To sum up:—for the point after leó, i.e. for Westcott and Hort's text, and the punctuation demanded by the rules of Syriac syntax, we have codd. 8* to 17* 20, and perhaps also 14*; for the point after ἱππος, i.e. for Westcott and Hort's margin and the text printed by Mr. Gwilliam, we have codd. 1 7 23, and the later punctuators of 4 8 14 and 21.

There can be no doubt that the later tendency was to put the stop where Mr. Gwilliam has put it. It is implied in the Arabic Dīalessa, a translation made in the eleventh century; indeed, it would probably be difficult to get Syriac evidence for the stop after leó later than the seventh century. But the earliest witnesses tell another tale. Both the MSS assigned by Wright to the fifth century (codd. 14 and 17) had the stop by the first hand, and they are doubtless right in having it. I cannot but consider it a matter of regret that the Oxford Testament should have retained in this important verse a conventional punctuation that mangles the grammar and obscures the thought.

F. C. Burkitt.

NOTE ON ACTS xii 25.

In a paper entitled 'A point in Pauline Chronology' Mr. G. A. Simcox has directed the attention of readers of this Journal (vol. ii 586–590) to the difficult reading ὑπεστρέψαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ πληρώσατε τὴν διακονίαν. But his remedy, namely to omit the whole verse as an interpolation, is surely more desperate than the disease. Three alternatives at least seem preferable. (1) We may assume that the verse originally contained no reference to Jerusalem at all; or (2) we may connect ἵππος with πληρώσατε τὴν διακονίαν, giving it a more emphatic meaning than is usually suggested by those who favour this construction; or finally (3) we may be able to justify 'from Jerusalem' as after all the original reading.

(1) Most will admit that the textual phenomena are prima facie against the reading 'from Jerusalem,' either in its 'Western' form (δικ) or in its Alexandrine and Syrian form (ἐξ). It is discredited not only as a lectio factior divided against itself, but also by the fact that it is not the common usage of Acts to specify the place whence return is made, wherever it is indicated by the context. On the other hand, even the place whither is twice omitted after ὑποστρέφων, in Acts viii 28, xx 3. In the former of these we have ἦν δὲ ὑποστρέφων καὶ καθήμενος ἐν τῷ ᾠδαμός άτρού, where the destination is only to be inferred from a statement that the man was a eunuch of the queen of the Ethiopians. In

1 Τότε ὑπεστρέψαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ ἀκό δρομ τού καλομένου Ἐλαμώνος is the one case in which the place whence is named at all.
the latter we read that Paul ἐγινομεν γεγομεν του ἀποστριφειν δια Μακεδονιας, where ἀποστριφειν may be rendered ‘to retrace his steps.’ Accordingly one can fairly say that our author’s use of this verb is sometimes rather allusive in its reference. Hence also it is just possible that both forms of the reference to Jerusalem are glosses, του ἱεροουσαλημ being due to the copyist’s habit of writing του after ἀποστριφειν.

(2) But it is hard to believe that such a gloss was added independently in so many distinct lines of transmission, the original reading failing to survive in any MS, Father, or Version. It seems better to take even the difficult του ἱεροουσαλημ (supported by ΝΒΗΛΠ, minusc. alig.; Syr.-Harcl. mg.; Chrys. codd.) as original, and try to find out how our author could write it. Now if we are to justify the reading, instead of smoothing it to την του ἱεροουσαλημ πληρωσαντες διακοινιαν, as Westcott and Hort suggest, we must discover some reason for the emphatic position of του ἱεροουσαλημ. If του . . . διακοινια meant no more than την του . . . διακοινια, it would probably be indefensible as Greek. But need it? The root of the difficulty seems to lie in the common misreading of the facts implied in xii 29 f., into which a special reference to Jerusalem is wont to be imported. But if we take the passage as it stands, namely as stating that relief was prepared for ‘the brethren in Judaea’ and that it was sent ‘to the elders’ (i.e. in Judaea), we shall begin to see a fresh point in xii 25, which adds the information that its bearers ‘fulfilled the ministration up to Jerusalem.’ That is, they reached the mother-church itself with relief, and did not merely minister to the needs of more rural centres, where the famine would be felt most acutely.

(3) But having reached a point of view which invests the reference to Jerusalem (at all) with a fullness of meaning lacking on ordinary theories of the passage, we may ask whether ‘from Jerusalem’ may not after all be original. For it is only on the assumption that the relief was intended for and indeed sent to Jerusalem, rather than Judaea, that ‘from Jerusalem’ can be called lectio facilior. If on the contrary it be a pregnant and allusive touch, suggesting that the delegates ended up their relief journey through Judaea at Jerusalem—a circumstance which explains their returning with John Mark in their company—all this may have been missed by some scribe, who then substituted του (possibly with Gal. ii 1 ff. in mind). We are so apt to forget that there is no explicit mention, in the whole context, of any visit to Jerusalem; and when it is assumed among us, this is largely in connexion with a special and restricted exegesis of the reference to ‘the elders’ in xi 30. If the idea of ‘from Jerusalem’ be thus justified, it is immaterial whether

1 Only this requires the further assumption that his attention was nodding; else he would have written του Ακροπολιαν, as read by Ε, the Peshitta, the Thebaic and Ethiopic, and some minuscules.
Δεν ήθελα να μιλήσω για τον σκοπό αυτό, αλλά το να θυμίζει τον διάλογο αυτό.