

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Irish Biblical Studies* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_ibs-01.php

CODEX BEZAE AND RECENT ENQUIRY

by

Ian M. Ellis

1) The Manuscript:

Codex Bezae is a bi-lingual uncial manuscript of the Gospels and Acts. The two sides face each other on opposite pages: Greek on the left and Latin on the right. The material on which the text is written is a good quality vellum and is mostly well preserved, although there are some lacunae. The actual text is presented in $\sigma\iota\chi\omicron\iota$, or sense-lines, and the Gospels appear in the 'Western' order (Mt, Jn, Lk, Mk). The MS measures 10" by 8". The writing itself is described by Scrivener as in "bold, regular, and elegant uncial characters with the words undivided"/1.

Four hundred years ago this year, in 1582, Théodore de Bèze, having found the MS at the convent of St. Irenaeus at Lyons, presented it to the University of Cambridge; hence its title, Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis. The symbol for the Greek side of the MS is $\underline{\text{D}}$, while $\underline{\text{d}}$ represents the Latin side.

In spite of the vast amount of research of which Codex Bezae has been the subject, its exact date and place of origin have not yet been established beyond question. Progressively, scholarly opinion has been setting earlier dates of origin. Until this century, the traditional view was that Codex Bezae originated in the sixth century; Kenyon and Lowe then suggested the fifth, and more recently H.J. Frede of the Vetus Latina Institute in Beuron has suggested a fourth century dating /2.

The work of approximately twenty correctors can be distinguished. Their work suggests a location of origin in the Greek world, as all but one of them are concerned with the Greek side. For this

reason, the theory that Codex Bezae originated in Lyons, where Théodore de Bèze found it, appears untenable. In this connection, it may further be noted that the Bishop of Clermont, Prato, is said to have brought Codex Bezae to the Council of Trent. There he tried to give celibacy a biblical foundation with the variant found only in D (Jn 21:22 εαν αυτον θελω μενειν ουτως).

Southern Italy has also been suggested as our manuscript's place of origin; some of the graecisms in D imply a location where Greek was more familiar than Latin. Yet, some of the errors in D would not have been made by a Greek. Southern Italy during the period 4th. - 6th. centuries (the period in which Codex Bezae originated) was a Latin period, falling between the ancient and medieval Greek periods.

Ropes, however, prefers Sicily as the place of origin /3. Here, while the official language was Latin, the people continued to speak Greek. Souter prefers Sardinia, as he was able to claim that it was here that Codex Claromontanus originated; its Latin text is that of Lucifer of Cagliari. Ropes recognizes the close relationship between Bezae and Claromontanus, but assigns the origin of both to Sicily. The actual writing of these two MSS is similar, although the Bezan scribes' is "less skilful and regular"/4. Ropes' view that Sicily is the place of origin commends itself most. The circumstances in Sicily in 4th. - 6th. cents., outlined above, suggest that this is the home of Codex Bezae. Further, the fact that Bezae is in parts close to the African text tends to support a location close to Africa.

2) The Textual Characteristics of D:

Codex Bezae is full of itacisms, in particular ι to ϵ . The Eusebian canons are found in the margin of the MS. Many of Codex Bezae's readings are singular, many are only supported by the Old Latin, sometimes with the Syriac.

Professor E.J. Epp was able to demonstrate clearly that

in the text of Acts in D there are clear theological tendencies discernible in the variants peculiar to Codex Bezae /5. He shows that in Codex Bezae in Acts the Jews and their leaders are portrayed as more hostile to Jesus and to the Apostles than elsewhere. At Ac 13:28f, for example, the text of D adds the Jews' specific request that Jesus should be crucified /6. Such distinctive tendencies are not, however, as easily found in the Synoptic Gospels. The textual interest here is primarily in the isolation of harmonizations to the text of the other Synoptic evangelists, assimilations within the context of individual passages (which occur less often than do harmonizations), and in the study of the inter-relationship of the Greek and Latin texts, which are parallel. A study of the inter-relationship of the Greek and Latin texts of Codex Bezae in Acts has been carried out by Sheldon Mackenzie /7. We must note that the question whether the Latin side of Codex Bezae is dependent on the Greek, or vice versa, has been debated for over a hundred years.

In 1864, Scrivener favoured the Greek as the basis of the Latin /8. Then, in 1891, Harris went to the other extreme /9. Harris was following the example of J.J. Wettstein in the eighteenth century. In 1910, Vogels maintained that the basis of D was a Latin Diatessaron /10. Vogels' theory was countered in the following year by de Bruyne /11. In 1964, B.M. Metzger maintained that, although the Latin text had been corrected in places by the Greek, the Codex still preserved an ancient form of the Old Latin text /12. Bonifatius Fischer, OSB, who established the Vetus Latina Institute at the arch-abbey of Beuron in Southern Germany, claims with forthrightness that the Latin of Codex Bezae bears virtually no relation to the Old Latin: "Der Tatbestand der fast durchgehenden Abhängigkeit vom danebenstehenden griechischen Text wird heute beinahe allgemein anerkannt ... Jedenfalls fällt der lateinische Text von d (5) aus dem Rahmen

der sonstigen lateinischen Bibel heraus, wenn auch auf der anderen Seite Berührungen mit afrikanischen und europäischen Texten nicht geleugnet werden können, die in Mk und Apg häufiger zu werden scheinen"/13; S is the Beuron number for d. Fischer is diametrically opposed to Metzger on this point; he states that Metzger writes "im Widerspruch zu den Tatsachen"/14. Fischer condemns R.C. Stone's investigation into the Latin of Codex Bezae, the methodology of which he terms "sinnlos"/15. Fischer expresses himself in forceful terms, and the student of Codex Bezae will be glad to see more detailed material from him on this subject.

The consensus of opinion is that the Greek of Codex Bezae is prior to the Latin, although the Old Latin tradition has affected the Greek in places. The problem in isolating latinizations in the Greek text of D is that these Greek variants may be syriasm or semitisms. Vital here is the comparison of the Latin side with other Old Latin texts. If a distinctive reading in D, taken for a syriasm or a semitism, is witnessed throughout the Latin tradition, the argument for latinization obviously gains weight. However, at all times it is important to bear in mind the possibility of harmonization to a parallel synoptic passage, or of assimilation within the context of the passage. One of the major failures of Harris's work /16 was his disregard of the possibilities of harmonization and assimilation in many instances.

F.H. Chase was a major champion of the Syriac cause; he saw the Syriac behind the very striking variants of D in Acts /17 . By way of introduction to his thesis, he lists ten examples (in Acts), although it appears that he is too ready to let his theory prejudice his examinations. Nevertheless, Harris showed that Ephrem used a text like D in his commentaries on the Pauline Epistles and Acts /18.

At the turn of the century, it was suggested that

Antioch was the place of origin of the Old Latin /19, a theory which was reinforced by the fact that close relations are discernible between the Old Syriac and Old Latin /20. These relations would be very understandable if Tatian brought "Western" readings to the East from Rome. Thus, the theory of the Antiochian origin of the Old Latin is highly speculative. Contemporary scholarship tends to view North Africa as the place of origin of the Old Latin /21. Nevertheless, the possibility of syriasm or semitisms lying behind distinctive variants in Codex Bezae must be constantly borne in mind.

3) Gospels-Acts Relationship in D:

It has already been noted that the Bezan text of the Synoptic Gospels does not display the same highly distinctive characteristics as does the Bezan text of Acts. A very possibly inference is that the scribe of Codex Bezae copied from two separate sources, one - that of Acts - being a much freer text than the other. On the other hand, it is possible that he took particular trouble with Acts, introducing his own expansions and alterations in order to convey his own particular theological bias. Of these two possibilities, the former seems the more likely, as one would not expect a scribe to isolate one part of his work for theological revision, and, even if he were to, one would expect his particular emphases to be concentrated in the first part of his work; as his copying would proceed, the intensity of his own distinctive work would lessen. If we adopt this possibility, it is clear that there must have been some tradition of a highly distinctive text specifically of Acts.

Professor E.J. Epp has made a study of the Coptic MS G67 and the rôle of Codex Bezae as a Western witness in Acts /22. Epp shows that it

is possible to speak of a distinctive 'Western' text of Acts, and even suggests that the Homogeneity of the Western text must be investigated, as well as the question as to whether it is the result of a process of revision. He concludes: "... it must be emphasized that a not inconsiderable number of unique readings in D, h or other pure Western witnesses are now attested by copG67, and this is an indication at least that the question of homogeneity deserves further study now."/23.

4) Theories of the 'Western' text:

In the early nineteenth century, J.L. Hug noted a series of characteristics in D: harmonizations, apocryphal-like additions, liturgical alterations, and the elimination of tautologisms /24. Hug rejected outright the theory of Latin influence and considered D to be a member of the Egyptian $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\eta$ $\epsilon\chi\delta\omicron\sigma\iota\varsigma$ on account of its agreement with Clement, Origen and sy(h). In many respects, Hug's work was quite valuable, although there are occasions in D where Latin influence seems undeniable. Latin influence is, however, of very little significance.

Constantin von Tischendorf did not regard the text of D as wholly independent of the Latin; nevertheless, he classed D with the best MSS, mainly on account of its age. Tischendorf may be criticized for depending too much on the age of MSS without giving sufficient consideration to the textual relationships. He has been accused of resting too heavily on h in the eighth edition of his Greek New Testament.

In 1896, S.P. Tregelles made an important and significant observation: viz., that when D is joined by another ancient witness its authority is much enhanced, yet when standing alone it is of limited value. Tregelles published one edition of the Greek New Testament /25. Valuing early witnesses highly, his principles of textual criticism were similar to those of Karl Lachmann (Lachmann's 1831 edition was based on the early uncials, the Fathers and the Old Latin, without reference to miniscule witnesses).

The year 1881 is a landmark in the history of the textual criticism of the Greek New Testament: it saw the publication of Westcott and Hort's critical edition of the Greek New Testament. Mention must be made here of their theory of the 'Western' text. They considered it to be both ancient and widespread, and regarded Q, D(p), the Old Latin and Sy(c) as its major witnesses. Regarding its antiquity, they considered that it might be dated even prior to the mid-second century, it having been used by many of the ancient Fathers /26. They noted the Western text's love of harmonizations and assimilations and its general looseness. For Westcott and Hort, their Neutral (H-8) text was the best, with the exception of what they termed "Western non-interpolations". These consist of several passages in the last three chapters of Luke, and one at Mt 27:49, where Westcott and Hort regard the Western text as preserving the original, shorter text.

Until recently, scholars accepted this theory of "Western non-interpolations". However, critical studies in recent years by J. Jeremias /27 and K. Aland /28 have been followed by the important article by K. Snodgrass, "Western non-interpolations"/29. Snodgrass concluded: "With Aland and Jeremias, the 'Western non-interpolations' in Luke and John have little, if any, claim to authenticity. Of the passages considered in Matthew and Mark, it is necessary to omit Matt 6:15, 25; 23:26 and 27:49 from our discussion, for they are not really 'Western non-interpolations'. Of the remaining passages in Matthew and Mark, the internal evidence was not conclusive for Matt 13:33 and Mark 2:22. In the remaining four cases, the Western readings find little or no support from the internal evidence."/30.

Snodgrass notes that, as a result of the papyri, it is doubtful that any of the readings supported only by Q and its non-Greek allies is the genuine text. He is convinced on both internal and external

grounds that the case against the 'Western' readings is decisive.

F.H. Chase championed the Syriac as the influence behind the distinctive 'Western' text. In The Old Syriac Element in Codex Bezae /31, he maintained that Bezae's distinctive variations show Syriac influence. This theory was strongly contended, mainly because there was no known Syriac text like D. The main weakness of Chase's work is that he was too thoroughgoing in applying this theory of Syriac influence; it is indeed possible to maintain that there is some Syriac influence in Codex Bezae, but extreme caution is required in isolating Syriacisms. A reading taken for a Syriacism may be an Aramaism, or indeed an assimilation or a harmonization.

The work of Hermann von Soden has been described as "a magnificent failure". His judgement regarding the 'Western' text, and D in particular, was to reject the Syriac hypothesis, holding that most readings in D which appear to be Syriacisms are really only readings which are coincidentally common to D, Sy(s,c). As with Westcott and Hort, von Soden had his own theories of methodology, but here we note that Codex Bezae fell into his I-text which was a mixed Western/Caesarean text. For von Soden, the I-text probably derived from Eusebius and Pamphilus of Caesarea; it could not be constructed exactly, but inferred from a number of MSS of mixed character: D, Q, 565. Although von Soden thought much of his discovery of the I-text, his theory is now regarded as ungrounded: it contains too many representatives of too many families (Western, Caesarean, Old Latin, Old Syriac and witnesses mixed with the Koine text).

After von Soden, text-critics tended in the main to follow Westcott and Hort in England, while in Germany the inventive approach continued. H.J. Vogels suggested that a harmony underlay D (he had isolated some 1,500 harmonizations in the MS)/32. This harmony he considered to be in Greek, being subsequently translated into Syriac by Tatian; this provided a Syriac Diatessaron behind Sy (s,c,p). It is now possible to explain features

common to D and Sy as finding their community through the Diatessaron. Over against Vogels, however, Sanders was sceptical of relying on a theory of harmonization and of stressing the influence of Tatian's Diatessaron too much. Vogels' main failure was to assume that harmonizations all tended to find their origin in Tatian.

In the first half of this century, Plooy held that a Latin text lay behind the text of D. For him, the Liège Diatessaron witnessed for a Latin Diatessaron (which he was able to show lay behind the Dutch). Plooy was probably quite correct in positing a Latin text behind the Liège Diatessaron, yet he was wholly unjustified in supposing that this Latin text lay behind others /33.

A.F.J. Klijn concludes /34 that the decade 1949-59 was characterized by intensive study of the Old Syriac and the riddles of the Caesarean text. The decade 1959-69 was then dominated by the discoveries of (1) the Bodmer papyri, (2) the Syrian Commentary of Ephrem on the Diatessaron, (3) the Gospel of Thomas, discovered among the gnostic writings of Nag Hammadi, and (4) G67.

The importance of the Coptic MS G67 (a MS of Acts) cannot be over-emphasized. It dates from 4th. - 5th. cents., and has the Münster siglum DX14. T.C. Petersen provided an English translation of G67 /35, which showed a very close relationship with readings of D, and thus provided evidence for a 'Western' text in Coptic. About 1967, however, Haenchen and Weigandt were somewhat critical of Petersen's conclusion that G67 was the "earliest completely preserved and entirely unadulterated witness of the Western text". For Haenchen and Weigandt it was a mixed text, and they doubted that a pure 'Western' text ever existed /36. E.J. Epp compared G67 with D, making the important observation that some readings, originally thought to be singular to D, are now witnessed in another MS /37. We may conclude that Petersen's evaluation of G67

was not entirely balanced: it is a mixed text, providing more evidence for already noted 'Western' readings, and itself containing some new readings. Nevertheless, it is a highly important MS in any consideration of the 'Western' text.

The Gospel of Thomas indicates that 'Western' readings are known prior to Tatian, and possibly go back to some Christian centre (similar readings can be found in the East and West, Rome, Edessa and Egypt). This centre may well have been Antioch. Perhaps this will help us with the question whether there ever existed a 'Western' text as such. We can think of Antioch, a Christian centre, being the place at which a loose but not entirely uncontrolled text grew up, and from which these readings travelled in many directions.

5) Text-Critical Methodology:

There are many ways in which scribal errors arise in manuscripts. These are familiar to every student of the Greek New Testament: homoioteleuton, homoiarchton, haplography, dittography, itacism, even the confusion of letters in uncial script (cf. C and E; Q and O). In the case of a dictated text, obviously errors may arise as a result of a scribe mis-hearing a word. Yet the student has first of all to determine whether a distinctive reading is an error at all: it may be an intentional alteration of the text (if not the original text itself). Such intended changes in the narrative can be the result of a scribe wishing to express his own particular dogmatic outlook or the tradition of his particular locality, or it may simply be a desire to improve the grammar or style of the passage. In the former case, dogmatic reasons have often been the cause of changes in J's text (particularly in Acts, and to a lesser extent in the narrative leading up to Jesus' crucifixion; cf. Mt). Grammatical and stylistic improvements are particularly characteristic of the later MSS, especially of the 'Byzantine' family. Nevertheless, scribes were at all times prone to improve the text rather than copy what they

considered either grammatically faulty or stylistically clumsy.

In evaluating a variant, the critic should - as far as he can - construct its history, bearing in mind that both "external" and "internal" considerations are important. External evidence relates to (i) the date of the MS, and of its text, and (ii) the geographical distribution of the text in the MS concerned. Internal evidence includes Westcott and Hort's well-known Intrinsic and Transcriptional probabilities, relating respectively to the author and the scribe.

It is just over one hundred years since the first publication of Westcott and Hort's Greek New Testament /38. Thus, it is appropriate to consider the present state of text-critical methodology of the New Testament in the context of the passing of a century.

Since 1881, there have been important developments in text-critical work: the discovery of new manuscripts (in particular the Chester Beatty and Bodmer papyri /39), further research into methodology by many textual critics, the publication of new Greek texts of the New Testament /40, and greater understanding of the lectionaries, the early Fathers and the Versions. The avowed aim of all textual criticism is the restoration of the original text of the New Testament, and all of these developments will assist scholars greatly in that continuing task.

The student of the text of the New Testament encounters many dicta - some wise, and some not so wise. Westcott and Hort contributed to this store of sayings: "Knowledge of documents should precede final judgement upon readings", "All trustworthy restoration of corrupted texts is founded on the study of their history", to which may be added the statement that "community of readings implies community of origin" /41. This short selection of quotations should not give the impression that

Westcott and Hort placed a sole emphasis on "external" evidence. The "Internal Evidence of Readings", divided into Intrinsic and Transcriptional Probabilities, was part of the total method which went on to include the "Internal Evidence of Documents" and of "Groups" successively. They stressed the importance of the genealogy of manuscript groups, and they used this genealogical method to bring an end to the domination of the Textus Receptus - one of their most significant contributions to the history of the Greek New Testament. The genealogical method has, nevertheless, received adverse criticism from some during this century. For B.M. Metzger a compromise method involving some degree of genealogical investigation appears appropriate /42.

Using their method, Westcott and Hort distinguished their now famous four types of text : the Syrian (alpha), Western (delta), Alexandrian (gamma) and Neutral (beta) texts. The alpha text was for them the latest and was conflated, mixed and smooth. They showed that the Textus Receptus was a descendant of this unreliable, expanded text. They noted the assimilative and harmonistic tendencies of the delta text, which they nevertheless claimed was early. The gamma text, with its emphasis upon proper syntax, was the product of a Greek literary centre. The beta text was the most pure, and they attached such importance to this last text-type that they could assert that none of its readings should ever be rejected absolutely; some were, however, to be placed on an "alternative footing", and in particular when they received no support from the Versions or the Fathers /43. Their faith in the Neutral text, associated principally with the codices Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, did not prevent them departing from it to follow the delta text in those passages which they termed "Western non-interpolations". These were expansions within the beta text (or so they judged them) which the delta text did not share. Westcott and Hort chose to regard the shorter delta text as the original.

If this aspect of Westcott and Hort's work has been

dealt a fatal body-blow (cf. 4: Theories of the 'Western' Text - above), we should not forget that the theory of "Western non-interpolations" was developed under the conviction that the delta text, although expanded, was of very early date. Further, Westcott and Hort worked without the knowledge of the papyri, which we today are fortunate enough to possess/44.

In 1968, E.C. Colwell, giving due consideration to the then contemporary state of New Testament textual criticism, observed therein a state of relative imbalance. It is a tribute to the lasting value of Westcott and Hort's endeavours that he pleaded for a reconsideration of their work as being capable of providing the necessary counter-balance. The title of his article summed up his feelings: "Hort Redivivus-- A Plea for a Program" /45. In his criticisms of the state of textual criticism, and in particular of text-critical methodology at that time, Colwell isolated two specific tendencies which he regretted: the ignoring of the history of the manuscript tradition, and an over-emphasis upon internal evidence which he felt characterized the work on the RSV and NEB. Balance is always of the greatest importance in text-critical method. Colwell, in his Hort Redivivus plea, searches for this balance. Perhaps, however, the tendency to over-emphasize internal considerations was born with the growing awareness that the early course of New Testament textual transmission was very fluid, defying strict groupings and stemmas.

The whole debate on the relative importance of internal and external evidence has been much to the fore in recent years. G.D. Kilpatrick is associated with "rigorous" eclecticism in which internal evidence is given a paramount significance. In a recent text-critical study of three verses in the New Testament (Mt 4:8, Lk 5:1 and

Ac 3:14) /46, Kilpatrick has stressed the importance of stylistic considerations. For him, these may indicate the original nature of a reading which appears in very few witnesses. Nevertheless, he makes the significant comment that, "Very few witnesses are however no guarantee of originality ... Nor do any witnesses have a monopoly in the original form of the text. We may believe that Q is sometimes right against the majority; we must admit that it is sometimes wrong." /47. Elsewhere, Kilpatrick states, however, that readings must be accepted or rejected on their intrinsic merits /48. G.D. Fee notes that this rigorous eclecticism "leaves textual judgements to the whims of the individual practitioner" /49, and therefore proposed a "reasoned" eclecticism in which internal and external evidence would be complementary to each other. He stresses, however, that he is not advocating a complete return to Hort for, while Westcott and Hort started with one text type as superior, rational eclecticism starts with readings, and when internal evidence is inconclusive then appeals to external evidence based on the relative value of witnesses. This measured shift from Westcott and Hort is in the right direction. We know too much today to place our faith in one superior text type. The best eclecticism is the one which is truly eclectic. Vaganay, who rejected the genealogical method in New Testament textual criticism, defined reasoned eclecticism as the one in which "verbal criticism, external and internal criticism all have their part to play, and they must give each other mutual support" /50.

Westcott and Hort started with the Neutral text and departed from it in cases where, for them, it was obviously correct to do so - as in the case of the "Western non-interpolations"; today, however, we start with readings. G.D. Fee was thus correct in that the basic difference between text-critical methodology today and in Westcott and Hort's day concerns the "point of departure". Nevertheless, external evidence is still important today and Hort's estimation of B

has found confirmation in P75, although we should on no account be tempted to a Hortian-like adherence to this text. Fee states that "manuscripts can be judged as to their relative quality and such judgements should affect textual decisions." /51. In this connection he quotes Günther Zuntz's work on P46 /52, characterizing the papyrus as possessing a high degree of purity, and his own work on P66 /53 showing the scribe to be wild and to possess a tendency to edit. Westcott and Hort's principle that "Knowledge of documents should precede final judgement on readings" thus cannot be said to be entirely redundant.

A century after Westcott and Hort's Greek New Testament was first published, textual criticism can still look to them - as, for example, Colwell did - to find assistance to proper balance in methodological procedure. Nevertheless, we depart from Hortian methods in no longer being able to ascribe as much integrity as he did to a particular manuscript group. This brief comparison of the methods of Westcott and Hort and of today should leave us both with respect for their contributions and with an awareness of the limitations of their principles. Hort himself draws attention to the importance of accumulative knowledge and experience: "All instructive processes of criticism which deserve confidence are rooted in experience, and that an experience which has undergone perpetual correction and recorection." /54.

NOTES:

1. F H Scrivener, Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis, Cambridge, 1864, p. xv.
2. H J Frede, Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften, Freiburg, 1964, p. 18, Anm. 4, as in Metzger, Text, Oxford, 1968, p. 264
3. J H Ropes, Beginnings of Christianity, Part I, Vol III, pp. lxvii ff.
4. Ropes, ibid., p. lviii, n.2

5. E J Epp, Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae in Acts, Cambridge, 1966.
6. Cf also my Codex Bezae at Acts 15, Irish Biblical Studies, Issue 2, July 1980.
7. A thesis deposited at St. Andrews University.
8. F H Scrivener, op. cit., Cambridge, 1864.
9. J R Harris, Codex Bezae - A Study in the So-Called Western Text of the N T, C U P Texts and Studies, 1891.
10. P J Voegels, Die Harmonistik im Evangelientext des Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis, Leipzig 1910, as in Die alten Übersetzungen des neuen Testaments, die Kirchenwörterzitate und Lektionare, ed. K. Aland; Der Codex Bezae und Verwandte Probleme, B Fischer, W. der Gruyter, Berlin 1972, p. 42.
11. D de Bruyne, Rev Ben, 28 (1911), as in Die alten Übersetzungen, cf /10 above.
12. B.M Metzger, Text, Oxford, 1968, p. 74.
13. B Fischer, Der Codex Bezae und Verwandte Probleme, ibid., pp. 42 ff.
14. ibid., pp. 42 ff.
15. R C Stone, The Language of the Latin Text of Codex Bezae, Urbaba, 1946; Fischer, op. cit., p. 41, n. 131.
16. op. cit.
17. F H Chase, The Old Syriac Element in Codex Bezae, London, 1893, as in A F J Klijn, Researches, 1949, p. 27, n. 95.
18. J R Harris, Four Lectures on the Western Text, London, 1894; The Old Syriac Text of Acts, pp. 14-34, as in Klijn, op. cit., p. 29, n. 98.
19. B M Metzger, The Early Versions of the N T, Oxford, 1977. cf. p. 288, n.2.

20. B.M. Metzger, ibid., p. 286.
21. B.M. Metzger, ibid., pp. 286 ff.
22. JBL , LXXXV, 1966, pp. 197 ff.
23. ibid., p. 212.
24. J L Hug, Einleitung in die Schriften des NT, Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1808.
25. London, 1857-1872.
26. cf Metzger, Text, p. 132.
27. J Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, London, SCM 1966, pp. 145-159.
28. K Aland, Neue Neuestamentliche Papyri II, NTS 12, 1965-66, pp. 193-210.
29. JBL 1972, pp. 369-379.
30. Art. cit., p. 378.
31. London, 1893.
32. H J Vogels, Die Harmonistik im Evangelientext des Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis, in Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, XXXVI, 1913.
33. Cf D Plooy, A Primitive Text of the Diatessaron, the Liège MS of a Medieval Dutch Translation, A Preliminary Study, Leyden, 1923.
34. Researches, Leiden, 1969.
35. T C Petersen, An Early Coptic MS of Acts: An Unrevised Version of the Ancient So-called Western Text, C B Q 26, 1964, pp. 225-41.
36. Cf E Haenchen and P Weigandt, The Original Text of Acts?, N T S, 14, 1957/68.
37. E J Epp, Coptic MS G67 and the Role of Codex Bezae as a Western Witness in Acts, JBL lxxxv(1966), pp. 197-212.

38. The NT in the Original Greek, Macmillan, 1881.
39. The Chester Beatty Papyri, P45, P46 and P47 are located at the Chester Beatty Library, Dublin (published under the editorship of F G Kenyon, The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri, London 1933-7). The Bodmer Papyri, P66, P72, P74 and P75 are at Geneva (a fragment of P66 is at the Chester Beatty Library in Dublin). P66 was edited by V Martin, P72 by M Testuz, P74 by R Kasser and P75 by V Martin and R Kasser.
40. K Aland ed. Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum, Württembergische Bibelanstalt, Stuttgart 1976; UBS, British and Foreign Bible Society (and other Societies), 1966 and 1968.
41. The New Testament in the Original Greek, (op. cit.), Introduction and Appendix, pp. 31, 40 and 60 respectively.
42. B M Metzger, Text, Oxford 1968, p. 161.
43. op. cit., p. 225.
44. Cf. above, ad loc.
45. Chapter Eleven in E C Colwell, Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the NT, Leiden, Brill 1969; originally in Transitions in Biblical Scholarship, ed. J Coert Rylaarsdam (Essays in Divinity, Vol VI (Chicago 1968), pp. 131-156).
46. G D Kilpatrick, Three Problems of NT Text, Novum Testamentum vol. XXI October 1979, Fasc. 4, pp. 289-292,
47. *ibid.*, p. 292.
48. G D Kilpatrick, Griesbach and the Development of Text Criticism, In J.J Griesbach: Synoptic and Text Critical Studies 1776-1976 (Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series 34) ed. B Orchard and TRW Longstaff, C U P 1978 p. 152.

49. G D Fee, Rigorous and Reasoned Eclecticism - Which?, in Studies in NT Language and Text: Essays in Honour of G D Kilpatrick, Leiden 1976, p. 177.
50. L Vaganay, An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the NT, London, Sands, 1937, pp. 91f; as in G D Fee, op. cit., p. 175.
51. G D Fee, Modern Text Criticism and the Synoptic Problem, in Griesbach Festschrift (op. cit.), p. 157.
52. G Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles, London 1953.
53. G D Fee, Papyrus Bodmer II (P66): Its Textual Relationships and Scribal Characteristics, Studies and Documents 34, Salt Lake City, 1968.
54. op. cit., note 41 above, p. 66.

The Rev Ian M. Ellis is an Honours Graduate in Divinity at the Queen's University of Belfast. He is presently engaged in research into the text of St. Matthew's Gospel in Codex Bezae. He is Curate-Assistant in St. Mark's Church, Armagh and Chaplain to Armagh Royal School.
