

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01620-9 - St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem
Wilfred Lawrence Knox
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

Books of enduring scholarly value

Religion

For centuries, scripture and theology were the focus of prodigious amounts of scholarship and publishing, dominated in the English-speaking world by the work of Protestant Christians. Enlightenment philosophy and science, anthropology, ethnology and the colonial experience all brought new perspectives, lively debates and heated controversies to the study of religion and its role in the world, many of which continue to this day. This series explores the editing and interpretation of religious texts, the history of religious ideas and institutions, and not least the encounter between religion and science.

St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem

St Paul's conversion to Christianity transformed a vicious persecutor of Christians into one of the most important and influential figures in the foundation of the early church. Paul's broad theological knowledge and his ambitious vision for the faith made him a major force in the development of Christianity from its origins as an obscure Jewish sect. W.L. Knox's 1925 biography examines what influenced Paul's theological ideas and how his desire to extend the church's reach to gentiles and the wider world put him in opposition with other early church figures like St Peter. Placing Paul's work in the social and religious context of Jerusalem following the death of Jesus, Knox evokes the atmosphere of persecution in Jerusalem and the inner social dynamics of the early Christian sect, evaluating Paul's impact on the growing church and the particular ideas and elements of doctrine that prevailed as a result of his involvement.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01620-9 - St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem
Wilfred Lawrence Knox
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Cambridge University Press has long been a pioneer in the reissuing of out-of-print titles from its own backlist, producing digital reprints of books that are still sought after by scholars and students but could not be reprinted economically using traditional technology. The Cambridge Library Collection extends this activity to a wider range of books which are still of importance to researchers and professionals, either for the source material they contain, or as landmarks in the history of their academic discipline.

Drawing from the world-renowned collections in the Cambridge University Library, and guided by the advice of experts in each subject area, Cambridge University Press is using state-of-the-art scanning machines in its own Printing House to capture the content of each book selected for inclusion. The files are processed to give a consistently clear, crisp image, and the books finished to the high quality standard for which the Press is recognised around the world. The latest print-on-demand technology ensures that the books will remain available indefinitely, and that orders for single or multiple copies can quickly be supplied.

The Cambridge Library Collection will bring back to life books of enduring scholarly value (including out-of-copyright works originally issued by other publishers) across a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences and in science and technology.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01620-9 - St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem
Wilfred Lawrence Knox
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem

WILFRED LAWRENCE KNOX



Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01620-9 - St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem
Wilfred Lawrence Knox
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,
São Paulo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo, Mexico City

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108016209

© in this compilation Cambridge University Press 2010

This edition first published 1925
This digitally printed version 2010

ISBN 978-1-108-01620-9 Paperback

This book reproduces the text of the original edition. The content and language reflect the beliefs, practices and terminology of their time, and have not been updated.

Cambridge University Press wishes to make clear that the book, unless originally published by Cambridge, is not being republished by, in association or collaboration with, or with the endorsement or approval of, the original publisher or its successors in title.

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01620-9 - St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem
Wilfred Lawrence Knox
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

**St Paul and the Church
of Jerusalem**

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01620-9 - St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem
Wilfred Lawrence Knox
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: Fetter Lane



NEW YORK
The Macmillan Co.
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA and
MADRAS
Macmillan and Co., Ltd.
TORONTO
The Macmillan Co. of
Canada, Ltd.
TOKYO
Maruzen-Kabushiki-Kaisha

All rights reserved

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01620-9 - St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem
Wilfred Lawrence Knox
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem

BY THE REVEREND
WILFRED L. KNOX, M.A.

*Priest of the Oratory of the Good Shepherd,
Formerly Scholar of Trinity College,
Oxford*

**Bono Pastori
Sancto Salvatori**

CAMBRIDGE
at the University Press
MCMXXV

Cambridge University Press

978-1-108-01620-9 - St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem

Wilfred Lawrence Knox

Frontmatter

[More information](#)

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

Cambridge University Press
978-1-108-01620-9 - St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem
Wilfred Lawrence Knox
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

P R E F A C E

IN this book I have endeavoured to put forward a narrative of the life of the Apostle of the Gentiles during that period of his career in which he was in contact with the original community of Christians in Jerusalem, who were responsible for the preservation of the record of the life and teaching of Our Lord. Such a narrative involves an examination of the nature and implications of his doctrines, and the extent to which they were already explicitly held by those who were before him in the faith or represented a new development in the Christian religion. The attempt is complicated by the vast amount of literature published in recent times both on the whole life of S. Paul and on particular aspects of his teaching. The difficulty is increased by the fact that much of this literature is the work of specialists who have pressed their own particular point of view to lengths which a fuller knowledge of other aspects of the subject would have shown to be untenable. Naturally I do not flatter myself that I have avoided the opposite danger of giving a very inadequate amount of attention to many, if not all, of the features which call for consideration. For example, I am conscious that the relation of S. Paul to the contemporary religious movements of the Hellenistic world needs fuller consideration; but until the literature and in particular the original writings available for the study of the subject are more accessible this shortcoming is hardly to be avoided.

I should be guilty of ingratitude if I did not here record the debt I owe to the late Professor Haverfield and the late Mr H. J. Cunningham of Worcester College, Oxford, to whom I owe my interest in the history of the Roman Empire and such little knowledge of it as I possess. *Requiescant in pace.*

On account of the vast extent of the modern literature on the subject I have limited my references to it to the smallest possible compass; my indebtedness to the work of Schürer, Ramsay, Charles, and others will be obvious to any reader. For my impertinence in presenting to the public a book on such a subject, which has been composed for the most part in the intervals of parochial work in London, I can only offer my humblest apologies.

WILFRED L. KNOX

THE ORATORY HOUSE,
CAMBRIDGE.
November, 1924.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	
(a) SOURCES	ix
(b) CHRONOLOGY	xiii
(c) THE <i>CODEX BEZAE</i>	xiv
<i>Chapter I</i>	
THE CHURCH OF JERUSALEM	1
<i>Appendix I.</i> Primitive Christology	30
<i>Appendix II.</i> Spiritual Gifts	32
<i>Chapter II</i>	
STEPHEN AND SAUL	39
<i>Appendix.</i> The High Priesthood under the Roman Govern- ment	61
<i>Chapter III</i>	
THE FIRST EXTENSION OF THE CHURCH	
§ I. PHILIP AT SAMARIA	66
§ II. THE RE-ORGANIZATION	75
<i>Chapter IV</i>	
THE ENTRANCE OF THE GENTILES	
§ I. SAUL THE CONVERT	94
<i>Appendix I.</i> S. Paul and Hellenistic Judaism	126
<i>Appendix II.</i> S. Paul and Hellenistic Religion	136
§ II. THE CONVERSION OF CORNELIUS	150
<i>Chapter V</i>	
THE CHURCH AT ANTIOCH	
§ I. THE FIRST MISSIONARIES	156
§ II. THE FAMINE PROPHECY AND THE SECOND PERSECUTION	165
§ III. THE FAMINE AND THE FIRST CONCORDAT	179
§ IV. PETER AT ANTIOCH	191

	PAGE
<i>Chapter VI</i>	
THE APPEAL TO THE WORLD	
§ I. CYPRUS AND GALATIA	199
Note on the meaning of <i>διέρχομαι</i>	216
§ II. THE COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM	219
Note on the meaning of Galatia	236
§ III. THE SECOND JOURNEY	239
§ IV. THE ROMAN CHURCH	252
§ V. MACEDONIA AND ACHAEA	261
<i>Chapter VII</i>	
THE COLLECTION FOR THE SAINTS	
§ I. PREPARATIONS	284
§ II. EPHESUS	296
Note on the Acts and Ephesus	307
§ III. THE CRISIS AT CORINTH	309
§ IV. THE VICTORY AT CORINTH	328
<i>Chapter VIII</i>	
THE END OF THE JOURNEYS	
§ I. PAUL AND ROME	345
§ II. PAUL IN JERUSALEM	357
<i>Appendix I. The Apostolate</i>	363
<i>Appendix II. The Primitive Eucharist</i>	372
INDEX	386

INTRODUCTION

(a) SOURCES

THE primary sources for the period of the life of S. Paul during which he was in active personal contact with the Church of Jerusalem are the letters written by him to his converts in Galatia and at Thessalonica and Corinth. The authenticity and substantial integrity of these letters are not seriously disputed except in the case of 2 Thessalonians. This letter is not in itself of great historical importance; reasons are, however, given in the text for supposing that the objections commonly raised against its authenticity are ill-founded. The same applies to the arguments of some critics that the concluding chapters of Romans do not belong to that Epistle. In the case of 2 Corinthians reasons are given for regarding the Epistle in its present form as a combination of portions of two separate Pauline Epistles to the Corinthian community. Apart from these minor questions the Epistles of this group form our primary authority, being first-hand documents for the study of the life and work of their author.

Second only to these stands the book known as the Acts of the Apostles. It might seem natural to examine here the much-debated question of its origin, date and method of composition. Such a discussion would, however, be impossible at this point, since the answer to these questions depends very largely on the extent to which the book can be accepted as being in the main a reliable historical record of the events which it narrates. It is clear that the author does not profess to have been an eye-witness of more than a comparatively small portion of the career of his hero, and that for the rest of his narrative he depends on sources of some kind other than his own observation. Thus the question arises whether these sources were in themselves reliable, as he claims that the sources for his narrative of the Gospel were (assuming him to be the author of the Gospel traditionally ascribed to S. Luke). Further, it is necessary to examine the method followed by him in dealing with his information, in so far as it was not derived from his own immediate personal contact with S. Paul, if indeed those portions of the narrative which profess to be the work of an eye-witness are genuinely what they profess to be, and are the work of the final editor. In particular it is necessary to ask whether we find throughout the narrative personal peculiarities of outlook and methods of dealing with the material at the author's disposal, or whether the material has been simply pieced together without criticism or revision by the editor from whom it received its final form.

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-01620-9 - St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem
 Wilfred Lawrence Knox
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

All these questions can only be answered by a very close consideration of the actual text of the Acts taken as a whole. To attempt such an examination here would simply be to anticipate the greater part of the narrative given in the text of this book and the reasons stated in the notes for believing that narrative to be correct. If those conclusions be accepted, it follows that the author in the main had access to sources of the highest authority and that he was in a position to supplement them from other sources of almost equal merit. A crucial instance of this is the section viii. 4–25. If the explanation of the narrative given in c. III. § i. n. 12 be correct, it is clear that the author had at his disposal in the first instance a simple narrative of the visit of S. Philip to Samaria and the confirmation of his work there by the two chief Apostles. This narrative also included the incident of Simon Magus. From another source the writer was aware of the fact that the whole question of the admission of Samaritans to the Church had been a matter of vigorous controversy; since, however, the subject of the controversy was in principle identical with that involved in the later controversy as to the admission of the Gentiles, he had no reason for describing it at length. Accordingly he has introduced three phrases which imply the controversy, in order to avoid the appearance of omitting it altogether, but has otherwise ignored it. A similar method of dealing with the information available will be found in his terminology in viii. 14, xi. 1 and 22 as discussed in c. III. § ii. n. 20. Numerous other instances are to be found which confirm this view. The author is regularly in the habit of covering by an allusion a whole incident or series of incidents, of which he is well aware, but which he does not for one reason or another desire to describe in full; his method of doing so is to introduce into the information at his disposal from one source phrases or sentences which reveal the possession of information drawn from a different origin. His object is in many cases to avoid, as far as possible, a full discussion of the painful controversies of the past between S. Paul and the Christians of Jerusalem. His allusions would be intelligible to those who remembered these controversies; to a later generation of uncritical readers they would be quite unintelligible; they have almost invariably been misunderstood by the compiler of the *Codex Bezae*. In general it will be manifest that if the interpretation of the evidence of the Acts put forward in this book be accepted, the Acts must be regarded as a source of the highest historical value, second only to the Pauline Epistles; but to give the grounds on which this conclusion rests

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-01620-9 - St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem
 Wilfred Lawrence Knox
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

xi

at this point would simply mean anticipating the main part of the book.

For the same reason it seems unnecessary to investigate at this point the other documentary sources for the life and times of S. Paul. For the most part I have followed the views generally held by recognized authorities; where in any case I have dissented from such views the reasons will be found in the book itself; to discuss them here would simply be to anticipate results which depend for their validity on the whole view of the facts which I have advanced. This is particularly the case with regard to the Epistle of S. James and the Epistle to the Ephesians. In the case of the former in particular the question of authenticity must depend on the question whether the Epistle is consistent with such information as we can glean from other sources as to the outlook of primitive Hebrew Christianity. In regard to the non-canonical books of the Old Testament I have in general followed the accounts of their origin and composition put forward in Charles' *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. I am conscious that in regard to the primitive literature of rabbinical Judaism my lack of first-hand knowledge is one of the numerous defects of this book; as it is, I have been compelled to make the best of the recognized modern writers on this subject. None the less this literature must always be a secondary source for the study of primitive Christianity; for it is only where we find the conceptions of rabbinical Judaism already present in pre-rabbinical literature that we can be certain that they were present in Pauline Judaism.

In one respect it is scarcely possible at present to express a decided opinion as to the origin of Pauline and early Christian ideas. The whole question of the relation of S. Paul to the Hellenistic theology in which the mystery-cults expressed and propagated themselves needs fuller investigation than it has yet received. At the same time it will be clear, from the discussion of the subject in c. iv. § i. Appendix 2, that its treatment by such writers as Reitzenstein is seriously vitiated by a failure to recognize that in several cases alleged borrowings on the part of S. Paul from Gentile literature of this character appear on closer investigation to be perfectly straightforward developments of the Old Testament. The relation of Jewish to Gentile theology in the centuries before the Christian era will need much fuller investigation before any decisive verdict can be given on the whole of this subject. Further, it will be necessary to recognize how easily resemblances of thought and language may occur to writers who are

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-01620-9 - St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem
 Wilfred Lawrence Knox
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

occupied in the same task, namely the expression of religious and mystical experience in language intended to appeal to the reader who has himself little or no first-hand knowledge of that experience.

ABBREVIATIONS, ETC.

Josephus. (References to the *Editio Stereotypa*, as quoted by Schürer; these references are given in the margin of Niere's text.)

Antt. Antiquitates Judaicae.

B.ĵ. Bellum Judaicum.

c. Apion. Contra Apionem.

Vita.

Philo. References to the Richter edition of 1828, with those of Mangey's text added in parenthesis. Unfortunately the Cohn-Wendland text was not fully available until a considerable part of this book was completed, and it seemed preferable to use the older system, rather than to revise the whole of the references to Philo in accordance with a system different from that generally used by writers on the New Testament.

The various books of Philo are referred to by the initial letters or syllables of the Latin titles of the Richter edition.

Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. References are given in accordance with Charles' *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T.* (referred to as *Apocr. and Pseud.*).

ĵub. The Book of Jubilees.

Ps. Arist. The "Letter of Aristeas."

1 En. The Book of Enoch.

Adam and Eve. The Books of Adam and Eve. (Where necessary the "Apocalypse of Moses" incorporated in this document is referred to as *Apoc. Moys.*)

Testt. XII Patr. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. (The particular Testaments are referred to as *Test. Reub.* etc.)

Or. Sib. The Sibylline Oracles.

Ass. Moys. The Assumption of Moses.

2 En. The Book of the Secrets of Enoch.

2 Bar. The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch.

3 Bar. The Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch.

4 Esdr. The Fourth Book of Ezra.

Pss. Sol. The Psalms of Solomon.

4 Macc. The Fourth Book of Maccabees.

P.A. Pirke Aboth.

Bibl. Antt. The book commonly known as the *Biblical Antiquities*

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-01620-9 - St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem
 Wilfred Lawrence Knox
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

xiii

formerly ascribed to Philo. References are given to the S.P.C.K. translation of 1917.

Tr. San. The Tractate Sanhedrin (references to the S.P.C.K. translation).

Tr. Ber. The Tractate Berakhoth (references to S.P.C.K. translation).

H.E. The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius (references to Bright's edition, Oxford, 1881).

It will perhaps be convenient to note here certain abbreviations employed to designate more recent works which are quoted with some frequency.

Hor. Hebr. The *Horae Hebraicae* of John Lightfoot (references to the Oxford edition of 1859).

E.E.P. Kirsopp Lake's *Earlier Epistles of S. Paul*.

G.ŷ.V. Schürer's *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes* (references to the Leipzig edition of 1901).

Dict. d'Arch. Chrét. The *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, edited by Leclercq and Cabrol, now in course of publication.

Voc. Gr. Test. Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament*.

Life and Times. Edersheim's *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (1887 edition).

Hastings' *D.B.* Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (1910 edition).

P.R.E. Mommsen, *Provinces of the Roman Empire*.

(b) CHRONOLOGY

For the purpose of convenience a summary is given of the main dates in S. Paul's career during the period covered by this book. The grounds on which these dates are based are discussed in detail in the book itself.

A.D. 35–36 (*i.e.* between the autumn of 35 and the spring of 36). Death of S. Stephen and conversion of S. Paul.

A.D. 38 (spring). S. Paul returns to Jerusalem from Damascus and leaves for Tarsus.

A.D. 40. One year's ministry of SS. Paul and Barnabas at Antioch.

A.D. 41. The Herodian persecution.

A.D. 48 (spring, possibly autumn of 47). "Famine-visit" of SS. Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem.

A.D. 48 (summer)–49 (spring). First missionary journey.

A.D. 49 (summer). Epistle to the Galatians and Council of Jerusalem.

A.D. 50 (spring—autumn). Second journey (from the Syrian Antioch to Corinth).

- A.D. 51 (summer). Gallio arrives in Corinth.
 A.D. 52 (spring). S. Paul leaves Corinth.
 A.D. 52 (autumn). S. Paul opens his mission at Ephesus.
 A.D. 55 (summer). S. Paul leaves Ephesus.
 A.D. 55 (autumn). S. Paul reaches Corinth.
 A.D. 56 (spring). S. Paul leaves Corinth, reaching Jerusalem about Pentecost.

(c) THE BEZAN RECENSION OF THE ACTS

At various times the view has been put forward that in the *Codex Bezae* and its variants we have access to an original Lucan text of the Acts of which the generally received text is an abridgment made by the author himself. There is no doubt that in the main this belief is due to the fact that the Bezan text of the proceedings of the Council of Jerusalem in xv. 20 and 28 is free from the difficulty presented by the received text. It omits the reference to "things strangled" and adds a negative form of the rule of Christian conduct, "Do unto others as ye would they should do unto you." The whole question of this particular passage is discussed in c. vi. § ii. n. 41, where reasons are given for supposing that the received text is probably the correct one, and that which we should naturally expect in the conditions of the time at which the Council met, in view of the necessity of regulating the common meals of the Church in such a way as not to offend Jews who still observed the Law; while the rapid failure of the Pauline attempt to combine in the Church Gentiles who did not observe the Law and Jews who continued to do so explains the early abandonment of the actual practice enjoined in the decrees of the Council. Naturally the neglect of the decrees would lead to the alteration of the text by a copyist who saw that they no longer harmonized with Christian practice. In any case the relative value of this group of MSS. must be judged not by the fact that in this case they offer us an easier reading but by the general character of the variations from the received text.

Now it is well known that in general the MSS. of this family offer us a longer text. This is in itself suspicious. There is absolutely no explanation of the motive which would lead S. Luke to compose a shorter draft of his narrative; still less of any motive which would lead him to abbreviate it by the omission of odd sentences here and there, resulting altogether in a merely trifling abbreviation of the whole. On the other hand, we are familiar with the practice of

INTRODUCTION

xv

introducing single words, phrases, and whole sentences into an existing text in order to explain points which appear ambiguous in the original or to add details which may be inferred from it, or in order to increase its value for dogmatic purposes. In such revisions we also find a tendency to omit phrases which seem superfluous or difficult, or which clash with the writer's own presuppositions. The most familiar instance of such rewriting is the treatment of S. Mark's Gospel by the other two Synoptists, although their revision is complicated by the fact that they employ not only that Gospel but other trustworthy sources as well. Although the process is familiar to students of the N.T. it is perhaps desirable to illustrate it once again. The narrative of the Transfiguration will serve as an instance in which the various motives are very clearly to be seen (Mt. xvii. 1 *seqq.*, Mk ix. 2 *seqq.*, Lk. ix. 28 *seqq.*).

Mt.	Mk	Lk.
<p>καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἕξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννη τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν. καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος, τὰ δὲ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο λευκὰ ὡς τὸ φῶς. καὶ ἰδοὺ ὄφθη αὐτοῖς Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἥλειας συνλαλοῦντες μετ' αὐτοῦ. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος εἶπεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ· κύριε καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι· εἰ θέλεις, ποιήσω ὧδε τρεῖς σκηνάς, σοὶ μίαν καὶ Μωϋσεὶ μίαν καὶ Ἥλειᾳ μίαν. ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, ἰδοὺ νεφέλη φαιεὶν ἔπεσκειασεν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα. καὶ προσήλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἀνάμενος αὐτῶν εἶπεν· ἔγερθητε καὶ μὴ φοβείσθε. ἐπάραντες δὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς αὐτῶν οὐδένα εἶδον εἰ μὴ αὐτὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον. καὶ καταβαίνοντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· μηδενὶ εἰ-</p>	<p>καὶ μετὰ ἡμέρας ἕξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους. καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο στιλβόντα λευκὰ λίαν ὡς γναφεὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκάναι. καὶ ὄφθη αὐτοῖς Ἥλειας σὺν Μωϋσεί καὶ ἦσαν συνλαλοῦντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ· ραββεί, καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι, καὶ ποιήσωμεν τρεῖς σκηνάς, σοὶ μίαν καὶ Μωϋσεὶ μίαν καὶ Ἥλειᾳ μίαν. οὐ γὰρ ἤδει τί ἀποκριθῆ· ἔκφοβοι γὰρ ἐγένοντο. καὶ ἐγένετο νεφέλη ἐπισκιάζουσα αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐξάπινα περιβλεψάμενοι οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον μεθ' ἑαυτῶν. καὶ καταβαίνοντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ ἅ εἶδον διηγήσωνται, εἰ μὴ ὅταν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆ. καὶ τὸν λόγον ἐκράτησαν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς συνζητοῦντες τί ἐστὶν τὸ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆ-</p>	<p>ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ, καὶ παραλαβὼν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ προσεύχεσθαι αὐτὸν τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον καὶ ὁ ἱματισμὸς αὐτοῦ λευκὸς ἕξαστράπτων. καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο συνελάλουν αὐτῷ, οἵτινες ἦσαν Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἥλειας, οἱ ὄφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ ἔλεγον τὴν πληροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ· ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ἦσαν βεβαρημένοι ὑπνω· διαγρηγορήσαντες δὲ εἶδον τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς δύο ἄνδρας τοὺς συνεστῶτας αὐτῷ. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ διαχωρίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν· ἐπιστάτα, καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι καὶ ποιήσωμεν σκηνάς τρεῖς, μίαν σοὶ καὶ μίαν Μωϋσεὶ καὶ μίαν Ἥλειᾳ, μὴ εἰδὼς ὁ λέγει· ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ἐγένετο νεφέλη καὶ ἐπεσκίαζεν αὐτούς· ἐφοβήθησαν δὲ ἐν τῷ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν νεφέλην. καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε. καὶ</p>

Mt.	Mk	Lk.
<p>πητε τὸ ὄραμα ἕως οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθῆ, καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγοντες· τί οὖν οἱ γραμματεῖς λέγουσιν ὅτι Ἡλείαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· Ἡλείας μὲν ἔρχεται καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα· λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι Ἡλείας ἤδη ἦλθεν καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν. οὕτως καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει πάσχειν ὑπ' αὐτῶν. τότε συνήκαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.</p>	<p>ναι. καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτόν λέγοντες· ὅτι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς ὅτι Ἡλείαν δεῖ ἐλθεῖν πρῶτον; ὁ δὲ ἔφη αὐτοῖς· Ἡλείας μὲν ἐλθὼν πρῶτον ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα· καὶ πῶς γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ καὶ ἐξουδενηθῆ; ἀλλὰ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι καὶ Ἡλείας ἐλήλυθεν, καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλον· καθὼς γέγραπται ἐπ' αὐτόν.</p>	<p>ἐν τῷ γενέσθαι τὴν φωνὴν εὐρέθη Ἰησοῦς μόνος. καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐσίγησαν καὶ οὐδενὶ ἀπήγγειλαν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις οὐδὲν ὧν ἑώρακαν.</p>

The first point that strikes us when the original Marcan narrative is compared with the two later editions of it is the intensification of the miraculous element. The vivid impression of garments glittering white “as no fuller on earth could white them” has become in S. Matthew purely conventional; Our Lord’s face shines like the sun and His garments are white as the light; in S. Luke they are “flashing white”; the attempt to enhance the supernatural has lost the genuine personal touch of the original. This conventionalization of the narrative meets us still more strikingly in the Marcan detail of the bewilderment of the disciples as to the meaning of Our Lord’s words about the resurrection of the Son of Man from the dead. S. Mark’s narrative goes back to a time when the Resurrection of Our Lord was not a thing to be assumed as a matter of course; the later narratives have forgotten that the disciples at this point did not even expect His death. In these two cases the narrative shows clear traces of expansion to harmonize it with the beliefs of the primitive Church.

We find in the same way instances both of omission and expansion to avoid difficulties in the original in the closing section of the narrative. S. Mark preserves the extremely cryptic saying of Our Lord that Elias has already appeared, and that they have done unto him whatever they would. S. Matthew boldly asserts that the disciples then understood that He was speaking of S. John the Baptist. It is no doubt true that Our Lord had this reference in mind; that the disciples understood it at the moment is perhaps more doubtful. In any case the interpretation is inserted to explain the very difficult Marcan saying, while S. Luke avoids the difficulty by omitting the whole passage. Probably it is with a similar motive that S. Matthew

INTRODUCTION

xvii

omits the detail that S. Peter did not know what he was saying when he suggested the three booths; S. Matthew sees nothing strange in his desire to remain on the mountain of vision. (Note how S. Luke conventionalizes this passage by making them weighed down by sleep, a suitable frame of mind for seeing visions.)

Details added to expand the narrative and so meet the natural desire of the primitive Church to learn as much as possible about the life of Our Lord are to be found in both narratives. Thus S. Matthew alters the bare statement that the disciples suddenly looked about them into the statement that Our Lord came and touched them, saying *ἐγερθήτε καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε*; S. Luke informs us that He went up into the mountain to pray, and was praying when the Transfiguration took place. (It is of interest to note that he is already so familiar with the story that he simply states that Our Lord took His disciples up into "the mountain," although we have no allusion to this mountain in the preceding narrative.) In the same way he informs us that the subject of the conversation between Our Lord and Moses and Elias was His approaching death at Jerusalem.

To these types of alteration we may add those that are due to considerations of style; thus S. Matthew changes the clumsy *κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους* into *κατ' ἰδίαν*; the Aramaic *ῥαββεί* becomes *κύριε* in S. Matthew and *ἐπιστάτα* in S. Luke. Finally we may notice changes for which it is impossible to conjecture the reason, such as the notice in S. Matthew that John was the brother of James, and S. Luke's change of six days into eight.

From the above very rough analysis of a single passage it will be clear that the expansion of an original narrative in this manner seemed at one point in the history of the Church a natural and reasonable thing to do; it remains to enquire whether the Bezan emendations are of this character. We have already seen reason to believe that it is natural to suspect that the emendation of the narrative of the Council of Jerusalem was due to the desire to harmonize it with existing practice; our suspicion will become almost a certainty if we can trace elsewhere a motive for revision similar to any of those which we have found in the case of the synoptic narratives. In point of fact we find all of them at work; we may classify the leading instances as follows:

(a) *Changes introduced for dogmatic reasons.* Nothing is so striking in the narrative of the Acts as the variations in the titles by which Our Lord is referred to; it can hardly be doubted that in this respect S. Luke has accurately reproduced the practice of a period which

was not interested in dogmatic accuracy as to the nature of His personality. But the *Codex Bezae*, which it will be convenient to denote here by its usual symbol, D, will have none of this, if it can be avoided. So in i. 21, iii. 13, iv. 33, viii. 16, xi. 20, xv. 11, xvi. 31, xix. 5, xxi. 13, the word *Χριστός* has been added to *κύριος Ἰησοῦς*. In ii. 38, v. 42, x. 48 *κύριος* is added to *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*; in vii. 55 and xviii. 5 *κύριος* to *Ἰησοῦς*. These emendations do not affect the Christology of the Acts as a whole; but they show a constant tendency to improve the text by assuming a fixed Christology, which is inclined to suspect any phrase less adequate than *κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*. We may notice here a miscellaneous group of additions, whose manifest purpose is to harmonize the text with the orthodox Christian tradition, or to heighten the miraculous and devotional element.

i. 2. D adds (after *ἐξελέξατο*) *καὶ ἐκέλευσε κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*.
 i. 5. D adds that the Apostles are to receive the Holy Ghost at Pentecost.

ii. 30. D reads *ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ ἀναστῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ καθίσαι*.

ii. 47. D cannot confine the reputation of the Apostles to Jerusalem and substitutes *κόσμος*; further, he finds the primitive community a little lax in its organization and adds *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό*.

iv. 24. D adds *ἐπιγόνυτες τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνέργειαν* (for such a phrase we have no Lucan parallel).

iv. 31. D adds *παντὶ τῷ θέλοντι πιστεῦειν* (perhaps simply an inferential expansion).

iv. 32. D adds a conventional piece of piety *καὶ οὐκ ἦν διάκρισις ἐν αὐτοῖς οὐδεμία*.

v. 5. D adds *παραχρῆμα* before *πεσών*.

v. 38, 39. D adds *μὴ μίαναντες τὰς χεῖρας ἀφετε αὐτούς*, and *οὔτε ὑμεῖς οὔτε βασιλεῖς οὔτε τύραννοι· ἀπέχεσθε οὖν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτων* after *καταλύσαι αὐτούς*, with the obvious intention of intensifying the impression made by the Apostles on Gamaliel.

vi. 8. S. Stephen's miracles were wrought *διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*.

vi. 10. D rewrites the end of this verse thus: *τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ ᾧ ἐλάλει διὰ τὸ ἐλέγχεσθαι αὐτούς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας*. Verse 11 opens *μὴ δυνάμενοι οὖν ἀνοπθάλμειν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ*. Here we have an obvious addition, calculated to enhance the superiority of S. Stephen over his opponents.

viii. 1. D writes *διωγμὸς μέγας καὶ θλίψις*. This is typical of his method. Just as Our Lord is always described as *ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός*, so persecution always becomes persecution and tribulation or *vice versa* (cf. xiii. 50).

viii. 24. D adds of Simon *ὃς πολλὰ κλαίων οὐ διελίμπανεν*. D uses the word *διαλιμπάνω*, S. Luke does not (cf. xvii. 13).

INTRODUCTION

xix

x. 30. D writes *ἀπὸ τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας μέχρι τῆς ἄρτι ὥρας ἤμην νηστεύων τὴν ἐνάτην τε προσευχόμενος*. It seems that D thought it edifying that Cornelius should be fasting as well as praying.

x. 41. D ends this verse *καὶ συνεστράφημεν μετὰ τοῦ... ἐκ νεκρῶν ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα*—an obvious harmony with Acts i. 3.

xi. 2. D here invents a wholly new incident. *ὁ μὲν οὖν Πέτρος διὰ ἱκανοῦ χρόνου ἠθέλησεν πορευθῆναι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. καὶ προσφωνήσας τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ἐπιστηρίξας αὐτοὺς πολλὸν λόγον ποιούμενος διὰ τῶν χωρῶν διδάσκων αὐτούς· ὃς καὶ κατήντησεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἀπήγειλεν αὐτοῖς τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ*. It is only charitable to assume that this incoherent string of participles is in part due to the errors of copyists. In the first instance D was shocked at the abrupt change from the conversion of Cornelius to the unedifying wrangle at Jerusalem. Hence (1) S. Peter is said to have been anxious for some time to go there. (2) A conventional farewell at Caesarea is inserted. (3) We are given a conventional and improbable missionary journey between Caesarea and Jerusalem. (4) S. Peter announces his success at Caesarea with triumph. The whole passage is simply a clumsy compilation of fragments borrowed from viii. 25, xiv. 27, and similar passages. With the actual situation it is quite inconsistent. See c. iv. § ii.

xi. 17 (after *τὸν θεόν*) *τοῦ μὴ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς πνεῦμα ἅγιον πιστεύσασιν ἐπ' αὐτῷ*. But Cornelius had already received the Holy Ghost; D however thinks it proper that a convert should receive the Holy Ghost from an Apostle.

xi. 27. *ἦν δὲ πολλὴ ἀγαλλίασις· συνεστραμμένων δὲ ἡμῶν*. It is inconceivable that a meeting on this occasion should result in rejoicing (c. v. § ii. n. 6). It seems that D knew the tradition of a Lucan connection with Antioch. This tradition apparently originated from Acts xiv. 22, which seems to imply his presence at the Pisidian Antioch; from this arose a tradition, perhaps correct, of his "Antiochene" origin, which was wrongly transferred to the more famous Syrian Antioch. In the latter city S. Luke has no particular interest. Considering its actual importance as the first centre of Gentile Christianity it is remarkable how he ignores it.

xii. 23. D rewrites the ending *καὶ καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος γενόμενος σκωληκόβρωτος ἔτι ζῶν καὶ οὕτως ἐξέψυξεν*. The detail *ἔτι ζῶν* is intended to enhance the divine judgment.

xiii. 8. (After *πίστεως*) *ἐπειδὴ ἥδιστα ἠκουεν αὐτῶν* is added to enhance the devotion of the proconsul.

xiii. 12. *ἐθαύμασεν καὶ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ*, an obvious intensification.

xiii. 33. The quotation is extended to include the reference to the Gentiles.

xiii. 38. D makes two insertions: *καὶ μετάνοια ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε δικαιωθῆναι. ἐν τούτῳ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιούται παρὰ θεῷ*. Obviously he is puzzled by the compression of language; hence for the Pauline doctrine of a righteousness which faith does and the

Law cannot convey he invents a doctrine of repentance from things from which it is impossible to be made righteous by the Law, which is meaningless.

xiii. 41. *καὶ ἐσίγησαν*, to drive home S. Paul's victory.

xiii. 43. *ἐγένετο δὲ καθ' ὅλης τῆς πόλεως διελθεῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ*, a clumsy anticipation of *v.* 49.

xiii. 45. D inserts *ἀντιλέγοντες καὶ* before *βλασφημοῦντες* (cf. above, on viii. 1).

xiv. 4. D adds *κολλώμενοι διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ*.

xiv. 10. D inserts the proper formula *σοὶ λέγω ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*.

xiv. 25. *εὐαγγελιζόμενοι αὐτοὺς* is added. D cannot admit that S. Paul passed through a port without preaching.

xiv. 27. D writes *ὅσα ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν μετὰ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν*, a phrase which is almost incredible from any source but this.

xv. 7. D writes *ἀνέστησεν ἐν πνεύματι Πέτρος*. Cf. also the insertion of *φερόμενοι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι* in *v.* 29, *πληρεῖς πνεύματος ἁγίου* in *v.* 32, and *εἶπεν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῷ* in xx. 3. Whereas S. Luke only introduces allusions to the work of the Holy Ghost for a just reason, D reduces it to a pious convention.

xvi. 4. D writes *διερχόμενοι δὲ τὰς πόλεις ἐκήρυσσον καὶ παρεδίδουσαν αὐτοῖς μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν* (note the typical insertion of the full title) *παραδιδόντες καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς τῶν ἀποστόλων*. Of course they did nothing of the kind on these private visits to the Churches: but D feels bound to introduce his conventional piety.

xvi. 40. D writes *καὶ ἰδόντες τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς διηγῆσαντο ὅσα ἐποίησεν κύριος αὐτοῖς παρακαλέσαντες αὐτοὺς καὶ* (note the typical aggregation of participles). Another piece of conventional piety.

xvii. 13. D writes *καὶ ταράσσοντες τοὺς ὄχλους οὐ διελίμπανον*. The change is trivial, but this recurrence of the non-Lucan word *διαλιμπάνω* is significant.

xvii. 15. After *Ἀθηνῶν* D inserts *παρήλθεν δὲ τὴν Θεσσαλίαν· ἐκωλύθη γὰρ εἰς αὐτοὺς κηρῦξαι τὸν λόγον*. We shall see below how D misses the whole point of the narrative of this journey; it is sufficient here to note the pious invention of a reason for his not preaching in Thessaly.

xviii. 6. D writes *πολλοῦ δὲ λόγου γινομένου καὶ γραφῶν διερμηνευομένων, ἀντιτασσομένων κ.τ.λ.* Again a monstrous aggregation of participles for the sake of a conventional narrative.

xviii. 8. D ends the verse *πιστεύοντες τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*.

xviii. 27. D writes *ὃς ἐπιδημήσας εἰς τὴν Ἀχαίαν πολλὴν συνεβάλλετο ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις*.

xix. 1. Here we have an amazing insertion. *Θέλontos δὲ τοῦ Παύλου κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν βουλήν πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἶπεν αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν*. Apparently D, having inserted at xviii. 21 the statement (probably correct) that S. Paul wished

INTRODUCTION

xxi

to be in Jerusalem for a feast, and failing to see that the Church in v. 22 is that of Jerusalem and not the insignificant body at Caesarea has to explain why he never went to Jerusalem after all. Note the introduction of the Holy Ghost out of piety. Of course the alteration reduces the whole story to nonsense.

xix. 5. D adds (after Ἰησοῦ) Χριστοῦ εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

xix. 8. D writes ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλης ἐπαρρησιάζετο.

xx. 24. D writes διαμαρτύρασθαι Ἰουδαίους καὶ Ἕλλησιν τὸ εὐαγγελίον.

xx. 25. τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

Hitherto we have been dealing with additions intended to heighten the dogmatic or devotional value of the narrative; we may next consider explanatory expansions inserted to clear up obscurities or simply to state explicitly the obvious meaning which it implies but does not state in so many words. These expansions in general are without dogmatic or devotional purpose, though in certain cases, e.g. xix. 1 (see above), the two motives are combined, while in others it is hard to say exactly which category applies. In the following list only the most obvious and important cases are considered.

i. 14. D adds καὶ τέκνοις.

ii. 37. D adds at the end of the verse ὑποδείξατε ἡμῖν.

ii. 45. D adds καθ' ἡμέραν after διεμέριζον αὐτά. He has inserted the detail from the "daily ministrations" of vi. 1, omitting to notice that it makes nonsense here. The daily ministrations were conducted by the Twelve, not by the rich converts.

iii. 3, 4, 5. According to the received text S. Peter fixes his eyes (ἀτενίζω) on the lame man, as does S. Paul in xiv. 9. D considers this suitable for a miracle, consequently he writes that the lame man fixed his gaze (ἀτενίσας τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς αὐτοῦ) on SS. Peter and John and asks for alms. S. Peter fixes his eyes on the lame man (ἀτενίσας, here correct, is changed to ἐμβλέψας) and says ἀτενίσον εἰς ἡμᾶς. D continues ὁ δὲ ἀτενίσας αὐτοὺς καὶ προσδοκῶν τι λαβεῖν παρ' αὐτῶν εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος.

iii. 13. D ends the verse κρίναντος ἐκείνου καὶ ἀπολύειν αὐτὸν θέλοντος· ὑμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον ἐβαρύνετε. Here D misunderstands the sense of κρίναντος and states that Pilate, having judged Our Lord, wished to release Him. Note the substitution of ἐβαρύνετε (non-Lucan) for ἠρνήσασθε to avoid the repetition of the word.

iii. 17. D writes καὶ νῦν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐπιστάμεθα ὅτι ὑμεῖς μὲν κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε τὸ πονηρόν. Here are two regular characteristics of D. (1) Wherever possible he harmonizes the formula of address into ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί. Instances of this are too numerous to need quotation. (2) He is fond of introducing a word to point the moral; so here τὸ πονηρόν, a phrase also inserted in v. 4. Cf. also v. 38 (see above), xii. 3, where after Ἰουδαίους is added ἡ ἐπιχειρήσις αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς πιστοὺς, xiv. 2, διωγμὸν κατὰ τῶν δικαίων, xvi. 39 (see below).

iv. 18. D writes *συγκατατιθεμένων δὲ αὐτῶν τῇ γνώμῃ φωνήσαντες αὐτούς*, to make it clear that the Sanhedrin did come to a decision. The addition is unnecessary and clumsy, since the previous verses are a summary of the discussion, not a single speech. D has tried to harmonize the narrative with v. 39.

iv. 25. In order to minimize the confused genitives D omits *τοῦ πατρὸς*.

v. 10. D reads *συστείλαντες ἐξήνεγκαν καὶ ἔθασαν* to harmonize with v. 6.

v. 15. D explains *ἀπηλλάσσοντο γὰρ ἀπὸ πάσης ἀσθενείας ὡς εἶχεν ἕκαστος αὐτῶν*.

v. 18. *καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕκαστος εἰς τὰ ἴδια*.

v. 21. *ἐγερθέντες τὸ πρῶτ' καὶ συγκαλεσάμενοι... (v. 22) οἱ δὲ παραγερόμενοι καὶ ἀνοξάντες τὴν φυλακὴν... Note the clumsy insertion of participles and the insertion of details which add nothing to our knowledge.*

v. 35. D changes *αὐτούς* into *τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ συνεδρίους*. There is no N.T. parallel for the last word.

vi. 1. D adds at the end *ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ τῶν Ἑβραίων*.

vi. 3. *τί οὖν ἐστίν, ἀδελφοί; ἐπισκέψασθε ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν*.

vii. 4. D adds at the end of the verse *καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν*.

vii. 21. D adds (after *αὐτοῦ*) *παρὰ τὸν ποταμόν*.

vii. 24. D adds *ἐκ τοῦ γένους* after *ἀδικούμενον* and ends the verse *καὶ ἔκρυψεν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἄμμῳ*. Note the obvious insertions to suit the O.T.

vii. 26. Moses says *τί ποιεῖτε, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί; ἵνα τί...*

vii. 37. After *ὡς ἐμὲ* is added *αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε*.

viii. 1. After *ἀποστόλων* is added *οὐ ἔμειναν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ*—a typically unnecessary explanation.

x. 25. A long and quite unnecessary explanation is given here, intended to make the story more interesting. *προσεγγίζοντος δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου εἰς τὴν Καισαρείαν προσδραμῶν εἰς τῶν δούλων διεσάφησεν παραγεγονέναι αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ Κορνήλιος ἐκπηδήσας καί.* This is characteristic of D at his best. No new information of any value is given; the details are probable in themselves, but not worth recording.

xi. 25, 26. *ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι Σαῦλός ἐστιν εἰς Θάρσον ἐξῆλθεν ἀναζητῶν αὐτόν καὶ ὡς συντυχὼν παρεκάλεσεν ἐλθεῖν*.

xii. 10. *κατέβησαν τοὺς ἑπτὰ βαθμοὺς καί.* This is a curious addition. D is hardly bold enough to insert such a detail unless he knew it to be correct. If it be correct, it seems to indicate that he possessed a knowledge of Jerusalem as it was before its destruction by Titus. Many Jewish Christians would be alive before A.D. 100 who possessed this knowledge; very few would survive after A.D. 120. Thus it would seem that D can claim a very high antiquity.

xii. 22. *καταλλαγέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῖς Τυρίοις*.

xiii. 27. The obvious difficulty of this passage leads D to rewrite it. *οἱ γὰρ ... ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν μὴ συνιέντες γραφὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς ... ἀναγινωσκομένας κρίναντες ἐπλήρωσαν καὶ μηδεμίαν αἰτίαν θανάτου εὐρόντες ἐν αὐτῷ κρίναντες αὐτὸν παρέδωκαν Πειλάτῳ ἵνα εἰς ἀναί-*

INTRODUCTION

xxiii

ρειν. ὡς δὲ ἐτέλεσαν ... γεγραμμένα [εἰσιν an error of transmission] ἡτοῦντο τὸν Πειλᾶτον τοῦτον μὲν σταυρῶσαι καὶ ἐπιτυχόντες πάλιν καὶ καθελόντες. All that need be said of this is that it makes confusion worse confounded.

xiii. 44. D writes ἀκοῦσαι Παύλου πολὺν τε λόγον ποιησαμένου περὶ τοῦ κυρίου.

xiv. 2. οἱ δὲ ἀρχισυναγωγοὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐπήγαγον αὐτοῖς διωγμὸν κατὰ τῶν δικαίων καὶ ἐκάκωσαν... ἀδελφῶν ... ὁ δὲ κύριος ἔδωκεν ταχὺ εἰρήνην. It is only charitable to suppose that the double mention of the ἀρχισυναγωγοὶ is a copyist's error. For τῶν δικαίων cf. above on iii. 17 (note that it is only in D that such a phrase is used of the Christians). The last clause is due to D's inability to grasp S. Luke's meaning, which is that the Apostles continue their mission for a considerable time in the face of opposition. D supposes that the original opposition came to an end and then broke out afresh.

xiv. 7. καὶ ἐκινήθη ὄλον τὸ πλῆθος ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ· ὁ δὲ Παῦλος καὶ Βαρνάβας διέτριβον ἐν Αὐστροῖς. The first clause is merely an expansion. The latter is meant to explain the fact that they are still in Lystra although Derbe has been mentioned. For the proper explanation cf. c. vi. § i. n. 32.

xiv. 19. διατριβόντων δὲ αὐτῶν καὶ διδασκόντων, an addition similar to the foregoing.

xv. It is in this chapter that D has found the fullest scope for his imagination. In the opening section, *vv.* 1–5, we have, if the section is properly interpreted, a perfectly plain narrative, except for the lack of a subject to ἔταξαν in *v.* 2. The narrative is, however, a hopeless confusion unless we grasp the fact that the demands of the Pharisees in *v.* 5 are different from those of the judaizers in *v.* 1. D sees the confusion, since he fails to realize the difference between the Pharisees and the ordinary Hebrew converts. Consequently he has resort to drastic measures. In *v.* 1 the demand of the Hebrews is amplified into περιτμηθῆτε καὶ τῷ ἔθει Μωϋσέως περιπατήτε in order to suit *v.* 5. Verse 2 is enlarged to avoid the difficulty of ἔταξαν by the addition of two new clauses, ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος μένειν οὕτως καθὼς ἐπίστευσαν δι᾽ ἰσχυριζόμενος· οἱ δὲ ἐληλυθότες ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ παρήγγειλαν αὐτοῖς τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ καὶ τισιν ἄλλοις ἀναβαίνειν, while at the end is added a new clause, ὅπως κριθῶσιν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς. (We may note in passing that this last addition is sufficient by itself to discredit D; there is no imaginable possibility that S. Paul would have consented to be judged on the matter at Jerusalem.) Having failed to realize the peculiar position of the Pharisees D proceeds to harmonize their demands with those of the Hebrews of *v.* 1 by adding before ἐξανέστησαν in *v.* 5 οἱ δὲ παραγγείλαντες αὐτοῖς ἀναβαίνειν πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ἐξανέστησαν λέγοντές τινες ἀπὸ τῆς αἵρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων πεπιστευκότες. The clumsiness of his interpolation needs no comment; nor is it necessary to point out that we are now committed to the ludicrous view that SS. Paul and Barnabas, having

gone up to Jerusalem to be judged about the admission of the Gentiles to the Church without circumcision, are received at Jerusalem as if the matter had never been raised at Antioch, until the Pharisees, who had caused the trouble in the latter city, raise it afresh.

We may further note in *v.* 12 the insertion *συγκατατιθεμένων δὲ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Πέτρου εἰρημένους*; it would be difficult to decide whether this is merely a pointless attempt to enlarge our information or whether it is intended to enhance the position of S. Peter. The former explanation is the more probable, since in general D shows no particular interest in S. Peter.

The alteration of the decision of the Council needs no further discussion here. At *v.* 34, however, we have one of those interpolations which D is fond of making, which has a disastrous result. He notices the difficulty involved in the fact that at *v.* 40 Silas joins S. Paul, although in *v.* 33 he returns with Judas to Jerusalem, while no mention is made of a journey by S. Paul to Jerusalem to fetch him. So he states *ἔδοξεν δὲ τῷ Σίλῳ ἐπιμεῖναι αὐτοῦ*. It need hardly be pointed out that had his account been true, it would have been easy for S. Luke to say that Judas went alone in the first instance. There was never a more obvious instance of a clumsy interpolation. In point of fact this alteration misses a point of crucial historical importance (cf. c. vi. § iii. n. 4).

xv. 41 shows another explanatory addition at the end, *παραδιδούς τὰς ἐντολὰς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*. In point of fact it seems probable that Syria and Cilicia were easily accessible from Antioch at any time of the year; there was no reason for them to wait until S. Paul was ready for his second journey. Even if the decrees were not delivered until S. Paul's visit, it would be playing into the hands of S. Paul's opponents for S. Luke to mention the matter. But D fails to appreciate the point and inserts this clause in order to harmonize this verse with xvi. 4, where the statement is appropriate, for Derbe and Lystra lying beyond the Taurus were inaccessible in winter.

xvi. 10. Here we have an explanatory addition of the usual type, *διεγερθεὶς οὖν διηγήσατο τὸ ὄραμα ἡμῖν καὶ ἐνόησαμεν ὅτι*.

xvi. 12. S. Luke's local patriotism has led him into a very doubtful statement that Philippi was the first city of its district of Macedonia. D goes one better and calls it the *κεφαλὴ*, leaving S. Luke's words *πόλις κολωνία* at the end with no sort of meaning for the word *πόλις*.

xvi. 30 shows an amusing insertion. The reader cannot fail to be struck by the carelessness of the gaoler in leaving the prison open while he visits the Apostles; so D inserts *τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀσφαλίσάμενος*.

xvi. 35. D rubs in the humiliation of the magistrates with a series of insertions.

35. *ἡμέρας δὲ γενομένης συνήλθον οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν καὶ ἀναμνησθέντες τὸν σεισμόν τὸν γεγονότα ἐφοβήθησαν καὶ ἀπέστειλαν*. This is, of course, mainly "padding" inferred from the Lucan text.

INTRODUCTION

xxv

39. *καὶ παραγερόμενοι μετὰ φίλων πολλῶν εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν παρεκάλεσαν αὐτοὺς ἐξελθεῖν λέγοντες· ἠγνοήσαμεν τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς ὅτι ἐστε ἄνδρες δίκαιοι* (for this cf. above on iii. 17). *καὶ ἐξαγαρόντες παρεκάλεσαν αὐτοὺς εἰπόντες* (note the amazing clumsiness of the repetition). *ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης ἐξέλθατε μὴ ποτε πάλιν συστραφῶσιν ἡμῖν ἐπικράζοντες καθ' ὑμῶν.*

xvii. 12. D adds at the end of the verse the unnecessary remark *τινὲς δὲ ἠπίστησαν.*

xvii. 13. D adds at the end *οὐ διελίμπανον.* This is a favourite word of his, but not of S. Luke's.

xvii. 27. D writes *μάλιστα ζητεῖν τὸ θεῖον*, adapting the rest of the verse to suit the change of genders. *τὸ θεῖον* is, of course, unparalleled in S. Luke.

xvii. 28. D inserts (after *ἐσμεν*) *τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν*, another favourite phrase.

xviii. 4. D alters to *εἰσπορευόμενος δὲ εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον διελέγετο καὶ ἐντιθεῖς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἐπειθεν οὐ μόνον Ἰουδαίους ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἕλληνας.* Here D has actually preserved the sense of the original, since his revision suggests the caution of S. Paul's opening mission.

xviii. 12. D adds *κατεπέστησαν συλλαλήσαντες μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἐπὶ τὸν Παῦλον καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας*—an entirely unnecessary explanation.

xviii. 21. *εἰπὼν δὲ με πάντως τὴν ἑορτὴν τὴν ἐρχομένην ποιῆσαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα· πάλιν δὲ.* Here D is probably correct as to his inference, but it is merely an attempt to harmonize this passage with the last journey. As evidence the value of the insertion is *nil*.

xviii. 27. D thinks a long insertion necessary to explain Apollos' motives for visiting Corinth. *ἐν δὲ τῇ Ἐφέσῳ ἐπιδημοῦντές τινες Κορίνθιοι καὶ ἀκούσαντες αὐτοῦ παρεκάλουν διελθεῖν σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτῶν· συγκατανεύσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ οἱ Ἐφέσιοι ἔγραψαν τοῖς ἐν Κορίνθῳ μαθηταῖς ὅπως ἀποδέξωνται τὸν ἄνδρα.*

xix. 13. D here finds a very obscure and confused text and tries to improve it. His version runs: *ἐν οἷς καὶ υἱοὶ Σκευᾶ τινὸς ἱερέως ἠθέλησαν τὸ αὐτὸ ποιῆσαι· ἔθος εἶχαν τοὺς τοιοῦτους ἐξορκίζειν· καὶ εἰσελθόντες πρὸς τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον ἤρξαντο ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα λέγοντες· παραγγέλλομέν σοι ἐν Ἰησοῦ ὃν Παῦλος κηρύσσει ἐξελθεῖν.* It is obvious here that we have not an original text but a clumsy attempt to improve a hopeless confusion.

xix. 25. Note the characteristic change of *ἄνδρες* into *ἄνδρες συνεχρῆνται.*

xix. 28. After *θυμοῦ* is added *δραμόντες εἰς τὸ ἄμφοδον.* Here the inserted participle is excessively clumsy. *ἄμφοδον* is non-Lucan.

xx. 3. Here the original is compressed though not really obscure, but D thinks an explanation needed. Hence he writes (after Ἰουδαίων) *ἠθέλησεν ἀναχθῆναι εἰς τὴν Συρίαν· εἶπεν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῷ ὑποστρέφειν διὰ Μακεδονίας· μέλλοντος οὖν ἐξίεναι αὐτοῦ μέχρι τῆς Ἀσίας συνεπέτο.* Here we have a good instance of D's lack of intelligence. S. Paul's journey to Jerusalem is ascribed to a plot of the Jews,

whereas it was in fact necessitated by the circumstances. The journey through Macedonia (due in fact to the plot to murder him at sea) is then ascribed to the Spirit (cf. above on xv. 7).

xx. 15. D inserts *καὶ μέιναντες ἐν Τρωγυλίῳ* after *Σάμον*. Possibly this was the natural stopping place; if so, it is of interest to note that D had some local knowledge of coasting voyages in Asia Minor.

xxi. 15. The text of D is defective here, but derivative texts show that it attempted to solve the difficulty of the original. Thus in *v. 15 ἐπισκευασάμενοι* becomes *ἀποταξάμενοι*, which is purely conventional. The following verses run *ἀνεβαίνομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀπὸ Καισαρίας σὺν ἡμῖν δὲ καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν· οὗτοι δὲ ἤγαγον ἡμᾶς παρ' ὧ̄ ξενισθῶμεν. καὶ παραγενόμενοι εἰς τινα κώμην ἐγενόμεθα παρὰ Μνάσωνί τινι Κυπρίῳ ἀρχαίῳ μαθητῇ. κακεῖθεν ἐξιόντες ἦλθομεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα*. Certain writers regard the fact that in this text D knows that it is a two-days' journey from Caesarea to Jerusalem as a proof of local knowledge. It is probably only an inference from the text.

We may now summarize the results of our investigations into these alterations of the text of the Acts. It is certain from the fact that they are quoted by very early patristic writers, notably Irenaeus and Tertullian, in reference to the Council of Jerusalem, that it is a copy of a very ancient and widely current text, but as has been noticed the very fact that it avoids the difficulty of the received text exposes it to the gravest suspicion. Nor can any really plausible reason be given for the production by S. Luke of two texts of the Acts. It is usually supposed that the text of D is the longer original version, and the received text an abbreviation of it drawn up by S. Luke for the benefit of some particular community. To this, which is obviously of a purely *a priori* character, it must be objected that no writer could be expected to be at the labour of revising his work by the laborious method of omitting or abbreviating single sentences scattered up and down the whole book, if he could do it by the simpler method of omitting whole sections; and the narrative of the Acts contains several sections which are entirely otiose and could easily be omitted if greater brevity were desired. Obviously it would be simple to replace the passage xi. 1-17 by a couple of sentences or to omit the accounts of S. Paul's conversion in the narratives of his arrest and trial in the later chapters of the book. By cutting out these entirely otiose repetitions he could gain far more space than by omitting odd sentences.

The final test must be, however, the character of the variations themselves. It will be seen from an examination of the passages quoted above that they are in a large number of instances determined by a desire to enhance the dogmatic or devotional value of the text

Cambridge University Press
 978-1-108-01620-9 - St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem
 Wilfred Lawrence Knox
 Frontmatter
[More information](#)

INTRODUCTION

xxvii

or to suggest a general level of doctrinal orthodoxy. In other cases they are explanations of obscure passages or apparent inconsistencies; and in many of these cases they succeed in obscuring completely the sense of the original narrative. In other cases they are intended to increase our knowledge by the insertion of new details, which as a matter of fact could be inferred from the text by any intelligent reader, or else are based on a desire to make the details of one part of the narrative similar to those of another.

In other words D is a revision of the Acts precisely similar to the revision of S. Mark's Gospel as found in S. Matthew and S. Luke, except for the fact that D had not at his disposal other valuable sources of information, such as that known as Q in the case of the Gospels, and was hampered by his own quite unique stupidity. This view is confirmed by his frequent use of non-Lucan words noted above and by his frequent failure to harmonize the grammar of the original with his interpolations. In the case of the few interpolations supposed to imply local knowledge we have no proof that he possessed anything more than that knowledge of Palestine and the coast of Asia which might be possessed by any Jew of the Dispersion who had travelled from Greece, Asia Minor or Macedonia to Jerusalem; and there must have been many thousands of Jewish Christians who fell within this category during the period A.D. 50-100. It would indeed be a matter of great interest if we could identify him with any degree of certainty as falling in this class, but it is highly doubtful whether the details are precise enough to justify such a view.

The real interest of D lies in the fact that it reveals to us a period in which the Church was sufficiently interested in the books of the New Testament to transcribe them, but at the same time felt perfectly free to alter and expand them. In other words they are regarded as interesting but not as inspired texts. Fortunately the period was a very brief one, and consequently these documents have not been rendered worthless by attempted improvements which obscure the true text. A few more editors of D's calibre would have rendered the Acts utterly worthless as an account of Christian origins. Incidentally it is of interest to note that the whole situation of affairs which S. Luke writes for has vanished at the time when he was edited by D; for it is precisely his somewhat obscure allusions to that situation that D is most fond of improving.