-35.39-45; 11,2-5.30-12,3.5.7-9; 15,29-31.34-36.37b-39a.40b-16,1-4.13-17,10

11. P.W. COMFORT – D.P. BARRETT (eds.), *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, Wheaton, IL, Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., 2001.

12. K. JAROS, *Das Neue Testament nach den ältesten Griechischen Handschriften: Die handschriftliche griechische Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments vor Codex Sinaiticus und Codex Vaticanus*, Ruhpolding Mainz, Verlag Franz Philipp Rutzen; Vienna-Würzburg,

Of these papyri, all originated in Egypt as far as can be told: several were found in Fayum, others in Oxyrhyncus, others in places unknown. From the list it can be seen that P^{8.33/58.38.41.50.56.57.91.127} only have passages where D05 is extant; P^{45.50.74} have, in addition, passages that have been lost from D05; finally, P^{29.48.53.112} only have passages where D05 is no longer extant. As pointed out in the introduction above, even though several of the manuscripts are dated later than the date of c. 400 assigned to Codex Bezae (P^{33/58.41.56.74}), any agreement with D05 is important in so far as shows that the text was known and was being copied in Egypt after 400 – in other words, that it was an Eastern as much as a Western text.

Earlier discussion of the readings of the papyri that give some support to D05 in Acts (chiefly P^{38.45.50}) was published by B. Aland in 1986, when she concluded that the oldest papyri represented early stages of change to the primitive text, D05 being the culmination of that process of modification¹³. Her study was developed by J.K. Elliott in 2003, where he essentially confirmed that conclusion, though allowing for the possibility that the original text may still be found in occasional Bezan readings, even singular ones¹⁴.

4. *The Text of Codex Bezae and of the Papyri*

The text of Codex Bezae is easily accessible in the facsimile edition made by Scrivener¹⁵, which is usually accurate. Any errors that occur in the facsimile with regard to readings cited in this article have been corrected using the study of the manuscript made by David Parker¹⁶, among

Echter, 2006. It should be noted that R.S. BAGNALL (*Early Christian Books in Egypt*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 2009), challenges a conservative dating of the earliest papyri.

13. B. ALAND, *Entstehung, Charakter und Herkunft des sog. westlichen Textes untersucht an der Apostelgeschichte*, in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 62 (1986) 5-65. The conclusion is summarized and restated in K. ALAND, *Text und Textwert der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments. III: Die Apostelgeschichte* (ANTF, 20-21), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 1993, pp. 710, 719.

14. J.K. ELLIOTT, *Codex Bezae and the Earliest Greek Papyri*, in C.-B. AMPHOUX – J.K. ELLIOTT (eds.), *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity. Proceedings of the Lille Colloquium, July 2000 / Le texte du Nouveau Testament au début du christianisme. Actes du colloque de Lille, juillet 2000*, Lausanne, Éditions du Zèbre, 2003, 161-182, esp. pp. 178-181.

15. F.H. SCRIVENER, *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis*, Pittsburgh, PA, Pickwick Press, repr. 1978.

16. PARKER, *Codex Bezae* (n. 2). Also valuable are M.-É. BOISMARD – A. LAMOUILLE, *Le texte occidental des Actes des Apôtres: Reconstitution et rehabilitation*. I: *Introduction et textes*; II: *Aparat critique*, Paris, Éditions Recherche sur les Civilisations, 1984; J.H. ROPES, *The Text of Acts*, vol. III in F.J. FOAKES JACKSON – K. LAKE (eds.), *The Beginnings of Christianity*, I, *The Acts of the Apostles*, London, Macmillan, 1926.

others. On occasion, it has been necessary to consult the manuscript itself¹⁷ or the photographic reproduction of it¹⁸. All the variants that exist with respect to Codex Vaticanus (B03)¹⁹ and Codex Sinaiticus (•01)²⁰ are noted and discussed in the critical apparatus of *The Message of Acts*²¹, where the support for the respective readings is also given. The readings from the papyri have been retrieved from the critical edition of Acts by Reuben Swanson²², consulting images and transcriptions of the manuscripts as the need arose²³.

In order to establish a more complete picture against which to view the papyri readings in the Bezan lacunae, we will first look at the quantity and nature of agreement in the other papyri that only have the extant Bezan text. The basis for comparison will be the units of variation identified in *The Message of Acts*, where each and every instance of variation between D05 and B03 (and •01) is noted and presented, together with the supporting witnesses, as grammatically discrete units (usually segments of sentences, unless an entire sentence is affected by a series of variant readings). In many instances, the variation in one instance is found to be closely dependent on, or related to, variation elsewhere, whether in adjacent readings or further away. This is an important factor, meaning that further study of the papyri as documents in their own right (rather than as a string of variant readings) would be helpful in order to investigate the coherence of their text in terms of linguistic forms as also the content.

In classifying the papyri readings as supporting D05 or B03, account is not taken of minor disagreement (e.g., involving the article, a pronoun or preposition) when a reading clearly reflects one text rather than the other. For a more nuanced appreciation of each papyrus, especially the lengthier passages contained in P^{45.74}, a more detailed analysis of the

17. The manuscript is kept at Cambridge University Library, UK.

18. Several copies of the photographic reproduction exist, for example at Birmingham University Library and the Dr Williams Library in London.

19. For an edition of B03, see C. TISCHENDORF, *Novum Testamentum Vaticanum: Post Angel Maii Aliorumque, Imperfectos Labores, Ex Ipso Codice*, Leipzig, Giesecke and Devrient, 1867.

20. Codex Sinaiticus can be viewed online at www.codexsinaiticus.org (last accessed 5/1/10).

21. For details, see note 3 above.

22. R. SWANSON, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus. The Acts of the Apostles*, Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

23. For high quality digital photographs and transcription of P^{29.38.45.48.50.53}, see JAROS, *Das Neue Testament* (n. 12). Introductory presentation and transcriptions of P^{29.38.45.48.50.53} are also to be found in COMFORT – BARRETT (eds.), *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts* (n. 11). Finally, online images of P^{38.53.112} are available at <http://www-user.uni-bremen.de/~wie/bibel.html#pap> (last accessed 5/1/10).

minor disagreements would be important, but to have included such information in the present study would have made the data unwieldy.

II. PAPYRI WITHOUT THE TEXT OF THE LACUNAE OF CODEX BEZAE

1. P⁸: 4,31-37; 5,2-9; 6,1-6.8-15

The readings of P⁸ agree with D05 or B03 at places of difference as follows:

D05: 4,32 (× 2).33.34

B03: 4,31.36 (× 3); 5,2.3 (× 4).4 (× 3).5 (× 3).8 (× 4); 6,1.2 (× 2).3 (× 2).4.5.8.9.10 (× 3).11.12.13 (× 3)

Except for a cluster of four readings near the beginning of the papyrus, at the other 35 places of disagreement between D05 and B03 in the portions of Acts contained in P⁸ there is systematic agreement with B03 against D05²⁴. The four places of agreement with D05 suggest that there may have been interesting agreement elsewhere but the extant portion of text is too small to draw further conclusions:

- 4,32a.b, the variants involve a matter of a) the number and case of the pronoun, where the singular genitive αὐτοῦ of D05 has little support (2147 *pc*), and b) the number of the verb, where the plural ἔλεγον of B03 is the minority reading (P⁷⁴ 049. 945. 1241 *pc*, *dicebant* d).
- 4,33, where B03 has a singular word order, (οἱ ἀπόστολοι) τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως, P⁸ shares the order of all the other witness including D05: τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, though it omits Χριστοῦ from the name of Jesus (also omitted by B03 but included by •01 with several others).
- 4,34, with D05 (E H³ P Ψ 049. 056. 33. 69. 614. 1241. 1245. 1611. 2412. 2495 M), τις ὑπῆρχεν is read in preference for ἦν τις of B03 (τις ἦν P⁷⁴ • *al.*). The two verbs are often affected by variation in Acts²⁵; here in D05, the choice of ὑπάρχω can be accounted for by the presence of εἶναι in the following line of that text and/or the repetition of ὑπάρχω at the end of the sentence in D05 as well as in B03 and P⁸ (but not 801).

24. The agreement of P⁸ with D05 at 6.8, noted by ELLIOTT (*Codex Bezae* [n. 14], p. 180, following the data supplied by K. ALAND, *Text und Textwert* [n. 13]), is, in fact, also supported by •01 and B03 among many other manuscripts.

25. RIUS-CAMPS – READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts* (n. 3), I, p. 284.

2. *P*³³: 7.6-10.13-18; *P*⁵⁸: 15.21-24.26-32

Initially classified as two separate manuscripts, it was later found that the two fragments belonged to the same codex. They agree with D05 or B03 as follows:

D05: 15,24.27

B03: 7.6.7 (× 2).8.13.14 (× 2).15 (× 2).16 (× 2).18; 15,23.28 (× 3).29 (× 3).30.32 (× 3)

Out of 25 places of variation between D05 and B03, *P*³³ supports the reading of B03 except twice at 15,24.27:

- 15,24, the presence of ἐξεληθόντες in D05 has wide support, including that of *P*⁷⁴ (see below), •01², most minuscules and many versions; its omission is attested by only a few minuscules in addition to •01* and B03.
- 15,27, the participial phrase in the future ἀπαγγελοῦντας ταῦτα is shared with D* (Ψ 88. 181. 257. 467. 614. 913. 915. 1108. 1175. 1611. 1646. 1799. 1898. 2412 *pc* *sy*^{p,h} *sa* *aeth*; Didasc Chr.), whereas most witnesses attest the B03 reading ἀπαγγέλλοντας τὰ αὐτά with the more familiar present participle.

While this agreement is not greatly significant in terms of meaning or even grammatical tendency, it does illustrate support for D05 that cannot be simply explained away as accident or coincidence. The sporadic nature of the variation suggests that the text was circulating in a form that had retained some but by no means the most important readings found in D05 (the conclusion of the letter from the apostles and elders in Jerusalem [15.29] is not read in the form of D05, for example).

3. *P*³⁸: 18,27–19,6.12-16²⁶

The early date and the frequent similarities with D05 make this a document of exceptional interest:

D05: 18,27.28; 19,1 (× 2).2.3.5 (× 2).6 (× 2).13.14.15

B03: 19,4 (× 2).12.13.15.16 (× 2)

Neither D05 nor B03: 18,28; 19,2.3

In numerical terms, the support given by *P*³⁸ to D05 is significant: out of 23 variants between D05 and B03, *P*³⁸ shares the D05 reading 13 times,

26. See COMFORT – BARRETT, *Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts* (n. 11), pp. 144-146.

that of B03 seven times and on three occasions has a reading different from both, where its text is singular. Some of the shared Bezan readings are a matter of tense, word order, prepositions and the use of pronouns, and are often supported by •01. Others display more striking agreement:

- 18,27, the description of Apollo(niu)s giving ongoing help to the churches during his stay in Achaia supports an otherwise singular reading of D05.
- 18,28, the presence of διαλεγόμενος in P³⁸ as well as D05 (supported by 257. 383. 614. 1799. 2147. 2401^c. 2412) illustrates the use of a characteristic verb used by Luke to depict the nature of Paul’s discussion with his Jewish audiences²⁷.
- 19,1a.b, Paul is instructed to go to Asia by the Holy Spirit when he, for his part, wanted to go to Jerusalem. The agreement of P³⁸ with D05 is fully shared by sy^{hmg}.
- 19,2, the response of the disciples in Ephesus to Paul’s questioning about the Holy Spirit, namely that they had not heard if anyone was receiving the Holy Spirit, is identical in P³⁸ and D05 (together with P⁴¹ sy^{hmg} sah).
- 19,5b, the full liturgical formula appears to be used with reference to the water baptism of the disciples, as in D05 (257. 383. 614. 1799. 2147. 2412 sy^{h**}; Chr)²⁸.
- 19,14, in the presentation of the exorcists in Ephesus, P³⁸ has some of the initial elements of B03 (the men were the sons of a Jewish High Priest) but is then close to the account of D05 (while smoothing out some of the difficulties), which presents them as going into the house of a demon-possessed person and attempting to carry out an exorcism. Partial support to D05 is also given by sy^{hmg}.

4. P⁴¹: 17,28–18,2.17–18.22–25.27; 19,1–4.6–8.13–16.18–19; 20,9–13.15–16.22–24.26–38; 21,1–4.26–27; 22,11–14.16–17

This is a bilingual Coptic-Greek papyrus of a late date. It has readings from both D05 and B03:

D05: 17,30a; 19,2; 20,13.22 (× 2).23.24 (× 2).28.29.30 (× 2).36; 21,2

27. RIUS-CAMPS – READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts* (n. 3), III, p. 312, n. 59.

28. The use of full titles by D05 is commonly assumed to reflect the ecclesiastical practice of the later Church. The use of such formulae in the writings of Paul rather tells against that interpretation, and indicates on the contrary that they have their origin in a Jewish rather than a later Christian context. Detailed analysis of their presence in D05 reveals that they routinely occur in formal settings (baptism, healings, exorcisms) but not in other situations (see discussion in READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text* (n. 4), pp. 254–274.

B03: 17,30b.31 (× 2); 18,1.25; 19,14.15.16 (× 2); 20,13.15.23 (× 2).24 (× 2); 22,12.13 (× 2)

Neither D05 nor B03: 18,25; 19,3; 20,24; 22,17

In this instance, the numerical comparison of P⁴¹ with the readings of D05 and B03 is not particularly telling, for the ratio is 14 (D05): 19 (B03), with four readings shared by neither D05 nor B03. It may be noted that several times when P⁴¹ differs from B03 (either agreeing with D05 or with a third reading) its reading is shared by P⁷⁴ (on which see below).

Some of the readings of P⁴¹ that agree with D05 are shared by a number of Greek witnesses, sometimes with versional support (17,30; 20,13; 20,22a; 20,24a.30b); they involve such matters as tense, choice of pronoun or connective. Other readings more clearly reflect typical Bezan concerns with little additional attestation:

- 19,2, the disciples in Ephesus respond that they had not heard if anyone was receiving the Holy Spirit (P³⁸ sy^{hmg} sah).
- 20,22b, P⁴¹ is alone in attesting the reading of μὴ γινώσκων in D05 against μὴ εἰδώς of all the other manuscripts.
- 20,23, the papyrus has the mention of Jerusalem like D05 (614. 2412 gig sa) but, like the Sahidic version, with the Hebrew-derived spelling instead of the Hellenistic form.
- 20,24b, Jews as well as Greeks are specified as the audience of Paul's testimony, a D05 reading otherwise supported only by versions and Fathers (gig vg sa^{mss}; Lcf Ephr).
- 20,30a, similarly, the choice of the verb ἀποστρέφω in place of ἀποσπάω is not attested in the Greek witnesses outside D05 (sy^p and Ir^{lat}).
- 21,2, P⁴¹ apparently includes the mention of Myra after Patara, as does D05 and many versions (b gig ph w vgTh sa).

In summary, whilst several of these readings are of note because they involve a characteristic interest of D05 in the Holy Spirit, places including Jerusalem and the dual identity of Paul's audience, they are far from being the most striking readings in terms of defining the purpose or message of the D05 writer.

5. P⁵⁶: 1,1.4-5.7.10-11

The extent of P⁵⁶ is rather limited to permit meaningful identification of one type of text or another. The extant readings are as follows:

D05: 1,10.11

B03: 1,4

Although assigned by the Alands to the Alexandrian text type²⁹, in actual fact two Bezan variants are attested by P⁵⁶ against the reading of B03:

- 1,10, the singular ἐν ἑσθῆτι λευκῆ is well attested (C² E H² 049. 056. 33. 614. 1739. 2412. 2495 M e sy geo; Or Aug); on the other hand, the plural read by B03 apparently corresponds to the presence of two men and has some support (• A C* Y 81. 323. 945. 1175 *pc lat*; Eus) which, according to N-A²⁷, also included the corrected reading of P⁵⁶.
- 1,11, the compound verb ἐμβλέπω is read with the majority of witnesses against the simple verb of B03 (* E 33. 81. 323. 945. 1241. 1270. 1739^s. 2495 *al*; Eus).

6. P⁵⁷: 4,36–5,2.8-10

At the two places of variant reading between D05 and B03 in the portion of text contained in P⁵⁷, the papyrus supports the B03 reading:

B03: 4,37; 5,10

There is no agreement in the extant passage with D05.

7. P⁹¹: 2,30-37; 2,46–3,2³⁰

The one leaf of this papyrus is reasonably legible; it always follows B03 at places of variant reading with D05 except once:

B03: 2,35.36 (× 3).37.46 (× 2).47; 3,1 (× 2)

Neither D05 nor B03: 2,32

At 2,32, the papyrus appears to be unique in omitting the verb ἐσμέν, which D05 and B03 read after or before the complement respectively.

8. P¹²⁷: 10,32-35.39-45; 11,2-5.30 – 12,3.5.7-9; 15,29-31.34-36.37b-39a. 40b – 16,1-4.13 – 17,10

This recently published papyrus³¹, the latest in the New Testament list, has not yet been thoroughly analysed in terms of the nature of agreement

29. K. ALAND – B. ALAND, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, trans. E.F. RHODES, Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1995, p. 99.

30. See COMFORT – BARRETT, *Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts* (n. 11), pp. 622-623; JAROS, *Das Neue Testament* (n. 12), pp. 4029-4032.

31. D.C. PARKER – S.R. PICKERING, 4968. *Acta Apostolorum 10–12, 15–17*, in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 74 (GRM, 95), London, The Egypt Exploration Society, 2009, 1-45.

with D05 and B03. The initial description by the editors of the manuscript, portraying it as “a new free version” of the original text, is based on the assumption that D05 is another such “free version”³². The reconstruction of the text of the papyrus is further based on the assumption that the underlying text, where it is no longer visible, resembled that of B03 (or perhaps N-A²⁷). Both of these assumptions depend on the “general view that the longer text is secondary”³³. Working without such preconceptions produces somewhat different conclusions, as we hope to demonstrate at a later date with a detailed analysis of the readings of P¹²⁷. In the meantime, it may be noted that of the 538 variant words (rather than readings, which form the basis for comparison of the other papyri in this study), 296 are aligned with D05, 47 with B03 and 195 are found in neither D05 nor B03.

III. PAPYRI WITH THE TEXT OF THE LACUNAE OF CODEX BEZAE: 8.26–10.14

1. P⁴⁵: 4,27-36; 5,10-21.30-39; 6,7-7,2.10-21.32-41; 7,52-8,1.14-25; 8,34-9,6.16-27; 9,45-10,2.10-23.31-41; 11,2-14; 11,24-12,5.13-22; 13,6-16.25-36; 13,46-14,3.15-23; 15,2-7.19-27; 15,38-16,4.15-21.32-40; 17,9-17³⁴

The importance of this papyrus lies in its early date and its extensive text, which includes passages from the Bezan lacunae. Its value for comparison with other manuscripts is, however, marred by its poor condition³⁵. While the possibility that it had the unusual “Western” order of Gospels was noted by its first publisher³⁶, its text has been described as a “free

32. While noting the calculation made by Read-Heimerdinger of the length of D05 in Acts compared with B03, and the relative proportion of variation in speech and narrative (p. 6), Parker and Pickering make no mention of evidence adduced by her, as also by Rius-Camps, for the narrator’s Jewish perspective or his critical evaluation of the apostles in D05. For an accurate picture of the closeness of any manuscript of Acts to D05, these factors cannot be ignored.

33. PARKER – PICKERING, *Acta Apostolorum* (n. 31), p. 6.

34. See COMFORT – BARRETT, *Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts* (n. 11), pp. 155-62, 187-201; JAROS, *Das Neue Testament* (n. 12), pp. 3427-3721.

35. Robert Waltz notes (<http://www.skypoint.com/members/waltzmn/ManuscriptsPapyri.html>, last accessed 8/1/10): “P⁴⁵ is surely in the worst condition of any of the substantial Biblical papyri”.

36. F.G. KENYON, *Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible*. Part II: *The Gospels and Acts*, London, Emery Walker Ltd, 1933, 1934.

paraphrase³⁷, but also very close to B03³⁸. There appears to have been very little, if any, detailed analysis of the text in Acts.

a) *Where D05 is extant*

The readings of P⁴⁵ reflect those of D05 or B03 thus:

D05: 4,30 (× 2); 5,32.37; 7,13.15.17.18.19.38; 8,17.18; 10,18.19 (× 2). 33.34.37; 11,7.12.13. 24; 13,6.9.25.29.33; 14,15.17.20; 15,4 (× 2).5; 16,3.32; 17,11.15

B03: 4,32 (× 2).34.35; 5,10.12 (× 2).13.15.18.31.34 (× 2).35.36 (× 2).38; 6,7.8.9.10 (× 2). 13.15; 7,1.11.19.33.35.37.38.39; 8,14.15.17.10,32.33.37 (× 2); 11,2 (× 2).3.9.25 (× 2).26 (× 2) 27.28 (× 3).29; 12,1 (× 2).2.3 (× 2). 5.15 (× 3).16 (× 2).17 (× 3).17.18.20.21; 13,7 (× 2).8 (× 2).10.11 (× 4).12 (× 3).14.26.27 (× 4).28 (× 2).29 (× 2).30.31.33 (× 2).34.50; 14,1.15.16.17 (× 2).19 (× 3).20.21; 15,3.4 (× 2).5.6 (× 2).7.8.20 (× 3).23.25.38.41; 16,1 (× 4).3.4 (× 3).16 (× 4).17(× 3).18 (× 3).19 (× 5).33.34.35.36 (× 2).37. 38 (× 2).39 (× 2).40 (× 2); 17,11 (× 2).12.13(× 2).14 (× 3).15 (× 2).16.17 (× 2)

Neither D05 nor B03: 13,13.31.48.52; 15,40; 16,33.38

When D05 varies from •01/B03 in the extant passages of P⁴⁵, the papyrus more often shares the reading of B03 than that of D05 (171:36). On eight occasions, the reading of P⁴⁵ differs from the readings of either D05 or B03. Apart from one orthographical difference (13,13) and one difference in conjunction (13,52), those readings contain words or expressions that present a further synonym in addition to the separate variants of D05 and B03; once, the papyrus displays a combination of the D05 and B03 reading (13,31).

Of the 36 occasions when P⁴⁵ supports D05 against B03, seven can be disregarded for our purposes in so far as B03 has a singular reading. Of the remaining 19, 10 are further supported by the mass of minuscules and several or all of E08 H013 L019 P025 Ψ044 33 1739.

Most agreement with D05 occurs over small details, involving such elements as the article, conjunctions, word order and participles whose significance is difficult to assess without examining the overall patterns

37. E.C. COLWELL, *Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of P⁴⁵, P⁶⁶, P⁷⁵*, in ID. (ed.), *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (NTTS, 9), Leiden, Brill; Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1969, 106-124.

38. Waltz (see n. 35 above) comments: "My own analysis indicates that the manuscript is in fact closer to B than to any other uncial. On the face of it, it would appear that P⁴⁵ comes from the Alexandrian tradition, but has been so heavily edited that it begins to appear 'Westernized'". As usual, this evaluation assumes priority of the Alexandrian text.

of use within the papyrus³⁹. However, there are some readings that are of particular interest because they support a D05 minority reading:

- 5,37, the omission of πάντες is attested in Greek only by the minuscule 209, though otherwise by the Old Latin manuscripts in general and Ephraem.
- 7,17, τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἧς ἐπηγγείλατο in place of τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἧς ὠμολόγησεν (or ὠμοσεν) reflects a Hebraism (the verb with its cognate noun), supported by a wide range of versions (p vg^{mss} sy^{hmg} mae aeth; Beda^{gr mss acc.10}) but in Greek only by E08, probably as a retroversion from its Latin text.
- 10,34, the word order ἀνοίξας δὲ τὸ στόμα Πέτρος, as opposed τὸ ἀνοίξας δὲ Πέτρος τὸ στόμα, is found only in the Old Latin gig and one Vulgate manuscript.
- 11,12, the instruction of the Spirit to Peter to go to Caesarea without prevarication (μηδὲν διακρίναντα) is also absent from the Old Latin l p* and sy^h
- 11,13, the omission of the article before the noun ἄγγελον, to be expected since the angel has not been mentioned previously⁴⁰, is supported only by Ψ 044 where it could well be due to a scribal decision rather than the reading of the exemplar.
- 13,6, in addition to the support of P⁴⁵ for the reading of D05, only 36. 181. 431. 453. (1837) p read ὄνοματι in place of ὄνομα.
- 15,4c, d, the compound participle ἀπαγγείλαντες has the support only of the Vulgate; the word order ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς μετ’ αὐτῶν, giving relatively less prominence to the subject compared with the alternative ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν μετ’ αὐτῶν, has the support of a few minuscules (614. 618. 2147. 2412) and the Old Latin gig.

Overall, the picture is too mixed to be able to predict how P⁴⁵ may have compared with D05 in the lacunose passages.

b) *Where D05 is lacunose*: 8,37–9,6.16-27; 9,45–10,14

B03: 8,37.39; 9.5.17 (× 2).18 (× 2) 19.20.22.36.37.40; 10,10.12.13

Not B03: 9,3 (× 2).19.37.38.39; 10,11

There are 23 variants between P⁴⁵ and B03 where P⁴⁵ is extant. At 16 of these, including the major variants of 8,37.39, P⁴⁵ agrees with B03.

39. As part of a larger pattern, features such as these have been found to be highly significant, see # I above.

40. On the function of the article in Acts, see J. (READ-) HEIMERDINGER – S.H. LEVIN-SOHN, *The Use of the Definite Article before Names of People in the Greek Text of Acts with Particular Reference to Codex Bezae*, in *FilNeo* 5 (1991) 15-44.

In comparison, at only seven places does P⁴⁵ disagree with B03, five times (9,3a.b.37a.38; 10,11) with regular Greek support (E H L P Ψ, with or without 33 1739 M, and four times (9,19b.37a.38.39; 10,11) with significant support from the versions, especially the Old Latin and the Middle Egyptian. While most readings are a matter of preposition choice, conjunctions and word order, two are of particular interest:

- 9,19b, the choice of ἡμέρας ἱκανάς (supported by h and mae) conveys the impression of a longer period of time than the alternative ἡμέρας τινάς read by all other manuscripts.
- 10,11, P⁴⁵ partially supports the Latin page of d5 (Ψ I; Cl Didasc CAp) against B03 and most other witnesses in the description of Peter's vision of "some container": first, by presenting it as a factual rather than a metaphorical event with the absence of ὡς ὀρόνην μεγάλην; and secondly, by focussing on the fact of its being held by "four corners" rather than on its descent, with the participle δεδεμένον in place of καταβαῖνον and with a word order that reads τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς before σκευῶς τι instead of after it.

2. P⁵⁰: 8,26-32; 10,26-31⁴¹

This miniature codex presents two episodes of Acts.

a) Where D05 is extant: 8,26-29a; 10,26-31

D05: 8,26; 10,28

B03: 8,27 (× 4).28 (× 2),

Neither D05 or B03: 8,28; 10,30

Despite the assertion that P⁵⁰ generally concurs with •01 and B03⁴², there is some interesting agreement with D05 in the extant text:

- 8,26, the aorist participle followed by the aorist imperative πορεύθητι is read together with D05 alone, in place of the aorist imperative followed by the present imperative of B03 and most other manuscripts.
- 10,28, P⁵⁰ supports (together with Sy^P Sah) the inclusion of ἀνδρὶ before ἀλλοφύλῳ, thus highlighting the contrast between a Jewish man (ἀνδρὶ Ἰουδαίῳ) and a foreigner.

41. See COMFORT – BARRETT, *Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts* (n. 11), pp. 362-364; JAROS, *Das Neue Testament* (n. 12), pp. 4058-4078.

42. P.W. COMFORT, *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography & Textual Criticism*, Nashville, TN, Broadman & Holman Publishers, 2005, p. 69.

- 10,30, the mention of fasting is included in P⁵⁰ as in D05 (and A^C P H Ψ 049. 056. 69. 1175 M) but not B03; however, in the other details of Cornelius' account, it resembles B03.

b) *Where D05 is lacunose: 8,29b-32*

There are only four variant readings:

B03: 8,30b.31

Not B03: 8,30a.32

Where P⁵¹ disagrees with B03, the nature of the support suggests that they could have been D05 readings, though the portion of text is too small to present strong evidence:

- 8.30a, P⁵⁰ takes up the verb of the angel's command, προσελθόν, with some support, notably from the versions (181. 460 sy^p sa mae).
- 8.32, the papyrus appears to read an alternative participial form of κείρω, together with P⁷⁴ •01 and many others.

3. *P⁵³: 9,33–10,1*⁴³

The variants of the papyrus are too small in number and nature to contribute any insight into the D05 readings:

B03: 9,42; 10,1

Not B03: 9,35.36.37 (× 2)

The first three readings that disagree with B03 have the same kind of support as P⁴⁵ (H L P 1739 and the majority of minuscules, see III.1.a and b above) with, in addition, the support of E08 at 9,35 and •01 at 9,36.37a. At 9,37b, the arthrous ἐν τῷ ὑπερώῳ, attested also by many minuscules but not the uncials of the previous readings, is possibly an indication that its symbolic nature was understood⁴⁴.

4. *P⁷⁴ (7^e): 1,2-5.7-11.13-15.18-19.22-25; 2,2-4; 2,6–3,26; 4,2-6.8-27; 4,29–27,25; 27,27b–28,31*⁴⁵

This late papyrus is exceptional in several ways. First, it is the longest of the papyri of Acts, having most of the text intact apart from occasional

43. See COMFORT – BARRETT, *Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts* (n. 11), pp. 359-363; JAROS, *Das Neue Testament* (n. 12), pp. 3769-3792.

44. On the symbolism of the "upper room", see RIUS-CAMPS – READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts* (n. 3), II, p. 206.

45. For a transcription of P⁷⁴ see www.chrles.multiply.com/photos/album/54/Bible_Papyrus_p74 (last accessed 5/1/10).

lacunae in the first four chapters and one verse missing in ch. 27; only P⁷⁴ has portions of text after 21,2a that are also extant in D05.

Secondly, its text is unusual in that it displays a fair amount of agreement with D05, some of it striking, despite numerically being closer to B03. P⁷⁴ has been described as “Egyptian text, Category I”⁴⁶, but at least as far as Acts is concerned, the picture that emerges from a detailed analysis is rather more mixed⁴⁷. It is noteworthy that both in its agreements with D05 against B03 and in its readings that agree with neither B03 nor D05, there is an exceptional degree of agreement with •01. The figures that demonstrate this pattern are given in the analysis below.

In this section, we will take the text of Acts up to end 22,29a, that is, up to the end of the extant text of D05, and will consider the remaining chapters of the later Bezan lacunae in the next section together with other papyri that only have portions of text from those later chapters.

a) *Where D05 is extant: 1,1–8,29a; 10,14b–21,2a; 21,10b–15; 21,18–22, 10a.20b–29a*

Because of the large amount of data, the figures for the agreement of P⁷⁴ with either D05 or B03 are summarized, giving the number of readings in brackets after the chapter number:

D05: **1** (× 0); **2** (× 6); **3** (× 4); **4** (× 2); **5** (× 6); **6** (× 28); **7** (× 11); **8** (× 2); **10** (× 7); **11** (× 6); **12** (× 6); **13** (× 9); **14** (× 5); **15** (× 4); **16** (× 9); **17** (× 11); **18** (× 3); **19** (× 6); **20** (× 10); **21** (× 5); **22** (× 3)

B03: **1** (× 5); **2** (× 40); **3** (× 39); **4** (× 28); **5** (× 64); **6** (× 4); **7** (× 92); **8** (× 5); **10** (× 75); **11** (× 44); **12** (× 50); **13** (× 90); **14** (× 67); **15** (× 74); **16** (× 97); **17** (× 74); **18** (× 71); **19** (× 105); **20** (× 90); **21** (× 81); **22** (× 50)

Neither D05 nor B03: **1** (× 2); **2** (× 2); **3** (× 0); **4** (× 2); **5** (× 2); **6** (× 0); **7** (× 5); **8** (× 3); **10** (× 3); **11** (× 0); **12** (× 3); **13** (× 6); **14** (× 1); **15** (× 2); **16** (× 2); **17** (× 2); **18** (× 2); **19** (× 2); **20** (× 5); **21** (× 3); **22** (× 3)

In total, for the extant text of D05 up to 22,29a, there are 117 agreements of P⁷⁴ with D05 to 1284 agreements with B03 and 46 occasions when the papyrus has the reading of neither D05 nor B03 (a total of 13% disagreement between P⁷⁴ and B03). Overwhelmingly, the agreement of P⁷⁴ with D05 is over matters of grammatical choice: the tense, the use of the

46. ALAND – ALAND, *The Text of the New Testament* (n. 29), p. 101; cf. “category I” means “manuscripts of a very special quality which should always be considered in establishing the original text” (p. 105).

47. The Alands’ description illustrate the problem of relying on their “textstellen” for an analysis of text-types, for these represent samples of text rather than the entire document, and do not consider all the *vll* within the samples, either.

article, the choice of preposition or conjunction, the inclusion of the pronoun or word order. This is also true of the papyrus readings that are not shared by either D05 or B03, where a number of variants also involve synonyms (synonyms are only found occasionally among the P⁷⁴ – D05 agreements). In the midst of this type of *vl*, several agreements of the papyrus with D05 stand out because they involve something more obviously significant:

- 15,17-18, where D05 has a somewhat different conclusion to James’ speech to the meeting in Jerusalem, P⁷⁴ tallies closely with the Bezan reading: (ποιήσει) ταῦτα· γνωστὸν ἅπ’ αἰῶνός ἐστιν (– P⁷⁴ A) τῷ κυρίῳ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ (A lat [sy^{hmg}; Ir^{lat}]) where B03 reads: (ποιῶν) ταῦτα γνωστὰ ἅπ’ αἰῶνος. The agreement is all the more striking because of the fact that other witnesses echo the D05 reading but not so closely: (ποιῶν) ταῦτα (+ πάντα H 056 M sy^h, ^sE L P 049)· γνωστὰ ἅπ’ αἰῶνός ἐστι τῷ θεῷ πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ (E H L P 049. 056. 0142. 614 M [gig] sy^{(p),h}; CAp Chr). The variant involves a different sentence division, with D05 attaching ταῦτα to the previous sentence, as does also P⁷⁴ even though it reads the participle for the future verb. As a result, whereas these concluding words in B03 are attached to James’ quotations from the prophets, in D05 and P⁷⁴ they stand as a personal statement from James expressing his conviction that the Lord’s “work” (the drawing in of the Gentiles in this context, cf. 13,2.41) is part of an eternal plan. This focus on the divine plan for the Gentiles within the history of Israel is a key feature of Codex Bezae in both of Luke’s volumes⁴⁸.
- 15,24, with the presence of ἐξελεῖθόντες (P^{33,74} •² A C E H [L] P Ψ 049. 056. 33. 1739 M latt sy^{p,h} [sa] bo aeth; Ir^{lat} Or^{lat} Socr Pac), which B03 omits, D05 presents the trouble-makers who had gone to Antioch not just as being from the Jerusalem church (ἐξ ἡμῶν), but as having “gone out” from them. This makes evident conflict among the members of the church in the early days, an aspect that the Bezan text generally highlights in comparison with the Alexandrian text⁴⁹.
- 16,26, the inclusion of the adverb παραρῆμα to describe the opening of the doors of the jail in Philippi is present in most witnesses other than B03 (and gig; Cyr Lcf Cass). The same word is present in D05 where it is absent from B03 elsewhere in Acts at 5,5 D05 (E p); 14,10 D05 (E sy^{p,hmg} mae).

48. See RIUS-CAMPS – READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts* (n. 3), III, pp. 118-122, on the speech of Barnabas and Paul in Antioch of Pisidia (13,46-49).

49. For a marked example of the Alexandrian text playing down conflict, cf. 15,36-41 and the disagreement between Paul and Barnabas, which is considerably stronger in D05.

- 20,28, P⁷⁴ is among the numerous witnesses supporting the D05 expression attributed to Paul in his speech to the Ephesian elders, τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ κυρίου. B03, also with widespread support, has τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, the expression found in the letters of Paul (cf. 1 Cor 1,2; 10,32; 11,16.22; 15,9; 2 Cor 1,1; Gal 1,13; 1 Thess 1,4). The Bezan expression, on the other hand, is the one recurring in the LXX to refer to the assembly of Israel (e.g. Deut 23,2.3.4.9; 1 Chron 28,8; Micah 2,5). The variant affects the sense of the following relative clause, in which either “the Lord” is said to have acquired the church through his own blood, or “God” acquired it through the blood of his own (son).
- 21,22, the variant occurs once more in a speech pronounced by James, this time to Paul in the company of the elders in Jerusalem. Whereas B03 has him simply say that the Jewish believers will hear that Paul has arrived in Jerusalem, in D05 he goes further in saying that it will be imperative to hold a meeting because of it. P⁷⁴ is but one of the many and diverse witnesses that support the presence of the clause in D05, albeit with an inversion of word order (πάντως δεῖ πλῆθος συνελθεῖν· ἀκούσονται γάρ D05 || πάντως δεῖ συνελθεῖν πλῆθος· ἀκούσονται γάρ P⁷⁴ (• *p.m.*) || πάντως ἀκούσονται B03.

It is worth drawing attention to the fact that of the 117 agreements between P⁷⁴ and D05 against B03, 63 also have the support of •01. In six instances, the reading of B03 stands alone, but even if these are put to one side agreement of P⁷⁴ with D05 and •01 against B03 occurs in close on 50% of cases, something not seen for any other papyrus. A similar picture is seen in the readings of P⁷⁴ that are neither those of D05 or B03: 19 of the 46 readings have the support of •01. Thus, P⁷⁴ occupies a special position between D05, •01 and B03, which it would be worth investigating further in assessing the relationship between these texts and their development.

b) *Where D05 is lacunose*: 8,29b–10,14a; 21,2b–10a; 22,10b–20a

The agreement of P⁷⁴ with B03 is as follows:

B03: 8,30 (× 2).33.37.39; 9,1.3 (× 2).4 (× 2).5 (× 2).6 (× 5).7.8.9 (× 2).13.17 (× 2).18.19b.20.22 (× 2).25.30.31.34.38.39 (× 2).40; 10,1.3.4.5.6 (× 2).8.9 (× 2).10.11.12.13; 21,3 (× 4).4 (× 6).5 (× 4).6 (× 2).10; 22,10b.11 (× 2).12.13 (× 3).14.15.17.18 (× 2).19
Not B03: 8,31.32.39; 9,1.2.11.12 (× 2).15.18.19.34.35.36.37 (× 2).42; 21,5.6; 22,11.12.15 (× 2).16

P⁷⁴ agrees with B03 81 times and disagrees 24 times. The proportion (30%) is considerably higher than the disagreement of the papyrus with

B03 in the extant portions of D05, even allowing for minor agreement with B03 in those passages, which was disregarded when the papyrus clearly has the B03 and not the D05 reading (cf. #1.4 above). As such, it suggests that D05 readings would have been found among the P⁷⁴ readings (cf. a) above). Furthermore, leaving aside the B03 reading of 9.11 which is singular, of the other 23 disagreements of P⁷⁴ with B03, 15 are supported by •01, a higher proportion (65%) than in the passages for which D05 is extant (49%, cf. a) above), again suggesting that some of those readings may have been found in D05. The presence of the Latin page d5 at 21,5.6 and 22,1.15 illustrates the possibility:

- 21,5, the word order ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο ἡμᾶς ἐξαρτίσαι τὰς ἡμέρας is read by P⁷⁴ and •01 (B² C H L P Ψ 049. 056. 614. 1739 M) against the B03 order 1 2 3 5 4 6 7 (A E 2344 *pc*), where d5 has the singular reading of *sequenti autem die*.
- 21,6, the compound verb ἀνέβημεν of P⁷⁴ is also read by •01 (A C 36. 453. 614. 1175. 1505. 2344 *pc*; Chr Theoph I^{lem}) where ἐνέβημεν is the reading of B03 (•² E Ψ 945. 1739. 1891 *pc*; Chr); d5, on the other hand, omits the verb altogether.
- 22,11, the majority reading of P⁷⁴, οὐκ ἐνέβλεπον (• *rell.*), goes against the singular B03 reading οὐδὲν ἔβλεπον, but the compound verb is also distinct from the Latin *non videbam* of d5, though the negative forms correspond (cf. οὐκ ἔβλεπον, E 1270. 2464 *pc*).
- 22,15, the word order ἔση μάρτυς of P⁷⁴ is shared by •01 and d5 (*eris testis*), where B03 alone reads μάρτυς ... ἔση. However, there is considerable disagreement over the pronoun, with P⁷⁴ being the only witness to read the plural αὐτῶν; d5 has the singular genitive *eius* (αὐτοῦ) with many others (Ψ 3. 36. 383. 431. 453. 460. 614. 1505. 1611. 1765. 2147. 2412. 2495, *illius* *vg aeth*; Chr Theoph I^{lem}), whereas all others including B03 and •01 have the dative singular αὐτῷ.

It is, however, the nature of the variation that makes it difficult, if not impossible, to determine which particular variants may have been the readings of the Greek Bezan text. Indeed, as can be seen in the above examples, in these passages the disagreement with B03 concerns variants of a grammatical and occasionally lexical nature but there are no readings that are different in substance. For example, the shorter reading of 8.37, 39 is shared with B03, even though the witnesses that have the longer text are varied and not the usual collection of “Western” witnesses⁵⁰.

50. For a detailed analysis of 8.37, see J. (READ-) HEIMERDINGER, *La foi de l'eunuque éthiopien: Le problème textuel de Actes 8:37*, in *Études Théologiques et Religieuses* 4 (1988) 521-528.

IV. PYPYRI WITH THE TEXT OF THE LACUNAE OF CODEX BEZAE:
21,2B-10A; 22,29–28,31

1. P²⁹: 26,7-8.20⁵¹

Despite the extremely fragmentary state of this manuscript, which has just some letters from ten lines of Acts, it is nevertheless clear that it presents a text somewhat different from the familiar one. It has been called “Western”⁵² and “free”⁵³. Whatever label may be given, it certainly appears to offer some interesting readings. The size and disposition of the letters is irregular, making reconstruction particularly speculative⁵⁴. As far as can be made out, a comparison of the readings with B03 shows some disagreement:

B03: 26,20a

not B03: 26,7 (× 2).20 (× 3)

The disagreement with B03 is striking because it involves rather more than variation in grammatical or lexical form:

- 26,7a, although the reading of P²⁹ (λατρεύει ἐν ἐλπίδι), supported only by g1g, does not alter the sense of the B03 text (λατρεῦον ἐλπίζει), there is a difference in focus, with the finite verb giving greater prominence to the worship of the twelve tribes in comparison with the participle⁵⁵. Such a difference in focus is typically found in a comparison of D05 with B03.
- 26,7b, Paul’s reference to the king found in several places and forms in the various manuscripts and omitted altogether by P²⁹ (and A02 Ψ 044 36. 94. 453 *pc* g1g vg). Its inclusion is a repetition of the reference at the beginning of the speech after the same phrase ἐγκαλοῦμαι ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων (cf. 26,2). Its original absence could account for the diversity of word order when it was inserted.
- 26,20, P²⁹ seems to agree with B03 (and P⁷⁴ •01 H13 L020 P025 383; Chr Theoph II_{lem}) in omitting the repetition of the pronoun ἐν but for the rest of the verse is distinct from B03. In the following reconstruction

51. See COMFORT – BARRETT, *Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts* (n. 11), pp. 124-127; JAROS, *Das Neue Testament* (n. 12), pp. 4025-4028.

52. B.M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, ²1994, p. 250.

53. ALAND – ALAND, *Text of the New Testament* (n.; 29), p. 97.

54. COMFORT – BARRETT (*Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts* [n. 11], p. 125) describe the hand as similar to that of P⁴⁵.

55. For further discussion, see RIUS-CAMPS – READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts* (n. 3), IV, pp. 341-342.

of the manuscript, the first part of line 3 has been modelled on the text of the Old Latin h in view of the shared reading of ἐκήρυξα visible at the end of the line⁵⁶:

p²⁹

1 ἀπειθῆς τῇ οὐρανίῳ ὀπτασία ἀ]λλὰ τοῖς ἐ[ν
2 Δαμασκῶ πρώτον τε καὶ Ἱερο]σολύμοις κα[ὶ
3 τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ (h^{vid.} sy^p) καὶ ταῖς ἔξω πόλεσιν (h^{vid.})] ἐκήρυξα (h sy^p sa^{gr}; Cass)
4 μετανοεῖν καὶ ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν

B03

1 ἀπειθῆς τῇ οὐρανίῳ ὀπτασία ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐν
2 Δαμασκῶ πρώτον τε καὶ Ἱεροσολύμοις
3 πᾶσαν τε τὴν χώραν τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπήγγελλον
4 μετανοεῖν καὶ ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν

κηρύσσω is the verb Luke used of the beginning of Paul's ministry in the synagogues of Damascus at 9,20 (D05 lacuna), and is found in D05 four times where it is missing in the Alexandrian text (of the apostles: 1,2; of Paul: 16,4; 17,15; 19,14). Those to whom Paul preached are separated into two distinct groups in both texts, though in different ways: the first group is common to both, with those in Damascus and Jerusalem closely linked by the single preposition ἐν; B03 continues to link with τε the region of Judaea and the Gentiles⁵⁷, apparently wanting to present explicitly Paul's proclamation as embracing Jews and non-Jews. P²⁹, on the other hand, makes no mention of Gentiles, the second group of places here being Judaea and the cities outside (cf. 26,11). According to this text, Paul is careful to avoid reference to the Gentiles in his defence of his conduct as a faithful Jew. Since it was at the point when he mentioned the Gentiles in his first defence to the people in Jerusalem that the crowd refused to let him continue speaking (cf. 22,21-22), his use of a circumlocution on this occasion could be a deliberate tactic to prevent arousing the hostility of his audience. Luke's presentation of Paul as an orator skilled in manipulating his audience for his own ends is particularly noticeable in the text of his first speech of defence according to D05⁵⁸.

56. Other reconstructions based on the majority (i.e. Alexandrian) reading are proposed by C.K. BARRETT, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, vol. II, Edinburgh, T&T Clark, 1998, p. 1164; BOISMARD – LAMOUILLE, *Le texte occidental* (n. 16), II, p. 177; JAROS, *Das Neue Testament* (n. 12), p. 4027; ROPES, *Text* (n. 16), p. 237.

57. The preposition εἰς before πᾶσαν τὴν χώραν in B03 may have been omitted by haplography after Ἱεροσολύμοις or, as Delebecque suggests (E. DELEBECQUE, *Les deux Actes des Apôtres* (Études Bibliques, NS 6), Paris, Gabalda, 1986, p. 361), it may be a question of "un accusatif d'extension dans l'espace".

58. For a detailed comparison of the Bezan text of Paul's first speech of defence with the Alexandrian text (21,40–22,21), see RIUS-CAMPS – READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts* (n. 3), IV, pp. 227-240.

Thus, in so far as P²⁹ resembled the text of the Old Latin h in this verse, it would be a further, early witness to readings that could well have been those of Codex Bezae.

2. P⁴⁸: 23,11b-17a.25-29a⁵⁹

The text of this fragment, all of which relates to the plot of the Jews to ambush Paul in Jerusalem, is strikingly different in its legible portions from that of B03:

B03: 23,28a

Not B03: 23,12 (× 3).12 (× 2).13.14 (× 2).15 (× 3).16 (× 2).25.26.27 (× 2).28 (× 3).29 (× 2)

The one agreement at 23.28 involves the conjunction τε against δέ, where both readings are well attested. This may be a case of phonetic confusion, as appears to happen frequently in Acts⁶⁰, though both conjunctions could be justified in this instance. The disagreement between P⁴⁸ and B03 is rather more significant:

- 23,12a, the *vl* again suggests confusion between δέ and τε, with δέ of P⁴⁸ well supported (P⁷⁴ A C E H L P S 81 M e gig vg sa bo arm; Lcf Chr).
- 23,12b, the possible reading in P⁴⁸ of ΚΑΙΤ..., the last visible letters in the middle of a line, and the more certain reading of ΒΟΗΘΕΙΑΝ at the beginning of the next⁶¹ represent a clause not found in any other witness. Though it is difficult to reconstruct the missing text, it is worth noting that the same variant of βοηθεῖν in place of συλλαβέσθαι is found at Lk 5,7 D05. For βοήθειαν, cf. also 21,28, βοηθεῖτε.
- 23,12c, P⁴⁸ (and gig h vg sy^p [bo] aeth; Lcf) uses the verb συστραφέντες in place of the noun phrase ποιήσαντες συστροφήν of B03, and further qualifies the people involved in the plot as “some of the Jews” ([L] H P S 1409 M it vg [sa^{mss}]) rather than the Jews *en bloc*, as 23,13 will make clear.
- 23,12d, where the use of μήτε ... μήτε in B03 sets the two actions of eating and drinking in parallel (cf. 23,21), P⁴⁸ (a few minuscules e;

59. In addition to COMFORT – BARRETT, *Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts* (n. 11), pp. 352-354 and JAROS, *Das Neue Testament* (n. 12), pp. 4041-4057, see A.C. CLARK, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1933, repr. 1970, pp. 409-413.

60. See READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Bezan Text of Acts*, pp. 204-205; 210-211; RIUS-CAMPS – READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts* (n. 3), IV, p. 282.

61. Cf. CLARK, *Acts* (n. 59), p. 409.

- Chr) gives prominence to the second action with its use of a single μή before the verb πειεῖν.
- 23,12e, the particle ἄν read by P⁴⁸ alone expresses the indefinite length of time that the plotters were prepared to wait (cf. 23,14b below). The wording of B03, ἕως οὗ, is repeated in 23,14b B03 and 23,21.
 - 23,13, P⁴⁸ (h sy^h aeth) takes up the verb ἀναθεματίζω of the previous sentence in referring to the oath taken by the plotters, whereas B03 uses a new noun phrase.
 - 23,14a, the inclusion in P⁴⁸ (h gig Lcf) of τὸ σύνολον underlines the absolute nature of the vow taken.
 - 23,14b, the indefinite nature of the Jews' plan is again shown by P⁴⁸ (cf. 23.12e above): this time, it is alone in using ἕως ὅτου in place of the previous ἕως ἄν (here read by Ψ 104. 181. 242. 467. 1175. 1838. 1898. 2464 pc; Theoph^{lem}); B03 repeats the same phrase ἕως οὗ as at 23,12e B03, 21.
 - 23,15a, where B03 has the plotters instruct the high priest and elders to give notice to the tribune together with the Sanhedrin (νῦν οὖν ὑμεῖς ἐμφανίσατε τῷ χιλιάρχῳ σὺν τῷ συνεδρίῳ), P⁴⁸ appears to have a text resembling that of the Old Latin gig and h (and also sy^{hmg} sa; Lcf) in setting out the request as a favour to be granted to the plotters and carefully distinguishing between the convocation of the Sanhedrin and the notice to be given to the tribune: νῦν οὖν παρακαλοῦμεν ὑμᾶς, ποιήσατε ἡμῖν τοῦτο· συναγαγόντες τὸ συνέδριον ἐμφανίσατε τῷ χιλιάρχῳ...
 - 23,15b, the inclusion of the second person pronoun ὑμῖν in P⁴⁸ (vg^{mss} sy^{p.h**}) underlines the importance of the Sanhedrin for the plotters.
 - 23,15c, P⁴⁸ seems to support the reading of 614. 2147. 2412 h sy^{hmg} in including having the Jewish plotters express their willingness to die if need be (ἐὰν δέη καὶ ἀποθανεῖν), thus highlighting their determination to have Paul killed
 - 23,16a, P⁴⁸ again appears to share the reading of the Old Latin h (*iuvenis filius sororis*) in presenting Paul's nephew as “a certain young man”, νεανίας τις υἱὸς ἀδελφῆς, with the typical marker of representativity seen so often in Luke's writing, especially the text of D05⁶².
 - 23,16b, the role of the Jews is yet again emphasized in P⁴⁸ (gig h p vg^{mss} [sy^{p.h**}] sa aeth) by the possessive pronoun αὐτῶν.

62. On the function of τις in Luke's work to present a representative character, see RIUS-CAMPS – READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts* (n. 3), IV, p. 163, n. 112.

- 23,24, with widespread support (614. 2147. 2412 *pc a b c gig p vg^{cl} sy^{h**}*; Cass, though with minor differences in wording), P⁴⁸ has a narrator's aside commenting on the point of view of the tribune who feared that if Paul were killed in an ambush he could be accused of having received payment to assist in the attack: ἐφοβήθη γὰρ μήποτε ἐξαπάσαντες αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτείνωσιν, καὶ αὐτὸς μεταξὺ ἐγκλημα ἔχη ὡς εἰληφῶς ἀργύρια.
- 23,25, the text of P⁴⁸ continues from the narrator's aside with a new clause, referring somewhat elliptically to a letter the tribune gave "to them" (presumably the centurions) for Felix in Caesarea: γράψας δὲ αὐτοῖς ἐπιστολὴν ἐν ἧ ἔγέγραπτο While the Georgian version supports this reading, other versions and some minuscules (614. 2147. 2412 *pc c p gig vg sy^{hmg}*) attest a wording that makes the P⁴⁸ reading easier: ἔγραψε δὲ ἐπιστολὴν περιέχουσαν τάδε, apparently under the influence of the majority reading found in B03: γράψας ἐπιστολὴν ἔχουσαν τὸν τύπον τοῦτον.
- 23,26, the name of the governor Felix is highlighted by the word order of the address in P⁴⁸ (*gig sa*): Φήλικι τῷ κρατίστῳ ἡγεμόνι, the other witnesses placing the name after the title.
- 23,27a, P⁴⁸ is alone in using the verb ῥύομαι when the tribune speaks of saving Paul (cf. Lk 1,74; 11,4 D05); in all other manuscripts is found ἐξαίρέω, the verb that Luke uses elsewhere for dramatic rescues (cf. Acts 7,10.34; 12,11; 26,17; cf. also Exod 3,8 LXX).
- 23,27b, in his letter to the governor, the tribune presents his arrest of Paul (21,31-33) as a rescue in response, according to P⁴⁸ (*gig*), to Paul's noisy protestation that he was a Roman citizen: κράζοντα καὶ λέγοντα εἶναι Ῥωμαῖον. That this account so plainly contradicts Luke's narrative (cf. 22.25-29) may be why the other witnesses minimise the tribune's re-writing of events, saying simply μαθὼν ὅτι Ῥωμαῖός ἐστιν.
- 23,28b, P⁴⁸ (P⁷⁴ E H L P S 049. 056. 383. 1241. 1505. 2147. 2495 M; Chr) reads the simple verb γινῶναι where B03 has the compound ἐπιγινῶναι.
- 23,28c, again P⁴⁸ (1838. 2138*) uses the simple verb in place of the compound ἐγκαλέω, and furthermore uses it transitively (along with Ψ 614. 1505. 1611. 2412. 2138. 2495 *vg*) where B03 has the preposition διὰ to introduce the charge
- 23,28d, the tribune's account of his taking Paul to the Sanhedrin is probably omitted by B03 (and 81) through homoioteleuton⁶³. In P⁴⁸

63. The readings for P⁴⁸ in the apparatus of N-A²⁷ do not tally with the reconstruction of the manuscript in JAROS, *Das Neue Testament* (n. 12), pp. 4049-4050, followed here.

- (2344 [E] *gig* *vg* *aeth*), he refers to the Sanhedrin in the absolute (*κατήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον*) where B03² and the other witnesses qualify it as the Sanhedrin of the Jews (*τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν*).
- 23,29a, from what can be made of P⁴⁸, the charge against Paul is underlined as having no other basis than Jewish religious matters: οὐδὲν πλεῖον εὔρον ἐγκαλούμενον ἢ..., a reading found in *gig*. The other witnesses do not read the negative comparison.
 - 23,29b, the reading of *gig*, attested also by sy^{hmg} (and partially 614. 2147. 2412), allows the reading of P⁴⁸ to be reconstructed as qualifying the Law mentioned in B03 as that of Moses and including a reference to Jesus: *περὶ ζητημάτων τοῦ νόμου αὐτῶν Μωϋσέως καὶ Ἰησοῦ τινός*.

It can be seen from the extensive list of variants that the extant text of P⁴⁸ is frequently and consistently different from the text of B03, in the same way that D05 is. Moreover, the readings represent the type of variants found in D05: more emphatic wording; word order to highlight the name rather than the title of a person; extra details; a character presented as a representative; the determination of the Jews to have Paul killed. Like D05 also, P⁴⁸ has the support of the versions, especially the Old Latin *h*, and to a lesser degree *gig*, and also of the Syriac tradition in sy^{h(mg.**)}, but no other witness varies so extensively and so consistently with B03 as does P⁴⁸, another feature that is true of D05.

3. P⁷⁴: 22,29–27,25; 27,27b–28,31

For a presentation of the manuscript, see III.4 above. The entire text is present in P⁷⁴, except for 27,26–27a. The agreement with B03 is as follows:

B03: 22,30 (× 2); 23,1 (× 2).2.3.4.5 (× 3).6 (× 4).8.10 (× 2).11.12 (× 4).13.14 (× 2).15 (× 3).16 (× 2).17.18.19.20 (× 2).21.22 (× 2).23 (× 2).24 (× 3).25.26.27 (× 2).28 (× 3).29 (× 3).30 (× 2).32.33.34 (× 2). 35 (× 2); 24,1 (× 2).2.3.4.5 (× 3).6.7-8a.9.10 (× 3).11.12 (× 2).13.14.15.16.18.20 (× 2).21 (× 2).22.23 (× 2).24 (× 2).25.26.27; 25,1.2.3 (× 3).4 (× 3).5.6 (× 2). 7 (× 2).9 (× 2).11 (× 2).12.13 (× 2).15 (× 2).16.17.18 (× 2).21 (× 3).22.23 (× 4).24 (× 4).25 (× 2).26 (× 2); 26,1 (× 2).2.3 (× 2).4. 6.7.9.10.12.14 (× 3).15.17.18.20 (× 3).21.22.23.24 (× 2).25 (× 2).26 (× 5).28 (× 5).29 (× 2).30.31.32; 27,1.2 (× 2).3.4 (× 2).5 (× 3).6 (× 2).7 (× 3).8.10 (× 2).11-12 (× 2).14.15.16 (× 2).17 (× 5).19 (× 2).20 (× 2). 22.29.30 (× 2).31 (× 2).32.34 (× 5).35.36.39.42.43; 28,1.2 (× 3).3 (× 3).6 (× 3).7.8.9.11.12.14 (× 2).15.16 (× 5).17 (× 2).18.19 (× 2).20. 21.22.23.24. 25.27 (× 2).29.30.31

Not B03: 23,1.7 (× 3).8.10 (× 2).12.17.18.23.28 (× 2).31.35; 24,2.13.14.22.24 (× 2).25; 25,1. 10.17.18.22.26; 26,1.3.4.9.10 (× 2).11.16 (× 2).17.18.21.26.31; 27,5.6.17.27.29.34.41; 28.1. 12.13.14.28

P⁷⁴ agrees with B03 at 248 places, and disagrees with B03 at 54 places. The proportion (22%) is higher than for the portion of text where D05 is extant (13%, cf. §III 4.a. above), though not as high as for the earlier passages of D05 lacunae (30%, cf. §III.4.b above). Once more, it would seem that D05 readings would have been among those attested by P⁷⁴, though there is the same difficulty as before in identifying them. Among the many concerning the use of the article, the choice of conjunction or preposition and word order, it is perhaps those involving a lexical choice that stand out (23,7a.b.18; 24,24a.b.25; 27,27; 28,13). Interestingly, within the portions of text extant in D05 there is rarely agreement between P⁷⁴ and D05 when there is a lexical variant – rather, in those instances, all three manuscripts tend to have different readings.

As in the earlier chapters, the readings of P⁷⁴ are often shared by •01: disregarding three places where B03 has a singular reading, there are 26 such examples. The extent of the agreement between P⁷⁴ and •01 suggests that they both represent an earlier stage in the development of the text of Acts than B03. The greater closeness of •01 to D05 than of B03 to D05, even though it is to much a lesser extent than the closeness between P⁷⁴ and •01, points to the same conclusion.

4. \wp^{112} : 26,31-32; 27,6-7

The letters on this small fragment are clearly visible, but there are just a few lines of text, with only the letters from the middle of the page. This makes the reconstruction difficult but it would seem to be possible to note the following agreement:

B03: 26,31

Not B03: 26,32 (× 2); 27.7

Although the fragment begins with a reading that is like that of B03, in the subsequent verses there are some notable differences:

- 26,31, in a clause where three different word orders are found, P¹¹² appears to agree with B03 (and • 33. 69. 88. 104. [330]. 927. 945. 1175. 1739. 1891. 2344) in placing the pair of nouns before the adjective: οὐδὲν θανάτου ἢ δεσμῶν ἄξιον.
- 26,32a, P¹¹² (with 326 2464) continues to report the discussion being held by the king Agrippa and his party with the governor Festus by

qualifying their opinion (“he [Paul] is doing nothing that deserves death or imprisonment”, see 26,31 above) with a conditional clause, εἰ μὴ ἐπεκέκλητο Καίσαρα, which apparently relates to the last term only, thus explaining why Paul could not be released forthwith. B03, in contrast, switches to a declaration made by Agrippa to Festus at this point: Ἀγρίππας δὲ τῷ Φῆστῳ ἔφη· ἀπολελύσθαι ἐδύνατο ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος εἰ μὴ ἐπεκέκλητο Καίσαρα.

- 26,32b, once the discussion has been reported in P¹¹², it is the governor who takes a decision regarding Paul, reconfirming his earlier decision (cf. 25,12.21.25b.27): καὶ οὕτως ἔκρινεν αὐτὸν ὁ ἡγεμῶν ἀναπέμπεσθαι Καίσαρα (97. [421] *pc h p² w sy^{p.[hmg]}*). In B03, the decision is held over to the following sentence (27,1), where it is expressed obliquely with an impersonal passive verb and in a subordinate clause:: Ὡς δὲ ἐκρίθη τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν, παρεδίδουν τὸν τε Παῦλον... P¹¹² is no longer extant for this verse, but its Old Latin ally *h* (and *vg^{R2} sy^{hmg}*) omits the subordinate clause and brings this episode of the narrative to a close with a time phrase, *et in crastinum* (retroversion: καὶ τῇ ἐπιούσῃ).
- 27,7, the word order of P¹¹² at the opening of this verse is unique in Greek, apparently reading βραδυπλοοῦντες ἐν ἱκαναῖς δὲ ἡμέραις. If the verb is indeed a participle (only the first three letters are visible) it should perhaps be taken as belonging to the previous sentence; all the other manuscripts read ἐν ἱκαναῖς δὲ ἡμέραις βραδυπλοοῦντες, attaching the participle to the new sentence. The papyrus wording seems to be reflected in some versions: *et cum tarde navigaremus per aliquos dies devenimus Gnidum* (*h sy^p aeth*), except that these witness do not have καὶ μόλις (clearly visible in P¹¹²) before the following verb.

It can thus be seen that P¹¹² is close to the Old Latin *h* and *sy^{hmg.p}*. This relationship may well mean that readings of D05 are to be found among its variants. The text of *h* is very fragmentary but it is remarkably close to that of D05 in the earlier chapters where both texts are extant⁶⁴. The portions of *h* remaining from the latter part of Acts include the section present in P¹¹² (23,8-24) as well as 26,20–27,13, where again there are readings that reflect the kind of Bezan readings found in the earlier chapters. As for the Syriac version, the readings in the Harklean margins are sometimes close to D05 though are often contaminated by the Alexandrian text; the Peshitta is more aligned still with the Alexandrian text

64. For details, see CLARK, *Acts* (n. 59), pp. 247-255.

but even in this text there are readings that give support to the text of D05 at places with little other support.

V. CONCLUSION

By way of conclusion, it will be useful to summarize the findings of this survey of the papyri of Acts and to highlight points of interest that suggest valuable avenues along which to continue exploration.

Of the papyri that share portions of text with those extant in D05, three (P^{33.57.91}) are seen to have nothing in common with D05 and to almost always agree with B03 in the few verses they contain. In addition, for all that P⁵³ differs from B03 more often than it agrees, the manuscript contains only verses lost from D05 and is too fragmentary to be able to comment on any relationship it may have had with it.

As for the rest, the study confirms the so-called ‘Western’ nature of certain papyri, whilst also exposing readings in many of the others that repeat or echo readings of the Bezan text, traces that are frequently overlooked because they have been hidden behind labels of other manuscripts or text-types. The dissimilarity with B03 of the three 3rd century papyri traditionally regarded as Western, P^{29.38.48}, is reinforced by detailed analysis. Only one of those, P³⁸, has portions of text that are extant in D05. It gives support to some otherwise singular readings of D05; elsewhere, D05 and the papyrus have the additional support of early versions, especially the Syriac and occasional Old Latin manuscripts. Among the Greek witnesses that support the more widely attested readings is •01. The readings of P^{29.48}, representing only passages for which D05 is lacunose, are likewise at times singular, at others have the support of the versions. In addition to grammatical variation, many of the readings of all three papyri reflect narrative concerns quite distinct from those of the Alexandrian text, such as are seen in the extant portions of D05. In view of these facts, there is a strong possibility that among the readings in the D05 lacunae, some may well have been attested (possibly with small differences) by D05.

The differences in the articulation of the narrative of chs. 26–27 in P¹¹², whilst revealing nothing definite about a particular perspective or concern, are nevertheless also the kind of differences that are seen in D05; the support of the Old Latin h is an additional argument for suspecting that its readings may echo those of D05. More conclusive findings relate to the papyri that contain portions of text extant in D05, where some characteristic Bezan concerns are once more found, sometimes in the

midst of more general agreement with the Alexandrian text. Such is the case of P⁴¹, which attests a number of D05 readings that have little other Greek support, a particularly interesting fact in view of the late 8th century date of the papyrus. A similar example is P⁵⁰, where the nature of the agreement with the extant portions of D05, which is not the kind to have arisen by chance, suggests that its readings for other verses may also have been found in D05.

In the case of P^{8.58}, the readings shared with D05 are likewise not of the kind to have come about accidentally, especially as they have wide support. On the other hand, for P^{8.56}, where the Bezan agreements concern linguistic features that cannot be readily identified with one text or another and do not directly affecting the meaning, a firm conclusion about whether agreement is accidental or not cannot be reached.

The two longest papyri, P^{45.74}, dating from the beginning of the time span of the Acts papyri to almost the end respectively, illustrate the complexity of the relationships of the papyri of Acts to either D05 or B03. In numerical terms, both are considerably closer to B03 but to leave the matter at that is to disregard some important agreement with D05. Much of it concerns linguistic matters that cannot be evaluated in detail without examining the whole of the extant text of the papyri, though it is by no means without significance as Read-Heimerdinger's earlier linguistic comparison of D05 with •01/B03 sought to demonstrate. The agreement of P^{45.74} with D05 in such matters is often well supported, whether by a group of uncials and minuscules mostly regarded as 'Byzantine' or by •01⁶⁵. In places, however, these two papyri attest a D05 minority reading, with at times only or mainly versional support. When a similar picture is seen in their readings in the D05 lacunae, there is therefore the possibility that they represent the D05 text. What mainly allows this conclusion to be drawn is the higher proportion of disagreement between the papyri and B03 in the lacunose portions of D05 than in the passages where D05 is extant.

What is striking is that even while recognizing the support of papyrus readings for the content of D05, it is only in P³⁸ that any of the agreement concerns what can be seen as criticism of Paul. None of the readings that reveal the Bezan narrator's particularly sophisticated knowledge of Jewish exegesis are found in the papyri although, since many examples of this are not contained in the extant text of the papyri of Acts, it is of course possible that they may have been attested but are now lost.

65. The existence of a likely •01 reading predating that of D05 was noted at 2.5 in RIUS-CAMPS – READ-HEIMERDINGER, *The Message of Acts* (n. 3), I, p. 153-155.

When the papyri attest readings that are neither those D05 nor B03, they almost always consist of grammatical variation or synonyms rather than presenting any difference in content. In view of this pattern, occasional papyrus readings that broadly echo D05 in content, content omitted by B03, but with somewhat different wording are worth noting. This is the kind of pattern also noted to exist at times between D05 and the early versions, and one that has given rise to the description of their text as a ‘free text’.

If D05 transmits, overall, the earliest text of Acts, an explanation for the development of the text is suggested by the analysis of the papyri, which may be set out as a simplified hypothesis thus: as the book was copied for different readers, the original intention and point of view of the narrator were gradually modified. This, the first changes involved toning down his critical presentation of the Christian protagonists and altering his concern to anchor the narrative in the history of Israel from a Jewish perspective. These were alterations that would have taken place at a very early date in Greek, at a time before the New Testament had acquired its status of a fixed text⁶⁶, though the changes appear to have been made in no way uniformly – indeed, some of the characteristic D05 content was translated unaltered into various languages, and some the less difficult D05 readings survived into the later Byzantine manuscripts. The linguistic articulation of the text would have been altered more slowly and more unevenly, with some of the early readings being preserved in •01 and the text of B03 representing the most radical departure from the D05 form of the book of Acts.

Bangor University
Bangor
Gwynedd
LL54 7DG
Wales (UK)
j.readh@googlemail.com

Jenny READ-HEIMERDINGER

Esglesia St Pere de Reixac
Ap. 41
08110 Montcada i Reixac
Spain
riuscamps@yahoo.es

Josep RIUS-CAMPS

66. It has been estimated that most of the alteration to the text of the New Testament took place before 200 CE; see AMPHOUX – ELLIOTT (eds.), *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity* (n. 14), esp. pp. 5-8, 9-18.