



DEUTSCHE  
BIBEL  
GESELLSCHAFT

NOVUM  
TESTAMENTUM  
GRAECUM  
  
EDITIO  
CRITICA MAIOR

EDITED BY  
THE INSTITUTE FOR NEW TESTAMENT TEXTUAL RESEARCH

III  
ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

EDITED BY  
HOLGER STRUTWOLF, GEORG GÄBEL,  
ANNETTE HÜFFMEIER, GERD MINK,  
AND KLAUS WACHTEL

PART 3: STUDIES

DEUTSCHE BIBELGESELLSCHAFT

NOVUM  
TESTAMENTUM  
GRAECUM  
  
EDITIO  
CRITICA MAIOR

HERAUSGEGEBEN VOM  
INSTITUT FÜR NEUTESTAMENTLICHE TEXTFORSCHUNG

III  
DIE APOSTELGESCHICHTE

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON  
HOLGER STRUTWOLF, GEORG GÄBEL,  
ANNETTE HÜFFMEIER, GERD MINK  
UND KLAUS WACHTEL

TEIL 3: STUDIEN

DEUTSCHE BIBELGESELLSCHAFT

BARBARA ALAND ZUM 80. GEBURTSTAG  
IN DANKBARKEIT GEWIDMET

TO BARBARA ALAND ON THE OCCASION OF HER 80TH BIRTHDAY  
IN GRATITUDE

Die Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft ist eine kirchliche Stiftung des öffentlichen Rechts. Sie übersetzt die biblischen Schriften, entwickelt und verbreitet innovative Bibelausgaben und eröffnet für alle Menschen Zugänge zur Botschaft der Bibel. International verantwortet sie die wissenschaftlichen Bibelausgaben in den Ursprachen. Durch die Weltbibelhilfe unterstützt sie in Zusammenarbeit mit dem Weltverband der Bibelgesellschaften (United Bible Societies) weltweit die Übersetzung und Verbreitung der Bibel, damit alle Menschen die Bibel in ihrer Sprache lesen können.

Weitere Informationen finden Sie unter [www.die-bibel.de](http://www.die-bibel.de)

The Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft (German Bible Society) is a not-for-profit religious foundation. It is engaged in translation of the Scriptures, the development and dissemination of innovative Bible editions, and in giving all people access to the message of the Bible. It bears international responsibility for scholarly Bible editions in the original languages. Through its international programs, in collaboration with other members of the United Bible Societies, it supports translation and distribution of the

Bible worldwide, so that everyone can read the Bible in their own language.

You can find more information at [www.die-bibel.de](http://www.die-bibel.de)

ISBN 978-3-438-05613-9

Novum Testamentum Graecum  
Editio Critica Maior  
III: Die Apostelgeschichte / Acts of the Apostles  
Teil 3 / Part 3

© 2017 Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart  
Alle Rechte vorbehalten / All rights reserved  
Printed in Germany

## INHALTSVERZEICHNIS – TABLE OF CONTENTS

Vorwort . . . . .	VI
Preface . . . . .	VII
Text-Critical Commentary	
<i>Klaus Wachtel</i> . . . . .	1
„Neue“ Varianten in den Kirchenväterzitaten	
<i>Nikolai Kiel</i> . . . . .	39
The Quotations of Acts in the Gospel Commentary of Fortunatianus of Aquileia	
<i>Georg Gäbel</i> . . . . .	68
Augustine’s Quotations from Acts 1:1-26; 2:1-13 in his Early, Anti-Manichean Writings <i>Contra Epistulam Manichaei quam Vocant Fundamenti</i> and <i>Contra Felicem</i> (Text-Type K)	
<i>Georg Gäbel</i> . . . . .	70
Hinweise zur Verzeichnung der koptischen Versionen	
<i>Siegfried G. Richter und Katharina D. Schröder</i> . . . . .	72
Die gotischen Zitate aus der Apostelgeschichte in einem Palimpsest des 6. Jahrhunderts	
<i>Carla Falluomini</i> . . . . .	81
„Western Text,“ „D-Text Cluster,“ „Bezan Trajectory,“ Or What Else? – A Preliminary Study	
<i>Georg Gäbel</i> . . . . .	83
On the Relationship of the „Western Text“ and the Byzantine Tradition of Acts – A Plea Against the Text-Type Concept	
<i>Klaus Wachtel</i> . . . . .	137
Der Text der Apostelgeschichte bei Irenäus von Lyon und der sogenannte „Westliche Text“	
<i>Holger Strutwolf</i> . . . . .	149
The „Western“ Text of Acts Evidenced by Chrysostom?	
<i>Gunnar Büsch</i> . . . . .	186
Der Wegweiser zum Mittelägyptischen in der ECM	
<i>Siegfried G. Richter</i> . . . . .	221
Der „harklensische Apparat“ der Acta Apostolorum	
<i>Andreas Juckel</i> . . . . .	228

## Vorwort

Mit diesem Band legen wir einige Studien vor, die sich aus unserer gemeinsamen Arbeit ergeben haben. So hat Klaus Wachtel in einem textkritischen Kommentar zu ausgewählten Stellen die Diskussionen und Entscheidungen des Herausgebergremiums dargestellt. Damit ist es möglich, die Kriterien und die Art ihrer Anwendung nachzuvollziehen, die als Grundlage weiterer Diskussion gedacht sind. Überhaupt versteht sich die ECM ja nicht als das Ende sondern als Eröffnung einer neuen Phase der textkritischen Arbeit am Neuen Testament.

Ebenso legen die für verschiedene Bereiche der ECM Zuständigen Studien zu speziellen Problemen ihrer jeweiligen Arbeitsgebiete vor. Hier gilt, was für die gesamte ECM maßgeblich war: Wir arbeiten in einem Team zusammen, zeichnen aber für die jeweiligen Beiträge eigenständig verantwortlich.

So stellt Nikolai Kiel den Prozess der Auswertung der patristischen Zitate unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Kriterien zur Bestimmung von nur in Zitate erhaltenem Überlieferungsgut dar. Georg Gäbel steuert zunächst zwei kurze Beiträge zu Zitaten aus der Apg in dem neu entdeckten Kommentar des Fortunatianus von Aquileia und im Frühwerk des Augustin bei. Siegfried Richter und Katharina Schröder gewähren einen Einblick in die Art und Weise der Verzeichnung der koptischen Versionen im Apparat der ECM. Carla Falluomini schließlich stellt zwei kurze Apg-Zitate aus einem neu entdeckten gotischen Palimpsest aus dem 6. Jahrhundert vor.

Die übrigen Beiträge widmen sich den viel diskutierten Problemen des sogenannten „westlichen Textes“. Georg Gäbel knüpft an seine Untersuchungen zu P127 an und stellt das Gesamtphänomen und die

Grundlinien der Erforschung des „westlichen Textes“ systematisch dar. Mit exemplarischen Analysen des Variantenmaterials überprüft er bestehende Theorien und formuliert eine neue Fragestellung. Klaus Wachtel setzt die byzantinische Tradition in Beziehung zum Entstehungs- und Überlieferungsprozess der paraphrasierenden und erweiternden Schicht „westlicher“ Varianten. Der Verfasser dieses Vorwortes steuert eine Untersuchung zum Text der Apostelgeschichte bei Irenäus von Lyon bei. Gunnar Büsch untersucht eine bisher für den „westlichen Text“ in Anspruch genommene Handschrift des Actakommentars des Johannes Chrysostomus. Siegfried Richter bestimmt und kategorisiert die Varianten, die für die Diskussion der textgeschichtlichen Einordnung des Mittelägyptischen einschlägig sind. Andreas Juckel schließlich untersucht den Quellenwert des harklensischen Apparats für die Erforschung des „westlichen Textes“ der Apostelgeschichte.

Da die Beitragenden ihre Studien zwar ausführlich miteinander diskutiert aber doch eigenständig verfasst haben, haben wir eine gewisse Variationsbreite in Fragen des Stils, einschließlich des Formats der Fußnoten und bibliographischen Angaben, zugelassen. Zudem war es frei gestellt, den Beitrag in deutscher oder englischer Sprache zu schreiben.

Wir hoffen, dass dieser Band die Diskussion um die Textgeschichte der Acta Apostolorum voranbringt und Ansatzpunkte für einen methodischen Neubeginn bietet.

Münster, 2. Mai 2017

Holger Strutwolf

## Preface

In this volume we present several studies resulting from our common work. Klaus Wachtel provides a text-critical commentary on select passages based on the discussions and decisions of the editorial team. This enables the reader to comprehend the criteria and their application, which lays the groundwork for further discussion. The ECM does not see itself as an end at all, but rather as opening a new phase of text-critical work on the New Testament.

Likewise, the ECM collaborators present studies focusing on special problems within their respective fields. This applies to the whole ECM project: We work together as a team, but are independently responsible for our respective contributions.

Nikolai Kiel explains the process of evaluating patristic citations, paying special attention to the criteria applied to distinguish variants preserved only in citations. Georg Gäbel contributes two short pieces about citations from Acts in the newly discovered commentary by Fortunatianus of Aquileia and in the early works of Augustine. Siegfried Richter and Katharina Schröder provide insight into how the Coptic versions were incorporated into the ECM apparatus. Finally, Carla Falluomini presents two short Acts citations from a newly discovered Gothic palimpsest from the 6th century.

All other contributions are dedicated to much discussed problems of the so-called “Western text”. Georg Gäbel builds on his research on P127, and systematically presents the overall phenomenon and principal

lines of research on the “Western text”. He provides exemplary analyses of relevant variation, puts existing theories to the test, and brings forth a set of questions for further research. Klaus Wachtel deals with analogies and relationships between the Byzantine tradition and the creation and transmission of the paraphrastic and expansionist stratum of “Western” variants. The author of this preface contributes a study about the text of Acts in Irenaeus of Lyon. Gunnar Büsch examines a manuscript of John Chrysostom’s commentary on Acts, which has hitherto been attributed to the “Western text”. Siegfried Richter determines and categorizes the variants relevant for a text-historical classification of the Middle Egyptian version. Finally, Andreas Juckel discusses the relevance of the Harklean apparatus for research on the “Western text” of Acts.

While the contributors discussed their studies extensively with each other, they have written them independently, thus we allowed for a certain range of variation in questions of style, including the format of footnotes and bibliographical details. Moreover, the authors were free to write in German or English.

We hope that this volume will advance the debate about the textual history of the *Acta Apostolorum* and may provide starting points for a new methodological approach.

Münster, May 2, 2017

Holger Strutwolf





# Text-Critical Commentary

Klaus Wachtel

## Introduction

A presentation of basic terms and procedures on which this commentary is based was published in two contributions to TC 2015 <rosetta.reltech.org/TC/v20/>:

- G. Gäbel, A. Hüffmeier, G. Mink, H. Strutwolf, K. Wachtel: "The CBGM Applied to Variants from Acts: Methodological Background" (cited as "CBGM Background")
- K. Wachtel: "Constructing Local Stemmata for the ECM of Acts: Examples" (cited as "Examples").

The TC articles refer to "Genealogical Queries Acts (Phase 2)", a suite of tools available online at <intf.uni-muenster.de/cbgm/actsPh2/>. In phase 3 of our work on the reconstruction of the initial text, these tools were updated to <intf.uni-muenster.de/cbgm/actsPh3/>. The textual commentary presented here refers to phase 3. The results achieved in phase 3 are available with a new interface at <intf.uni-muenster.de/cbgm/actsPh4/>.

### 1. The selection of variant passages to be commented on

A textual commentary is given for each passage where the editors of ECM Acts reconstructed the initial text different than NA28 and UBS5. A commentary is also included for passages with a split guiding line. For other passages a commentary is given if the editors' assessment needs additional explanation to supplement the guidelines below. The passages of the commentary are identified accordingly:

**N** – New initial reading  
**S** – Split guiding line  
**M** – Miscellaneous

### 2. Guidelines and rules for assessing variants and their Greek manuscript attestations<sup>1</sup>

1. Singular readings and unique readings of small groups which differ from the mainstream of transmission are secondary. Exceptions to this rule require strong support from internal criteria. However, as was the case with the Catholic Letters, such variants are systematically subjected to text critical analysis if they are supported by witnesses closely related to *A*.

2. An attestation lacking coherence is a sign of multiple emergence i.e. posteriority of a variant. Multiple emergence weakens the force of internal criteria which might be used to account for the priority of the variant.
3. Good coherence of an attestation is primarily a sign of unfractured transmission. Good coherence is a valid argument for the priority of a variant only if supported by internal criteria.
4. A strong argument for assessing a variant as initial text is provided by an attestation which combines coherence and a broad range of diverse witnesses closely related to *A*. In such cases strong coherence only materializes if *A* is part of the attestation.
5. The priority of a majority reading is indicated if it is linguistically more difficult or contextually less suitable and thus atypical of the majority text. This may be valid even if the competing variant has a broad range of witnesses closely related to *A*.
6. The source of a variant is likely to be a similar variant. If the attestation of a variant indicates that two or more other variants need to be considered as possible sources then Transcriptional Probability (TP) suggests that the one which requires the least change to be transformed into the variant in question is preferable.
7. The source of a variant is questionable:
  - a) if Genealogical Coherence (GC) and TP point to different potential source variants or cannot be aligned with each other for other reasons;
  - b) if we cannot decide which of two or more variants is the prior one because neither GC nor TP provides a convincing argument.
8. Consciously introduced editorial variants are exceptional. If possible, variation should be explained with reference to the process of copying itself and to known causes of error.
9. If the witnesses of a variant have to be assigned to different source variants, then the attestation should split accordingly.

*R(ule) 1 and R(ule) 2 leading to a split guiding line*

Commentaries for passages with a split guiding line may consist only of a reference to one of the following scenarios:

- R1: TP provides no good argument that applies to the variants in question. At the same time, one of them is supported by a coherent majority of witnesses, while the other's attestation has a wider range

<sup>1</sup> These guidelines were first published in "CBGM Background" p. 3, referring to cases discussed in "Examples".

of early *A*-related witnesses and may be lacking overall coherence.<sup>2</sup>

Examples: 1:25/18, 3:7/24-28, 13:45/25, 13:45/28

R2: TP provides no good argument that applies to the variants in question, while there are coherent cores of *A*-related witnesses on either side.

Examples: 13:46/36 (a/b), 13:49/14, 13:52/4 (a/c)

In R1, a wider range of early *A*-related witnesses outweighs a coherent majority attestation that has a smaller range of *A*-related witnesses at its top. In R2, the coherent cores of *A*-related witnesses are given approximately equal weight, regardless of the rest of the attestations.

Usually, simply stating “R1” or “R2” is sufficient to explain the situation, but sometimes an explanation why TP does not present a sufficient argument is also provided.

### 3. “Genealogical Queries – Acts”

[intf.uni-muenster.de/cbgm/acts](http://intf.uni-muenster.de/cbgm/acts)

To document our work on the local stemmata and the text of ECM Acts, we provide access to the data we used in phase 3 of our work (the third iteration of the material). The database behind phase 3 reflects the state of work that resulted from phase 2. The printed text, including the split guiding lines, reflect the result of phase 3. This allows the user to see the basis for our work on the text and the local stemmata in phase 3 representing the state from which the printed edition was produced. The state of work reached at the end of phase 3 is available as “Genealogical Queries – Acts (Phase 4)” at [intf.uni-muenster.de/cbgm/actsPh4/](http://intf.uni-muenster.de/cbgm/actsPh4/).

There is a Guide available on the website providing more information about how “Genealogical Queries – Acts” functions. For this introduction, a few basic recommendations about efficient use of the “Coherence in Attestations” module (Phase 3) may suffice.<sup>3</sup>

For Acts the default value of connectivity is “Lower (1-5 ancestors)” which means that we acted on the assumption that for this writing a more cautious approach is appropriate. The connectivity of variants in Acts appears to be generally lower than in the Catholic Letters. In most cases, the user wants to assess the coherence of one attestation in comparison with another one. For this purpose it is crucial that the same parameters are used for both. For example, if one of the variants in question is *a*, and *a* is regarded as initial text, then the user should set *Initial Reading* (IR) to *a*, in order to see how the witnesses are related to *A*. If the coherence of the *c* attestation, for instance, is to be compared, then IR should be set to *c* accordingly. If the user wants to factor *A* out of the equation, IR should be set to ? for the respective variants.

If the coherence appears weak with lower connectivity, it often interesting to ascertain at which rank a strand or a single witness is integrated into one textual flow with the other witnesses of a variant. For this purpose the user may tick “Connectivity: Absolute”, which will connect all witnesses to one consistent graph. Typically, a higher ranking number points to a weaker connection between the witnesses in question. Clicking the “Show Table” feature above the graph will open the table of ranking numbers and percentages behind the graph. Data can be further differentiated by the lists of potential ancestors and descendants.

For example, if “Connectivity: Absolute” is set for 16:12/12-16a, 218 is connected to 1509 as a seventh potential ancestor. The “Show Table” feature tells us that the respective percentage of agreement is 90.794. Is this relatively high or relatively low? The list of potential ancestors of 218 (with “Exclude Fragments and Undirected Relationships”) displays that there are only three potential ancestors that 218 agrees with more than the majority text: 18, 468, and 35. Between the third and the fourth potential ancestor, 1735, there is a gap of about 1.7 percentage points, and it takes three more steps to reach ranking number 7. An agreement rate of 90.794 is still higher than the average (AA) and the median agreement (MA), but the closely related witnesses are obviously found in the first three positions. Hence the binding force attributed to the variant had to be fairly high to accept the relationship of 1509 and 218 as coherent. In this case, a TP of the independent emergence of the

<sup>2</sup> It is methodologically important to distinguish between manuscripts and the texts they contain. To say it in the words of Gerd Mink, “The CBGM deals with texts, not with manuscripts. The text is the witness.” (Mink 2009, 38; cf. 33-38 and Mink 2004, 29). Accordingly, “early witnesses” are not necessarily preserved in early manuscripts. They are states of texts relatively close to the beginning of the transmission, the Ausgangstext. Manuscripts from the second millennium are sometimes witnesses to an earlier text.

<sup>3</sup> These notes refer to “Genealogical Queries – (Acts) Phase 3” because the ECM editors worked with this version. In the meantime the new interface (Phase 4) is available. Differences and further development are explained in an online Guide.

variant is enforced by the fact that the first six potential ancestors of 218 support variant *b*.

For 1842, whose seventh potential ancestor is 218, this conclusion cannot be drawn. The list of potential ancestors for 1842 starts with 89.913% for L23 as its first potential ancestor and is less than 0.6 percentage points lower for 218. In this situation, the coherence values cannot contribute to the assessment of the origin of *a* in 1842.

#### 4. Impasses according to TP

- 1) Luke typically connects sentences with *τέ*, although *δέ* is more common. Variation may reflect secondary adaptation to common usage or to Luke's preference.
- 2) 03, known for its tendency to omit dispensable words,<sup>4</sup> is often the most prominent witness for omissions of phraseologically common redundant words.
- 3) TP often cannot provide a decisive argument when an aorist subjunctive is required by classical usage, even though the general linguistic development favors the future tense, especially if variation may be due to vowel interchange (cf. 4:16/6, 4:21/20, 7:7/12, 8:31/22).
- 4) The article is increasingly used with proper names even in places where it is not referring to a person being mentioned in the preceding passage (cf. 2:14/4-6). The general linguistic development supports the use of the article, which has become mandatory in modern Greek.<sup>5</sup>
- 5) *θεός* and *κύριος* are frequently used like proper names, particularly under the influence of the LXX.<sup>6</sup>

Unless otherwise stated, Accordance 11 (OakTree Software 2015) <[www.accordancebible.com](http://www.accordancebible.com)> was used on the tagged Rahlfs LXX and/or NA28 editions to calculate the number of occurrences of words or phrases.

#### Abbreviations

ADNTCE – Amsterdam Database of New Testament  
 Conjectural Emendations  
 Con – Connectivity  
 GC – Genealogical Coherence  
 GenQ – Genealogical Queries (see Bibliography)  
 IR – Initial Reading  
 M – Miscellaneous  
 MT – Majority Text  
 N – New initial reading  
 NA – Nestle-Aland  
 NT – New Testament  
 R – Rule  
 S – Split guiding line  
 TP – Transcriptional Probability  
 TFD – Textual Flow Diagram

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. Hort, Introduction, 234-236, who in spite of his preference for 03 concedes that "it is on the whole safer for the present to allow for a proneness on the part of the scribe of B to drop petty words not evidently required by the sense" (236); cf. Carlo Martini in his introduction to *Novum Testamentum e codice Vaticano Graeco 1209*, Vatican City 1968, p. xxi-xxii.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. BDR/BDF 260.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. BDR/BDF 254.

#### Bibliography

Accordance 11 (OakTree Software 2015) <[www.accordancebible.com](http://www.accordancebible.com)>

Barrett – Charles K. Barrett: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles (2 vols.), ICC, Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1994, 1998.

BDAG – Walter Bauer: A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, ed. W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich; 3rd ed. rev. by F.W. Danker. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press 2000.

BDF – F. Blass and A. Debrunner: A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, ed. R.W. Funk. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press 1961.

BDR – F. Blass / A. Debrunner / F. Rehkopf: Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht 17. Aufl. 1990.

Conzelmann – Hans Conzelmann: Die Apostelgeschichte, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 7, Tübingen: Mohr 1972.

GenQ – Genealogical Queries – Acts <[intf.uni-muenster.de/cbqm/acts](http://intf.uni-muenster.de/cbqm/acts)>

GenQ2 – Genealogical Queries – Acts (Phase 2) <[intf.uni-muenster.de/cbqm/actsPh2](http://intf.uni-muenster.de/cbqm/actsPh2)>

GenQ3 – Genealogical Queries – Acts (Phase 3) <[intf.uni-muenster.de/cbqm/actsPh3](http://intf.uni-muenster.de/cbqm/actsPh3)>

GenQ4 – Genealogical Queries – Acts (Phase 4) <[intf.uni-muenster.de/cbqm/actsPh4](http://intf.uni-muenster.de/cbqm/actsPh4)>

Haenchen – Ernst Haenchen: Die Apostelgeschichte. KEK, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 12. Aufl. 1959.

Hort – Notes On Select readings, in: B.F. Westcott / F.J.A. Hort: The New Testament in the Original Greek, Bd. II, Appendix I, Cambridge / London 1882.

- Jervell – Jacob Jervell: *Die Apostelgeschichte*. KEK, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht 1998.
- Lake and Cadbury – *The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I, The Acts of the Apostles*, ed. F.J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake; vol. IV, *English Translation and Commentary*, by K. Lake and H.J. Cadbury, London: Macmillan 1933.
- LSJ – H.G. Liddell/R. Scott: *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. and augmented by H.St. Jones, Oxford: Clarendon 1940 (repr. 1985).
- Metzger – Bruce M. Metzger: *A Textual Commentary of the Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 1994 (2nd printing 1998).
- Mink 2004 – Gerd Mink: *Problems of a Highly Contaminated Tradition: The New Testament*, in: P. van Reenen, A. den Hollander, M. van Mulken (eds.), *Studies in Stemmatology II*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins 2004, p. 13-85.
- Mink 2009 – Gerd Mink: *The Coherence-Based Genealogical Method – CBGM: Introductory Presentation*, 2009, online <<http://egora.uni-muenster.de/intf/service/downloads.shtml>>.
- Moulton III: Nigel Turner, *Syntax*, in: James H. Moulton (ed.), *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, T&T Clark: Edinburgh 1963.
- NA26-28 – Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 26th edition 1979 by K. Aland, M. Black, C.M. Martini, B.M. Metzger, A. Wikgren, 27th/28th edition 1993/2012 by B. Aland, K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C.M. Martini, B.M. Metzger; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- NET Bible – *The NET Bible, New English Translation*, Biblical Studies Press 1996-2005 [Version 3.4 used in the Accordance 11 environment].
- Nicklas/Tilly: Tobias Nicklas and Michael Tilly (eds.): *The Book of Acts as Church History*. (BZNW 120) Berlin/New York: de Gruyter 2003.
- Omanson – Roger L. Omanson: *A Textual Guide to the Greek New Testament. An Adaptation of Bruce M. Metzger's Textual Commentary for the Needs of Translators*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 2006.
- Pervo – Richard I. Pervo: *Acts: A Commentary. Hermeneia*, Minneapolis: Fortress 2009.
- Rahlfs – Alfred Rahlfs (ed.): *Psalmi cum Odis, Septuaginta vol. X*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck/Ruprecht 1967.
- Ropes – *The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I, The Acts of the Apostles*, ed. F.J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake; vol. III *The Text of Acts*, by James Hardy Ropes, London: Macmillan 1926.
- Tischendorf – *Novum Testamentum Graece, Editio octava critica maior*. Leipzig 1869-1872.
- Strutwolf 2014 – Holger Strutwolf: *Urtext oder frühe Korruption? Einige Beispiele aus der Apostelgeschichte*, in: *Texts and Traditions. Essays in Honour of J. Keith Elliott*, eds. Peter Doble und Jeffrey Kloha, Leiden/Boston 2014, 255 - 280.
- UBS3-5 – *The Greek New Testament*, 3rd edition 1975 by K. Aland, M. Black, C.M. Martini, B.M. Metzger, A. Wikgren, Stuttgart: United Bible Societies; 4th/5th edition 1992/2014 by B. Aland, K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C.M. Martini, B.M. Metzger; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft/United Bible Societies.
- Wendt, KEK 1888 – Hans H. Wendt: *Handbuch über die Apostelgeschichte, Kritisch Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament 3*, ed. H.A.W. Meyer, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck/Ruprecht 1888.
- Wevers – John W. Wevers (ed.): *Genesis, Septuaginta vol. I*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck/Ruprecht 1974.
- Ziegler – Joseph Ziegler (ed.): *Isaias, Septuaginta vol. XIV*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck/Ruprecht 1939.

**S 1:6/10 a/b**

**GC:** There is coherent majority attestation with a broad *A*-related basis for *b*, which is additionally supported by all available patristic citations. The attestation for *a* is small but contains the 4th/5th century witnesses most closely related to *A*. Nevertheless, the textflow diagram for *a* shows incoherencies.

**TP:** Simplex and compound are synonymous and are equally common in Lk and Acts. In late Greek, however, the simplex often means *request*.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, the prefix may have been introduced (and kept) for clarification. On the other hand, ΕΠ- may have occasionally been dropped after -ΕΣ.

**S 1:8/24-26 a/b**

The dative in *b* is smooth, inconspicuous, and a coherently attested majority reading. The preceding pronoun in genitive in *a* is slightly unusual because it appears to be inadequately emphasized in this position. Although there are quite a few examples in Luke for this word order, this is not a strong TP argument, especially considering that there is a lack of coherence in the attestation of *a*, not of *b*. Variant *a*, on the other hand, is also supported by a coherent group of *A*-related witnesses.

The decision is left open because the attestation of *b* is more coherent than *a* and has a sufficiently broad *A*-related basis. In addition, *b* is supported by nearly the entire versional and patristic evidence.

**M 1:8/36 a<\*, not a/b**

**GC:** The extensive attestation of *a* is very coherent and has a broad *A*-related basis, while *b* appears to have emerged independently at least four times (Con=5, IR=?).

**TP** is not applicable here, because the repeated ἐν may have been dropped for stylistic reasons or may have been put in to distinguish the countries of Judea and Samaria from the city of Jerusalem.<sup>2</sup>

**N 1:10/34-36**

**GC:** Coherence and diversity are good in the main strand of the attestation of *b* (starting with 03, if IR=?), but according to GC, *b* seems to have emerged several times from *a*, while the attestation of *a* is perfectly coherent.

**TP:** The tendency towards *b* (plural subject) speaks for the priority of the majority reading *a*, more so because the majority has the plural at Lk 24:4.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. LSJ and BDAG s.v. ἐρωτάω.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Metzger 244.

**M 1:11/16 a<\*, not a/b**

**GC** clearly signals multiple emergence of *b* from *a* (IR=?, Con=5).

**TP:** *b* avoids the tension between the prefix ἐμ- and the preposition εἰς immediately following.<sup>3</sup>

**M 1:13/30-38 a<\*, not a/f**

**GC:** A core of witnesses most closely related to *A* support *a*, including the 4th/5th century majuscules, accompanied by several incoherencies. The majority attestation for *f* includes only a small *A*-related basis and is incoherent (four strands with IR=?, Con=5).

**TP:** The order of apostles in *a*, from which *b* and *c* derive,<sup>4</sup> are without parallel, while *e* corresponds to Mt 10:2 and Lk 6:14, *f-i* to Mk 3:17.

The decisive argument for *a* is that it is different from all other enumerations of the apostles in the New Testament.<sup>5</sup>

**S 1:14/33 a/b**

**GC:** The attestations of both variants have sufficiently broad ranges of *A*-related witnesses to compete.

**TP:** The repetition of σύν with the third element of the enumeration is ostensibly awkward, but it may serve the purpose of clearly distinguishing men from women.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, TP does not contribute a decisive argument.

**N 1:15/40**

The decision for *a* is based on the pronounced incoherence of the *b* attestation, probably motivated by Luke's clear preference for ὡσεὶ over ὡς in similar contexts.

<sup>3</sup> Metzger (245) points to the possibility that "copyists heightened the account by introducing the compound form (which seems to imply a degree of intensity not suggested by the simple form)". The many incoherencies in the *b* attestation, however, support his alternative explanation that "the initial syllable was accidentally dropped in copying".

<sup>4</sup> Ropes (6) points out that the omission of καί in 05 here and before Σίμων (word 58) "is due to the arrangement of the names in two columns".

<sup>5</sup> For more details see Barrett 87, Haenchen 120, Pervo 46.

<sup>6</sup> According to Metzger (246f), the GNT3 committee preferred the variant without σύν because its addition would separate Jesus from his brothers and might have been inserted "in the interest of supporting the perpetual virginity of Mary". Pervo (40) and Barrett (90) agree that this could be a motive for the repetition of σύν. The additional σύν, however, does not accomplish this supposed goal because it only repeats σύν (word 16) and because αὐτοῦ (word 38) makes it clear enough anyway that Jesus had brothers.

**M 1:16/13** a<\*, not a/b

**GC:** There is a core of witnesses most closely related to *A*, including the 4th/5th century majuscules, are at the top of a coherent strand in the *a* attestation, but accompanied by several incoherencies. The majority attestation for *b* is incoherent (four strands with IR=?, Con=5).

**TP:** The phrase including the demonstrative does not follow a discernable formula. The demonstrative may have been dropped accidentally between two words with the same ending, which may explain the incoherencies in the *a* attestation.

**M 1:17/8** a<\*, not a/b

**GC:** Wider range of early *A*-related witnesses for *a*, coherent majority attestation for *b*.

**TP:** *καραριθμέω* is usually followed by prepositional phrases with *ἐν*, *μετά* or *εἰς*, while *σύν* would be an inconspicuous irregularity, not peculiar enough to label it the harder reading. Moreover, *σύν* may have crept in under the influence of the preceding *-ς ἦν* (/sin/).

**S 1:25/18** a/b -- R1

According to GC, there was a tendency to replace *ἐξ* with *ἀπό*. The prepositions, however, appear to be exchangeable.

**N 1:26/8**

**GC:** The attestation of *a* is perfectly coherent, while *b* seems to have emerged from *a* several times. Even many of the witnesses in the coherent strand with 03 at its top have their first potential ancestors in the *a* attestation.

**TP:** Ropes (10) sees *αὐτοῖς* as the clearer reading, while Metzger (250) states *αὐτῶν* is a clarification avoiding the ambiguity of *b* ("they gave lots to them" or "they cast lots for them". Barrett (104), too, regards *a* as the easier reading. The procedure of drawing lots, however, is not described clearly, and the technical term would be *βάλλειν κλήρους*.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, it is not entirely clear that *a* is the easier reading. As the technical term *βάλλειν κλήρους* probably known to Greek scribes is not used here, *δίδωμι* was most likely understood in its common sense "give". The dative fits well with this notion, while "gave their lots" sounds slightly odd in this context.

**N 2:3/16-18**

**GC:** The attestation of *b* is relatively small and incoherent, while *a* is transmitted by the mainstream.

**TP:** In general, *καί* connects sentences more frequently than *τε*, but the latter is used quite commonly this way in Acts. It is more likely that *τε* was replaced by *καί* than *vice versa*. The presence of *καί* would not have motivated a change to the text.

**N 2:5/6**

Ropes thinks that "*ἐν* is probably due to emendation of what seemed unliturgical use" (12). The use of *εἰς* when it does not involve a goal may appear unusual to a modern reader, while in late and modern Greek it replaces *ἐν* nearly completely (cf. Barrett 117). The incoherence of the weak *b* attestation shows that these witnesses, probably followed this tendency replacing the initial reading, *ἐν*, with *εἰς*.

**S 2:7/5** a/b

**GC:** There is a small *A*-related attestation supported by a large strand of late Byzantine witnesses (*K*<sup>r</sup>) for *a*, and coherent majority with a broad *A*-related top for *b*.

**TP:** *πάντες* may have been inserted to enforce the statement parallel with verse 12.<sup>8</sup>

It was decided to leave the decision open because of the weak attestation for *a*.

Minority vote K. Wachtel:

**GC:** Variant *a* may well be the initial reading because it boasts the agreement of 03, 05, and *K*<sup>r</sup> in a shorter reading, and is supported by an early citation, three Old Latin manuscripts, *mae*, and *Eth*. **TP:** A secondary insertion of *πάντες* may have been motivated by the parallel in v. 12 or influenced by (*ἅ*)*παντες* at 5/16, but there is no obvious reason for an omission of the word.

**S 2:7/16-26** a/b -- R2

**N 2:20/24**

**GC** clearly supports *b*<*a*, although there is a range of *A*-related witnesses in the attestation of *b*.<sup>9</sup>

**TP:** It is easy to explain the omission of *η* after *ν* in majuscule script, while there is no motive for secondary insertion of a redundant *η*.

**M 2:14/4-6** a<\*, not a/b

**GC:** There are incoherencies in both attestations in question, but *a* is supported by a far wider range of early *A*-related witnesses, including a coherent strand continuing into the Byzantine tradition.

**TP:** Inapplicable (Introduction 4.4).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. BDAG s.v. *κλήρος* 1.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Ropes (13) and Metzger (252) who both see *a* as a reading in "the 'Western' text".

<sup>9</sup> Ropes (18) prefers the shorter reading because it is attested by 01, 02, 04, 05 and 81.

N 2:20/28

**GC:** For *a*, there is coherent majority attestation with a broad range of *A*-related witnesses at the top.

**TP:** As a rule, the superordinate noun and the genitive either have an article or are both anarthrous, unless the genitive is a proper name. Both variants must be grammatically sound because κύριος is frequently used as a proper name.<sup>10</sup> It is more likely that τὴν was accidentally omitted after a similarly sounding ending of the preceding word, rather than being a secondary addition.

S 2:22/22-28 a/c -- R2

N 2:33/43

Though the agreement between 03 and 05 may be seen as a strong argument in favor of variant *b*, there are no reasons based on internal criteria to support their reading as initial text.

M 2:34/24 a<\*, not a/b

**GC:** There is an overwhelming majority attestation for *a*, and scattered support by only four witnesses for *b*.  
**TP:** Inapplicable (Introduction 4.2, 4.5).

S 2:36/18-30 a/b -- R2

S 2:37/8-10 a/b -- R2

M 2:38/2-12 a<\*, not a/n

**GC:** Variant *a* is supported by a strong, coherent core of *A*-related witnesses, albeit accompanied by several incoherencies. Variant *b* transposes the verb and 05 adds to the diversity of the *a* attestation as an indirect witness. The majority attestation is split between *e* and *l*, the K<sup>r</sup> reading, but both are lacking support from early *A*-related witnesses. According to external criteria, the only alternative to *a* as initial reading would be *n*, as it is attested by 03. There are, however, only two other Greek witnesses showing no coherence with 03 and a sole Old Latin manuscript supporting *n*.

**TP:** At first sight, *n*, the shortest reading, seems to explain the presence of different verbs of speech in different places.<sup>11</sup> However, the only significant witness of *n* is 03, known for its inclination to omit dispensable words. Moreover, there is a stylistic reason for omitting φησὶν, namely “that it interrupts the sequence

<sup>10</sup> BDR 259, esp. n. 4; cf. Barrett 138.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Metzger 261, who emphasizes this point in an individual vote against the Nestle-Aland and UBSGNT editorial committee which encloses φησὶν within square brackets.

μετανοήσατε καὶ βαπτισθήτω”.<sup>12</sup> The transposition in *b* probably avoids this interruption.

S 2:38/36-40 a/d

The shorter but more common reading is found in the MT,<sup>13</sup> and a broader range of early *A*-related witnesses is found for the longer reading *a*.

S 2:40/12-18 a/f

**GC:** The *A*-related attestation of *a*, although accompanied by incoherencies, is much stronger than that of *f*.  
**TP** in favor of *f*: The pronoun missing in the shorter reading in the MT is “wandering”, and there is no graphical reason for its omission.

S 2:43/2 a/b -- R2

S 3:6/46-48 a/b

**GC:** The comprehensive *a* attestation is opposed by only a few, though early, witnesses, including the Sahidic version.

**TP:** The omission is either for stylistic or formal reasons because Peter himself raises the lame immediately after his command (v. 7 ἤγειρεν αὐτόν), or it is an adaptation to a usage known from similar healing stories (Mt 9:5, Mk 2:9, Lk 5:23, Jn 5:8)?<sup>14</sup>

S 3:7/14-16 a/b -- R2

The majority reading, *b*, may avoid the clumsy repetition of the pronoun. On the other hand, incoherencies in the *a* attestation suggest that sometimes an inclination towards abundance prevailed.<sup>15</sup>

S 3:7/24-28 a/b

**GC:** The TFD for *a* shows a coherent main section with

<sup>12</sup> Barrett 153. However, like the Nestle-Aland and UBSGNT editorial committee, he leaves the decision open.

<sup>13</sup> The majority reading is rejected by commentators. Ropes (22), Metzger (261f), and Barrett (154) see it as assimilation to the baptismal formula in the Gospels, while Pervo (84) suggests the text was abridged to give it “a more universalistic application”.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Metzger (267) for the bracketed NA/GNT reading. Pervo (100) prefers the longer reading because the immediate context seems to have motivated an omission. Barrett (183) is certain that the shorter reading is original and was filled out according to the conventional expression.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. BDR/BDF 278 on the tendency toward pleonastic usage of the pronoun in the NT. Barrett suggests that αὐτόν “may have been added in order to prevent even a moment’s doubt whether ἤγειρε was to be taken as transitive or intransitive” (183).

03 or *A* at its top, but also has signs of multiple emergence, while there is a coherent majority attestation for *b*, if IR=*b*.

**TP:** Variant *a* has the more common word order, although a preceding possessive genitive that is not emphasized is not unusual in the NT.<sup>16</sup> Thus, *b* cannot be considered the harder reading. The MT, *b*, has the less common word order, but *a* has a stronger *A*-related attestation for the more common word order.

**S 3:9/6-12 a/b -- R1**

**S 3:10/2-4 a/b -- R1, TP1**

**S 3:10/10 a/b -- R1**

The incoherencies in the *a* attestation reflect the tendency to replace οὔτος with αὐτός, a historical linguistic development completed in modern Greek. Hence, *b* may be an Atticization.

**S 3:11/14 a/b**

**GC:** Both attestations show incoherencies with Con=5, but a wider range of early *A*-related witnesses supports *a*.

**TP:** It is unusual that the second of two proper names that are joined by καί is anarthrous, as if the persons were subsumed under a two-part term. 11/8b may smooth the expression by omission, as variant *a* possibly does by adding the second article.

Although *b* is the harder reading, its attestation is incoherent and points to multiple emergence. Variant *a* is better attested even though it is the smoother reading.

**S 3:11/20-28 a/b -- R1**

**GC** suggests multiple emergence of *a*, probably because the variant provides a slightly clearer syntactical structure.

**S 3:12/6 a/b -- R1**

**N 3:13/8 and 12**

**GC** suggests multiple emergence of *c* from *a*, while the attestation of *a* is perfectly coherent and includes a sufficiently broad range of *A*-related witnesses. The attestation of *a* at words 8 and 12 is basically the same, including the entire Syriac tradition and the majority of Sahidic manuscripts.<sup>17</sup>

**TP:** The Byzantine text (*a*) does not repeat ὁ θεός before

Ἰσαάκ and Ἰακώβ. As the subject is repeated, not only in the quoted LXX passages Ex 3:6 and 15, but also in the Byzantine text of Acts 7:32, the fuller form here is probably a secondary adaptation.<sup>18</sup>

Variant *b* repeats θεός twice without the article, just as in Ex 3:6 and 15. It remains unclear, however, whether the source is *a* or *c*.

**S 3:19/10 a/b**

**GC:** 01 and 03 are the only witnesses for *b*.

**TP:** πρὸς with final infinitive occurs only rarely in the NT (cp. Mk 13:22 and Lk 18:1), which would suggest *b* is the harder reading.<sup>19</sup> The construction of ἔπιστρέφειν with πρὸς, is, however, as inconspicuous as it is with εἰς. Therefore, TP is not strong enough to outweigh the unanimous majority support for *a*.

**S 3:25/34 a/b**

**GC:** The coherent majority attestation is a strong argument for the first person. There is, however, a wider range of early *A*-related witnesses for *a* with incoherencies perhaps due to the prevailing second person in the immediate context.<sup>20</sup>

**TP:** Since Peter regularly addresses the hearers in the second person in this speech, there is a clear motivation for the author, as well as scribes, to follow this usage here. The author did not however follow this rule in 3:13/24, and variant *b* here may be explained as a parallelization with that passage – or may be regarded as initial reading, as in 3:13/24.

**M 3:25/52 a<\*, not a/b**

**GC:** Coherent majority attestation with a broad *A*-related basis for *a*, many incoherencies in the *b* attestation.

**TP:** The rare compound in *a* is prone to be replaced by the common simplex. The graphical similarity of the

<sup>18</sup> Pervo (102) thinks that the longer form “cannot be attributed to assimilation to the LXX of Exod 3:6 or to the Gospels (Luke 20:37 | Mark 12:26)”. Although it is true that Acts 3:13/8 and 12 were probably not consciously aligned with one of these passages, a reminiscence of the longer, more weighty expression can, however, explain its intrusion here very well. Pervo qualifies his statement by pointing to Acts 7:32, where the longer form is the MT. A strong argument for the short form here is that it is in fact supported by the majority against the fuller parallel.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Metzger 272f.

<sup>20</sup> According to Metzger (274), the NA/GNT decision for *a* is based on the assumption that “general usage of Acts” led to replacing the second with the first person pronoun. The argument seems to go back to Ropes (32). There are, however, exceptions to this usage elsewhere (7:51f., 28:25).

<sup>16</sup> Cf. BDR/BDF 284.

<sup>17</sup> 049 and 1501 are the only witnesses for *c* at 8 and *a* at 12.