

FILOLOGIA NEOTESTAMENTARIA

Facultad de Filosofía y Letras
Universidad de Córdoba

51

Vol. XXXI - 2018

Herder

FILOLOGÍA NEOTESTAMENTARIA

Facultad de Filosofía y Letras
Universidad de Córdoba

51
Vol. XXXI-2018

Herder

The journal *Filologia Neotestamentaria* was founded in 1988 by professors JUAN MATEOS [Pontifical Oriental Institute (Rome, Italy)] and JESÚS PELÁEZ (University of Cordoba, Spain) and edited by Ediciones El Almendro (Cordoba, 1988-2016). As of 2017 the journal is being published and distributed by Herder Editorial, Barcelona

Edición digital: José Toribio Barba

© Herder Editorial S.L.
Provenza, 388
08025 Barcelona
España

ISSN: 0214 - 2996
ISBN: 978-84-254-4218-6

NOTA DEL EDITOR

La marca que va entre corchetes en color rojo [p. XX/XXX] establece una correspondencia con la paginación de la versión PDF de la revista.

ÍNDICE

ARTÍCULOS

[Stanley E. Porter, *Revisiting the Greek Verb: An Extended Critique*.](#)

[Juan Barreto - Carmen Rita Jorge - María Maite García, *Aproximación al estudio del campo semántico de los lexemas verbales de movimiento en el Griego del Nuevo Testamento*.](#)

[Paul L. Danove, *Interpreting and Translating Γίνομαι as a Verb of Process in the New Testament*.](#)

[Didier Lafleur, *Greek New Testament and Purple Manuscripts: The Case of Beratinus 1 \(Φ.043\) and Beratinus 2 \(min. 1143\)*.](#)

[Karl L. Armstrong, *The End of Acts and the Comparable Age of its Variants*.](#)

[Peter R. Rodgers, *The Question of 1 Peter 3:13*.](#)

[RECENSIONES Y PRESENTACIÓN DE LIBROS](#)

Paul L. Danove, *New Testament Verbs of Communication: A Case Frame and Exegetical Study* (David A. Black).
David A. Fiensy and James Riley Strange (eds.), *Galilee in the Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods*,
Volume 1: *Life, Culture, and Society* (Karl L. Armstrong).

[LIBROS RECIBIDOS](#)

Revisiting the Greek Verb: An Extended Critique¹

STANLEY E. PORTER

This is an extended review of a recent volume edited by Steven Runge and Christopher Fresch on various dimensions of the Greek verb. This review extends comments originally made in a session at the Society of Biblical Literature annual meeting in 2017. This review offers both general comments about linguistics and the nature of language and specific comments about this volume and Greek, utilizing a framework suggested by Thomas Kuhn. I conclude that this volume conveys a disparate and potentially conflicting array of opinions, with some more and less plausible than others, thus undermining the ostensive purpose of the volume as presenting a coherent and unified perspective on the Greek verb.

Keywords: Greek, verb, verbal aspect, Thomas Kuhn, linguistics.

Introduction

Linguistics may be unique among human intellectual endeavors, in that the object of analysis, language, is the inevitable medium of analysis. The result is that it is impossible to speak about the object of analysis without being required to use the object itself (hence the need of meta-language). This applies whether one is examining one's own language or another language, and is even more greatly compounded by attempts to examine ancient languages. This has resulted in the complex history of language study that traces its origins in theories of original language through to the modern structuralist and perhaps post-structuralist era, as users of language constantly reflect upon language.

In her insightful introduction to linguistics, Julia Kristeva notes the theoretical result. As she says,

by moving away from empiricism [the result of recognizing that even mathematics is ideological], the study of language should enable science to [p. 3/150] understand that its “discoveries” depend upon the conceptual system that is applied to the object being studied, and that these discoveries are more or less given ahead of time. In other words, linguistics believes that its discoveries of the properties of language are dependent upon the model used in the description, even upon the theory the model belongs to [she differentiates model as particular applications of theory]. This has resulted in considerable interest in the innovation of theories and models, rather than a sustained investigation enabled by the use of a single model. Linguistics doesn't describe language as much as make its own language. This turnabout, which seems paradoxical, has a double consequence. On the one hand, theoretical research in no

way implies that language remains unknown, buried under the mass of forever-new models of linguistic operation. But, on the other hand, the attention of scientific discourse is drawn to the very process of knowledge as a process of the construction of a model, which is overdetermined by a theoretical, or even ideological agency. In other words, the science of language is not oriented solely toward its object, *la langue*; it is also oriented toward its own discourse, its own foundations. Every discourse about language is thus *required* to think about *its* object, *its* language, through the model it has chosen for itself, that is, through its own matrices. Without ending up in a relativism and an agnosticism that would deny the objectivity of all knowledge, such a means of proceeding forces linguistics (and every science that follows its path) to question itself about its own foundations, to become a science of its *process*, while remaining the science of an *object*.²

Kristeva notes that what she says is rarely admitted within linguistics.

Thus, I have tried to be straightforward about my linguistic orientations from the outset of my linguistic career. Using the terminology of a fairly recent analysis of various linguistic models, I am not syntactocentric but fall strongly upon the communicative side of the communicative and cognitive theoreticians.³ My primary theoretical orientation is Systemic Functional Linguistics, and more particularly Formal Systemic Functional Grammar, affirming formally based semantic categories populating semantic networks, semantics over pragmatics, grammatical and lexical monosemy, and little use for prototypical comparisons (and some of the theories that drive their analysis). This short description (there are no doubt other elements of the model) will indicate why I find some [p. 4/150] of the ideas presented in the recent volume, *The Greek Verb Revisited*, to be productive but others to be unproductive. Before I engage in such discussion, however, I summarize its contents.

Summary of Contents

This lengthy volume of 658 pages (plus 28 pages of preliminaries) comprises three parts. The first, Overview, includes a chapter by Buist Fanning on the (now well-known) Porter/Fanning debate on verbal aspect, Christopher Thomson on differing definitions of aspect, Rutger Allan on tense and aspect in classical Greek, and Nicholas Ellis on a cognitive-linguistic framework for treatment of the Greek verb. The second part, Application, includes Stephen Levinsohn on grounding, Patrick James on the verbs in John 11, Steven Runge on grounding in nonnarrative, Randall Buth on participles, and Levinsohn again on copula-participle combinations. The third part, Linguistic Investigations (have the previous ones not been?), includes Elizabeth Robar on the historical present, Peter Gentry on the augment, Christopher Fresch on typology and prototypes, Buth again on perfect Greek morphology, Robert Crellin on the semantics of the perfect, Runge again on the discourse function of the Greek perfect, Michael Aubrey on Greek prohibitions, Amalia Moser on tense and aspect after the New Testament,

Rachel Aubrey on the middle voice, and an envoi by Geoffrey Horrocks. The book concludes with indexes.

Critical Comments

My comments regarding RF, however, are not simply that I agree or disagree with what it presents in this large number of essays. There are a number of preliminary general comments I wish to make about the book, before attempting to place it within a larger theoretical context.

General Comments

My general comments regarding RF are three

First, I think that RF suffers from a sense of its own insecurity. This may not be the individual contributors' fault but that of the editors or even the publishers. Books today do not allow readers to make up their own minds on the matter contained but attempt to sway opinion. There is [p. 5/150] an underlying assumption that you, as reader, are not capable of judging for yourself the value of a book. I am not just referring to the cloying blurbs included on the back cover or, in this case, the front cover as well. I mean also the fact that the book feels compelled to include them inside the front cover (two pages of them, more like a HarperOne than a Brill book) and publicize and include both a foreword and an envoi—the envoi hardly poetic and more commendatory than explanatory (referring to some of the characteristics mentioned in the Merriam-Webster's dictionary definition). Any good book should be able to stand on its own, without needing to be propped up or explained by others. This book is trying too hard to say how important it is.

Second, the title, *The Greek Verb Revisited*, is not entirely accurate. It perhaps depends on how one defines “verb,” but there are several discussions included in RF that are beyond the verb (e.g. an essay on grounding by Runge that says relatively little about the verb), or that are not all focused in the same way upon similar elements of the Greek verb. There is thus a lot of extraneous seed-picking going on here. Further, the book is hardly a fresh “approach,” since there is no singular approach, but many different approaches used. These include cognitive functionalism, other cognitive approaches (some better defined than others), role and reference grammar, polysemism, descriptivism, historical linguistics, pragmatics, prototypology, and no doubt some others whose subtlety or explicitness I have missed. There are also many essays whose value for exegesis (the ostensive purpose according to the sub-title) is not clearly evident, at least to me, and some approaches and conclusions that are in tension with each other, if not being outright contradictory.

Third, despite how RF represents itself, there is an underlying current, sometimes becoming explicit, that it is trying to address a singular opponent. That opponent

happens to be me, and by implication others who have similar views to mine (and we do agree on many things). I am flattered that my volume on verbal aspect published in 1989 continues to generate such lively response, but I have written on a lot of other linguistics topics as well (and other subjects).⁴ I gauge that negative sentiment of this volume (at least in part) on the fact that I am apparently the most cited author in the index, more so even than Bernard Comrie (I am flattered) or any other linguist. As a result of this volume's [p. 6/150] preoccupation, there are a number of major scholars who are not discussed, such as Johannes Louw, whose views on the perfect tense-form are very important. Louw is not cited in the index (there is a reference to his work on p. 526 note 53, on prohibitions, and an unattributed citation of Louw in my translation within a quotation on p. 482). There are others missing as well, such as Francis Pang on lexical aspect.

In light of these several general comments, I now assess the volume in relationship to a broader conceptual framework regarding methodological innovation.

The Greek Verb Revisited in a Kuhnian Framework

One way to evaluate the substantive essays in RF—and I will not engage all of the essays, both because of space and because some of them simply do not merit it—is in the light of the philosopher of science Thomas Kuhn's notion of paradigm shift.⁵ The major concept that RF purports to talk about is the Greek verb, and by that something to do primarily with verbal aspect.⁶ There are three ways to examine RF in relation to a Kuhnian paradigm shift in study of the Greek verb over the last several years.

A Paradigm Shift Has Certainly Occurred and We are Simply Tidying Up. The first position is to believe that a paradigm shift regarding the Greek verb has occurred and we are simply tidying up necessary loose ends. There are numerous essays in this book that seem to assume that a paradigm shift has occurred, by which I mean that, even though we may still be disagreeing on some related and even tangential issues, some of them even of relative importance, we have generally concurred that Greek is an aspectual language. For example, some note that in the tripartite configuration of TAM—tense, aspect, mood (or TMA, tense, modality, aspect; voice should probably be added to this configuration for discussion of Greek)—Greek is an aspect prominent language, but English is a tense prominent language. For the record, I believe I was the first to discuss for New Testament Greek all three of these topics, tense, aspect, [p. 7/150] and mood, in a coordinated way in my initial monograph on the Greek of the New Testament (I may still be the only one), and I could not concur more wholeheartedly on Greek as an aspectual language.

Some of the issues that would remain outstanding and that are raised in RF, however, are: (1) the definition of verbal aspect itself, (2) the issue of tense and time in the indicative, and (3) the aspectual semantics of the perfect.

(1) First is the definition of verbal aspect. There is much in this edited volume that endorses the notion of “viewpoint aspect.” The more I think about this definition the more I dislike it. I think that the use of this definition skews the discussion by making

aspect more conducive to being conflated or confused with *Aktionsart* or whatever one chooses to call it (incidentally, the one author who claims that scholarly discussion of *Aktionsart* has occurred outside of mainstream linguistics is wrong, unless he does not consider Karl Brugmann a mainstream linguist—which he was for his time; cf. also Georg Curtius, but with slightly different terminology). I emphasize in my work—and perhaps need to emphasize again—that verbal aspect in Greek grammaticalizes a subjective choice by the language user of how to conceptualize a process, not some kind of independent viewpoint on the action, which is easily conflated with the notion of how actions are characterized, the typical issue of *Aktionsart*. Aspect is not, I believe, about the procedural character of actions, but about how authors grammaticalize their choice of conception of a process. The aspectual system is a semantic system apart from *Aktionsart*, a pragmatic category. *Aktionsart* has not effectively been systematized and cannot, I believe, simply be imported into the discussion of aspect, as do so many such as Comrie and others throughout this volume, as well as many others in the wider field of general linguistics (e.g. Thomson, Allan, Crellin, M. Aubrey, Moser in this volume). I think they do this so that they have something typologically interesting to talk about in so-called non-aspectual languages, but their expansive and voracious definition simply confuses the discussion. Much of the discussion of this volume is not about aspect but about *Aktionsart* masquerading as aspect or trying to substitute for aspect. Aspect is grammaticalized in the verbal aspectual system and is (virtually entirely) independent of how actions may be characterized in context or situation.

Related to this issue is the problem of attempting to define verbal aspect as a temporal category (e.g. Thomson [pp. 13-80]). I realize that Comrie defines aspect as concerning the “internal temporal constituency” of a process.⁷ Some have taken this to indicate that Greek is a tensed [p. 8/150] or at least time-based language. This is not at all what Comrie had in mind. In fact, he distinguishes the two—tense and aspect—by stating that tense is a deictic category used in an absolute or relative way to position one event in relation to points of time, while aspect “is not concerned with relating the time of the situation to any other time-point.”⁸ The difference is what he calls “situation-external time (tense)” versus “situation-internal time (aspect).”⁹ As several of the contributors recognize (e.g. Moser, M. Aubrey, Horrocks), Greek is an aspectual language. Those who still try to press for Greek as also a tensed language on the basis of this kind of mistaken reasoning should abandon it. This does not solve the problem. Greek aspect is a morphologically based semantic category based upon verbal opposition.

(2) This discussion of aspect directly leads to consideration of whether Greek is a tensed language in the indicative mood. The fact that it is only tensed (if at all—and I do not believe that it is) in the indicative is instructive in indicating the significance of aspect. However, I am not willing to concede tensedness even for the indicative. The clarification of the definition of aspect eliminates the false play on words noted above as a motivation for the tense hypothesis. The argument used several times in RF is that Greek is no more untensed than is English, because just as Greek has “exceptions” to a time-based conception (aorist = past, etc.), so does English, and we know that English is

a tensed language.

There are several important responses to make to this argument, such as it is.

First, the kind of iconicity of tense-form and time implied by such a position argues also against the aspect-based character of Greek, something that everyone agrees is fundamental to the semantics of the Greek verbal system, especially as the time-based conception is admittedly not found outside of the indicative (although one essay in RF tries to smuggle it back in under typology [e.g. Buth, pp. 273-306]). This is hardly a way forward!

Second, what is the factor that marks this temporal character (for those who propose such a position)? The claim is that it is the augment or the augment and other morphology (I found the morphological discussions in RF theoretically unconvincing [e.g. Ellis; Buth], and prefer a paradigm-functional model).¹⁰ There are many assumptions made in this [p. 9/150] book, such as the time-based nature of Greek, the value of typologizing, how “linguists” are right and biblical scholars wrong, etc., so it strikes me as odd that even though many Greek scholars and linguists have argued against the augment as a time indicator, including K. L. McKay, whose work is unfortunately minimized in this work, there are those who still insist that the augment is such. It strikes me as special pleading to argue in this way, especially in light of the historical linguistic reconstruction of Greek offered in RF as well (e.g. Moser [pp. 539-62]). There are also other good reasons for arguing against it, as has been made clear by a number of scholars. The augment cannot be a temporal indicator unless it is assumed that the augment is such an indicator, and even then this does not explain the apparent exceptions.

Third, there are several possible other responses to this comparison of Greek and English. This argument assumes that English is a tensed rather than an, or tensed more than an, aspectual language. Is this true? I think that strong arguments can be made that it is not. In fact, there are strong arguments that English is less tensed and more aspectual, perhaps somewhere in the middle of the cline, than is usually stated—assumptions otherwise notwithstanding (it is hard to look outside of one’s own language). Another possible response is that this position does nothing to explain the usage in Greek or English, but merely complicates the situation. By this reckoning, not only can we not account for the supposedly aberrant usage in English, but we certainly cannot explain it in Greek, because this comparison makes Greek into a tense prominent language, something that we all recognize is not the case. Appeal to a tense/aspect mismatch such as with the narrative present (e.g. Buth, Runge, Robar, the last of whom posits unfounded claims) simply shifts the priority in this direction as well. A better explanation is perhaps to recognize that one cannot engage in simplistic linguistic typologizing of Greek and English. We must recognize that the range of possible Greek tense-form functions—recognizable “exceptions” such as the narrative present, various gnomic uses, etc.—within an aspect prominent system must be considered in a different way from similar exceptions in a tense prominent system, if that is what English is. My monosemous view of aspectual semantics being systemically fundamental for all mood

forms drives me to this conclusion for the indicative as well, and, I would contend, is the most elegant explanation of other perspectives also. I simply do not understand why it is important to defend temporal reference in Greek, when there is such strong theoretical and pragmatic empirical evidence to the contrary. To show how poor the argumentation can become at points, one of the authors in RF argues against the use of the notion of “remote” as a semantic feature with the claim, based in English, that “‘he [p. 10/150] was standing’ is not farther away geographically than ‘he is standing’” (p. 424). To quote Tennessee Williams in *The Glass Menagerie*, “time is the greatest distance between two places.”¹¹ These are conceptions that capture meaningful semantic relationships, and do so well.

(3) The third area is the aspectual semantics of the perfect tense-form. In many ways (see the Introduction to RF), this volume represents itself as a response to the discussion of Fanning, Campbell, and Porter on the perfect tense-form held at the Society of Biblical Literature annual meeting in 2013—and still awaiting publication. In an odd statement, just in case anyone misses it, one of the authors notes in an addendum to a chapter (pp. 484-85) that three of the included essays (by Crellin, Buth, and Runge) offer such a response (I note that one of the other essays that addresses the perfect is not included as part of the response [by Allan]; perhaps it did not propose the right response, although Allan’s polysemous cognitive accumulation of procedural features would appear to be in conformity with other essays in the volume).

There are several specific problems with this proposed approach and response to the semantics of the perfect tense-form. First, it probably would have been better if the response had in fact been a focused and clear response, rather than roping in all of the other essays in RF, which range widely into such things as prohibitions, voice, participles, periphrastics, and a variety of other discussions.

Second, these three highlighted essays can hardly be said to constitute a response in kind to the original essays of 2013. The first (Buth [pp. 416-29]) uses a lexical-incremental morphological approach that results in, inevitably, equating morphological complexity with semantic complexity in a specific and rigid way, and attempts to explain this through a vague cognitive linguistic framework. The second (Crellin [pp. 430-57]) is a discussion not of verbal aspect as defined above but of *Aktionsart*, in which various conceptions are seen as part of the posited situation (note that Louw’s work is not mentioned here; it was written in Afrikaans and that perhaps explains it). The result is a discussion of context, even discourse, not aspect as a morphological category. The third essay (Runge [pp. 458-85]) is cast around an inappropriate play on the notion of “relevance” and is concerned with finding a negative conclusion as to whether the perfect indicates prominence, never really becoming a discussion of the semantics of the perfect as aspect (another essay on grounding and prominence [Levinsohn, pp. 163-83] is even more problematic in its formulations). So these essays are far from pushing forward the discussion of the meaning of the perfect tense-form. [p. 11/150]

One frequently visited notion in this volume, visited mostly in a negative way that tries to dismiss it, is that the perfect cannot be stative as I have argued elsewhere, or rather

that it can indicate “state” in some but not all uses (both positions are asserted).¹² This example of mis-definition indicates the problems that occur when one confuses pragmatic *Aktionsart* with semantic verbal aspect. The assertion—and it is an assertion—that the term “stative” cannot be used to describe the semantics of the perfect tense-form because this is a term that is used of *Aktionsarten* is simply wrongheaded. I don’t know if this terminological usage is true or not, but I do note that throughout RF the term that is often used of procedural character of lexical items (verbs) is “state” and not necessarily “stative.” However, is this contention really a problem? I think not. The term “stative” is being used semantically to describe the conception of a process characterizing the state of a subject, grammaticalized by a particular tense-form. The term is being used within the system of verbal aspect, not within the constellation of Vendlerian (or other) process types, with its varying and unsystematic and unprincipled discussion of pragmatically based action types. Just because a term is used in one context does not mean that it cannot be used in another system. The result of such discussion of the perfect for most in RF is that it is a polysemous and contextually determined characterization of action types, best conceived with such terms as state or result or the like. This is not a discussion of verbal aspect at all. I contend that the best description of the aspectual semantics of the perfect tense-form is stative, a view that has been well-argued before and is consonant with the views of others such as McKay and Louw (who, as already noted, are not given their due in this book).

A Paradigm Shift Has Occurred But Much is Still to be Done. Perhaps one might wish to argue that, even though a Kuhnian paradigm shift has occurred and the general notions have been accepted, the specifics still have quite a distance to go and further modifications are necessary (an intermediate position).

There is evidence within RF that such is its perspective. One discussion that tends in this direction is the conflation of *Aktionsart* and aspect, so that what purports to be a discussion of the latter is in fact a discussion of the former. I realize that I have mentioned this topical confusion above, but I have mentioned it there as a point of inadvertent distraction to the aspectual view. There are other places within this book [p. 12/150] where it appears that the discussion is designed in some way to enhance our understanding of aspect by introducing *Aktionsart* or related categories. The problematic nature of what exactly is being introduced by doing this is seen in a variety of ways. One of these is the varied terminology itself: *Aktionsart*, actionality, lexical aspect, procedural character, procedural class, predicate classes, or predicate types (the index refers in one place to this last category but has no entry for it). These are all terms used somewhere in the book (along with the many different definitions of aspect laid out in one of the chapters e.g. Thomson, [pp. 13-80]).¹³ This is not the only confusion of terms. All of the terms seem to be used in varying ways to speak of how actions might be described or characterized, and here too the specific types used vary significantly. Some use Vendler’s original four classes of action (state, activity, accomplishment, and achievement) in relationship to three characteristics (stativity, durativity, and telicity) (Thomson). These have been expanded by others (e.g. M. Aubrey, based on Van Valin

and role and reference grammar) to include semelfactive (as a noun) and active achievement (as opposed to simply an achievement?), as well as causative, along with the characteristics of state, dynamism, telicity, and punctuality. One can see simply on the basis of the terminology itself—rather than this indicating a settled state in linguistics, an impression one may get from some of the essays in RF—that this terminology is disorganized and highly problematic. This fact has been noted before, in seeing the widely differing views of actions and their types in various treatments. The confusion is furthered by the failure to note at which rank of discussion these process types occur. Are these characterizations of actions lexical (Thomson), phrasal, clausal (M. Aubrey), or contextual or situational (M. Aubrey)? All levels seem to be at play in one form or another in the varying discussions in RF. Finally, how is it that one determines these characteristics of actions? This is especially problematic if one does not have a linguistic model that treats the variables. Besides the fact that one of the discussions makes a wide-spread but unprincipled appeal to context, when context is defined very narrowly in the linguistic theory at play in the chapter (e.g. Discourse Representation Theory, a formal semantics totally ignored in the chapter), it is clear that something other than verbal aspect as a morphologically based category as part of the verbal system is being discussed. This fact is as much as admitted in the essay on prohibitions, which distinguishes grammaticalized aspect from *Aktionsart*, and even then is only able to find some rough generalizations. [p. 13/150]

No Paradigm Shift has Occurred and We Are Not Sure We Want One. The third Kuhnian option is that one might wish to argue that RF indicates that a paradigm shift has not yet occurred in Greek linguistics from traditional grammar to an aspectual view of the verb, and that a paradigm shift is still to come if one arrives at all. There is also some evidence of that position in RF, and even an implicit view that this book—as disparate as it is—will possibly effect such a change.

The evidence of this lack of a paradigm shift is seen in two major features. The first feature is the continued appeal to traditional grammar and the conclusions of traditional grammarians. This is found in a number of areas. These include:

(1) views of the nature of tense, in which the temporal nature of Greek is simply assumed on the basis of previous language study rather than fully engaging with other views of language (many essays, but see e.g. Buth [pp. 273-306]);

(2) the confusion over *Aktionsart* noted above, in which *Aktionsart*, a product of nineteenth-century linguistic thought, both is heralded as the state of play for discussion of the semantic structure of the Greek verbal system when it has already proven incapable of serving in this capacity, and continues to be revived, modified, and revitalized as if it were a new way forward that is the same as discussion of verbal aspect (study of the lexicon or pragmatics is not the same as the study of the Greek verbal system); and

(3) defense of a variety of positions, such as temporality, the semantics of the augment, and the traditional definition of the perfect (e.g. Crellin [pp. 430-57]), on the basis of traditional diachronically motivated language discussion, in which there is a sudden shift

from synchrony to diachrony, with a modest appeal to the future development of Greek (Moser [pp. 539-62]) as a means of understanding the Greek of the New Testament (and such odd and mistaken characterizations as Hellenistic Greek being transitional Greek—a view that could be said of any language that occupies diachronic space between two temporal points).

The second feature, where the anticipated and not yet arrived view of Greek is perhaps most clearly seen, is the use of cross-linguistic typologizing. I am not a typologist, so I am probably speaking out of turn here. However, typologizing seem to me to have several problems—despite the fact that, admittedly, a number of linguists like to appeal to typological relations (as do authors in RF [e.g. Allan, Ellis, Runge, Fresch, Buth, Moser, R. Aubrey]). The first problem is that such typologies appear to be a refashioning of a series of thoughts regarding language that date back to nineteenth-century comparative philology, when scholars first became interested in the common features of language and then posited and [p. 14/150] developed their genetic relationships. This led to discussion of language universals, as it was supposed that all of these languages had universal characteristics underlying their various phenomenal features. This then led to contemporary typologizing, as a means of speaking of varying degrees of similarity among languages, regardless of genetic relationship, based upon wide enough scope. Another problem is that typology is not determinative. Languages may or may not have particular characteristics, and just because they are similar in some respects does not mean that they are similar in others, and they may also be similar or different to varying degrees (and so what? Linguistics is not done simply by counting languages). Another problem is that features within one language may not be used in the same way in others even if they are labeled in the same way, or they may not even be found in other languages.¹⁴ The perfect tense-form in Greek may be a good example, as evidenced when typologists try to apply a binary analysis to the entire Greek aspectual system that they claim is “typical” of other languages. A final problem is that typologizing depends upon accurate knowledge of the languages being compared. The linguist David Crystal recounts how linguists are often asked how many languages they speak, when few are fluent in more than one.¹⁵ If linguists are going to analyze languages, then they must depend on studies of those languages, ideally not on the traditional grammars still in existence for ancient Greek. Greek must be described and mapped as Greek, before it is typologized in relation to other languages.

My conclusion, unlike Fanning’s in the book, is that a Kuhnian paradigm shift was not only necessary but has indeed occurred in the study of Greek, even if not all—and some of those are unfortunately represented in RF—are willing to admit it or embrace it.

Conclusion

As a final thought, I think that, overall, RF is, like many collections of essays by a variety of authors, a disparate collection, with varying essays written sometimes by those who end up confusing issues more than clarifying them, and sometimes by those who are

genuinely trying to understand the Greek language as Greek. I believe that it is time that we all recognize—and this involves not just Greek linguists but other [p. 15/150] New Testament scholars as well—that, even if we don’t agree on all the specific details, a major shift in understanding of Greek has occurred. We cannot go back and pretend that the past thirty or more years of discussion have not occurred. We must not only recognize this fact but embrace the implications of such a paradigm shift, accept the direction of its development, and move forward in research. I unfortunately get the feeling that RF may, at least in some respects, represent a minority opinion by some disaffected scholars who believe that their voice in this paradigm shift has not been heard. Their voice has been heard, but it has just not proved convincing.

Stanley E. PORTER
McMaster Divinity College
1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, ON L8S 4K1
CANADA
porters@mcmaster.ca

[p. 16/150]

¹ This is a review of *The Greek Verb Revisited*, edited by Steven E. Runge and Christopher J. Fresch (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016). This is a slightly revised form of the review that, because of time constraints, was presented in abbreviated form at the Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics Section, Society of Biblical Literature 2017 Annual Meeting, Boston, MA, 18-21 November 2017. I will refer to the volume as RF.

² Julia Kristeva, *Language: The Unknown: An Initiation into Linguistics* (trans. Anne M. Menke; New York: Columbia University Press, 1989 [1981]), 219-20.

³ I use the basic distinction made in Robert D. Van Valin, Jr., and Randy J. LaPolla, *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function* (CTL; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 8-15. Within the communication and cognition theories they include a wide variety that themselves have much that differentiates them.

⁴ See Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood* (SBG 1; New York: Peter Lang, 1989). Other volumes include: Porter, *Studies in the Greek of the New Testament: Theory and Practice* (SBG 6; New York: Peter Lang, 1996) and *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament: Studies in Tools, Methods, and Practice* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2015), among others.

⁵ Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (2nd ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970 [1962]).

⁶ There are several chapters on other dimensions as well. These include a chapter on prohibitions that assumes a settled conclusion on aspect (M. Aubrey, pp. 486-538), and one on the middle voice (R. Aubrey, pp. 563-625) that speaks a lot about “energy” but in the end runs out of it despite some very interesting, but I think finally unconvincing, ideas. The unexpected result of this latter chapter was that I became more convinced of the theta passive as a distinct voice, even if closely related to the middle; a robust use of Hallidayan ergativity would provide a needed jolt.

⁷ Bernard Comrie, *Aspect* (CTL; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 3.

⁸ Comrie, *Aspect*, 5; cf. 2.

⁹ Comrie, *Aspect*, 5.

¹⁰ On terminology for characterizing views of morphology, see Gregory Stump, *Inflectional Morphology: A*

Theory of Paradigm Structure (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

¹¹ Tennessee Williams, *The Glass Menagerie* (New York: New Directions, 1945), 114.

¹² I get some support from one essay (James [pp. 184-220]) that is unfortunately out of touch on Johannine scholarship.

¹³ I am perplexed, however, that Thomson gives permission to “linguists” to have widely varying definitions, but not to biblical linguists.

¹⁴ See William Croft, *Verbs: Aspect and Causal Structure* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 128-29.

¹⁵ David Crystal, *What Is Linguistics?* (3rd ed.; London: Edward Arnold, 1974), 7.

Aproximación al estudio del campo semántico de los Lexemas verbales de movimiento (H) en el griego del Nuevo Testamento¹

JUAN BARRETO - CARMEN RITA JORGE - MARÍA MAITE GARCÍA

This article offers a general outline of the semantic domain of *verbs of movement* in the Greek New Testament and, among them, of those denoting directional displacement of an Agent Entity. Special attention is given to the lexeme ἔρχομαι, its meaning and asymmetries with the corresponding Spanish lexical repertory.

Keywords: Semantics, Greek lexicography, Verbs of movement, ἔρχομαι.

Algunas aclaraciones metodológicas²

El presente estudio tiene en último término una finalidad lexicográfica. Partimos del principio de que un diccionario elaborado con criterios semánticos no debe limitarse a consignar un repertorio de equivalencias léxicas en castellano de los distintos lexemas griegos, sino que, en primer lugar, ha de proporcionar la definición abstracta de su contenido semántico [p. 17/150] de modo que el lector o traductor pueda por él mismo encontrar en cada momento la equivalencia más adecuada en su lengua³.

Ahora bien, para una definición más precisa del contenido semántico de cada lexema habrá que proceder a identificar su posición en el sistema de relaciones semánticas dentro de un determinado campo. Se impone una tarea de clasificación con el fin de establecer su relación dentro del campo semántico pertinente, puesto que es dentro del conjunto de oposiciones que lo constituyen donde finalmente se delimita su sentido.

En este trabajo presentamos sólo un esbozo de clasificación de los lexemas, pertenecientes a la especie semántica Hecho (H) que indican *movimiento* en el griego del Nuevo Testamento. Es obvio que no podemos presentar una descripción detallada de un campo tan extenso y complejo⁴. Nuestra intención es ofrecer una síntesis a modo de carta de navegación que nos permita tener una visión de conjunto. Dentro de este campo nos detendremos seguidamente en la clasificación de los lexemas verbales que indican *desplazamiento* de una Entidad (E) agente; a modo de ejemplo haremos algunas anotaciones sobre el análisis de ἔρχομαι para, finalmente, estudiar algunos de los problemas que plantea al traductor la asimetría de este lexema con el repertorio correspondiente castellano que cubre esa misma significación.

1. Clasificación de los lexemas verbales (H) que denotan movimiento

Los lexemas verbales que denotan movimiento (H)⁵ pueden ser clasificados en tres subcampos, según los ejes semánticos en torno a los cuales se articulan: [p. 18/150]

1.1. Lexemas que se entienden en la oposición movilidad vs. estaticidad: κινέω, σείω, σαλεύω... La movilidad puede afectar al sujeto o al objeto: *moverse* o *poner en movimiento*; se oponen a aquellos que indican *estado de quietud* o *reposo*: κεῖμαι, στήκω...

1.2. Lexemas que denotan cambio de lugar o desplazamiento direccional. Se entienden en la oposición de dos ubicaciones en el espacio: *aquí* vs. *allí*. El desplazamiento puede referirse:

1.2.1. a la Entidad agente: ἔρχομαι, πορεύομαι, βαίνω⁶; se oponen a los que indican *permanencia* en un lugar: εἶναι ἐν, μένω, διατρίβω, οἰκέω...

1.2.2. a la Entidad objeto de la actividad: φέρω, ἐλαύνω, βάλλω...

1.3. Lexemas que denotan cambio de postura, no simple paso del estado de reposo al de movimiento, ni desplazamiento de un lugar a otro, sino de una postura –σχήμα– a otra del mismo sujeto. La oposición en la que se entienden es esta postura vs. otra postura. Implica que una determinada E siempre tiene una postura, por eso las oposiciones se han de dar dentro del sistema de posturas determinadas codificadas en la cultura: p. ej. por las coordenadas espaciales de verticalidad vs. horizontalidad en las que se mueve la E agente: ἐγείρω, ἀνίστημι vs. κάθημαι...; κλίνω (intr.), προσκυνέω, γονυπετέω, ἀναπεδάω, vs. ἵσταμαι...

2. Lexemas verbales que indican desplazamiento direccional del sujeto

Por razones de brevedad nos ceñiremos a aquellos Hs que denotan *desplazamiento direccional* del sujeto: subcampo 1.2.1 de los mencionados arriba. [p. 19/150]

En los lexemas que denotan desplazamiento del sujeto se pueden considerar distintos grupos según las *Determinaciones* (D) o/y las *Relaciones* (R) que se introduzcan en la denotación⁷. Se expresan frecuentemente a nivel morfológico con preverbios que se añaden a lexemas menos marcados: p. ej. ἔρχομαι > κατέρχομαι o con otros prefijos: εὐθυδρομέω o a través de la especialización del tema de la raíz: πίπτω...

2.1. La Determinación (D) afecta al desplazamiento mismo, añadiendo rasgos que lo especifican. Las determinaciones más frecuentes son:

2.1.1. Las que señalan la *posición* o *trayectoria* del movimiento en el espacio:

2.1.1.1. En la oposición verticalidad vs. horizontalidad: ἀνέρχομαι, κατέρχομαι ἀναβαίνω, καταβαίνω, ἀνήκω, καταποντίζω... denotan una D que sitúa el desplazamiento en esas coordenadas espaciales⁸. Ejemplo: ἀνέρχομαι. Definición⁹: “Actividad de desplazamiento (H) en sentido ascendente (D) de alguien (E1) hacia o desde (R) un lugar (E2)”: *subir*.

2.1.1.2. En la oposición rectitud vs. no rectitud: περιέρχομαι, κυκλόω,

εὐθυδρομέω, ὀρθοποδέω... Ejemplo: περιέρχομαι. Definición: “Actividad de desplazamiento (H) en sentido no recto (D) de alguien (E1) en torno a (R) un lugar (E2)”: *deambular, dar vueltas, andar de acá para allá*.

2.1.2. Las que se refieren a la cuantificación del movimiento:

2.1.2.1. Cuantificación referida a la trayectoria del movimiento:

– En la oposición parcialidad vs. totalidad. Ejemplo: ἀναβαίνω¹⁰. Definición: “Actividad de desplazamiento (H) gradual (D) en sentido ascendente (D’) de [p. 20/150] alguien o algo (E1) hacia o desde (R) un lugar (E2)”: *subir (a pasos, gradualmente)*¹¹.

– Cuantificación del movimiento en relación con la distancia entre el punto de partida y de llegada, en el eje *cercanía* vs. *lejanía*. Ejemplo: ἐγγίζω. Definición: “Actividad de desplazamiento (H) de aproximación (D) de alguien o algo (E1) hacia (R) un lugar (E2)”: *acercarse, aproximarse*.

– Con elemento relacional comparativo: προέρχομαι, φθάνω. Ejemplo: προβαίνω. Definición: “Actividad de desplazamiento (H) gradual (D) cuantificado (D’) hacia o desde (R) un lugar (E2) de alguien (E1) en comparación con (R’) su (E1’) posición (H1) inicial (R2)”: *adelantarse, caminar hacia delante*.

2.1.2.2. Cuantificación del tiempo del movimiento en la oposición celeridad vs. lentitud: τρέχω, σπεύδω, φθάνω...; p. ej.: τρέχω. Definición: “Actividad de desplazamiento (H) veloz (D), de alguien (E1) hacia (R) un lugar (E2)”: *correr*.

2.2. Las Relaciones (R) son las que todo movimiento de desplazamiento mantiene:

2.2.1. Con las Entidades (espaciales o ubicadas en el espacio) que marcan el inicio o término del movimiento: ἀπέρχομαι, εἰσέρχομαι, ἐγγίζω... La Relación que expresa la direccionalidad se inscribe en la polaridad origen vs. término. Ejemplo: εἰσέρχομαι. Definición: “Actividad de desplazamiento (H) de algo o alguien (E1) hacia el interior de (R) un lugar delimitado (E2)”: *entrar en, meterse en*.

2.2.2. Con el espacio mediador del desplazamiento: διέρχομαι, ὁδεύω, διϊκνέομαι, καταποντίζω, διαπλέω... Ejemplo: διέρχομαι. Definición: “Actividad de desplazamiento (H) a través de (R) un espacio (E) de alguien (E1) hacia o desde (R’) un sitio (E2)”: *pasar, pasar por, atravesar, pasar a través de, ir a través de*.

2.2.3. Con otras Entidades adyacentes al movimiento: παρέρ-χομαι, παραβαίνω, παραπλέω, παραπορεύομαι. Ejemplo: παρέρχομαι. Definición: “Actividad de desplazamiento (H) de alguien o algo (E1), en contigüidad (R’) con algo o alguien [p. 21/150] (E3) inmóvil (H1) desde o hacia (R) un lugar (E2)”: *pasar, pasar junto a*.

2.2.4. Con otros sujetos del mismo movimiento (H): συνέρχομαι, συνεισέρχομαι¹², συμβαίνω, συνοδεύω, προέρχομαι, ἀκολουθέω... Ejemplo: συνέρχομαι. Definición: “Actividad de desplazamiento (H) hacia o desde (R) un lugar (E2) de alguien (E1) en compañía de (R’) una o más personas (E3) que ejercen una idéntica actividad (H’ + R’’)”: *ir junto con, ir con, venir junto con, venir con, acompañar*.

2.2.5. Con Entidades instrumentales del movimiento: πλέω, πεζεύω, πέτομαι, ὀρθοποδέω... Ejemplo: πλέω. Definición: “Actividad de desplazamiento (H) hacia o desde (R) un lugar (E2) de alguien (E1) en una embarcación (R’ + E3)”: *navegar*.

3. Anotaciones sobre ἔρχομαι

3.1. Ἔρχομαι y su familia. Características generales

Entre los lexemas verbales que denotan desplazamiento (H) direccional del sujeto incluidos en el que hemos denominado subcampo 1.2.1, el lexema ἔρχομαι puede considerarse como archilexema de ese subcampo semántico por las características siguientes:

- Es el más neutro o menos marcado: “Actividad de desplazamiento (H) hacia o desde (R) un lugar (E2) de algo o alguien (E1)”: *ir*, *venir*. El lexema griego es neutro en cuanto a la perspectiva de acercamiento (*venir*) o alejamiento (*ir*). Connota el agente y el término de origen o destino.

Esta falta de marca lo hace extremadamente versátil, dotándolo de una altísima capacidad, por una parte, de incorporar preverbios (en la práctica, casi la totalidad del repertorio de la lengua) que permiten añadir denotaciones relacionales que precisan su sentido; y, por otra, de conectar con elementos contextuales que le permiten desarrollar una amplia gama de acepciones (cf. § 3.2, listado de sememas y algunas de las equivalencias léxicas en español).

- Es, con mucho, el que más frecuencia registra (642 ítems) en el corpus neotestamentario).
- Además, es el que genera la mayor familia léxica dentro del campo. [p. 22/150] Por su capacidad para la combinación con preverbios, esta familia domina el campo con un total de 1413 ítems. Véase el índice de frecuencias por lexema: ἀνέρχομαι (3), ἀντιπαρέρχομαι (2), ἀπέρχομαι (117), διέρχομαι (43), εἰσέρχομαι (194), ἔλευσις (1), ἐξέρχομαι (218), ἐπανέρχομαι (2), ἐπεισέρχομαι (1), ἐπέρχομαι (9), ἔρχομαι (642), κατέρχομαι (16), παρεισέρχομαι (2), παρέρχομαι (29), περιέρχομαι (3), προέρχομαι (9), προσέρχομαι (86), προσήλυτος (4), συνεισέρχομαι (2), συνέρχομαι (30).

Una de las características de ἔρχομαι y muchos de sus compuestos es que, dada la analogía entre desplazamiento o *cambio de lugar* y *cambio de estado* o *actividad*, con frecuencia expresan también esos cambios: *no existencia* → *existencia*. Sirva de ejemplo ἔρχομαι, como lexema de desplazamiento menos marcado, cuando expresa el tránsito a la existencia o a la presencia, sin que haya desplazamiento real; según la naturaleza de la entidad agente, el tránsito a la existencia puede traducirse:

- Si los agentes son animados, *venir*, *presentarse*:
 - Mt 3,11: ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερος μου ἐστίν *pero el que viene después de mí es más fuerte que yo* (cf. Mc 1,7; Lc 3,16).
 - Mt 24,5: πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου *Pues muchos vendrán en mi*

nombre (cf. Lc 21,8).

- Si los agentes son Hechos, producirse, cumplirse, realizarse:
 - Mt 6,10: ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου *que se cumpla aquí tu reinado*.
 - Mt 24,39: ἕως ἧλθεν ὁ πατακλυσμὸς καὶ... *hasta que se produjo el diluvio y...*

Finalmente, es característico de los verbos de desplazamiento de esta familia su uso para expresar también la *progresión del tiempo*. De hecho, la representación del tiempo está ligada en la lengua a la del espacio (adverbios y preposiciones para expresar la ubicación en el espacio se usan también para la posición en el tiempo).

- Jn 4,23: ἀλλὰ ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν *pero llega la hora, y es ahora*.
- Lc 22,7: Ἦλθεν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἁζύμων *Y llegó el día de los Ázimos*.

3.2. Aceptaciones y equivalencias léxicas de ἔρχομαι en castellano.

El listado de acepciones del lexema ἔρχομαι se divide en dos grupos principales: sentido propio (en el que el desplazamiento es físico) y sentido figurado (en el que el desplazamiento es metafórico).

3.2.1. Desplazamiento en sentido propio o transición con movimiento real.

3.2.1.1. Neutro en cuanto a la idea de alejamiento o acercamiento o focalizando punto de partida + punto de llegada: εἰς + E2 local: *ir, venir*.

- Mc 3,20: Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς οἶκον *Y se fue a casa*. [p. 23/150]

3.2.1.1.a. Cuando el término es personal: πρὸς + E2 personal: *ir, ir a ver, ir al encuentro*.

- Mc 2,13: καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἦρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν *y todo el mundo iba a verlo*.

3.2.1.1.b. Como movimiento de respuesta a una causa externa: mandato, propósito, invitación o ruego.

3.2.1.1.b.1. Con término local: *ir, venir, acudir*.

- Mt 22,3: καὶ οὐκ ἤθελον ἐλθεῖν *y no quisieron acudir (los convidados a la boda)*.

3.2.1.1.b.2. Con término personal: Relación de Superioridad de E2 con respecto a E1: *presentarse (ante), comparecer (ante)*.

- Lc 19,18: καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ δεύτερος λέγων *Y se presentó el segundo diciendo*.

3.2.1.2. Perspectiva de acercamiento respecto a E2: *venir*.

- Mt 2,2: εἶδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἦλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ *pues vimos su estrella en el oriente y vinimos a postrarnos ante él*.

3.2.1.2.a. Movimiento de retorno correlativo a otro anterior, explícito en el contexto: *volver, regresar*.

- Mt 25,19: μετὰ δὲ πολὺν χρόνον ἔρχεται ὁ κύριος τῶν δούλων ἐκείνων *y después de mucho tiempo, vuelve el señor de aquellos esclavos*.

3.2.1.3. Caracterización aspectual:

3.2.1.3.a. Punto de inicio o de partida: incoativo (aor. o pres. hist.): *marchar*,

salir, irse, dirigirse a.

- Lc 2,16: καὶ ἦλθαν σπεύσαντες y salieron a toda prisa.

3.2.1.3.b. Proceso del movimiento: continuo + Direccionalidad (pres. o imperf.): encaminarse, dirigirse.

- Jn 20,3: Ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητὴς καὶ ἦρχοντο εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον *Salen entonces Pedro y el otro discípulo y se encaminaron al sepulcro.* [p. 24/150]

3.2.1.3.c. Final del proceso: momento puntual del término del movimiento: *llegar*. Concatenación o sucesión de dos acciones.

- Lc 8,51: ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν οὐκ ἀφῆκεν εἰσελθεῖν τινα Y al llegar a la casa, no dejó entrar a nadie.

3.2.1.3.c.1. Punto final del movimiento, sin alusión a espacio o movimiento anterior, se prescinde del proceso, sin conocimiento previo por parte de E3: *presentarse, aparecer* (Ausencia vs. Presencia: Movimiento real).

- Mc 3,31: Καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ Y *se presenta su madre y sus hermanos.*

3.2.1.4. Movimiento de venida con intencionalidad de aproximación entre las entidades E1 y E2: acercarse.

- Mc 1,40: Καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτὸν λεπρὸς παρακαλῶν¹³ αὐτόν Y *se le acercó un leproso*¹⁴ *rogándole.*

3.2.1.4.a. Cuando E2 es personal y está cualificado (E2 + A1), un médico, sacerdote, letrado, para satisfacer una carencia, necesidad o duda: acudir.

- Lc 6,18: οἱ ἦλθον ἀκοῦσαι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἰαθῆναι *los cuales habían acudido a oírlo y a ser sanados.*

3.2.1.5. Neutralización de los puntos de referencia locales, *unde* y *quo*. Se contempla el movimiento en sí mismo. Movimiento a través de (*qua*): pasar por.

- Hch 5,15: ἵνα ἐρχομένου Πέτρου κἀν ἡ σκιά ἐπισκιάσῃ τινὶ αὐτῶν *para que al pasar (por allí)*¹⁵ *Pedro, su sombra cayera sobre alguno de ellos.*

3.2.1.6. Perífrasis iterativa: ἔρχομαι + part. pres.: *ir* + gdio, *venir* + gdio. Son acciones simultáneas. [p. 25/150]

- Lc 13,6: καὶ ἦλθεν ζητῶν καρπὸν ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ οὐχ εὑρεν y *vino buscando fruto en ella y no lo encontró.*

3.2.1.7. Perífrasis de finalidad: participio de aoristo de ἔρχομαι + verbo personal (giro semítico): *ir a / irse a, venir a*. Acciones sucesivas.

- Mt 5,24: καὶ τότε ἐλθὼν πρόσφερε τὸ δῶρόν σου y *entonces vete a presentar tu ofrenda.*

3.2.1.8. Perífrasis lexicalizada de referencia espacio-temporal: *caminar, andar* (ἔρχομαι ὁδὸν = ὁδεύω; βαίνω).

- Lc 2,44: ἦλθον ἡμέρας ὁδὸν¹⁶ καὶ... *anduvieron un día de camino y...*

3.2.2. Desplazamiento en sentido figurado o transición sin movimiento real.

3.2.2.1 Transición sin movimiento real.

3.2.2.1.a. Tránsito entre espacios calificados: *venir*. Contexto profético, de misión (E1 = Animado) (Epifánico: *aparecer*).

- Mt 11,3: σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν; ¿Tú eres el que va a venir o esperamos a otro?

3.2.2.1.b. Tránsito de una situación a otra, de H1 a H2: *llegar (a ser)* (γίγνομαι).

- 1Tim 2,4: καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν y *lleguen al conocimiento de la verdad*¹⁷.

3.2.2.1.b.1. Tránsito al estado de existencia. Si los agentes son Hechos (E = H): *producirse, haber, cumplirse, realizarse*. Significado más próximo a γίγνομαι.

- Mt 18,7: ἀνάγκη γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα *Pues es inevitable que se produzcan aquí los escándalos*.

3.2.2.1.b.2. Perífrasis de transición: momento mismo del cambio de una situación a otra: pres. de ἔρχομαι + pres. personal: y va y... [p. 26/150]

- Jn 21,13: ἔρχεται Ἰησοῦς καὶ λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον *va Jesús y coge el pan*.

3.2.2.1.c. Tránsito entre unidades de tiempo (E = D): *llegar*.

- Jn 9,4: ἔρχεται νῦν ὅτε οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι *llega la noche cuando nadie puede trabajar*.

3.2.2.1.d. Tránsito metafórico: noético o elocutivo.

3.2.2.1.d.1. Noético reflexivo: cuando agente y objeto son el mismo: *recapacitar, reflexionar*.

- Lc 15,17: εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐλθὼν ἔφη *recapacitando, dijo*.

3.2.2.1.d.2. Elocutivo de referencia: *referirse a, aludir a*.

- 2Co 12,1: ἐλεύσομαι δὲ εἰς ὁπτασίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις κυρίου *me referiré a las visiones y revelaciones del Señor*.

3.2.2.2. De origen, de procedencia por nacimiento: *ser de, venir de, proceder de*.

- Jn 7,42: ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ καὶ ἀπὸ Βηθλέεμ τῆς κώμης ὅπου ἦν Δαυὶδ ἔρχεται ὁ χριστός; ¿...*de la semilla de David y de la aldea de Belén, de donde era David, viene el Ungido?* [p. 27/150]

3.3. Anotaciones sobre las equivalencias léxicas de ἔρχομαι en castellano

Teniendo en cuenta que el lexema griego es neutro en cuanto a la perspectiva de acercamiento (*venir*) o alejamiento (*ir*), intentaremos exponer algunos de los factores contextuales que orientan en la elección de una u otra acepción.

El *alejamiento* o *acercamiento* siempre lo es en relación con la ubicación de alguien o algo. Mientras el lexema griego se abstrae de esa relación que queda confiada al contexto, el castellano la lexicaliza de manera diferente: *ir* (alejamiento); *venir* (acercamiento).

En castellano, pues, no hay un lexema equivalente neutro en cuanto a la perspectiva de alejamiento o acercamiento. El traductor se verá obligado en cada caso a elegir entre una u otra: *ir* o *venir* y para ello ha de individuar los elementos contextuales que justifiquen

su elección. En definitiva, se ha de determinar en el contexto la ubicación del alguien o algo en relación con los cuales el movimiento se considera acercamiento o alejamiento.

Los criterios contextuales que determinan la adopción de una u otra perspectiva son los siguientes:

3.3.1. Si la expresión representa la voz del narrador y esta voz se considera en una posición neutra con respecto a los desplazamientos de los distintos actores del relato (cuando el narrador no ejerce ningún rol en él), el verbo castellano *ir* representa el término menos marcado. El narrador señala los espacios y describe los movimientos de los demás actores sin atribuirse él mismo ninguna ubicación particular. Esta ubicación neutra es la que adopta el oyente/lector con relación a la de los actores del relato.

En este caso el verbo se entiende en el eje de oposiciones *estacionamiento* vs. *desplazamiento*, sin que contenga ningún rasgo referente a la oposición *cercanía* vs. *lejanía*. Desde el punto de vista del narrador los actores *van* a X, o, de X a Y, nunca *vienen* con respecto a él, p.e.:

-Mt 12,9: καὶ μεταβὰς ἐκεῖθεν ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν *y se marchó de allí y fue a la sinagoga de ellos.*

La traducción alternativa *vino a la sinagoga*, indicaría que el narrador contempla la acción de venir *desde* la sinagoga, lo que no estaría justificado en este contexto.

3.3.2. Si la expresión representa la voz de un actor del relato, la perspectiva viene determinada por la situación de éste con respecto al término del *desplazamiento* expresada por el verbo (situación que se expresaría a nivel morfosintáctico con el adverbio ὧδε, *aquí* y que se encontraría en oposición a ἐκεῖ, *allí*, de donde parte el desplazamiento). Podría darse un doble caso:

3.3.2.1. La ubicación de la voz del actor del relato (ὧδε, *aquí*) y la del término del desplazamiento es coincidente: la perspectiva es de acercamiento, *venir*, p.e.:

- Mt 2,2: εἶδομεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἦλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ *pues vimos su estrella en el oriente y hemos venido a postrarnos ante él.*

La ubicación de la voz de los magos, agentes del desplazamiento, y el término de su desplazamiento es el mismo: el *aquí* de los magos (Jerusalén, en este caso) opuesto al *allí* de donde ha partido el movimiento (ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ); el texto expresa el acercamiento a ese lugar donde están; la traducción *hemos ido*, por el contrario, indicaría alejamiento, lo que no es el caso. Otro ejemplo:

- Mt 14,29: ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· ἐλθέ. καὶ καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου [ὁ] Πέτρος περιεπάτησεν ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα *Le dijo: Ven. Pedro bajó de la barca y [p. 28/150] echó a andar sobre el agua.*

La ubicación de la voz (ὧδε, *aquí*) de este agente del relato (Jesús) y el término del desplazamiento del otro agente (Pedro) es el mismo. Se expresa el acercamiento del segundo con respecto al primero. La traducción alternativa, *vete*, indicaría alejamiento, en contra del sentido del texto.

3.3.2.2. La ubicación de la voz del agente (ὧδε, *aquí*) y la del término del

movimiento no coinciden; se requiere la referencia implícita o explícita a otro espacio (ἐκεῖ, *allí*) como término del movimiento. Se entiende que el desplazamiento es de alejamiento con respecto a la ubicación que actualmente ocupa el actor. En este caso la traducción deberá ser *ir*, p.e.:

- Jn 5,7: ἐν ᾧ δὲ ἔρχομαι ἐγώ, ἄλλος πρὸ ἐμοῦ καταβαίνει *en lo que yo voy, otro llega antes que yo*.

El actor, en este caso el paralítico, se refiere a la piscina como lugar distinto de aquel donde se encuentra. La traducción *en lo que vengo yo* no daría cuenta de este sentido de alejamiento de la actual posición del paralítico.

3.3.2.3. Hay otro caso que merece atención. Expresiones imperativas como éstas:

- Jn 1,39: λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἔρχεσθε καὶ ὄψεσθε *Les dijo: Venid y veréis* (cf. Jn 1,46; 11,34).

En el texto subyace una oposición espacial que marca la dirección del desplazamiento (*aquí / allí*). En teoría esa expresión podría indicar una invitación a que se alejaran del lugar actual (*id y veréis*) y, efectivamente, así es. En el contexto, el término del desplazamiento al que se refieren es el lugar donde habita Jesús (Jn 1,38: Παββί, [...], ποῦ μένεις;), que no coincide con el lugar donde los interlocutores se encuentran; pero *en castellano*, cuando el que da la orden o expresa el deseo (la voz del actor) se desplaza *también* con sus interlocutores, se emplea el verbo *venir* y no *ir*. Así, en el caso que nos ocupa, la traducción: *Venid y veréis* expresa que Jesús se dispone a *ir con ellos* a su casa (cf. Jn 1,46, Felipe con Natanael a ver a Jesús; cf. Jn 11,34, María y los que le acompañaban en el duelo con Jesús al lugar del sepulcro) y que, por tanto, el imperativo no es una invitación a sus interlocutores a alejarse de él. Esto viene requerido por el contexto. No significaría lo mismo si se tradujera: *Id y veréis*, que implicaría una invitación a los interlocutores no sólo [p. 29/150] a desplazarse del lugar actual sino a alejarse también del que pronuncia el imperativo hacia otro lugar.

Sin embargo, cuando la expresión castellana señala por otros recursos morfológicos (p.e. la primera persona plural del verbo) que el que da la orden o hace la invitación se desplaza también con sus interlocutores *ha* de usarse el verbo *ir* y no el verbo *venir*. Se diría *vayamos a ver*, en un contexto similar al de los ejemplos señalados; y, por contra, no sería adecuado decir *vengamos a ver*, para indicar que todos se alejan hacia *otro* lugar distinto a aquel en que ahora están (Ἔλθωμεν ἐπὶ τοὺς κανόνας, Epict. *Diatr.* XXVIII, 28).

3.3.3. Cuando el texto presenta las dos direcciones contrapuestas (acercamiento vs. alejamiento) expresadas en dos lexemas correlativos, ἔρχομαι indica la primera polaridad, *venir*:

- Mt 8,9: καὶ λέγω τούτῳ· Πορεύθητι, καὶ πορεύεται, καὶ ἄλλῳ· ἔρχου, καὶ ἔρχεται *y si le digo a uno que se vaya, se va; o a otro que venga, viene* (cf. Lc 7,8)

- Jn 3,8: ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει *aunque no sabes de dónde viene ni adónde va* (en este caso los adverbios refuerzan la direccionalidad

señalando el punto de partida y el de llegada del movimiento: πόθεν ἔρχεται / ποῦ ὑπάγει; cf. Jn 8,14 bis).

- Mc 6,31: ἦσαν γὰρ οἱ ἐρχόμενοι καὶ οἱ ὑπάγοντες πολλοὶ, καὶ...*Es que eran muchos los que venían e iban, y...*

4. A modo de recapitulación

Esta breve aproximación al análisis del campo semántico de los lexemas verbales de desplazamiento, de la cual ἔρχομαι es el lexema menos marcado y más genérico, pone de manifiesto la utilidad y aun necesidad de tal estudio para poder delimitar el contenido semántico de cada lexema y las relaciones que mantiene dentro del particular sistema de oposiciones de la lengua griega. Al mismo tiempo, se hacen patentes las simetrías y disimetrías de las correspondencias semánticas con el castellano, lo que es imprescindible para la comprensión y traducción de los textos.

Juan BARRETO BETANCORT
C/ Pedro Felipe 17
38350 Santa Cruz de Tenerife
ESPAÑA
jbarreto@telefonica.net

[p. 30/150]

Maite GARCÍA DÍAZ:
C/ Agustín Cabrera Díaz ,1, 3º
38008 - Santa Cruz de Tenerife
mmgardi@ull.es

Carmen Rita JORGE HERNÁNDEZ
El Tejar, 15,2º
38300 La Orotava
Santa Cruz de Tenerife
ESPAÑA
carmenritajorgeh@gmail.com

[p. 31/150]

¹ Este artículo ha sido publicado con anterioridad en L. Roig Lanzillota - I. Muñoz Gallarte (eds.), *Liber amicorum en honor del profesor Jesús Peláez del Rosal*, pp. 37-52. Se une a la línea de investigación iniciada por Juan Mateos con el *Método de análisis semántico aplicado al griego del Nuevo Testamento* (El Almendro,

Córdoba 1989), continuada en la obra *Metodología del Diccionario Griego Español del Nuevo Testamento*, de Jesús Peláez (El Almendro, Córdoba 1996), y desarrollada a partir de estas dos obras por el grupo de investigación GASCO (Grupo de Análisis Semántico de la Universidad de Córdoba) con el que colaboramos desde el principio, proyecto que consiste en la elaboración de lo que será en su día el primer *Diccionario Griego-Español del Nuevo Testamento* (DGENT), del que se han publicado ya los primeros cinco fascículos y está en curso de publicación el sexto (letras alfa-delta).

² Para la metodología de análisis nos referiremos en general a las dos obras citadas en la nota anterior. Ambas han sido traducidas recientemente al inglés por Andrew Bowden y serán editadas en un solo volumen con una amplia introducción a cargo del Prof. David du Toit de la Facultad de Teología de la Universidad Luterana de Múnich. La publicación de la obra, que aparecerá con el título de *New Testament Lexicography*, correrá a cargo de la Editorial berlinesa De Gruyter y está programada para este año 2018.

³ Peláez, *Metodología*, 18. Para la cuestión del significado en lexicografía remitimos a las obras mencionadas de Mateos y Peláez. Además es de interés: J.P. Louw, “How Do Words Mean – If they Do?”, *FilNeot* 4 (1991) 125-142 y “The Analysis of Meaning in Lexicography”, *FilNeot* 6 (1993) 139-148.

⁴ Estamos realizando un estudio completo sobre este tema que esperamos culminar en breve.

⁵ Para las especies semánticas remitimos a las mismas obras mencionadas en nota 2, para el aspecto teórico, a Mateos, y para su aplicación práctica, a Peláez. Como fuentes del *Método* de Mateos, cf. E.A. Nida & Ch.R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (Leiden 1974); E.A. Nida, *Exploring Semantic Structures* (Múnich 1975); *Componential Analysis of Meaning* (La Haya – París 1975); J.P. Louw, *Semantics of New Testament Greek* (Philadelphia – Pensylvania 1982); A.J. Greimas, *Sémantique Structurale* (París 1966). Hasta la fecha, son cinco los fascículos publicados según el *Método* y la *Metodología*: J. Mateos, J. Peláez & GASCO, *Diccionario Griego-Español del Nuevo Testamento. Análisis semántico de los vocablos I: Ἀρών-αἱματεκχυσία* (Córdoba 2000); J. Mateos, J. Peláez & GASCO, *Diccionario Griego-Español del Nuevo Testamento. Análisis semántico de los vocablos II: αἰμορροέω-ἀνὴρ* (Córdoba 2002); J. Mateos (†), J. Peláez & GASCO, *Diccionario Griego-Español del Nuevo Testamento. Análisis semántico de los vocablos III: ἀνθίστημι-ἀπώλεια* (Córdoba 2007); Idem, *Diccionario Griego-Español del Nuevo Testamento. Análisis semántico de los vocablos IV: ἄρ-ἄψυχος* (Córdoba 2010); Idem, *Diccionario Griego-Español del Nuevo Testamento. Análisis semántico de los vocablos V: Βάαλ-βωμός* (Córdoba 2012). La publicación del fasc. VI está prevista para 2018: Γαββαθά-δωροφορία. Dentro de este proyecto han aparecido también los siguientes diccionarios temáticos: *Diccionario de personajes del Nuevo Testamento*, a cargo de Lautaro Roig Lanzillotta (El Almendro 2011), con una versión de divulgación titulada *Quién es quién en el Nuevo Testamento*, *Diccionario de nombres propios de persona* (El Almendro, Córdoba 2009) y *Diccionario Geográfico del Nuevo Testamento*, a cargo de Pope Godoy, de carácter divulgativo (El Almendro, Córdoba 2010). Paralelamente a la publicación de lemas por orden alfabético se están realizando en la actualidad otros dos diccionarios temáticos: *Diccionario ecológico del Nuevo Testamento* y *Diccionario de utensilios del Nuevo Testamento*. Entre los trabajos ya terminados, pero aún no publicados, podemos citar dos más: *Clasificación semántica de los sustantivos en el Nuevo Testamento* (Jesús Peláez, Israel M. Gallarte) y *Diccionario del uso del adjetivo en el Nuevo Testamento* (Dámaris Romero).

⁶ La forma verbal simple (βαίνω) no aparece en el NT, aunque sí formas nominales de la misma raíz (βάσις, βῆμα, βωμός) y una amplísima gama de formas compuestas con preverbios.

⁷ Las Determinaciones (D) y Relaciones (R) se pueden acumular en la conformación del núcleo sémico aunque diversamente jerarquizadas (H + D + R, o bien, H + R + D).

⁸ Es evidente que para un estudio cabal de estos lexemas habría que estudiar la red de oposiciones que constituyen el subsistema que conforman, porque es en esas oposiciones donde se delimita el sentido de cada uno de ellos. Lo mismo vale evidentemente para las distintas categorías que siguen.

⁹ Nos dispensamos por razones de espacio del desglose sémico de los componentes de la fórmula. Nuestra intención aquí es ofrecer una primera aproximación. La definición que se ofrece es el semema más genérico del lexema, pero no necesariamente el único. Esta observación se aplica a los demás ejemplos.

¹⁰ Cf. nota 6. Los compuestos de βαίνω: ἀναβαίνω y καταβαίνω arriba mencionados tienen una doble determinación de la direccionalidad, la señalada por los preverbios en la polaridad *verticalidad* vs. *horizontalidad* y la cuantificación definida como *gradualidad* en la polaridad semántica *parcialidad* vs. *totalidad*. Cf. nota 7.

¹¹ De hecho la forma nominal βάσις (H) significa *paso*, mientras que βῆμα (E) indica una superficie determinada por un *paso* (medida) y βαθμός (E) *grada*, *escalón*. Justamente en esta denotación de Determinación se diferencia ἀναβαίνω del afín ἀνέρχομαι que es menos marcado, cf. § 2.1.1.1..

¹² En el lexema συνεισέρχομαι vemos cómo la acumulación de preverbios se corresponde con una acumulación de *Relaciones*. Definición: “Actividad de desplazamiento (H) hacia el interior (R) de un lugar delimitado (E2) de alguien (E1) en compañía de (R’) una o más personas (E3) que ejercen esa misma actividad (H’ + R’’)”: *entrar*

junto con, entrar con.

¹³ Nótese que, en este caso concreto, se trata de acciones sucesivas, primero ἔρχεται y después παρακαλῶν.

¹⁴ Violación de la distancia preceptiva dada por la Ley respecto a leprosos o impuros.

¹⁵ El término *QVA* de referencia es τὰς πλατείας, *las calles*.

¹⁶ Nótese que de ordinario, el verbo ἔρχομαι es intransitivo: literalmente, *anduvieron el camino de un día*. Es decir, el espacio que puede ser recorrido durante un día.

¹⁷ Podría ser expresada de otra manera: γνώσται ἀληθείας γένεσθαι.

Interpreting and Translating Γίνομαι as a Verb of Process in the New Testament

PAUL L. DANOVE

The verb γίνομαι presents novel characteristics that pose significant difficulties for interpretation and translation into English. This article develops these characteristics and then resolves the New Testament occurrences of the verb into ten distinct usages. The discussion of each usage specifies the licensing properties of the verb, proposes guidelines for interpretation, and offers illustrative examples of translations that clarify the implication that the verb consistently designates a process. The concluding discussion clarifies the conditions that accommodate polysemous occurrences that admit to interpretation and translation with more than one usage.

Keywords: γίνομαι, Greek, lexical, semantic, syntactic, usage, verb.

1. Preliminary Considerations

This discussion proposes the procedure for formulating translations that reflect the verb's consistent use to designate a process, considers the verb's novel characteristics, and develops the method for specifying the semantic, syntactic, and lexical characteristics of the complements required by γίνομαι in its various usages.

1.1. *The Proposed Interpretation and Translation of Γίνομαι*

This article proposes that γίνομαι consistently designates a process and that its occurrences require translation by words or phrases that make this process explicit. Γίνομαι (and its compounds) imposes on its [p. 33/150] first (subject) complement the interpretation that the subject is involved in a process or is undergoing a change. In this regard, γίνομαι is a generic verb of process, in that it does not specify the nature of that process or change. The nearest equivalent to γίνομαι in English is “come to be”, and the following discussions develop alternate translations primarily in relation to the various senses of “come to be”.

1.2. *Two Further Novel Characteristics of Γίνομαι*

Γίνομαι presents two further novel characteristics, the second of which has the potential to pose difficulties for interpretation and translation into English. First, γίνομαι may appear with active, middle, and passive forms with little or no impact on its interpretation. That is, middle and passive base forms, which typically signal subject affectedness, do not contribute salient information for interpretation. This probably is a consequence of the fact that the verb already imposes the implication that the first

complement is in process or changing and so is affected. This characteristic has no impact on translation into languages like English that present no mechanism for marking subject affectedness beyond passivization.

Second, γίνομαι has the capacity to raise to the status of a verbal argument (phrasal elements that are required to complete the meaning of the verb) words and phrases that are restricted to the status of adjuncts (phrasal elements that are not required to complete the meaning of the verb) with most other Greek (and English) verbs. For example, γίνομαι may require completion by an entity that functions as a semantic Temporal, “the time, either durative or punctual, of an action or event”; whereas Temporal expressions almost universally are relegated to the status of adjuncts with other verbs. Thus γίνομαι appears to function as the process parallel to the non-process εἰμί (be) in being a verb that raises to prominence semantic relationships that otherwise cannot be raised to prominence. This can pose significant difficulty for translation into English which is more restrictive in the semantic relationships that can be raised to prominence. This characteristic permits γίνομαι to [p. 34/150] appear with ten distinct usages, which are constituted by all occurrences in which the verb requires completion by the same set of arguments. Among these, the Temporal usage has no English parallel and so poses significant difficulty for interpretation and translation.

1.3. *The Semantic, Syntactic, and Lexical Description of Licensing Properties*

This discussion develops the method of semantic, syntactic, and lexical description of the complements required by γίνομαι in its various usages.

Semantic Description

Γίνομαι requires completion by at most two arguments in its various usages. Although the semantic functions of second arguments vary significantly, the first (subject) argument shows only limited variation. In five usages, the first argument functions as a semantic Patient, “the entity undergoing an action”, the function most closely aligned with the implication of an entity in process or undergoing a change. In three usages, the first argument takes on the function of a semantic Theme, “the entity moving from one place to another or located in a place”, insofar as the process or change may be interpreted to encompass a change in locale, the characteristic of motion. In one usage, the first argument takes on the function of a semantic Event, “the complete circumstantial scene of an action or event”. With the remaining usage, the first argument has a Temporal function.

Syntactic Description

Γίνομαι requires completion by either one or two arguments in its various usages. When requiring completion by only one argument, the verb realizes this argument as the first syntactic complement (subject). When requiring completion by two arguments, the

verb realizes the Patient or Theme argument as first complement.

Lexical Description

In typical fashion, γίνομαι permits the omission of the first complement when its referent can be retrieved from the context. For the purpose of this study, such omitted first complements receive description as a [p. 35/150] noun phrase (N), that is, a noun with all of its modifiers or a pronoun. Otherwise, the verb realizes its first complement by N, a prepositional phrase (P), or a verb phrase (V), that is, a verb with all of its required complements. Since the case of the realized N first complement depends on the type of verb phrase in which it appears, the syntactic case of first complement noun phrases remains unspecified. Prepositional phrase (P) realizations are introduced by “P/” followed by the governing preposition and, when the preposition imposes more than one possible syntactic case on its object, an abbreviated statement of the syntactic case of the object appears in brackets after a plus sign: e.g., P/ἐν (on) and P/μετά [+acc] (after). First complement maximal verb phrases are independent clauses, V, infinitive phrases with subject accusative, V+i (that), infinitive phrases with subject accusative introduced by ἐν plus the definite article, P/ἐν τῷ V+i (when, while), and genitive case participial phrases (genitive absolute) with a Temporal function, V+p [+gen] (when, while).

Second complement noun phrase (N) realizations receive description by an abbreviated statement of their syntactic case after a plus sign: N+acc, N+dat, and N+gen. A second complement noun phrase that retrieves its syntactic case from the verb’s required first complement receives notation as N+1. Prepositional phrase (P) realizations follow the same pattern as when in first complement position. Adverbial (A) realizations are introduced by “A/” followed by the adverb: e.g., A/ἐκεῖ (there) and A/ᾧδε (here). Adjective (Adj) realizations are restricted to second complements that retrieve their syntactic case from the verb’s required first complement: Adj+1. Second complement noun phrase realizations that retrieve their syntactic case from the first complement on occasion are introduced by the adverbs ὥς (like) and A/ὥσεί (as if): A/ὥς N+1 and A/ὥσεί N+1. Verb phrases (V) realizations are restricted to the infinitive phrase, V+i, the ἵνα (that) clause, V+ἵνα, and the genitive absolute, V+p [+gen].

2. Usages with a Required Patient

Γίνομαι presents five usages with a required Patient argument. With these usages, the verb is two-place, that is, requires completion by the Patient first argument and a second argument with a different semantic function. The following discussion develops these two-place usages in the order of decreasing frequency of occurrence. [p. 36/150]

2.1. Usage #1: Transformation (Patient-Resultative)

When requiring completion by a Patient and a second argument, γίνομαι most frequently appears with the Usage of Transformation, in which the verb requires

completion by a Patient and a Resultative, “the final state of an entity”. This is the most frequently occurring usage of γίνομαι in the NT. With this usage, γίνομαι is best translated by “come to be” in the sense of (1) “become”, (2) “become” or “prove to be” when the Resultative designates a quality (these occurrences are marked by a preceding asterisk in the footnotes), or (3) “become” or “[come to be] made into” when the verb licenses a P/εἰς realization of the Resultative (γίνομαι + P/εἰς). The following occurrences illustrate these three translations in relation to the three most frequently occurring realizations of the Resultative, N+1 (1) and Adj+1 (2), and its P/εἰς realization (3).

(1) ἐγένετο τὸ τρίτον τῆς θαλάσσης αἷμα (Rev 8,8)

One third of the sea came to be/became blood.

(2) ἐγενήθημεν νήπιοι ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν (1 Thes *2,7)

We came to be/became/proved to be gentle among you.

(3) ἡ λύπη ὑμῶν εἰς χαρὰν γενήσεται (John 16,20)

Your sadness will come to be/become/ be made into joy.

Elsewhere the Resultative is realized by N+gen (of), V+ἵνα (that), P/κατὰ μόνας (alone), A/ἀφόβως (fearlessly), A/ἔλαττον (less [than]), [p. 37/150] A/ναί [καὶ οὐ] (yes [and no]), A/ὁμοθυμαδόν (unanimously), A/ὁσίως (holily), A/ὡς (like) N+1, and A/ὡσεὶ (as if) N+1.

ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ γὰρ υἱὸς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς...οὐκ ἐγένετο ναὶ καὶ οὐ (2 Cor 1,19a)

The Son of God Jesus Christ did not come to be/become yes and no.

Although Greek/English Lexicons typically identify a number of occurrences of γίνομαι with this usage as idiomatic, their interpretation is either straightforward or easily resolved. For example, the occurrence in Acts 12,18b is deemed idiomatic primarily because its statement runs counter to the English expression, “What has become of X?”. Its interpretation, however, is straightforward.

ἦν ταραχος οὐκ ὀλίγος ἐν τοῖς στρατιώταις τί ἄρα ὁ Πέτρος ἐγένετο (Acts 12,18b)

There was no small confusion among the soldiers concerning what Peter came to be/became [i.e., free, captive to someone else, etc.]/proved to be [i.e., unable to be bound, stealthy, etc.].

On five occasions, phrases built on the preposition ἐν (in) adjectively qualify a resultant state of being.

οἱ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν Χριστῷ (Rom 16,7)

[Those] who also came to be/became ‘in Christ’ before me.

ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ (Rev 1,10)

I came to be/became ‘in the spirit’ on the Lord’s day.

In Acts 20,3b, “come to be of a mind/intent” (γίνομαι γνώμης) has a straightforward interpretation.

ἐγένετο γνώμης τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν διὰ Μακεδονίας (Acts 20,3b)
He came to be/became of a mind to return through Macedonia. [p. 38/150]

On five occasions, the Resultative is permissibly omitted, insofar as its referent can be retrieved from the context. In the first example, the transformation pertains to the possession of the Patient; and, in the latter examples, the transformation pertains directly to the Patient.

ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν, ἵνα ἡμῶν γένηται ἡ κληρονομία (Luke 20,14)
Let’s kill him, so that the inheritance [of him] may come to be/become [the inheritance] of us.

ὃς οὐ κατὰ νόμον ἐντολῆς σαρκίνης γέγονεν (Heb 7,16)
Who has come to be/become [a priest, cf. 7,15] not according to a law of a command concerning the flesh.

ἡ γὰρ ἄνοια αὐτῶν ἐκδηλος ἔσται πᾶσιν, ὥς καὶ ἡ ἐκείνων ἐγένετο (2 Tim 3,9)
For their madness will be conspicuous to all as also that of those came to be/became [conspicuous].

2.2. Usage #2: Effect by an Agent (Patient-Agent)

With the Usage of Effect by an Agent, γίνομαι requires completion by two arguments that function as a Patient and an Agent, “the entity that actively instigates an action and/or is the ultimate cause of a change in another entity”. With this usage, γίνομαι is best translated by “come to be” in the sense of “[come to] be done”, or “[come to] be made”. The Patient is realized by N and the Agent by P/ὑπό [+gen] (by) and P/παρά [+gen] (by) or is permissibly omitted.

ἤλπιζέν τι σημεῖον ἰδεῖν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ γινόμενον (Luke 23,8)
He was hoping to see some sign coming to be/being done by him.

παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη (Matt 21,42b)
This came to be/was done by [the] Lord.

γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου (Matt 6,10)
Let your will come to be/be done [by us, by Jesus’ disciples]. [p. 39/150]

2.3. Usage #3: Benefaction (Patient-Benefactive)

With the Usage of Benefaction, γίνομαι requires completion by two arguments that function as a Patient and a Benefactive, “the ultimate entity for which an action is

performed or for which, literally or figuratively, something happens or exists”. With this usage, γίνομαι is best translated by “come to be [for]” in the sense of (1) “happen [for]” or (2) “come to be/become + possessive form of the English noun or pronoun”, or, through a transform of English (but not Greek) grammar, (3) “come to have” with the Benefactive as first complement and the Patient as second complement. The third mode of translation generally is preferable in subjunctive clauses headed by εἰ (if) and μήποτε (lest). The Patient is realized by N and V+i and the Benefactive by N+dat (for). As the second example illustrates, English grammar avoids complex first complements and extraposes “it” in the subject position and places the V+i (that clause in English) after the verb.

μήποτε καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀντικαλέσωσίν σε καὶ γένηται ἀνταπόδομά σοι (Matt 18,12)

(1) Lest they also invite you in return and repayment comes to be/happens for you.

(2) Lest they also invite you in return and repayment comes to be/becomes yours.

(3) Lest they also invite you in return and you come to have repayment.

ἐγένετο δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐνιαυτὸν ὅλον συναχθῆναι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ διδάξαι ὄχλον ἱκανόν (Acts 11,26)

But it came to be/happened for them also that for a whole year they came together in the assembly and taught a worthy crowd.

When the Patient references a woman and the Benefactive a man, this usage may have the added implication of entering into a relationship of marriage.

ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρὸς μοιχαλὶς χρηματίσει ἐὰν γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ (Rom 7,3a.3b)

While the man is living, she will be called an adulteress if she comes to be/becomes another man’s (wife).

While the man is living, she will be called an adulteress if another man comes to have her (as wife). [p. 40/150]

2.4. Usage #4: Effect by an Instrument (Patient-Instrument)

With the Usage of Effect by an Instrument, γίνομαι requires completion by two arguments that function as a Patient and an Instrument, “the means by which an action is performed or something happens”. With this usage, γίνομαι is best translated by “come to be” in the sense of “[come to] be done”, or “[come to] be made”. The Patient is realized by N and the Instrument by P/διὰ [+gen] (through) and P/χωρίς (not though, without).

πάντα δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν (John 1,3)

All things came to be/were made through him, and without [not through] him not one thing came to be/was made.

πολλὰ τε τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγίνετο (Acts 2,43b)

Many signs and wonders came to be/were done through the apostles.

2.5 Usage #5: Joint Happening (Patient-Comitative)

With the Usage of Joint Happening, γίνομαι requires completion by two arguments that function as a Patient and a Comitative, “the entity specified as associated with another entity”. In the only NT example of this usage, γίνομαι is best translated by “come to be”. The Patient is realized by N and the Comitative by P/σύν ([associated] with). The combination of phrasal elements requires the extraposing of the semantically empty “there” in subject position.

ἐξαίφνης ἐγένετο σὺν τῷ ἀγγέλῳ πλῆθος στρατιᾶς οὐρανόυ αἰνούντων τὸν θεὸν καὶ λεγόντων (Luke 2,13)

Suddenly there came to be [associated] with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God and saying, ...

3. Usages with a Required Theme

Γίνομαι presents three usages with a required Theme argument. With all three usages, the verb is two-place and requires completion by a Theme first argument and a “local” second argument. With these usages, the change or process involving the Theme receives interpretation as a change in locale or a process of motion. The following discussion develops these two-place usages in the order of decreasing frequency of occurrence. [p. 41/150]

3.1. Usage #6: Motion to a Goal (Theme-Goal)

With the Usage of Motion to a Goal, γίνομαι requires completion by two arguments that function as a Theme and a Goal, “the literal or figurative entity towards which something moves”. The translation of γίνομαι with this usage is difficult because English grammar restricts the local argument following “come to be” to a static location. As a consequence, γίνομαι with this usage is best translated by “come [to be]”. The Theme is realized by N and the Goal by P/ἐγγύς (near), P/εἰς (into, to), P/ἐπὶ [+acc] (on, over), P/πρός [+acc] (to), A/ἐγγύς (near), A/ἐκεῖ (there), and A/ᾧδε (here).

γενομένων δὲ ἡμῶν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀσμένως ἀπεδέξαντο ἡμᾶς οἱ ἀδελφοί (Acts 21,17)

When we came to Jerusalem, the brothers and sisters greeted us gladly.

ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πάντας φόβος τοὺς περιοικοῦντας αὐτούς (Luke 1,65)

Fear came onto all the ones living near them.

3.2. Usage #7: Motion Terminating in a Location (Theme-Locative)

With the Usage of Motion Terminating in a Location, γίνομαι requires completion by two arguments that function as a Theme and a Locative, “the literal or figurative place in which an entity is situated or an event occurs”. The implication is that the Theme comes to be located in a place as a result of a process of motion. With this usage, γίνομαι is best

translated by “come to be”. The Theme is realized by N and the Locative by P/εἰς (among), P/ἐν (in, among), P/ἐπάνω (over), P/ἐπὶ [+gen] (on), P/κατά [+acc] (throughout, along), P/μετά [+gen] (with), and P/ὑπό [+acc] (under).

τοῦ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γενομένου ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐν οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ (Matt 26,5)
When Jesus came to be in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper....

εὐθέως ἐγένετο τὸ πλοῖον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἰς ἣν ὑπῆγον (John 6,21)
Immediately the boat came to be on the land to which they were going. [p.
42/150]

3.3. Usage #8: Motion from a Source (Theme-Source)

With the Usage of Motion from a Source, γίνομαι requires completion by two arguments that function as a Theme and a Source, “the literal or figurative entity from which something moves”. As with Usage #6, the translation of γίνομαι with this usage is difficult because English grammar restricts the local argument following “come to be” to a static location. As a consequence, γίνομαι with this usage is best translated by “come [to be]”. The Theme is realized by N and the Source by P/ἐκ (from, out of).

φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν (Mark 1,11)
A voice came out of the heavens.

2.4. Usage #9: Occurrence (Event)

With the Usage of Occurrence, γίνομαι requires completion by one argument that functions as a semantic Event. This is the second most frequent NT usage of the verb. With this usage, γίνομαι is best translated by “come to be” in the sense of “happen”. The Event most frequently is realized by a noun phrase (N).

ἐγένετο συνδρομὴ τοῦ λαοῦ (Acts 21,30)
A running together of the people came to be/happened.

Second in frequency is the maximal verb phrase (V) realization of the Event. Since English has no direct mechanism for incorporating γίνομαι into the translation, it must be omitted or incorporated through a separate clause.

ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὰς παραβολὰς ταύτας, μετῆρεν ἐκεῖθεν [p.
43/150] (Matt 13,53)

When Jesus finished these parables, he went away.

This came to be/happened: when Jesus finished these parables, he went away.

Third in frequency is the infinitive with subject accusative phrase (V+i) realization of the Event, which on one occasion is preceded by the neuter singular genitive article (τοῦ V+i). These occurrences are best translated by a “that” clause. English extraposes “it” as the subject and places V+i (“that” clause) after the verb.

γίνεται κατακεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ (Mark 2,15)
It came to be/happened that he was reclining in his house.

5. Usage #10: Time (Temporal)

With the Usage of Time, γίνομαι requires completion by one argument that functions as a semantic Temporal. Since English has no verb that both designates process or change and requires completion by one argument that functions as a Temporal, direct translation is impossible. The contexts in which these occurrences appear, however, follow a specific format, and this format recommends a means of translation. The verb phrase incorporating γίνομαι with this usage consistently is coordinated by καί (and) with a following verb phrase whose verb accommodates the licensing of a Temporal adjunct. This permits the formulation of a translation by omitting both γίνομαι and καί and making the Temporal argument of γίνομαι the Temporal adjunct of the verb of the following verb phrase. Although this formulation maintains the information introduced in the γίνομαι verb phrase, incorporation of the implication that the Temporal complement is in process or undergoing change frequently is awkward (as in the first example). The Temporal complement is realized by V+p [+gen] (when, while), P/ἐν (on), P/ἐν τῷ V+i (when), and P/μετά [+acc] (after).

ἐγένετο αὐτοῦ ἀνακειμένου ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, καὶ ἰδοὺ πολλοὶ τελῶναι καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐλθόντες συνανέκειντο τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ (Matt 9.10)

When he came to be sitting in the house, [behold] many tax collectors and sinners, coming, were reclining with Jesus and his disciples. [p. 44/150]

ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐλθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκόν τινος τῶν ἀρχόντων [τῶν] Φαρισαίων σαββάτῳ φαγεῖν ἄρτον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦσαν παρατηρούμενοι αὐτόν (Luke 14,1)

When he came into a house of a certain leading Pharisee on a Sabbath to eat bread, they were watching him.

6. Polysemous Occurrences

The previous discussions assigned each occurrence of γίνομαι to a specific usage. Many occurrences, however, are polysemous in that they admit to interpretation according to two usages, and the previously assigned usage represents a judgment on the more likely interpretation in the light of contextual considerations. Such polysemy is especially common among occurrences that admit to interpretation as having Usage #2 (Effect by an Agent) with a permissibly omitted Agent or as Usage #9 (Occurrence). The assigned usage appears first.

ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ στόματος ἐξέρχεται εὐλογία καὶ κατάρα. οὐ κρίνῃ, ἀδελφοί μου, ταῦτα οὕτως γίνεσθαι (Jas 3,10)

From the same mouth come forth blessing and curse. It ought not be, my brothers and sisters,

Usage #9 that these things come to be/happen in this way.

Usage #2 that these things come to be done (by you) in this way

Polysemy also may occur with Usages #7 (Location), in which γίνομαι requires completion by a Locative argument, and Usage #9 (Occurrence), in which γίνομαι admits to but does not require completion by a Locative adjunct. In such occurrences the assignment of a usage depends on a judgment of whether (Usage #7) or not (Usage #9) an entity's location in a place is a consequence of motion. The assigned usage appears first.

ἐγένοντο φωναὶ μεγάλαι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ (Rev 11,15a)

Usage #9 Great voices came to be/happend in the heavens.

Usage #7 Great voices came to be [located] in the heavens.

7. Conclusion

This article specified the interpretations, translations, and novel characteristics of the uses of γίνομαι, developed procedures for describing the semantic, syntactic, and lexical requirements of the verb, and resolved [p. 45/150] the New Testament occurrences of the verb into ten distinct usages. The discussion of each usage clarified the licensing properties of the verb, proposed guidelines for interpretation, and offered illustrative examples of translations. The concluding discussion noted the most frequent conditions that give rise to polysemous interpretations.

Paul L. DANOVE
Department of Theology
Villanova University
800 Lancaster Avenue
Villanova, PA 19085
USA

paul.danove@villanova.edu

[p. 46/150]

1. Thus this article supports the lexicon entry for γίνομαι in J.H. Thayer, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Coded with Strong's Concordance Numbers* (Edinburgh 1908), 115-17, which attempts to maintain the implication of process throughout. The article simultaneously critiques the entry for γίνομαι in W. Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. (Chicago 1979), 160 (§II), which proposes the use of γίνομαι as a substitute for missing forms of εἶμι and so accommodates the interpretation of γίνομαι as a stative verb, and the entries in J.P. Louw and E.A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of*

the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains (2 vols.; 2nd edn; New York 1989), which propose a stative use for occurrences of γίνομαι: “to possess certain characteristics, with the implication of having been acquired”, 150 (§13.3); “to exist and conduct oneself, with the particular manner specified by the context”, 504 (§41.1); “to belong to someone”, 558 (§57.2); “to be in a place, with the possible implication of having come to be in such a place”, 725 (§85.6); and “a marker of new information, either concerning participants in an episode or concerning the episode itself”, 811 (§91.5).

2. Thayer, *Lexicon*, 115.

3. J. Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* (London 1969) 373, discusses the nature of this affectedness; cf. R.J. Allan, *The Middle Voice in Ancient Greek: A Study in Polysemy* (ASCP 11; Amsterdam 2003) 19-20. J.I. Saeed, *Semantics* (Oxford 1997), 162-65, considers various categories of affectedness.

4. These and subsequently introduced semantic functions receive description according to the thematic roles developed in Saeed, *Semantics*, 139-71, and P.L. Danove, *Linguistics and Exegesis in the Gospel of Mark: Applications of a Case Frame Analysis and Lexicon* (JSNTSup 218; SNTG 10. Sheffield 2002) 31-45.

5. See the discussion of the function of εἰμί in Danove, *Linguistics and Exegesis*, 55-58.

6. Nominative case appears in indicative and subjunctive clauses, genitive in the genitive absolute, and either dative or accusative in various classes of infinitive phrases.

7. Usage #1 (Patient-Resultative): N-N+1, Matt 4,3; 5,45; 13,32; Mark 1,17; Luke 1,2; 4,3; 6,16; 10,36 [article omitted]; 11,30; 13,4; 20,33; 24,19; John 1,12.14; 2,9; 4,14; 9,27; 10,16; 12,36; 15,8; Acts 1,16.22; 5,24; 7,52; *12,18b; 15,39; 21,30; 26,29; Rom 2,25; 4,18; 7,13a; 11,6.17.34; 15,8; 16,2; 1 Cor 1,30; 4,9.16; 7,23; 8,9; 9,22b.23; 10,6.7.20; 11,1; 13,1.11; 14,20a; 2 Cor 5,21; *7,14; Gal 3,13.24; Eph 3,7; 5,1; Phil 3,17; Col 1,23.25; 4,11; 1 Thes 1,5b.6.7; 2,14; 1 Tim 4,12; Tit 3,7; Heb 2,17; 5,5; 6,20; 7,20.22.23; 10,33; 11,6.7; Jas 1,22.25; 2,4.11; 3,1; 1 Pet 3,6.13; 5,3; 2 Pet 1,4.16.20; Rev 8,8; 16,3.4; 18,2; N-Adj+1: Matt 9,16; 10,16; 12,45; 13,22; 17,2; 20,26; 23,26; 24,32.44; Mark 2,21; 4,19.22.32; 6,14.26.35; 9,3.6.50; 10,43; 13,28; 16,10; Luke 6,36.49; 8,17; 9,29; 11,26; 12,40; 13,2; 16,11.12; 18,23.24; 19,17; 23,12; 24,5.31.37; John 5,6.9.14a; 8,33; 9,22.39; 12,42; 20,27; Acts 1,18.19.20; 4,16; 7,13.29.32.39; 9,42; 10,4.10a.40; 12,23; 16,27.29; 19,17.28; 20,18; 21,40; 23,10; 24,25; 26,19; 27,16.36; Rom *3,4b.19; 6,5; 7,13c; 10,20; 12,16; 15,16.31; 1 Cor 3,13.18a.18b; 7,21; 9,22a.27; 10,32; 11,19; 14,20b.25; 15,10.58; 2 Cor 5,17; 6,14; 12,11; Gal 4,16; 5,26; Eph 4,32; 5,7.17; Phil 1,13; 2,8.15; 3,6; Col 1,18; 3,15; 1 Thes *2,1,*7.8; 1 Tim 2,14; Phlm 6; Heb 1,4; *2,2; 3,14; 5,9.11.12; 6,4.12; 7,26; 11,24.34; 12,8; Jas 1,12; 2,10; 5,2; 1 Pet 1,15; 2 Pet 2,20; 3 John 8; Rev 1,18; 2,8.*10; 3,2; 6,12b; 11,13b; 16,10; and N-P/εἰς: Matt 21,42a (Psa 118,23); Mark 12,10 (Psa 118,23); Luke 13,19 (Psa 103,12 LXX); 20,17 (Psa 118,23); John 16,20; Acts 4,11 (Psa 118,23); 5,36; Rom 11,9 (Psa 69,23 LXX); 1 Cor 15,45 (Gen 2,7 LXX); 1 Thes 3,5; 1 Pet 2,7 (Psa 117,22 LXX); Rev 8,11; 16,19.

8. Usage #1 (Patient-Resultative): N-N+gen, Acts 20,3b [τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν is a complement of γνώμη]; N-V+ἵνα, Acts 27,42; N-P/κατὰ μόνας, Mark 4,10; N-A/ἀφόβως, 1 Cor 16,10; N-A/ἐλαττον, 1 Tim 5,9; N-A/ναί, 2 Cor 1,19a.19b; N-A/ὁμοθυμαδόν, Acts 15,25; N-A/ὁσίως, *1 Thes 2,10; N-A/ὡς N+1, Matt 6,16; 10,25; 18,3; 28,4; Luke 22,26; Acts 4,4; Rom 9,29; 1 Cor 4,13; 9,20; Gal 4,12; Rev 6,12c; and N-A/ὡσεὶ N+1, Mark 9,26; Luke 22,44b.

9. BDF, 156 [§299(2)].

10. Usage #1 (Patient-Resultative): N-ἐν ἄγωνίᾳ, Luke 22,44a; N-ἐν ἐκστάσει, Acts 22,17b; N-ἐν πνεύματι, Rev 1,10; 4,2; N-ἐν Χριστῷ, Rom 16,7.

11. Usage #1 (Patient-Resultative): N-N omitted: Luke 2,42 [cf. παιδίον, 2,40]; 20,14 [cf. κληρονομία]; Heb 7,16 [cf. ἱερεὺς; 7,15]; Rev 11,15b [cf. βασιλεία]; and N-Adj omitted, 2 Tim 3,9 [cf. ἐκδηλος, 3,9].

12. Usage #2 (Patient-Agent): N-P/ὑπό [+gen], Luke 13,17; 23,8; Acts 12,5; 20,3a; 26,6; Eph 5,12; and N-P/παρά [+gen], Matt 18,19; 21,42b; Mark 2,27; 12,11; N-omitted, Matt 6,10; 11,20.21a.21b.23a.23b.26; 26,42; Luke 10,13a.13b.21; 14,22; 22,42; 23,31; Acts 21,14; 26,4; Rom 11,5; 1 Cor 14,26.40; 16,14; Heb 4,3; Jas 3,9; Rev 12,7; 16,17; 21,6.

13. Usage #3 (Patient-Benefactive): N-N+dat, Matt 8,13; 9,29; 15,28; 18,12; Mark 4,11; 5,16.33; 9,21; Luke 1,38; 14,12; 19,9; John 5,14b; 15,7; Acts 2,43a; 7,40; 24,2; Rom 7,3a.3b.4; 11,25; 1 Cor 4,5; Eph 6,3; 2 Tim 3,11; and V+i-N+dat, Acts 11,26; 20,16a; 22,6.17a; Gal 6,14.

14. Usage #4 (Patient-Instrument): N-P/διὰ [+gen], Mark 6,2b; John 1,3a.3c.10.17; Acts 2,43b; 4,30; 5,12; 12,9; 14,3; 19,26; Heb 9,11; and N-P/χωρίς, John 1,3b; Heb 9,22.

15. Usage #6 (Theme-Goal): N-P/ἐγγύς, John 6,19; N-P/εἰς, Luke 1,44; 4,23; Acts 20,16b; 21,17; 25,15; 28,6; N-P/ἐπὶ [+acc], Matt 27,45; Mark 15,33b; Luke 1,65; 3,2; 4,25.36; 23,44; 24,22; Acts 4,22; 5,5.11; 10,10b; 21,35; N-P/πρός [+acc], John 10,35; Acts 10,13; 1 Cor 2,3; 2 John 12; N-A/ἐγγύς, Eph 2,13; N-A/ἐκεῖ, Acts 19,21; and N-A/ὡδε, John 6,25.

16. Usage #7 (Theme-Locative): N-P/εἰς, Gal 3,14; 1 Thes 1,5a; N-P/ἐν, Matt 8,24; 26,6; Mark 1,4; 9,33; Acts

8,1.8; 12,11; 13,5; 1 Cor 9,15; 2 Cor 1,8; 2 Tim 1,17; 2 Pet 2,1; Rev 1,9; N-P/ἐπάνω, Luke 19,19; N-P/ἐπί [+gen], Luke 22,40; John 6,21; N-P/κατά [+acc], Luke 10,32; Acts 27,7; N-P/μετά [+gen], Acts 7,38; 9,19; and N-P/ὑπό [+acc], Gal 4,4b. For the Locative function of P/εἰς, see P.L. Danove, *Grammatical and Exegetical Study of New Testament Verbs of Transference: A Case Frame Guide to Interpretation and Translation* (SNTG 13; LNTS 329; London 2009) 43-44.

17. Usage #8 (Theme-Source): N-P/ἐκ, Matt 21,19; Mark 1,11; 9,7b; Luke 3,22; 9,35; Acts 2,2; 19,34; Rom 1,3; Gal 4,4a; 2 Thes 2,7; 1 Tim 6,4; Heb 11,3.

18. Usage #9 (Event): N, Matt 1,22; 5,18; 8,16.26; 13,21; 14,6.15.23; 16,2; 18,31a.31b; 19,8; 20,8; 21,4.21; 23,15; 24,6.20.21a.21b.34; 25,6; 26,2.5.20.54.56; 27,1.24.54.57; 28,2.11; Mark 1,32; 4,17.35.37.39; 5,14; 6,2a.21.47; 9,7a; 11,19.23; 13,7.18.19a.19b.29.30; 14,4.17; 15,33a.42; Luke 1,20; 2,2.15b; 4,42; 6,13.48; 8,24.34.35.56; 9,7.34.36; 10,15; 12,54.55; 15,10.14; 17,26.28; 20,16; 21,7.9.28.31.32.36; 22,14.24.66; 23,19.24.47.48; 24,12.18.21; John 1,6.15.28.30; 2,1; 3,9.25; 6,16.17; 7,43; 8,58; 10,19.22; 12,29.30; 13,2.19a.19b; 14,22.29a.29b; 19,36; 21,4; Acts 2,6; 4,21.28; 5,7a.7b; 6,1; 7,31; 8,13; 10,16.37; 11,10.19.28; 12,18a; 13,12.32; 14,5; 15,2.7; 16,26.35; 19,10.23; 20,37; 23,7.9.12; 25,26; 26,22; 27,27.29.33.39; 28,9; Rom 3,4a.6.31; 6,2.15; 7,7.13b; 9,14; 11,1.11; 1 Cor 6,15; 7,36; 15,37.54; 16,2; 2 Cor 3,7; 8,14a.14b; Gal 2,17; 3,17.21; Phil 2,7; 1 Thes 2,5; 3,4; 2 Tim 2,18; Heb 7,12.18; 9,15; Jas 3,10; 1 Pet 4,12; 1 John 2,18; Rev 1,1.19; 4,1; 6,12a; 8,1.5.7; 11,13a.15a.19; 12,10; 16,2; 16,18a.18b.18c.18d; 22,6.

19. Usage #9 (Event): V, Matt 7,28; 11,1; 13,53; 19,1; 26,1; Mark 1,9; 4,4; Luke 1,5.8.23.41.59; 2,1.6.15a.46; 7,11; 9,18.33.37; 11,1.14.27; 17,14; 18,35; 19,29; 20,1; 24,30.51; Acts 9,3.

20. Usage #9 (Event): V+i, Matt 18,13; Mark 2,15.23; Luke 3,21; 6,1.6.12; 16,22; Acts 4,5; 9,32.37.43; 14,1; 16,16; 19,1; 21,1.5; 27,44; 28,8.17, and τοῦ V+I, Acts 10,25.

21. Usage #10 (Temporal): V+p [+gen], Matt 9,10; P/ἐν, Luke 5,17; 8,1.22; P/ἐν τῷ V+i, Luke 5,1.12 [εἰμί omitted]; 9,51; 14,1; 17,11; 19,15; 24,4.15; and P/μετά [+acc], Luke 9,28.

Greek New Testament and Purple Manuscripts: The Case of *Beratinus* 1 (Φ.043) and *Beratinus* 2 (min. 1143)

DIDIER LAFLEUR

Beratinus 1 (Gregory-Aland Φ.043) and *Beratinus* 2 (GA 1143) are two purple manuscripts currently housed in Tirana, Albania. *Beratinus* 1 is an uncial codex dated from the 6th century and only contains parts of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark; its text, classified as Byzantine by the Alands, was only known through Pierre Batiffol's publications (1885, 1887). *Beratinus* 2 is a minuscule manuscript dated from the 9th century, and contains the four Gospels; its text was never studied or published despite its palaeographical similarity with GA 565. At first these two manuscripts were briefly described by Anthimos Alexoudis during the last quarter of the 19th century but his survey was the first and the last as nobody, except Batiffol, carried on the research afterwards. Because Albania remained isolated for decades, the textual transmission of these manuscripts was never reassessed. This article gives a short codicological approach of the two manuscripts and, especially for GA Φ.043, recalls the variant readings revealed more than a century ago by Alexoudis and Batiffol. Only based on autopsy of the manuscripts, the survey offers unpublished readings of *Beratinus* 1 and *Beratinus* 2 and gives fresh and supplementary data over a textual transmission of the Greek New Testament.

Keywords: Greek New Testament, Albania, Berat, *Beratinus* 1, *Beratinus* 2, purple manuscripts, textual criticism.

1. Introduction

Beratinus 1 and *Beratinus* 2, currently housed in the Albanian National Archives (Arkivi Qëndror i Shtetit, Drejtoria e Përgjithshme e Arkivave, Fonds Kodikët e Shqipërisë 488, Dosjes 1 and 2 respectively), are two famous purple manuscripts known as Φ.043 and minuscule 1143 in the Gregory-Aland numbering. In addition to these codices, Aland's 1994 *Kurzgefasste Liste*, registered six other Greek purple manuscripts including five majuscules as N.022 (*Codex Petropolitanus*), O.023 (*Codex Sinopensis*), Σ.042 (*Codex Rossanensis*), the lectionary l46 (*Codex* [p. 47/150] *Neapolitanus*) and the majuscule 080. The last purple manuscript is the minuscule 565, a four-Gospel codex.

Beratinus 1 is a majuscule codex dated from the 6th century and contains only parts of Matthew and Mark (Mt 6:7-28:20, Mk 1:7-14:57); its text, classified as Byzantine by the Alands, was only known by Western scholarship through two articles of the Church historian Pierre Batiffol who published it in 1885 and 1887 and, to a lesser extent, by Ἀνθίμος Ἀλεξούδης, the Metropolitan of the Albanian city of Berat, in 1901. *Beratinus* 2 is a minuscule manuscript dated from the 9th century and contains the four complete Gospels: so far as we know, its text was never studied or published and the Alands also

classified it as Byzantine.

This survey is an attempt to offer fresh data about those two purple manuscripts. Considering today the very bad state of preservation of these documents, in the aftermath of the vicissitudes that they had suffered, the preliminary part of this article presents a short codicological approach of these artefacts. The following part is devoted to Φ.043 and its text, first in historical perspective with Batiffol's editions of 1885 and 1887, then through Ἀλεξούδης' surveys and modern editions such as Nestle-Aland 27. The third part of the study focuses on min. 1143 and suggests some common palaeographical elements between min. 1143 and 565.

First of all, the present article offers fresh variant readings of Φ.043 and min. 1143, both collated by autopsy in Albania. The methodology used for the selected readings was first the legibility of the text, then the [p. 48/150] already published variant readings in the ANTF series. The main reason of this collation *in situ* was the extreme difficulty of reading, especially the text of *Beratinus* 1 which could not be collated by microfilm or through digitalization. Once stated, the selection of readings was obvious: collating every legible part of the text, keeping in mind that Batiffol's 1887 edition was the unique source for modern critical apparatuses. With such damaged manuscripts, lists of readings provided in previous discussions are needed: they will help us to check whether or not Batiffol's flawed data were used. Since the textual transmission of *Beratinus* 1 and *Beratinus* 2 was never reassessed after Batiffol and Ἀλεξούδης' surveys, our collations will provide new light on these purple artefacts within contemporary Greek New Testament philology.

2. A Codicological Approach

At first, *Beratinus* 1 and *Beratinus* 2 were briefly described, on a codicological basis, by the Metropolitan during the second half of the 19th century. Batiffol and Ἀλεξούδης' surveys were the first and the last as nobody carried on the research afterwards: for political reasons, [p. 49/150] Albania remained isolated for decades and furthermore these two codices were hidden in the city of Berat. During the 1970's Johannes Koder and Erich Trapp brought a fresh overview to the Greek manuscripts housed in Tirana but without the purple codices which were then considered to be lost. In 2003, the publication of Roderic L. Mullen, and more recently Daniel B. Wallace's digital preservation campaign for Greek New Testament manuscripts (CSNTM) emphasized afresh these two highly valuable documents.

The disappearance of the two manuscripts during numerous decades, from the beginning of the 20th century to 1968, caused various rumours including the one which asserted that the purple documents were hidden inside an artesian well. The truth was that they were indeed hidden, but inside a hole dug in the ground, behind the iconostasis of the church of Saint George in Berat, as we have seen it in March 2014. These baseless rumours were again magnified when the manuscripts were rediscovered in 1968 and sent to China for restoration. In Beijing, at the Chinese Academy of Sciences, a facsimile of

each of these two artefacts was produced.

This restoration tried to preserve what could be preserved by sealing each folio of the manuscripts between two airtight Plexiglass sheets but it has also caused severe and irreversible damage to the documents as, for example, the cutting of the extant quires. Apart from numerous damaged folios, the most legible artefact remains *Beratinus* 2: inscribed with gold letters, the text of the Gospels is not badly preserved except for the kephalaia which were written with silver ink and so, extremely hard to read. Concerning *Beratinus* 1, it was written entirely with such ink and the chemical components of the silver were the main cause of its current illegibility. At first glance, it seems that *Beratinus* 1 is more legible than supposed. But this is an illusion: after an accurate examination of the text, we have discovered that some Plexiglass sheets did not contain only one folio, but two. This partly explains why we cannot today read the [p. 50/150] continuous text of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark; this emphasizes also how essential are the readings provided in previous publications.

3. Φ.043 and Its Text

3.1. *The Readings of Φ.043 in Historical Perspective*

3.1.1. *Batiffol's First Edition (1885)*

Considering the text of the purple codices, Pierre Batiffol was the first, in 1885, to publish some readings of Φ.043. The third part of his article was devoted to the current research in the field of textual criticism, including the four text-type traditions, justified – as Batiffol said – by Westcott and Hort's edition: «*byzantine* ou *syrienne*», «*alexandrine*», «*occidentale*», and «*le texte neutre*» (p. 370). Straightaway, Batiffol stated that Φ.043 was not a pure witness from one of the above traditions: «*le codex Beratinus ... est certainement mixte*», he said, «*comme on pourra s'en convaincre sans qu'il faille l'établir par une argumentation spéciale. Le seul point qu'il importe de bien éclaircir c'est son parentage*». After a short review about itacisms which he had read in the manuscript, Batiffol published sixty readings which he divided into three groups: a) Alexandrian readings, b) Western readings, and c) Singular readings. The first group was composed of the following examples and tended to prove that «*l'influence de la tradition alexandrine sur le texte du Beratinus est sensible*»:

Math. VII, 24. ομοιωθησεται ανδρι... a B Z. 1, 13...

VIII, 13. εν τη ωρα εκεινη <και υποστρεψας ο εκατονταρχος εις τον οικον αυτου εν αυτη τη ωρα ευρεν τον παιδα αυτου υγιαινοντα>. C X. 33... *Vers. aegypt.*

IX, 13. αλλα αμαρτωλους <εις μετανοιαν> C L X *Vers. aegypt.*

X, 10. μηδε ραβδους C L X Γ etc.

XI, 16. παιδιοις καθημενοις εν αγοραις C L X Γ etc.

XXI, 1. ηλθον εις βηθφαγη <και βηθανιαν> C. 13. 33. 69

XXI, 28. ανθρωπος <τις> ειχεν τεκνα C... Δ... 33...
 XXII, 7. <και ακουσας> ο βασιλευς <εκεινος> ωργισθη C X Δ...
 XXIV, 5. λεγοντες <οτι> εγω ειμι C...
 XXV, 13. ...την ωραν <εν η ο υς του ανου ερχεται> ωσπερ... C...
 XXVI, 63. κατα του θεου <του ζωντος> CΔ...*vers. aegypt.*

Marc. XI, 13. ουδεν ευρεν ει μη φυλλα <μονον>. C. 33

XIV, 45. λεγει <χαιρε> ραββι. C. 1. 13... [p. 51/150]

This Alexandrian influence was not pre-eminent and, according to the author, «le texte du *Beratinus* est foncièrement occidental», as proved by the readings which composed the second group:

Math. VII, 21. ...του πατρος μου του εν ουρανοις <αυτος εισελευσεται εις την βασιλειαν των ουρανων> *itala, cureton*, C. 33.
 VIII, 28. Και ελθοντος αυτου, *itala*, a B C. 1. 13. 22. 33.
 IX, 36. οτι ησαν εσκυλμενοι, *itala*, a B, C, D... X, Γ.
 X, 12. ασπασασθε αυτην <λεγοντες ειρηνη τω οικω τουτω> *itala, cureton*, a D. 1. 22. 209.
 X, 15. γομορρας, C D. 1. 22.
 XII, 10. και ιδου ην ανθρωπος <εκει> ms.; και ιδου ανθρωπος ην <εκει> D, *itala, cureton*.
 XIII, 7. και επνιξαν, a D. 13. 124...
 XIV, 2. <μητι> ουτος εστιν ιωαννης <ο βαπτιστης ον εγω απεκεφαλισα>, *itala*, D.
 XV, 5. η τη μητρι <κορβαν ο εστιν> δωρον, Γ *solus*.
 XVIII, 12. τι <δε> υμιν δοκει, D, *cureton*.
 XX, 28. λυτρον αντι πολλων. <υμεις δε ζηтите εκ μικρου αυξησαι και εκ μειζονος ελαττων ειναι εισερχομενοι δε και παρακληθεντες διπνησαι μη εις τους εξεχοντας τοπους ανακλινεσθε μηποτε ενδοξωτερος σου επελθη και προσελθων ο διπνοκλητωρ ειπε σοι ετι κατω χωρι και καταισχυνηση. εαν δε αναπεσης εις τον ηττονα τοπον επελθη σου ηττων ερει σοι ο διπνοκλητωρ αγε ετι ανω και εσται σοι τουτο χρησιμωτερον>. Εκπορευομενων...
 XXI, 9. ...υψιστοις <απηντων δε αυτω πολλοι χαιροντες και δοξαζοντες τον θεον περι παντων ων ιδον>, *cureton solus*.
 XXIV, 36. ουδε οι αγγελοι των ουρανων <ουδε ο υιος>, *itala*, a B D. 13. 28. 86. 124.
 XXVI, 8. εις τι η απολεια αυτη <του μυρου>, *itala*, 61. 63. 71. 157.
 XXVII, 9. δια του προφητου, *itala*, 33. 157...
 XXVII, 17. συνηγμενων δε, *itala*, D, 13, 69.

XXVII, 34. και ουκ ηθελησεν (B D E, 1. 33. 69. 124. *itala*).

XXVII, 35. <ινα πληρωθη το ρηθεν δια του προφητου διεμερισαντο τα ιματια μου
εαυτοις και επι τον ιματισμον μου εβαλον κληρον>, *itala*, Δ, 1.

XXVII, 40. και λεγοντες <ουα> ο καταλυων, *itala*, D, M Δ.

Marc. II, 24. ιδε τι ποιουσιν <οι μαθηται σου> τοις σαββασιν, *itala*, D, M, 1. 13. 28.
69. 102. 124, *cureton*.

II, 26. ει μη τοις <αρχι>ερευσι <μονοις>, *itala*, D, 13. 33. 69. 124.

VI, 2. πολλοι ακουοντες εξεπλησσοντο <επι τη διδαχη αυτου> λεγοντες, *itala*, D,
118.

VIII, 17. τι διαλογιζεσθε <εν ταις καρδιαις υμων (itala, D, 28. 67. 124)
ολιγοπιστοι>, 13. 28. 61. 69. 124.

VIII, 26. λεγων <υπαγε εις τον οικον σου και εαν> εις την κωμην, *itala*, 13. 28. 61.
69. [p. 52/150]

XI, 31. λεγοντες <τι ειπωμεν> εαν ειπωμεν... *itala*, 13, 28, 69, 124.

XII, 38. εν ταις αγοραις <ποιεισθαι>, D *solus*.

XIII, 19. θλιψεις οiai ου γεγοναν ουδεποτε τοιαυται, *itala*, D.

As a last evidence of the special features of *Beratinus* 1, Batiffol showed by his third list its singular readings:

Math. VIII, 14. ιδεν την πενθεραν αυτου βεβλημενην <επι κλινης> και
πυρεσσουσαν.

IX, 28. προσηλθον αυτω οι τυφλοι <δεομενοι> και λεγει...

IX, 30. και <παραχρημα> ανεωχθησαν αυτων οι οφθαλμοι.

XI, 18. ηλθε γαρ ιωαννης <ο βαπτιστης> μητε...

XII, 18. ο αγαπητος [μου] εις ον ευδοκησεν...

XIV, 23. ανεβη εις το ορος κατ' ιδιαν προσευξασθαι <σταδιους πολλους απεχον
απο της γης>.

XX, 6. ευρεν αλλους εστωτας <εν τη αγορα> αργους.

XXIV, 10. και αλληλους παραδωσωσιν <εις θανατον> και...

XXIV, 18. μη επιστρεψατω <εις τα> οπισω.

XXVII, 16. ειχον δε τοτε δεσμιον επισημον λεγομενον βαραββαν <ος δια φονον
και στασιν ην βεβλημενος εις φυλακην>. συνηγμενων δε...

Marc. II, 3. και ερχονται προς αυτον <τινες> φεροντες παραλυτικον...

II, 26. ουκ εξεστιν φαγειν ει μη τοις <αρχι>ερευσι μονοις...

IV, 10. ηρωτησαν αυτον οι περι αυτον συν τοις δωδεκα <φρασον ημιν> την
παραβολην.

V, 26. ...δαπανησασα τα <υπαρχοντα> αυτης...

VI, 51. εκοπασεν ο ανεμος <και περιεσωσεν αυτους>.

VIII, 38. ...εν τη γενεα ταυτη τη <πονηρα και> μοιχαλιδι και αμαρτωλω...

IX, 47. ...εκβαλε αυτον <και βαλε απο σου>.

In addition to the aforementioned readings, Batiffol noted three singular «conflate readings» of *Beratinus* 1 (Mt 16:4 24:45, Mk 6:17), and concluded that this codex «présente un texte mixte, mais se rattachant étroitement à la tradition occidentale; il a accueilli un certain nombre de leçons alexandrines, mais en même temps il offre quelques leçons singulières que nous pourrions appeler pré-occidentales» (sic, p. 376). Even though we have to restore Batiffol's article in context, we do not know how that part of Batiffol's survey was received.

3.1.2. Batiffol's Second Edition (1887)

Two years later, Batiffol edited *in extenso* the text of *Beratinus* 1, i.e. the remaining parts of the Gospel of Matthew, then 6:3-28:20, and [p. 53/150] the nearly complete Gospel of Mark, 1:1-14:60. This large survey was completed by four lists of variants. The first of these was what Batiffol called the singular readings. «Les leçons propres du *Beratinus* sont assez nombreuses. Si nous laissons de côté celles qui ne sont que des variantes purement graphiques», he wrote, «nous nous trouvons en présence de leçons surtout paraphrastiques, qui se sont produites naturellement ou par l'influence des passages parallèles des autres évangiles» (p. 456). Then he listed them as follows:

Math. VIII, 14, ιδεν την πενθεραν αυτου βεβλημενην <επι κλινης> και τυρεσσουσαν: cf. Math. IX, 2; Marc. VII, 30.

IX, 28, προσηλθον αυτω οι τυφλοι <δεομενοι> και λεγει. (In a footnote, Batiffol added that «δεομενοι est donné par les cursifs 5, 123, 124, 218, 219, 220, par a, g¹ et h: mais Φ est le seul oncial à le fournir. Cf. Luc. I, 64»).

IX, 30, και <παραχρημα> ανεωχθησαν αυτων οι οφθαλμοι.

XI, 18, ηλθεν γαρ ιωαννης <ο βαπτιστης> μητε αισθιων μητε πεινων. [Cette leçon se retrouve dans le cursif 346].

XII, 18, ο αγαπητος [μου] εις ον ευδοκησεν: *deest* μου. [De même dans a, ff.]

XII, 43, ακαθαρτον πνευμα εξελθη «εκ» του ανθρωπου. [De même dans le cursif 440.] Cf. Marc. I, 26

XIII, 26, εφανη και [τα] ζιζανια.

XIV, 23, προσευξασθαι <σταδιους πολλους «απεχον» απο της γης> οψιας. Notre manuscrit est le seul, à s'en rapporter à l'appareil critique de Tischendorf, qui mette cette intrusion à cette place. (In a footnote, Batiffol added that «Placée après τὸ δὲ πλοῖον ἤδη μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης ἦν, en sorte que ἄπεχον se construise avec πλοῖον et non avec Ἰησοῦς, cette intrusion est propre aux manuscrits B, 13, 124, 238, 346. Ici déjà nous nous trouvons en présence d'une variante introduite maladroitement par le scribe de Φ dans un texte qui ne la comportait pas»).

XIV, 24, εναντιος ο ανεμος <αυτοις> Τεταρτη: cf. Marc. VI, 48.

XVI, 7, διελογιζοντο [εν εαυτοις] λεγοντες.

XVI, 21, και γραμματεων <του λαου> και αποκτανθηναι: cf. οι πρεσβύτεροι του λαου, Math. XXI, 23; XXVI, 3, etc. [Cette leçon se retrouve dans les cursifs 13, 124, 346]. [p. 54/150]

XVI, 28, αμην <αμην> λεγω υμιν, répétition familière à saint Jean (Jo. I, 52; III, 3; id. 5; id. 11, etc.).

XVII, 18, επετιμησεν αυτω ο ιησους <λεγων εξελθε> και εξηλθεν: cf. Marc. V, 8.

XX, 6, ευρεν αλλους εστωτας <εν τη αγορα> αργους: cf. Math. XX, 3.

XX, 15, η ουκ εξεστιν [μοι] ποιησαι ο θελω. C'est probablement une erreur du scribe, MOI étant tombé devant ΠΟΙ.

XXI, 2, ευθεως <εισπορευομενοι> ευρησετε: cf. Marc. XI, 2; Luc. XIX, 30.

XXI, 3, αποστελει αυτους <ωδε>. Τουτο δε: cf. Marc. XI, 3.

XXI, 5, ο βασιλευς σου ερχεται [σοι] πραυς: cf. Jo. XII, 15.

XXI, 10, εν τοις υψιστοις <απηγτων δε αυτω πολλοι χαιροντες και δοξαζοντες τον θεον περι παντων ων ιδον>. Και εισελθοντος: cf. Luc. XIX, 37 et Jo. XII, 15. Cette intrusion est donnée par le syriaque de Cureton.

XXI, 21, εαν εχητε πιστιν <ως κοκκον σιναπεως> και μη διακριθητε: cf. Math. XVII, 19.

XXI, 38, και ημων εσται η κληρονομια [αυτου]. Και λαβοντες: cf. Marc. XII, 7.

XXII, 3, αυτου «ειπειν τοις κεκλημενοις»: cf. Math. XXII, 4.

XXIV, 41, και <η> μια αφιεται: cf. Luc. XVII, 35.

XXV, 21, εφη δε [αυτω] ο κυριος. [Se retrouve dans les cursifs 346 et 435].

XXVI, 53, η «δοκιτε» οτι, pour δοκεις.

XXVI, 65, ηκουσατε την βλασφημιαν <εκ του στοματος αυτου>: cf. Luc. XXII, 71.

XXVII, 1, οι πρεσβυτεροι του λαου [κατα του Ιησου] ωστε θανατωσαι «τον ιησουν» και. (sic)

XXVII, 16, ειχον δε τοτε δεσμιον επισημον λεγομενον βαραββαν <ος δια φονον και στασιν ην βεβλημενος εις φυλακην> · συνηγμενων. (In a footnote, Batiffol added that M. Samuel Berger me signale cette leçon comme se rencontrant à cet endroit dans plusieurs manuscrits de la Vulgate. On peut y joindre les cursifs 13, 346. Cf. Luc. XXIII, 25).

Marc. I, 17, και ειπεν αυτοις [ο ιησους] δευτε, omission de ο ις par confusion avec les trois dernières lettres de αυτοις. [Se retrouve dans le cursif 21].

II, 3, και ερχονται προς αυτον <τινες> φεροντες παραλυτικον.

II, 26, ουκ εξεστιν φαγειν ει μη τοις <αρχ>ιερευσιν μονοις. [Se retrouve dans le cursif 28].

IV, 10, ηρωτησαν αυτον οι περι αυτον συν τοις δωδεκα <φρασον ημιν> την παραβολην: cf. Math. XV, 15.

IV, 33, ελαλει αυτοις τον λογον [καθως ηδυναντο ακουειν].

V, 10, ινα μη εξω της χωρας αυτους αποστιλη · ην δε εκει, cet ordre des mots se trouve dans les cursifs 1, 131 et 209.

V, 26, δαπανησασα τα <υπαρχοντα> αυτης.

VI, 14, και ειπεν <τοις παισιν αυτου> οτι: cf. Math. XIV, 2.

VI, 35, οι μαθηται αυτου «ειπον» οτι: cf. Luc. IX, 12. [p. 55/150]

VI, 51, και εκοπασεν ο ανεμος <και περιεσωσεν αυτους> και λιαν · Corruption du και περισσως εν εαυτοις de D, 2 pe, b.

VIII, 30, ινα μηδενι λεγωσιν <τουτο> περι αυτου: cf. Luc. IX, 21.

VIII, 38, εν τη γενεα ταυτη τη <πονηρα και> μοιχαλιδι και αμαρτωλω: cf. Math. XII, 45. [Se retrouve dans le cursif 124].

IX, 47, εκβαλε αυτον <και βαλε απο σου> καλον σοι: cf. Math. XVIII, 9.

XI, 3, και αποστελει αυτον ευθεως ωδε, cet ordre est propre à Φ.

XI, 4, εξω [επι] του αμφοδου. [Se retrouve dans le cursif 435].

XI, 24, <και> δια τουτο.

XIII, 9, [ἀρχαὶ ὠδίνων ταῦτα] omis par Φ, probablement par erreur. [C'est pourtant la leçon de C].

XIV, 5, τουτο πραθηναι το μυρον, cet ordre est propre à Φ.

XVI, 11, δουναι αργυριον.

This list was significantly more important than the one he had published two years earlier, composed of thirty-three new occurrences, asserted by the author as singular readings. To this group, Batiffol added a few readings which he considered «comme de véritables et curieux *conflate readings*» (p. 459-60). Amongst those, three were exactly the same as published two years before (Mt 16:4 24:45, Mk 6:17), to which he attached Mk 2:18 and 10:21.

Batiffol's methodology tended to prove how high the percentage of Western readings was within an Alexandrian context: «Sur un fonds syrien», he said, «la proportion la plus forte y est en faveur des leçons occidentales» according to the following readings:

Math. VII, 21, του πατρος μου του εν ουρανοις <αυτος εισελευσεται εις την βασιλειαν των ουρανων>: C*, 33, Cureton, *Vetus latina*, saint Cyprien.

X, 12, ασπασασθε αυτην <λεγοντες ειρηνη τω οικω τουτω>: D, 1, 22, 209, *Vetus latina*.

XII, 10, και ιδου ην ανθρωπος <εκει>: α*, D, L, *Vet. lat.*, Cureton.

XIV, 2, <μητι> ουτος εστιν ιωαννης <ο βαπτιστης ον εγω απεκεφαλισα>: D, a, b.

XVII, 1, και <εγενετο> μεθ ημερας: D, *Vetus latina*, saint Hilaire.

XVIII, 10, τουτων <των πιστευοντων εις εμε>: D, b, c, Cureton, saint Hilaire.

XVIII, 12, τι <δε> υμιν δοκει: D, a, Cureton.

XX, 28. λυτρον αντι πολλων <υμεις δε ζηтите εκ μικρου αυξησαι και εκ μειζονος ελαττων ειναι · εισερχομενοι δε και παρακληθεντες διπνησαι μη εις τους εξεχοντας τοπους ανακλινεσθε μη ποτε [p. 56/150] ενδοξωτερος σου επελθη και προσελθων ο διπνοκλητωρ ειπη σοι ετι κατω χωρι και καταισχυνθηση · εαν δε αναπεσης εις τον ηττονα τοπον επελθη σου ηττων ερει σοι ο διπνοκλητωρ αγε ετι ανω και εσται σοι τουτο χρησιμωτερον> · Εκπορευομενων D, *Vetus latina*, Cureton.

XXI, 9, υπιστοις <απηντων δε αυτω πολλοι χαιροντες και δοξαζοντες τον θεον περι παντων ων ιδον>: Cureton *solus*». (In a footnote, Batiffol added: «La leçon curetonienne est exactement: ἐξῆλθον εἰς ὑπάντησιν. Dans tous les cas, cette variante dépend de Luc. XIX, 37, et de Jo. XII, 13, combinés»).

XXVII, 35, <ινα πληρωθη το ρηθεν δια του προφητου διεμερισαντο τα ιματια μου εαυτοις και επι τον ιματισμον μου εβαλον κληρον>: Δ, 1, a, b (cf. Westcott et Hort, II, *Notes on select readings*, p. 20).

XXVII, 40, και λεγοντες <ουα> ο καταλυνων: D, M, Δ, Σ, a, b, c, saint Ambroise. cf. Marc. XV, 29.

Marc. II, 23, και <παλιν> ενεγενετο: D, 13, 69, 124, 346, a, ff, g.

II, 24, ιδε τι ποιουσιν <οι μαθηται σου> τοις σαββασιν: D, M, Σ, 1, 28, 13, 69, 124, 346, 2 pe, *Vetus latina*. Cf. Math. XII, 2.

II, 26, ει μη τοις <αρχ>ιερευσιν <μονοις>: D, 33, 13, 69, 124, 346, *Vetus latina*. Cf. Math. XII, 4.

III, 14, <και αποστολους ωνομασεν>: a, B, C*, Δ, 28, 13, 69, 124, 346, 238.

IV, 31, μικροτερος εστιν παντων των σπερματων: D, *Vet. lat.*

VI, 2, πολλοι ακουοντες εξεπλησσοντο <επι τη διδαχη αυτου> λεγοντες: D, 118, 2 pe, *Vet. lat.* Cf. Marc. I, 22.

VIII, 14, και επελαθοντο <οι μαθηται αυτου> λαβειν: D, 13, 69, 124, 346, 28. Cf. Math. XVI, 5.

VIII, 17, τι διαλογιζεσθε <εν ταις καρδιαις υμων (D, 28, 67, 124, 2 pe, a, b, c) ολιγοπιστοι>: 28, 61, 13, 69, 124, 346, 2 pe

VIII, 26, λεγων <υπαγε εις τον οικον σου και εαν> εις την κωμην: D, 28, 61, 13, 69, 346, 2 pe, a, b, f. (In a footnote, Batiffol added «Cf. Westcott et Hort, II p. 99»).

VIII, 34, οπισω μου «ακολουθειν»: D, X, 1, 28, 2 pe, *Vet. lat.*

IX, 21, επηρωτησεν ο ιησους · l'addition de ο ιησους se retrouve dans N, Σ, 13, 69, 124, 346, 2 pe, 28, a, c, b.

XI, 13, φυλλα <μονον>: C², N, Σ, 13, 69, 124, 346, 28, 2 pe, b, c, q, r.

XI, 31, λεγοντες <τι ειπωμεν> εαν ειπωμεν: D, 28, 13, 69, 124, 346, 2 pe, a, b, c.

XII, 38, εν ταις αγοραις <ποιεισθαι>: D, 2 pe, (a, c, i, r, Vulg.).

XII, 43, η πτωχη αυτη: D, Σ, 2 pe, a, b, i, q.

XIII, 19, θλιψεις οια ου γεγοναν ουδεποτε τοιαυται: D, 2 pe, *Vet. lat.*

XIV, 41, απεχει το <τελος> ηλθεν η ωρα: D, 13, 69, 124, 2 pe, *Itala.*

XIV, 61, επηρωτησεν αυτον <εκ δευτερου> λεγων: 13, 69, 124, 346, 2 pe, c, ff².

According to Batiffol, the above occurrences (eleven for Matthew, eighteen for Mark), were enough to justify the important Western [p. 57/150] influence on *Beratinus* 1, which the author called «la couleur occidentale de l'élément distinctif du Beratinus». In addition to these readings, Batiffol noted that «dans une proportion moindre nous y relevons des leçons que l'on peut qualifier d'anciennes non occidentales», i.e.:

Math. VI, 10, και επι γης, avec B, a, Z, Δ, Σ, 1, 22, 406, Clem., Orig.

VI, 25, τι φαγητε «η» τι πιητε · avec B, 13, 124, 33, Origène.

VII, 24, ομοιωθη[σε]ται ανδρι φρονιμω, avec B, a, Z, 1, 13, 124, 22, 33, la version sahidique, Origène, etc.

VIII, 13, υπαγε [και] ως επιστευσας, supprime και avec B, a, la sahid. et la memph.

VIII, 13, <και υποστρεψας ο εκατονταρχος εις τον οικον αυτου εν αυτη τη ωρα ευρεν τον παιδα αυτου υγιαινοντα>, avec C, a*, M, U, X, 124.

XIV, 19, επι του χορτου, avec a, B, C*, I, Σ.

XVI, 20, αυτος εστιν ο χριστος, sans ιησους, avec B, a, L, X, Origène.

XVIII, 7, αναγκη γαρ ελθειν, suppression de εστιν avec B, L, Σ, 1, 33, la sahidique, saint Cyrille.

XIX, 5, τον πατερα <αυτου>, ajoute αὐτοῦ, avec C, Δ, Σ, 1, 13, 69, 124, 346, 33, la sahidique, la memphitique, Origène. [Cette leçon doit être alexandrine, mais elle peut être aussi tout accidentelle].

XXII, 25, γημας, avec a, B, L, Σ.

XXIV, 48, ερχεσθαι, avec Σ, 1, 157, 209.

XXVI, 8, αυτη του μυρου, avec Σ, 157, a, b, etc.

XXVIII, 19, πορευθεντες ουν, avec B, Δ, Π, Σ.

Marc. III, 4, εσιωτησαν, avec Σ, L, a, g¹, q.

IV, 11, τα μυστηρια, avec G, Σ, 1, 118.

IV, 31, κοκκω, avec a, B, D, Δ, Π*, Σ.

VII, 11, οσ<εαν>, avec A, Σ, 33. (sic)

VIII, 15, ορατε <και> βλεπετε, addition de καί avec 13, 69, 124, 346, 28, et la memphitique.

XI, 30, <ποθεν> ην, avec a, C, 33, et la sahidique.

XII, 28, ιδων, avec a*, C, D, L, Σ.

XIII, 11, υμεις εστε, avec M, U, Σ...

Batiffol's second edition attested how numerous were the singular readings of Φ.043. His statements, more accurate than in 1885, proved that he changed his mind and did not consider any more the text of *Beratinus* 1 as «foncièrement occidental».

3.1.3. *Αλεξούδης' Edition (1901)*

Some readings of Φ.043 were also published by Ἀνθιμος Ἀλεξούδης during the year 1901, in two instalments of the *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια* journal. The first of those was composed of sixteen Matthean readings (*EA* 21:17, 27 April 1901, p. 160): [p. 58/150]

Ματθ. Η, 14. Εἶδε τὴν πενθερὰν αὐτοῦ βεβλημένην καὶ πυρέσσουσαν – [ιδων την πενθεραν αυτου βεβλημένην (επι κλινης) και πυρεσσουσαν].

Θ, 28. προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ τυφλοὶ καὶ λέγει – [προσηλθον αυτω οι τυφλοι (δεομενοι) και λεγει]. (sic)

Θ, 30. καὶ ἀνέωχθησαν αὐτῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ – [και (παραχρημα) ανεωχθησαν αυτων οι οφθαλμοι].

ΙΑ, 18. ἦλθε γὰρ Ἰωάννης μήτε ἐσθίων μήτε πίνων – [ηλθεν γαρ Ιωαννης (ο βαπτιστης) μητε εσθιων μητε πεινων].

ΙΒ, 18. ὁ ἀγαπητός μου εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν – [ο αγαπητος (μου) εις ον ευδοκησεν].

ΙΒ, 43. ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα ἐξέλη ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου – [ακαθαρτον πνευμα εξελθη «εκ» του ανθρωπου]. (sic)

ΙΓ, 26. ἐφάνη καὶ τὰ ζιζάνια – [εφανη και (τα) ζιζανια].

ΙΔ, 23. προσεύξασθαι· ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης – [προσεύξασθαι (σταδιους πολλους «απεχον» απο της γης) οψιας]. (sic)

ΙΔ, 24. ἐναντίος ὁ ἄνεμος. Τετάρτη – [εναντιος ο ανεμος (αυτοις) Τεταρτη].

ΙΣΤ, 7. διελογίζοντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγοντες – [διελογιζοντο (εν εαυτοις) λεγοντες].

ΙΣΤ, 21. καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι – [και γραμματεων (του λαου) και αποκτανθηναι].

ΙΣΤ, 28. ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν – [αμην (αμην) λεγω υμιν].

ΙΖ, 18. ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν – [επετιμησεν αυτω ο ιησους (λεγων εξελθε) και εξηλθεν].

Κ, 6. εὗρεν ἄλλους ἐστῶτας ἀργούς – [ευρεν αλλους εστωτας (εν τη αγορα) αργους].

Κ, 15. οὐκ ἔξεστί μοι ποιῆσαι ὃ θέλω – [η ουκ εξεστιν (μοι) ποιησαι ο θελω].

ΚΑ, 2. εὐθέως εὐρήσετε – [ευθεως (εισπορευομενοι) ευρησετε].

The second instalment (*EA* 21:30, 27 July 1901, p. 299), included thirty-two readings of which thirteen were from the Gospel of Matthew and nineteen from the Gospel of Mark:

Ματθ. ΚΑ, 3. ἀποστελεῖ αὐτούς. Τοῦτο δὲ – [ἀποστελεῖ αὐτοὺς (ὠδε). Τουτο δε].

ΚΑ, 5. ὁ βασιλεὺς σου ἔρχεταιί σοι πραῦς – [ο βασιλευς σου ερχεται (σοι) πραῦς].

ΚΑ, 10. ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις. Καὶ εἰσελθόντος – [εν τοις υψιστοις (απηντων δε αυτω πολλοι χαιροντες και δοξαζοντες τον θεον περι παντων ων ιδον) και εισελθοντος].

ΚΑ, 21. ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν, καὶ μὴ διακριθῆτε – [εαν εχητε πιστιν (ως κοκκον συναπεως) και μη διακριθητε].

ΚΑ, 38. ἀποκτείνομεν αὐτὸν, καὶ κατάσχωμεν τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ. Καὶ – [και ημων εσται η κληρονομια (αυτου). Και λαβοντες]. [p. 59/150]

ΚΒ, 3. αὐτοῦ καλέσαι τοὺς κεκλημένους – [αυτου «ειπειν τοις κεκλημενοις»].

ΚΔ, 41. καὶ μία ἀφίεται – [και (η) μια αφιεται].

ΚΕ, 21. ἔφη δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Κύριος – [εφη δε (αυτω) ο κυριος].

ΚΣΤ, 53. ἡ δοκεῖς, ὅτι – [η «δοκιτε» οτι].

ΚΣΤ, 65. ἠκούσατε τὴν βλασφημίαν αὐτοῦ – [ηκουσατε την βλασφημιαν (εκ του στοματος αυτου)].

ΚΖ, 1. οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ κατὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ὥστε θανατῶσαι αὐτὸν – [οι πρεσβυτεροι του λαου (κατα του ιησου) ωστε θανατωσαι τον «Ιησουν» και (sic)

ΚΖ, 16. εἶχον δὲ τότε δέσμιον ἐπίσημον λεγόμενον Βαραββᾶν. – Συνηγμένων οὖν αὐτῶν [ειχον τοτε δεσμιον επισημον λεγομενον βαραββαν (ος δια φονον και στασιν ην βεβλημενος εις φυλακην) συνηγμένων δε αυτων] (sic)

ΚΖ, 46. Ἡλὶ, Ἡλὶ, λαμὰ σαβαχθανὶ, τοῦτ' ἔστι Θεέ μου Θεέ μου ἵνα τί μὲ ἐγκατέλιπες; – [ηλει ηλει λιμα σαβαχθανει ` τουτεστι Θεε μου Θεε μου ινα τι με εγκατελειπας].

Μάρκ.

Α, 17. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς – [και ειπεν αυτοις (ο Ιησους) δευτε].

Β, 3. καὶ ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν, παραλυτικὸν φέροντες – [και ερχονται προς αυτον (τινες) φεροντες παραλυτικον] (sic)

Β, 26. οὐκ ἔξεστι φαγεῖν, εἰμὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι, καὶ ἔδωκε – [ουκ εξεστιν φαγειν ειμη τοις (αρχ)ιερευσι μονοις].

Δ, 10. ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα τὴν παραβολὴν – [ηρωτησαν αυτον οι περι αυτον συν τοις δωδεκα (φρασον ημιν) την παραβολην].

Δ, 33. ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον, καθὼς ἠδύναντο ἀκούειν – [ελαλει αυτοις τον λογον (καθως ηδυναντο ακουειν)].

Ε, 10. ἵνα μὴ αὐτοὺς ἀποστείλῃ ἔξω τῆς χώρας. Ἦν δὲ – [ινα μη εξω της χωρας αυτους αποστειλη. ην δε εκει]. (sic)

Ε, 26. δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' ἑαυτῆς πάντα – [δαπανησασα τα (υπαρχοντα) αυτης].

ΣΤ, 14. καὶ ἔλεγεν ὅτι – [και ειπεν (τοις παισιν αυτου) οτι].

ΣΤ, 35. οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγουσιν – [οι μαθηται αυτου «ειπον» οτι].

ΣΤ, 51. καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος· καὶ λίαν – [και εκοπασεν ο ανεμος (και περιεσωσεν αυτους) και λιαν].

- H, 30. ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσι περὶ αὐτοῦ – [ἵνα μηδενὶ λεγῶσι (τουτο) περὶ αὐτου].
- H, 38. ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἀμαρτωλῷ – [ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταυτη τη (πονηρα και) μοιχαλιδι και αμαρτωλω].
- Θ, 47. ἔκβαλε αὐτόν· καλόν σοί ἐστι – [ἐκβαλε αὐτον (και βαλε απο σου) καλον σοι].
- ΙΑ, 3. καὶ εὐθέως αὐτὸν ἀποστελεῖ ὧδε – [και αποστελει αὐτον ευθεως ωδε].
- ΙΑ, 4. ἔξω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφοδου – [ἐξω (επι) του αμφοδου]. [p. 60/150]
- ΙΑ, 24. Διὰ τοῦτο – (και) δια τουτο]. (sic)
- ΙΓ, 9. ἀρχαὶ ὠδίνων ταῦτα – (αρχαι ωδινων ταυτα).
- ΙΔ, 5. τοῦτο πραθῆναι ἐπάνω – [τουτο πραθηναι το μυρον].
- ΙΔ, 11. ἀργύριον δοῦναι – [δουναι αργυριον].

As far as we know – and in spite of the mention «ἔπεται συνέχεια», no more readings were published. As a conclusion, if we except Mt 26:46 which was not mentioned before, Ἀλεξούδης' list was a partial reprint, though more accurate than before, from Batiffol's 1887 list which described ninety-seven readings from *Beratinus* 1. When he published these instalments, Ἀλεξούδης had already moved to Samsun, by the Black Sea shore, and he had then no more access to the purple manuscript which remained in Berat. Nevertheless, we may suggest that Ἀλεξούδης' readings were not only a simple translation from Batiffol's publication. During thirty-three years, from 1854 to July 1887, Ἀλεξούδης remained the Metropolitan of the city of Berat and he had complete leisure to explore and collate there the purple manuscript.

3.2. The Readings of Φ.043 in Some Modern Editions

As the unique known source of *Beratinus* 1, Batiffol's 1887 extensive published text had spread out all over the 20th century in most of the Greek New Testament editions. One of those was mainly developed by Hermann von Soden in his second volume of *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments* published in 1907. The German scholar included Φ.043, which he designated as ε17, in his «Typ II», with the others purple codices Σ.042 (ε18), Ν.022 (ε19), 080 (ε20), and Ο.023 (ε21). According to him, though these manuscripts did not preserve exactly the same text, they represented «zweifelloso einen gemeinsamen Texttypus». Amongst these, Φ.043 stood apart from the others for the reason that von Soden claimed that «so hat zuweilen <ε>17 allein eine *I*-Lesart erhalten», as for Mt 8:25 8:28 11:5 11:8 11:21 11:23 12:8 12:32 12:46 13:26 13:30 14:3 17:3 21:2 and 21:7. Even if he did not fully subscribe to Batiffol's proposal which [p. 61/150] firmly linked Φ.043 with the Western text-type, von Soden agreed that the peculiar readings of Φ.043 established, to a certain extent, within the purple group, a slight connection with the text-type «*I*». Later in the century, in 1935-1940, S.C.E. Legg quoted the manuscript in his «Elenchus siglorum» as «Φ Beratinus. Saec. VI. *deest* xiv. 62 εἶπεν ἐγώ... xvi.40» but, at the end of the century, in 1995, R.J. Swanson did not include Φ.043 in his multi-volume work.

Concerning the Nestle-Aland editions, there were twenty-seven occurrences listed throughout NA 27: twenty-two concern the Gospel of Matthew and five the Gospel of Mark. We list below these occurrences as they appear in the 27th Nestle-Aland edition and we also add for convenience, other witnesses' agreement according to Swanson's editions. Those are given in square brackets: [...]^s.

Mt 10:19 παραδωσωσιν Φ 892 l2211 *al* [unknown form]^s

Mt 14:14 επ αυτους Φ 33 1424 *pc* [+ G K W *f*¹³]^s

Mt 15:6 και την μητερα αυτου Φ 565 1241 *pc* (b) c q (sy^s) mae bo [565 *tantum*]^s

Mt 15:14 εις βοθυνον εμπεσουνται W Φ 565 1424 *al* [+ F]^s

Mt 15:31 ακουοντας B Φ *pc* e sy^{hmg} [+ 1071]^s

Mt 17:4 ποιησομεν Φ *f*¹ *pc* [+ 13]^s

Mt 17:17 πονηρα Z Φ l2211 *pc* [no witnesses quoted]^s

Mt 19:8 add ο Ιησους post αὐτοῖς a Φ *pc* a b c mae [+ M]^s

Mt 20:5 εκτην ωραν και ενατην Φ *pc* [no witnesses quoted]^s

Mt 20:28 add. (*cf* L 14,8-10) υμεις δε ζητετε εκ μικρου αυξησαι και εκ μειζονος ελαττων ειναι. εισερχομενοι δε και παρακληθεντες δειπνησαι μη εις τους εξεχοντας τοπους ανακλινεσθε, μηποτε ενδοξοτερος σου επελθη και προσελθων ο δειπνοκλητωρ ειπη σοι · ετι κατω χωρει, και καταισχυνηθη. εαν δε αναπεσης εις τον ηττονα τοπον επελθη σου ηττων, ερει σοι ο δειπνοκλητωρ· αγε ετι ανω, και εσται σοι τουτο χρησιμωτερον Φ (D it vg^{mss} sy^c) [no more witnesses added]^s

Mt 21:7 αυτον D Φ l2211 [no more witnesses quoted]^s

Mt 21:9 add. (*cf* L 19,37; J 12,13) απηντων δε αυτω πολλοι χαιροντες και δοξαζοντες τον θεον περι παντων ων ιδον Φ (sy^c) [no more witnesses added]^s

Mt 21:24 ενα λογον C D Φ 579 1424 *al* [F L 28 118 157]^s [p. 62/150]

Mt 22:13 δησαντες αυτου χειρας και ποδας αρατε αυτον και εκβαλετε M Φ 565 [+ 157 (εκβαλατε), 579 (εμβαλεται), 1071 (εκβαλατε), 1424 (εκβαλλετε)]^s

Mt 23:3 τηρειτε *tantum* Φ *pc* [no witnesses quoted]^s. Oddly enough, the 27th NA edition did not mention Φ.043 within the previous reading which added the verb τηρειν post ὑμῖν as W 0102 0107 *f*¹³ 33 M q sy^{p,h}. According to Batiffol (*Les manuscrits grecs de Bérat*, 1887, p. 502), Φ.043 read παντα ουν οσα αν ειπωσιν υμιν τηρειν τηρειτε κατα δε τα εργα αυτων μη ποιειτε but unfortunately the manuscript is presently illegible at this point.

Mt 24:10 εις θανατον και μισησουσιν αλληλους Φ *pc* [no witnesses quoted]^s, showed a discrepancy with Batiffol's text (*Les manuscrits grecs de Bérat*, 1887, p. 504), because Φ.043 read εις θανατον και μισησωσιν αλληλους, and not the future as published by the Alands. Unfortunately, once again, the manuscript is not readable at this point (Plexiglass sheet numbered 81).

Mt 26:18 om. ο διδασκαλος λεγει Α Φ [no more witnesses quoted]^s

Mt 26:35 δε Φ 69 *sa^{mss} bo^{pt}* [no more witnesses quoted]^s

Mt 26:67 add. αυτον D G Φ *fⁱ 579 700 pc sy^(s)* [+ 1071]^s

Mt 27:9 δια του προφητου *tantum* Φ 33 a b *sy^{s,p} bo^{ms}* [+ 157]^s

Mt 27:16 add. (*cf* Mk 15,7) ος δια φονον και στασιν ην βεβλημενος εις φυλακην Φ *pc (fⁱ³, vg^{mss} sy^s mae)* [no more witnesses added but ὅστις διὰ φθόνον ἦν βεβλημένος εις φυλακὴν *fⁱ³ 1071*]^s

Mt 28:6 ο Ιησους Φ [no witnesses quoted]^s. On the one hand, our extant collation of this legible passage has shown that Batiffol's collation was wrong (see below the extant text of Mt 28:6). On the other hand, this reading was printed by the Alands: it represents the perfect example of an erroneous collation which was then inserted in a Greek New Testament edition.

Mk 2:26 τοις αρχιερευσιν μονον Φ [unknown form]^s. Unfortunately, as the manuscript is currently illegible, we may suppose that the 27th NA edition was wrongly printed because Batiffol's editions (1885 and 1887), including his full extensive text, read τοις αρχιερευσι μονοις (*Les manuscrits grecs de Bérat*, 1887, p. 522). According to Swanson, min. 579 reads τοις αρχιερευσιν μονοις too.

Mk 5:33 επ αυτην Φ *fⁱ³ 565 1241 pc* [no more witnesses quoted]^s

Mk 5:40 ο δε Ιησους Φ *fⁱ pc sy^{h**}* [+ M]^s

Mk 6:51 και περιεσωσεν αυτους και λιαν εκ περισσου εν εαυτοις Φ (reading already quoted in 1885 and 1887 Batiffol's articles) [no more witnesses added]^s

Mk 14:61 om. ο χριστος Γ Φ *pc k* [no more witnesses added]^s

All these readings came from Batiffol's 1887 extensive published text and some of them (Mt 20:28 21:9 24:10 27:9 27:16, Mk 2:26 6:51) were already detailed through his surveys. The 28th Nestle-Aland edition keeps only three readings of Φ.043: Matthew 20:28, 27:9, and Mark 2:26. [p. 63/150]

3.3. Some Extant Readings of Φ.043

We publish here 34 readings of *Beratinus* 1: sixteen are from Matthew, eighteen are

from Mark, all collated by autopsy. We recall here that each folio is currently sealed between two airtight Plexiglass sheets: these Plexiglass sheets were paginated during the restauration of the codex in China; so there is no extant foliation. As said above, the first criterion of the below readings was the legibility of the codex, not a process of selection based upon philological issues. Please note the following sigla: [] indicates a restored text, | means the end of the line, () resolves a *nomem sacrum*, the terms *non leg.* or *non legitur* are for an illegible text, *cod.* is for *codex* and accurately reproduces the text of it.

Mt 13:27 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 30)

ΠΟΘΕΝ | [O]YN EXEI ZIZA | [N]IA Φ.043

πόθεν οὖν ἔχει ζιζάνια A B (ζειζ.) D W M

πόθεν οὖν ἔχει τὰ ζιζάνια **a**^{*(NA27+28+S)} L Θ *fi*³ 28 1424 *al*

Mt 13:36 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 31)

ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΟΙΚ[ΙΑΝ] | Ο Ι(ΗΣΟΥ)Σ Φ.043

εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ὁ ἰησοῦς C K L W Δ Θ 0233 *fi*³ 33 565 579 892 1241 M sy^{(p).h}

εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ *fi*¹ 1424 *pc*

εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν *sine add.* **a** B D *pc* sy^{s.c}

Mt 16:8 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 44)

ΟΥΚ ΕΛΑ | ΒΕΤΕ Φ.043

οὐκ ἐλάβετε C K L W Γ Δ *fi*¹ 33 565 1071 1424 M sy

οὐκ ἔχετε **a** B D Θ *fi*³ 579 700 892 1241 *pc* sy^{hmg}

lac. A 28

Mt 16:13 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 43 sic)

ΤΙΝΑ | ΜΕ Φ.043

τίνα με C (τίνα λέγ. με) D K L M U W (τίνα λέγ. με) Γ Δ Θ Π *fi*³ 28 33 565 892 1071 1241 1424 M sy^(s.c)

τίνα *tantum* **a** B 0281 579 700 *pc* sy^{p.h}

lac. A

Mt 16:13 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 43 sic)

ΛΕΓΟΥΣΙΝ | ΟΙ ΑΝ(ΘΡΩΠ)ΟΙ ΕΙΝΑΙ | ΤΟΝ Υ(ΙΟ)Ν ΤΟΥ ΑΝ(ΘΡΩΠ)ΟΥ
Φ.043

λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου B Θ *fi*³ 28 565 700 M

οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγουσιν εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου **a**^{c(s)} **a**^{2(NA27+28)} D (- τόν) 579 700

οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι λέγουσιν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου **a**^{*(NA27+28+S)} [p. 64/150]

Mt 16:20 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 45)

ΤΟΤΕ ΔΙΕΣΤΙΛΑ[*non leg. cod.* Φ.043

τότε διεστείλατο **a** B^{2(NA27+28)} B^{c(S)} C K L W Γ Δ Θ *f¹ f¹³* 565 700 892 1071 1241
1424 M *sy^{p,h}*

τότε ἐπετίμησεν B^{*(NA27+28)} D *sy^c*

Mt 16:20 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 45)

ΤΟΙΣ ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙΣ | ΑΥΤΟΥ Φ.043

τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ K L W Γ Δ Θ *f¹ f¹³* 33 565 892 1241 1424 M *sy*

τοῖς μαθηταῖς *tantum* a B C D 579 700 1071 *pc*

Mt 17:23 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 49)

ΚΑΙ ΤΗ | [ΤΡ]ΙΤΗ | ΗΜΕΡΑ Φ.043

καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ a A B^c Θ *f¹ f¹³* 28 33 565 700 M

καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας D *it sy^s bo*

Mt 17:23 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 49)

ΕΓΓΕΡΘΗΣΕΤΑΙ Φ.043

ἐγερθήσεται a A D K Θ *f¹* 28 33 565 700 M

ἀναστήσεται B 047 *f¹³* 892 1424 *al*

Mt 17:27 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 50)

Π[Ο] | ΡΕΥΘΕΙΣ Ε[ΙΣ] | ΘΑΛΑΣΣΑ[Ν Φ.043

πορευθεῖς εἰς θάλασσαν a B K L M U Y W Δ Θ Π Ω *f¹* 33 579 1071

πορευθεῖς εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν D E F G H S X *f¹³* 28^s 565 700 1241 1424 *pm*

Mt 25:11 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 87)

ΥΣΤΕΡΟΝ ΔΕ | ΕΡΧΟΝΤΑΙ Κ[ΑΙ] | ΑΙ ΛΟΙΠΑΙ Φ.043

ὕστερον δὲ ἔρχονται καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ a A B Δ Θ *f¹ f¹³* 28 33 565 700 M

ὕστερον δὲ ἦλθον αἱ λοιπαὶ D

ὕστερον δὲ ἦλθον καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ W

Mt 26:43 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 97)

ΚΑΙ ΕΛΘΩΝ | ΕΥΡΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΥΣ | ΠΑΛΙΝ ΚΑΘΕΥΔΟΝΤΑΣ Φ.043

καὶ ἐλθὼν εὗρεν αὐτοὺς πάλιν καθεύδοντας A K W Δ^{c(S)} Π 565 *al sy^h*

καὶ ἐλθὼν πάλιν εὗρεν αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας P^{37vid} a B C D L Θ *f¹ f¹³* 700 *al sy^{s,p,hmg}*

καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐρίσκει αὐτοὺς πάλιν καθεύδοντας M U 28 579 M

Mt 26:73 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 101)

non leg.] ΤΩ ΠΕΤΡΩ | *non leg.*] ΗΘΩΣ ΚΑΙ | *non leg.* Φ.043

τῷ πέτρῳ ἀληθῶς καὶ σύ a A B W *f¹³* 28 33 565 700 M

τῷ πέτρῳ ἀληθῶς *tantum* D Θ *f¹* *pc sy^s* [p. 65/150]

Mt 27:54 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 108)

non leg.]ΘΩΣ Θ(ΕΟ)Υ Υ(ΙΟ)Σ | [*non leg.*]ΤΟΣ Φ.043

ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν οὗτος A F K L M U W Δ Θ Π *f*¹ 28 33 565 579 700 1071 M

ἀληθῶς υἱὸς θεοῦ ἦν οὗτος *a*^{c(S)} B D

ἀληθῶς υἱὸς ἦν τοῦ θεοῦ οὗτος *a*^{*(NA27+28+S)}

Mt 27:64 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 109)

ΜΗΠΟΤΕ Ε[Λ] | ΘΟΝΤΕ[Σ] Ο[Ι ΜΑ] | ΘΗΤΑΙ ΑΥΤ[ΟΥ] | ΚΛΕΨΩΣΙΝ |
ΑΥΤΟΝ Φ.043

μήποτε ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κλέψωσιν αὐτόν A C^{*(NA27+28+S)} D E H K W Y Δ
Θ *f*¹ *f*¹³ 33 157 579 *pm*

μήποτε ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ νυκτὸς κλέψωσιν αὐτόν C^{c(S)} C^{3(NA27+28)} F G L M
U Γ 565 700 892 *pm* *sy*^s

μήποτε ἐλθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ κλέψωσιν αὐτόν *a* (ψουσιν) B

Mt 28:6 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 110)

ΤΟΝ ΤΟΠΟ[Ν] | ΟΠΟΥ Ε[ΚΕΙΤΟ] | Ο Κ(ΥΡΙΟ)Σ Φ.043

τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἔκειτο ὁ κύριος A C D K L M U W Γ Δ Π 0148 *f*¹ *f*¹³ 28 565 700

M *sy*^{(p).h[NA27]} *sy*^{p.h[NA28]}

τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἔκειτο *tantum a* B Θ 33 *pc* *sy*^s

Mk 1:34 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 119)

ΚΑΙ | ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΑ [ΠΟΛ] | ΛΑ ΕΞΕΒΑ[ΛΕΝ Φ.043

καὶ δαιμόνια πολλὰ ἐξέβαλεν *a* (ἐξέβαλλ.) A B C K L M U W Δ Θ Π *f*¹ *f*¹³ 28 565
700 M

Mk 2:13 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 122)

ΚΑΙ ΕΞΗΛΘΕ[Ν] | ΠΑΛΙΝ ΠΑΡ[Α] | ΤΗΝ ΘΑΛΑΣΣ[ΑΝ Φ.043

καὶ ἐξῆλθεν πάλιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν A B D (- πάλιν) W Θ *f*¹ 28 124 157 565
579 700 M

καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ ἰησοῦς πάλιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν Σ *f*¹³ (ἐπὶ *l.* παρά 69*) 1071 (πάλιν
ὁ ἰησ.)

καὶ ἐξῆλθον πάλιν εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν *a*^{*(L+NA27+28+S)}

Mk 3:11 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 126)

ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΠΝ(ΕΥΜ)ΑΤΑ | ΤΑ ΑΚΑΘΑΡΤΑ Φ.043

καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα *a* A B C F L M P U Γ Δ Π *f*¹ 33 157 346 565 983 M

τὰ πνεύματα δὲ τὰ ἀκάθαρτα W 700 (καὶ τὰ πνεύμ. δέ)

καὶ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα Θ^{LA} 1689

καὶ πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα D 13 28 69 124 543 788 826 828 *pc* [p. 66/150]

Mk 3:11 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 126)

ΟΤΑΝ ΑΥΤΟ[Ν] | ΕΘΕΩΡΕΙ Φ.043

ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρει A F K M P U Γ Π Ω *f*ⁱ 157 700 M

ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν a B C D (*add. οὖν p. ὅταν*) G L Δ Θ *f*ⁱ³ 33 565 579 *pc*

ὅταν αὐτὸν ἰδόν W

Mk 3:11 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 126)

Π[ΡΟΣ] | ΕΠΙΠΤΟΝ ΑΥ[ΤΩ Φ.043

προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ a A B^{NA27+28} C D F G K L M P W Δ Θ Π *f*ⁱ³ 28 33 565 579 *pm*

προσέπιπτεν αὐτῷ E H S U V Ω *f*ⁱ 157 700 *pm*

προσέπειπταν αὐτῷ B^s (*sed* προσέπιπταν αὐτῷ^L)

Mk 3:11 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 126)

ΚΑΙ ΕΚΡΑΖ[ΕΝ] | ΛΕΓΟΝΤΑ Ο[ΤΙ Φ.043

καὶ ἔκραζεν λέγοντα ὅτι E H M U 157 700 *pm*

καὶ ἔκραζον λέγοντα ὅτι A B C F G L P Γ Δ Θ Π Ω *f*ⁱ *f*ⁱ³ 33 565 579^s 1071 1424 *pm*

καὶ ἔκραζον αὐτῷ λέγοντα ὅτι 788

καὶ ἔκραζον λέγοντες ὅτι a D (- ὅτι) K W (- ὅτι) 28 69 579^{NA27+28} *pc*

Mk 5:15 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 136)

ΤΟΝ ΕΣΧΗΚΟΤΑ | ΤΟΝ ΛΕΓΕΩΝΑ Φ.043

τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεγεῶνα a^{1(NA27)} a^{2(NA28)} A B C K U W Θ *f*ⁱ *f*ⁱ³ 28 33 565 700 M

τὸν ἐσχηκότα τὸν λεγιῶνα a^{*(NA27+28+S)} L Δ 579

om. D sy^s bo

Mk 5:33 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 138)

Η ΔΕ ΓΥΝΗ ΦΟ | ΒΗΘΙΣΑ ΚΑΙ | ΤΡΕΜΟΥΣΑ | ΕΙΔΥΪΑ Ο ΓΕ | ΓΟΝΕΝ Φ.043

ἡ δὲ γυνὴ φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα εἰδυῖα ὃ γέγονεν a^c (καὶ εἶδ. a^{*}) A B C K L M N U W Π *f*ⁱ *f*ⁱ³ M

ἡ δὲ γυνὴ φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα διὸ πεποιήκει λάθρα εἰδυῖα ὃ γέγονεν D Θ (πεποιήκεν^{L+NA27+28} *cum errore*, πεποῖκεν^{LA+S}) 28 (πεποιήκεν^L *et* ἰδοῦσα^{L+S}) 124 565 700 (- λάθρα) *pc*

Mk 7:4 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 148)

ΚΑΙ ΞΕΣΤΩΝ | ΚΑΙ ΧΑΛΚΙΩΝ | ΚΑΙ ΚΛΙΝΩΝ Φ.043

καὶ ξεστῶν καὶ χαλκίων καὶ κλινῶν A D K M U W Γ Θ Π *f*ⁱ *f*ⁱ³ 28^c 33 565 579 700 M sy^{p,h}

καὶ ξεστῶν καὶ χαλκίων *tantum* P^{45vid} a B L Δ 28^{*} *pc* bo [p. 67/150]

Mk 7:29 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 151)

ΕΞΕΛΗΛΥΘΕ[N] | ΤΟ ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΟ[N] | ΕΚ ΤΗΣ ΘΥΓΑ|ΤΡΟΣ ΣΟΥ ` Φ.043
ἐξελήλυθεν τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς σου P⁴⁵ A D K M N U W Π f¹³ 28 33
565 700 M

ἐξελήλυθεν ἐκ τῆς θυγατρὸς σου τὸ δαιμόνιον a B L Δ Θ

Mk 13:25 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 182)

K]ΑΙ ΟΙ ΑΣΤΕΡ[ΕΣ] | ΤΟΥ ΟΥ(ΡΑ)ΝΟΥ Ε | ΣΟΝΤΑΙ ΕΚΠΙ | ΠΤΟΝΤΕΣ Φ.043

καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσονται ἐκπίπτοντες K M Γ Δ f¹ M sy^h

καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες ἔσονται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πίπτοντες a A (ἐκπίπτ.) B (πείπτ.s) C U
(ἐκπίπτ.) Θ Π Ψ 1424 pc

καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες οἱ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσονται πίπτοντες D (πείπτ.s) sy^{hmg}

καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσονται ἐκπίπτοντες f¹³ 28 2542 pc

καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσοῦντε W^s (πεσοῦνται W^{NA27})

καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες πεσοῦνται ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ 565 700

Mk 13:33 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 183)

non leg. | *non leg.* | ΠΡΟΣ| *non leg.* Φ.043

βλέπετε ἀγρυπνεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε a A C K L Γ Δ Ψ f¹ 700 M sy

βλέπετε δὲ ἀγρυπνεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε W

βλέπετε δὲ καὶ ἀγρυπνεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε Θ f¹³ 28 565

βλέπετε ἀγρυπνεῖτε *sine add.* B 2427 pc

βλέπετε οὖν ἀγρυπνεῖτε *sine add.* D

Mk 14:22 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 186)

ΚΑΙ ΑΙΣΘΙ[ΟΝΤΩΝ] | ΑΥΤΩΝ ΛΑΒ[ΩΝ] | Ο Ι(ΗΣΟΥ)Σ Φ.043

καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ ἰησοῦς a^{*(S)} a^{*,2(NA27+28)} A C K L M P U Γ Δ Θ Π Σ Ψ
f¹ 13 28 69 124 157 346 543 579 700 826 828 892 983 1071 1241 1424 1689 2542
M sy^{p,h}

καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν *sine add.* a^{c(S)} a^{1(NA27+28)} B D W (*om.* αὐτῶν^{LA+S}) l547
565 788 2427 sy^s

Mk 14:22 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 186)

ΑΡΤΟΝ Φ.043

ἄρτον a A B C D K L P U W Γ Δ Θ Π f¹ 13 28 124 346 543 565 579 700 788 826
828 1424 l547 M

τὸν ἄρτον M Σ 69 983 1241 1689 pc

Mk 14:31 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 187)

Ο ΔΕ ΠΕΤΡΟ[Σ] | ΕΚΠΕΡΙΣΣΟΥ | ΕΛΕΓΕΝ ΜΑ[ΛΛ]ΟΝ Φ.043

ὁ δὲ πέτρος ἐκπερισσοῦ ἔλεγεν μᾶλλον A G M N S U Ω 28 1071 [p. 68/150]

ὁ δὲ ἐκπερισσοῦ ἔλεγεν μᾶλλον K Γ Π M
ὁ δὲ πέτρος μᾶλλον περισσῶς ἔλεγεν ὅτι W
ὁ δὲ ἐκπερισσῶς ἐλάλει a B D

Mk 14:31 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 187)

EAN ΔΕΗ [ME Φ.043

ἐὰν δέη με a²(NA27+28) a^c(S) A B D¹(NA27+28) D^c(S) L N Ψ *f*¹₁₃ 579 700 *al*

ἐάν με δέη C H K M S U W Γ Δ Θ Π Ω 28 565 828 M

Mk 14:39 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 188)

ΚΑΙ ΠΑΛΙΝ ΑΠ[ΕΛ] | ΘΩΝ ΠΡΟΣ[ΗΥ] | ΞΑΤΟ ΤΟΝ Α[ΥΤΟΝ] | ΛΟΓΟΝ
ΕΙΠ[ΩΝ Φ.043

καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθὼν προσηύξατο τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπὼν a A B W Θ *f*¹ 28 124 565
700 828 M

καὶ πάλιν ἀπελθὼν προσηύξατο *tantum* D

Mk 14:47 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 189)

ΑΥΤΟΥ [*non leg.* | ΩΤΙΟΝ Φ.043

αὐτοῦ τὸ ὥτίον A C K L N W Γ Δ Θ *f*¹₁₃ 28 565 579 700 1424 2542 M *sy*^h

αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτάριον a B D Ψ *f*¹ 2427 *pc sy*^{hmg}

Concerning verbal criticism, these 34 readings reveal that Φ.043 had kept a few peculiar itacisms and/or vocalic changes such as Mk 5:33 with ΦΟΒΗΘΙΣΑ instead of φοβηθεῖσα, and ΑΙΣΘΙ[ΟΝΤΩΝ instead of ἐσθιόντων in Mk 14:22. Moreover we may notice that there is no confusion between the letters: O and Θ are clearly distinct, as well as A, Δ and Λ, Γ and T, and so on. So, we do not find here some of the numerous misspellings which were abundant in the uncial Θ.038 and the simple scribal errors or confusion of similar sounds when transcribing from dictation in a scriptorium are nil. Consequently, the accuracy of the writing, added to the purple vellum, plainly testify to the luxury character of the manuscript and imply a single copy and not a dictation in a scriptorium.

The analysis of our above textual variants, even on the basis of a small number of readings, sheds a different light on the text of *Beratinus* 1. We may confirm here that the text of Φ.043 has a firm Byzantine position as proved by most of the readings here collated. Twenty-seven readings agree with the siglum M which represents the Majority text, including the Byzantine Koine text, and only a few of them (Mt 17:27 27:64, Mk 3:11 twice quoted), agree with one of the parts of M, designated by *pm*, [p. 69/150] *permulti*. The remaining readings (Mt 26:43, Mk 14:31 twice quoted), agree with A.02. Our extant collations confirm the results of Kurt and Barbara Aland's survey which was published in *The Text of the New Testament*. On the basis of Batiffol's edition, the authors had selected 243 readings: 131 show «agreements with the Byzantine text», 83 have «agreements with the Byzantine text where it has the same reading as the original

text», 11 have «agreements with the original text», and 18 are «independent or distinctive readings». As a conclusion, the Alands claimed that the text of Φ.043 was a «Byzantine text», classified within their so-called «category V» which included «manuscripts with a purely or predominantly Byzantine text». We can thus no longer maintain the view that was held by Batiffol that Φ.043 had a «texte mixte» with a high percentage of Western readings.

Nevertheless, one peculiar textual feature of the manuscript, which echoed amongst the twenty-seven occurrences of the 27th NA edition, was to emphasize the influence of the text of the Gospels of Mark, Luke and John over Φ.043. That was mainly printed in Mt 20:28 which referred to Lk 14:8-10, then Mt 21:9 which referred to Lk 19:37 and Jo 12:13, and Mt 27:16 which referred to Mk 15:7. None of these additions were extant in any of the other purple manuscripts such as N.022 O.023 Σ.042 and 080. Therefore these occurrences attest how the Byzantine position of Φ.043 was not so firmly set up when it was copied and how its text remained unstable with noteworthy features during the 6th century. Consequently, the severe statement of the Alands, asserting that «from the sixth century there have been preserved several manuscripts of consummate artistry (parchment stained purple, inscribed with silver letters, and illuminated with gold), and yet since they offer nothing more than a Byzantine text <...> they are in consequence quite irrelevant for textual criticism», this statement should be moderated and the text of Φ.043 fully collated anew. Even if we are here far away from the textual context of some peculiar clusters of minuscule manuscripts like Family 1 or Family 13 which were, at first, used daily on a liturgical basis, the Alands' statement seems a little bit excessive. Nevertheless, on no account, could the text of Φ.043 be designated as a «free text» with numerous and peculiar readings. First, it was a luxury manuscript the text of which was very carefully written, it was not used during the church service, and second, it was a text which was not provided by a recension but a text in progress, a living text, [p. 70/150] which still included some major readings from the past and the textual stability of the future.

To conclude, we have here demonstrated how Batiffol's collations have to be considered with care because of the short time he spent in Berat in 1885: according to the extant legible text, we have also proved how many of them were inconsistent (Mt 13:27 17:27 28:6, Mk 14:31). In view of these circumstances, the removal of the most part of the readings from the 27th NA edition was a wise editorial decision. Nevertheless, Batiffol and Ἀλεξούδης' collations remain of high value for the reason that they still appear as the only record we have kept from a previous state of the manuscript.

4. Minuscule 1143 and Its Text

4.1. Textual Studies and Palaeographical Elements

Unlike Φ.043, the text of min. 1143 was never published and its readings never studied neither by Pierre Batiffol nor by Ἀνθίμος Ἀλεξούδης. In his 1887 article about «Les manuscrits grecs de Bérat d'Albanie et le codex Purpureus Φ», Batiffol stated that «le

texte <du *Beratinus* 2>, autant que j'en ai pu juger par une collation partielle, ne s'écarte pas de la tradition bien connue du texte byzantin» (p. 445). This definitive statement will remain and the text will never be studied anymore primarily due to the disappearance of the manuscript during the following decades, secondarily because of the main scholarship interest which was first turned towards *Beratinus* 1. Therefore the readings of min. 1143 were never quoted in our modern critical editions and the reference of the manuscript never appeared under the M siglum of the Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece. Some of the volumes of the ANTF series briefly indicated that, concerning 1143, the «film <was> not available». [p. 71/150]

Nevertheless this lack of information seems a little bit curious if we consider anew Batiffol's palaeographical analysis of *Beratinus* 2. In his 1887 survey, Batiffol reported that «chaque page est à une colonne, et la colonne est de dix-sept lignes, comme dans le *Codex Theodoræ* de Saint-Petersbourg. <...> L'écriture a le même aspect que celle du *Codex Theodoræ*, mais entre les deux je relève une différence importante: dans le *Codex Anthimi* en effet, ô a cette vieille forme de u qu'on trouve déjà au IX^e siècle, tandis que dans le *Codex Theodoræ* il affecte une forme onciale dégénérée ... et que l'on ne retrouve pas avant la fin du X^e siècle». Beyond the palaeographical issue, the most important element remains the parallel established by Batiffol between min. 1143 and min. 565. Always for the same reasons, the comparison between these two artefacts was never reassessed until Axinia Džurova's articles in 2011. According to the author who consulted the two purple codices by autopsy, «ce qui est impressionnant <...>, c'est l'analogie quant à la coloration un peu particulière du parchemin». Moreover, several common codicological features concerning the *mise en page* must to be noted: same number of lines, one column, chrysography, palaeographical kinship. However Džurova stated that «vérifiant sur place les deux manuscrits, nous n'avons pas découvert la différence entre les deux copistes concernant la transcription du bêta, signalée par Batiffol». These very close connections between min. 1143 and min. 565 lead the author to the following conclusion: «Ce qui est le plus probable», she wrote, «est qu'ils ont été écrits dans le même atelier et peut-être par le même copiste». Our own autopsy of *Beratinus* 2 confirmed Džurova's analysis about the supposed palaeographical differences published by Batiffol in 1887: these differences do not exist and the two writings are similar.

This similarity is of first importance for textual criticism. How two purple manuscripts, dated from the end of the 9th century, written with gold ink certainly in the same *atelier* and perhaps by the same copyist, both ordered by the Byzantine imperial court, may have such different texts? As we have recalled it above, min. 565 is a first order witness of the [p. 72/150] Greek New Testament and its text, especially for the Gospel of Mark, was recognized as «Caesarean» by biblical scholars. In view of this, it seems to us valuable to reassess the text of min. 1143.

4.2. Some Extant Readings of min. 1143

We publish below 64 readings of *Beratinus* 2: twenty-seven are from Matthew,

thirteen are from Mark, fifteen are from Luke, and nine are from John. All were directly collated by autopsy. As for Φ.43, we recall here that each folio is currently sealing between two airtight Plexiglass sheets and so it is not folioed. Please note the following sigla: [] indicates a restored text, | means the end of the line, () resolves a *nomen sacrum*, the terms *non leg.* or *non legitur* are for an illegible text, *cod.* is for *codex* and accurately reproduces the text of it.

Mt 4:23 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 33)

Καὶ περιῆγεν ὅλην [*non leg.*]αν ὁ ἰ(ησοῦ)ς διδάσκων 1143

καὶ περιῆγεν ὅλην τὴν γαλιλαίαν ὁ ἰησοῦς διδάσκων K M U W Γ Δ Π *f*¹³ 28 565
579 700 1241 1071 M

καὶ περιῆγεν ὁ ἰησοῦς ὅλην τὴν γαλιλαίαν διδάσκων *a*^{c(S)} *a*¹ (NA27+28) D *f*¹ 33^{NA27+28+S1}
(- ὁ ἰησοῦς^{s2}) 157 892 1424 *pc*

καὶ περιῆγεν ὁ ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ γαλιλαίᾳ διδάσκων *a*^{*(NA27+28+S)}

καὶ περιῆγεν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ γαλιλαίᾳ (γαλειλ.^s) διδάσκων B *sy*^c
lac. A Θ

Mt 5:24 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 39)

τὸ δῶρόν σου ἔμπρ[*non leg.*] θυσιαστηρίου ` 1143

τὸ δῶρόν σου ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου *a* B D W Θ *f*¹ *f*¹³ 28 565 700 M
lac. A

Mt 8:15 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 62)

καὶ διηκόνει αὐτοῖς 1143

καὶ διηκόνει αὐτοῖς *a*^{c(S)} *a*¹(NA27+28) L M Δ *f*¹ *f*¹³ 33 157 565 892 1071 1424 *pm sy*^{s.c}

καὶ διηκόνει αὐτῷ B^{c(S)} (B^{*(S)} διεκ.) C K U W Γ Θ Π 579 700 *pm*

διηκόνει αὐτῷ *tantum a*^{*(S)}

lac. A

Mt 9:10 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 68)

ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ` καὶ ἰδοὺ πολλοί 1143

ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ καὶ ἰδοὺ πολλοί B C 565 M

ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἰδοὺ πολλοί *a* D 892 *pc* [p. 73/150]

ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ πολλοί 700

lac. A 28

Mt 9:36 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 74)

Ἴδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἐσπλαγχνίσθη 1143

ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἐσπλαγχνίσθη *a* B D W 28 565 700 1424 M

ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ὁ ἰησοῦς ἐσπλαγχνίσθη C M N *f*¹³ *al sy*^{p.h**}(NA27) *sy*^{p.h}(NA28)

lac. A

Mt 12:5 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 90-91)

(Plexiglass sheet numbered 90) ἢ οὐκ ἀν]έγνωτε ἐν τῷ νόμῳ|(Plexiglass sheet numbered 91)μω ὅτι τοῖς [*non leg.* 1143

ἢ οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὅτι τοῖς **a B Θ** *f*¹ 28 33 (ἀν *l.* οὐκ) 565 579 700 **M**

ἢ οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὅτι ἐν τοῖς **C D W** 157 *pc*

ἢ οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὅτι τοῖς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τοῖς *f*¹³

lac. A

Mt 12:43 (Plexiglass numbered 99)

καὶ οὐκ εὕρισκει ᾠ 1143

καὶ οὐχ εὕρισκει **a B D W Θ** *f*¹ *f*¹³ 28 565 **M**

καὶ μὴ εὕρισκον 700

lac. A

Mt 12:44 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 99)

τότε λέγει ᾠ ἐπιστρέψω εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ὅθ[εν] ἐξῆλθον ᾠ 1143

τότε λέγει ἐπιστρέψω εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον **C G K L M U W Γ Δ Θ Π Ω** 157 565 579 700 1071 **M**

τότε λέγει εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ἐπιστρέψω ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον **a B D** 33 1424

τότε λέγει ὑποστρέψω εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον *f*¹ *f*¹³ 28

lac. A

Mt 12:44 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 99)

καὶ ἐλθὼν εὕρισκει σχολάζοντα σεσαρωμένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον 1143

καὶ ἐλθὼν εὕρισκει σχολάζοντα σεσαρωμένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον **B C^{2(NA27+28)} W Θ** *f*¹ *f*¹³ (ἐλθὼν) 28 33 (ἐλθὼν) 565 579 700 (ἐλθὼν) **M**

καὶ ἐλθὼν εὕρισκει σχολάζοντα καὶ σεσαρωμένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον **a^{c(S)}** (- ἐλθὼν **a^{* (S)}**) **C^{* (NA27+28+S)}** 1424 (ἐλθὼν) *al* [p. 74/150]

καὶ ἐλθὼν εὕρεισκει τὸν οἶκον σχολάζοντα σεσαρωμένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον **D**

lac. A

Mt 15:14 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 123)

ὁδηγοὶ εἰσιν τυφλοὶ τυφλῶν 1143

ὁδηγοὶ εἰσιν τυφλοὶ τυφλῶν **C M N U W Γ Δ Π** 0106 157 565 1071 **M**

τυφλοὶ εἰσιν ὁδηγοὶ τυφλῶν **a^{c(S)} a^{1(NA27)} a^{2a(NA28)} L Z Θ** *f*¹ *f*¹³ 33 579 700 892 1241 1424 *al* *syp.h*

τυφλοὶ εἰσιν ὁδηγοὶ **B D** (ὁδαγοὶ) 0237

ὁδηγοὶ εἰσιν τυφλοὶ **a^{* (S)} a^{*.2(NA27)} a^{*.2b(NA28)}**

lac. A

Mt 17:4 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 136)

ἡλία μίαν ᾠ 1143

ἡλία μίαν **a** (ἡλεία) C D (ἡλεία) K L Δ Θ Π *f*¹³ 33 157 700 1424

μίαν ἡλία B M S U Y Γ Ω 28 565 1071 1241 M^s *pm*^{NA27+28}

lac. A

Mt 18:1 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 141)

ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ 1143

ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ **a** B (*add.* δέ *p.* ἐκείνῃ) D E M (*add.* δέ *p.* ἐκείνῃ) W 0281 (*add.* δέ *p.* ἐκείνῃ) *f*¹³ 28 565 *sa*^{mss} (*add.* δέ *p.* ἐκείνῃ) M

ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ Θ *f*¹ 700 1424 *pc* *sy*^{s.c}

lac. A

Mt 20:8 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 158)

κάλεσον τοὺς ἐργάτας καὶ ἀπόδος αὐτοῖς 1143

κάλεσον τοὺς ἐργάτας καὶ ἀπόδος αὐτοῖς B D K N W Γ Δ Θ *f*¹ *f*¹³ 28 33^{vid} 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 M *sy*

κάλεσον τοὺς ἐργάτας καὶ ἀπόδος **a** C L Z 085

lac. A

Mt 20:26 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 162)

οὐχ οὕτως δὲ ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν ᾠ 1143

οὐχ οὕτως δὲ ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν C M Γ^s 28 33 1424 1582^{c(s)}

οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν **a** C E^(s) K L W 085 Θ *f*¹ *f*¹³ 565 (*non leg.*]τως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν^s) M *sa*^{mss} *bo*

οὐχ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν B D Z 0281 *pc* *sa*^{mss}

lac. A [p. 75/150]

Mt 20:26 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 162)

ἀλλ' ὅς ἐὰν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν [*non leg.* 1143

ἀλλ' ὅς ἐὰν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας **a** H K M S U W Γ Δ Θ Π *f*¹ *f*¹³ 28 (λει) 157 565 700 M

ἀλλ' ὅς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας D 33

ἀλλ' ὅς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας ἐν ὑμῖν B *pc*

lac. A

Mt 21:7 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 165)

καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπ' αὐτῶν 1143

καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπ' αὐτῶν **a** B L
καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπάνω αὐτῶν C K M N U W Γ Δ Π *f*ⁱ 28 157 565 579 700 1071
1424 M
καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπ' αὐτῶ **Θ** 33 788
καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπ' αὐτόν D *pc*
καὶ ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῶ *f*ⁱ³
lac. A

Mt 21:7 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 165)

τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν ᾠ 1143
τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν **a**^{c(S)} **a**^{1(NA27+28)} C F H K L M N S U W Y Γ Δ Π Ω *f*ⁱ *f*ⁱ³ 28 33 565
579 700 1424 M *sy*
τὰ ἱμάτια *tantum* **a**^{*(NA27+28+S)} B D Θ *pc*

Mt 21:23 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 169)

καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῶ 1143
καὶ ἐλθόντι αὐτῶ K (εἰσελθ.) M U W Δ Π 28 157 565 579 1071 1424 (εἰσελθ.) M
καὶ ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ **a** B C D L Θ *f*ⁱ *f*ⁱ³ 33 700
lac. A

Mt 21:44 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 174)

καὶ ὁ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον τοῦτον συνθλασθήσεται ᾠ ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν πέσῃ ᾠ λικμήσῃ
αὐτόν 1143
καὶ ὁ πεσὼν ἐπὶ τὸν λίθον τοῦτον συνθλασθήσεται ᾠ ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν πέσῃ λικμήσῃ
αὐτόν **a** B C K L W Z Δ Θ (- καί) *f*ⁱ *f*ⁱ³ 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 M *sy*^{c.p.h}
om. tot. uers. D 33 *sy*^s
lac. A

Mt 22:13 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 177)

τότε εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῖς διακόνοις 1143 [p. 76/150]
τότε εἶπεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῖς διακόνοις C D K M U W Δ Π 0102 *f*ⁱ 28 157 579 1071
1241 1424 M
τότε ὁ βασιλεὺς εἶπεν τοῖς διακόνοις **a** B L Θ 085 *f*ⁱ³ 33 565 700 892 *pc* *sy*^h
lac. A

Mt 22:37 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 181)

ὁ δὲ ἰ(ησοῦ)ς ἔφη αὐτῶ 1143
ὁ δὲ ἰησοῦς ἔφη αὐτῶ K M U Y Γ Δ Π *f*¹ 28 565 579 1241 1424 M *sy*^{p.h}
ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτῶ **a** B L 33 892 *pc*
ἔφη αὐτῶ ἰησοῦς D

ὁ δὲ ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ W Θ *f*¹³ 700 *pc*
lac. A

Mt 23:12-14-13 (Plexiglass sheets numbered 184-185)

— 23:12 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 184) ταπεινω| (Plexiglass sheet numbered 185) θήσεται ἄ καὶ ὅστις [*non leg.*] | αὐτὸν ὑψωθήσεται ἄ 23:14 [*non leg.*] | μὴν γραμματεῖς καὶ [*non leg.*] | ὑποκριταί ἄ ὅτι κ[*non leg.*] | οἰκίας τῶν χρηρῶν καὶ προφά | σει μακρὰ προσευχόμενοι ἄ διὰ | τοῦτο λήψεσθε περισσότερον | κρίμα ἄ 23:13 οὐαὶ ὑμῖν γραμματεῖς | καὶ φαρισαῖοι κτλ. 1143

— 23:12 ταπεινωθήσεται καὶ ὅστις ταπεινώσει ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται 23:14 οὐαὶ δὲ ὑμῖν γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί ὅτι κατεσθίετε τὰς οἰκίας τῶν χρηρῶν καὶ προφάσει μακρὰ προσευχόμενοι διὰ τοῦτο λήψεσθε περισσότερον κρίμα 23:13 οὐαὶ ὑμῖν γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι κτλ. K M U W Γ Δ Π 0102 0107 28 157 565 579 700 1071 1241 1424 M *syp.h*

om. Mt 23:14 a B D L Θ *f*¹ 33

lac. A

Mt 23:13 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 185)

οὐαὶ ὑμῖν 1143

οὐαὶ ὑμῖν a*(NA27+28+S) K M U W Γ Δ Π 0102 0107 28 157 565 579 700 1071 1241 1424 M *syc.p.h*(NA27) *syc.p*(NA28)

οὐαὶ δὲ ὑμῖν a^c(S) B D L Θ *f*¹³

Mt 26:48 (f. 108v, numbered 222)

λέγων ἄ ὃν ἔαν φιλήσω 1143

λέγων ὃν ἔαν φιλήσω P³⁷ a A K M W Δ Π 124 157 579 1071 M

λέγων ὃν ἄν φιλήσω B C D L U Θ *f*¹ 28 33 69 565 700 788 1424 [p. 77/150]

Mt 27:3 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 229)

μεταμεληθεὶς ἄ[*non leg.*] 1143

μεταμεληθεὶς ἀπέστρεψεν a¹(NA27) a²(NA28) a^c(S) A C K L^s M U W Γ Δ Θ Π *f*¹ *f*¹³ 33 565 700 M

μεταμελήθη καὶ ἔστρεψεν a*(NA27+28+S)

μεταμεληθεὶς ἔστρεψεν B L^{NA27+28} *pc*

Mt 27:45 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 237)

ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἄ 1143

ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν A B D U W Δ Θ *f*¹ *f*¹³ 565 700 M

ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν a^c(S) a¹(NA27+28) 1424 *pc*

om. haec uerba a*(NA27+28+S) *pc*

lac. 28

Mt 27:65 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 241)

ἔφη δέ 1143

ἔφη δέ **a** A C D M* S U Y W Δ Π Ω *f*ⁱ 28 565 579 892 1424 *pm*^{NA27+28} *sy*^{h**}

ἔφη *tantum* B K L M^c Γ Θ *f*ⁱ³ 33 157 700 1071 1241 *pm*^{NA27+28} M^s *sy*^{s.p}

Mk 2:18 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 269)

ἰω]άννου καὶ οἱ τῶν φαρ[ισαίων νη] | στεύοντες 1143

ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ τῶν φαρισαίων νηστεύοντες L U Γ Δ *f*ⁱ 28 (φαρησ.) 33 892 2542 M *sy*^{hmg}

ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν φαρισαίων νηστεύοντες W

ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι νηστεύοντες P⁸⁸ **a** A B (ἰωάνου *et* φαρεισ.) C D K M Θ Π *f*ⁱ³ 157 565 1241 1424 2427 *al sy*^{p.h}

Mk 3:32 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 278)

καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος 1143

καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος **a**^(s) A B C K L W Δ Π *f*ⁱ *f*ⁱ³ 28 33 157 700 [p. 78/150]

καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλοι Θ^{c(s)} (ἐκάθεντο Θ^{*s)} 565

καὶ ἐκάθητο ὄχλος περὶ αὐτόν M U Γ M

καὶ ἐκάθητο πρὸς τὸν ὄχλον D

καὶ ἐκάθητο πρὸς αὐτὸν ὄχλος **a**^(s)

Mk 3:32 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 278)

εἶπον δὲ αὐτῷ ` 1143

εἶπον δὲ αὐτῷ A E F^{c(s)} G H K M S U Y Γ Π Ω *f*ⁱ 33 157 1424 M

καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ **a** B C D L W Δ *f*ⁱ³ 1071

εἰπόντων δὲ αὐτῶν Θ (τον *et* τον^{LA}) 28 565 700

Mk 3:32 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 278)

ἰδοὺ ἡ μή(τη)ρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ζητοῦσί σε 1143

ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω ζητοῦσίν σε **a** B C G K L Y Δ Θ Π *f*ⁱ *f*ⁱ³ 28 33 157 565 1071 1424 *pm sy*

ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου ἔξω στήκουσιν ζητοῦτες σε W^s (ζητοῦντες^L)

ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου ἔξω ζητοῦσίν σε A D E F H M U Γ Ω 124 700 *pm sy*^{hmg}

Mk 6:49 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 308)

αὐτὸν περιπατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης 1143

αὐτὸν περιπατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης A D W *f*ⁱ 28 69 124 565 700 788 828 M

αὐτοὺς περιπατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης 13 346 543 826

αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης περιπατοῦντα **a** B L Δ Θ 33 579
om. haec uerba 983 1689

Mk 6:49 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 308)

ἔδοξαν φάντασμά εἶναι 1143

ἔδοξαν φάντασμά εἶναι A D K M N U Γ Θ Π f^{i3} 157 565 700 1071 1424 M

φάντασμα ἔδοξαν εἶναι W f^i 28 2542 *pc*

ἔδοξαν ὅτι φάντασμά ἐστίν **a** B L Δ 33 579 892 *pc*

Mk 12:33 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 364)

καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως 1143

καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως **a** A B K L M U W Γ Δ Π Ψ f^{i3} 28 157 700 1071 M

καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεως D Θ 565

Mk 12:33 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 364)

καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος ᾠ 1143

καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος A K M U Γ Π 087 f^{i3} 157 700 1071
M $sy^{p.h}$ sa^{ms}

καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος **a**^(s) (- τῆς **a**^(s)) B L W Δ Θ Ψ 28 565 892 1241 2427 *pc*
 sa^{mss}

καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ D

Mk 12:33 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 364)

καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον [*non leg.*] ἑαυτὸν ᾠ 1143

καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτὸν B K M U Θ Π Ψ $f^i f^{i3}$ (τὸ πλησ.) 28 33 157
565 579 700 1071 1424 M [p. 79/150]

καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς σεαυτὸν **a**^(s) A D L S Γ

καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν **a**^(s) W Δ

Mk 12:33 (Plexiglass sheets numbered 364-365)

πλεῖον ἐστὶ πάντων | (Plexiglass sheet numbered 365) τῶν ὀλοκαυ[*non leg.*] 1143

πλεῖον ἐστὶν πάντων τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων A D K M U S W (- τῶν) Γ Θ Π $f^i f^{i3}$ 28
157 565 700 1071 1424 (- πάντων) M

περισσότερόν ἐστιν πάντων τῶν ὀλοκαυτωμάτων **a** B L Δ 33 579 (- ἐστίν)

Mk 14:71 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 390)

ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο ἀναθεματίζειν 1143

ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο ἀναθεματίζειν **a** A B C D K L M N U W Γ Δ Θ Π Ψ $f^i f^{i3}$ 28 33 157
579 700 1071 1424 M

ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο καταθεματίζειν 565

Mk 14:71 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 390)

καὶ ὁμνύειν 1143

καὶ ὁμνύειν $a^{NA27+28}$ A C $K^{NA27+28}$ N W $\Delta \Theta \Psi f^i f^{i3}$ 28 33 565 579 1241 1424 *pm*

καὶ ὁμνύνειν $a^s K^s$ 118^{*(s)}

καὶ ὁμνύναι B E L S U Y $\Gamma \Omega$ 700 892 2427 *pm*

καὶ λέγειν D vg^{ms}

Mk 16:3 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 400)

ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου ᾠ 1143

ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου a A B f^i 28 124 565 579 700 M

ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου C D W $\Theta \Psi f^{i3}$ 1424

Lk 6:4 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 465)

καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔλαβεν καὶ 1143

καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔλαβεν καὶ A $C^{(s)}$ $C^{3(NA27+28)}$ M U $\Gamma \Delta \Lambda \Psi M^{syh}$

καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως λαβὼν $P^{4vid(NA27+28)}$ B $C^{*(NA27+28+S)}$ L Θ 892 *pc*

καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως *tantum* a D (προσθ.s) K W $\Pi f^i f^{i3}$ 565 579 700 1241 2542 *al*

Lk 7:38 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 484)

κλαίουσα ᾠ ἥρξα[το] βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ τοῖς δάκρυσι ᾠ 1143

κλαίουσα ἥρξατο βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ τοῖς δάκρυσιν A K M P U $\Gamma \Delta \Lambda \Pi f^i f^{i3}$ 28 565 M [p. 80/150]

κλαίουσα τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἥρξατο βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ a B L W Ψ 33 579 700 1071

κλαίουσα ἥρξατο τοῖς δάκρυσιν βρέχειν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας Θ

κλαίουσα τοῖς δάκρυσι ἔβρεξε τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ D

Lk 8:35 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 495)

ἐξῆλθον δὲ ἰδεῖν τὸ γεγονός 1143

ἐξῆλθον δὲ ἰδεῖν τὸ γεγονός P^{75} a A B W Θf^i (καὶ ἐξ.) f^{i3} 28 565 700 1424 M *tot. uers. diff.* D

Lk 9:48 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 510)

καὶ εἶπεν [αὐτ]οῖς ὅς ἐάν δέξηται 1143

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅς ἐάν δέξηται a A B C $E^{*(s)}$ K M U W $\Gamma \Delta \Theta \Lambda \Pi \Omega f^i$ 28 565 579 700 1424 M

καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅς ἂν δέξηται D (- αὐτοῖς) L Ψ 33 1071

Lk 9:48 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 510)

τοῦ | [*non leg.*]ν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου | ἐμὲ δέχεται ᾠ 1143

τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐμὲ δέχεται a A B C K L M U W Γ Δ (- τό)
Θ Λ Π Ψ 28 33 157 565 700 1071 1424 M

τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐμὲ δέχεται P⁷⁵ (δέχητ.) D fⁱ pc

Lk 9:48 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 510)

καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἐμὲ δέξηται δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με ᾠ 1143

καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἐμὲ δέξηται δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με A C M W Γ Δ (δέξητ. ἐμέ) Θ
Λ Π fⁱ 28 565 579 700 1424 M

καὶ ὃς ἂν ἐμὲ δέξηται δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με P⁷⁵ (δ' ἂν) B K L U Ψ 33 157
1071

καὶ ὃς ἐμὲ δέχεται δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με a

καὶ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με *tantum* D

Lk 10:5 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 514)

non leg.]ερχεσθε πρῶ | [*non leg. cod.* 1143

οἰκίαν εἰσέρχεσθε πρῶτον K Θ (έρχεσθαι)

οἰκίαν εἰσέρχησθε πρῶτον A M U W Γ Δ Λ Π Ψ 28 565 1424 M

εἰσέλθητε οἰκίαν πρῶτον P⁷⁵ a B

οἰκίαν εἰσέλθητε πρῶτον C L fⁱ 700 1071

Lk 10:29 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 519)

δικαιοῦν 1143 [p. 81/150]

δικαιοῦν A C^c(S) C³(NA27+28) K M N U W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ fⁱ fⁱ³ 28 33 565 700 1424 M

δικαιῶσαι P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ a B C^{*}(NA27+28+S) D L Ξ 070 157 579 892 1071 1241 2542 pc

Lk 10:30 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 519)

ὑπολαβὼν δέ 1143

ὑπολαβὼν δέ a²(NA27+28) A C²(NA27+28) D K L N W Γ Δ Θ Ξ Ψ 070 fⁱ fⁱ³ 28 33 565
579^{NA28} 700 892 1071 1241 1424 2542 M sy^h

ὑπολαβὼν *tantum* P⁴⁵ P⁷⁵ a^{*}(NA27+28+S) B C^{*vid}(NA27+28) 579s

Lk 13:6 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 548)

συκὴν τις εἶχεν ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι αὐτοῦ πεφυτευμένην cod. 1143

συκὴν τις εἶχεν ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι αὐτοῦ πεφυτευμένην K Y Π

συκὴν εἶχεν τις ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι αὐτοῦ πεφυτευμένην A M N U W Γ Δ Θ Λ fⁱ³ 28 565
700 1424 M

συκὴν εἶχεν τις πεφυτευμένην ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι αὐτοῦ P⁷⁵ a^c(S) (- τῷ a^{*}(S)) B L W Ψ
fⁱ 157 579 1071

συκὴν τις εἶχεν πεφυτευμένην ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι αὐτοῦ D

Lk 15:13 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 565)

διασκορπίσε τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ 1143

διασκορπίσεν τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτοῦ P⁷⁵ A B G N W Θ *fⁱ fⁱ³* 28 565 700 M

διασκορπίσεν τὴν οὐσίαν ἑαυτοῦ **a**

διασκορπίσεν ἑαυτοῦ τὸν βίον D

Lk 19:7 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 592)

καὶ ἰδόντες πάντες διεγόγγυζον λέγοντες cod. 1143

καὶ ἰδόντες πάντες διεγόγγυζον λέγοντες **a** A B L W Θ 28 565 700 M

καὶ ἰδόντες πάντες διεγόγγυζον *tantum* D *sy^c*

Lk 20:9 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 601)

ἤρξατο [δὲ πρ]ὸς τὸν λαὸν λέγειν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην ` 1143

ἤρξατο δὲ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν λέγειν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην A B W Θ *fⁱ fⁱ³* 28 565 700 M [p. 82/150]

ἤρξατο δὲ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην **a**^{*(S)}

ἔλεγεν δὲ τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην D

Lk 20:9 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 601)

ανὸς ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα ` 1143

ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα **a** B K L M N Q Γ Δ Λ Π Ψ *fⁱ* 28 33 565 579 700 892 1424 M

ἄνθρωπός τις ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα A W Θ *fⁱ³* 157 1071 1241 2542 *al sy*^{NA27}
sy^{s.c.p.h}(NA28)*

ἀμπελῶνα ἐφύτευσεν ἄνθρωπος D (ἀμπελῶνα^{*(S)})

Lk 20:9 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 601)

καὶ ἐξέδοτο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς 1143

καὶ ἐξέδοτο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς **a**^{c(S)} **B**^{c(S)} D K M N Q W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ *fⁱ fⁱ³* 28 33 157 565 700 1071 1424 M

καὶ ἐξέδετο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς **a**^{*(S)} A **B**^{*(S)} C L 579

Jo 4:53 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 691)

ὅτι ἐκείνη 1143

ὅτι ἐκείνη P⁷⁵ **a**^{*(NA27+28+S)} B C 1 892 *al*

ὅτι ἐν ἐκείνῃ P⁶⁶ **a**^{c(S)} **a**^{2(NA27+28)} A D K L M N U Γ Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ *fⁱ³* 28 33 565 579 700 1071 M

Jo 7:3 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 716)

θεωρήσωσιν 1143

θεωρήσωσιν P⁶⁶ **B**^{c(S)} **B**^{2(NA27+28)} G K U Γ Θ Λ Π Ψ *fⁱ fⁱ³* 28 565 579 700 892 1241 M

θεωρήσουσιν P⁷⁵ a^{c(S)} a^{2(NA27+28)} B^{*(NA27+28+S)} D L M N W Δ 33 157 1424 *al*
θεώρουσιν a^{*(NA27+28+S)}
lac. A

Jo 7:3 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 716)

τὰ ἔργα σου ἃ ποιεῖς 1143
τὰ ἔργα σου ἃ ποιεῖς a^{c(S)} a^{2(NA27+28)} K L M N W Γ Δ Λ Π Ψ fⁱ³ 28 33 157 579 700
1424 M
τὰ ἔργα ἃ σὺ ποιεῖς G Θ fⁱ 565 1071 *pc*
σοῦ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιεῖς P⁶⁶ B
τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιεῖς a^{*(NA27+28+S)} D 1241 *al* sy^{s.c.p}
lac. A

Jo 8:38 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 733)

ἐγὼ ὁ ἑώρακα 1143 [p. 83/150]
ἐγὼ ὁ ἑώρακα K (ἑώρακα^s) M (ἑώρακα^s) S U Y Γ Δ Λ Ψ Ω 28 (ἑώρακα^s) 700 1424
M (ἑώρακα^s) sy^h
ὁ ἐγὼ ἑώρακα fⁱ
ἐγὼ ἃ ἑώρακα D^{c(S)} (ῥακα D^{*(S)}) L (ἑώρακα^s) N Θ (ἑώρακα^s) 33 579 892 1071 *al*
ἃ ἐγὼ ἑώρακα P⁶⁶ P⁷⁵ (ἑώρακα^s) a B C W 565 (ἑώρακα^s) *pc*
lac. A

Jo 8:38 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 733)

καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ὅ 1143
καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ὅ a^{c(S)} a^{2(NA27+28)} L M S U Γ Δ Λ Ψ Ω 28 700 1424 M sy^h
καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἅ P⁶⁶ P⁷⁵ a^{*(NA27+28+S)} B C D K N W (- οὖν) Y Θ fⁱ fⁱ³ 33 565 579 1071
al
lac. A

Jo 8:38 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 733)

ἐωράκατε 1143
ἐωράκατε P⁶⁶ a^{*(NA27+28+S)} D N S U Γ Δ Λ Ψ Ω 579^{NA27+28} 700 1071 1424 M^{NA27+28} sy
ἐοράκατε M Δ Ω 28 579^s M^s
ἠκούσατε P⁷⁵ a^{2(NA27+28)} B C K L^{NA27+28} W Y Θ fⁱ fⁱ³ 33 565 892 *al* sy^{hmg}
ἠκούσεται a^{c(S)} L^s
lac. A

Jo 8:38 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 733)

παρὰ τῷ πατρί | [no text 1143
παρὰ τῷ πατρί ὑμῶν D M N S U Γ Δ Λ Ψ Ω 28 579 700 1071 M sy

παρὰ τοῦ πατρός P⁶⁶ P⁷⁵ B L W *pc*
παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν a C K Y Θ *fi fi3* 33 565 892 *al sy^{hmg}*
lac. A

Jo 8:54 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 737)

ἐγὼ δοξάσω ἐμαυτὸν 1143
ἐγὼ δοξάσω ἐμαυτὸν P^{66c(S)} P⁷⁵ a^{*(S)} B C^{*(S)} D U W Θ Π *fi fi3* 579
ἐγὼ δοξάζω ἐμαυτὸν P^{66*(S)} a^{c(S)} A C^{c(S)} K L M N Δ Λ Ψ 28 33 157 565 700 1071
1424 M [p. 84/150]

Jo 14:15 (Plexiglass sheet numbered 786)

τηρήσατε 1143
τηρήσατε A D K M Q U W Γ Δ Θ Λ Π *fi fi3* 28 157 565 700 1424 M
τηρήσετε B L Ψ 1071 *pc*
τηρήσητε P^{66(NA27+28)} (τηρήσεται) a 060 33 579^{NA27+28} (τηρήσεται) *pc*

Our analysis of the above textual variants shows that 1143 agrees with M in 52 occurrences, i.e. more than 81%; in 5 readings (Mt 8:15 17:4 27:65 Mk 3:32 14:71), the agreement is only with *pm*, used in place of M when the Majority text is divided. Only two variant readings suggest a possible relationship with the uncial K.017, a Byzantine witness, consistently cited of the first order in the Nestle-Aland edition. Minuscule 1143 has only a few agreements with the Alexandrian text (Mt 21:7 Jo 4:53 8:54) and none with the Western text. *Beratinus* 2 has no «Caesarean» affinities: when 565 is quoted with 1143 they are both parts of the Byzantine tradition.

5. Conclusion

We have demonstrated above, on the basis of our fresh collations, that the full text of Φ.043 as published by Batiffol in 1887 should be considered very carefully. In spite of our research in France and in Albania, we did not find any proof of an archive attesting an exhaustive collation of the 190 folios of this manuscript. In all cases, the removal of most of the readings of Φ.043 in the 28th Nestle-Aland edition was justified. Our analysis of the extant text sheds a different light on this codex. We confirm here that the text of *Beratinus* 1 has a solid Byzantine position and this partly corroborates the results of Kurt and Barbara Aland's survey. However their severe statement about the purple manuscripts considered as «irrelevant for textual criticism» should be moderated and the text of Φ.043 thoroughly collated. Concerning *Beratinus* 2, our collations confirm that this minuscule belongs to the Byzantine tradition, especially to the Kα group, as described by Paul Anderson from the Center for the Study and Preservation of the Majority Text. Beyond the text-type kinship, the question of the exemplar of *Beratinus* 2, arises. According [p. 85/150] to most recent palaeographical surveys, it is quite

certain that minuscule 565, a «Caesarean» witness, was of the same hand as minuscule 1143.

Considering the textual transmission of these two purple codices, it seems that *Beratinus* 1 and *Beratinus* 2 were written during two different stages of the Majority text. With Φ .043 and the other purple uncial codices – but perhaps even more with *Beratinus* 1 – we can trace back the Byzantine mainstream tradition as early as the 6th century. Even if these manuscripts are closely akin, further extensive collations will show if they really share one common ancestor. Concerning *Beratinus* 2, it already represented, during the 9th century, a standardized form, typical of the second millennium. Furthermore, a codicological approach, following the hypothesis that minuscules 565 and 1143 were likely to have been produced in Constantinople, adding to the recognition that a same scribe was responsible for such different witnesses, proves that during this century, it was still possible to disseminate in luxury artefacts quite different texts of the Greek New Testament.

Didier LAFLEUR

Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes - CNRS

Section grecque et de l'Orient chrétien - Collège de France

52 rue du Cardinal Lemoine

F - 75005 Paris

FRANCE

didier.lafleur@irht.cnrs.fr

[p. 86/150]

1. N.022 (*Codex Petropolitanus*) is housed in Sankt-Peterburg, Rossijskaja Nacional'naja Biblioteka (RNB), Φ . N°906, Gr. 537 [Granstrom 18]. It is composed by of 182 ff.; other parts of this ms. are: 1) Αθήνα, Βυζαντινό και Χριστιανικό Μουσείο 0862 (fragment 21) [1 f. = Mt 14:22-31], 2) Lerma, Castello Spinola, sine numero [1 f. = Jo 3:14-21], 3) London, British Library, Cotton Titus C XV [4 ff. = Mt 26:57-65 27:26-34, Jo 14:2-10 15:15-22], 4) New York, Pierpont Morgan Library and Museum 874 [1 f. = Mt 15:38-16:7], 5) Πάτμος, Μονή του Αγίου Ιωάννου του Θεολόγου 67 [33 ff. = Mk 6:53-15:23], 6) Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, *Vat. gr.* 2305 [6 ff. = Mt 19:6-13 20:6-22 20:29-21:19], 7) Θεσσαλονίκη, Μουσείο Βυζαντινού Πολιτισμού, Ms. 1 [1 f. = Jo 6:31-39], 8) Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, *theol. gr.* 31 [2 ff. = Lk 24:13-21.39-49]. The uncial O.023 (*Codex Sinopensis*) is housed in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Supplément grec 1286, the uncial Σ.042 (*Codex Rossanensis*) is in Rossano Calabro, Museo Diocesano di Arte Sacra, Ms. 1, and the uncial 080 is presently Al-Iskandariyya, Βιβλιοθήκη του Πατριαρχείου 496 (Mk 9:14-18.20-22 10:23-24.29) with some ff. in Sankt-Peterburg, Rossijskaja Nacional'naja Biblioteka (RNB), Φ . N°906, Gr. 275 [Granstrom 9]. Lastly, 146 is Napoli, Biblioteca Nazionale, ex-Vindob. gr. 02* (*olim* Wien, ÖNB, Suppl. gr. 12).

2. Sankt-Peterburg, Rossijskaja Nacional'naja Biblioteka (RNB), Φ . N°906, Gr. 53 [Granstrom 81]).

3. The 28th Nestle-Aland revised edition, published in 2012, was not taken in account; see below 3.2.

4. *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, Arbeiten zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter.

5. The first publication in which these two purple codices were mentioned was in an account of Αλεξούδης' diocese: *Σύντομος Ιστορική Περιγραφή της Ἱερᾶς Μητροπόλεως Βελεγράδων καὶ τῆς ὑπὸ τὴν πνευματικὴν αὐτῆς δικαιοδοσίαν ὑπαγομένης χώρας, νῦν πρῶτον συνταχθεῖσα καὶ ἰδίῳι ἀναλώμασι τύποις ἐκδοθεῖσα ὑπὸ τοῦ Μητροπολίτου Βελεγράδων Ἀνθίμου Δ. Ἀλεξούδη τοῦ ἐκ Μαδύτων τῆς Θρακικῆς Χερσονήσου, Ἐν Κέρκυρα*.

Τυπογραφείον «Ἡ ἸΟΝΙΑ» Ἀδελφῶν Κάων, 1868, p. 113-14. During the following years, Ἀλεξούδης published notes and codicological descriptions of the Berat manuscripts, including Φ.043 and 1143: «Δύο σημειώματα ἐκ χειρογράφων ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀμασειᾶς Ἀνθίμου τοῦ Ἀλεξούδῃ», *Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρίας* (sic) *τῆς Ἑλλάδος* 4 (1892): 277-79; «Κατάλογος τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς συνοικίας Κάστρου, πόλεως Βερατίου τῆς Μητροπόλεως Βελεγράδων εὐρισκομένων ἀρχαίων χειρογράφων, ὑπὸ τοῦ Μητροπολίτου Ἀμασειᾶς Ἀνθίμου τοῦ Ἀλεξούδῃ», *Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος τῶν ἐτῶν 1896 καὶ 1897*: 352-53. Ἀλεξούδης published also a more precise codicological description of min. 1143, designated as «Τεῦχος ΜΑ'», in his article «Κώδικες ἐπαρχίας Βελεγράδων. Κατάλογος μετὰ περιγραφῆς χειρογράφων κωδίκων ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ὕλης, εὐρισκομένων ἐν Βερατίῳ καὶ ἰδίως ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς συνοικίας Κάστρου, οἷον τῆς Μητροπόλεως Βελεγράδων τῆς ἐπ' ὀνόματι τῆς Κοιμήσεως τῆς Θεοτόκου τιμωμένης, τῆς Παναγίας Εὐαγγελιστρίας, τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Θεολόγου καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Γεωργίου. Ὑπὸ τοῦ Σεβασμ. Μητροπολίτου Ἀμασειᾶς Ἀνθίμου», *Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ Ἀλήθεια* 20:50 (15 December 1900): 545. A complete description of Φ.043, designated as «Τεῦχος ΜΒ'», was published the following year, in the same journal, *EA* 21:2 (12 January 1901): 15-16.

6. «Bericht über eine Reise nach Südalbanien», *JÖB* 15 (1966): 391-94, and «Katalog der griechischen Handschriften im Staatsarchiv zu Tirana», *JÖB* 17 (1968): 197-214. An Albanian translation of this survey was published in 2003, «Katalog i dorëshkrimeve në greqisht në Arkivin e Shtetit në Tiranë», in *Kodikët e Shqipërisë*, S. Sinani-Drejtoria e Përgjithshme e Arkivave eds., Tiranë, p. 53-64.

7. «Dorëshkrimet biblike që gjenden në Arkivin Qendror të Shtetit në Shqipëri (Tiranë), të kataloguar në Fondin 488» [Albanian translation of an unpublished English survey], in *Kodikët e Shqipërisë*, S. Sinani-Drejtoria e Përgjithshme e Arkivave eds., Tiranë, 2003, p. 215-32.

8. <http://www.csntm.org/Blog/Archive/2009/7/31/MoreAlbaniaManuscriptImagesPosted> (last access February 2018).

9. «Evangeliorum codex graecus purpureus Beratinus Φ», *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 5 (1885): 370-76.

10. «Les manuscrits grecs de Bérat d'Albanie et le codex Purpureus Φ», *Archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires: Choix de rapports et instructions publié sous les auspices de l'Instruction Publique et des Beaux-Arts, Troisième série, Tome XIII*, Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1887, p. 437-556. An Albanian translation of this article, except the full extant Greek text of the codex, was published in 2003: «Dorëshkrimi greqisht (en grec) nga Berati i Shqipërisë *Codex Purpureus Φ*», in *Kodikët e Shqipërisë*, S. Sinani-Drejtoria e Përgjithshme e Arkivave eds., Tiranë, p. 25-45.

11. Indeed «XIV, 11», as corrected by Ἀλεξούδης; see below.

12. ... *in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*. I. Teil, Untersuchungen, II. Abteilung: *Die Textformen, A. Die Evangelien*, Berlin: Arthur Glaue, p. 1245-49.

13. Erroneously quoted by von Soden as «βασιλειων» (ibid., p. 1246), whereas Batiffol had edited «βασίλειων» («Les manuscrits grecs de Bérat d'Albanie et le codex Purpureus Φ», 1887, p. 477).

14. Erroneously quoted by von Soden as «λαλησαι αυτον» (ibid., p. 1246), whereas Batiffol had edited «λαλησαι αυτω» («Les manuscrits grecs de Bérat d'Albanie et le codex Purpureus Φ», 1887, p. 481).

15. Von Soden's reference as «17 3 εγενετο» (*Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, p. 1246), was rather inconsistent because the verb was not in that verse.

16. *Nouum Testamentum graece secundum textum Westcotto-Hortianum: Euangelium secundum Marcum, cum apparatu critico nouo plenissimo, lectionibus codicum nuper repertorum additis, editionibus versionum antiquarum et patrum ecclesiasticorum denuo inuestigatis edidit S.C.E. Legg*, Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1935. The Gospel of Matthew was published in 1940.

17. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts. Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus, Matthew, Mark*, Sheffield-Pasadena: Sheffield Academic Press-William Carey International University Press, 1995.

18. Batiffol's collation was erroneous: «ποθεν ουν εχει τα ζιζανια», in Batiffol, *Les manuscrits grecs de Bérat*, 1887, p. 483.

19. Batiffol's collation was erroneous: «πορευθεις εις την θαλασσαν», in Batiffol, *Les manuscrits grecs de Bérat*, 1887, p. 492.

20. Batiffol's collation was wrong: «τον τοπον οπου εκειτο ο ις», in Batiffol, *Les manuscrits grecs de Bérat*, 1887, p. 517. Following Batiffol's edition, NA 27 restored «τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἔκειτο ὁ Ἰησοῦς».

21. Unlike what he had previously edited, Batiffol has developed here the *nomen sacrum*: «καὶ τὰ πνευματα τὰ ακαθαρτα», in Batiffol, *Les manuscrits grecs de Bérat*, 1887, p. 523.

22. We restore here «ΕΚΡΑΖ[ΕΝ]» according to Batiffol, *Les manuscrits grecs de Bérat*, 1887, p. 523.
23. Batiffol edited «Η δε γυνή φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρεμουσα εἰδὺα ὁ γέγονεν», in Batiffol, *Les manuscrits grecs de Bérat*, 1887, p. 528.
24. On the facsimile, Mk 13:33 was restored as «ΒΛΕΠΕΤΕ ΑΓΡΥ | ΠΙΝΙΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΣ | ΕΥΧΕΣΘΕ». Batiffol edited the same reading: «Βλέπετε ἀγρυπνίτε καὶ προσευχεσθε», see Batiffol, *Les manuscrits grecs de Bérat*, 1887, p. 547.
25. Batiffol's collation was erroneous: «εἰς με δεῖ», in Batiffol, *Les manuscrits grecs de Bérat*, 1887, p. 549.
26. Such examples were already noted by Batiffol, «Evangeliorum codex graecus purpureus Beratinus Φ», *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire* 5 (1885): 371.
27. *An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, 2^d ed., Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1995, p. 118.
28. Ibid., p. 104.
29. Ἀλεξοῦδης' surveys about min. 1143 were only codicological: *Σύντομος Ἱστορικὴ Περιγραφή...*, p. 113-14; «Δύο σημειώματα ἐκ χειρογράφων...», *Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρίας* (sic) *τῆς Ἑλλάδος* 4 (1892): 277; «Κατάλογος...», *Δελτίον τῆς Ἱστορικῆς καὶ Ἐθνολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας τῆς Ἑλλάδος* 5 (1898): 352-53; «Κώδικες ἐπαρχίας Βελεγράδων...», *EA* 20/50 (1900): 545.
30. Aland, B.-Aland, K.-Wachtel, K.-Witte, K., *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, IV. *Die Synoptischen Evangelien*, 1. *Das Markusevangelium*, Band 1,1: *Handschriftenliste und vergleichende Beschreibung*, ANTF 26, Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998, p. 13; Id., *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, V. *Das Johannesevangelium*, 1. *Teststellenkollation der Kapitel 1-10*, Band 1,1: *Handschriftenliste und vergleichende Beschreibung*, ANTF 35, Berlin-New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2005, p. 13.
31. «Les manuscrits grecs de Bérat d'Albanie et le codex Purpureus Φ», p. 445.
32. *Manuscrits grecs enluminés des Archives Nationales de Tirana (VI^e-XIV^e siècles), Études choisies*, vol. 1 *Texte*, vol. 2 *Album*, Scriptorium balcanicum 1, Sofia: Centre de Recherches Slavo-Byzantines «Ivan Dujčev» auprès de l'Université «St. Clément d'Ohrid»-Archives Nationales de Tirana-Vestigia, Centre d'études des manuscrits auprès de l'Université «Karl Franzens», Graz, 2011, p. 23-41; «Quelques remarques sur les codices pourpres enluminés de la Renaissance macédonienne (le Beratinus II – Codex Aurelius Antimi et le Cod. gr. 53 de Saint Pétersbourg)» sic, *Scripta* 4 (2011 [2012]): 29-48.
33. *Manuscrits grecs enluminés*, p. 28.
34. Ibid., p. 38.
35. In addition to the wrong accentuation with «συχήν», we may mention here the dittographical form «πεφυτευμένην»: the copyist repeated twice the same syllable due to the next line: «συχήν τις εἶ | χεν ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι αὐτοῦ πεφυ | φυτευμένην».
36. παρὰ τῷ π(α)ρὶ are the last words at the bottom of the recto; the upper left corner of the folio is no more extant.
37. <http://www.cspmt.org/?q=node/11> (last access February 2018).

The End of Acts and the Comparable Age of its Variants

KARL L. ARMSTRONG

The text(s) of Acts, its end, and its date, are three of the most complicated and fiercely debated issues in Luke-Acts scholarship today. All three issues remain unsolved despite the numerous attempts in recent history. This essay addresses the broader textual debate of Acts while examining the extant manuscripts for chapter 28, 11-31 with the aim of trying to understand the significance of the variants in light of the often debated and yet ever present ‘Western’ tendencies. It will be argued that these variants provide additional evidence in support of Epp’s proposition that the Alexandrian and Western textual families are not only comparable in age, but decidedly earlier than previous thought.

Keywords: Western text, text-types, tendencies, Acts 28, date of Acts, textual criticism, papyri, codices, uncials, minuscules, transmission history, variants, Paul.

1. Introduction

The last chapter of Acts provides no shortage of scholarly opinion and the questions that arise “constantly call for re-examination”. The enigmatic nature of Acts 28 has been discussed by scholars as early as Chrysostom in an attempt to bring clarity to the issues that are raised. The two most recent monographs on this subject have suggested narrative and literary critical solutions to the ending. These efforts have in some ways advanced scholarship, but one aspect of the enigma has remained untouched — the textual variants of Acts 28. Scholars who solely rely [p. 87/150] on the ‘text’ of Acts found in the Nestle-Aland (or UBS) are limiting themselves to one set of manuscripts — to the exclusion of the ‘Western’ textual variations found in others. These variants are not simply “scraps on the cutting room floor” as they can also “function as ‘windows’ into the world of early Christianity, its social history, and the various theological challenges it faced”.

In 1949, F. G. Kenyon stated what could easily be said today — that the issue of the Alexandrian and Western texts remains “the outstanding issue in the criticism of the New Testament”. Delobel, in his excellent summary, states that it is “not an exaggeration to pretend that the ‘Western’ text is the *most complicated* matter in the field of New Testament textual criticism” (my emphasis). And yet, none of the recent approaches [p. 88/150] to the end of Acts addresses this issue in detail or provide a first-hand encounter with the actual manuscripts themselves. A critical study on the end of Acts should first assess and engage the “centuries-old riddle” of the variants no matter how “secondary” they appear to be. Second, all of the variants of Acts 28, 11-31 should be studied

together in light of the historical events relating to Acts in general, but especially those tied to its end. Substantial pieces of the puzzle will be forfeited when we neglect the historical context as well as the variants.

The goal of this essay is by no means an attempt to solve the puzzle of the ending, nor the ongoing problem of the text(s) of Acts; it is much more modest: to understand the significance of the variants in light of [p. 89/150] the ever present ‘Western’ tendency for expansion. It will be argued that these variants provide additional evidence in support of Epp’s proposition that the Alexandrian and Western texts are comparable in age. Second, a further deduction is that the age of these variants are decidedly early (pre-70 CE) which directly challenges post-70 CE advocates. This conclusion arises not only from a detailed examination of the variants in Acts 28, 11-31 (with the help of INTF), but also due to another essay where I consider the major positions represented by the early (pre-70 CE), middle (post-70 CE to ±80 CE), and late dating advocates (90-130 CE). A strong case for an early date of the Western variants of Acts stems from a consideration of the cumulative textual and historical evidence. [p. 90/150]

2. The ‘Western’ Front

But first, all is not “quiet on the ‘Western’ front”. The history of discussion behind the two versions of Acts is extensive and many scholars have put their hand to the plough in the quest to provide a cogent solution. Furthermore, recent trends in text-critical scholarship suggest that the time is ripe for revisiting theories with regards to the origins and development of the text of Acts. Although the grander problem of the origin of the text(s) of Acts will not be solved in this essay, the variants found in Acts 28, 11-31 shed light onto an early period in the textual history of Acts.

Since there are multiple variants, roughly comprising at least two versions (or editions) of Acts, we must go beyond a tacit rejection of the ‘lesser’ variants by Committee decisions. Meanwhile, a tacit acceptance of the eclectic text leaves out a valuable piece of textual history and clues to the end of Acts puzzle.

This text-critical problem is unavoidable; Strange insists that it is “forced upon the reader of Acts” — and “decisions about the text affect conclusions about the work in all its aspects”. This ‘problem’ has been noted for a long time. Concerning the Western texts, J. H. Ropes in 1926 asserted that:

we should be the poorer, for those fragments of its base, which it enshrines like fossils in an enveloping rock-mass, would probably have perished, and we [p. 91/150] should have lost these evidences of a good text of extreme antiquity, vastly nearer in date to the original autographs than any of our Greek manuscripts.

In 1999, Delobel’s survey of this issue *actualized* what Ropes *hypothesized* — Delobel claims that it was not until the mid-1980’s that scholarship began to engage the ‘Western’ front once more:

Apart from a few stubborn ‘heretics,’ most editors and exegetes during the preceding decades had based their text-critical decisions on the explicit or silent assumption that the ‘Western’ text is the result of some form of corruption of the original text, which is more faithfully represented by the Alexandrian text-tradition. Everything seemed to be ‘quiet on the Western front.’ But all of a sudden, the hostilities started again.

Delobel credits the “impressive” study by Boismard and Lamouille as a primary reason for the shift in focus away from a pure Alexandrian development to a reconsideration of the Western text once more. Barbara Aland in her 1986 article explains that when she first wrote her methodology she assumed that the “established” view was that the Western text is a later revision of the book of Acts — “Dem ist aber nicht so”.

There have been numerous attempts to provide a solution to the distinct and divergent “traditions” or “text-types”. The first position (credited to Blass) is that the author of Acts “issued two editions of each of his works”. The major critique against this view is that “it has not always [p. 92/150] been clear why the author made the changes that he did”. Where Blass’s position is later adapted by Boismard and Lamouille, Tavardon builds on Boismard-Lamouille’s work, and sees the Alexandrian text as the work of a redactor, thus promoting the Western text as “more primitive”. Like the first, the second theory involves “two different but related editions” except that the second view contends that the Alexandrian text came first. It is possible that the Alexandrian text could have been expanded upon and improved — though few scholars accept this possibility.

The third position — the “revision” or “interpolation” theory — is perhaps the most popular. This view suggests that the “early period of textual transmission was more fluid, and this resulted in a number of interpolations being added to the text, possibly by revisers”. Clark proposed a fourth view that the Alexandrian text, which came later, was the result of abbreviation due to the “stichometric arrangement” of the Western text. Last, a fifth position involves theories of translation that attempt to explain the Western text’s “growth in length”. [p. 93/150]

There are a few more theories worth mentioning that represent a blending of the previous viewpoints. For example, Delebecque proposes that Luke first wrote the Alexandrian draft of Acts around 62 CE. The Western text was Luke’s second improved edition completed a few years later in 67 CE. His view is a blend of Ropes and Aland due to the Alexandrian priority — he also joins rank with Blass who ascribes “the Western text to the same author and dating it in the first century”. Amphoux, contends that the Western text of the gospels “is the most anciently accessible form of the text” and that the Alexandrian text “is the result of editorial work” from around 175 CE.

More recently, the work of Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger has significantly “disquieted” the Western front further. Using principles of discourse analysis, Read-Heimerdinger proposes that Codex Bezae (05) is earlier than the Alexandrian text and not “the work of an enthusiastic and fanciful scribe who embellished the original text represented by the Alexandrian manuscripts”. In their combined work they “highlight the

inner coherence of Bezae in Acts” drawing attention to the “distinct message communicated by its narrator, in the hope that the manuscript’s witness to the concerns of the early Church might once more be recognized and valued”. In many ways, their conclusions support the intrinsic value of the Western variants of Acts 28, 11-31 in this essay.

Although the debate regarding the age and stages of Bezae’s development continues, it is clear that it does represent a concrete expression of the later developing Western tradition. It seems reasonable to suggest [p. 94/150] that the (pre-Bezae) Western text preserves an earlier ‘version’ of the text of Acts. Who the author (or authors) of this version is, and just how early it is, remain a matter of ongoing debate. Nevertheless, the Western text is at the very least, the earliest commentary on the primitive text available.

Delobel claims the problem stems from the second century, “the period during which the text may be supposed to have enjoyed [the] most freedom and to have suffered most corruption”. He maintains that although “imaginative constructions are to be welcomed” every “theory can only be hypothetical”. The inevitable deduction is that both pro-Western and pro-Alexandrian views must remain theories because the textual evidence is mixed, and for at least two reasons. First, because the “earliest papyri for Acts are from the third century” and second, because many of them exhibit Western tendencies (i.e. P³⁸, P²⁹ and P⁴⁸). Consequently, we must not confuse our hypotheses with facts — or our “building” will be “no stronger than its basement”.

Tuckett provides a more recent assessment of this text-critical problem while engaging the Alands and especially B. Aland’s definitive article on the subject. Aland, after examining Bezae (D 05) and notable papyri (P³⁸ and P⁴⁸ especially) posits that somewhere during the *second century* variants began to appear. Later in the third century, these variants developed into something more significant — as the similarities between [p. 95/150] Codex 614 and some early manuscripts reveal. Some infer that the text carried in codex 614 and its sister text 2412 (twelfth/thirteenth century), should be used to “establish the stage of the text prior to the early third century”. The Western tradition then is best understood as a series of developmental stages; and although related, the earlier texts should not be directly equated with the fifth century Codex Bezae (D) (05). It was not until sometime later in the fourth or fifth century that Codex D became the refined product of this ‘Western’ development.

The better, external evidence for the early Western text is found in P³⁸ — not simply because it is more Western than 614, but because the manuscript is far older (third century). This early Western branch is found also in P⁴⁸, and although P²⁹ is very fragmentary, it may also contain Western readings. This is very compelling evidence because there are only six early papyri (P²⁹, P³⁸, P⁴⁵, P⁴⁸, P⁵³, P⁹¹) and one third century parchment (0189) to begin with. Furthermore, although P⁴⁵ shows the “greatest affinity” with the Alexandrian uncials (α, A, B, C), the gospels (Matthew, Luke, and John) exhibit a mix of Alexandrian and Western traditions. Since there are only seven manuscripts that are earlier than [p. 96/150] the third century, it is very difficult “to maintain that the ‘Western’ textual family is significantly less well attested among all early manuscripts”.

There are further reasons to turn back the clock — the alleged agreement between the D text and Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*. In 1923 Souter determined that the “Greek text of Acts, even in its surviving fragments, shows striking observations about Irenaeus’ text of the gospels”. Sanday had also found that “there are close points of contact with fourth century patristic quotations” both in the Gospels *and* in Acts. He states that “there is a distinct possibility that the Latin version of Irenaeus was already accessible to Tertullian when he wrote his treatise against the Valentinians in AD 207. If that is so, its date might be represented as ±200”.

In collaboration with Turner, and his work on the text of the Gospels and Acts (pp. 229-52), Sanday says that although Turner does not “specify any precise date” he “clearly suggests that the translation is considerably early”. In his analysis, Souter explains how the “translator wrote in Africa in the period 370 to 420” CE. A few years later, Ropes, who agrees with this assessment, argues that a “copy of Acts used by Irenaeus was, like his copies of the Gospels and the Pauline epistles, a Greek manuscript [p. 97/150] with a thorough-going ‘Western’ text, showing but few departures from the complete ‘Western’ text”.

More recently, Barrett claims that Irenaeus “is the first Christian author extant to quote Acts *explicitly*. He does so frequently and at length” (my emphasis). Barrett, through his list of examples, shows that there is “no doubt that Irenaeus is often in agreement with readings found in D, in the Old Latin MSS, in the Harclean, or in combinations of these”. Similarly, Tuckett concludes by stating “it is clear how the judgement of Ropes and others [i.e. Barrett, Souter] has been reached: there is clearly a significant level of agreement between the text of Acts presupposed by Irenaeus and the D text of Acts”.

Last, there are many prominent third, fourth and fifth century patristic manuscripts that use the D text. One of the most notable is John Chrysostom (347-407 CE) whose sermons, that showcase Western (and Byzantine) variants, are the “only complete commentary on Acts that has survived from the first ten centuries”. Therefore, it seems very likely that the D text has roots that date “before and perhaps long before, the year 150” CE. [p. 98/150]

3. The Manuscript Record for Acts 28, 11-31

Despite the changing trends in NT textual criticism, one unifying principle among text critics is that the study of the manuscripts themselves remains a prerequisite for making any judgments about a text, or the history of its development. This is somewhat ironic because text critics often have divergent views on everything from choosing a variant, to the overall goals of the discipline. Where some scholars emphasize the need to compare actual manuscripts instead of a set of readings, should not the goal be to include a consideration of both? Consequently, the following three sections will catalogue the extant papyri, uncials and minuscules of Acts (that may or may not include 28, 11-31) and compare them with the NA²⁸. The overall goal is to assess what the variations and changes may (or may not) suggest in light of the grander Western tendencies of

expansion.

a) *Manuscripts with an Alexandrian Ending*

The first manuscript on the docket is P⁷⁴ — which is commonly considered to be the best surviving Acts manuscript to date. The Alands considered P⁷⁴ to be a top manuscript of a “very special quality” used for establishing the original text. Accordingly, it is no surprise that the (diplomatic) text of Acts 28, 11-31 (P⁷⁴) is basically the same as the NA²⁸, starting with verse 11: [μ]ετα δε τρις μηνας [α]νηχθημεν εν πλο[ι]ω [p. 99/150] παρακεχιμακοτ[ι] εν τη νησω αλεξανδρινω παρασημω διοσκοροις. Folio 184 contains verse 12 and most of verse 13 as well. P⁷⁴ has τρις instead of τρεῖς at the end of verse 12. Verses 14-15 are very fragmented but seem to reflect the NA²⁸. At the bottom of the fragment (folio 184) one can see [Τρ]ιων [ταβερνών]. Verse 16 reads: [με]νιν καθ εαυτο[ν] συν τω φυλαττοντι αυτον στρατιωτ[η] and starts with εγενετο in verse 17. P⁷⁴ shows part of απεσταλη and σωτηρι[ον] from Acts 28, 28 (folio 187).

The subsequent fragment contains only two words from verse 30 and the remaining verse 31: [π]ρος αυτον κηρυσσων (The NA²⁸ states that verse 29 is missing from P⁷⁴). The final folio is missing vv. 29-30 and includes the rest of verse 31: [π]ρος αυτον κηρυσ[σ]ων την βασιλειαν [τ]ου θυ̅ και διδασκων [τ]α περι της βασιλιας [ι]υ̅ χυ̅ μετα πασης σωτηριας ακωλυτως. The πραξις [απ]οστολων follows underneath a series of symbols and what looks like a tally count for the scribe. It is doubtful that the non-Alexandrian verse 29 was originally part of this manuscript.

The next manuscript to examine is the fourth century Codex Sinaiticus a (01). Although 01 is known for some Western readings, it follows the NA²⁸ very closely with regards to verses 11, 16, 19, 28-31 with no Western variants in the whole chapter. The fifth century Codex Alexandrinus (A) (02), like Sinaiticus, once contained the whole Bible (and then some). It contains the book of Acts right up until 28, 30: εμεινεν δε διαιτιαν ολην (Ἐνέμεινεν in the NA²⁸). The text does not show any signs of the Western variants. The fourth century B (03) Codex Vaticanus is also a “primary witness for the Alexandrian or Old Uncial text”. Verse 11 reads: Μετὰ δὲ τρεῖς μῆνας ἀνήχθημεν ἐν πλοῖῳ παρακεχειμακότη ἐν τῇ νήσῳ, Ἀλεξανδρίνῳ, παρασήμῳ Διοσκοούροις. Vaticanus contains vv. 12-14 while including καὶ οὕτως εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἦλθαμεν. Verse 15 is the same as the NA²⁸ except that the article οἱ is missing before ἀδελφοὶ and has the *nomem sacrum* θεῶ. Verse 16 is the same with σὺν τῷ φυλάσσοντι αὐτὸν στρατιώτῃ. Verse 28 reads οὖν ὑμῖν ἔστω [p. 100/150] ὅτι instead of οὖν ἔστω ὑμῖν ὅτι. Although verse 29 is absent in B (03), there is a large space between ἀκούσονται (v 28) and Ἐνέμεινεν (v 30)! Verses 30 and 31 are the same with Πράξεις ἀπολστόλον at the end.

E (08), with its biblical majuscule hand, is a sixth or seventh century Graeco-Latin Majuscule that ends with Acts 26, 29 ὁ δὲ Παῦλος (224v) and starts again with Acts 28, 26 πορεύθητι πρὸς τὸν λαόν. Hence, the earlier (pre-verse 26) variants cannot be examined. Verse 28 reads: γνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπεστάλη τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ· αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀκούσοντα[ι]. E shows a true omission for verse 29 between ἀκούσοντα[ι] (verse 28) and Εμινεν (Ἐνέμεινεν) from verse 30. Verse 31 is

identical to the NA²⁸ except that it reads παρρησία instead of παρρησίας. The final words are written below verse 31: Πράξεις τῶν ἀγίων αποστόλων.

The ninth century codex Athous Laurensis (Ψ, 044) does not contain the expanded verse 16 or verse 29. 048, the ‘category II’ fifth century double palimpsest includes the Alexandrian παρασήμερ Διοσκούροις and not the expanded verse 16, 19 or verse 29. 033, the tenth century Byzantine (category V) uncial does not contain verse 29. 1175, the tenth century manuscript, contains the Διοσκούροις of verse 11, but not the extra variants in verse 16, 19 or the extra verse 29. Similarly, the ninth century Codex 2464, and the tenth century Codex 1739, include the Alexandrian Διοσκούροις in verse 11, and not the extra variants in verse 16, 19 or the extra verse 29. Codex 81, which is dated to 1044 CE, reflects the same Alexandrian text as 1739 and 2464 with the addition of πράξεις τῶν αποστόλων at the end (56v). [p. 101/150]

b) *Manuscripts without Acts 28, 11-31*

This section is somewhat of a grey area because unfortunately, most of the earliest papyri (and uncials) do not include Acts 28, 11-31 (irrespective of Alexandrian, Western or a mix of readings): P⁸, P²⁹, P³³, P³⁸, P⁴¹, P⁴⁵, P⁴⁸, P⁵⁰, P⁵³, P⁵⁶, P⁵⁷, P⁹¹, P¹¹², P¹²⁷, 04, 05, 057, 076, 077, 095, 096, 097, 0140, 0165, 0175, 0189, 0236 (Greek and Coptic), 0244 and 0294. Since P²⁹ is counted among “the witnesses to the Western text” it is unfortunate that only Acts 26, 7-8 and verse 20 remains. Likewise, the sixth century fragment P³³ does not contain anything from Acts 28 at all — only Acts 7, 6-10; 7, 13-18; 15, 21-24; 15, 26-32. The Western fragment P³⁸ (which is known to be related to Codex 614) is dated to around the year 300 CE or earlier, and only includes Acts 18, 27-19, 6; 19, 12-16.

Meanwhile P⁴¹, the very fragmentary eighth century papyrus (which includes a Coptic translation) only contains approximately Acts 17, 28-22, 17. P⁴⁵, the third century papyrus contains only Acts 4, 27-17, 17. Another third century papyrus, P⁴⁸, exhibits a Western “type of text” where only Acts 23, 11-17 and 23, 25-29 survived. P⁵⁰ (fourth to fifth century) contains only Act 8, 26-30; 8, 30-32; 10, 26-27; 10, 27-30; 10, 30-31. The third century papyrus, P⁵³, includes only Act 9, 33-10, 1. P⁵⁶, a fifth to sixth century papyrus, includes only Act 1, 1-11. The fourth (to fifth century) papyrus P⁵⁷ contains only Act 4, 36-5, 2; 5, 8-10. The third century papyrus, P⁹¹, includes only Acts 2, 30-37, 46-47; 3, 1-2. P¹¹² (fifth century), contains only Act 26, 31-32; 27, 6-7. P¹²⁷ (fifth century), has only Act 10, 32-17, 10. All of these fragmentary papyri are missing Acts 28, 11-31 — hence, we cannot know with certainty what variants the ending contained — but given that three of the earliest six papyri exhibit Western readings (P²⁹, P³⁸, P⁴⁸), and the proto-Alexandrian P⁹¹ is too fragmentary to be sure, the propensity is certainly there. The same goes for the list of uncials that do not contain Acts 28, 11-31 — the whole of chapter 28 is missing (or destroyed) in every single case (recall list above).

Perhaps the most disappointing for this study is the fifth century Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus C (04) and Codex Bezae D (05) — both are missing Acts 28, 11-31, and both are known for their Western readings. First, it is unfortunate that this difficult to read

twelfth century [p. 102/150] palimpsest C (04) does not contain Acts 28, 5 onwards. Since it is known for its Western readings, it is very possible the end of Acts may have once contained Western variants. Next, although Codex D (=Bezae, 05) is an extremely important manuscript for the greater textual discussion, it is also unfortunate that it is missing the rest of Acts after chapter 22, v. 29b onwards. It is extremely likely that Bezae once contained Western variants in Acts 28 as it is “the most important representative of the so-called Western text”.

Last, 0166 is a tiny fragment worth mentioning that includes a few words from Acts 28, 30 and part of the first word in verse 31. The text is reproduced here as follows:] [δι]ετι [αν ολην εν] [ι]διω [μισθωμα]τι και[απεδεχε]το παν[τας τους] εισπορευ[ομε]νους προ[ς αυτον] κηρυσ[σων την]. It is anyone’s guess if this fragment once contained verse 29 or other any other Western variants. We can only speculate as to the number of variants (Western or otherwise) that were once a part of these ancient texts.

c) *Manuscripts with a Western Ending*

This third section will discuss the manuscripts that exhibit some form of Western (and non-Alexandrian) reading of Acts 28, 11-31. Beyond the known Latin and Syriac manuscripts that contain some of these variants, the following Greek manuscripts meet this criterion: H (014), L (020), P (025), 18, 323, 383, 424, 614, 630, 945, 1241, 1505 and 2412. First on the list is H (014), the ninth century Byzantine codex Mutinensis (43 leaves, 33.0 cm x 23.0 cm) resides in Modena Italy at the Biblioteca Estense — this is an important uncial because it contains only the book [p. 103/150] of Acts. It exhibits the Alexandrian text: παρασήμῳ Διοσκούροις and the expanded verse 16: εἰς Ῥώμην· ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος παρέδωκεν τοὺς δεσμίους τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῳ· τῷ δὲ παύλῳ· ἐπετραπεί (the remaining text here matches the NA²⁸). The text of verse 29 reads: καὶ ταῦτα αὐτοῦ εἰπόντος· ἀπῆλθον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, πολλὴν ἔχοντες ἐν ἑαυτοῖς συζήτησιν·.

Codex Angelicus L (020) is a ninth century Byzantine text that resides in the Institute Biblioteca (Rome). Angelicus has the Διοσκούροις from verse 11 (NA²⁸) and the expanded verse 16 with a few spelling errors/variants: παρέδωκε(ν), στρατοπα(ι)δάρχῳ and στρατιώτ(ι). The text of (verse 29) folio 42v, Col. 2 reads: καὶ ταῦτα αὐτοῦ εἰπόντος· ἀπῆλθον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· πολλὴν ἔχοντες· ἐν ἑαυτοῖς συζητησιν· (the straight upright letters suggests a biblical majuscule style). The scribe makes use of ‘combination’ letters such as found on line 5 where τοῦ, from αὐτοῦ, is morphed into one symbol.

Many of the ninth century (and later) minuscules include the Western variants. Since the majority of the 2,931 plus minuscules have not been examined in detail, it is very likely a good portion of them contain Western variants. Codex 614 (thirteenth century) has been frequently discussed as a known Western manuscript. Due to its “special textual character” and its (potential) relationship to D (05), the Alands considered this to be a category III manuscript. Categories aside, the quality [p. 104/150] of agreement between 614 and 05 is too low; it seems best to think of it as a mixed Byzantine witness.

For example, 614 shows a blend of textual families with some striking similarities with

the NA²⁸ — Acts 28, 11, for example, is the same with the παρασήμῳ Διοσκούροις (which reflects the Alexandrian tradition). Verse 12 is also the same except ἡμέρας τρεῖς is found in reverse order in 614 (metathesis). Verse 13 has περιελθόντες instead of περιελόντες. Meanwhile, verse 14 begins to show some textual cross-pollination that is different from the NA²⁸. It has ἐπ' αὐτοῖς instead of παρ' αὐτοῖς, ἐπιμεῖναντες instead of ἐπιμεῖναι, and εἰς Ραμὴν ἦλθομεν instead of εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἦλθαμεν. Verse 15 has ἡμῶν ἐξηλθον instead of ἡμῶν ἦλθαν and ἄχρις Απφίου instead of ἄχρι Ἀππίου. Most notable is how verse 16 contains this extra, sizable, text following εἰς Ῥώμην: ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος παρέδωκε τοὺς δεσμίους τῷ στρατοπεδάρχη· τῷ δὲ παύλῳ ἐπετραπή μένειν καθ' ἐ-αυτὸν ἕξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς.

Verse 19 also contains this extra variant after Ἰουδαίων and before ἡναγκάσθην: καὶ ἐπικραζόντων αἶρε τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἡμῶν (and cried out, “Away with our enemy”). Further additions (v. 19) follow κατηγορεῖν (NA²⁸)/ κατηγορήσαι· (614): ἀλλ' ἵνα λυτρώσωμαι τὴν ψυχὴν μου ἐκ θανάτου· (but in order that I might free my soul from death). Verse 28 is the same except it has an interesting *nomen sacrum*: σ ρ̄ιον for σ[ωτή]ριον. The additional verse 29 is also found in 614 (80v): καὶ ταῦτα αὐτοῦ εἰπόντος ἀπῆλθον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· πολλὴν ἔχοντες ἐν ἑαυτ[οῖς] συζήτησιν.

There are several interesting peculiarities about verse 29. First, the scribe is attentive to all accents, breathing marks, and diaeresis marks — one sits above the first Ἰ in Ἰουδαῖοι, the second is found in συζήτησιν. Also, ἑαυτοῖς is missing the second half of the word: οῖς. Since the last [p. 105/150] letter of line 18 is a τ, and the following word συζήτησιν begins with a σ, it is easy to see how the copying error occurred (due to ὁμ.). Verse 30 is mostly the same except it has the conjunction οὖν instead of δὲ plus ἰουδαίους τε καὶ ἑλλήνας·. Verse 31 reveals an interesting error in a triad of *nomina sacra*: κῡ κῡ ω̄ · instead of (κυρίου, Ἰησοῦ, Χριστοῦ).

4. Evaluation of the End of Acts Variants

In the final analysis, it seems that, on the one hand, there is sufficient evidence to show an early origin of the Western text. On the other, there remains a general lack of consensus concerning theories of what came first and how the texts of Acts developed. Even among pro-Alexandrian scholars, there are those who suggest that the Western text has its roots in the early second century (and earlier). There are also a growing number of scholars who are finding sufficient value in studying the variants for their intrinsic worth and the light they can shed on the historical development of the text (beyond a need to establish an initial or original text).

So what is the value of these variants in Acts 28, 11-31 — “what do they suggest”? Perhaps it is better to ask, “What do they *not* suggest”? The goal as stated in the introduction is to understand the significance of the variants in light of the known Western tendencies. These tendencies, though often debated, exhibit one unifying characteristic since [p. 106/150] Westcott and Hort onwards — and that is *expansion*. However, as we have seen, the differences among the manuscripts with respect to Acts

28, 11-31 are relatively colourless. The end of Acts begs for an answer to what happened to Paul — his appeal to Caesar and upcoming trial (Acts 25, 11). At the same time this triumphant ending begs for at least a scribal note concerning the catastrophic events that soon followed! And yet not one single extant manuscript of Acts says anything about either. So what conclusions can be drawn from the evidence?

The greatest observation is, in fact, a negative one. The so-called Western variants do *not* present any major theological, social, cultural or historical differences as compared with the Alexandrian text. Given the generally accepted tendency for Western scribe(s) to expand on the text of Acts, intrinsic probabilities implies that a Western editor would capitalize on the story line and present a much more colourful ending to Acts. Everything culminates with the hero of the story (Paul) in house arrest and awaiting trial in Rome (vv. 16, 30). In recent times, a variety of literary or narrative solutions have been offered, but these do not account for the colourless expansions in light of Roman and Jewish history in the mid 60's CE. Is it reasonable to suppose that the later versions of Acts were published well into the late first or early second century, decades apart from the first draft while betraying no major differences in the end of the narrative? No, it is more reasonable to suggest that the variants are comparable in age. The gap between the first draft and the later stages of its transmission is minor, represented by months and years — and not decades.

Not only is the author of Acts (in 28, 11-31) silent with regards to the terrible events that affected the Roman Empire, the city of Rome, and the church in the mid 60's CE, the Western scribes and editors are also equally silent. In my opinion, the earliest and simplest explanation (that Luke knew no more) should be given greater attention because of [p. 107/150] the combined silence of *all* the variants. Great literary efforts (often divorced from a study of the variants and especially the historical context of Acts 28) have been given to explain away this silence through various literary methodologies and theories of foreshadowing without addressing the foundation of history and lower criticism first. If a scribe would take the time to provide additional details about Paul's imprisonment with regards to the captain of the guard (τῷ στρατοπεδάρχῳ) in Acts 28, 16, how could the same scribe fail to narrate Paul's martyrdom, the dying multitudes of Christians and victims of the great fire of Rome, the Jewish War with Rome, or the destruction of Jerusalem and its Temple? There is not so much as a marginal notation anywhere, in any textual strata of Acts.

The burden of proof must be shifted back to scholars who claim that the end of Acts evinces sophisticated literary devices not only by the [p. 108/150] original author, but across the entire manuscript record. Is it realistic to argue that all of these scribes, writing from different geographical areas, faithfully maintained the same silence throughout the first and second century? Surely the later Western redactor(s) and scribes would say something of the obvious about Paul, his trial and death, or the destruction of the Temple or Jerusalem itself? How completely out of context is the picture of Paul's peaceful relationship with the Roman authorities and his free preaching — that spans the entire manuscript record — given the events that followed the narrative?

The city of Rome takes center stage in Acts 28 and yet every textual variant examined in this essay fails to mention the city's greatest disaster — the fire of Rome in 64 CE that turned 70% of the city into ashes, along with a sizable portion of the Christian population as a result of the subsequent Neronian persecution. Only a madman with the talents of Shakespeare could invent such an ending if these events had already passed. [p. 109/150]

Concluding Observations: The End of Acts and the Comparable Age of its Variants

Whatever date one ascribes to the text(s) of Act 28, 11-32, they are comparable in age, especially when factoring the modest expansions that betray no clear knowledge of the aftermath of Paul (the book's hero), nor the destruction of Rome and Jerusalem (the book's central locations), nor the Jewish Temple (the book's central institution). For all the Western tendencies for expansion, there is not one reference to these tragic events anywhere in the manuscript record of Acts. Nor are there any clearly significant theological expansions that reflect a later state of the church's life or theology. These observations further strengthen Epp's observation regarding the "comparable age" of the B and D text clusters. Given the lack of expansion, it is proposed that the age of the variants should be dated within relative proximity to the events of the mid and late 60's CE that impacted Rome, Judaica and the church in remarkable ways.

Karl Leslie ARMSTRON
18 Kinnell St.
Hamilton, ON L8R 2J7
CANADA

k.l.armstronge@gmail.com
[p. 110/150]

1. C. K. Barrett, "The End of Acts", in ed. Cancik et al (eds.), *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion: Festschrift Für Martin Hengel (Frühes Christentum, vol. 3; Tübingen 1996)* 545-55 (555).

2. The mystery of Acts 28 is noted in: Loveday C. A. Alexander, *Acts in Its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles* (London 2005) 207; Daniel Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian: Writing the "Acts of the Apostles"* (Cambridge 2002) 205-30 and more recently: Troy M. Troftgruben, *A Conclusion Unhindered: A Study of the Ending of Acts within Its Literary Environment* (WUNT 2/280; Tübingen 2010) 23.

3. Troy M. Troftgruben, *A Conclusion Unhindered* and Charles B. Puskas, *The Conclusion of Luke-Acts: The Significance of Acts 28:16-31* (Eugene 2009).

4. Ropes laments that "it is unfortunate that no better name should be at hand". Cf. J. H. Ropes, "The Text of Acts", in Kirsopp Lake, Frederick John Foakes-Jackson, and James Hardy Ropes, *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I: The Acts of the Apostles. Volume III: The Text of Acts* (5 vols.; London 1926) xvii-cccxx (quotation from Ropes's preface on p. vii). Likewise, Tuckett says the 'Western' text is misleading: Christopher Tuckett, "How Early is the 'Western' Text of Acts?", in Tobias Nicklas and Michael Tilly (eds.), *The Book of Acts as Church History: Textual Traditions and Ancient Interpretations* (BZNW 120; Berlin 2003) 69-86 (70). Some scholars

(most notably Parker) have seriously called into question the validity of text-types, and notes how the Western text-type differs “from each other almost as much”. D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge 2008) 171. Porter also observes how the discipline is in a “state of flux” where the “methods of categorizing and using manuscripts are undergoing serious revaluation”. Stanley E. Porter, *How We Got the New Testament: Text, Transmission, Translation* (Grand Rapids 2013) 57. I am in general agreement with Elliot’s emphasis on the text-types as “family allegiances between mss” and Epp’s classification as “clusters” in a looser sense as the variants in this study show. Cf. J. K. Elliot, *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles. Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation* (NovTSup 137; Leiden 2010) 7 and Epp’s article on “The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism”, in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee (eds.), *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids 1993), 83-108.

5. Cf. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, “Introduction”, in Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger (eds.), *The Early Text of the New Testament* (Oxford Scholarship Online, 2012) <http://www.oxfordscholarship.com>, 1-19 (5) in reference to Ehrman’s principle in: “The Text as Window: New Testament Manuscripts and the Social History of Early Christianity”, in Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (eds.), *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research* (Grand Rapids 1995) 361-79.

6. F. G. Kenyon, *The Text of the Greek Bible; a Students’ Handbook* (London 1949) 171. Cadbury sees the two texts in Acts as “so similar as to be not independent, so different as not to be merely the accumulation of usual variants in copying, has posed to scholars a difficult if not insoluble problem. How did two such texts arise?” H. J. Cadbury, *The Book of Acts in History* (London 1955) 149.

7. Joël Delobel, “The Text of Luke-Acts. A Confrontation of Recent Theories”, in J. Verheyden (ed.), *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (BETL CXLII; Leuven 1999), 83-107 (106). Metzger considers the “evaluation of the ‘Western type of text’ to be “one of the most persistent problems in New Testament textual criticism”. Cf. B. M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (3rd ed.; New York 1992) 293. Epp relays how the Western/Alexandrian textual controversy “really has not been resolved” and the obvious bias from Westcott and Hort continues through to the Alands’ who obviously “pre-judged” the D-text manuscripts and in a sense they had been already “sent into exile”. See: E. J. Epp, “Traditional ‘Canons’ of New Testament Criticism: Their Value, Validity, and Viability-or Lack Thereof”, in Klaus Wachtel and Michael Holmes (eds.), *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research* (Leiden 2012) 79-127 (99-100).

8. There have been several studies on the broader “texts” of Acts: C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles* (2 vols., ICC; Edinburgh 1998); M. E. Boismard, “The Text of Acts: A Problem of Literary Criticism”, in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee (eds.), *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis—Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger* (Oxford 1981) 147-57; Joël Delobel, “Focus on the ‘Western’ Text in Recent Studies”, *ETL* 73 (1997) 401-10; Delobel, “Luke-Acts”, 83-107; Peter Head, “Acts and the Problem of Its Texts” in Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke (eds.), *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting. The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting* (vol. 1; Grand Rapids 1993) 415-44; F. G. Kenyon, “The Western Text in the Gospels and Acts”, *PBA* 24 (1939) 287-315. B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (4th ed.; New York 1994) 222-36; S. E. Porter, “Developments in the Text of Acts before the Major Codices”, in Tobias Nicklas and Michael Tilly (eds.), *The Book of Acts as Church History: Textual Traditions and Ancient Interpretations* (BZNW 120; Berlin 2003) 31-68; W. A. Strange, *The Problem of the Text of Acts* (SNTSMS 71; Cambridge 1992) 1-34 and especially: Christopher Tuckett, “How Early”, 69-86 and his more recent article: “The Early Text of Acts”, in Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger (eds.), *The Early Text of the New Testament* (Oxford Scholarship Online: <http://www.oxfordscholarship.com>, 2012) 1-20.

9. See: Delobel, “Luke-Acts”, 106 and Head, “Acts”, 415-44 (415) respectively.

10. Prior to WWII, historical concerns took center stage in Acts studies as exemplified by the massive (and still useful) work: Kirsopp Lake, Frederick John Foakes-Jackson, and James Hardy Ropes (eds.), *The Beginnings of Christianity* (5 vols.; London 1926). Afterwards, the pendulum swung from historical concerns to an unbalanced emphasis on the theology and literary motives of Luke. Since the 1990’s, attempts were made to revisit the historical context of Acts once more. See: D. W. J. Gill, I. H. Marshall and B. W. Winter, “Preface”, in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*, ix-xii and especially, Colin Hemer, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (Tübingen 1989) 1-29.

11. Although there are many studies on the Western theological tendencies, some have challenged Epp’s earlier (1966) thesis [E. J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* (Cambridge 1992)] and since then have not found any great differences between the author Of Acts and the Western variants. Cf. Strange, W. A, *Problem*, 26-27 (65) and C. K. Barrett, “Is there a Theological Tendency in Codex Bezae”, in E. Best and R. McL. Wilson *Text and Interpretation* (Studies Presented to Matthew Black; Cambridge 1979), 15-27

(25-27). However, it seems that Epp, at the very least, generated greater attention towards the variants of Acts at a key turning point in Acts scholarship. G. D. Kilpatrick, review of E. J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts, Vigiliae Christianae* 24 (1970) 166-70.

12. Epp claims that a “defensible argument can still be made for their comparable age”. Cf. Epp, “Traditional ‘Canons’”, 100.

13. See: K. L. Armstrong, “A New Plea for an Early Date of Acts”, *JGRChJ* 3 (2017) 79-110. Mittelstaedt also argues for an early date and concludes that Acts was written in 62 CE. I am grateful to Dr. Mittelstaedt who was kind enough to send me a copy of his valuable book: Alexander Mittelstaedt, *Lukas als Historiker: Zur Datierung des lukanischen Doppelwerkes* (TANZ 43; Tübingen 2006) 251–55. For the most recent attempts to date Acts into the early second century: Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: Defining Struggle* (Columbia 2006) and Richard I. Pervo, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa, California 2006). Others remain unconvinced: F. Scott Spencer, Review of *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*, by R. I. Pervo and *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle*, by Joseph B. Tyson. *Interpretation* April (2008) 190-93 and R. C. Tannehill, Review of *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*, by R. I. Pervo. *CBQ* 69 (2007) 827-28. While Pervo and Tyson barely address the positions of scholars from the early and middle groups, they also neglect historical concerns in favour of shaky (and previously discounted) dependency theories on Josephus and Marcion. However, it seems entirely possible (though notoriously debated) that Acts relies on Paul’s letters (at least in some ways). Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 145. But to argue that Paul’s letters were not published until 100 CE is unsubstantiated (Tannehill, Review of *Dating Acts*, 828). Furthermore, it seems entirely fanciful and anachronistic to argue that Luke-Acts was written as a reaction to Marcion 120-125 CE when he was gathering his followers. Tyson, *Marcion*, 78, 127. It makes much greater sense to argue the opposite, especially where the destruction of Jerusalem, its Holy Temple and institutions (that occurred some 50 plus years before Marcion), are woven into every fabric of Luke-Acts.

14. Delobel, “Luke-Acts”, 83; This popular phrase hails from: Erich Maria Remarque, *Im Westen nichts Neues* (Berlin 1928).

15. See: Kenyon, “The Western Text”, 299.

16. My initial research has led me to agree (in principle) with Ropes’s original 1926 assessment that “a definite Western text, whether completely recoverable in its original form or not, once actually existed”. Cf. Ropes, *Acts*, viii.

17. Where Metzger (*Text*, 207) sees “the reconstruction of the history of a variant reading” as a “prerequisite to forming a judgement about it”, Kenyon (*Greek Bible*, 253) sees the comprehension of the history of the NT text as “the final goal of textual criticism”.

18. Some text critics are adamant that the best we can hope for is an initial text (*Ausgangstext*). See: Elliot, *Textual Criticism*, 7. For a contrary view see: Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, *Fundamentals of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids 2015) 1-6.

19. While Marshall includes a brief note on the *stratopedarch* found in the expanded verse 16 of some Western texts, and verse 29, he does not refer to the Western ‘omissions’ found in Acts 28, 11, 28, 12-14a, or the addition of verse 19, and the extended verse 31. I. Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Repr., 1980. TNTC; Leicester 2008) 439-47 (446).

20. Strange, *Problem*, 1. For example, Puskas dismisses the Western variants in favour of the “the superior Alexandrian text”. Puskas, *Conclusion*, 25, 92 n.78. Meanwhile others ignore the variants entirely! E.g. David J. Williams, *Acts* (NIBC; Peabody 2002) 446-55.

21. Ropes, *Acts*, ix. Parker maintains that the early second century Western text of Acts (and possibly earlier) can be found among the Old Latin, Syriac and D text. D. C. Parker, “Codex Bezae: The Manuscript as past, Present and Future”, in Scot McKendrick and Orlaith O’sullivan (eds.), *The Bible as Book: the Transmission of the Greek Text* (London 2003) 43-50 (48-49).

22. Delobel, “Luke-Acts”, 83.

23. Delobel, “Luke-Acts”, 83. The opposition from pro-Western scholars is so great that it almost “looks like a conspiracy against the dominant critical text” (p. 96). Joël Delobel, “Focus on the ‘Western’ Text in Recent Studies”, *ETL* 73 (1997) 401-10.

24. Delobel, “Luke-Acts”, 83; M. E. Boismard and A. Lamouille, *Le texte occidental des Actes des Apôtres: Reconstitution et rehabilitation* (Synthèse 17; Paris 1984).

25. Barbara Aland, “Entstehung, Charakter und Herkunft des sog. Westlichen Textes untersucht an der Apostelgeschichte. (Formation, caractère et provenance du Texte occidental: le cas des Actes des Apôtres)”, *ETHL* 62 (1986) 5-65 (6). Boismard and Lamouille’s 1984 work shifted her viewpoint. Delobel, “Luke-Acts”, 83.

26. It is beyond question that two editions (or versions) of Acts exists. Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:26; Metzger,

Commentary, 222.

27. See: Kenyon, "The Western Text", 299. The two editions are related. Cf. Porter, "Developments", 33. The two edition view goes back at least as far as Jean Leclerc in 1684 (Semler had also suggested that Hemsterhuis was of a similar view). In 1871 Lightfoot revived it while F. Blass (in 1895) presented this idea in full detail. For Blass the Western text of Acts is earlier, while the Gospel is later. See Kenyon (p. 299) and Porter, *New Testament*, 62; Boismard and Lamouille, *Le texte Occidental*, 1:ix; "Le texte Occidental des Actes des apôtres. À propos d'Actes 27, 1-13", *ETL* 63 (1987) 48-58; Boismard, "The Text of Acts", 147-57 and for the original proposal see: F. Blass, *Acta Apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter* (Göttingen 1895), 24-32 and: idem, *Philology of the Gospels?*.

28. Cf. Porter, "Developments", 34.

29. Boismard and Lamouille, *Le texte occidental*, 1:5. Boismard employs indirect evidence — "les petits, les obscurs, les sans grade" (1:9) as noted by: Delobel, "Luke-Acts", 89-96 (88). See also: Paul Tavadon, *Le texte alexandrin et le texte occidental des Actes des Apôtres: doublets et variantes de structure* (vol. 37; Paris 1997).

30. Porter, "Developments", 34.

31. Porter, "Developments", 34. Westcott, Hort, Kenyon, Dibelius, and Ropes all held to this view. The variant readings could have began as early as the first draft of Acts was written in the mid 60's CE. Strange thinks Luke left marginal notations in his first draft which later became the Western text. Cf. Strange, *Problem*, 185-89. Delobel agrees with Strange's view in that the Western readings are "(narrative or theological) commentary" (p. 105). Head, however, critiques Strange's thesis noting the "several weaknesses in his approach" especially the dubious assumption that Luke's annotations were somehow kept separately over 80 years. Head, "Acts", 427. The various Bezan correctors suggest an evolution of the text where marginal notations may have entered the text early on. Cf. Parker, "Codex Bezae", 43-50, but especially p. 48. See also: Delobel, "Luke-Acts", 91-2. Last, the view that Luke left his work unfinished is not a new one. Troftgruben, *A Conclusion Unhindered*, 12.

32. Clark modified his position later to show the "conscious editorial effort" by the editor who "created the Alexandrian text". Cf. Porter, "Developments", 35 and Kenyon's critique of Clark in: Kenyon, "The Western Text", 287-315.

33. Porter, "Developments", 35. Here Porter argues for Alexandrian priority while the Western text evinces later editorial activity. Head, explains how this Alexandrian "consensus is clearly reflected in the texts of the favoured modern editions of the Greek New Testament (NA²⁶, UBS³)". Head, "Acts", 415-44 (419). Likewise Metzger explains how the Committee "more often than not" preferred "the shorter, Alexandrian text". Metzger, *Commentary*, 235. He also claims "the information incorporated in certain Western expansions may well be factually accurate, though not deriving from the original author of Acts" (p. 235).

34. Delobel, "Luke-Acts", 88 and Édouard Delebecque, *Les Deux Actes des Apôtres* (Études bibliques 6; Paris 1986).

35. Delobel, "Luke-Acts", 94. Amphoux's work on the gospels supports an early date of the text.

36. Josep Rius-Camps, *Commentari als Fets dels Apòstols* (4 vols.; Barcelona 1991-2000); Delobel, "Luke-Acts", 95. See also Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism* (JSNTS 236; London 2002) and the their combined work in: Josep Rius-Camps and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition* (4 vols. LNTS 415. London 2009).

37. Read-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts* (abstract). She proposes that the Bezan text is earlier because it "displays an exceptional degree of linguistic consistency and a coherence of purpose which is essentially theological, with a marked interest in a Jewish point of view".

38. Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger, *The Message of Acts*, 4:12.

39. They believe that their extended Bezan text is one that "preserves a voice of the Church in the first decades of its existence". Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger, *The Message of Acts*, 4:ix.

40. See: Parker, *Introduction*, 288 and 298; Porter, "Developments", 66-7. Parker further suggests that the Bezan text "is not a defined text... We have not a text, but a genre". Cf. Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 284.

41. Head, "Acts", 444.

42. Delobel, "Luke-Acts", 96.

43. Delobel, "Luke-Acts", 96.

44. Delobel, "Luke-Acts", 103. See my note 47 below (esp. Comfort and Barrett's remarks).

45. Delobel, "Luke-Acts", 98-106 (102).

46. See: Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Edition and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism* (Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes; 2d ed.; Grand Rapids 1989), 54-64 and also: Aland, "Charakter und Herkunft", 5-65. B. Aland claims that the Western text

“cannot be traced back to a period earlier than the early third century”. Cf. also: Tuckett, “How Early”, 70. While Boismard considers the Western text to be the original, B. Aland considers it to be a corruption of the Alexandrian text, which “remained much closer to the autographs”. Delobel, “Luke-Acts”, 91.

47. Porter considers the age of P³⁸ to be close to 300 CE while P⁴⁸ can be dated to the late third century. Porter, *New Testament*, 63. Cp. Metzger, *Commentary*, 5* and Aland and Aland, *Text*, 98-99. Comfort and Barrett suggest P³⁸ is “late second or early third century” while (via Sanders) they state that the form is close to P. Oxy. 843 (late second century), P. Oxy 1607 (late second or early third century), and that other “comparable examples of this kind of handwriting can be seen in P. Oxy. 37 (ca. 200), P. Oxy. 405 (ca. 200), and P. Oxy. 406 (early third century)”. Cf. Philip W. Comfort and David P. Barrett, *The Complete Text of the Earliest New Testament Manuscripts* (Grand Rapids 1999) 135. Perhaps further research on the form and hand of such texts (i.e. P³⁸) may push the date back further. They also state that P³⁸ (in addition to D, P²⁹, and P⁴⁸) is “representative of the ‘Western’ form of the Book of Acts” (p. 135).

48. Aland’s “Hauptredaktor”, the ancient Western redactor/editor, produced the extra Bezan material. Tuckett, “How Early”, 70.

49. See: Tuckett, “How Early”, 75. At the same time, the similarities between 614 and 2412 are compelling. Aland and Aland, *Text*, 137. Acts 28, 29, for example, is almost exactly the same in 614 (including the diaeresis above the ι’s) — except συζήτησιν contains a marked ð. Similar to Aland, Kenyon earlier considered 1571 and 1165 each to be an “unquestionably Western text of Acts” and this shows how “texts of this type existed in Egypt in the fourth century”. Cf. Kenyon, “The Western Text”, 314. Meanwhile, Tuckett considers 614 to be a “Byzantine manuscript rather than ‘Western’”. Tuckett, “How Early”, 75; and also Kurt Aland, *Text und Textwert der Griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments III: Die Apostelgeschichte* (2 vols. Berlin 1993) 1.135. Further, Strange considers 383 and 614 to be a Byzantine text-type with some Western readings. Strange, *Problem*, 11. Strange’s assessment is reasonable based on my analysis of Acts 28, 11-31.

50. Tuckett, “How Early”, 70-71.

51. Some date Bezae earlier, while some prefer later. See: Barrett, *Acts*, 1:5.

52. Tuckett, “How Early”, 72, 75. In 1927, Sanders dated the fragment “as early as 200-250 CE” (Tuckett p.71); H. A. Sanders, “A Papyrus Fragment of Acts in the Michigan Collection”, *HTR* 20 (1927) 1-19.

53. Tuckett, “How Early”, 73.

54. Tuckett, “The Early Text of Acts”, 1 and his note 1 on p. 13. Comfort notes that while P⁵³ and P⁹¹ are both ‘proto-Alexandrian’, the latter is “too fragmentary to be sure”. Cf. Phillip Comfort, *Encountering the Manuscripts: An Introduction to New Testament Paleography & Textual Criticism* (Nashville 2005) 64 and 79.

55. Comfort, *Manuscripts*, 66. Kenyon, in his *editio princeps* thought the original order was Western (Matthew, John, Luke and then Acts). Frederic G. Kenyon, *Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri II/1: The Gospels and Acts, Text* (London 1933); *II/2: The Gospels and Acts, Plates* (London 1934). It may be worth following up with a detailed study of the version of Acts in P⁴⁵ especially where Colwell showed how the scribe did not copy word for word (i.e. P⁷⁵), but phrase per phrase, freely omitting material. Cf. Ernst Colwell, “Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of P⁴⁵, P⁶⁶, P⁷⁵”, in Ernst Colwell (ed.), *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (New Testament Tools and Studies 9; Leiden 1969) 106-24 (118-19). Royse also found that the scribe had a “marked tendency to omit portions of the text, often (as it seems) accidentally but perhaps also deliberately pruning”. James Royse, “Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri” (PhD dissertation, Graduate Theological Union) 156.

56. Tuckett, “How Early”, 74.

57. It is remarkable that a second century writer employed Western readings. The traditional view (contra B. Aland, “Charakter und Herkunft”, 43-56), has been defended by Barrett, *Acts*, 1:15-18 and Tuckett, “How Early”, 76-82. The Latin translation of Irenaeus’s book is considered to be “a faithful one”. Delobel, “Luke-Acts”, 103.

58. Sanday et al. *Novum Testamentum Sancti Irenaei Episcopi Lugdunensis* (Oxford 1923) clxiv.

59. Sanday et al., *Sancti Irenaei*, clxv.

60. Sanday et al., *Sancti Irenaei*, lxiii. He cautions that it should not be dated “too near the actual completion of the Greek Irenaeus” because there is evidence of development between the Greek and Latin versions (p. lxiii).

61. Sanday et al., *Sancti Irenaei*, lxiv. Based on Turner’s comments, Sanday gives the Latin translation a third century dating.

62. Sanday et al., *Sancti Irenaei*, xcvi. Sanday agrees with Souter’s assessment (p. lxiv). Souter relays the earlier opinion of Hort who also suggested that the “true date of the translation is the fourth century. The inferior limit is fixed by the quotations made from it by Augustine about 421” (p. lxv). See: B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek* (Cambridge 1882) 160. Ropes accepts Souter’s translation estimate of 370 to 420 CE. Ropes, *Acts*, clxxxvii.

63. Ropes, *Acts*, clxxxvii.
64. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:15. He compares the D text with Irenaeus (*Haer.* 3) on pp. 16-17.
65. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:16 and Parker: “Codex Bezae: The Manuscript”, 48-49.
66. Tuckett, “How Early”, 82. Delobel explains how the date of the *Hauptredaktion* may be subject to change pending further research on the “longer readings in Irenaeus”. Delobel, “Luke-Acts”, 104. He goes on to say the *Hauptredaktion* would only “need a (somewhat) earlier dating” and “not the rejection of the theory as such” (p. 104). Remarkably Irenaeus mirrors the Western theological tendencies such as the modified Apostolic Degree with the absence of “things strangled”, the added Golden rule, and the longer reading in Acts 15, 29 (Tuckett, “How Early”, 85). All of this evidence from Irenaeus leads him to a second century date for the Western text (or earlier). Tuckett’s research (and the earlier work of Ropes, Souter, Westcott and Hort), challenges B. Aland’s assessment (p. 86).
67. Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian (third century), Eusebius of Caesarea, Lucifer of Cagliari, Athanasius of Alexandria, Cyril of Jerusalem (fourth century), Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, Cyril of Alexandria, Speculum, and the venerable Bede (fifth century). Eusebius of Caesarea shows a curious “mixture of Old Uncial and Western readings” Barrett, *Acts*, 1:18-20 (19).
68. Quasten, “The Golden Age”, 3:440. Chrysostom’s work is especially significant because the “ancient commentaries on Acts are few” (Troftgruben, *A Conclusion Unhindered*, 22). Chrysostom’s text is “basically Antiochian, as one might be expected, but shows from time to time awareness of Western variations”. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:20. Chrysostom quotes the Alexandrian version of Acts 28, 11-16 similar to Codex 614, but with the addition of verse 29.
69. Ropes, *Acts*, ccxlv. Ropes (along with Jackson and Lake) conclude that the Western text (ironically) hails from the East and “perhaps in Syria or Palestine” (ccxlv). They further suggest that the revisers aim was to “improve the text, not to restore it, and he lived not far from the time when the New Testament canon in its nucleus was first definitely assembled” (ccxlv).
70. Metzger, *Text*, 207; Porter, “Developments”, 32, 36 and; Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 1.
71. For a helpful comparison of the traditional and socio-historical goals for the discipline see: Porter and Pitts, *Fundamentals*, 1-6.
72. Porter, “Developments”, 36.
73. My aim is to try and find “likely motives for the perceived changes throughout the tradition” while appreciating “all variants as part of the living text” (Elliot, *Textual Criticism*, 49). Refer also to: Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford 1993) and Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge 1997).
74. P⁷⁴ is a sixth or seventh century manuscript (from the Bodmer collection in Geneva) that contains a large portion of Acts. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31; New York 1998) 47.
75. Category I, so Aland and Aland, *Text*, 101. The scale of quality (on p. 106) is from 1 (being the best) to 5 (being the worst). Barrett further notes the “general agreement with a A B, that is, the Old Uncial, or Alexandrian text”. Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:3. For criticism of the circular nature of the Alands’ categories see: B. M. Metzger and B. D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (4th ed.; New York 2005) 238 and also J. K. Elliott, “The Early Text of the Catholic Epistles”, in Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Krueger (eds.), *The Early Text of the New Testament* (Oxford 2012) 204-24 (209).
76. The missing breathing marks and accents reflect the manuscript. Some of the Western versions omit Μετὰ δὲ τρεῖς μῆνας and παρασήμῳ Διοσκοῦροις. See also: Boismard, *Le Texte Occidental*, 424. Διοσκοῦροις is the usual Attic spelling of the word where ου represents the Hellenistic form. Barrett, *Acts*, 2:128.
77. For a descriptive list of the uncials see: Aland and Aland, *Text*, 107-28 and Barrett, *Acts*, 1:4-7.
78. It is no surprise to find the διοσκοῦροις in verse 11(316v) with no expanded verse 16 or the additional verse 29. In verse 16 it has μὲνιν instead of μένειν (NA²⁸) with πράξεις αποστολων at the very end.
79. Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:5. For its Egyptian roots see: Ropes, *Acts*, xlv-xlviii.
80. Notice the variant spelling τρεῖς instead of τρις in P⁷⁴.
81. οὕτως is missing in some Western texts. Cf. Boismard, *Le Texte Occidental*, 424.
82. Though speculative, it is possible the scribe was aware of v. 29.
83. Note the spelling variation of Πράξεις in 03 as compared with P⁷⁴.
84. Latin is on the left of the manuscript, with Greek on the right. E is housed in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. E’s physical dimensions are 27.0 x 22.0 cm with 227 leaves.
85. τοῦτο is missing from ἀπεστάλη [τοῦτο] τὸ σωτήριον.
86. The ι is likely buried between the parchment pages. Verse 30 is the same except for Εμινεν instead of

Ἐνέμεινεν (NA²⁸). The last few letters of εἰσπορευομένων is hard to decipher.

87. The last word of verse 31 is usually ἀκολύτως. Here it is found with a variant spelling and is followed by an ἁμήν.

88. Aland and Aland, *Text*, 118.

89. This manuscript is not indexed for Acts (INTF).

90. Folio 52v includes the extra ἁμήν and the signature πράξεις αποστόλων.

91. There may be, however, evidence of redaction due to the large space between verse 28 and 30 in 033, 1175, 1739 (and 03).

92. The last word of verse 13 shows: ποτιελους·|corrector: ποτιολους (INTF). The indexing is off by one page (cf. 55r). The final word ἄποστόλων is written as a unique *nomen sacrum*. The ἄ has the breathing mark and a long, flowing accent, followed by two π's with large dots above them.

93. Uncial 066 does contain Acts 28, 8-17 and shows no sign of Western expansion or omission.

94. Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:2. A Western version of Acts 28, 11-31 is likely.

95. P³⁸ could be dated earlier (see my note 47 on the issue).

96. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:3.

97. There is “considerable” interest in P¹²⁷. See: Tuckett, “The Early Text of Acts”, 13.

98. Recall the discussion above: Tuckett, “How Early”, 74 and Comfort, *Manuscripts*, 64 and 69.

99. Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:5 and Ropes, *Acts*, lv.

100. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:6.

101. This 5.0 by 7.0 cm gem is housed in Heidelberg Germany at the Zentrum für Altertumswissenschaften (ZAW), Institut für Papyrologie. James 1:11 is found on the verso (INTF).

102. The following manuscripts contain the expanded version of verse 16: gig, p, sy^{h2}, and sa. Verse 29 is also found in: vg^{cl} and sy^{h2}. In some manuscripts (p, vg^{mss} and sy^h) verse 31 has this extended ending: *dicens quia hic est Christus Jesus filius dei per quem incipiet totus mundus iudicari*.

103. The following manuscripts include some version of the expanded text that includes the στρατοπεδάρχῳ found in Acts 28, 16: 1241 (στρατοπεδάρχῳ), 18, 323, 614, 630 and 945 (στρατοπεδάρχῃ). Verse 29 is found in: P (025) (ninth century, folio 248, col 1); 323 (very decorative and clear, twelfth century); 383 (very clear, thirteenth century); 945 (eleventh century); 424 (eleventh century); 630 (twelfth to thirteenth century). Notice how συζήτησιν in 630 has the ü but not ï (cp. 614 and 2412). 1241, the very decorative twelfth century text, includes verse 29 (note the decorative picture of Paul with a halo, 137r). See also the decorative thirteenth century manuscript 1505 that shows v. 29 but the αὐτοῦ εἰπόντος is reversed (136v).

104. Compare this with 614's reading below: ἐπετράπη μένειν καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς.

105. The book ends with: πράξεις τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων.

106. Cf. Porter and Pitts, *Fundamentals*, 47. Here 020 has the same Greek text as 614 and 2412.

107. Where 2412 contains the extra diaeresis, 020 shows no accent or diaeresis markings at all. There is an abrasion here along with ἔ[χο]ντες on line 7.

108. Aland and Aland, *Text*, 128.

109. Cf. Aland and Aland, *Text*, p. 128; L. Vaganay, *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (edited by C. B. Amphoux and translated by J. Heimerdinger; Cambridge 1991), 22 and Parker's discussion on Byzantine manuscripts and text-types in general: *Introduction*, 171-74. The lack of attention to the minuscules has long been observed. Wisse, for example, remarks how “lower criticism seems to have become the study of what to do when Codex Vaticanus and P75 disagree”, while “a study of the minuscules could change this situation”. Wisse, *The Profile Method for Classifying and Evaluating Manuscript Evidence* (Studies and Documents, 44; Grand Rapids 1984), 5 as noted by Michael Holmes, “From Nestle to the *Editio Critica Maior*: A Century's Perspective on the New Testament Minuscule Tradition”, in *The Bible as Book*, 129. For an up-to-date list of manuscripts visit: <http://www.uni-muenster.de/INTF>.

110. This ‘second order’ witness (so NA²⁸) resides in Milan, Italy at the Biblioteca Ambrosiana. It includes 276 leaves and is approximately 25.0 cm x 18.0 cm (INTF).

111. Aland and Aland, *Text*, 106, 133. 2412 agrees with 614 in 96.62% of the mutually extant passages (p. 322). Barrett notes the strong textual relationship with 614, P³⁸ (c.300 CE) and P⁴⁸ (third century).

112. Parker, *Introduction*, 290. Concerning the similarities see: Aland and Aland, *Text*, 107, 133, 149 and Tuckett, “How Early”, 74-76.

113. Comfort, *Manuscripts*, 292. Cp. Porter and Pitts, *Fundamentals*, 115.

114. This text is the same as the NA²⁸ plus this western addition noted above: Ὅτε δὲ εἰσῆλθομεν εἰς Ῥώμην, [plus Western variant] ἐπετράπη τῷ [δε] Παύλῳ μένειν καθ' ἑαυτὸν [plus Western variant: ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς]

σὺν τῷ φυλάσσουντι αὐτὸν στρατιώτῃ.

115. Richard N. Longenecker, *The Acts of the Apostles* (vol. 9, EBC; Grand Rapids 1981) 571.
116. The superscript line is far above the ρ. Evidently, even the word salvation carried sacred significance.
117. “And having said these things, the Jews departed, having a great dispute among themselves”. See also 614’s *editio princeps*: A.V. Valentine-Richards and J. M. Creed, *The Text of Acts in Codex 614 (Tisch. 137) and its Allies* (Cambridge 1934), 60.
118. Valentine-Richards and Creed, *Codex 614*, 60. The original editors of 614 assumed the full εαυτοῖς in their reading (see also NA28 v. 29 apparatus).
119. ἰουδαίους τε καὶ ἔλληνας is probably a theological insertion that seeks to clarify the adjective πάντα (here in attributive structure). Cf. S. E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Biblical Languages: Greek 2. 2nd ed.; Sheffield 1994) 119.
120. There is plenty of scholarship regarding *nomina sacra*, however, perhaps one of the best treatments is found in: Comfort, *Manuscripts*, 199-253 and Kraft who carefully (and I think successfully) challenges some of the prevalent theories [esp. C. H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt* (London 1979)] on the origins of *nomina sacra*: Robert A. Kraft, “The ‘Textual Mechanics’ of Early Jewish LXX/OG Papyri and Fragments”, in *The Bible as Book*, 51-72.
121. Delobel, “Luke-Acts”, 106.
122. Recall my note 33 above and Eldon J. Epp, “Issues in New Testament Textual Criticism: Moving from the Nineteenth Century to the Twenty-First Century”, in David Alan Black (ed.), *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids 2002) 17-76 (38, 41). Ropes saw the second century development of the Western text as a “monument of the life and thought of that period, an historical source, although one not easily reconstructed with completeness and accuracy”. Cf. Ropes, *Acts*, x.
123. Elliot, *Textual Criticism*, 18; Epp, “Traditional ‘Canons’”, 100 and Parker, *Textual scholarship and the Making of the New Testament* (Oxford 2012) 26-27.
124. Recall Head’s observation on the Western *Tendenz*: Head, “Acts”, 415.
125. See: B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek II* (2nd ed.; London 1896) 122-6, 174; W. M. Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (London 1905), 24-7; Hemer, *Acts*, 55 and Strange, *Problem*, 4, 38-56.
126. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 52.
127. Given the variety of conclusions regarding the end of Acts, it requires a careful assessment of the “extant evidence, drawing only such conclusions as seem to be warranted by it”. Cf. Lindsey P. Pherigo, “Paul’s Life after the Close of Acts”, *JBL* 70 (1951) 277-85 (277).
128. Tajra claims the concentration on “legal terminology and procedure can only lead to the conclusion that Luke has given a legally realistic account of Paul’s judicial history in Acts”. H. W. Tajra, *The Trial of St. Paul: A Juridical Exegesis of the Second Half of the Acts of the Apostles* (Tübingen 1989), 1-2.
129. Cf. Hemer, *Acts*, 365-410.
130. Rackham, regarding Paul’s death, said it seemed “incredible” if “S. Luke had known it, he should have not mentioned it”. Cf. Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles*, li and his classic essay: “The Acts of the Apostles II: A Plea for an Early Date”, *JTS* 1 (1899/1900) 76-87. The earliest and simplest explanation goes back as early as the late second century: Muratorian fragment (lines 35-39), Clement, *1 Clem.* 5:2-7, Chrysostom, *Hom. Act.* 55 and Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.22.1, 6-8; 3.1.3. Cf. Troftgruben, *A Conclusion Unhindered*, 8-11.
131. Many of these attempts originate with: Bartlett, “Two New Testament Problems. I. St. Paul’s Fate at Rome”, 464-67 and later: Trompf, “On Why Luke Declined to Recount the Death of Paul: Acts 27-28 and Beyond”, 232-34. More recent efforts suggest that Luke is using a rhetorical procedure (narrative suspension) to explain this silence in: Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian*, 229-230. Troftgruben (*A Conclusion Unhindered*) prefers to compare the end of Acts with the endings of “famous epic works” (170). He proposes how the narrative openness and closure finds a ‘linkage’ that “connects the story of the narrative (i.e. Acts) to another, subsequent story” (p. 169). Acts then is an ‘expansive saga’ that continues beyond the end “in similar ways Homer’s *Iliad* envisions events that occur beyond the end of the narrative: the death of Achilles and the fall of Troy, events that occur later on in the Epic Cycle” (p. 176, also 177, 187). However, Homer’s *Iliad* is a completely different book and genre than Acts. Second, narrative criticism (pp. 5) as a methodology does not address the text critical concerns or the historical context of Acts.
132. It has long been observed how Western readings regularly “impinge on historical questions”. See: Head, “Acts”, 419. And yet, with all the propensity to fill in the “historical” blanks elsewhere the scribes (or redactor) of these variants remain silent with regards to the major events that tragically affected both the church and the city of Rome. The earliest redactor or B. Aland’s “Hauptredaktor” could have been from Rome as he seemed to be aware

of very specific political and military situations unique to the Imperial city. Cf. Tuckett, “How Early”, 70. The στρατοπεδάρχῳ (Acts 28, 16) in particular gives an “impression of authenticity”. Cf. Kenyon, “The Western Text”, 310 and also F. F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts* (Revised; NICNT; Grand Rapids 1983) 528-29 and Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, 347-48. That the ‘stratopedarch’ in the western text of Acts 28, 16 is the Praetorian Prefect Afranius Burrus is interesting but speculative. Ben Witherington III, *New Testament History: A Narrative Account* (Grand Rapids 2001) 788.

133. While some literary explanations sound ‘critical’ they are unduly skeptical: E.g. Gerd, Lüdemann, *The Acts of the Apostles: What Really Happened in the Earliest Days of the Church* (Amherst, New York 2005) 347, 349 and Richard I. Pervo, *Acts. Hermeneia* (Minneapolis 2009) 688. Parsons considers Acts to be a ‘suspended’ ending: Mikeal C. Parsons, *Acts. Paideia* (Grand Rapids 2008) 366.

134. Marguerat notes the positive attitude in Acts towards Rome versus the negative portrayal in Revelation: “It is the goal of Paul’s mission for the former [in Acts] and the symbol of evil for the latter”. Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian*, 34-35. Likewise Tajra recognizes the “positive tone on which Acts ends”. Tajra, *The Trial of St. Paul*, 164. The Western additions in Acts 28 are also favourable to Rome suggesting a time that was prior to Nero’s conflagration policy against Christians.

135. Tacitus records the devastating news: “Rome is divided into fourteen regions, among which only four remained intact. Three were burned to the ground, and of the other seven there were only a few houses left, which were severely damaged and half-burnt” (Tacitus, *Ann.* 15.40). Cf. Peter Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries* (ed. Marshall D. Johnson; Minneapolis 2003) 47. In addition to the death of Paul (c. 63-64 CE), the great fire of Rome (64 CE.), and the destruction of the Jewish temple (70 CE), many other significant historical events are *not* clearly detailed in Acts: 1) The deaths of the other two great apostles: James (62 CE) and Peter (c. 64 CE); 2) the Jewish Revolt in 66 CE; 3) the death of Nero in 68 CE; 4) the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE; 5) the Roman Triumph in 71 CE; 6) The eruption of Mount Vesuvius and the destruction of Pompeii and Herculaneum in 79 CE. Cf. Hemer, *Acts*, 365-410. Tajra finds “a few facts about Paul’s final days” — 1) that Paul died in Rome; 2) Paul died during Nero’s reign (54-68 CE); 3) Paul was martyred. H. W. Tajra, *The Martyrdom of St. Paul* (Tübingen 1994), 199. Every single variant at the end of Acts is equally silent concerning Paul’s death.

136. Epp, “Traditional ‘Canons’”, 100.

The Question of 1 Peter 3:13¹

PETER R. RODGERS

Commentators have noted a contradiction between 1 Peter 3:13 and 4:14. However, a focus on Isaiah 50:9, alluded to in 3:13 and its context of the Third Isaianic Servant Song shows that the same combination of ideas is present in Isaiah 50: None can harm you; I hid not my face from shame and spitting. The linguistic and thematic resonances between 1 Peter and Isaiah 50, indeed of Isa 40-55, further strengthen this contention.

Keywords: 1 Peter, suffering, Isaiah, Servant, echoes.

“And who is there to harm you if you are zealous for what is good?”

Καὶ τίς ὁ κακώσων ὑμᾶς ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταὶ γένησθε;

The Puzzle of 1 Peter 3:13

Some recent commentators have puzzled over this verse, noting that it seems to be contradicted in verse 14, where the writer continues, “But if you do suffer...” For example, Donelson writes, “The question that opens this passage seems somewhat misstated. Not only does all of 1 Peter assume that doing good will not forestall abuse by others; the very next verse also declares that possibility.”² F. W. Beare even thinks the writer naïve.³

Several explanations have been offered for this apparent contradiction between 3:13 and 3:14. The first is to see verse 13 as a further explication of verse 12, the truth in the quotation from Psalm 34 that those who [p. 111/150] do good will be looked after by God. This view sees the word for harm, *κακώσων*, as referring to the inner self, the “hidden person of the heart,” (3:4).⁴ Other interpreters insist that where the word “to harm” is found in Acts it consistently refers to physical persecution.⁵ Some scholars note the close parallel in Socrates’ remark “No harm can befall a good man, either when he is alive or when he is dead, and the gods do not neglect his cause.”⁶ Others note that “the intention is rhetorical, or proverbial, designed as a further incentive to appropriate conduct.”⁷ Bo Reike focussed on the term he translated “Zealots for what is good,” arguing that Christians would avoid danger if only they behaved correctly in society. However, the very expression *Zealots took on such a negative connotation* during and after the Jewish revolt of 66-70 CE that the term was eventually replaced in part of the manuscript tradition by *μμηται*.⁸

Ben Witherington sees his way through the difficulty of the seeming contradiction between verses 13 and 14 by suggesting that verse 13 represents a voice other than the

author, in deliberative style, which the author then answers in the next verse.⁹

An Echo of Isaiah 50:9

Since none of these explanations of the tension between 3:13 and 3:14 is entirely satisfactory, a solution should be sought from another angle. Several commentators have pointed to a possible allusion to Isaiah 50:9, “Behold the Lord shall help me, who shall harm me?”¹⁰ But none, in my estimation, has teased out the implications of this allusion. I propose that [p. 112/150] the allusion to Isaiah 50:9 is linked closely to the preceeding quotation, as many scholars suggest, and that with the two citations from scripture in close succession we may detect the remnants of careful exegetical activity. That activity included the bringing of two OT passages together through similarity of words or ideas.¹¹ Since 1 Peter elsewhere strings together several quotations with the use of *Kai*, (2:8,4:18) *it is possible that the Kai at 3:13 is not simply transitional or inferential*,¹² but actually signals the technique of stringing quotations together with the result that they mutually interpret each other (*Gezera Shewa*).

In this connection it is worth considering the context of Isaiah 50:9. This is the third of the Isaianic Servant Songs (the fourth being the Suffering Servant passage, Isa 52:13-53:12, which has exercised a shaping influence on 1 Peter). The whole passage is singularly illuminating:

For the Lord God helps me,
Therefore I have not been disgraced;

Therefore I have set my face like flint,
And I know that I shall not be put to shame;¹³
He who vindicates me is near.
Who will contend with me?
Let us stand up together.
Who is my adversary?
Let him confront me.
It is the Lord God who helps me;
Who will declare me guilty?
(Isa 50:7-9)

In the LXX the last line printed here (50:9) reads τίς κακώσει με; and this has led many commentators to note the echo in 1 Peter 3:13. But the citation of these three words would serve to evoke the whole passage and to bring to mind the career of the servant as he takes the downward turn that leads to the suffering of Isa 53. Here is how he describes his perception of his career:

The Lord God has given me
The tongue of a teacher [p. 113/150]

That I may know how to sustain the weary with a word.
Morning by morning he wakens- wakens my ear
To listen to those who are taught.
The Lord opens my ear, and I was not rebellious
I did not turn backward.
I gave my back to those who struck me,
And my cheek to those who pulled out the beard,
I did not hide my face from insult and spitting.
(Isa 50:4-6).

In his landmark study, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, Richard Hays drew attention to the phenomenon of *metalepsis*, the ancient literary and rhetorical technique of citing a small portion of a passage in a way that evokes the whole passage.¹⁴ The portion not cited is thereby *transumed*, or *left unsaid and lying beneath* the surface, but exercises a powerful impact on those with ears to hear the echo. Hays wrote, “When a literary echo links the text in which it occurs to an earlier text, the figurative effect of the echo can lie in the unstated or suppressed (transumed) points of resonance between the two texts”.¹⁵ The unspoken portion of the text is clamoring to be said, and to be drawn into the open. But its very power lies in the fact that it is not stated. It seems that in a letter that has just cited Isaiah 53 *in extenso* to explicate both Christ’s example and his achievement (2:21-25), the career of the servant is very much in the air. And the servant is one who can both affirm “*Who can harm me?*” and also “*I gave my back to those who struck me, and my cheek to those who pulled out the beard, I did not hide my face from insult and spitting.*” There is no missatatement here, no naivety, no contradiction between the confidence in God’s help and the reality of persecution. The story of the servant in Isaiah 50 and 53 is the story of the suffering Messiah in 1 Peter, and of those who follow in his steps.

Echoes of Scripture

The robust study of echoes of the scriptures of Israel in the NT, which began with the publication of Richard Hays’ *Echoes of Scripture in the* [p. 114/150] *Letters of Paul* in 1989, has also produced some sharp critique. Some have objected that the criteria for identifying echoes has been imprecise, and that they are often proposed on the basis of only one or two words that the texts have in common.¹⁶ Hays, followed by Michael Thompson, has offered a number of criteria for identifying echoes of scripture, and this is not the place to review them.¹⁷ Suffice it to say that a number of scholars would object that the three words (actually only two words) in common between 1 Peter 3:13 and Isa 50:9 are insufficient to establish a clear echo of scripture here. Some scholars have insisted on at least six common words for the establishment of an OT exho in the NT.¹⁸ But this seems too severe, and misses many nuances in the NT use of the OT. The pioneering work of Hays and Thompson constitutes an essential and promising place to

explore echoes of scripture in the NT writings. One criterion which may be especially helpful in this particular study is Hays' third criterion: *Recurrence*. Hays asks, "How often does Paul elsewhere cite or allude to the same scripture passage? This applies not only to specific words that are cited, more than once, such as Hab 2:4, but also to larger portions of Scripture to which Paul repeatedly refers, such as Deuteronomy 30-32 or Isa 40-54. Where such evidence exists that Paul considered a passage of particular importance, proposed echoes from the same context should be given additional credence."¹⁹

1 Peter is an especially fruitful document for exploring this criterion.

We note that Psalm 34 (LXX 33) is quoted at least twice in the letter, and alluded to several other times.²⁰ Isaiah 53 is alluded to six times in 1 Peter 2:21-25, and there may be other echoes of the fourth servant song elsewhere in the Letter (1:18-19, 3:18).²¹ At least twice we have citations from Isaiah 8 (2:8, 3:14-15). Recurrence seems to be a special technique of the authors of this short letter. Can we find any echoes of Isaiah 50, the third Servant Song, in the letter other than in 3:13? Several verbal and thematic correspondences between Isaiah 50 make the claim of the echo of the third Servant Song all the more plausible. The final section of this paper will explore these. [p. 115/150]

Linguistic and Thematic Resonances of Isaiah 50 in 1 Peter

The most striking resemblance between the third Servant Song and 1 Peter (aside from the proposed echo in 3:13) is the expression in vs. 7 οὐ μὴ αἰσχυνθῶ (I shall not be put to shame). This is very similar, linguistically and thematically, to Psalm 34 (LXX 33): 6 οὐ μὴ καταισχυνθῇ, (he/she will not be put to shame.). This line is combined in 1 Peter 2:6 with Isa 28:16 and constitutes a composite citation. Given the importance of honor and shame throughout the letter,²² it is clear that this expression re-inforces Peter's message both linguistically and thematically.

Another linguistic resonance can be found at Isaiah 50:10 *Who among you fears the Lord*. (Τίς ἐν ὑμῖν ὁ φοβούμενος τὸν κύριον). Fear in general, and the "fear of the Lord" in particular is a theme that receives major emphasis in the letter.²³ "Fear" is the keyword in the allusion to Isaiah 8:12-13 at 1 Peter 3:14-15. *Do not fear what they fear, and do not be intimidated, but in your hearts sanctify Christ as Lord...* The letter contains three verbal and six nominal uses of the term φόβος, and other words for fear (πτόησιν, 3:6, παραχθῆτε, 3:14). Both linguistically and thematically, fear is a keynote of 1 Peter, and it is similarly a concern in Isaiah 50.

The study of *the fear of God in 1 Peter invites a fresh look at Psalm 34*. This psalm has long been recognized as exercising an important influence on the letter. Perhaps the combination of Psalm 34 with 1 Peter in the Bodmer Miscellany (P72) is our earliest evidence of this in the reception history of the letter.²⁴ In modern times Bornemann in the 1919, and Christianson just this past year have focussed on this influence.²⁵ For our purposes we note that the long passage from Psalm 34, cited in 1 Peter 3:10-12, begins

with the line (not cited in 1 Peter) *Come, O children, listen to me; I will teach you the fear of the Lord. (Psa 34 (LXX 33) 11)*. This suggests a close association between the third servant song (Isaiah 50) and the texts cited in close proximity (Psalm 34 and Isaiah 8) for both of which *the fear of the Lord* is a central concern. Other portions of [p. 116/150] both Psalm 34 and Isaiah 8 are employed elsewhere in 1 Peter (2:3=Psalm 34:8; 2:8=Isa 8:14). This suggests not just a random selection of texts but a thoughtful focus on specific texts already associated in early christian kerygma and paraenesis, and used in this letter in order to encourage the Anatolian Christians to stand firm in the face of persecution.

Elsewhere I have argued that the use of scriptural texts, previously associated in Jewish exegesis, is reflected in 1 Peter. In particular I cited 4 Mac 18:10-19.26 Among the scripture passages taught to the sons by the father were the following: Psalm 34:19, *Many are the ills of the righteous*, Proverbs 3:18, *There is a tree of life for those who do his will*, and Isaiah 43:2, *Even though you go through the fire the flame shall not consume you*. All three of these passages are cited in 1 Peter. These scriptures, *inter-alia*, seem to have been especially valuable to Jews undergoing trial for their faith, and 1 Peter seems to be following an established pattern in the selection of texts in Jewish exegesis.

The proposed echo of Isa 50:9 in 1 Peter 3:13 relates to another important thematic feature of 1 Peter: the image of exile and return. Indeed, the idea of Exile may be the controlling metaphor of the letter.²⁷ Since Isaiah 50 occurs in a section of scripture whose major concern is return from Exile (Isaiah 40-55) it is not surprising to find an echo from this chapter in the letter. Indeed, there are several quotations, allusions and echoes of this section in the Letter: Isaiah 40 (1:24-5) Isa 43 (2:9) Isa 53 (2:21-25). The section seems to have exercised a shaping influence on the the thought of the letter. J. Ross Wagner wrote a major study of the influence of this section of Isaiah's prophecy on the letter to the Romans, especially chapter 9-11 and 15. Wagner referred to "Isaiah and Paul in Concert in the Letter to the Romans." In light of the recurrence of citation from this section of Isaiah in 1 Peter, I believe we may legitimately speak of Isaiah and Peter in concert in 1 Peter. Similarly, Rikki Watts has studied the influence of Isaiah 40-55 on the Gospel of Mark, entitled *Isaias's New Exodus in Mark*.²⁸ We might usefully speak of "Isaiah's New Exodus in 1 Peter."

In one further respect there is a correspondence between the third Servant song of Isaiah 50 and 1 Peter 3:13-17. Both employ the language of the lawcourt. In Isaiah 50:9 we find several technical terms of controversy speech or legal proceedings. The verb *yarshi' eni* means to declare [p. 117/150] someone guilty, to condemn them in a court of law. And the term *ba'al mishpat* means an adviser in a lawcourt, or alternatively, an accuser.²⁹ This use of lawcourt imagery is part of a wide-ranging use of judicial language throughout Isaiah 40-55. On this passage Walter Bruggeman wrote, "The servant I exposed to challenge and dispute, and may face formal accusation as a troublemaker, or perhaps only endlessly hostile distractions of resisters. But the servant will not give in."³⁰ Similarly 1 Peter 3:15 employs the language of legal proceedings to

encourage the Anatolian Christians to bear witness under trial. The terms ἀπολογία (defense) and λόγος (account) were employed as technical terms for trial in courts of law. Whether or not the writer of 1 Peter is envisioning formal legal inquiry (Beare) or as most commentators think, a recurring informal request for Christians to give account of the hope that is in them, the correspondence between Isaiah 50:4-9 and 1 Peter 3:13-17 is striking. It makes all the more plausible the proposal of an echo of Isaiah 50:9 in 1 Peter 3:13. It also points to the deep influence that Isaiah 40-55 has had on the shaping of the thought and language of 1 Peter.

To sum up, then, I believe that the echo of Isaiah 50:9 at 1 Peter 3:13 offers a key to solving the aparent contradiction between verse 13 and 14, and that there are strong linguistic, thematic and rhetorical resonances of the third servant song in the letter. To explore this and other echoes of scripture in 1 Peter can help us to a deeper understanding of this scripture-filled letter.

Peter R. RODGERS
5554 Kiva Dr.
Carmichael, CA, 95608
U.S.A.
peterrod@gmail.com [p. 118/150]

1 I am grateful to Dr. Travis B. Williams for valuable suggestions on an early draft of this paper, presented at SBL Annual Meeting, San Antonio, Tx., November, 2016. Thanks also to Jennifer Thompson for help with the final draft.

2 Lewis R. Donelson, *I and II Peter and Jude, A Commentary*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2010, 103.

3 Francis Wright Beare, *The First Epistle of Peter, The Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966, 136. Similarly, see Moffatt, *The General Epistles*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1928, 137; Leonhard Goppelt, *A Commentary on 1 Peter*, Edited by Ferdinand Hahn, translated by John E. Alsup, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993, 240.

4 Reinhard Feldmeier, *The First Letter of Peter, A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Translated by Peter H. Davids, Waco: Baylor University Press, 2008, 193. Ernest Best, *1 Peter*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, 132, who cites earlier commentators on this view (Schelkle, Knopf, Bigg, Selwyn, Wand).

5 Goppelt, *A Commentary in 1 Peter*, 240

6 Plato *Apology*, 41d. See J.N.D. Kelly, *Commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude*, London: A and C. Black, 1969, 140.

7 G.W. Forbes, *1 Peter: Exegetical Guide to the Greek New Testament*, Nashville: Band H Academic, 2014, 113.

8 Bo Reike, *The Epistles of James, Peter and Jude*, AB37, Garden City: Doubleday, 1964, 107.

9 Ben Witherington III, *Letters and Homilies II for Hellenized Christians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Peter*, Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2007 177. who cites John H. Elliott, *1 Peter, A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB37 B)* New York, Doubleday, 2000, 619-20.

10 Elliott, *1 Peter*, 619. Karen Jobes, *1 Peter, (BECNT)* Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005, 226, Witherington, *Letters and Homilies*, 177. Donaldson, *I and II Peter and Jude*, 103.

11 Peter Rodgers, *Exploring the Old Testament in the New*, Eugene: Resource Publications, 2012, 45-54.

12 Mark Dubis, *1 Peter: A Handbook on the Greek Text*, edited by Martin M Culy, Waco: Baylor University Press, 2010, 105.

13 LXX Isa 50:8 reads in Codex Sinaiticus, ου μη κατασχυνη, cf 1 Pet 2:6!

- 14 Quintillian, *Institutes of Oratory*, 8.6.
- 15 Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989, 20. See also Hays' recent *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels*, Waco: Baylor University Press, 84. Hays' seven criteria are: *Availability, Volume, Recurrence, Thematic coherence, Historical plausibility, History of interpretation, Satisfaction*. See Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, 29-33.
- 16 Stanley E. Porter, *Sacred Tradition in the New Testament*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2016, 1-47, gives a review of the issues and offers his own critique.
- 17 M. Thompson, *Clothed with Christ, The Example and Teaching of Jesus in Romans 12:1-15:13*. Eugene, Or: Wipf and Stock, 2011. Originally published in 1992.
- 18 C.A Beetham, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letter of Paul to the Collosians*, BIS 96, Leiden: Brill, 2008, 15-17.
- 19 Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 30. Hays notes a similar procedure in C.H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Substructure of New Testament Theology*, New York: Scribners, 1953, 61-110.
- 20 Jobes, *1 Peter*, 221-223.
- 21 *Ibidem*, 194.
- 22 John. H. Elliott, "Disgraced yet Graced" in *Conflict Community and Honor in 1 Peter*, Eugene: Cascade, 2007, 51-86.
- 23 Peter R. Rodgers, "Fear of God" in *EBR*, Vol 8,
- 24 See J.K. Elliott, "The Early Text of the Catholic Epistles" in Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, *The Early Text of the New Testament*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2012, 214-218.
- 25 W. Bornemann, "Der erste Petrusbrief. Eine Taufrede des Silvanus," *ZNW* 19 (1919-20) 143-65. S. M. Christensen, "Solidarity in Suffering and Glory, The Unifying Role of Psalm 34 in 1 Peter 3:10-12" *JETS* 58 (2015) 335-52.
- 26 DTIB, 583.
- 27 Andre M. Mbuvi, *Temple, Exile and Identity in 1 Peter* (LNTS 345) New York: T and T Clark, 2007, 22-33.
- 28 Rikki Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000.
- 29 A. Trites, *The New Testament Concept of Witness*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977. 38, citing C.R. North, *The Second Isaiah*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964, 204.
- 30 W. Bruggerman, *Isa 40-55*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998, 122.

RECENSIONES Y PRESENTACIÓN DE LIBROS

Paul L. Danove, *New Testament Verbs of Communication: A Case Frame and Exegetical Study* (LNTS 520; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015).

Paul Danove, Professor of New Testament Studies at Villanova University, has produced an innovative study relating distinct uses of verbs and deriving their various connotations. Danove is well-known in New Testament circles as the author of two major works dealing with case-frame analysis: *Grammatical and Exegetical Study of New Testament Verbs of Transference: A Case Frame Guide to Interpretation and Translation* (2009); and *Linguistics and Exegesis in the Gospel of Mark: Applications of a Case Frame Analysis and Lexicon* (2002). His current study applies case-frame analysis to describe the 4,528 occurrences of the 122 New Testament verbs that designate communication. The author establishes a heuristic model for relating distinct uses of verbs and their various connotations.

According to case grammar, sentences consist of two parts. One is called the “presentence,” and the other is called the “predication.” The presentence indicates the various ways in which a predication can be modified (e.g., negated, questioned, etc.). The predication always consists of a verb and various “arguments.” The term “argument” highlights the fact that in case grammar, we are not just speaking of lexical items called verbs, but also their function of giving information about the events and/or situations in which participants are involved. In case grammar, predications consist of different configurations of roles associated with predicates. Into these predication structures, lexical items are inserted. Just which lexical items may be inserted depends on what roles are present in the predication.

Chapter 1 of this book develops procedures for describing the lexical, syntactic, and semantic associations that complements require of their verbs. Chapter 2 specifies the concepts associated with different verbal usages. Chapters 3-5 consider usages of oral communication with an emphasized content (chapter 3), an emphasized experiencer (chapter 4), and all uses of non-oral communication (chapter 5). The author specifies the common features grammaticalized by verbs and proposes guidelines for both interpreting and translating occurrences of these verbs with their uses. [p. 119/150]

Chapter 6 describes ten uses of events derived from communication and specifies common licensing properties of verbs with these uses. Chapter 7 illustrates the licensing properties and features of verbs with the uses of communication. Chapter 8 discusses four New Testament verbs of communication that occur with both active and middle forms. These verbs are αἰτέω, ἀπειλέω, διατάσσω, and εὐαγγελίζω. Chapter 9 develops three sets of clarifications about significant elements discussed in chapters 1-8. Finally,

chapter 10 summarizes all of the grammatical information derived from the study of the 4,528 occurrences of the 122 verbs that designate communication. The book concludes with a lexicon and parsing guide (pp. 188-231).

This study has succeeded in establishing procedures for describing the licensing properties of verbs through the specification of lexical, syntactic, semantic characteristics of verbal complements. In particular, the book contains a very helpful discussion of the function of λέγω melding and λέγω coordination. The study also helpfully differentiates between active and middle forms with the same verbs of communication. The author has clearly shown how New Testament verbs of communication consistently raise the emphasized argument as subject when passivized.

As every student of the Greek New Testament knows, in linguistic metalanguage, grammar consists of various components. The underlying semantic structure forms one component, the surface syntactic structure forms another, and the surface phonetic structure forms yet another. In accord with much current linguistic thinking, a model of case grammar must account for the language user's ability to use language in relation to specific contexts and communicative goals. Case frame analysis has contributed to our understanding of the language of the New Testament and has provided new insights for both teachers and students of the language. At the present time, linguistic analysis of the New Testament is one of the most active and creative areas of biblical studies. As is the case with other academic disciplines, linguistics is not absolutely essential to the study of the literature of the New Testament. One does not need to know linguistics in order to read and understand, for example, Paul's letter to the Romans. That being said, linguistics can contribute a great deal to our understanding of a text. It can help us develop a consistent analysis and prompt us to ask questions about the language of the text that we might otherwise ignore. The present study helps ensure a proper foundation for exegesis by enabling the student to recognize the systematic regularities in the language of a text. For this reason, Professor Danove's book is to be considered a most welcome contribution to the field of New Testament studies.

David Alan Black

black@sebts.edu [p. 120/150]

David A. Fiensy and James Riley Strange (eds.), *Galilee in the Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods, Volume 1: Life, Culture, and Society* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014), xviii+411 pp. ISBN 9781451466744. Pbk. \$69.00

This landmark collection of essays provides a fantastic overview of the important contributions of archaeology since the 1970s upon our understanding of life in ancient Galilee and Palestine in general. Here we have a collection of essays that reflects the expressed need by archaeologists for NT scholars to go beyond textual stratigraphy—while giving serious consideration to the stratigraphy of the archaeological sites in Galilee (so, Jonathan L. Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus: A Re-examination of the Evidence* [Harrisburg 2002] xi, 1). Where the first volume presents collected chapters on the “life and culture of ancient Galilee” the second presents reports on all of the

“archeological excavations” where significant remains have been found in the 100 BCE-200CE timeline (6-7).

In many ways this volume helps to re-calibrate both NT and Jewish studies toward a more robust trajectory that inculcates the material and literary remains of Galilee. This collection of data has been added to the matrix of interpretation concerning the historical Jesus and his contemporaries. The editors, David A. Fiensy and James Riley Strange, define their period of inquiry of Galilee to be between “100 BCE and 200 CE” that they call the “second Temple period through the Mishnaic period” (xviii). Although I appreciate Zangenberg’s overall review and some of his criticism of the ‘chronological’ limitations of the volume (and even his ‘geographical’ points), the challenges the editors must have faced in trying to fit all eighteen essays within such a specific timeframe seems overly critical—especially given such a large collection of research (cf, Jürgen K. Zangenberg, *RBL* 02, 2016). It seems this project is sufficiently ambitious to fit these essays together chronologically and topographically (see also their detailed chronological list of events and rulers on page ix-xv). The essays are grouped together in four categories that inculcate a broad array of subject matter from: 1. *Overview of Galilean Studies* (Introduction to Galilee: Volumes 1 and 2 by the editors plus the first official essay written by Roland Deines), 2. *History* (essays 2-7), *Village life* (8-12), and *Economics* (13-18).

In their preface (xvii-xviii), Fiensy and Strange rightly contend that is “difficult to overstate the importance of Sephoris for the history of the archaeology of Galilee, as well as for understanding Formative Judaism and nascent Christianity” (xvii). Accordingly, archaeological research from Sephoris and Upper Galilee has caused many scholars to “reevaluate their understandings of the origins of Galilee’s populations, village and city relations, economy, Jewish social identity, and even how to read the NT gospels, Josephus, the writings of the sages, and other texts that talk about the region” (xvii). All of this seems to justify the need to reflect upon the interpretations of each essay in light of the plethora of new data that has surfaced in the Hellenistic and Roman sites of Galilee in the last thirty years (3). Overman captures the importance of this new information and fieldwork calling it “nothing short of a revolution” (358).

Before venturing into the individuals essays, it is worth observing that the volume also contains a helpful archaeological chronology (ix), a timeline for events and rulers in Galilee and Judea in the late Second Temple through Mishnaic periods (xi-xv), and is followed by a series of color maps and photos [p. 121/150] of Galilee. After the preface (xvii-xviii), the first section, “Overview of Galilean Studies,” begins with the editors’ opening perspective in the: “Introduction to Galilee: Volumes 1 and 2” (3-10). They start with the call for a more “sober appraisal of ancient Galilee” than the “charming and idyllic” image presented by the nineteenth-century biographer of Jesus, Ernest Renan (3). They claim that the last thirty years of research has “sought to do that” but the “current study of Galilee is fraught with conflicting conclusions” (3). They produce a helpful summary of six varying conclusions on Galilee and Sephoris that readers should be aware of, along with the key works noted in their footnotes (3-5). They also maintain

that the “quest for the historical Jesus is at the same time a quest for the historical Galilee” (5). This axiom has become a popular cliché that was first introduced by the late Sean Freyne (in whom the volume is dedicated): “More than once I have been tempted to make the fairly obvious comment that the search for the historical Galilee is about to replace the quest for the historical Jesus” (12).

A further salient point is worth mentioning. In order to understand Jesus’ “later message and/or his pattern of ministry” it may be useful to consider the “geographical and cultural location of Jesus’ youth” (5). Beyond historical Jesus research, it is true that a growing number of scholars are seeing Galilee as “the context for the composition of the sayings source commonly called Q” (5, and also Reed, *Galilean Jesus*, 170-96; John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* [Minneapolis 2000] 170-75, 214-61). In essence, the introduction presses the point that both NT and Jewish scholars need to evaluate the data from the archaeological surveys in light of the associated research on Galilee. In essence, Galilee remains a central nexus of study for both Judaism and early Christianity.

The reader can decide whether or not the expressed aim of the editors is truly met—and although it is a tall order it seems to me that it has been met with excellence. First, their goal was to “make this information easily accessible” to both NT and Mishnah scholars who may be “unfamiliar with these materials” and at the same time “usable to the average intelligent reader” (6). I can say with confidence they have met the former goal but I would recommend that readers should have at least some background in history, archaeology, Jewish or NT studies. Furthermore, the material seems more appropriate for graduate level studies rather than an introductory bachelor’s class. Having said that, perhaps the beginner should be presented with this volume first as it offers a more accurate picture than what is commonly taught concerning ancient Galilee being some desperately poor and backward region (see Meyer’s comments on p. 27). Second, they endeavored to “hear all voices: archaeologists, historians, biblical scholars, and social science interpreters; Christians, Jews, and secular scholars; North Americans, Europeans, and Israelis”—including the experts and excavators, a few “newcomers,” and even “outsiders’ who offer a new look at the data” (6). Mission accomplished.

The second part of the overview comprises of an essay by Roland Deines on “Galilee and the Historical Jesus in Recent Research” (11-48), who explains why the study of ancient Galilee is crucial for historical Jesus research. If one [p. 122/150] wants to study the life of Jesus or understand “his message, his demeanor, his impact, and his ‘success’” than we must turn to Galilee (12). So much so that Deines remarks how the current ‘Third Quest for the Historical Jesus’ is to “no small extent Galilee research: whoever wants to say something about the earthly Jesus does so with reference to Galilee” (12). Subsequently, he presents “Recent Galilee Research as the Basis for the Quest of the Historical Jesus” (16-26), with the remainder of the chapter focused on “Archaeology and the Jewish Galilee” (26-37).

Some of his observations are worth drawing attention to. For example, given the contradictory views of Jesus that as proposed by Vermes and Crossan, Deines finds

common ground—where “they both presume a certain image of Galilee—or reconstruct such—in which they place Jesus and from which they understand his activities” (19). So Galilee is the common denominator. Where this research is a “successful example of a fruitful and stimulating cooperation between archaeology and text-based scholarship” he remarks how the work of Eric Myers and Sean Freyne are “particularly deserving of praise in this regard” (26). In particular, Meyers helped to “combat the widespread propensity to equate Galilee with a particular backward population” and the notion that developed areas of Galilee “in terms of religious nature” were “not particularly different from Judea or Jerusalem” (27).

With regards to social stratification, those who see Galilee at the time of Jesus as an “exploited poverty-stricken poorhouse” are discredited further by “newer archaeological evidence” that suggests the region exhibited a “relatively prosperous situation” (31). In addition, Deines argues that Galilee is thoroughly Jewish, though perhaps not as Jewish as Jerusalem. The city of Sephoris in particular has been shown to not simply be a ‘half-pagan’ city but one that was thoroughly Jewish with a measure of Hellenization (33). Along with Tiberias the cities were clearly Jewish and did not follow the ‘normal’ “religious and philosophical” culture of the Roman world like Hippos, Scythopolis, Gadara, or Caesarea (34). Meanwhile the literary texts that mention Galilee, “come with their own set of interpretive difficulties”—as such they are “not simply a mirror image of reality; their purpose is to affect their audience” (34). He concludes with a caution built upon Albert Schweitzer’s classic observation that as we create a view of Jesus in our own image, scholars are likewise in danger of creating “his or her own image of Galilee first, onto which then Jesus and his message can be projected” (37). Therefore, our view of Galilee should be based on what is “discernible in the literary and archaeological sources” (37).

The second section comprises six chapters on “History” starting with Morten Hørning Jensen’s excellent essay on “The Political History in Galilee from the First Century BCE to the End of the Second Century CE” (51-77). Jensen begins with an introductory note on why “History Matters” then discusses five sub-topics: “Galilee Reborn (104-63 BCE),” “Roman Reorganization (63-37 BCE),” “Herodian Hegemony (37 BCE-66 CE),” “Galilee at War (66-67 CE),” and “Galilee Reborn—Yet Again (70-200 CE)” just before arriving at his conclusion. His clarification on the meaning of “Galilee of the Gentiles” giving the sense that Galilee is ‘encircled’ by the Gentiles rather than ‘inhabited’ by the [\[p. 123/150\]](#) Gentiles is significant. He further observes that it was the Hasmonean dynasty who “rejudaized” Galilee through a process of “settlement and investment” (57). To some it might seem to be hair-splitting, but I think Zangenberg’s qualification on Jensen’s point is worth further discussion. Namely, “Is the Hasmonean colonization perhaps better seen as a re-invention rather than a rebirth?”

After Jensen, Deines offers a second essay (third in the volume) on “Religious Practices and Religious Movements in Galilee: 100 BCE-200 CE” (78-111). This is an insightful essay from the start and well-worth the read. He explains how none of our literary sources (NT, Josephus, rabbinic texts etc.) wrote on “Galilee for Galilee’s sake”

to such a degree that it is presently “impossible to write a *comprehensive* history of religious practices and movements in Galilee from 100 BCE to the early third century” (his emphasis, 79-80). He discusses four “religious movements” in Galilee including the “Pharisaic movement, the Bar Kokhba war, the Jewish Christian movement, and the early rabbinic movement” (80). For each, he successfully appropriates a key principle in archaeological theory whereby “textual and archaeological evidence can be used to support and corroborate each other” (80, on this subject see also: Peter Kosso, *Knowing the Past: Philosophical Issues of History and Archaeology* [Amherst, NY: 2001] 172; Matthew Johnson, *Archaeological Theory: An Introduction* [Malden, MA: 1999] 3-11; Reed, *Galilean Jesus*, 212). The cumulative insights in this article alone (which exceed the scope of this book review) are reason enough to add this to one’s library!

Meanwhile Mark A. Chancey ponders “The Ethnicities of Galileans” (112-28) while suggesting that the region grew in diversity during the period. He reasons that archaeology has revolutionized our understanding of Galilee settlement patterns where the evidence suggests the region was thoroughly Jewish and not a mix of pagans (117). This interpretation arises from the material evidence that demonstrates how the lamps in Galilee were either made locally or imported from Jerusalem while pre-Hasmonean lamps were imported — which probably reflects the kosher/purity laws of the time (120). Chancey further articulates how pagan practices did not clearly proliferate in the region until *after* the second century CE (124). In the end he concludes Galilee’s “increased ethnic diversity contributed to the ongoing process of Jewish self-definition” (125).

In the fifth essay, Lee I. Levine talks about the “The Synagogues of Galilee” (129-50). He surveys all of the available literary references to synagogues in Galilee (Nazareth, Capernaum, Tiberias) and also factoring in the available archaeological evidence of the synagogues of Gamla/Golan, Khirbet Qana, Migdal/ Magdala while discussing their “social and religious implications” (130). In the end, he offers a brief note on the “Post-70 CE Era” archaeological evidence regarding the synagogues along with an appendix that examines the “Less-Certain Identifications of Galilean Synagogues” of Migdal/Magdala, Capernaum, Chorazin, Nevoraya/Nabratein.

Subsequently, Thomas Scott Caulley offers a short, but intriguing study of “Notable Galilean Persons” (151-66) including Hezekiah (Ezekias) the Bandit, [p. 124/150] Judas son of Hezekiah, Judas the Galilean, Honi (Onias) the Circle-Drawer, Hanina ben Dosa, Antipas, Agrippa I, Agrippa II, Bernice (Berenice), John of Gischala, Justus of Tiberias, Menahem (son of Judas the Galilean) and Judah Ha-Nasi. Although I wonder what his thesis is (beyond shining a light on thirteen non-NT heroes, cf. 151) the value of this essay is obvious—and I will be incorporating his insights on the ‘heroes’ for my own research!

In the final essay for this section on “Social Movements in Galilee” (167-74), Richard Horsley posits that the contemporary movements of Jesus and John the Baptist (among others) “follow the same cultural pattern of prophets like Moses” (173). He rightly explains that “All of these were movements of villagers, evidently of Israelite heritage”

(173). Although this brief essay provides a decent summary of his own research, the remaining articles in this volume suggest the situation in Galilee is far more complex (as previously noted by Zangenberg and also Ralph K. Hawkins, *RBL* 12, 2016)

The third section on “Village Life” starts with Fiensy’s article on “The Galilean Village in the Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods” (177-207). This valuable survey covers a lot of ground ranging from village and town sizes to the differing methods on how to calculate populations (182-85). This is a crucial conversation simply because of the disparity that can occur between literary and material remains. He gives the example from Josephus who claims the smallest village in Galilee has 15,000 people where the archaeological data from the time indicates they lived in villages of only a “few hundred to 2,000” (185)! This is no surprise as Josephus is famous for exaggerating his numbers (see also Fiensy’s conclusion on page 201). He provides many such insights while looking at specific sites such as Khirbet Karqush and Khirbet Qana (187-190) while rounding out his discussion on the agrarian economy of Galilee (while he rightly explains how *all* ancient Mediterranean and Middle eastern economies were agrarian, 195).

Andrea M. Berlin takes up the ninth essay on “Household Judaism” (208-15) that is both concentrated and convincing. She rightly contends that household items (i.e. stone vessels, pottery, lamps, and *mikva’ot*) found in Judea and Lower Galilee were intentionally and distinctly plain—thus demonstrating separation from the Gentile world. At the same time, the material evidence also reveals a post-70 CE reversion! In the end, she concludes that the use of stone vessels “would have communicated a pride of place, a place suffused with an increasingly visible and material Jewish identity” (214). Although I agree with Zangenberg that Berlin’s view (214-15) that a Jewish sense of separation “contributed” to the revolt in 66 CE requires further clarification, however, it does seem to be a sustainable hypothesis despite the obvious Hellenistic influences on material culture. This is not the place to discuss the manifold reasons for the revolt (that was brewing long before the 60s CE), but the Galilean’s distinctly Jewish way of life (as evidenced by the literary and archaeological data) seems sufficient to validate Berlin’s thesis as plausible.

In another contribution by Fiensy, he examines “The Galilean House in the Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods” (216-41). This article essentially attempts to answer the question, “What sort of house in Galilee would you [p. 125/150] live in?” during the volume’s timeframe (216). He examines the various house types, sizes, structures, courtyards, while providing a section on “House Sizes and Standard of Living” (235-38). He concludes by stating:

You would likely have lived in a house with plastered stone walls, a dirt floor, and a flat roof made with wooden beams, other smaller branches, and mud plaster. Your house would have been one room—possibly two rooms—and it would have shared a courtyard with other nuclear families, most likely your cousins...Your family would have provided the labour to build the house, but you may have employed a master

builder to supervise the work (238).

Jonathan L. Reed offers the next essay on “Mortality, Morbidity, and Economics in Jesus Galilee” (242-52). Reed paints a clear picture of the unstable living conditions of Galilee in the first century as “substantially different from the modern world and cannot be characterized as stable. Chronic and seasonal disease, especially malaria, cut down significant segments of the population and left even the healthy quite often ill” (242). Reed concludes by explaining how “descriptions of life under Antipas as stable miss the mark” (250). This is especially true as we consider how “Sudden death, rampant disease, frequent pregnancy, and impulsive yet increasing migration would make for a rather unstable environment with volatile households whose compositions were constantly and abruptly changing” (250). His research makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of how the health of a population greatly impacts their socio-economic situation.

The remaining essay in the third section is by John C. Poirier who offers fresh evidence on the issue of education: “Education/Literacy in Jewish Galilee: Was There Any and at What Level?” (253-60). He contends that the level of education among Jews in Galilee during the period in question has been told “differently by different scholars” (253). This is yet another case where archaeology weighs into the debate when literary sources are either lacking or simply incorrect. It wasn’t until 1937 that scholars began to successfully challenge the Talmud’s (and Josephus’s) widely accepted statement on the depth of Jewish education (253)—despite a lack of discussion in other literary sources and the evidence of Rome’s overall literacy level of just 5-10% in the western provinces (254).

The fourth section on “Economics” presents seven essays starting with Strange’s essay on “The Galilean Road System” (263-71). Strange provides a short overview of the network of roads in Roman Galilee and specifically the roads from Nazareth to Cana and from Cana to Capernaum (268-69). Although part of the road network is “international” the “majority is formed of local trails” which makes it easier to see “how Jesus gathered crowds” given all the footpaths and roads in Galilee (269). Meanwhile Ze’ev Safrain in his instructive essay: “Urbanization and Industry in Mishnaic Galilee” (272-96) deals with “cities, the urbanization process, and industry in the Galilee during the Tannaitic period, from 70 to 22CE” (272). Although variously disputed Safrain notes that a “literary historical source” like the Talmud, includes “exaggeration, forgetting, bias, and subjectivity, and it promotes an ideology” [p. 126/150] (272, note 1). He looks at a plethora of topics such as settlement structure, urbanization, urban distribution, ethnography, architecture, industry, commerce and Jewish settlements while finishing with a talk on “The Galilean Cities and the Rabbinic Leadership” (292). He concludes by suggesting the rabbinic literature is “extreme” in their viewpoint—especially when it comes to the “description of sexual depravity” in the cities (294).

Agnes Choi offers a nuanced view in: “Never the Two Shall Meet? Urban-Rural Interaction in Lower Galilee” (297-309, note that Hawkins lists the wrong page range

here [*sic.* 297-322]). Choi recognizes the debate that exists with regards to the relationship between the urban and rural economies (297). She concludes by suggesting the trade dynamics were such that the “tenants and small farmers” were the ones who “bore the brunt of transportation costs” while the urban elite were in charge of distribution (309). I agree with Zangenberg who questions the differences between Safrai’s and Choi’s conclusions especially where Safrai earlier stated: “Consequently, the rural sector was independent from the polis in terms of supplying services” (293). Were they independent (Safrai) or dependant (Choi)? Perhaps this is symptomatic of the debate as the answer seems to be much more complicated.

The next essay, “Inner Village Life in Galilee: A Diverse and Complex Phenomenon” by Sharon Lea Mattila (312-45) brings balance to the previous essays by Safrai and Choi while further revealing the rich complexity of village life in rural Galilee during this time. Matilla correctly points out the fact that much research in the past on life in the Graeco-Roman world has been ‘top-down’ and polarized on the activities of the ruling class (312). Meanwhile, the lower class peasants are depicted as barely surviving, lacking knowledge in trade, and existing to pay their rich tenants—in summary, a model without a working middle class (312). She successfully challenges these assumptions while showing the “relative wealth” and sophistication of the rural landscape (339). We also know from rabbinic testimony and the archaeological remains that ‘the poor’ of Galilee enjoyed a wide variety of foods and services while producing and trading specialized products (316-17).

She offers examples such as Babatha who was known as a highly successful young woman and date farmer with considerable means (326-327). Her essay is filled with important and thought provoking insights such as her interpretation of the available material evidence from Tel Anafa that included sheep, imported cattle for meat and the rearing of their own pigs (338). Mattila thinks this was either a military post (with the possibility of mercenaries in the employ of Herod Philip) or an operation of shepherds who traded wool for their “flour or bread, wine, oil, and other supplies” (338). All in all, Galilean villages should not be seen as composed of simple peasants, but “ready participants in such market exchange”—in fact, some villagers became pretty wealthy and industrious! Last, I would suggest that her findings concur with earlier established research across the Roman Empire (cf. Graeme Barker and John Lloyd, *Roman Landscapes: Archaeological Survey in the Mediterranean Region. Archaeological Monographs of the British School at Rome. No. 2* [London 1991] 338). [\[p. 127/150\]](#)

Subsequently, we have a debate that attempts to answer the question “Was the Galilean Economy Oppressive or Prosperous?” The first response to this question is by Douglas E. Oakman, “Late Second Temple Galilee: Socio-archaeology and Dimensions of Exploitation in First-Century Palestine” (346-56). He considers the degree of social oppression in Herodian Galilee and whether Jesus and his followers were “responding to perceived oppression” (347). He is correct in his view that archaeology, like biblical studies, “is an interpretive discipline” (347). He is further right in his assessment that “social questions asked of excavation can sharpen the interpretive results”—albeit with

one major caveat—"interpretation must reckon always with an incomplete record" (354)! In the end he explains how the interpretation through "text and spade" reveals "material prosperity, exploitative relations benefitting the power elites, and reasons to believe that the commoner felt oppression and sometimes perceived its social mechanisms with utter clarity" (354).

The sister essay is by J. Andrew Overman, "Late Second Temple Galilee: A Picture of Relative Economic Health" (357-65) who recognizes how the archaeology of Galilee supplies sufficient new data to "balance our literary sources" (358). He maintains the "amount of information uncovered and the dedicated fieldwork that has occurred in Galilee on Hellenistic and Roman sites over the last thirty years are nothing short of a revolution" (358). He concludes that Galilee with its developed technology and growing economy suggests a "picture of relative economic health" (363). However, he also claims that this does not mean that it was 'prosperous' or just/fair for everyone (363). In every period of history, it seems there will always be those who are poor (John 12,8).

The eighteenth and final essay by Fabian Udoh looks at the issue of "Taxation and Other Sources of Government Income in the Galilee of Herod and Antipas" (366-87). Despite Udoh's observation on the "dearth of evidence" that prevents a "detailed reconstruction of the tax systems" under Herod the Great and Antipas he draws some conclusions seem tentative at best. For example, in contrast to NT scholars he suggests that Herod employed "land taxes" that were "paid in produce" and not in coin while suggesting Herod and Antipas minted only "bronze coins" and citing Cicero's comments about Sicily where the farmer's there essential can't 'grow' coins as that would mean selling off equipment (375, and Cicero, *Verr.* 2.3.199). While he speculates that some taxes might have "occasionally" required "cash payments" he argues that taxes "paid in coins" is "not supported by the evidence" (375).

I see his point, and it is possible, but this is Galilee and not Sicily; and this also disregards some of the literary evidence (where there is clearly no apologetic, political, or literary gain in fabricating such stories that involve paying taxes by coin, i.e. Mark 12, 16; Luke 20, 24 and Matt 22, 17). Furthermore, he contends (based largely on Millar) that there is "no shred of evidence that Herod conducted a census in his kingdom or that Antipas did so in Galilee" (379, Fergus Millar, *The Roman Near East: 31 BC—AD 337* [Cambridge 1993] 46). Notwithstanding the interpretive difficulties of the census in Luke 2, 1-7, Udoh's solution seems to be oversimplified. Otherwise, his essay offers [p. 128/150] a valuable contribution on taxation and other sources of revenue for Herod and Antipas. After this final essay, the book provides a list of contributors (389-90), abbreviations (391-93), and indices of ancient sources (395-406) and subjects (407-11).

Here are some of my concluding thoughts. My overall opinion is that this is a valuable collection of essays for anyone remotely interested in the early history of the region. For archaeologists, teachers and students of Judaism and Christianity, this should be required reading. The extensive bibliography and detailed footnotes are also valuable as they offer a handy collection of sources that invites further study. Along those lines, one thing that would have been beneficial to include (as previously noted by Hawkins) is a

concluding chapter.

I have tried to address some outstanding interpretive questions that have been left behind by some of the individual essays. Some of those questions have been noted in previous reviews while others are my own. Since textual scholars and archaeologists are “forced to interpret” in light of the “material culture used and left by the inhabitants of, the Galilee” these instructive essays have the capacity to generate further interest and study (7). This point leads into what could perceivably be the greatest contribution of this volume and that is the way in which literary and non-literary sources have been woven together in order to “support and corroborate each other” (80). As such these essays have the ability to ask new questions of the data while sharpening our interpretations on such a key time and place in history. This is an important work that will be useful for years to come.

Karl L. Armstrong
k.l.armstronge@gmail.com [p. 129/150]

LIBROS RECIBIDOS

ISRAEL M. GALLARTE - DÁMARIS ROMERO - MARTA MERINO

AGAMBEN, GIORGIO, *Pilate and Jesus* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2015) 63 pp. 11,5 x 18 cm. ISBN: 978-0-8047-9454-1.

En esta obra de divulgación, Poncio Pilato se presenta como una de las figuras más enigmáticas de la teología cristiana. El único personaje no cristiano nombrado en el Credo de Nicea es descrito en los escritos cristianos posteriores como un supervisor colonial cruel en asuntos seculares, o un juez conflictivo convencido de la inocencia de Jesús en los Evangelios, o un cristiano piadoso, o un demonio virtual. Este libro trata del papel de Pilato en el juicio de Jesús como punto de partida para investigar la función del juicio legal en la sociedad occidental y las formas en que tal juicio exige que adjudiquemos las demandas contrapuestas entre lo eterno y lo histórico.

ALLEN, GARRICK V. - WOODMAN, IAN PAUL - SIMON PAUL (eds.), *The Book of Revelation. Currents in British Research on the Apocalypse* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2015) 336 pp. 15,5 x 23,5 cm. ISBN: 978-3-16-153869-8.

Este volumen representa una amplia gama de intereses de investigación sobre el Libro del Apocalipsis, operativa en la investigación británica actual, y examina cuestiones de género, estructura, composición, reutilización de las Escrituras, exégesis, asuntos temáticos e historia de la recepción. Esta colección de trabajos, de un grupo diverso de académicos “senior y junior”, es accesible a un amplio círculo de lectores y es relevante para las discusiones críticas no solo sobre el Apocalipsis, sino también sobre el Nuevo Testamento y los estudios del cristianismo primitivo.

BALCH, DAVID L., *Contested Ethnicities and Images* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2015) 497 pp. 16,5 x 24 cm. ISBN: 978-3-16-152336-6.

Esta obra se divide en tres grandes apartados: 1) Lucas-Hechos (caps. 1 al 11), 2) El arte romano y el Nuevo Testamento (caps. 12 al 18) y 3) Reseñas [p. 131/150] de libros (caps. 19 y 20). Los valores étnicos cambiaron a medida que la Roma imperial se expandió, desafiando los valores etnocéntricos en la propia Roma, así como en Grecia y Judea. Retóricamente, los escritores romanos, griegos y judíos, elogiaban a sus ciudades. Todos afirmaban que recibirían extranjeros. Además, las narraciones greco-romanas de las tensiones urbanas entre ricos y pobres, soberbios y humildes, promovieron la reconciliación y el compañerismo entre las clases sociales. Lucas escribió el libro de los Hechos en este contexto étnico, económico y político, presentando a Jesús como fundador de una comunidad que cambió las leyes para alentar a recibir a los extranjeros, lo que promovió el crecimiento cívico y misionero,

así como los intereses legítimos de los pobres y humildes. David L. Balch relaciona el arte romano con el cristianismo primitivo e introduce a famosos artistas corintios pre-romanos, muestra mujeres representadas visualmente como sacerdotes, compara los discursos carismáticos dionisiaco y corintio, y sostiene que las asambleas más grandes de los primeros creyentes paulinos “se asentaron” (1Cor 14,30) en tabernas. Además, el autor demuestra que la imagen de una mujer embarazada en Apocalipsis 12 subvierte las pretensiones imperiales del origen divino del emperador y observa que las representaciones visuales de artistas domésticos romanos de “una categoría de mujeres que alteran las formas de conducta esperadas” (Bergmann) animó a mujeres cristianas como Tecla, Perpetua y Felicitas a ir más allá de los estereotipos de género de considerarse víctimas. Balch concluye con dos reseñas de libros: una, de la obra de Nicolas Wiater sobre el biógrafo e historiador griego Dionisio, que fue modelo para Flavio Josefo y Lucas-Hechos; la segunda, de un libro de Frederick Brenk sobre filosofía helenística y religión mística en relación con el cristianismo primitivo.

BAZZANA, GIOVANNI B., *Kingdom of Bureaucracy. The Political Theology of Village Scribes in the Sayings Gospel Q* (Leuven-Paris-Bristol: Peeters, 2015) 383 pp. 24,6 x 16 cm. ISBN: 978-90-429-3178-7.

“El Evangelio de los dichos de Jesús” o “Fuente Q” fue compuesto en las décadas centrales del s. I por aldeanos galileos que habían adquirido conocimiento de la lengua griega, principalmente a través de su participación en la administración pública. El autor de esta obra, tras detallar los materiales susceptibles de ser analizados, trata los siguientes temas: 1) La figura del *komogrammateus*, “administrador del territorio” en el mundo griego y romano, 2) los escribas de pueblo y la lengua del “Evangelio de los dichos de Jesús” en Q, 3) el perfil socio-cultural de los administradores en la Galilea rural en el s. I d.C., 4) y 5) el concepto de *Basileía tou theou* en los dichos de Q y 6) la teología política de la burocracia. En este libro se analiza, por tanto, el texto de Q para redescubrir las huellas terminológicas e ideológicas de la actividad de esta subélite rural de escribas en el Evangelio de los dichos de Jesús. Dados los cargos burocráticos ocupados por los miembros de este grupo, el uso peculiar de la frase *basileia tou theou* adquiere un significado específico por sus implicaciones político-teológicas. Sobre la base de la reciente revisión de Giorgio Agamben de la categoría de teología [p. 132/150] política, la actitud de Q sobre la realeza divina se entiende como una instancia de negociación de esta subélite de escribas de las posiciones sociales y políticas frente a la expansión de la hegemonía imperial romana en el Mediterráneo oriental. En este contexto, el (los) autor (es) de Q concibe(n) escenarios apocalípticos en los que la monarquía divina reemplaza a los gobernantes humanos y los burócratas nativos de estas subélites pueden compartir el ejercicio del gobierno cósmico.

BEALE, G. K.- CAMPBELL, DAVID H., *Revelation. A Shorter Commentary* (Grand Rapids, Michigan-Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company,

2015) 562 pp. 23 x 15,5 cm. ISBN: 978-0-8028-6621-9.

La extensa monografía de Gregory K. Beale es un minucioso comentario al libro del Apocalipsis, prácticamente motivo a motivo: las cartas a las siete iglesias, Dios y Cristo glorificados, los siete sellos, las siete trompetas, el conflicto profundo, etc. En la introducción, el autor deja clara su concepción sobre el último de los libros del NT. En su opinión se trata de una composición en continuidad con toda la literatura bíblica, de modo que, para comprenderlo, es preciso conocer las numerosas alusiones al AT que incluye. Sólo así se puede intentar abordar su significado. El epílogo sirve, además, al autor para comprender la relevancia del Apocalipsis hoy. Intercalados a lo largo del volumen hay más de sesenta conjuntos de “Sugerencias para la reflexión” con la finalidad de ayudar a los lectores a comprender mejor la importancia del Apocalipsis en sus vidas y en nuestro mundo actual.

BEDNARZ, Terri, *Humor in the Gospels. A Sourcebook for the Study of Humor in the New Testament, 1863-2014* (Lanham-Boulder-New York-London: Lexington Books, 2015) 344 pp. 15 x 23 cm. ISBN: 978-1-4985-0136-1.

Esta obra es un tratado completo sobre el humor en el Evangelio. Su autora revisa críticamente 150 años de estudios bíblicos sobre el tema, desde artículos de revistas poco conocidos y libros descatalogados hasta los trabajos clásicos más respetados en la actualidad. La obra cubre una variedad de discusiones académicas sobre las diversas formas y funciones del humor evangélico, examina los límites para asociar el humor con las representaciones evangélicas de Jesús, las dificultades para identificar el humor en los textos bíblicos antiguos y los avances de los enfoques literarios, contextuales y retóricos para reconocer el humor evangélico. Este trabajo también incluye una extensa bibliografía para seguir estudiando el humor evangélico, en particular, y el bíblico, en general.

BIRK, STINE, *Depicting the Dead. Self-Representation and Commemoration on Roman Sarcophagi with Portraits* (Aarhus, N: Aarhus UP, 2013) 335 pp. ISBN: 978-87-7124-416-8.

La tradición ya consolidada según la cual los sarcófagos constituyen declaraciones gráficas en forma de alegoría sobre la vida y los recuerdos personales de los individuos fallecidos frente a las narraciones mitológicas [p. 133/150] constituye el ámbito de estudio de este trabajo. Su objeto de investigación son, especialmente, los sarcófagos romanos, a menudo conocidos como *stadt-romisch*. La finalidad de esta obra es, en primer lugar, examinar el modo de leer los sarcófagos romanos y, en segundo lugar, investigar los valores de género representados en ellos y cómo situar al individuo en esta iconografía estandarizada. El autor divide el libro en cuatro capítulos, precedido por una introducción y seguido de una retrospectiva. Los capítulos de esta obra se centran en cuatro temas principales: gestión de la identidad, imágenes para la contemplación, visualización del género y conmemoración de los niños. A continuación, se incluye una bibliografía y tres apéndices centrados en los sarcófagos (en conmemoración de mujeres, hombres, niños, parejas y retratos de

figuras cultas), acompañados de una breve guía sobre cómo usar el catálogo. Las entradas del catálogo proporcionan la información estándar: retrato en el sarcófago, ubicación, condición, procedencia, relieve frontal, fecha y bibliografía.

BRADLEY, ARNOLD, *Christ as the Telos of Life* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2014) 259 pp. 15,5 x 23 cm. ISBN: 978-3-16-153326-6.

El autor de esta obra examina la lógica argumentativa y el objetivo central de la carta de Pablo a los Filipenses. Mediante un análisis exegético de esta carta, Arnold muestra que la argumentación de Pablo está estructurada de manera similar al patrón de pensamiento de la filosofía moral antigua (Aristóteles, Epicureísmo y Estoicismo). Dentro de ese marco, Pablo utiliza la figura del atletismo en lugares clave para conceptualizar la naturaleza de la existencia cristiana. Arnold sostiene que Pablo resume su perspectiva de la vida en la imagen del corredor en Fil 3,13-14, que funciona como una descripción vívida. Esta imagen juega un papel central en el objetivo retórico de Pablo en esta carta, presentando en germen su llamada persuasiva para que los filipenses persigan a Cristo como el *τέλος* de su vida. La obra se divide en tres apartados: 1) Aproximación a Filipenses y consideraciones metodológicas, 2) Contexto histórico: Filosofía moral, Atletismo y Discurso realista y 3) Análisis exegético: Filosofía Moral, Imaginería del atletismo y Discurso realista en Filipenses.

CARRAWAY, GEORGE, *Christ is God Over All. Romans 9,5 in the Context of Romans 9-11* (London-New York: Bloomsbury, T & T Clark, 2013) 231 pp. 23,5 x 15,5 cm. ISBN: 978-0-567-54632-6.

Este libro sigue la estela del pensamiento erudito cristológico surgido tras la obra *Kyrios Christos*, escrita por Bousset. El autor se basa en la sintaxis de Rom 5,5 para aducir que Pablo se refería a Jesús como Dios y que dicha declaración no está fuera de lugar al comienzo de Rom 9-11. Carraway hace frente a las objeciones de quienes señalan que un monoteísta como Pablo no alude a Jesús como Dios en ningún otro lugar, verificando que existe conexión entre Rom 9,5 y el resto de Rom 9-11. Así, conecta las declaraciones monoteístas de Pablo sobre el Dios único para los judíos y los gentiles en Rom 3 con el concepto de único Señor de todos en Rom 10,5-13. [p. 134/150] El autor afirma que el redentor de Sión en 11,25-27 es Cristo, y que este es el mismo Cristo redentor de Israel en 9,5.

CHARLESWORTH, JAMES H. – MCDONALD, LEE MARTIN - JURGENS, BLAKE A., *Sacra Scriptura. How “Non-Canonical” Texts Functioned in Early Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015. 198 pp. 15 x 23 cm. ISBN: 978-0-56714-887-2.

Muchos de los escritos considerados “apócrifos” y “pseudepigráficos” estaban en circulación en los primeros siglos del judaísmo y el cristianismo. Su influencia e impacto en el desarrollo de las comunidades primitivas y del pensamiento judío y cristiano aún no han sido suficientemente examinados. Si bien este juicio es

especialmente cierto para los llamados apócrifos cristianos, también se aplica a otros escritos que no se incluyeron en las Biblias judía y cristiana, ni en otras colecciones sagradas de escrituras, como las rabínicas y las patrísticas. La mayoría de estos escritos antiguos funcionaron, hasta cierto punto, como textos sagrados o *Scriptura Sacra* en las comunidades en las que se produjeron y en otras por las que circularon. Este volumen consta de 10 colaboraciones precedidas de prefacio y prólogo a cargo del editor, se centra en cómo se escucharon algunas de estas voces olvidadas en numerosas ocasiones en las primeras comunidades religiosas, ayudando a eliminar el angustioso silencio en muchas áreas del mundo antiguo.

CHURCH, PHILIP - WALKER, PETER – BULKELEY, TIM and MEADOWCROFT (eds.), *The Gospel and the Land of Promise. Christian Approaches to the Land of the Bible* (Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publications, 2011) 188 pp. 15 x 23 cm. ISBN: 13: 978-1-60899-545-5.

El significado de la expresión de la Biblia “Tierra prometida” sigue hasta el día de hoy siendo problemático en el marco de Oriente Medio a la luz de los sucesos que tienen lugar allí y cuyo influjo se extiende a otros lugares más allá de esta región. Los cristianos se enfrentan a un problema teológico importante cuando se refieren a esta expresión. Este conjunto de ensayos contribuirá, sin duda, a dar una respuesta bien informada y teológicamente coherente al concepto de “Tierra prometida”, que se presenta en esta obra en nombre de la paz para todas las personas en ese lugar y entre aquellos que continúan considerándola como “el lugar de la promesa”.

CLARK, BRUCE T., *Completing Christ's Afflictions* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2015) 190 pp. 15,5 x 23,5 cm. ISBN: 978-3-16-153334-1.

¿Cuál es la relación entre el “Cristo” preeminente que reconcilia el cosmos en Col 1,15-20 y el “Pablo” encarcelado en 1,24-29, que enigmáticamente “completa” las aflicciones de Jesús cuando declara a “todos” *el misterio*, oculto por mucho tiempo, pero solo ahora revelado por el Dios de Israel a sus santos? Después de encontrar terreno exegético sólido a través del estudio exhaustivo del extraño verbo *antanaplērōō* (en 1,24), Bruce Clark aborda esta pregunta y argumenta que Col 1,24, de acuerdo con 2Cor 5,18-6,4, [p. 135/150] presenta a Pablo como el único *diákonos* (ministro) de la *ekklēsia* universal y, por lo tanto, como aquel cuyos padecimientos completan singularmente los de Cristo, de modo que juntos, revelando la justicia de Dios, inician la reconciliación divina del universo.

DENNERT, BRIAN C., *John The Baptist and the Jewish Setting of Matthew* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2015) 336 pp. 15,5 x 23,5 cm. ISBN: 978-3-16-154005-9.

Aunque recientes discusiones sobre el Evangelio de Mateo han enfatizado la composición de este Evangelio dentro del marco del judaísmo del s. I, sin embargo, estos estudios no han analizado cómo funciona la figura de Juan el Bautista en este contexto. El hecho de no abordar el significado del Bautista dentro del contexto judío del Evangelio es sorprendente porque un estudio reciente sobre el Bautista histórico

ha enfatizado su ministerio y su lugar dentro del judaísmo del primer siglo. Por lo tanto, esta obra sitúa un tema antiguo dentro de un nuevo marco, afirmando que la atención al marco judío del Evangelio puede producir nuevas observaciones y explicaciones del papel de Juan el Bautista en el Evangelio de Mateo. El argumento general de este trabajo es que Mateo presenta a Jesús como la continuación y culminación del ministerio de Juan a fin de fortalecer las demandas del grupo de Mateo dentro de su entorno judío y vilipendiar a los oponentes de su grupo. Este argumento se desarrolla tanto a nivel externo (textos aproximadamente contemporáneos a Mateo, que muestran el respeto dado a Juan el Bautista en el momento de la composición del Evangelio de Mateo) como interno (la imagen distintiva de Juan ofrecida por el Evangelio de Mateo en el que Juan está más estrechamente relacionado con Jesús y es rechazado por las autoridades judías).

EBERHART, CHRISTIAN A., *Kultmetaphorik und Christologie* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2013) 328 pp. 16 x 24 cm. ISBN: 978-3-16-153943-5.

¿Qué ideas cristológicas y soteriológicas se transmiten en el Nuevo Testamento con la designación de Jesús como sacrificio y el discurso sobre su muerte expiatoria? Esta designación de Jesús como sacrificio así como su muerte expiatoria son motivo de incompreensión hoy, pues muchos las consideran ofensivas, ya que parecen asociarlas al asesinato violento y a la imagen de un Dios punitivo. Christian A. Eberhart examina en esta obra las metáforas culturales y los modismos del Nuevo Testamento dentro del marco del Antiguo y de los textos judíos primitivos sobre los rituales de los sacrificios. El autor muestra que el motivo del sacrificio en el Nuevo Testamento no se relaciona únicamente con la muerte de Jesús, sino también con su vida y misión, vistas como un todo, y que el culto expiatorio no está adecuadamente descrito con la idea de la muerte vicaria, sino que se asocia más bien a un proceso de salvación, basado en el concepto de purificación ritual y consagración. La obra se estructura en 8 capítulos: 1) Introducción, 2) Reflexiones sobre el método, 3) Jesús, la ofrenda 4) La sangre de Cristo, 5) La ofrenda de Jesús según la carta a los Hebreos, 6) El lexema ἱλάσκομαι [p. 136/150] en el Nuevo Testamento, 7) La metáfora del Cordero en el NT y 8: Síntesis y conclusiones: Culto metafórico y Cristología en el Nuevo Testamento.

FILTVEDT, OLE JAKOB, *The Identity of God's People and the Paradox of Hebrews* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2015) 312 pp. 15,5 x 23,5 cm. ISBN: 978-3-16-154013-4.

¿Confirma la carta a los Hebreos las nociones tradicionales de identidad judía, articula una nueva noción de identidad cristiana, o ninguna de estas alternativas es adecuada? Tomando el motivo del “pueblo de Dios” en la Carta a los Hebreos como punto de partida, Filtvedt explora estas preguntas y estudia lo que califica como “la paradoja de Hebreos”: la confrontación entre la continuidad del Pacto Sinaítico y la Ley, y la novedad de la interpretación cúllica del cristianismo en terminos de identidad étnica: quiénes son el “pueblo de Dios”. Para ello, se analiza, en primer

lugar, qué se entiende por identidad del pueblo de Dios desde un punto de vista étnico; en segundo lugar se presenta a Jesús como punto de conexión entre la culminación de la historia hebrea y la llegada de Cristo, dando énfasis a esa línea de continuidad; en tercer lugar, se afirma que el nuevo pacto es continuidad del antiguo en tanto que este es dado al pueblo de Dios, pero también es una modificación de la identidad de ese pueblo de Dios basada en el nuevo pacto; por último, el autor dedica el resto del libro a asentar lo anterior a través de la relación entre la narrativa de Israel (de acuerdo con el autor “secuencia de sucesos que adquieren sentido al ser interpretados en relación con otros y a la luz de un objetivo”) y la membresía del pueblo de Dios, y cómo entender la idea de “salir del campamento” y seguir perteneciendo al pueblo de Dios.

GLEAVES, G. SCOTT, *Did Jesus Speak Greek?. The Emerging Evidence of Greek Dominance in First-Century Palestine* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2015) 214 pp. 23 x 15 cm. ISBN: 978-1-4982-0433-0.

¿Jesús habló griego? Una respuesta afirmativa a esta pregunta desafiará, sin duda, los presupuestos tradicionales. La pregunta se relaciona directamente con la preservación histórica de las palabras de Jesús y la teología. Tradicionalmente, la autenticidad de las enseñanzas de Jesús se ha relacionado con la recuperación del arameo original que presumiblemente subyace a los Evangelios. La hipótesis aramea infiere que los Evangelios representan expansiones teológicas, propaganda religiosa o distorsiones flagrantes de las enseñanzas de Jesús. En consecuencia, descubrir el original arameo de las enseñanzas de Jesús separará al Jesús histórico de la personalidad mítica. G. Scott Gleaves, en esta obra, sostiene que la hipótesis aramea es inadecuada como criterio exclusivo de los estudios históricos sobre Jesús y no toma en consideración de modo adecuado la cultura multilingüe de la Palestina del primer siglo. La evidencia de los datos arqueológicos, literarios y bíblicos demuestra el dominio lingüístico del griego en la Palestina romana durante el siglo I y esto conduce no solo a la conclusión de que Jesús y sus discípulos hablaban griego, sino también al reconocimiento de [p. 137/150] que el Nuevo Testamento griego, en general, y el Evangelio de Mateo, en particular, eran composiciones originales y no traducciones de fuentes arameas subyacentes.

GOLDSTEIN, ELISABETH W., *Impurity and Gender in the Hebrew Bible* (Lanham-Boulder-New York-London: Lexington Books, 2015) 140 pp. 15 x 23 cm. ISBN: 978-1-4985-0080-7.

Esta obra explora el papel de la sangre en la Biblia hebrea y considera sus implicaciones teológicas para la posterior comprensión de la pureza y la impureza en la religión judía. Influenciada por la obra de Jonathan Klawans (*Sin and Impurity in Ancient Judaism*) y utilizando las categorías de impureza ritual y moral, su autora analiza la forma en que estas categorías se entrecruzan con las mujeres y con la impureza de la sangre femenina, e interpreta los fundamentos bíblicos de los tabús de pureza y sangre desde una perspectiva feminista. En definitiva, el propósito de este

libro es comprender la interrelación entre impureza y género, figuradamente o no, en la Biblia hebrea. Goldstein traza esta interrelación desde el año 1.000 a.C. y el 250 a.C. La obra termina con una consideración sobre la impureza femenina en la literatura de Qumrán.

HYLEN, SUSAN E., *A Modest Apostle. Thecla and the History of Women in the Early Church* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015) 182 pp. 23,5 x 16 cm. ISBN: 978-0-19-024382-

Eruditos y pastores importantes hablan de los roles de las mujeres en la iglesia primitiva donde estas desempeñaban funciones de liderazgo y ejercían autoridad, pero dicen que, con el establecimiento de roles institucionales formales, las mujeres fueron excluidas de la vida activa y del liderazgo. La evidencia del liderazgo de las mujeres se describe como “excepcional” o relegada a (los así llamados) grupos heréticos, que difieren de los grupos proto-ortodoxos precisamente en el tema de la participación de las mujeres. Los eruditos contrastan a menudo los Hechos de Pablo y Tecla con 1Timoteo y entienden que las dos obras representan comunidades diferentes con respuestas opuestas a la cuestión del liderazgo de las mujeres. En esta obra, Susan Hylen trata de Tecla como de un microcosmos desde el cual desafiar esta idea. Hylen lee 1Tim y las *Actas de Pablo y Tecla* como textos que emergen de un marco cultural común. En el período romano se esperaba que las mujeres exhibieran virtudes de género como la modestia, la laboriosidad y la lealtad a la familia. Sin embargo, estas persiguieron esas virtudes de maneras notablemente diferentes, incluido el liderazgo activo en sus comunidades. A la luz del trasfondo cultural en el que ya existían normas múltiples y contradictorias para el comportamiento de las mujeres, Hylen muestra que textos como las *Actas de Pablo y Tecla* y 1Timoteo siguen caminos diferentes. En 1Timoteo se afirma el liderazgo de las mujeres como diáconas y viudas, al tiempo que se defienden los estándares de modestia en la vestimenta y el habla para la mujer. En las *Actas de Pablo y Tecla* se presenta a Tecla como alguien que cumple con las normas establecidas [p. 138/150] culturalmente, aun cuando ella persigue una nueva y audaz forma de vida. El enfoque de Hylen apunta a una nueva forma de entender a las mujeres en la iglesia primitiva, que insiste en el reconocimiento del liderazgo de estas como una realidad histórica sin descuidar los prejuicios de género de la cultura en que vivieron.

KONRADT, MATTHIAS, *Israel, Church, and the Gentiles in the Gospel of Matthew* (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2014) 485 pp. 16,5 x 23,5 cm. ISBN: 978-1-4813-0189-3.

En esta obra, que es traducción inglesa del original alemán *Israel, Kirche und die Völker in Matthäusevangelium* (Mohr Siebeck 2007) se aborda uno de los problemas teológicos centrales del Evangelio de Mateo: ¿Cuáles son las relaciones entre Israel y la Iglesia, entre la misión a Israel y la misión a los gentiles? Para responder a estas preguntas, Matthias Konradt traza la sorprendente transición de las palabras y hechos de Jesús centrados en Israel (y sus discípulos) antes de Pascua

hasta la misión universal de los primeros seguidores de Jesús después de su resurrección. A través de un cuidadoso análisis histórico y narrativo, Konradt rechaza la interpretación del Evangelio de Mateo según la que la Iglesia reemplazó a Israel en los planes de Dios. Para este autor, la iglesia de la gentilidad nunca debió considerarse a sí misma como el Israel “nuevo” o “verdadero”, sino que representaba más bien una extensión de las promesas hechas primero a Israel y que, ahora, incluía a los gentiles. Tras 1) la introducción, el autor trata 2) del ministerio de Jesús y de sus discípulos centrado en Israel, 3) la reacción al ministerio de Jesús en Israel, 4) las consecuencias de la reacción negativa al ministerio de Jesús, 5) Israel y los gentiles, 6) Israel y la Iglesia y 7) diversas consideraciones sobre la situación de la comunidad de Mateo.

LARSEN, KASPER BRO (ed.), *The Gospel of John as Genre Mosaic* (Göttingen-Bristol, CT, USA: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015) 414 pp. 23 x 16 cm. ISBN: 978-3-525-53619-3.

En las últimas décadas, los estudiosos del Nuevo Testamento han desarrollado un creciente interés por ver cómo el Evangelio de Juan interactúa con las convenciones literarias de género y forma en el antiguo contexto judío y greco-romano. El presente volumen reúne colaboraciones de 16 autores con la finalidad de discutir el *status quaestionis* e identificar nuevas fronteras exegéticas. En el Evangelio de Juan, géneros y formas sirven como vehículos de significado ideológico y teológico. Centrando la cuestión sobre los análisis contemporáneos de género, el editor recopila estos trabajos que analizan minuciosamente los espacios narrativos que ocupan hombres y mujeres. Los temas tratados van desde los estudios de masculinidad y el lugar de la mujer en el texto sagrado, hasta el análisis de importantes elementos simbólicos, como el Señor, el Cordero y el Amante, o de distintos pasajes significativos del Evangelio de Juan, o de la contextualización de este Evangelio en el género literario de la novela griega. La finalidad del [p. 139/150] volumen es mostrar cómo las teorías antiguas y modernas sobre el género hacen avanzar nuestra comprensión del Cuarto Evangelio.

LIFTIN, DUANE, *Paul's Theology of Preaching. The Apostle's Challenge to the Art of Persuasion in Ancient Corinth* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 2015) 392 pp. 23 x 15 cm. ISBN: 978-0-8308-2471-7.

Ante la pregunta de si Pablo siguió la estrategia retórica de su época o tomó un camino diferente cuando predicó a Jesucristo crucificado y resucitado en la iglesia de Corinto y en otros lugares, y lo que ello significó para la predicación de la iglesia de hoy, Duane Litfin estudia el contexto retórico de la predicación de Pablo y la propia comprensión de su tarea como predicador. El autor realiza un análisis detallado de 1Corintios 1-4, revelando una nítida distinción entre las estrategias retóricas greco-romanas y la teología de la predicación de Pablo basada en el modelo del “heraldo obediente”. Esta obra es una edición revisada y ampliada de otra del autor *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation*, que proporciona una nueva visión del Nuevo Testamento

a quienes están interesados por los estudios paulinos y el Nuevo Testamento, por la retórica y los estudios greco-romanos. Además, al ofrecer una mejor comprensión del método de Pablo y del contenido de su declaración sobre “el poder y la sabiduría de Dios” revelada en Jesús, este libro ayudará a los predicadores a emprender la tarea de “predicar a Cristo crucificado”.

LUTHER, SUSANNE – RÖDER, JÖRG - SCHMIDT, ECKART D., *Wie Geschichten Geschichte schreiben. Früchristliche Literatur zwischen Faktualität und Fiktionalität* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2015) 452 pp. 15,5 x 23,5 cm. ISBN: 978-3-16-152634-3.

Recientes influencias lingüístico-filosóficas y literario-científicas sobre la Ciencia histórica obligan a nuevas lecturas de los primitivos textos cristianos con respecto a la relación entre realidad y ficción. Las contribuciones de este volumen reflejan estas tendencias desde un punto de vista científico y tratan de dar respuesta a los siguientes interrogantes: ¿Cómo se implementan modos factuales y ficticios de representación literaria para figuras narrativas, eventos, temas y motivos? ¿Cuáles son las intenciones? ¿Qué efectos se lograron? Ideas sobre el metadiscurso y la historia de la recepción de estos textos completan los temas de esta obra, que reparte las contribuciones bajo tres títulos: 1) Hacia una teoría de la Factualidad y la Ficcionalidad; 2) Discusión de textos cristianos primitivos y 3) Metadiscurso y e historia de la recepción.

MENKEN, MAARTEN J.J. *Studies in John's Gospel and Epistles. Collected Essays* (Leuven-Paris-Bristol: Peeters, 2015) 455 pp. 23x 15 cm. ISBN: 978-90-429-3201-2.

Este volumen reúne veintidós ensayos sobre el Evangelio y las Epístolas de Juan, publicados por el autor en el período 1980-2014, que son el fruto de una fascinación de por vida por la literatura joánica, primero con el [p. 140/150] Evangelio, más tarde también con las Epístolas. La obra se divide en dos grandes apartados: 1) Estudios temáticos y 2) Estudios de pasajes individuales. Los estudios temáticos –los primeros doce capítulos- se refieren a temas de la literatura joannea: traducción, cuestiones teológicas, uso e importancia del Antiguo Testamento y de la tradición judía, y preguntas introductorias sobre las epístolas de Juan. Los siguientes diez son estudios de pasajes individuales de Evangelio y Epístolas, con un interés especial en aquellos pasajes en los que la interpretación de las Escrituras figura de manera prominente. En su conjunto, los capítulos de esta obra muestran que una cristología centrada en el ser humano de Jesús como el único revelador de Dios es el corazón de la teología joannea, que las Escrituras judías se usan en el Evangelio de Juan para legitimar a Jesús como revelador de Dios, y que este Evangelio es un escrito que pretende constituir una nueva Sagrada Escritura.

MOLONEY, F.J., *The Resurrection of the Messiah. A Narrative Commentary on the Resurrection Accounts in the Four Gospels* (New York / Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2013) 203 pp. 22,5 x 15 cm. ISBN: 978-08-091-4844-79.

El presente volumen es una reconstrucción de los hechos ocurridos los días previos a la muerte de Jesús, su pasión y posterior resurrección a partir de los principales testigos textuales. Así, por este orden, se atiende a los relatos de Marcos, Mateo, Lucas y Juan, para terminar con una sección de conclusiones en las que se recogen interesantes reflexiones históricas y teológicas sobre el significado de los pasajes ayer y hoy. Los primeros cuatro capítulos de esta obra tratan los relatos de resurrección en Marcos (pp. 1-32), Mateo (pp. 33-68), Lucas (pp. 69-99) y Juan (pp. 101-136), respectivamente; el capítulo final ofrece un conjunto histórico y teológico de reflexiones sobre la resurrección de Jesús (pp. 137-182). Este volumen no está destinado a especialistas, sino a un público mucho más amplio. Contiene información muy útil diseminada a lo largo del libro que será beneficiosa para los lectores, ayudándolos a comprender mejor el contexto cultural y religioso más amplio en el que se escribieron los Evangelios.

MORRISON, GREGG S., *The Turning Point in the Gospel of Mark. A Study in Markan Christology* (Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publications, 2014) 268 pp. 15 x 23 cm. ISBN: 13: 978-1-61097-760-9.

Esta obra argumenta que las perícopas gemelas de la confesión de Pedro (8,27-38) y la Transfiguración (9,2-13) funcionan juntas como el punto de inflexión del Evangelio de Marcos, permitiendo al lector ver el enfoque principal del autor, que no es otro sino la identidad de Jesús y el significado de esa realidad para sus discípulos. La confesión de Pedro de que Jesús es el Mesías mira hacia atrás, al prólogo (1,1-13), y funciona como una conclusión a mitad de camino de la narración evangélica; la declaración de Dios en el monte de la Transfiguración mira hacia adelante y presagia la conclusión final (14,61-62; 15,39, Hijo de Dios). Jesús, en respuesta, enseña que el Hijo del hombre debe sufrir y morir antes de resucitar de entre los [p. 141/150] muertos (8,31). Cristológicamente, las imágenes del Mesías, el Hijo del Hombre y el Hijo de Dios convergen y presentan a Jesús, el crucificado, como rey, anunciando el reino de Dios con fuerza (9,1), actuando como gozne entre las dos perícopas. Cuando uno se enfrenta a este Jesús, -aunque en el relato evangélico sigue habiendo algo de inconcreto en la imagen de este y del reino de Dios-, la única decisión sabia (después de calcular los riesgos que conlleva, 8,34-38) es el seguimiento.

MURAOKA, TAKAMITSU, *A Biblical Aramaic Reader. With an Outline Grammar* (Leuven-Paris-Bristol: Peeters, 2015) 82 pp. 24x16 cm. ISBN: 978-90-429-3276-0.

Este libro de 82 páginas se destina a quienquiera que esté deseoso de leer en su idioma original los textos de la Biblia escritos en arameo. A un breve resumen de la gramática bíblica aramea (Morfología, Sintaxis y Paradigmas verbales) sigue un comentario gramatical versículo a versículo de los capítulos arameos de los libros de Daniel y Ezra, así como de Gen 31,47 y Jer 10,11. Tanto el bosquejo de gramática como el comentario gramatical presuponen el conocimiento básico de la gramática y del vocabulario hebreo bíblico. En el comentario se hacen constantes referencias a

las secciones gramaticales. La obra está escrita en un lenguaje fácil, no técnico, es adecuada para el autoaprendizaje y concluye con algunos ejercicios gramaticales con claves y paradigmas.

MOXNES, HALVOR, *A Short History of The New Testament* (London-New York: I.B. Tauris, 2014) 238 pp. 21,5 x 14 cm. ISBN: 978-1-78076-607-2.

Pocos documentos en la historia del mundo pueden igualar el impacto inspirador del Nuevo Testamento. A pesar de su variedad (Evangelios, Cartas y Apocalipsis), esta colección de textos del primer siglo mantiene siempre en su centro la figura enigmática de Josué / Jesús: el profeta judío que reunió a un grupo de seguidores a su alrededor, proclamó el fin inminente del mundo, pero que fue hecho prisionero por las autoridades de Roma, sufriendo la muerte de un criminal vergonzoso en la cruz. Cuando sus seguidores (incluido el antiguo perseguidor Saulo / Pablo) se convencieron de que Jesús había vencido la muerte y había resucitado a una nueva vida, el movimiento cruzó Palestina para expandirse por todo el mundo mediterráneo greco-romano. El autor muestra cómo los escritos de esta nueva y vibrante fe surgieron de la transmisión oral y, luego, se convirtieron en el pilar de una gran religión mundial. Esta obra explora igualmente los muchos y variados usos del NT en la música, la liturgia, el arte, la lengua y la literatura. Al discutir los orígenes textuales, así como su posterior recepción, Moxnes muestra cómo el Nuevo Testamento ha sido empleado tanto de herramienta de liberación como de medio de poder y control.

MOORE, NICOLAS J., *Repetition in Hebrews* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2015) 276 pp. 15,5 x 23,5 cm. ISBN: 978-3-16-153852-0.

En esta obra se define la figura de la “repetición” como “la acción o el hecho de hacer algo de nuevo” o “la reiteración o recurrencia de una acción [p. 142/150] o suceso”. Esta figura ha tenido una recepción accidentada y, a menudo, negativa en la historia cristiana, especialmente en relación con el ritual y la liturgia, siendo su función muy controvertida en la Carta a los Hebreos. En la primera parte de esta obra, Moore estudia la repetición en el AT, el libro de los Jubileos, Qumrán, Filón de Alejandría, Plutarco y en el cristianismo primitivo. En la segunda parte se centra en la carta a los Hebreos para tratar de “Repetición” y Revelación”, “Repetición y arrepentimiento”, “Repetición y ritual”, para concluir hablando de Repetición, Redención y Eternidad. Moore muestra que la repetición en Hebreos no opera en contraste uniforme con la muerte de Cristo de una vez por todas, sino que funciona en una variedad de formas, muchas de ellas constructivas. La singularidad del evento de Cristo se dilucida con referencia al Día de la Expiación que se realiza una vez al año, para expresar una suficiencia teológica que lo supera todo; la repetición puede estar en contraste o coexistir con este evento único. En particular, Moore argumenta que los sacrificios levíticos diarios prefiguran el acceso cristiano continuo a Dios y su adoración. Esta reevaluación de la repetición en Hebreos sienta las bases para una renovada apreciación de la repetición en el discurso teológico y en la vida religiosa.

MYLES, ROBERT J., *The Homeless Jesus in the Gospel of Matthew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2014) 220 pp. 16,5 x 24 cm. ISBN: 978-1-909697-38-6.

Si “vivir sin techo” conlleva, por lo general, una pérdida de poder y de representación social, entonces ¿por qué los eruditos del Nuevo Testamento consideran con tanta frecuencia la vida de un Jesús sin techo como un estilo de vida elegido, carente de dificultades? En esta nueva lectura provocativa del Evangelio de Mateo, Robert J. Myles desarrolla su interpretación basado en la crítica marxista del neoliberalismo y, en particular, en la teoría crítica de Slavoj Žižek. El desamparo, desde esta perspectiva, no se ve como una opción individual, sino como un subproducto de fuerzas económicas, políticas y sociales más amplias. Myles argumenta que, en la erudición bíblica reciente, la falta de hogar de Jesús ha sido fuertemente idealizada. ¿La huida a Egipto, por ejemplo, es importante principalmente para la presentación de Jesús como el nuevo Moisés o no debiera ser el centro de interés de esta escena el tema del desplazamiento forzoso? La respuesta, según Myles, es leer directamente a contracorriente de la erudición contemporánea, interpretando la falta de hogar de Jesús en un contexto económico, político y social más amplio, tal como está codificado en el texto bíblico. En esta obra, su autor niega, por tanto, la visión romántica de los eruditos del Nuevo Testamento que ven en la itinerancia de Jesús un estilo de vida sin dificultades. La obra tiene seis capítulos: 1) Falta de hogar e ideología, 2) Desplazamiento, 3) Reacción, 4) Destitución, 5) Rechazo y 6) Exterminio.

OGEREAU, JULIEN M., *Paul's Koinōnía with the Philippians* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2014) 592 pp. 15,5 x 23,5 cm. ISBN: 978-3-16-153488-1.

Julien M. Ogereau explora la dimensión socio-económica de la *koinōnía* de Pablo con los filipenses desde una perspectiva greco-romana. Después de [p. 143/150] realizar un riguroso estudio filológico de la terminología de negocios, que Pablo emplea en Filipenses a la luz de las fuentes documentales (papiros e inscripciones), el autor ofrece una lectura socio-económica detallada de la carta, que está informada por antiguas convenciones culturales. Desafiando la opinión reciente de los eruditos, Ogereau concluye que la relación de Pablo con los filipenses siguió el bien establecido patrón de la economía asociativa (*koinōnía* / *societas*), en la que Pablo suministró *ars et opera* (habilidad y trabajo), mientras que los filipenses contribuyeron con su *pecunia* (financiación). Tras la introducción, la primera parte de carácter filológico, estudia la terminología económica de Pablo a la luz de las fuentes documentarias, la historia de la investigación sobre el término, así como el lexema *koinōnía* y términos emparentados en el NT y en las fuentes documentarias. En la segunda parte realiza un análisis detenido exegético y socio-económico de la carta a los Filipenses.

PARK, YOUNG-HO, *Paul's as a Civic Assembly* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2015) 254 pp. 15,5 x 23,5 cm. ISBN: 978-3-16-153060-9.

La palabra *ekklêsía*, que en época clásica significaba “asamblea de todos los ciudadanos”, es el tema central del presente estudio. Young-Ho Park argumenta que la connotación democrática de esta palabra pervivió a lo largo de los períodos helenístico y romano. El uso de esta en el judaísmo del Segundo Templo debería entenderse también como parte de esta cultura política a la que los judíos se incorporaron en gran medida. Al adoptar este término en sus cartas, Pablo creó un universo simbólico en el que los cristianos se veían a sí mismos como los ciudadanos honorables que representaban la ciudad ante Dios. Como fruto de esta conexión de culturas, su uso en las cartas de Pablo es especial, pues la palabra *ekklêsía* pasó a significar la comunidad de fieles. Esta naturaleza cívica de la comunidad cristiana también se usó como la solución de Pablo al problema de Corinto, especialmente con respecto a la Cena del Señor y proporcionó un principio de organización para las comunidades locales. La obra consta de cinco capítulos: 1) La *ekklêsía* en el mundo político greco-romano, 2) La *ekklêsía* en los LXX y en el judaísmo del Segundo Templo, 3) El uso de *ekklêsía* en Pablo, 4) El énfasis de iglesia de la gran ciudad y 5) Diversidad local entre las Iglesias paulinas.

RAINBOW, PAUL A., *Theology. The Gospel, The Epistles and the Apocalypse* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 2014) 496 pp. 23,5 x 16 cm. ISBN: 978-0-8308-4056-4.

Paul A. Rainbow elabora en esta obra una síntesis muy completa de la teología del corpus joánico. Incluye todos los libros del Nuevo Testamento atribuidos a Juan: el Evangelio, las tres epístolas y el libro de Apocalipsis. Aunque no reclama una posición definitiva sobre el problema de su autoría, trata, sin embargo, de arrojar luz sobre la teología común a todos los autores del Nuevo Testamento. Las convicciones fundamentales de Juan sobre Dios, la humanidad, el pecado, el mundo y el significado del evento [p. 144/150] escatológico de Jesús sirven de unión entre los libros estudiados y el resto del canon del Nuevo Testamento. El corpus joanneo pone de relieve también las importantes áreas de Cristología, Soteriología y Eclesiología de modo digno de ser exploradas. La obra tiene 10 capítulos: 1) Introducción, 2) La revelación de Dios (el Padre), 3) El mundo, 4) La revelación de Dios en la persona de Cristo, 5) La revelación de Dios en la obra de Cristo, 6) La revelación del Padre en el Hijo por el Espíritu paráclito, 7) y 8) El creyente y el verdadero Dios, 9) Discípulos de Cristo en comunidad y 10) La comunidad de discípulos de Cristo en el mundo.

ROTH, DIETER T. – ZIMMERMANN, RUBEN – LABANHN, MICHAEL (eds.), *Metaphor, Narrative and Parables in Q* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2014) 423 pp. 16 x 24 cm. ISBN: 978-3-16-152338-0.

La investigación sobre la fuente Q ha sido frecuentemente impulsada por preguntas que abordan la legitimidad de la hipótesis de las dos fuentes o por cuestiones relacionadas con la reconstrucción de esta fuente. Los autores de este volumen hacen un esfuerzo consciente por reenfocar, al menos hasta cierto punto, las discusiones

sobre Q, cuestiones de reconstrucción crítica o redaccional de esta fuente para centrarse principalmente en los elementos narrativos y metafóricos de este documento, en general, y en las parábolas que hay en él, en particular. El presente volumen es una recopilación de los trabajos originales presentados en el congreso *Metaphorik und Narrativität in der Logienquelle Q* en la Universidad Johannes Gutenberg (Mainz) del 30 de agosto al 1 de septiembre de 2012. Por consiguiente, capítulo a capítulo, se trata una importante diversidad de temas en lengua inglesa y alemana, estructurados bajo los siguientes epígrafes: la metáfora, el aspecto narrativo y las parábolas en Q; otros temas particulares van desde aspectos centrados en la familia y formas de vida, según se deduce de la interpretación de los textos recogidos en Q, hasta la figura de Jesús o la finalidad y significado de sus parábolas.

ROTHSCHILD, CLARE K., *Paul in Athens* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2014) 215 pp. 16 x 23 cm. ISBN: 978-3-16-153260-3.

Sin duda, la visita de Pablo a Atenas y, en concreto, su discurso en el Areópago es uno de los momentos fundamentales tanto de la vida del apóstol, como del surgimiento de la literatura cristiana primitiva, si bien es cierto que, a la hora de buscar referentes literarios, los estudiosos no han llegado todavía a un consenso académico más allá de definir este discurso como “eclectico”. La autora comienza ofreciendo una panorámica sobre la historia de la investigación de este pasaje, para pasar a analizar el discurso desde el punto de vista textual; a continuación aborda el núcleo de su propuesta, y encontrando en Epiménides un claro antecedente de este discurso, se centra en, pero no se limitará a tratar del altar dedicado “al dios desconocido” y al dicho “En él vivimos, nos movemos y existimos” (17,28a). A fin de justificar estas semejanzas, la investigadora aborda un amplio espectro de la literatura griega y cristiana, haciendo ver las similitudes [p. 145/150] que existen entre ambas. En su conjunto, la obra investiga el nexo existente entre las tradiciones populares en torno al profeta de Creta Epiménides que dan unidad aparentemente a diversos elementos de Hechos 17, demostrando que, además de los ideales filosóficos populares, el episodio de Pablo en Atenas usa también *topoi* populares religiosos para reforzar la finalidad narrativa central del discurso.

SARGENT, BENJAMIN, *Written to Serve. The Use of Scripture in 1Peter* (London-New York: Bloomsbury, T & T Clark, 2015) 225 pp. 23,5 x 16 cm. ISBN: 978-0-56766-085-5.

El uso de las Escrituras en la primera carta de Pedro ha sido objeto de análisis muy extensos en los últimos treinta años. En esta obra, Benjamin Sargent ofrece un análisis completo y actualizado de cómo 1Pe 1,10-12 ofrece una “hermenéutica”, que da idea de cómo se interpreta la Escritura en esta carta. En lugar de ofrecer una hermenéutica cristológica fijada en el sufrimiento y la gloria de Cristo, como se ha dicho hasta hoy, el autor de esta obra afirma que la importancia principal de estos versículos es la orientación del testimonio profético hacia una comunidad escatológica como acto de servicio. De manera similar, en lugar de ofrecer una

narración teológica de la continuidad entre Israel y las comunidades cristianas, se puede ver que este pasaje sugiere una narrativa de profunda discontinuidad en la cual la comunidad en el presente se eleva por encima del pueblo de Dios del pasado. La obra consta de cuatro capítulos: 1) ¿1Pe 1,10-12, establecimiento hermenéutico?, 2) Cita formal de la Escritura en 1Pedro, 3) Alusión a la Escritura en 1Pe, 4) Trasfondo exegético del uso de la Escritura en 1Pedro, y 5) 1Pedro y la interpretación teológica de la Escritura.

SCHOLTEN, CLEMENS, *Theodoret. De Graecarum affectionum curatione* (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2015) 825 pp. 23,5 x 16 cm. ISBN: 978-90-04-27932-2.

La escritura de la obra “De Graecarum affectionum curatione” (Curación de las enfermedades griegas) de Teodoreto constituye un punto culminante de la apologética de la antigua iglesia. Teodoreto (circa 393 - circa 460), obispo de Ciro, se opone al prejuicio de que la fe y la conducta de la vida de los cristianos no eran compatibles con la educación y la civilización clásicas, promoviendo la capacidad integradora del cristianismo orientado globalmente para establecer comunidades locales pacíficas. La tradición griega en sí misma es testigo de la verdad del cristianismo. El texto se sitúa en el contexto de la vida y obras de Teodoreto. En esta obra se presenta la vida y obra de Teodoreto, se estudia el contexto cultural e histórico de la citada obra y la posibilidad de que Antioquía de Siria fuese su lugar de origen. La obra concluye con la edición crítica del texto griego de Raeder y su traducción alemana (en páginas paralelas) con notas a pie de página.

SMITH, DANIEL LYNWOOD, *Into the Word of the New Testament. Greco-Roman and Jewish Texts and Contexts* (London-New York: Bloomsbury, T & T Clark, 2015) 233 pp. 23 x 15,5 cm. ISBN: 978-0-56765-702-2. [p. 146/150]

Daniel Lynwood Smith orienta en esta obra a los lectores del Nuevo Testamento hacia su configuración histórica y cultural, presenta un elenco de personajes (Juan Bautista, María, José, Herodes, Pilatos, los doce discípulos, Pablo y otros) e ilumina conceptos clave del Nuevo Testamento, explorando su uso en los textos antiguos. Smith incluye en esta obra citas de Josefo, Tácito, la comunidad de Qumrán, Plinio el Joven y otros cuidadosamente seleccionados de fuentes antiguas menos conocidas. El texto está entrelazado de comentarios para servir de guía a los estudiantes. El autor proporciona, además, un glosario de términos complejos, para que todo sea lo más claro posible para el recién llegado a los estudios del Nuevo Testamento. En un formato conciso, Smith presenta la historia político-militar de Israel-Palestina, los movimientos mesiánicos del judaísmo del Segundo Templo, la antigua práctica de la crucifixión y el desarrollo del canon cristiano. A través de la inmersión en estos antiguos textos y contextos judíos, cristianos y greco-romanos, los lectores contemporáneos se acercan a experimentar el Nuevo Testamento con los ojos y oídos del siglo I.

SPRINKLE, PRESTON M., *Paul & Judaism Revisited. A Study of Divine and Human*

Agency in Salvation (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 2013) 256 pp. 23 x 15 cm. ISBN: 978-0-8308-2709-1.

Desde que E.P. Sanders publicó *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* en 1977, los estudiosos de Pablo han estado investigando, sopesando y debatiendo las similitudes y diferencias entre el concepto de salvación en el judaísmo, especialmente en Qumrán, y en Pablo. ¿Comparten ambos realmente una noción común? ¿O difieren profundamente? Y si es así, ¿cómo? Para dar respuesta a estas preguntas el autor se sumerge en las perspectivas deuteronomicas y proféticas del Antiguo Testamento sobre la actividad salvífica divina y humana. El objetivo de este estudio es comparar los motivos soteriológicos en Pablo y Qumrán para comprender mejor cómo estas dos comunidades judías del Segundo Templo entendieron la intervención divina y humana en la salvación. Según este autor, el Antiguo Testamento dice que Israel será restaurado cuando se arrepienta (motivo de restauración deuteronomico), pero también que Dios iniciará la restauración antes de [su] arrepentimiento (motivo profético). El centro de este trabajo, por tanto, contrasta y compara la comprensión deuteronomica y profética en la literatura seleccionada de Qumrán y Pablo.

STEIN, ROBERT H., *Jesus, The Temple and the Coming Son of Man. A Commentary on Mark 13* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 2014) 155 pp. 23 x 15 cm. ISBN: 978-0-8308-4058-8.

Los Evangelios contienen muchos dichos de Jesús difíciles de interpretar, pero quizás ninguno ha deconcertado e intrigado a los lectores tanto como el discurso de Jesús sobre la venida del Hijo del Hombre en Marcos 13. ¿Habla Jesús exactamente de un acontecimiento en el futuro inmediato como la próxima destrucción del templo? ¿O se está refiriendo a un evento [p. 147/150] distante, al fin del mundo? ¿O podría estar hablando de ambos eventos a la vez? Pero en ese caso, ¿qué palabras se aplican a cada evento y cómo podemos estar seguros? El autor de esta obra sigue su comentario mayor a Marcos con esta lectura aún más atenta de Marcos 13.

STOWASSER, MARTIN, *Das Gottesbild in der Offenbarung des Johannes* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2015) 256 pp. 15,5 x 23,5 cm. ISBN: 978-3-16-153449-2.

La imagen de Dios en el Apocalipsis de Juan resulta extremadamente polifacética desde el punto de vista religioso-histórico, y compleja desde el teológico. Esta antología, editada por Martin Stowasser, recoge contribuciones de diversos autores presentadas en unas jornadas científicas de la Universidad de Viena y examina las referencias intertextuales al Antiguo Testamento, los vínculos con la cultura dominante romano-helénica contemporánea y la visión estatal y socialmente crítica de la imagen de Dios. El autor toma en consideración el anclaje monoteísta de la imagen de Dios en el Apocalipsis de Juan junto con la cuestión de la dimensión esencial o funcional de la cristología y los epítetos divinos transferidos a Cristo. Se complementa presentando paralelos y diferencias con las declaraciones sobre Dios en el Evangelio de Juan. El volumen concluye con una perspectiva histórica del impacto de la imagen de Dios en la literatura moderna.

SUMNEY, JERRY L., *Paul. Apostle and Fellow Traveler* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2014), 185 pp. 23,5 x 16 cm. ISBN: 978-1-4267-4197-5.

A lo largo de todo el corpus paulino, el lector se encuentra con Pablo, hombre experto en argumentos persuasivos, que proporciona respuestas teológicas a problemas reales, a menudo espinosos, de las comunidades. Con esta obra, los lectores adquirirán una profunda comprensión del lugar de Pablo en la iglesia primitiva, de la relación entre la iglesia y la sinagoga, y entre la enseñanza de Pablo y la de Jesús. Al mismo tiempo situarán firmemente a Pablo dentro de la iglesia que existía antes de que él se uniera a ella, descubriendo que se había adherido a mucho de lo que lo precedió. La obra tiene tres capítulos: 1) El entorno de las iglesias paulinas, 2) Las cartas auténticas de Pablo y 3) Las otras cartas atribuidas a él.

TAM, JOSAPHAT C., *Apprehension of Jesus in the Gospel of John* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2015) 265 pp. 15,5 x 23,5 cm. ISBN: 978-3-16-154065-3.

El autor de esta obra discute el concepto de la “aprehensión (o percepción) de Jesús” en el Evangelio de Juan centrándose en el uso que hace Juan de los verbos “ver, oír, conocer, testificar, recordar, y en los vocablos que significan creer”. Al hacerlo, el autor contribuye a una mejor comprensión de este concepto y a las estrategias persuasivas de Juan, al delinear una comprensión de Jesús en línea con la trama general. Sobre esta base postula cuatro aspectos del impacto previsto de Juan en los lectores: en primer lugar, Juan tiene la doble meta de engendrar / fomentar la fe dirigida a [p. 148/150] lectores creyentes y no creyentes; en segundo, recuerda hábilmente a los lectores la importancia de la “presencialidad” de un Jesús vivo, omnisciente y divino; en tercer lugar, las actividades pasadas de “ver” y “escuchar” están asociadas en el Evangelio con la lectura del testimonio fiable de Juan en el presente y, por último, la (des)creencia de los lectores se abre a posibilidades desafiantes cuando se enfrenta al Jesús narrado.

TURLEY, STEPHEN RICHARD, *The Ritualized Revelation of the Messianic Age. Washings and Meals in Galatians and 1 Corinthians* (London-New York: Bloomsbury, T & T Clark, 2015) 198 pp. 23,5 x 16 cm. ISBN: 978-0-56766-385-6.

El centro de interés de esta obra gira en torno a los rituales que identificaron a las comunidades paulinas: los rituales de lavado y las comidas rituales. A partir de un análisis profundo de las cartas paulinas de Gálatas y 1Corintios, ejes principales sobre los que se articula el volumen, Turley observa que los rituales en el cristianismo primitivo eran reveladores, pues servían para ilustrar el comienzo de la era mesiánica a través de los participantes en el ritual e, igualmente, para conformar una ética cristiana, diferenciada del resto, y un espacio socio-cultural que permitía la auto-identificación de sus miembros. La obra se divide en tres grandes apartados: 1) Historia de la investigación: Lectura ritual de Pablo (“¿En qué consiste una lectura ritual de Pablo?”), 2) Pablo y los lavados rituales (Rituales de lavado en Gálatas; Bautismo, Ética y Cuerpo escatológico, 1Cor 6-11); Bautismo y Espíritu, 1Cor 12-13, y 3) Pablo y las comidas rituales (Las comidas antioqueñas, El Logos de la cena

del Señor, Pablo y las comidas rituales). La obra termina presentando las conclusiones sobre la lectura ritual de Pablo.

WHITE, ADAM G., *Where is the Wise Man? Graeco-Roman Education as a Background to the Divisions in 1 Corinthians 1-4* (London-New York: Bloomsbury, T & T Clark, 2015) 227 pp. 23,5 x 16 cm. ISBN: 978-0-56766-267-5.

Las divisiones en la iglesia de Corinto son catalogadas por Pablo en 1Cor 1,12 de este modo: “Cada uno por vuestro lado andáis diciendo: «Yo estoy con Pablo, yo con Apolo, yo con Pedro, yo con Cristo»”. White muestra cómo se daban estas divisiones en la educación greco-romana del siglo I. Consultando testimonios literarios y epigráficos relevantes, el autor de esta obra traza la imagen de la *paideia* antigua en todo el Imperio, en general, y en la Corinto romana, en particular, lo que sirve de telón de fondo a la situación en la comunidad cristiana, donde algunos de sus miembros de élite preferían como maestro a Apolo en lugar de a Pablo, ya que Apolo se parecía más a otros maestros de estudios más elevados. White toma una dirección nueva y diferente a otros estudios en este campo, argumentando que está en contra de los valores inculcados a través de la “educación superior”, en general, con los que los maestros están siendo comparados. Aunque White centra su atención en 1Cor 1-4, su comentario de estos versículos se expande hacia otros temas, bastante más amplios, analizados también con [p. 149/150] cuidado. La obra se divide en dos partes: I. La historia de la παιδεία (caps. 1: Παιδεία e inculturación, 2: Παιδεία y la teoría educacional, teóricos clásicos) y 3: La teoría educacional en el Antiguo Imperio). II: La defensa del estilo por parte de Pablo (caps. 5: Cristo y el hombre sabio, 6: Pablo y los oradores y 7: La sabiduría de Dios y la verdadera madurez). III. El papel de Pablo como apóstol y maestro, 1Cor 3-4 (caps. 8: La inmadurez de los corintios, 9: El papel de Pablo como maestro, 10: Los clientes intelectuales, 11: Pablo, el padre y 12: Conclusión).

WILSON, WALTER T., *Pauline Parallels. A Comprehensive Guide* (Louisville, Kentucky: John Knoss Press, 2009) 469pp., 23 x 15,5 cm. ISBN: 978-0-664-23120-0. Las cartas de Pablo a las iglesias primitivas constituyen una de las secciones más extensas y teológicamente significativas del Nuevo Testamento. El presente volumen analiza cada pasaje de estas cartas, sin excluir aquellas que algunos estudiosos no atribuyen a Pablo, mostrando la conexión y los paralelos de estas con pasajes de un amplio grupo de textos de la literatura antigua. Así se establecen paralelismos con otras cartas paulinas, con escritos del Nuevo Testamento y del Antiguo Testamento, con la literatura judía contemporánea como los Manuscritos del Mar Muerto y otras obras filosóficas y religiosas de Grecia y Roma. La obra de Wilson representa un estudio muy completo, resultando ser una ayuda valiosa para comprender a Pablo y situarlo en el contexto de la literatura de su tiempo.

WISCHMEYER, ODA, *Liebe als Agape* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2015) 292 pp. 14,5 x 22,5 cm. ISBN: 978-3-16-151882-9.

En la introducción de esta monografía se habla del concepto cristiano primitivo de amor-ἀγάπη y de su dimensión ética, social, institucional, teológica y escatológica. El primer capítulo trata, en general, de los mandamientos del amor en el Antiguo Testamento y de su recepción y reformulación en el Nuevo. El concepto de amor-ἀγάπη se establece a partir de los textos (caps. 3 y 4) y más tarde (cap. 4) se compara con el concepto de amor en el judaísmo y cristianismo primitivo, así como con su tratamiento en Plutarco. El cap. 6 y final está dedicado al estudio de este concepto en la Sociología, la Psicología y la Filosofía actuales, así como en la encíclica “Deus caritas est”; por último, se presentan las discusiones teológicas actuales sobre el tema. [p. 150/150]

Índice

Portada	2
Créditos	3
Nota del Editor	4
Índice	5
Artículos	6
Stanley E. Porter, Revisiting the Greek Verb: An Extended Critique.	6
Juan Barreto - Carmen Rita Jorge - María Maite García, Aproximación al estudio del campo semántico de los lexemas verbales de movimiento en el Griego del Nuevo Testamento.	18
Paul L. Danove, Interpreting and Translating Γίνομαι as a Verb of Process in the New Testament.	30
Didier Lafleur, Greek New Testament and Purple Manuscripts: The Case of Beratinus 1 (Φ.043) and Beratinus 2 (min. 1143).	42
Karl L. Armstrong, The End of Acts and the Comparable Age of its Variants.	80
Peter R. Rodgers, The Question of 1 Peter 3:13.	99
RECENSIONES Y PRESENTACIÓN DE LIBROS	106
LIBROS RECIBIDOS	117