

**ALLEGORY, MIMESIS AND THE TEXT:
THEOLOGICAL MOULDING OF LUKAN PARABLES IN
CODEX BEZAE CANTABRIGIENSIS**

by

ROLI GARCIA DELA CRUZ

**A thesis submitted to
The University of Birmingham
for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**Department of Theology and Religion
School of Historical Studies
The University of Birmingham
December 2004**

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

ABSTRACT

Allegory, Mimesis and the Text: Theological Moulding of Lukan Parables in Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis

The approach of this thesis is a departure from the traditional philological examination of understanding the variant readings in Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis. The parables of Jesus in Luke are the object of investigation. The witness of the Church Fathers in the form of their allegorical exegesis of the text of the New Testament is employed to explain variant readings of the Bezan text. The notion that the harmonising tendency in the accounts of the Gospels is simply due to embarrassment is challenged. The alternative theory argued here is that the harmonisation, particularly of Luke to Matthew, of the text of the Gospels is interpretative in nature. The ancient practice of mimetic cross-referencing or intertextuality has been utilised in the Bezan text of Luke. The practice of mimetic harmonisation as applied in classical literature is the context assumed in this study. Additionally, the representative mimetic view of the way in which the written text interacts with the reality of life is also considered in the light of a harmonistic approach to the interpretation of the Lukan text and the allegorical interpretation of the parables of Jesus. It is argued that allegorising variants and mimetic readings have moulded the Bezan text of Luke. An anti-Judaic tendency and a faith-seeking theological mimetic representation are embedded in the Bezan text. They become recognisable when evaluated in the light of the patristic exegesis of the Lukan parables in Codex Bezae. Thus, the understanding of the variant readings of the Lukan parables in Bezae should be studied in the light of ancient literary criticism and the early history of Christian exegesis of the Gospel parables.

In memory of Tatay Edring

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	ii
Dedication.....	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Abbreviations.....	ix
CHAPTER 1	
BEZAN ENIGMA AND ANCIENT TEXTS.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Configuration of the Ancient Texts.....	3
Value of the Intended Approach.....	10
Definition of the Distinctive Terms.....	15
Nature of the Bezan Puzzle.....	29
Delimitation of the Textual Investigation.....	37
Assumptions of the Working Hypothesis.....	40
CHAPTER 2	
METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES AND ANCIENT EXEGESIS.....	46
Contributions of the Various Approaches.....	46
Search to Develop an Appropriate Coherent Method.....	47
<i>Holmes on Matthew</i>	49
<i>Rice on Luke</i>	53
<i>Wensinck's Linguistic Approach</i>	56
<i>Mees' Literary Methodology</i>	58
<i>Read-Heimerdinger's Discourse Analysis</i>	62
<i>CroweTipton's Reader Response</i>	65
<i>Bartsch's Localised Reading</i>	69
<i>Parker's Manuscript Tradition</i>	74
Challenge to Find an Applicable Reading Model.....	76
Advantages of the Theoretical Framework.....	85
Methodology of the Interpretative Approach.....	92
CHAPTER 3	
GOSPEL HARMONY AND ALLEGORISING READING.....	104
Gospel Harmonisations Fitting to Mimetic and Polemic Purposes.....	104
Diatessaronic Model and Intertextual Reading as Interpretative Tool.....	106
Textual Cross-reference and Interpretative Allegory as Variant Readings.....	110
Mimesis Theory of Literary Imitation as Intertextual Authority Referencing.....	115
Disapproving Plato and Sympathetic Aristotle on Representational Mimesis.....	117
Latin Writers and Mimesis Theory on Classical Rhetoric.....	120
Patristic Assumption and Chain Referencing on Literary Imitation.....	127
Patristic Harmonisation of Gospel Parables as Allusive Mimetic Composition.....	131
Textual Alterations Fitting to Allegorical and Mimetic Readings.....	136
Patristic Understanding of Gospel Parables as Obscure Figurative Language.....	139
Allegorising Reading of Gospel Parables as Symbolic Mimetic Representation.....	144
Variant Readings Fitting to Allegorising and Mimetic Indices.....	149

CHAPTER 4	
ANTI-JUDAIC READING AND LUKAN PARABLES	156
The Wedding Guests, The Cloth Patch and The Old Wineskins (Lk 5.34-39)	160
The Return of Unclean Spirit (Lk 11.24-26)	173
The Great Banquet (Lk 14.16-24)	185
The Pounds (Lk 19.11-27)	191
The Barren Fig Tree (Lk 13.6-9)	204
The Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk 16.19-31)	215
CHAPTER 5	
FAITH-SEEKING UNDERSTANDING AND LUKAN PARABLES	226
Parables Probably Influenced by Allegory and Mimesis	231
The Sower (Lk 8.4-15)	231
The Servant's Reward (Lk 17.7-10)	247
Parables Plausibly Influenced by Allegory and Mimesis	249
The Two Houses (Lk 6.47-49)	250
The Dishonest Steward (Lk 16.1-9)	255
Parables Possibly Influenced by Allegory and Mimesis	257
The Servant in Authority (Lk 12.41-48)	258
The Good Samaritan (Lk 10.30-37)	261
Parables Not Impossibly Influenced by Allegory and Mimesis	268
The Defendant (Lk 12.57-59)	268
The Harvest and the Labourers (Lk 10.2)	276
CHAPTER 6	
CONCLUSION:	
THEOLOGY INFLUENCES EXEGESIS WHICH SHAPES THE TEXT	280
Outcome of the Alternative Study	281
Synthesis of Theological and Hermeneutical Approaches	282
Traditioning of Textual and Oral Materials	284
Description of Transmission and Reception Procedures	286
Reappropriation of Travelling and Living Texts	290
Implications for Further Research	292
Method for Textual Criticism: Definition of Autograph and Original Readings	293
Reconsideration of Q Source: Implication of Harmonised and Eclectic Texts	295
Exegesis of Gospel Parables: Fragmentation of Written and Oral Transmissions	297
Bibliography	300
Texts	300
References	302
Periodicals	302
Books	308
Websites	331
Unpublished	331
Antiquity	332

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere thanks is due to Prof. David Parker, my *Doktorvater*, for supervising this thesis. He has not only enthusiastically supervised me closely but was always a source of encouragement and inspiration in the process of my research and writing. He has also generously shared his personal collection of materials about Codex Bezae to me. I hope to emulate not only the quality of his scholarship but also his good relationship with his students. I have a model to imitate when I go back to the Philippines and teach my own students. I would also like to appreciate those who taught me the languages that became vital tools for the production of this thesis: Dr. David Taylor who taught me Syriac, Dr. Mark Goodacre who taught me Coptic and Dr. Philip Burton with Dr. Jon Balsarak who taught me Latin. I also thank the Revd. Konrad Schäfer for teaching me German. The opportunity to share my ideas during the formative stage of my thesis writing to the community of New Testament scholars became available through the New Testament Textual Criticism Seminar of the 57th Annual Meeting of *Studiosorum Novi Testamenti Societas* at Durham University, 6th – 10th of August 2002. I would like to thank the critical comments and good suggestions from those scholars who attended my presentation. These professional textual critics not only challenged my hypothesis but also provided a clear scope and direction that resulted to the completion of this thesis.

I cannot study in the University of Birmingham without adequate financial support. My main sponsoring institution, Langham Partnership International, London, has covered most of my expenses during the period of study. I cannot thank the Trust enough for the financial help. I also appreciate the funds from World Council of Churches, Geneva, and Bethesda Foundation, U.S.A. My thanks also to my home seminary, Asia Pacific Theological Seminary in Baguio City Philippines, for contributing to my financial needs as a

student. I would also like to express my gratitude to the congregation of Subang Jaya Assembly of God in Malaysia for their consistent financial help for four years.

Three of the New Testament scholars that I met in the period of my Ph.D. studies in Birmingham University were generous enough to share their own materials with me. My sincere appreciation goes to Drs. Roderic Mullen, Jenny Read-Heimerdinger and Andrew Gregory for giving me copies of their recent works that were pertinent to my research on Codex Bezae. Mrs. Leota Morar (my Aunt “Lee”) of Springfield, Missouri, allowed me to use her address in U.S.A. for the delivery of the hard-to-find books that I ordered through the internet. Thank you very much Aunt “Lee” for sending me all these books in U.K. free of charge. Several people also helped me with my written English. Church members of Saint John’s Parish, Harborne, Birmingham, spent time in correcting the use of English in my drafts. I would like to thank Gill McIlwaine, Elizabeth Baker, Ron McCulloch and Maurice Hobbs. My gratitude goes to Canon Paul Berg of Langham as well for standing as my counsellor and pastor during the period of my stay in England. He has been always a source of encouragement and wisdom. My acknowledgments will not be complete without recognising two couples who allowed me to be a very regular visitor in their homes and made my stay in England very pleasant: Allan and Olwen Anderson, and Gordon and Carol Harris.

There are several people associated with my department in the university that listened and gave their thoughts about my research. They were patient to me as I talked to them about Codex Bezae. They also gave their encouragement for me to keep on with my work. There is an inner urged from within me to mention all their names, beside those whom I already acknowledged, because they contributed to the shaping of my thoughts on Codex Bezae. My appreciation is due to Chang Jong Sik, Revd. John Hambidge, Catherine Smith, Prof. Frances Young, Emmanuel Sule, Dr. Michael Guy, Han Kyu Seok, Helen Ingram, Prof. Michael

Goulder, Hugh Houghton, Lynette Mullins, Christian Jones, Dr. Ulrich Schmid, Amy Myshrall, Opoku Onyinah, Jeong Jae Yong, Rachel Kevern, Revd. Philip Seddon, Prof. Neville Birdsall, Cho Young Seok, Bruce Morrill, Dr. Bill Elliott, Chung Kwang Ho, Eric Williams, Prof. R. S. Sugirtharajah, Han Seog Ho, David Trenchard, Goyo Cutimanco, Richard Goode, Isaiah Philip, Kim Jong Fil, Emmanuel Hooper and Samuel Dali.

The production of this thesis cannot be done without the prayers of those people whom I cannot enumerate, especially the students, staff and faculty of Asia Pacific Theological Seminary. My sincere appreciation is due for those who prayed for me during the four years that I stayed in England for my Ph.D. research, especially my mother Mrs. Ligaya dela Cruz. I should not forget my Academic Dean, Dr. Wonsuk Ma, for his encouragement for me to do a Ph.D. This work is dedicated in the memory of my father, Mr. Pedro “Tatay Edring” dela Cruz, who first urged me to continue my formal education and do a Ph.D. It is unfortunate that he did not live long enough to see his son pursuing a doctoral degree. I hope that this thesis that I have written would represent the diligent attitude and persistent character in accomplishing any kind of work on hand that I have witnessed and inherited from him. Most of all lest I overlook, I should say: *solī Deo gloria*.

ABBREVIATIONS

ACCSNT	Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture New Testament
AGLB	Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel
Aland and Aland, <i>Text</i>	Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, <i>The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism</i> , 2 nd ed., trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1989)
<i>Alten Übersetzungen</i>	K. Aland, ed., <i>Die Alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare: der Gegenwärtige Stand ihrer Erforschung und ihre Bedeutung für die Griechische Textgeschichte</i> , ANT 5 (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1972)
ANCL	<i>Ante-Nicene Christian Library: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to AD 325</i> , eds. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
ANT	Arbeiten zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung
APAACS	American Philological Association American Classical Studies
AThR	Anglican Theological Review
ATLA BibS	American Theological Library Association Bibliography Series
AUSS	Andrews University Seminary Studies
BAIFCS	The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting
BBC	<i>Bulletin of the Bezan Club</i>
BCPS	Bristol Classical Paperback Series
BDAG	Walter Bauer, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , 3 rd ed, rev. and ed. F. W. Danker (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000)

BDF	F. Blass, A. Debrunner, <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , trans. and rev. Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961)
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
<i>Bezae vs Sinaiticus</i>	H.-W. Bartsch, ed., <i>Codex Bezae versus Codex Sinaiticus im Lukasevangelium</i> (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1984)
BGBE	Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese
BIW	The Bible in Its World
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
Birdsall, "Origin"	J. Neville Birdsall, "The Geographical and Cultural Origin of the Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis: A Survey of the <i>Status Quaestionis</i> , Mainly from the Palaeographical Standpoint", in <i>Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Heinrich Greeven</i> , ed., Wolfgang Schrage, BZNW 47 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986), 102-14
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i>
<i>BMS</i>	James Philip Hyatt, ed. <i>The Bible in Modern Scholarship: Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December 28-30, 1964</i> (London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1966)
BRS	Biblical Resources Series
BS	The Biblical Seminar
<i>BSac</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Sacra</i>
BSGRT	Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana
<i>BSNTS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas</i>
<i>BT</i>	<i>The Bible Translator</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina
<i>CGSL</i>	Cyril of Alexandria, <i>Commentary on the Gospel of Saint Luke</i> , trans. R. Payne Smith (Long Island: Studion Publishers, Inc., 1983)
Colwell, <i>Studies</i>	Ernest C. Colwell, <i>Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament</i> , NTTS 9 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969)
<i>CJ</i>	<i>Classical Journal</i>
CJAS	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series
<i>CopTh</i>	<i>The Gospel According to Thomas: Coptic Text Established and Translated</i> , eds. and trans. A. Guillaumont, H.-Ch. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till and Yassah ‘Abd Al Masih (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976)
<i>CRBR</i>	<i>Critical Review of Books in Religion</i>
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSCP	Cornell Studies in Classical Philology
<i>DA</i>	<i>Dossiers d’ Archéologie</i>
E. Hatch, <i>Influence</i>	Edwin Hatch, <i>The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church</i> , The Hibbert Lectures 1888, ed. A.M. Fairbairn (London: Williams and Norgate, 1890; repr., <i>The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity</i> , foreword with new notes and bibliography by Frederick C. Grant, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957)
<i>EHGSL</i>	Ambrose, <i>Exposition of the Holy Gospel According to Saint Luke, with Fragments on the Prophecy of Esaias</i> , 2 nd ed., trans. Theodosia Tomkinson (Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 2003)
<i>Éphrem: Commentaire</i>	<i>Saint Éphrem: Commentaire de l’évangile concordant. Texte syriaque (Manuscrit Chester Beatty 709)</i> , ed. Louis

- Leloir, Chester Beatty Monographs 8 (Dublin: Hodges Figgis & Co. Ltd., 1963)
- Epp, *Theological Tendency* Eldon J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*, SNTSMS 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966; repr., Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2001)
- ET English Translation
- ETL *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*
- ETR *Etudes théologiques et religieuses*
- EvQ *Evangelical Quarterly*
- ExpTim *Expository Times*
- FC *The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation*
- FCI Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation
- GBS-OTS Guides to Biblical Scholarship-Old Testament Series
- GCS Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte
- Gospel Traditions* William L. Petersen, ed., *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*, CJAS 3 (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989)
- GRBS *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*
- Hauser and Watson, *History* Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson, eds., *A History of Biblical Interpretation*, Vol. 1, *The Ancient Period* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2003)
- HLFL Origen, *Homilies on Luke, Fragments on Luke*, trans. Joseph T. Lienhard, FC 94 (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1996)
- HTS Harvard Theological Studies
- IBS *Irish Biblical Studies*
- ICC International Critical Commentary
- IGNTP International Greek New Testament Project

<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSSSup	Journal of Semitic Studies Supplement
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
Kilpatrick, <i>Essays</i>	G. D. Kilpatrick, <i>The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays of G. D. Kilpatrick</i> , ed. J. K. Elliott, BETL 96 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990)
Lampe, <i>Patristic Lexicon</i>	G. W. H. Lampe, ed., <i>A Patristic Greek Lexicon</i> (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961)
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LCT	Literature, Culture, Theory
LD	Lectio divina
Lewis and Short, <i>Latin</i>	Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short, <i>A Latin Dictionary</i> (reprint, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975)
LSJ	Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> , 9 th ed., rev. and aug. Henry Stuart Jones with Roderick McKenzie (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966)
<i>Lunel Colloquium</i>	D. C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux, eds., <i>Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium, June 1994</i> , NTTTS 22 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996)
MCS	Monographs in Classical Studies
Metzger, <i>TCGNT</i> 1971 ¹	Bruce M. Metzger, <i>A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament</i> , 1 st ed. (London: United Bible Societies, 1971)
Metzger, <i>TCGNT</i> 1994 ²	Bruce M. Metzger, <i>A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament</i> , 2 nd ed. (London: United Bible Societies, 1994)

NA ²⁶	<i>Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , 26 th ed., eds. Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger and Allen Wikgren (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979)
NA ²⁷	<i>Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece</i> , 27 th ed., eds. Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini and Bruce M. Metzger (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993)
NGS	New Gospel Studies
NHS	Nag Hammadi Studies
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
<i>NPNF</i>	<i>A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church</i> , ed. Philip Schaff
NTL	The New Testament Library
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>NTTRU</i>	<i>New Testament Textual Research Update</i>
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
OBS	Oxford Bible Series
<i>OCP</i>	<i>Orientalia Christiana Periodica</i>
<i>OLD</i>	P. G. W. Glare, ed., <i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i> , 2 Vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968-76)
Parker, <i>Codex Bezae</i>	D. C. Parker, <i>Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and Its Text</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)
<i>PBA</i>	<i>The Proceedings of the British Academy</i>
PETSE	Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile
<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus</i> , Series Graeca, 166 Vols., ed. J.-P. Migne (1857-1886)
<i>PL</i>	<i>Patrologiae cursus completus</i> , Series Latina 221 Vols., ed. J.-P. Migne (1844-1864)

<i>PS</i>	<i>Patrologia Syriaca complectens opera omnia</i> , 3 Vols., ed. R. Graffin (1894-1926)
<i>PRSt</i>	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
<i>RCatT</i>	<i>Revista catalana de teologia</i>
RCSS	Records of Civilization Sources and Studies
Robertson, <i>Grammar</i>	A. T. Robertson, <i>A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research</i> , 3 rd ed. (New York: Hodder & Stoughton/George H. Doran Co., 1919)
Ropes, <i>Text of Acts</i>	James Hardy Ropes, <i>The Text of Acts</i> , ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, Vol. 3, <i>The Beginnings of Christianity</i> , Part I: <i>The Acts of the Apostles</i> (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1926)
<i>RRT</i>	<i>Reviews in Religion and Theology</i>
RSV	Revised Standard Version of <i>The Holy Bible</i>
SAC	Studies in Antiquity and Christianity
SAFPC	Studies in Ancient Folklore and Popular Culture
SBEC	Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity
SBLAB	Society of Biblical Literature Academia Biblica
SBLNTGF	Society of Biblical Literature The New Testament in the Greek Fathers
SC	Sources Chrétiennes
<i>SCAACLE</i>	Cyril of Alexandria. <i>S. Cyrilli Alexandriae archiepiscopi commentarii in Lucae evangelium: quae supersunt syriace e manuscriptis apud Museum Britannicum</i> . Edited by Robert Payne Smith. Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1858.
Scrivener, <i>Bezae</i>	Scrivener Frederick H., ed., <i>Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis, Being an Exact Copy, in Ordinary Type, of the Celebrated Uncial Graeco-Latin Manuscript of the Four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, Written Early in the Sixth Century, and Presented to the University of Cambridge by Theodore Bezae, A. D. 1581</i> (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1864; repr.,

Pittsburg: Pickwick Press, 1978; and Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, n.d.)

SD	Studies and Documents
SECT	Sources of Early Christian Thought
<i>SJT</i>	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
<i>SNTLT</i>	J. K. Elliott, ed., <i>Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of his sixty-fifth Birthday</i> , NovTSup 44 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976)
<i>SNTS</i>	<i>Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SRHEC	Studies in the Religion and History of Early Christianity
<i>STMNTTC</i>	Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee, <i>Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism</i> , SD 45 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993)
Stone, <i>Language</i>	Robert C. Stone, <i>The Language of the Latin Text of Codex Bezae With Index Verborum</i> , Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 30 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1946)
<i>StPatr</i>	<i>Studia Patristica</i>
SupVigChr	Supplements to <i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
SVSPPPS	Saint Vladimir's Seminary Press "Popular Patristics" Series
SWR	Studies in Women and Religion
<i>TC</i>	<i>TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism</i>
TCH	The Transformation of the Classical Heritage
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , eds., Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, 10 Vols.
<i>Textual Criticism</i>	Barbara Aland and Joël Delobel, eds., <i>New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Church History: A Discussion of Methods</i> , CBET 7 (Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1994)

<i>Theol</i>	<i>Theology</i>
<i>ThStKr</i>	<i>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</i>
<i>TNTCR</i>	Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, eds., <i>The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis</i> , SD 46 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1995)
TS	Texts and Studies
<i>TS</i>	<i>Theological Studies</i>
TUGAL	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
<i>TynBul</i>	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
UBS ⁴	Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds., <i>The Greek New Testament</i> , 4 th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft and United Bible Societies, 1994)
UCLACMRS	University of California, Los Angeles Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies
UWSLL	University of Wisconsin Studies in Language and Literature
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vetera Christianorum</i>
<i>VCRECLL</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae: A Review of Early Christian Life and Language</i>
WCB	World Christian Books
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
Yoder, <i>Concordance</i>	James D. Yoder, <i>Concordance to the Distinctive Greek Text of Codex Bezae</i> , NTTS 2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961)
Young, <i>Biblical Exegesis</i>	Frances M. Young, <i>Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997)
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

CHAPTER 1

BEZAN ENIGMA AND ANCIENT TEXTS

Introduction

Modern interest in Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis began when the Council of Trent, in 1546, borrowed it from the monastery of St. Irenaeus at Lyons.¹ Although its precise origin is continuously being debated, without consensus, among scholars, this manuscript is certainly a well-used Greek-Latin bilingual codex.² Codex Bezae³ was used by the Roman Catholic Church to throw light on New Testament textual issues, particularly the Latin side of the codex, during the historic Council of Trent by the Bishop of Clermont in Auvergne, William à Prato (Guillaume du Prat).⁴ When the D text manuscript was sent back to Lyons, it became available to people who critically studied the text of the New Testament.⁵ Hence, for

¹Scrivener, *Bezae*, vi. See E. A. Lowe, “The Codex Bezae and Lyons”, in *Palaeographical Papers 1907-1965*, 2 Vols., ed. Ludwig Bieler (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 1:182-6; repr. from *JTS* 25 (1924): 270-4, for a discussion of the manuscript’s relation with St. Irenaeus monastery in Lyons.

²Birdsall, “Origin”, 102-14. See also Parker, *Codex Bezae*, for the many hands that touched the text of the manuscript in its existence as a codex. The many hands that put their imprints on the manuscript show how it was used well in antiquity.

³Hereafter, the text-critical symbol “D” is used for Codex Bezae when the reference is generically made to the bilingual text, manuscript or codex, as well as the Greek side; and “d” for the Latin part. See my definition of Bezae on 15-6. The sigla used for citing any manuscript in this thesis follow that of NA²⁷.

⁴Ropes, *Text of Acts*, lvif. Cf. the account of Scrivener, *Bezae*, vi, on how the manuscript was used in the Council of Trent.

⁵Before the appearance of D in the Council of Trent in 1546 the only available knowledge about D is that it was restored in Lyons in the ninth-century. Apparently, even at this time the codex was still actively used. See Bernard Guineau, Louis Holtz and Jean Vezin, “Étude comparée des tracés à l’encre bleue du ms. Lyon, B.M. 484 et du fol. 384v du Codex de Bèze”, in *Lunel Colloquium*, 79-92. In this study the notion that the manuscript of D was restored in Lyons during the ninth-century is substantiated. The analysis of the authors was based on the distinguishing blue ink utilised by the restorers who put back the impaired folios of the codex in the ninth-century. The significance of this blue ink is that it is evidence that the codex was in Lyons in the ninth-century. The same blue ink was used also in the headings of ms. Lyon B.M. 484 which is a ninth-century manuscript. See folio 348b on the Greek side (Marc. XVI. 15-20). Cf. Stone, *Language*, 9-10, on his discussion of blue ink in folio 348. See also Roderic L. Mullen, “Le codex de Bèze: Un témoin d’une version antérieure”, in *DA* 279, *Saint Luc Évangéliste et historien*, (Dec 2002-Jan 2003), 35, who points out how the history of Codex D was little known before the ninth-century. Mullen, “Bèze”, 35-7, briefly surveys the popular theories of the manuscript’s origin and how it came to Lyons. Cf. Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 261-86, in his reconstruction of the history of the codex.

example an associate of Robert Stephen was able to consult this codex and passed on to him the readings of this manuscript for his 1550 edition of the New Testament.⁶ The manuscript stayed in Lyons up to the time when the Huguenots took over the town in 1562.⁷ During this period the manuscript was obtained from the Church of St. Irenaeus and it subsequently fell into the hands of the renowned scholar Theodore Beza.⁸ Eventually, Beza sent the codex to England and D has stayed ever since in Cambridge University Library. From a letter of Beza in 1581 it can be concluded that he sent the codex to Cambridge that year.⁹ However, it is most probable that it only reached Cambridge in 1582 when the vice-chancellor and senate of Cambridge University acknowledged receipt of the codex.¹⁰ Consequently, since it was Beza who gave the codex to Cambridge University where until now it has been kept in the university library, it was named after him and became known as Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis. The text of D has been a continuing enigma to students of New Testament text since it was rediscovered and consulted in preparing critical editions of the Greek New Testament.¹¹ Consequently, the textual puzzle posed by D is the methodological problem on how to deal with its “unique readings”.¹² The peculiar variant readings of D against the great

⁶Ropes, *Text of Acts*, lvi-vii. See also Scrivener, *Bezae*, vi-vii.

⁷Scrivener, *Bezae*, vi. See also Stuart R. Pickering, “The New Testament. The Survival and Dating of Codex Bezae”, *NTTRU* 1 (1993): 1-2.

⁸Scrivener, *Bezae*, vi.

⁹See the reprinted letter of Theodore Beza (dated 6 December 1581) that went together with the D manuscript when he donated it to Cambridge University and the response of the Vice-Chancellor and Senate (dated 18 May 1582) in Scrivener, *Bezae*, iv.

¹⁰The precise time of D’s arrival in Cambridge is unidentified. Thomas Kipling, *Codex Theodori Bezae Cantabrigiensis Evangelia et Apostolorum acta complectens quadratis literis Graeco-Latinus* (Cantabrigiae: E prelo Academico impensis Academiae, 1793), xxii, indicates that based on Beza’s correspondence with Walter Travers, Codex D only found its way in Cambridge at about the start of spring time in 1582.

¹¹See Scrivener, *Bezae*, viii-xi, for the list of the first scholars who studied D.

¹²The phrase “unique readings” (also “peculiar”, “distinctive”, “odd”, “unusual”) is used to describe the deviating D text from the accepted Alexandrian superior witness. However, the use is not only limited to singular variant readings. Rather, singular readings are only part of the larger unusual variants that may have

Alexandrian manuscripts that immensely influenced the text of the familiar modern critical editions of the Greek New Testament, have been a matter of interest and investigation among scholars, then and now.¹³

Configuration of the Ancient Texts

The D text of the Gospels, especially the Gospel of Luke, has many distinctive readings¹⁴ that New Testament textual scholars find difficult to explain.¹⁵ So much so that the existence of these peculiar variant readings in the third Gospel requires some explanation in order to determine whether they can be taken as authentic or spurious.¹⁶ In connection with the textual problem of the D text is the commonly held assumption that the second-century fluid text of the Gospels has been glossed, interpreted and harmonised by the bishops, scribes, readers and editors as they made use of their copies of manuscripts to go well with

parallels with other Greek manuscripts or early translations that are different from the recognised “better-quality” manuscripts. For the sorting and analysis of the peculiar variant readings of the D text see James D. Yoder, “The Language of the Greek Variants of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis” (Th.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1958). Yoder’s linguistic approach to D is grammatical in nature.

¹³Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 183-4, is concerned with instituting a “correct” methodology that will seriously consider the bilingual tradition of the D text. He also observes that those who assert that D “approximates to the original” become so absorbed “to discredit other texts”.

¹⁴The evidence of the unique readings of the Greek text of D has been clearly exhibited in Yoder, *Concordance*. This concordance is the “Appendix B: Concordance of Bezan Variants”, 551-611, of Yoder’s doctoral work at Princeton. Yoder’s thesis is summarized in James D. Yoder, “The Language of the Greek Variants of Codex Bezae”, *NovT* 3 (1959): 241-48. For the Latin text of d see Stone, *Language*.

¹⁵Not to mention the well known problematic D text of Acts, one can just be referred to Metzger, *TCGNT* 1971¹ and 1994², to find the textual problems of D in Luke discussed by one of the editors on behalf of the editorial committee of the Greek New Testament.

¹⁶A classic example of this dilemma is the Westcott and Hort’s “Western Non-Interpolations” approach toward the ending of Luke because of the problems posed by D. See Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Introduction and Appendix* (London: Macmillan, 1896), especially 175-7. For the assessment of Westcott and Hort see Klyne Snodgrass, “Western Non-Interpolations”, *JBL* 91 (1972): 369-79. See also George Rice, “Western Non-Interpolations: A Defense of the Apostolate”, in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, ed. Charles H. Talbert (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1984), 1-16. Cf. Aland and Aland, *Text*, 14-5, 32-3, 236; Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 134; Metzger, *TCGNT* 1994², 164-6; and J. K. Elliott, “The Case for Thoroughgoing Eclecticism”, in *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. David Alan Black (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2002), 115-7.

their own purposes.¹⁷ Thus it has been strongly argued that the functional text¹⁸ used by a Christian community within a liturgical context¹⁹ was made to fit into a certain theological perspective of that community where the textual tradition developed.²⁰ The Christian “tradents”²¹ who read, edited and copied the text of the Gospels, interpreted and transmitted their textual tradition since they took the Gospels as their own text,²² and developed and appropriated a textual tradition of the Gospels fitted to their community.²³ These tradents, particularly those in the initial period, were free to make alterations, adjustments and improvements to the liturgical text which they were using and transmitting.²⁴ This generally

¹⁷Cf. Martin Hengel, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels*, trans. J. Bowden (London: SCM Press, 2000), 19-33.

¹⁸Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 221, argues that “the really crucial setting for Christian use of scripture” was actually the use of the text in “the reading and telling, explaining and exhorting, that went on in the Christian assemblies”.

¹⁹For a survey of the liturgical use of the Scripture in worship from the Old Testament times to the second and third Christian centuries see Hughes Oliphant Old, *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church*, Vol. 1, *The Biblical Period* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998). But see especially 251-352 that discusses the way the Scripture was used in the liturgies and sermons produced in the early Church.

²⁰This perspective on the growth of the textual tradition is advanced by B. D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); and D. C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997). In a recent article Eldon J. Epp, “Issues in New Testament Textual Criticism: Moving from the Nineteenth Century to the Twenty-First Century”, in *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. David Alan Black (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2002), 55-61, recognises the positive contribution of Ehrman and Parker for the innovative prospects of the goals of the discipline.

²¹The plural noun “tradents” is the most helpful and closest word for the depiction of the transmitters of the text of the New Testament. “Tradent” is a “Latin term for person or community that transmits the tradition”. F. B. Huey, Jr. and Bruce Corley, *A Student’s Dictionary for Biblical and Theological Studies* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1983), 191. See the discussion of this terminology and my definition below on 23-5.

²²Cf. Charles A. Bobertz, “Prolegomena to a Ritual/Liturgical Reading of the Gospel of Mark”, in *Reading in Christian Communities: Essays on Interpretation in the Early Church*, eds. Charles A. Bobertz and David Brakke, *CJAS* 14 (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002), 174-87, who argues that textual discourse is always specifically located where its reading tradition develops.

²³Hans-Werner Bartsch, “Über den Umgang der frühen Christenheit mit dem Text der Evangelien. Das Beispiel des Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis”, *NTS* 29 (1983): 167-82.

²⁴This inference is contrary to the position held by the earlier textual critics such as Léon Vaganay, *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, trans. B. V. Miller (London: Sands, 1937), 12;

accepted postulation is based on the current development of critical studies and exegetical endeavours applied to the text of the New Testament.²⁵ The assumption of the fluidity of the Gospel text early on, can be taken as legitimate.²⁶ The same parallel pattern as that of the New Testament text, is observable on the Greek and Roman classics in how textual problems were resolved.²⁷

The handling of the writings of Homer in Greek and Virgil in Latin during antiquity is instructive. In the Hellenistic Greek application of the etymological and allegorical techniques for interpreting Homer, for instance, the ancient interpreters dealt with various textual difficulties according to what they thought was “the fitting” interpretation.²⁸ The transmission of Virgil’s text, as another example, was also influenced because “readings that

Frederic Kenyon, *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscript*, 5th ed. rev. and enl. by A. W. Adams, intro. by G. R. Driver (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1958), 23; Luther A. Weigle, ed., *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament* (New York: International Council of Religious Education, 1946), 42; John Knox, *Criticism and Faith* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1953), 56. Cf. the articles in *Gospel Traditions* and *Textual Criticism* for the attitude of contemporary textual critics on the fluidity of the text of the New Testament in the second-century.

²⁵Epp, “Issues”, 61, describes this development as “new possibilities” and “the goals of textual criticism properly expanded as well”. See Epp’s full survey of the recent development of the discipline and the new direction that it is headed on 17-76 of his very informative article.

²⁶It is not only the notion of the fluidity of the text of the Gospels that is at stake here but also the theory on the making and spreading of the books of the Gospels themselves. See Loveday Alexander, “Ancient Book Production and the Circulation of the Gospels”, in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, ed. Richard Bauckham (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 71-105. Alexander, 87, contends that “there was no authorial control over copying” once a book is out for circulation since “there was no author’s copyright in the ancient world” to protect the text written by the author.

²⁷The expectation to correct “mistakes” of manuscripts was also expected among the writings of Homer by his readers, students and editors. The recognised problematic passages and suspected spurious readings were edited out, spellings were corrected and the real Greek Homeric text is restored. See Yun Lee Too, *The Idea of Ancient Literary Criticism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 134-9, for the practice of ancient textual criticism in Homer. See also James E. G. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity*, MCS (Salem: Ayer Company, 1984), 28-54, for the procedure of the ancient Latin textual criticism in Virgil. Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 123-79, confirms what Too, in Homer, and Zetzel, in Virgil, have to say about the correction of manuscript copying “mistakes” in antiquity in his study of the Greek-Latin texts of D/d. Cf. G. D. Kilpatrick, “The Transmission of the New Testament and Its Reliability”, in Kilpatrick, *Essays*, 4-6; repr. from *Proceedings of the 945th Ordinary General Meeting of the Victoria Institute on 15 April, 1957* (Croydon: Victoria Institute, 1957), 92-101; also *BT* 9 (1958): 127-36, in his discussion on how a scribe makes corrections and includes other readings of the text at his hand in the manuscript(s) that he is working with.

²⁸David Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 66-71.

make sense” were “interpolated” in the text.²⁹ Thus whether etymology or allegory was employed in interpreting Greek Homer or Latin Virgil, the classical interpreters endeavoured to bring meaning to the text. Proper reading in their textual appreciation and fitting interpretation was according to what was sensible in their cultural milieu based on their “ancient configurations”.³⁰ Notably, the use of the ancient theory of mimesis or imitation, in appropriating a certain suitable reading both in epic and comedy was also directed by what was culturally and logically acceptable.³¹ In a more general sense it can be supposed that the application of the ancient textual critical decision was dictated by the notion of what was the fitting reading of those who practised the technique.³²

The possibilities for the application of the combination of allegory and mimesis as introduced above were surely available to the Christian Fathers³³ as well as to the early

²⁹Zetzel, *Latin*, 246-8.

³⁰See Jon Whitman, *Allegory: The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 14-57.

³¹Dawson, *Allegorical*, 29-31, 34-5, 61-4, maintains that poetry and narrative imitate how life was perceived in the ancient world in usage of language and etymological understanding. There is that inherent correlation relating “words and the world”. He essentially describes the common notion of mimesis in antiquity that the texts of the community reflected in a way their society was understood. It should be noted as well that the idea of mimesis progressed as a literary principle in the practice of “allusion”, i.e. “borrowing” of material of an older text by a new one. Thus mimesis or imitatio may be generally understood in terms of “intertextuality”. See my discussion below. For a handy description of the development of the tradition of mimesis or imitatio in antiquity see D. M. Hooley, *The Knotted Thong: Structures of Mimesis in Persius* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997), 242-67.

³²See for example Zetzel, *Latin*, 1-2, who points out at the outset that: “It was in antiquity that Latin texts were copied by people who read them as living literature, not as schoolbooks, people who read Latin not as an acquired language but as their native tongue, people who, if for those reasons alone, were far more capable of correcting them than any editor since”. The view of Zetzel is parallel to that of Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 175, 178, in terms of the correction of the text:

At first sight, the total of fourteen hundred corrections to the Greek seems to indicate extensive changes to the text of Codex Bezae. But in fact over 320 of these are orthographic, whilst 380 are simply the removal of nonsense, and others are slight...It must not be forgotten the correctors whom we have been studying will, consciously or unconsciously, have taken readings of D away to their examination of other manuscripts. The fact that it was repeatedly corrected indicates that the tradition was a living one in the East for several centuries.

³³For the use of allegory and mimesis among the Fathers see Frances M. Young, *The Art of Performance: Towards a Theology of Holy Scripture* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, Ltd. 1990), especially 45-159; and Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, especially 119-264.

tradents³⁴ who transmitted the text of the New Testament.³⁵ A good example how the combination of allegory and mimesis was used by a certain Church Father was in the context of catechetical preaching. Cyril of Jerusalem's "mystagogical lectures"³⁶ as they "function in worship" are well illustrated by his use of mimesis and allegory in his interpretation³⁷ of Rom 6 as a reference to baptism,³⁸ of 1 Jn 2.20-28 for explaining the sacrament of chrismation,³⁹ and of 1 Cor 11 in citation for the Eucharist.⁴⁰ Cyril of Jerusalem appropriated the text of the New Testament liturgically in his message during worship time, to teach his congregation about the sacraments of baptism, chrismation and Eucharist.⁴¹ The way these New Testament texts on sacraments were read liturgically and then expounded appropriately by those who gave sermons, even before and after Cyril of Jerusalem influenced their textual tradition.⁴² This is due to the fresh understanding and the handing over of the meaning of the text from

³⁴The Fathers were early tradents themselves. They were the primary witnesses to the growth of the text of the Gospels and the development of the Christian doctrinal tradition. Moreover, the Fathers were the guardians of the transmission of the New Testament text. See my definition of tradents below on 23-5. See also the first paragraph of this current volume in the section called "Value of the Intended Approach" below on 10-1.

³⁵For a quick survey on the influence of the conventional literary practice in antiquity that influenced Christianity see George A. Kennedy, "Christianity and Criticism", in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, eds. Peter Brooks et al., Vol. 1, *Classical Criticism*, ed. George A. Kennedy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 330-46.

³⁶For reference see Cyril of Jerusalem, *FC* 64:143-203.

³⁷See the informative discussion of Hughes Oliphant Old, *The Reading and Preaching of Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church*, Vol. 2, *The Patristic Age* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998), 18-32.

³⁸Cyril of Jerusalem, *FC* 64:161-7.

³⁹Cyril of Jerusalem, *FC* 64:168-80.

⁴⁰Cyril of Jerusalem, *FC* 64:181-90.

⁴¹See the *Mystagogical Lectures* 5.19-23 of Cyril of Jerusalem, *FC* 64:202-3.

⁴²The assertion of Kenneth W. Clark, "Textual Criticism and Doctrine," in *Studia Paulina in Honorem Johannis de Zwaan Septuagenarii*, ed. J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik (Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N. V., 1953), 54-5, is noteworthy: "The New Testament was originally composed as an interpretive document. Throughout its history it has continued its role as interpreter of doctrine. The freedom men assumed in altering its text was inspired by their understanding of Christian doctrine, and by their purpose to make it plain to others".

clergy to congregation.⁴³ Cyril of Jerusalem appropriated the allegorical and mimetic approaches to Rom 6, 1 Jn 2.20-28 and 1 Cor 11 in the language of mystery religions' ritual practices.⁴⁴ This kind of reading and preaching, represented by Cyril of Jerusalem, using the text of the New Testament in one way or another would produce marginal readings⁴⁵ on the manuscripts used by the readers and the preachers for their own purposes⁴⁶ when they utilised the text of their manuscripts.⁴⁷ Consequently a reading caused by mimesis⁴⁸ and

⁴³For a convenient discussion of the Fathers' attitude on the meaning of the scriptural text see Harry Austryn Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*, Vol. 1, *Faith, Trinity, Incarnation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), 73-101.

⁴⁴Old, *Patristic*, 2:18-32. Cyril of Jerusalem applied allegory and mimesis in a symbolic manner to the ceremonial rites in the performance of the sacraments in his reading of the New Testament texts on baptism, chrismation and eucharist. On the "re-enactment" or "impersonation" of mythical dramas due to the concept of mimesis see Gregory Nagy, "Early Greek Views of Poets and Poetry", in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, eds. Peter Brooks et al., Vol. 1, *Classical Criticism*, ed. George A. Kennedy (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 47-51.

⁴⁵A good example of this kind of manuscript is Codex Zacynthius (Ξ). It is the oldest extant palimpsest manuscript with a marginal catena alongside the surviving text of Lk 1-11. D. C. Parker and J. N. Birdsall, "The Date of Codex Zacynthius (Ξ): A New Proposal", *JTS* 55 (2004): 117-31, claim that the date of Ξ is about 700. See the series of publication on Ξ by J. Harold Greenlee, "A Corrected Collation of Codex Zacynthius (Cod. Ξ)", *JBL* 76 (1957): 237-41; "Some Examples of Scholarly 'Agreement in Error'", *JBL* 77 (1958): 363-4; "The Catena of Codex Zacynthius", *Bib* 40 (1959): 992-1001; and *Nine Uncial Palimpsests of the Greek New Testament*, SD 39 (Salt Lake: University of Utah Press, 1968), 5-6.

⁴⁶This is well illustrated by Eric G. Turner, *The Typology of the Codex* ([Philadelphia:] University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977), 84, where he points to the fact that there is an evidence that in a big layout of a codex a large space is provided "alongside the sacred text [that] the annotation that the reader will need". E. G. Turner, *Typology*, 84, gives a specific example: "Space for such annotation has been deliberately provided in the papyrus codex of Callimachus, P. Oxy. xx 2258 (28), page size 37B x 28H. This large page contained only twenty-three verses, occupying an area 20 B X 16H, and leaving side-margins each 8-10 cm. broad". Hence, E. G. Turner, *Typology*, 84, argues that: "If they were not designed for it [i.e. annotation], they certainly invite the generous commentary provided by the original scribe. We seem here to find a clear connection between format and the intention to include scholia".

⁴⁷To quote K. W. Clark, "Textual", 54:

Christian doctrines are imbedded in the New Testament text. They were not created by the authors, but they were interpreted by them. Personal experience and oral tradition have had much to do with formulating and conserving the doctrines of the church, but the written word is an essential interpretation of these doctrines... Certainly the doctrines of the church have not always been the same. They are not the same in different branches of the church today. But in all cases these doctrines inhere in the Scriptures, and the text is used by all to defend them. The language of the inspired Word is important to the interpretation of doctrine, and the two show interaction with one another.

⁴⁸Mimesis or imitatio is adaptable and yet intricate in its application. See Ellen Finkelpearl, "Pagan Traditions of Intertextuality in the Roman World," in *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*,

allegory⁴⁹ could come into the text because the tradents would see them as the fitting reading of the text.⁵⁰ The variant readings due to the process of glossing and assimilation into the text⁵¹ would be part of the growth of the tradition of the text by the community that used it.⁵²

ed. Dennis R. MacDonald, SAC (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001), 78-90, for an illustrative reflection on the “flexibility” and “complexity” of ancient mimesis.

⁴⁹Allegory is both rhetorical and exegetical in its employment. See the discussion of Wolfson, *Philosophy*, 24-72, on how allegory evolved from the context of rhetorics to a method of exegesis.

⁵⁰Amy M. Donaldson, “Were the Alexandrians Doing Textual Criticism on the New Testament in the Second Century?: An Examination of the Interplay of Textual Criticism and Exegesis in the Works of Origen in Response to Günther Zuntz”, unpublished paper read at The Third Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, The University of Birmingham, 7-10 April 2003, provides a good example in Origen of the way a tradent may use a fitting reading of text. She convincingly argues that the renowned Church Father did not search for the “original text” of the New Testament, “but the best version of the living text according to the standards of his day”. In conclusion, Donaldson, “Alexandrians”, 21, asserts:

While this does not mean that other scholars of his day were not more interested in this task than Origen himself, it remains true that Origen is our most vocal witness to the textual work of his day, and as a head of the catechetical school and an influential teacher at both Alexandria and Caesarea, it can be assumed that Origen would be a witness to the majority of scholars rather than a vocal minority.

⁵¹Cf. W. A. Strange, *The Problem of the Text of Acts*, SNTSMS 71 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 107-66, on his treatment of the “marginal annotation” and its penetration to the D text in Acts.

⁵²This process of the prevalence of glosses and assimilation was a common textual phenomenon in antiquity. It is instructive to note that even the reason for the occurrence of textual glosses received a serious treatment in the commentaries on Homer. See the discussion of Rudolf Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 237-9. It is also worth quoting in full the conclusion of Zetzel, *Latin*, 238, as he describes how glosses are assimilated into Virgil:

Given the nature of book circulation at Rome, as outlined above, it is also possible to see how such readings entered the transmitted texts. Our manuscripts are those of amateur and wealthy book-lovers; and like modern readers, they wrote comments in the margins, made corrections of errors where they noticed them, and generally created a book that was of service to themselves. If an Asterius read a commentary, or found another copy of Virgil, it is only reasonable to expect him to show signs of such readings in his own copy. Since a commentary or another copy might not say what sort of variant reading was given, and since an amateur might not abide by the rules of a professional critic, it was up to the reader or corrector to do as he chose. He might substitute one reading for another, or he might leave it in the margin. But even if he cautiously left it in the margin with an indication of its source, that did not mean that someone making a copy of his text, or using it to correct his own, would be so scrupulous. Some of these men, as far as we can tell, showed exemplary tact and caution, but not all need have done so, and it is pure wishful thinking to believe that our manuscripts descend only from those in which a scrupulous or cautious reader had made corrections. In general, there is no escaping the disturbing fact that, in antiquity, the preservation and the quality of a text were the result of the interests of its successive owners or readers, not of a scholarly editor. Whether or not we have a careful or a sloppy text, an interpolated version or an accurate representation of the author’s original work, depends entirely on the individuals whose copies have survived.

The preceding descriptions on the textual dynamics of Homer and Virgil are enlightening in the plausibility of the assimilation of glosses on the D text of Luke. The mimetic and allegorical reading of the user of the D text previously glossed on the leaves of the manuscript for the purposes of liturgy, catechesis or preaching has been assimilated within the textual tradition. The plausibility of this theory becomes a possibility when the dynamics

Value of the Intended Approach

One of the best materials among the New Testament manuscripts for the study of intentional textual modifications, due to what is fitting to the eyes of the tradents, is the D text because of its supposedly “theological tendency”.⁵³ This problematic diglot manuscript with Greek and Latin texts exhibits unique readings that may be explained by the use of the ancient conventional criticism of the early tradents who transmitted its bilingual text.⁵⁴ The value of the patristic literature as a comparative resource becomes most pertinent to make this claim plausible. Those who witnessed the development of the text of the New Testament, and left us some sort of documentation of what they witnessed, i.e. the text or texts that they used, were the Fathers of the Church.⁵⁵ The Fathers who were witnesses to the process of

of textual transmission is put in the context of the early Christian communities producing copies of the Gospel texts as guides to the received traditions of the Church and not as authoritative text, at least in the first couple of centuries of Christian history. Cf. Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 128-9, who maintains that Clement of Rome would have known the Synoptic Gospels not as “Holy Scripture” rather the available written text before him was practically just an “aid to memory”. Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 134, applies his view of Clement of Rome’s way of thinking toward written Gospel text as a representative of Christian attitude in the early history of the Church: “From 70 to around 130 the written Gospels tended to be there for the community rather as constant ‘aids to memory’ and not yet as ‘Holy Scripture’ in the strict sense, even if they were read aloud in worship”.

⁵³Among others the most recognised work on the theological tendency of D is that of Epp, *Theological Tendency*. Epp’s lead on the anti-Judaic bias was followed by his student George Edward Rice, “The Alteration of Luke’s Tradition by the Textual Variants in Codex Bezae” (Ph.D. diss., Case Western Reserve University, 1974). Rice also published a series of articles based on his dissertation. George E. Rice, “Luke 3:22-38 in Codex Bezae: The Messianic King”, *AUSS* 17 (1979): 203-8; “The Anti-Judaic Bias of the Western Text in the Gospel of Luke”, *AUSS* 18 (1980): 51-7; “Some Further Examples of Anti-Judaic Bias in the Western Text of the Gospel of Luke”, *AUSS* 18 (1980): 149-56; “The Role of the Populace in the Passion Narrative of Luke in Codex Bezae”, *AUSS* 19 (1981): 147-53; “Is Bezae a Homogeneous Codex?”, in *Perspectives on the New Testament: Essays in Honor of Frank Stagg*, ed. Charles H. Talbert (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985), 39-54; repr. from *PRSt* 11 (1984): 39-54. The doctoral dissertations of Epp and Rice are of special interest to the study of “theological tendency” in D because they are major studies that examined variant readings in D with minute details. The anti-Judaic tendency theory of Epp and Rice in the D text of Acts and Luke, respectively, lead M. W. Holmes to investigate the D text of Matthew in his doctoral dissertation concluding that there was an “early editorial activity” in the D text of Matthew. See the survey of theological tendency approach to D in Michael William Holmes, “Early Editorial Activity and the Text of Codex Bezae in Matthew” (Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1984), 14-23.

⁵⁴Cf. L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974), 1-37.

⁵⁵For a couple of examples of reconstructing the text of a particular Father see Roderic L. Mullen, *The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem*, SBLNTGF 7 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997); and Bart D. Ehrman, Gordon D. Fee and Michael W. Holmes, *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen*, SBLNTGF 3 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

interpreting and transmitting the text of the New Testament lived in the same literary environment where the D textual tradition was transmitted.⁵⁶ The theory that the New Testament text has been influenced by mimesis and allegory, since they were the literary conventions known to the tradents, should be put to test. Using this hypothesis is a valuable approach in studying the D text in the light of its literary environment⁵⁷ as well as the textual witness of the Fathers.⁵⁸ The relevant parables of Jesus in Luke's Gospel that exhibit peculiar readings in D (against the commonly accepted readings of the parables, i.e. the Alexandrian readings) are appropriate sample texts that can be used to probe the theory.⁵⁹ Using the Gospel parables with unusual readings in D is not only suitable but practical as well. The parables of Jesus were undisputedly recognised as allegorically interpreted by the Fathers.

The D text of the germane Lukan parables when collated with Papyrus Bodmer XIV (P⁷⁵)⁶⁰ and Codex Vaticanus (B),⁶¹ which are third and fourth century manuscripts

⁵⁶Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 190, also insists that “the only possible way to establish theological tendency is by comparison with the Fathers’ understanding of the text: given *their* interpretations of Luke and Acts, the critic would then have to ask whether the Bezan reading can credibly be regarded as representative of one or more of them”. (The italics are original.)

⁵⁷Examining the D text within its own literary setting has been explored by Michael Mees, “Lukas 1-9 in der Textgestalt des *Codex Bezae*. Literarische Formen in Dienste der Schrift”, *VC* 5 (1968): 89-110, in Luke and his work is commended by Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 190. Mees, nevertheless, has not considered the possibility of the influence of mimesis and allegory in the textual tradition of the D text. See my review of Mees in Chapter 2, 58-62.

⁵⁸For the use of the patristic evidence in the study of New Testament Textual Criticism see the fine articles of Gordon D. Fee, “The Use of Greek Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism: The State of the Question”, in *STMNTTC*, 344-59; repr. from *ANRW* (1992), II/26/1.246-65; and “The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism”, in *TNTCR*, 191-207; cf. Bart D. Ehrman, “The Use and Significance of Patristic Evidence for NT Textual Criticism”, in *Textual Criticism*, 118-35. See also J. Lionel North, “The Use of the Latin Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism”, in *TNTCR*, 208-23; and Sebastian P. Brock, “The Use of the Syriac Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism”, *TNTCR*, 224-36.

⁵⁹The results of the scholarly investigations that D is a free text are taken for granted. The distinctive readings of D in the Lukan parables will be investigated with the assumption that they are from loose transcriptions and transmissions, albeit not carelessly done even with a clear control. See Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 257-8.

⁶⁰Henceforth P⁷⁵ is the symbol employed when referring to Papyrus Bodmer XIV.

⁶¹Henceforward B is the sign used in citing Codex Vaticanus.

respectively, will be used to identify the unique readings of D against the Alexandrian readings. The result of the collation study of D against P⁷⁵ and B will be compared with the patristic readings, in particular, and attention will be given to allegorical interpretations of the chosen parables.⁶² The value of this intended approach is that parallels and cohesive concepts between them will throw light on the various possibilities and motives for the occurrences of such distinctive readings in D.⁶³ The influence of allegorical readings in the Gospel parables will be considered in terms of the process of transmission and transcription of the D text of Luke.⁶⁴ Thus, coherence between the distinctive parable readings of D and their patristic citations and interpretations will be explored within conditions of the interplay between them. This interplay will be utilised to give light on what had caused the unusual readings.⁶⁵ The connection between the D readings of the parables and patristic writings will

⁶²An explanation that an intentional change on a Gospel parable text that is due to allegonising is cited by J. W. Stewart in his work on the New Testament text of Clement of Alexandria. Stewart points out that Clement's addition of the phrase τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν in his quotation of Mt 11.16-17 or Lk 7.32 was due to his argument that "the Scriptures mean 'Christians' when they speak of 'children'". Clement's interpretation of the parable of The Children in the Marketplace was allegorical and it brought a stamp of allegorical reading of the text of the parable. See John William Stewart, "Doctrinal Influence Upon the New Testament Text of Clement of Alexandria" (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1966), 155-7.

⁶³Cf. Bart D. Ehrman, "The Text of the Gospels at the End of the Second Century," in *Lunel Colloquium*, 95-122, who cites examples of intentional alterations on D due to motives related to christology, anti-semitism, women oppression, church apology and ascetic practice. Although Ehrman does not give any allegorical examples, his argument brings "possibilities" for an allegorical interpretive reason as an explanation for some unique readings in the Lukan parables in D. Ehrman, "Text", 122, concludes:

I have tried, however, to suggest one of the ways Codex Bezae and other manuscripts from roughly the same period might be studied, viz., to understand better the symbiotic relationship that existed between the surviving texts of early Christianity and social worlds within which they were transmitted. My overarching thesis has been that scribes who knew of, or were personally involved with, the social conflicts of their day brought their concerns to bear on their transcriptions of the authoritative texts that were so central to many of the debates and controversies.

⁶⁴Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 284, maintains that the commonly labelled "Western" witnesses concur not in their readings of the text but apparently in the way they were copied only. Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 284, states: "Thus the apparent confederacy of what was once described as the 'Western text' is a similarity not in detail, but in character. We have not a text, but a genre. That is why the representatives of this free genre are distinct from all other types, but puzzlingly unlike each other".

⁶⁵Identifying layers of variants in the D text of Matthew like Michael W. Holmes, "Codex Bezae as a Recension of the Gospels", in *Lunel Colloquium*, 123-60, is not the goal here. It is assumed that the present text of D in Luke has already developed as a bilingual tradition. The patristic citations, interpretations in particular,

be examined within the literary and the bibliographical context of antiquity to explain the reason for the existence of the odd readings of the D text of Luke, in the way it was received as a legitimate text by the early Church.⁶⁶ Furthermore, the value of this approach is complemented by putting the development of the distinctive textual tradition of the D text in a liturgical context,⁶⁷ both in the homiletical and the catechetical practices of the early Christian communities that would explain why mimesis could be plausibly assumed as operating.⁶⁸

Since the second-century Church thrived in Gentile soil, early Gentile Christian thought, represented by the patristic literature, appropriated the Christian tradition to the Graeco-Roman classical tradition.⁶⁹ The Greek concept of mimesis, that arts and poetry imitate life, progressed in application to literary composition.⁷⁰ In particular, mimesis or (in Latin) “imitatio”, thrived in Latin literary criticism.⁷¹ The application of the mimetic literary aesthetics in the D text, specifically in the intertextual practice that is observable in the

of the Gospel parables that cohere with the reading of the D text of Luke will be considered as readings that had been accepted and copied by the tradents of D’s textual tradition.

⁶⁶For the way Luke was received by the Church in the second-century see the fine monograph of Andrew Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus*, WUNT 2. Reihe 169 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

⁶⁷The possibility that the bilingual tradition of the D text developed in a liturgical setting is very strong. Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 281 maintains that D was produced for Church use. It is not inconceivable to assume that the bilingual tradition of D developed in a liturgical setting.

⁶⁸For example in Didache, Justin, Tertullian and Hippolytus what has been preached in the homily and what has been taught in the catechesis should reflect the life of the believer. See Old, *Biblical*, 1:255-77.

⁶⁹For this point of view in understanding the influence of the classical tradition among the early Christian Fathers see Henry Chadwick, *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition: Studies in Justin, Clement and Origen* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966). See also Wolfson, *Philosophy*, 102-40.

⁷⁰Thomas Louis Brodie, “Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke’s Use of Sources”, in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*, ed. Charles H. Talbert (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1984), 17-32.

⁷¹See the way mimesis or imitatio has been employed by Latin writers from poetry to historiography in David West and Tony Woodman, eds. *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

Synoptic Gospels,⁷² would be crucial in the study, if explored in relationship with the allegorising textual readings in the Lukan parables in D.⁷³ The combination of allegory and mimesis was an approach⁷⁴ taken for granted in the production of Graeco-Roman literary texts.⁷⁵ In addition the role of mimesis in poetry and arts as it relates to life was debated right from the time of Plato and Aristotle.⁷⁶ The study of the applicable Gospel parables in the D text of Luke will be explored in the light of the patristic contemporary notion of mimesis and

⁷²The intertextual practice in D is not only due to plain harmonisation as demonstrated by Heinrich Joseph Vogels, *Harmonistik im Evangelientext des Codex Cantabrigiensis: Ein Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Textkritik* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1910). It should be concluded with Vogels that the Synoptic Gospels were subject to harmonisation and may have been harmonised, but we are not sure why and how they harmonised. There should be a sort of interpretative motive and literary practice that brought about the borrowing of texts that we understand now with Vogels as harmonisation of the D text of the Synoptic Gospels. But see also Tjitze Baarda, "ΔΙΑΦΩΝΙΑ—ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙΑ: Factors in the Harmonization of the Gospels, Especially in the Diatessaron of Tatian", in Tjitze Baarda, *Essays on the Diatessaron* (Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1994), 29-47; repr. from *Gospel Traditions*, 133-54, who argues for the harmonisation attempt of the Gospels as apologetic in principle. Cf. Helmut Koester, "The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century", in *Gospel Traditions*, 19-37. See my discussion of the possible interpretative model to understand the harmonisation in the Gospels in Chapter 3.

⁷³Cf. the discussion of Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 24-33, on "Harmonization, uncontrolled diversity of texts or radical reduction" citing the examples of Tatian and Marcion on the assumption of the Gospels' textual fluidity in the second-century.

⁷⁴For an insightful discussion of "symbolic or allegorical mimesis" as an explanation for Crates of Mallos' statement that "the shield of Agamemnon in *Iliad* 11 a 'mimema of the cosmos'" see Stephen Halliwell, *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 273-7. In the same discussion Halliwell also addressed the Stoics' application of "symbolic or allegorical mimesis".

⁷⁵The use of mimesis and allegory in classical literary criticism have been described by Kennedy, "Christianity", 344, in Macrobius' *Saturnalia*:

The sixth book of the *Saturnalia* examines Virgil's debt to earlier Roman writers; their words often sound better in his new contexts (6.1.2-6). The critical assumptions of the *Saturnalia* are that art is imitation of nature, that poets work within literary traditions, seeking originality by recasting and improving upon the art of their predecessors, that great poets are characterised by genius, acute power of observation, and learning; and that the function of literature is to provide instruction with the greatest pleasure. The philosophy seen in the *Saturnalia* is a popularised synthesis of Stoicism and neo-Platonism. Allegorical interpretation is a common tool.

Kennedy's point should not be missed. He is able to capture in brief how Macrobius as a case in point exhibits the way mimesis operates and that how allegorical interpretation helps to flesh out the ingenuity of the literature to give life lessons with the utmost delight to the audience. See Macrobius, *The Saturnalia*, trans. Percival Vaughan Davies, RCSS 79 (New York: Columbia University Press), 385-439.

⁷⁶See the nature of the debate of Plato and Aristotle on mimesis in Gerald F. Else, *Plato and Aristotle on Poetry*, ed. Peter Burian (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986); and Halliwell, *Aesthetics*, 37-259.

the practice of allegory in antiquity.⁷⁷ Hence the basic question examined in this work is whether the unique readings in the pertinent Lukan parables in D were deliberate alterations by the tradents of the text that are traceably influenced, directly or indirectly, by mimetic viewpoint and allegorical tradition contemporary to the patristic writings.⁷⁸ A corollary to this question of the influence of mimesis and allegory in the transmission of the textual tradition within the liturgical use of the text is the effect of the influence in the process of transmitting the theological tendency in the tradition of the D text of Luke.⁷⁹

Definition of the Distinctive Terms

Bezae. A further designation of the label “Bezae” besides what has been mentioned already is necessary to clarify its functional use in this thesis. The idea behind the term

⁷⁷Although the tendencies of the D text clearly existed in the second-century, its form of text could not have existed at that time. Thus, the D textual affinities and its patristic coherence could be safely dated beginning in the third-century. Aland and Aland, *Text*, 54-5 argue:

In the early period there was no textual tradition in the West that was not shared with the East: there was only a text with individual characteristics which varied from manuscript to manuscript, for in the second century the New Testament text was not yet firmly established. As late as 150, when the first traces of Gospel quotations are found in the writings of Justin Martyr, the manner of quotation is quite free. Earlier examples are even more allusive or paraphrastic. It is not until 180 (in Irenaeus) that signs of an established text appear. While it is possible that this “Early text” may have had certain characteristics in the West (as a local text), it is impossible to identify any occasion or person associated with its development in the way that B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort and their modern followers suggest. It is quite inconceivable that the text of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis could have existed as early as the second century. It is also significant, as we have mentioned, that hardly anyone today refers to this putative Western text without placing the term in quotation marks, i.e., as the “Western text.”

⁷⁸The conclusion of Arthur J. Bellinzoni, “The Gospel of Luke in the Second Century CE”, in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts*, eds. Richard E. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998), 75, is noteworthy in understanding the way Luke has been received in the second-century:

The second century Christian writings that reflect knowledge and use of Luke freely adapted the gospel and made significant alterations and modifications, sometimes harmonizing Luke with Matthew or otherwise radically modifying the text of the gospel. There is nothing in the literature before Irenaeus to suggest that church fathers in the second century felt obliged to preserve the Gospel of Luke in its original form.

⁷⁹J. K. Elliott, “Codex Bezae and the Earliest Greek Papyri”, in *Lunel Colloquium*, 181-2, confirms the works of Kurt Aland and Neville Birdsall that the D textual affinities are not yet available in the second-century, and instead it began in the third. Elliott’s conclusion opens the possibility that until the third-century or even fourth the bilingual tradition of D was still developing. Thus the process of D’s textual transmission as its bilingual tradition developed is longer than the early Alexandrian papyri.

Bezae is broad in its textual application.⁸⁰ When the symbol D is cited it refers to the text⁸¹ with all of its peculiarities as it currently exists.⁸² On the one hand, it should be recognised that the D text as it appears now represents a much older text than the date when it was copied. On the other hand, the text as it is on the codex has already developed its own bilingual tradition. Hence, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to pinpoint when the alterations to the text were made in the process of its transmission.⁸³ Therefore, any kind of investigation of the text must be done in its current codex form. It is also presupposed that the D text had a fully developed Greek-Latin bilingual textual tradition when it was copied on the existing parchment codex.⁸⁴

Text. The reference to the “text” is not only to the words that are written on a papyrus or parchment but also the way the tradition of the text developed, as well as the layout of the text as it appears in the codex.⁸⁵ Although the text of D, as a case in point, is taken as it

⁸⁰Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 194-249, 250, gives evidence to the dissimilarities of the textual features of the four Gospels and Acts as they are preserved in D. He maintains that the original precursor of D that consists of Matthew—John—Luke—Mark and Acts within one codex was gathered from independent Gospels and Acts manuscripts with probable diverse textual histories. See Parker, *Codex Bezae*, especially 112-9, 279-82.

⁸¹A thorough linguistic study of the Greek text of D has been done in Yoder’s dissertation where he looked at the grammatical character of the variant readings of D from itacisms and diphthongs to morphology and syntax. The work of Yoder, “Language” (diss.), becomes pertinent when the unique readings are considered whether they make a grammatical sense to be considered as an intentional alteration or just a simple orthographical mistake in transmission that does not make any sense grammatically.

⁸²The most recent and probably the best description and study of D to date as an extant Four Gospels and Acts manuscript of Greek-Latin bilingual textual tradition is that of Parker, *Codex Bezae*. Parker, in this extensive and thorough work started his examination of the hands that touched D, examined the manuscript palaeographically and codicologically, orthographically and bilingually and concluded in his reconstruction of the history of the D text.

⁸³Although Holmes, “Codex Bezae”, and Parker, *Codex Bezae*, found evidence on the existence of layers of textual tradition in their work on D, it is not the purpose of this thesis to identify them in the Lukan parables. The main concern of the investigation is the penetration of allegorising variants and mimetic readings in the text of D in the process of its textual transmission. J. N. Birdsall, as he evaluates the work of C.-B. Amphoux, cautions textual critics who are over confident in identifying the layers of the D textual tradition. See J. N. Birdsall, “After Three Centuries of the Study of Codex Bezae: The *Status Quaestionis*”, in *Lunel Colloquium*, xxviii-xxx.

⁸⁴See Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 22-3.

⁸⁵Cf. Kilpatrick, *Essays*, 113-27, in his “Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels and Acts”.

appears in the codex, the basic deduction is that there is already a long textual tradition behind it.⁸⁶ In other words, the current text of D was not just invented when it was produced as a bilingual codex.

Variant or Reading. The term “variant” is interchangeable in application with the word “reading”.⁸⁷ The two words, phrased together as “variant reading”⁸⁸ are frequently used in this current thesis as well.⁸⁹ When the word variant is used the implied stress is on the variant itself as a word, phrase or clause as it already arose and became established in the textual tradition.⁹⁰ When the word reading is used the expression assumes that the emphasis is on the nuance of the reading of the variant that has been transmitted.⁹¹ The goal of this

⁸⁶This is the central thesis of Parker, *Codex Bezae*. In a narrower study concerning the textual tradition of the Holy Spirit in Acts Matthew Black, “The Holy Spirit in the Western Text of Acts”, in *New Testament Textual Criticism, Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger*, ed. Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 159-70, demonstrates that although it may be presupposed that there are streams of influences and layers of traditions behind the “Holy Spirit variants” in the D text of Acts, it would be probable “to point to a core of original Lucan tradition, not necessarily preserved in every case exactly as Luke wrote, but in line with the Gentile, anti-Jewish and, one must add, enthusiastic or charismatic character of the primitive text of Acts”. Thus the D text could have actually preserved many of the original readings of the Holy Spirit texts in Acts. The long textual tradition behind D could have both preserved some original readings as well as expanded or omitted other earlier traditions lying beneath the original Lukan text.

⁸⁷The way I make use of the term “reading” as a technical language referring to a manuscript’s textual variation should not be confused with the general manner I employ the common word “reading” in conditions of its ordinary use to mean reading the text of a book. The context of the usage of the terminology should be the basis of the reference of meaning.

⁸⁸See e.g. the discussion of Ernest C. Colwell and Ernest W. Tune, “Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings”, in Colwell, *Studies*, 96-105; repr. from “Variant Readings: Classification and Use”, *JBL* 83 (1964): 253-61.

⁸⁹See the fine article of Eldon J. Epp, “Toward the Clarification of the Term ‘Textual Variant’”, in *STMNTTC*, 47-61; repr. from *SNLT*, 153-73, who clarifies that there is a difference between “variant” and “reading”. See also Gordon D. Fee, “On the Types, Classification, and Presentation of Textual Variation”, in *STMNTTC*, 62-79.

⁹⁰In this thesis “variant” and “reading” are employed very similarly, for both categories that Epp, *Clarification*, describes are applicable to the unique D readings in various functions. The main interest of this present investigation is the different effect that the D text produces caused by its peculiar readings. In addition Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 286, makes a strong emphasis that “the analogy between the free text and the early transmission of the material about Jesus is quite separate from the question about the authenticity of particular readings of that free text”. Hence, with Parker’s conclusion in his study of D, the central argument of my thesis does not require authenticity for the unique readings that are explored in D among the parables text in Luke.

⁹¹Malcolm Heath, *Interpreting Classical Texts* (London: Duckworth, 2002), 85, is helpful in pointing out that in textual criticism of any kind “no purely technical process is sufficient”. He maintains that because of

present writing is not to reconstruct the original text of the Gospels and Acts or to probe whether the D text is original or not.⁹² The purpose of the investigation instead is to explain the reason for D's variant readings.⁹³

Parable. Although the genre, nature and definition of parables are disputed in modern critical scholarship,⁹⁴ the application of the term "parable" in this work is based on the patristic conception of the Gospel parables.⁹⁵ It assumes the way the parables of Jesus were identified and used by the Fathers⁹⁶ for their own purposes as they expounded the Christian

"the errors that are inevitable when a text is repeatedly copied in a manuscript tradition...the text has therefore to be constructed in the very process of interpretation". Heath further argues: "A solution to a textual problem that is as elegant as it possibly could be in technical terms (one, for example, that keeps close to the transmitted reading and can explain economically how every manuscript variant arose) is unacceptable if it fails to provide a sense that is appropriate to the context". Here I am borrowing Heath's idea of a "transmitted reading" which is "appropriate to the context" that is caused by the "very process of interpretation". Although Heath's discussion is on modern practice of textual criticism in the classics the principle that he highlights, i.e. "the text has therefore to be constructed in the process of interpretation", is a valid procedure in the ancient practice of literary criticism and textual analysis. As I argued above, the decision for the appropriate reading of the text in antiquity is dictated by what is fitting to the social and cultural norms of the readers.

⁹²For a brief and insightful consideration of D in the reconstruction of the text of the Gospels and Acts see G. D. Kilpatrick, "Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels and Acts" in Kilpatrick, *Essays*, 113-27; repr. from *JTS* 44 (1943): 24-36. He deals with the "Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels and Acts". It is significant to stress the point with Heath, *Interpreting*, 85, that the text should be viewed as created during the actual exercise of the interpretative task. In this case the interpretative task is not to engage in historical exegesis, as in current scholarly practice of approaching texts, but for the ancients the task is seemingly to construct new texts and retell narratives in variety of ways. The transmission of text in antiquity such as D as a case in point is not static but dynamic.

⁹³The list provided by Epp, "Clarification", 57-60, is acknowledged yet his "insignificant readings" (the supposedly "nonsense readings", "clear and demonstrable scribal errors", "orthographic difference" and "singular readings") categories against the "significant readings or variants", although very helpful in reconstructing the text of Luke, are the ones that are examined in D. The "insignificant readings" in D may not be taken as "variants" on Epp's categories but they existed as variant readings in the D textual tradition because they fitted in and made sense to the tradents who were responsible for the development of its textual tradition.

⁹⁴See the most recent survey of Robert H. Stein, "The Genre of the Parables", in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000), 30-50; and Arland J. Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary*, BIW (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000), 1-19.

⁹⁵A helpful short study of ante-Nicene patristic perception of the parables is that of M. F. Wiles, "Early Exegesis of the Parables", *SJT* 11 (1958): 287-301. See also David W. Bercot, ed., *A Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs: A Reference Guide to More Than 700 Topics Discussed by the Early Church Fathers* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1998), 493-8, for a cross-section of quotation of patristic citations and interpretations of the different parables.

⁹⁶John Drury, *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory* (New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1985), 8, makes an important observation that in Aristotelian categories in *Rhetoric* 2.20 "parables were

Scripture.⁹⁷ The focus of its usage is on the way the Fathers understood and interpreted the meaning of parable in an allegorical sense.⁹⁸ The modern debate from Adolf Jülicher to the present status of biblical critical scholarship in the study of Gospel parables is not included in this present study.⁹⁹

Allegory. The use of the term “allegory”,¹⁰⁰ with its derivatives “allegorical” and “allegorising”, in this thesis, is to show that a text is interpreted in another way than that

used by orators in inductive or indirect proof as a generally recognized means of demonstration and illustration”. Drury briefly summarises that for Aristotle the two types of a *παράβολή* are first, “true events taken from history” and secondly, “invented example such as the fable or the parables used by Socrates in Plato’s dialogues”. He upholds that Aristotle resolves that the first one is his proclivity “against the second with its allegorical form”. The early Fathers would have assumed these categories made by Aristotle. Although Aristotle may prefer the first kind, the Fathers may have followed him but could also assume the second one was as valid as well. See also Niklas Holzberg, *The Ancient Fables: An Introduction*, trans. Christine Jackson-Holzberg, SAFPC (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002), 11-38, for a discussion that is instructive in making a distinction between a parable and a fable in the Graeco-Roman literary antiquity.

⁹⁷For the Greek and Latin Fathers’ interpretation of the parables that has influenced their medieval allegorical interpretation the standard work is Stephen L. Wailes, *Medieval Allegories of Jesus’ Parables*, UCLACMRS (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987). Here Wailes identified 41 parables and surveyed their patristic interpretations that influenced their medieval understanding. For the Syriac Fathers’ use of the parables see Kuriakose Antony Valavanolickal, *The Use of the Gospel Parables in the Writings of Aphrahat and Ephrem*, SRHEC 2 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996). Although Valavanolickal lists 42 authentic parables of Jesus, he notes that Aphrahat and Ephrem cited only 40 Gospel parables. I acknowledge Wailes, *Medieval*, for Greek and Latin sources and Valavanolickal, *Use*, for Syriac references with regards to the allegorical interpretation of the parables of Jesus by the early Fathers. The works of Wailes, *Medieval*, and Valavanolickal, *Use*, make my citation of the Fathers’ allegorical interpretation of the Gospel parables quicker and focused.

⁹⁸Both Wailes, *Medieval*, and Valavanolickal, *Use*, demonstrate that among other principles of interpretation the Fathers availed themselves of allegorical way of understanding the Gospel parables. Cf. Warren S. Kissinger, *The Parables of Jesus: A History of Interpretation and Bibliography*, ATLA BibS 4 (London: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1979), 1-33.

⁹⁹See, however, David B. Gowler, *What are They Saying About the Parables?* (New York: Paulist Press, 2000), for a concise survey of the modern parable interpretation from Jülicher until the end of the twentieth-century. See also Klyne R. Snodgrass, “From Allegorizing to Allegorizing: A History of the Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus”, in *The Challenge of Jesus’ Parables*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000), 3-29, on how recent scholarship is now abandoning Jülicher’s one point similitude principle of parable interpretation to more than one point application of meaning and that allegorical principle in parable interpretation cannot be simply set aside.

¹⁰⁰For the term allegory see Appendix I, “On the History of the Term ‘Allegory’”, of Whitman, *Allegory*, 263-8. See also Sze-Kar Wan, “Allegorical Interpretation East and West: A Methodological Enquiry into Comparative Hermeneutics”, in *Text and Experience: Towards a Cultural Exegesis of the Bible*, ed. Daniel Smith-Christopher, BS 35 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 154-79, for a discussion of Chinese allegorical interpretation. Wan, “Allegorical”, 176, maintains that the allegorical approach to text by the Chinese, without Greek or Jewish influence, shows that “a non-dualistic world view” of exegetical tradition attempts the text of the past to be “realizable and practical model for the present” as well as attaching “a tradition that begins with the event that gave rise to the text”. Wan, “Allegorical”, 176-7, further argues:

which the literal meaning allows¹⁰¹ but tolerates freedom in giving more meaning than the context requires.¹⁰² Its reference is to a strategy of approaching the text metaphorically¹⁰³

The hermeneutical task, according to the Confucian interpreters, is therefore not an epistemological one, but a moral one. The problem is not so much how one can understand the thought of the original author, and the solution does not lie with closing the ‘breach of intersubjectivity’. The Confucian formulation of the hermeneutical task (if the term is meaningful in this context) is: how does one become moral and where in this tradition does one find oneself? Exegesis is designed to induce, to provoke, to stimulate the reader to moral action and to orthodoxy.

Although Wan highlights the differences between the Greek and Chinese allegorical approaches to text I still see the basic common principle between the two interpretative traditions. The purpose of allegorical interpretation for the ancient people, Chinese and Greeks alike, is to make the text relevant to the present and that the allegorical categories given by the early exegetes were bound by the acceptable tradition of interpretation by their community.

¹⁰¹Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, especially 161-213, argues that although allegorical interpretation goes beyond what the literal sense of the text permits, the Fathers are bound in their allegorical interpretation by the established Christian traditions. See also Young, *Art*, 45-65, 88-110.

¹⁰²Usually when a text is read the literal sense of the words connected together which implies a certain idea is guided by the context of the whole text on hand. Allegorical interpretation comes in when the literal sense guided by the immediate context is set aside to read something else from the text that is being interpreted to get a certain meaning. Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 120, argues that:

The difference between ‘literal’ and ‘allegorical’ references was not absolute, but lay on a spectrum. Allegory in its rhetorical usage was a figure of speech among other figures of speech: it was to speak so as to imply something other than what is said, and included irony. Often to interpret something allegorically was simply to recognise metaphor rather than taking something very woodenly according to the letter. All language signified, and as sign was symbolic. The crucial question was what it symbolised or referred to.

Cf. R. P. C. Hanson, *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen’s Interpretation of Scripture* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959; repr., with an introduction by Joseph W. Trigg, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 7, who understands allegory in the following manner: “*Allegory is the interpretation of an object or person or a number of objects or persons as in reality meaning some object or person of a later time, with no attempt made to trace a relationship of ‘similar situation’ between them*”. (Italics are original.) Cf. also Drury, *Parables*, 5, in his definition of allegory:

The term ‘allegory’...means a concatenation of symbolic persons, places, things and happenings, which signifies a parallels concatenation in the actual world. Such a structure is distinguished from symbolism in general by having a precise and univocal meaning, to which an interpretation or decoding may provide the key.

¹⁰³I am adapting the idea of Frances Young in her approach to allegorical interpretation. See Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 176-82. With Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 152-7, I do not make a clear distinction between allegory and typology in terms of historical event. The distinction as Young, *Art*, 66-87, explores is quite difficult to make between the two for allegory and typology are related and overlap each other. See also Frances Young, “Allegory and the Ethics of Reading”, in *The Open Text: New Directions for Biblical Studies?*, ed. Francis Watson (London: SCM Press, 1993), 103-20; and “Typology”, in *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder*, eds. Stanley E. Porter, Paul Joyce and David E. Orton, BIS 8 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 29-48. Cf. Wan, “Allegorical”, 163-4 footnote 17, 173 footnote 38, who argues that there is only an “artificial” distinction between allegory and typology and that “typological interpretation [is] a subspecies of allegorical interpretation” where they both “represent two different approaches within the general phenomenon of allegorical interpretation”. But cf. also Henry M. Knapp, “Melito’s Use of Scripture in *Peri Pascha*: Second-Century Typology”, *VCRELL* 54 (2000): 343-74.

and not as an ancient methodology of interpretation.¹⁰⁴ The term used to be applied in rhetoric¹⁰⁵ and it was only Philo¹⁰⁶ who transposed the usage as an exegetical term.¹⁰⁷ Thus the concept of allegory assumed in this work is Philonic in nature as followed by Clement of Alexandria,¹⁰⁸ Origen¹⁰⁹ and Augustine.¹¹⁰

Mimesis or Imitatio. These terms are employed synonymously as referring to the patristic assumption¹¹¹ of classical theory¹¹² and not as a method per se.¹¹³ The Greek “mimesis” and Latin “imitatio” are transliterated and defined as in the way they were used in Graeco-Roman antiquity.¹¹⁴ These synonymous words are two sided ideas of the same coin,

¹⁰⁴Young, *Art*, 96, notes that: “Any educated person was used to paying attention to the ‘letter’ of the text, and this ‘verbal’ exegesis was called *methodikē*”. Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 183, also cites Origen, who although associated with the allegorical interpretation of Scripture, “made use of the standard techniques of *to methodikon* and *to historikon*, enquiring about the text, the language and the content, and practising narrative criticism”. In other words, *methodikē* for the Fathers refers to the way the words were cut to be read, grammar, rhetoric and logic of text which was part of their classical education. Cf. E. Hatch, *Influence*, 28-35.

¹⁰⁵See Thomas H. Olbricht, “Analogy and Allegory in Classical Rhetoric”, in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, eds. J. T. Fitzgerald, T. H. Olbricht and L. M. White, NovTSup 110 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2003): 371-89.

¹⁰⁶For Philo’s method of Scriptural interpretation see Dawson, *Allegorical*, 73-126.

¹⁰⁷Wolfson, *Philosophy*, 71. See also Robert Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*, TCH (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 44-54, for a discussion of Philo’s etymological technique and his awareness of “the standard Stoic allegories of Homeric myth, and of Greek myth in general”.

¹⁰⁸On the approach of Clement of Alexandria to the Scripture see Dawson, *Allegorical*, 183-234.

¹⁰⁹See Hanson, *Allegory*, 131-374, on Origen’s exegetical practice.

¹¹⁰For a convenient discussion on Augustine’s manner of interpretation see R. A. Markus, *Signs and Meanings: World and Text in Ancient Christianity* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1996), 1-43, 105-24.

¹¹¹See Young, *Art*, 137-55.

¹¹²In the words of Hooley, *Knotted*, 245, “classical literature was by its nature and heritage bound to mimetic compositional habits” and “the writer’s mind works in a context conditioned by a precursor”.

¹¹³See Halliwell, *Aesthetics*, especially 263-343 on mimesis as a classical theory and its legacy in classical criticism. See also Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, especially 152-7, 192-201, on her discussion of the patristic application of the theory of mimesis wherein the Fathers read the “typological representation” from the scriptural text and that they view “a type [as] a mimetic impress” in their interpretation of the biblical narrative.

¹¹⁴The transliterations of the original Greek and Latin are maintained throughout the work because there is no one English correspondent available to express the shades of meaning of mimesis or imitatio. See for

i.e. arts and poetry are meant to reflect the reality of life¹¹⁵, and show that literary imitation is founded on an established textual tradition.¹¹⁶ On the one hand, when an explicit reference is made to a written text reflecting life's reality¹¹⁷ the phrase "mimetic representation" (repraesentatio¹¹⁸), i.e. "mimesis of life/truth" (imitatio vitae/veritatis¹¹⁹) will be employed.¹²⁰ On the other hand, when the classical literary theory of borrowing literature material or emulating a reputable predecessor as a model is meant it will be cited as "mimetic composition", i.e. "literary imitation".¹²¹ The terms harmonisation, intertextuality and cross-

example Halliwell, *Aesthetics*, 6-22, who argues that mimesis cannot be merely equated with imitation. Both Greek and Roman writers have shown that the meaning of the concept is mystifying and vague. Nevertheless, mimesis has never been marginalised in antiquity. Rather, as a principle of ancient criticism, it was aptly taken for granted as "a general description of what poets and artists do". D. A. Russell, *Criticism in Antiquity*, 2nd ed., BCPS (London: Bristol Classical Press, 1995), 99.

¹¹⁵Plato and Aristotle debated the first theoretical discussion of mimesis that concerns whether the artists and the poets did imitate actual world. Plato (*Republic* 3.392D-398B [Plato 1, LCL 237:224-45], 6.500C-E [Plato 2, LCL 276:68-71], 10.595-607 [Plato 2, LCL 276:418-65]) was negative about mimesis whilst Aristotle (*Physics* 2.2.194a22-28 [Aristotle 1, LCL 228:120-3], 2.8.199a15-17 [Aristotle 1, LCL 228:172-3]; *Poetics* 9.1451b-1452a [Aristotle 23, LCL 199:58-63], 4.1448b4-23 [Aristotle 23, LCL 199:36-9]) was more positive about it.

¹¹⁶Perhaps, it was actually Isocrates, *Against the Sophists* 16-18 (Isocrates 2, LCL 229:172-75), who first employed mimesis (μιμησασθαι) in an exact allusion to oratorical piece. He taught that in his oratorical piece, the students must imitate their teacher. Here, Isocrates clarifies that the teacher should teach with preciseness so that the students can imitate his verbal discourse with clear-cut similarity. For Virgil's practice of literary imitation see Macrobius, *Saturnalia* 4.2, 5.11 (Macrobe, *Les Saturnales*, 2 Vols. in one, eds. Henri Bornecque and François Richard [Paris: Librairie Garnier Frères, n.d.], 2:4-11, 100-13. ET Davies, *Saturnalia*, 256-9, 323-9.); and Gellius, *Attic Nights* 9.9 (Gellius 2, LCL 200:174-83), 17.10 (Gellius 3, LCL 212:238-45). For Quintilian's discussion of the mimesis see *Orator's Education* 10.2 (Quintilian 4, LCL 127:323-37). See also Longinus, *On the Sublime* 13.2-14.3 (Longinus, LCL 199:210-5).

¹¹⁷This kind of terminological association of mimesis from "archaic imagery" to "modern imagination" with "representation of reality" is still in the heart of the modern debate as addressed by Arne Melberg, *Theories of Mimesis*, LCT 12 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 1-50.

¹¹⁸*OLD*, 2:1621, defines repraesentatio as a "re-embodiment" or "image"; and its verb form repraesento means "to represent in art, portray" and in its used with things, "to resemble, imitate".

¹¹⁹According to the *OLD*, 1:833, imitatio means "the action of imitating an example"; and when it is used with the genitive it means "to imitate, represent".

¹²⁰"Mimesis of life/truth" (imitatio vitae/veritatis) is a defined phrase borrowed from Halliwell, *Aesthetics*, 287-8. See Halliwell's footnotes 3 and 7 for references.

¹²¹The Latin literature is basically a reproduction of the Greek. It is just fair to appropriate the Latin term imitatio when reference to classical literary imitation is cited. See some of the examples discussed by J. W. H. Atkins, *Literary Criticism in Antiquity: A Sketch of Its Development*, Vol. 2, *Graeco-Roman* (Cambridge University Press, 1934; reprint, Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1961), 2:29, 62, 78-9, 94, 100, 112-3, 152,

referencing are equated with the application of literary imitation in the process of both reading performance and textual transmission of a literary tradition.¹²² The distinction between the phrases, “compositional mimesis” and “representative mimesis”, is used for convenience in order that the application of the two-sided function of mimesis can be articulated with proper points of reference.¹²³

Tradent. The term “tradent”, as already introduced above, is used to represent a person or community that passes on the tradition of the Scriptural text.¹²⁴ The tradent transmits tradition that is both oral and written which does not limit altered material from one or two copyists but may even include a whole community.¹²⁵ The decision to employ this

172, 222-3, 279-81. As D. A. Russell, “*De Imitatione*”, in *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, eds. David West and Tony Woodman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1, puts it:

One of the inescapable features of Latin literature is that almost every author, in almost everything he writes, acknowledges his antecedents, his predecessors—in a word, the tradition in which he bred. This phenomenon, for which the technical terms are *imitatio* or (in Greek) *mimesis*, is not peculiar to Latin; the statement I have just made about Latin writers would also be true very generally of Greek. In fact, the relationship between the Latin genres and their Greek exemplars may best be seen as a special case of a general Greco-Roman acceptance of imitation as an essential element in all literary composition. (The italics are original.)

¹²²See further discussion on the equation of mimetic composition to harmonisation, intertextuality and cross-referencing in Chapter 3.

¹²³See Russell, *De Imitatione*, 3-4, for the discussion of the issue regarding the “homonymous” use of mimesis or imitatio. Russell discusses further that ancient authors engaged in both senses that “the mimetic relationship of works of literature to each other and their mimetic relationship to the outside world” were played with by ancient authors in their mimetic assumption.

¹²⁴The telling explanation of James A. Sanders, “The Hermeneutics of Translation”, in *Removing the Anti-Judaism from the New Testament*, eds. Howard Clark Kee and Irvin J. Borowsky (Philadelphia: American Interfaith Institute/World Alliance, 2000), 45, in discussing the relation of “tradents and texts” is noteworthy to be quoted in full:

There is an overall observation one can make, in fact, about all tradents, ancient and modern, of biblical texts. A tradent was/is one who brings the past into the present, specifically a biblical text. All scribes, translators, commentators, preachers and teachers of the biblical text were/are tradents. Another word sometimes used instead of tradent is traditionist, that is, one who engages in his or her time in the traditioning process of a community text, such as the Bible...[Thus], a traditionist, or tradent, tries to bring the past into the present in an understandable way.

See also the way Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 75, 113, 141, 143, used the notion of tradent even in reference to the apostles. Cf. the role of the scribal tradents in the transmission of the Hebrew Scripture in Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 23-88.

¹²⁵Huey and Corley, *Student's Dictionary*, 191. Cf. also the more confined definition of “tradent” by W. R. F. Browning, *A Dictionary of the Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 375: “One who is responsible for preserving and handing on the oral tradition, such as a teacher or preacher or missionary, in the form of apophthegms or similar pericopae”. Cf. also the narrower use of Fishbane, *Biblical*, 23, 37, that

technical expression is due to the difficulty of identifying precisely who may be responsible for the variant readings appearing in the text of D.¹²⁶ Accordingly, the oral and the written traditions, as well as one person or more, even a whole community, may have been responsible for the textual variation of readings in the development of the textual tradition of a text.¹²⁷ Nobody would know for certain anyway who was responsible for the occurrence of

“scribes as tradents of traditions also put them in primary position with respect to their meanings” [i.e., the traditions transmitted] for they were “more than passive tradents”.

¹²⁶Should the one responsible for the entrance of variant readings be a scribe, an editor, a reader, a bishop, or someone else? Since the text has a textual tradition that has gone through a process what has been relayed to succeeding Christian communities is a tradent (—whoever he was/they were) shaped product. James A. Sanders, *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism*, GBS-OTS (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 62, poses a pertinent question that addresses the central thesis of this current dissertation:

For instance, since there is so amazingly little allegory used by *biblical* tradents (distinct from postbiblical expositors), it may be that we should decide that use of allegory today is suspect and violates the inherent constraints within canonical texts. ...But one wonders if true allegorical interpretation is not rare, at least in the Western canons, and if it needs to be located and identified carefully and perhaps eventually circumscribed in usage today. (The italics are original.)

Although the context of Sanders’ question is in the context of canonical criticism it is a relevant one. The question that he raised twenty years ago is the question that is addressed in this work. The unique readings of the D text (particularly the Lukan parables) as the representative of the “Western” text, is investigated through the lens of allegory and mimesis. The hypothesis probed is that the tradents are responsible for the penetration of the distinct reading found in D. Further the theory argues that the postbiblical expositors, particularly the Fathers’ exegesis of the pertinent texts influenced the occurrence of such divergent variant readings. The Fathers, who are the guardians and witnesses of the Gospels’ textual tradition, confirms that the tradents could have brought in readings that fitted the communities that received the text. Cf. Bartsch “Cantabrigiensis”, 167, who sees how tradents can pass copying errors: “Diese Veränderungen sind leicht als Schreibfehler zu erkennen, die nicht auf den bewußten Eingriff in den Text zurückgehen, den der erste Schreiber vorgenommen hat, ob wir ihn nun den Redaktor nennen, oder in ihm einen Tradenten alter, sonst verloren gegangener Überlieferung sehen wollen”. Bartsch, “Cantabrigiensis”, 181, also notes how the tradent passes the tradition:

Von daher wird die Bedeutung der Erstellung eines Urtextes relativiert. Sind die Evangelien für uns ein Glaubenszeugnis der frühen Christenheit, so ist die Erkenntnis, wie die Gemeinden des 3. und 4. Jhrh.s mit diesem Evangelien-Text umgingen von gleicher Bedeutung wie die ursprüngliche Fassung des Textes. Während der angenommene ‘Urtext’ eine eher abstrakte Größe ist, zudem abhängig vom jeweiligen Exegeten, ist uns die Entwicklung der Textform, wie sie sich in den Abschriften zeigt, deren Endergebnis der Codex Bezae ist, eindeutig erkennbar. Stehen wir aber als Christen in der Erbfolge der ersten Christen, so können wir uns nicht von denen trennen, die Tradenten der Überlieferung waren und in ihre Weitergabe der Überlieferung den eigenen Glauben und eigene Erkenntnisse eingetragen haben.

¹²⁷According to Sanders, “Hermeneutics”, 45-6, the tradent due to indispensable “responsibilities” interprets the tradition for the recipients in terms of the past and the present:

The one responsibility is to the past, or the biblical text, and the other is to the present, or the community being served. Put another way, a tradent specifically a translator, has to pay as much attention to the needs of his or her community to understand the text in their terms, as to the needs of the biblical text inherited from the community's past. It is integral to the task of traditioning to know the requirements for understanding by one's community in order to bring the past into the present.

the variant reading in the body of the text.¹²⁸ In this way, the readers and congregations who used the text could be included in the definition of tradent.¹²⁹

Scribe. A “scribe” is one who copies a written text.¹³⁰ This kind of person is responsible also for the preparation and production of the manuscript sheets and not only

¹²⁸On the one hand, to conclude that the one/s responsible for the variant readings in D was/were the editor/s, as Holmes in Matthew and Read-Heimerdinger in Acts, would be too specific. On the other hand, to assume that the scribe/s did the alterations, as Rice in Luke and CroweTipton in Acts, would not be technically right. My proclivity is to use the term “tradent” with Bartsch, “Cantabrigiensis”, which can be used in a more flexible way than editor or scribe. (See Chapter 2 for my review of the works of Holmes, Rice, Read-Heimerdinger, CroweTipton and Bartsch.) The reader/s, official/s, individual/s or bishop/s, may be responsible for glosses that later copied into the main body of the text by the copyist/s. Consequently, it should be maintained that the dynamics of the development of the textual tradition did not happen among editors, scribes or readers but within the setting of a Christian community that received the tradition. Cf. Harold K. Moulton, *Papyrus, Parchment and Print: The Story of How the New Testament Text Has Reached Us*, WCB 3rd Series 57 (London: Lutterworth Press, 1967), 31-5.

¹²⁹Sanders, “Hermeneutics”, 46, points out:

It is a commonplace in text criticism since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls and recent New Testament papyri to note that the earliest texts and versions of the Bible, both testaments, were more fluid and adapted to the needs of ancient communities than later texts and versions. Consciously 'accurate' copying and transmission did not become a concern in either early Jewish or early Christian communities until a certain point in their histories, the first century of the common era for the First Testament and the fourth century for the Second. This suggests that early tradents were keen on making sure their communities understood the text they were traditioning. The focus was on understanding, and that of necessity meant shaping and adapting the translation in such a way that their people were adequately served in terms of their own cultural gifts and givens. It also suggests, of course, that it was the understanding of the particular tradent and his community that shaped the effort.

¹³⁰The reference is to the Graeco-Roman copyist of texts. See H. L. Pinner, *The World of Books in Classical Antiquity* (Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1948), 24-6, 30-2. The Jewish scribes, as described by the Gospel writers, are not meant here. On Jewish scribes see Alan Millard, *Reading and Writing in the Time of Jesus*, BS 69 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 168-71. Nevertheless, the probability that Jewish scribes, particularly the Christian converts, may have copied some texts of the New Testament is not denied but would be difficult to prove if not impossible, whether a scribe was Jewish, Christian or neither. It is sufficient to share the operational theory of Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), x, that “Christian groups did not radically depart from established conventions when they produced, circulated, and employed books. Hence, we can draw upon evidence about the bibliographic practices in effect for Greek, Roman, and Jewish literature of the period to illumine Christian practice”. The scribes who copied the text of the New Testament were people that cannot just simply be taken for granted as Christians. However, it is more probable than not that they were Christians, or at least majority of them, due to the Christian adoption of the codex as the physical form of the Scripture copy. See C. H. Roberts and T. C. Skeat, *The Birth of the Codex* (London: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1983), 38-66, for a fine discussion on why the early Christians adopted the codex. See also Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 130, who concludes that “the scribes who copied early Christian texts were themselves Christians”. See Millard, *Reading*, 74-83, as well. The possibility of scribes copying the Scripture text in the context of Scriptoria, especially after the persecution at the reign of Constantine, is also noted in the scribal transmission of the text. See Aland and Aland, *Text*, 64-7; cf. Gamble, *Books*, 158-61.

copies of ancient books.¹³¹ The scribe, who copied a manuscript,¹³² may have made corrections to the exemplar¹³³ that was used, and may have made corrections to his new copy¹³⁴ if he found any mistake in what he recently copied.¹³⁵ A scribe may also be characterised by certain tendency or tendencies in copying or transmitting a textual tradition.¹³⁶ In this sense a scribe can be included in the broad category of tradent in this

Aland and Aland, *Text*, 70, point out that the “earliest Christian scriptorium may have been in Alexandria about 200”. Cf. also the discussion of Gamble, *Books*, 120-3, concerning the claim the Alands.

¹³¹See Metzger, *Text*, 3-21, on how scribes prepared the sheets (papyrus or parchment) for writing and their process of copying as he describes their “formal style of handwriting”, their employment of “contractions” and “abbreviations” of words that are used most often, and their use of *nomina sacra* as well as *scriptio continua*. See also the technical discussion of the dynamic relationship of scribe and codex in the process of producing a book in E. G. Turner, *Typology*, 73-88. E. G. Turner, *Typology*, 74, concludes “that normally the scribes did write these pages when the sheets were still detached (before the volume was stitched), but that not every scribe copying a single-quire codex did so”. Moreover, E. G. Turner, *Typology*, 87, claims that “Christianity was the popularizer of the single broad column that fills the page” as the format of the text of the codex manuscript. It is also noteworthy to mention that scribes could have used “shorthand”. If they used contractions and abbreviations it is also apparent that they could have used a shorthand way of writing that is made most probable due to the supplementary evidence from Oxyrhynchus Papyri iv, p. 204 f., No. 724, dated 155 C.E. This ancient document talks about “an ex-magistrate apprentices his slave to a shorthand writer for two years”. See the description of George Milligan, *The New Testament and Its Transmission: The Baird Lectures for 1929-30* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932), 11-2. Cf. Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians*, 3-8. Cf. also Millard, *Reading*, 175-6.

¹³²The copy of the text produced may or may not be a polished book manuscript. It is not assumed that a copyist is always a professional. He may be a non-professional but knows how to write and copied the text privately. This is especially true in Christian texts. See Gamble, *Books*, 77-9, 122-9, 231-7.

¹³³Aland and Aland, *Text*, 69.

¹³⁴Scribes may correct new copies that they reproduced. This example of a scribal tendency has been demonstrated by Fee in his study of P⁶⁶. See Gordon D. Fee, “P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria”, in *STMNTTC*, 258-9; repr. from *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*. eds. Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974), 30-1. See also Gordon D. Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II (P⁶⁶): Its Textual Relationships and Scribal Characteristics*. SD 34 (Salt Lake: University of Utah Press, 1968), especially 9-14, 35, 76-83.

¹³⁵This indicates that a scribe is expected to correct mistakes, his mistakes or others. This can be best illustrated by Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 7-49, 123-79, on the hands that left their imprint on the text of D. See also Zetzel, *Latin*, 206-10 for a description of scribal corrections of texts in classical Latin.

¹³⁶On studies about the tendencies of scribes, see Ernest C. Colwell, “Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of P⁴⁵, P⁶⁶, P⁷⁵”, in Colwell, *Studies*, 106-24; repr. from “Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text”, in *BMS*, 370-89; Peter M. Head, “Observations on Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels, especially on the ‘Scribal Habits’”, *Bib* 71 (1990): 240-7; and James R. Royse, “Scribal Tendencies in the Transmission of the Text of the New Testament” in *TNTCR*, 239-52.

present thesis due to his involvement in transmitting the written textual tradition of the Scripture.¹³⁷

Editor. The idea of an ancient “editor” is that of the notion of διόρθωτης¹³⁸ and that the product of the process is διόρθωσις¹³⁹ of the text that has gone through διορθοῦν.¹⁴⁰ The editor is responsible for the recension of a textual tradition.¹⁴¹ The changes that an editor made in a textual tradition were not only due to scribal error in copying,¹⁴² but were even deliberate alteration of words, phrases, clauses or sentences that have ideological and theological bearing on the textual tradition.¹⁴³ Hence, an editor plays the role of a tradent in transmitting the textual tradition that has been edited.¹⁴⁴

¹³⁷See e.g., Moulton, *Papyrus*, 16-8, who calls the Christian scribes as “orthodox copyists”. The whole book of Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians*, is devoted to the investigation of the scribal input to the text they copy.

¹³⁸Holmes, “Codex Bezae”, 159; and Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, and Dates* (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1964), 35, 40.

¹³⁹Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967; repr., with an introduction by Craig A. Evans, Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1998), 7. See also Holmes, “Codex Bezae”, 144, 150-2.

¹⁴⁰Saul Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Literary Transmission Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in I Century B.C.E.—IV Century C.E.*, 2nd ed. (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962), 90. See Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians*, 85-7, on how correction or recension of an ancient manuscript occurs.

¹⁴¹An editorial activity has transpired in the process of the transmission is the central thesis of several major works on the D text. Among them are Epp, *Theological Tendency*; Rice, “Alteration of Luke”; Holmes, “Early Editorial”; Heimerdinger, “Contribution of Discourse”, and CroweTipton, “*Theophilum*”. See also Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 109-27, for a discussion on the process of recension in the Gospels in his Chapter V, “The Revised Versions of Antiquity”.

¹⁴²For the correction of the copyist errors by an editor see Pinner, *World of Books*, 31-3.

¹⁴³See Gamble, *Books*, 108-32. Cf. Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians*, 105-27.

¹⁴⁴David Trobisch, *The First Edition of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 6, goes beyond the editorial activity on the text by an editor. The central argument of his research is that the New Testament, in the form that achieved canonical status, is not the result of a lengthy and complicated collecting process that lasted for several centuries. The history of the New Testament is the history of an edition, a book that has been published and edited by a specific group of editors, at a specific place, and a specific time.

What Trobisch, *First*, 8-44, has depicted in his study is a “final redaction” of the canonical edition of the New Testament. In this way he uses the evidence from the four great uncial manuscripts, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Alexandrinus and Ephraemi Rescriptus. Trobisch, *First*, 24-5, contends that the complete editions of the New

Reader. The “reader” is referring to the person who is reading the text of the scripture in the liturgical setting.¹⁴⁵ During the time of the Fathers it became an office.¹⁴⁶ A reader has the opportunity to correct the manuscript he is reading in terms of style and grammar or even make choices on what reading is suitable in disputed passages.¹⁴⁷ The reading of the text aloud made the ancient Scripture reader articulate what he read not only vocally but with full expression.¹⁴⁸ At times a reader was also expected to give a homily¹⁴⁹ out of the text he read.¹⁵⁰ Since a reader passes on the textual tradition that he reads, and may have glossed a manuscript text, he is also practising as a tradent.¹⁵¹

Testament (actually the complete editions of the Christian Bible) were copied apart from each other as demonstrated by the uncial texts. For Trobisch, *First*, 45-77, “editorial concept” covers “the final redaction of an anthology [that] always reflects a specific editorial concept”. See also David Trobisch, *Paul’s Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins*, foreword by Gerd Theissen (Minneapolis: Fortress Press 1994).

¹⁴⁵Everett Ferguson, “Reader”, in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, 2nd ed., 2 Vols., eds. Everett Ferguson, Michael P. McHugh and Frederick W. Norris (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997), 2:973. For a more thorough discussion on the development of the work of the reader see Robert Martineau, *The Office and Work of a Reader*, rev. ed. (London: Mowbrays, 1980).

¹⁴⁶Patristic evidence shows that a reader is a minor order. See Paul F. Bradshaw, *Ordination Rites of the Ancient Churches of East and West* (New York: Pueblo Publishing Co., Inc., 1990), 93-103.

¹⁴⁷See Gamble, *Books*, 123-9, and Millard, *Reading*, 162. The work of Parker, *Codex Bezae*, also gives evidence that the hands that corrected the manuscript could be that of the reader. See also my earlier discussion above on how Greek and Latin readers could have put their correction and glosses on the texts that they read.

¹⁴⁸See E. G. Turner, *Typology*, 84-5; and Gamble, *Books*, 203-5, 224-31.

¹⁴⁹An early example of homily given after the reading of the Scripture is that of Melito of Sardis, *On Pascha*, 1ff. See the discussion of Melito’s reading of the Scripture and his homily based on it in Thomas F. Torrance, *Divine Meaning: Studies in Patristic Hermeneutics* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd., 1995), 76-7.

¹⁵⁰See the discussion of Gamble, *Books*, 219. Cf. Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians*, 72-3, who observes that a number of textual harmonisations could be attributed to the “‘liturgical’ usage of ‘texts’” which occurred in the oral context of the ancient Church meetings where the New Testament text is read before the Christian congregations.

¹⁵¹E. G. Turner, *Typology*, 84, cites a specific example of a codex format where “the large format offers the opportunity to include alongside the sacred text the annotation the reader will need”. The format of the ancient codices attracted readers to put marginal annotations.

Nature of the Bezan Puzzle

By about 200 C.E. the dissimilarity in text between different New Testament manuscripts was evidently present.¹⁵² The theory of the allegorical reading's effect upon the text of the New Testament and the influence of mimetic assumptions of what is read can be pursued further if it is placed in the context of the transmission of the text of the Gospels, particularly the Gospel of Luke, in D.¹⁵³ There is already a quite developed textual tradition behind the text of D, which is composed of the four canonical Gospels arranged as Matthew-Mark-John-Luke and Acts of the Apostles, when its codex manuscript was produced about 400 CE.¹⁵⁴ As a celebrated uncial Greek-Latin diglot manuscript, D (and d) became an interesting object of study because of its unique readings over against the readings of the other supposedly superior New Testament manuscripts such as the Alexandrian text type.

¹⁵²Kilpatrick, "Transmission", 4.

¹⁵³I take the result of Prof. Birdsall's investigation as my basic assumption for my study of the D text of Luke, i.e. "that the text of Codex Bezae cannot be identified with any entity of the second century *tout simple*: if 'Western Text' means 'the text of Codex Bezae,' then it is not to be found in the second century". He asserts that the D text "developed under the influence" of different elements that intermingled "with surviving original readings". Thus, for Birdsall the text of D is "the product of more centuries than the one on which we are concentrating" which is during the second-century when the New Testament text was still fluid in textual forms. See J. Neville Birdsall, "The Western Text in the Second Century", in *Gospel Traditions*, 3-17, especially his conclusion on 16-7.

¹⁵⁴See Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 30, 35, 281, who based his dating of 400 CE on palaeographical ground. Cf. the palaeographical discussion of the date of the Latin text by Bernhard Bischoff, *Latin Palaeography: Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, trans. Dáibhí Ó Cróinín and David Ganz (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 72-5. Cf. also Stone, *Language*, 67-8, who put the date of D in the fifth-century based on his analysis of the Latin text of d. For further discussion on the fifth-century dating of Codex Bezae see F. C. Burkitt, "The Date of Codex Bezae", *JTS* 3 (1901-1902): 501-13; J. Chapman, "The Order of the Gospels in the Parent of Codex Bezae", *ZNW* 6 (1905): 339-46; Ropes, *Text of Acts*, lvii-lviii; E. A. Lowe, "A Note on the Codex Bezae", in *Palaeographical Papers 1907-1965*, 2 Vols., ed. Ludwig Bieler (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), 1:224-8; repr. from *BBC* 4 (1927): 9-14; Scrivener, *Bezae*, xiv-vi. Cf. Kurt Aland, "The Significance of the Papyri for Progress in New Testament Research", in *BMS*, 334, who insinuates a sixth-century date. Cf. also K. Sneyders de Vogel, "Le codex Bezae est-il d'origine sicilienne?", *BBC* 4 (1927): 10-3, who views D from a seventh-century dating. See also Hermann Josef Frede, *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften*, AGLB 4 (Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1964), 18-9, especially footnote 4, that D "im 4. Jahrhundert entstanden ist". Cf. Bonifatius Fischer, "Das Neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache", in *Alten Übersetzungen*, 41 footnote 133, who thinks that D has a fourth-century date when he insinuates: "Wenn der gelegentliche Einfluß der Vulgata-Evangelien sicher nachgewiesen wäre, dann hätte man damit einen *terminus post quem* gewonnen, nämlich das Jahr 383".

Since the D manuscript was copied, using an exemplar rather than written by dictation,¹⁵⁵ the possibility of the theory advanced here becomes more plausible as it is placed in the context of textual transmission in which some of the distinct readings of D may have had occurred. The rediscovery of Codex D and its relocation to Cambridge University by Theodore Beza allowed textual scholars to use different schemes to explain the peculiar variant readings of its bilingual text.¹⁵⁶ More interest is generated on examination of this bilingual codex through the publication of its facsimile by Cambridge University Press.¹⁵⁷ Proposals to make sense of the peculiar readings of D, range from the verbatim idiom of the original words of Jesus in Aramaic, fossilised into the Greek, to the developed theological inclination of the text against Judaism.¹⁵⁸ Thus D, known for its atypical readings against the “reliable” and “superior” Alexandrian manuscripts, is the appropriate New Testament manuscript employed in this investigation of allegorical and mimetic influence upon the text of the New Testament.

¹⁵⁵D. C. Parker, “A ‘Dictation Theory’ of Codex Bezae”, in *New Testament Text and Language: A Sheffield Reader*, eds. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans, BS 44 (Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 66-80; repr. from *JSNT* 15 (1982): 97-112; contra R. S. MacKenzie, “The Latin Column in Codex Bezae”, *JSNT* 6 (1980): 58-76.

¹⁵⁶The basic assumption of those who provide explanations for the distinct text of D is that the manuscript is erratic and the scribe is over zealous. See e.g. Frederic G. Kenyon, *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1901), 79, who views D as a manuscript that “which is very full of scribal errors”. Another scholar, Alexander Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (London: Duckworth, 1912), 27, maintains that: “The vulgarisms and errors in [the D text] forbid us to suppose that it was intended for formal and public reading. Neither side is simply a rendering of the other. There are many discrepancies between the two, and the two texts are in a sense of separate origin”. Also, A. T. Robertson, *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1925), 87, gives his opinion about D: “The scribe has also made numerous slips in matters of detail, blunders due perhaps partly to the manuscript and partly to the copyist himself who may have known Latin better than he did Greek...A dozen scribes in later time made corrections”. Milligan, *New*, 52, further points out that “the general character” of the D text actually “varies largely from the normal type in the way of additions and omissions”. Likewise, Stone, *Language*, 10, makes his observation that: “The scribe of Codex Bezae was frequently careless in the technical execution of his work”. Moreover, Kilpatrick, “Transmission”, 4, states that D is “the most erratic” among the great uncial witnesses to the text of the New Testament.

¹⁵⁷*Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis Quattuor Evangelia et Actus Apostolorum complectens Graece et Latine phototypice repraesentatus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1899). A textual transcription of D was also prepared by Scrivener, *Bezae*.

¹⁵⁸See Chapter 2 for the reviews of the approaches already used in studying the distinctive readings of the D text.

It is important to be aware that the attitude of the D tradition in recording the words of Jesus is loose and yet not reckless.¹⁵⁹ A good example of this enigma is the celebrated additional reading of D in Lk 6:4 where “non-canonical” words were put in the mouth of Jesus, τῆ αὐτῆ ἡμέρᾳ θεασάμενός τινα ἐργαζόμενον τῷ σαββάτῳ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἄνθρωπε, εἰ μὲν οἶδας τί ποιεῖς, μακάριος εἶ· εἰ δὲ μὴ οἶδας, ἐπικατάρατος καὶ παραβάτης εἶ τοῦ νόμου.¹⁶⁰ This same phenomenon of putting words in the mouth of Jesus, which is not known in other manuscript traditions, is common in the parables of Jesus in Luke,¹⁶¹ not to mention in Acts where words were put in the mouths of the apostles.¹⁶² Thus an attempt to investigate the D attitude in recording the words of Jesus in the development of its Greek-Latin tradition, opens fresh questions and an ingenious approach to the study of the words of Jesus preserved in the Lukan parables in D.¹⁶³ The

¹⁵⁹Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 285, after he has spent a long time studying the D text firmly concluded that: “Codex Bezae is a free text, but is essentially not a careless one”.

¹⁶⁰This problematic statement in Lk 6:4 has been dealt with by commentators in Luke as well as other attempts in different works. The most helpful in dealing with the textual issues and reason for its existence are Ernst Bammel, “The Cambridge Pericope. The Addition to Luke 6.4 in Codex Bezae”, *NTS* 32 (1986): 404-26; Joël Delobel, “Luke 6,5 in Codex Bezae: The Man Who Worked on Sabbath”, in *À cause de l'Évangile: Études sur les Synoptiques et les Actes, offertes au P. Jacques Dupont, O.S.B. à l'occasion de son 70^e anniversaire*, LD 123 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1985), 453-77; and J. Duncan M. Derrett, “Luke 6:5 Re-examined”, *NovT* 37 (1995): 232-48. See also Tobias Nicklas, “Das Agraphon vom ‘Sabbatarbeiter’ und sein Kontext: Lk. 6:1-11 in der Textform des Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D)”, *NovT* 44 (April 2002): 160-75.

¹⁶¹This phenomenon of putting words in the mouth of Jesus in D, if seemingly foreign or not obvious to the other Gospels, is certainly not alien to Luke. It is usually done through harmonisation of the readings of the Gospels, through additions, omissions, change of words and modification of word order. The changes made in the D text of Luke may also have allusions traceable to the Old Testament. For the work on Gospel harmony in D see Vogels, *Harmonistik*, particularly 87-105, for the list of harmonisation in Luke.

¹⁶²Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 286.

¹⁶³Although Luke and Acts have been correctly taken as two books in a sequel, the D text of Luke is studied independently from Acts for there is no evidence that these two books were jointly circulated and transmitted in the early church. The piece of information that in the arrangement of the books in the New Testament canon, that Luke and Acts are not placed one after the other, shows that they were not received in the early Church as a pair of writings. As Gregory, *Reception*, 2, argues:

Therefore it is important to realise that *Luke-Acts* as an object of study, two separate texts linked by a hyphen, is in fact a modern construct. Of course this is not to deny that Luke wrote two successive volumes—and perhaps even set out to write two successive volumes—each of which largely coheres with and informs the other. Rather, it is simply to note that for much of their subsequent history Luke’s two volumes have not been read in this way and, consequently, that it is not possible to assume that the knowledge and use of one of these texts by a subsequent reader or text need in itself require or indeed

parables of Jesus are excellent examples in this kind of study because they are presented by the Gospel writers as directly coming from the mouth of Jesus. To put it in another way, the Gospel parables are not only attributed to Jesus directly by the Christian tradition, but also they were believed to be in his own words.¹⁶⁴

The pertinence of the conundrum—that the very words of Jesus in parables were freely altered in the D text of Luke—as described above leads to the primary issue that this research is investigating. This problem is the question of the influence of the allegorical interpretation in the text of the New Testament. It is an alternative exploration of how to explain the unique readings of the D text. This is the basic reason why D is chosen as the New Testament manuscript for this study. In other words, the foremost question is how did these odd readings develop and enter into the centuries of tradition of the D text? Linguistic study¹⁶⁵ has been applied to the different books of D and a theological approach¹⁶⁶ has been

make probable the knowledge and use of the other. Nor do we know if ever they circulated together in this period, for once Luke released each volume he would have had no control over its circulation and copying. (The italics are original.)

See the dissertation summary of Andrew Gregory, “The Reception of Luke and Acts in The Period Before Irenaeus”, *TynBul* 53.1 (2002): 153-6. See also Stuart R. Pickering, “The Compiling of the Book of Acts and Its Separation from the Gospel of Luke”, *NTTRU* 1 (1993): 31-8.

¹⁶⁴Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 3rd German ed., trans. S. H. Hooke (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1954), 9-10, claims that the parables were from the “original rock of tradition” and “behind the Greek text we get glimpses of Jesus’ mother tongue”. He maintains that the parables are “trustworthy tradition, and are brought into immediate relation with Jesus”. Further, Jeremias, *Parables*, 20, sees the possibility of recovering “the original tones of the utterances of Jesus”. Moreover, Jeremias, *Parables*, 88, undertakes the ambition of going back to “the actual living voice of Jesus” in his study of the Gospel parables.

¹⁶⁵The linguistic analysis employed in understanding the peculiar readings of D are explored in the examination of Semitism by A. J. Wensinck, “The Semitisms of Codex Bezae and Their Relation to the Non-Western Text of the Gospel of Saint Luke”, *BBC* 12 (1937): 11-48. See also his unpublished work later published by Black, *Aramaic*, 296-304, as “Appendix C: The Unpublished Work of the Late A. J. Wensinck of Leiden”. Moreover, see other linguistic approaches such as Aramaism (and Syriacism) by Black, *Aramaic*; Syriacism by Frederic Henry Chase, *The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1893); and *The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1895); and Latinism by J. Rendel Harris, *Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-called Western Text of the New Testament*, TS 2/1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891). See also Vogels, *Harmonistik*, in his exploration of the harmonising of the D variants suggesting that they are actually Diatessaronic readings influenced by the Syriac.

¹⁶⁶E.g. see Harris, *Codex Bezae*, particularly 148-59, 191-214, 226-8 for his exploration of Montanist evidence, and 226-34, 235-40 for his discussion of Marcionite readings in D. On the one hand, P. H. Menoud, “The Western Text and The Theology of Acts”, *BSNTS* Nos. 1-3 (1950-52 one vol. reissue [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963]), 2:27; repr. from *SNTS*, Bulletin 2 (1951): 19-32, suggests that: “Negatively

experimented with, particularly with regard to Luke and Acts. The double-version-hypothesis, i.e. there are two published accounts of an original, has been well explored in Acts¹⁶⁷ and suggested in Luke¹⁶⁸ as well. Other methods, such as discourse analysis¹⁶⁹ and socio-rhetorical reading,¹⁷⁰ have been applied especially in Acts. Broader literary approaches such as retelling and reshaping of the narrative in Luke¹⁷¹ and the occasion for editing and different types of editorial activity in Matthew¹⁷² have been explored. Perhaps, because there is a deficiency of consensus as to the appropriate methodology, there is still room to explore the angle of the allegorical interpretation and the impact of the mimetic theory on the D

in denouncing and condemning the unbelief of the Jews: there is an undeniable anti-Jewish tendency peculiar to many Western readings". On the other hand, Arnold Ehrhardt, *The Apostolic Succession: In the First Two Centuries of the Church* (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), 28-30, observes a more positive Jewish tendency in D that shows "a partisan view in favour of the Church at Jerusalem". However, it was the work of Epp, *Theological Tendency*, which treated the theological tendency in the D text of Acts that created a controversy among the scholars.

¹⁶⁷Notably, Acts is the most studied text of D. The oldest approach to understand the D text of Acts is the hypothesis that there are actually a couple of versions of the early Church's record. The most recent investigation of the two versions of Acts is that of Strange, *Problem*, who ingeniously reconstructed Acts as an unfinished work of Luke that was then completed by posthumous editors that caused two versions. Strange describes the double-version approach applied in investigating the D text of Acts, in particular, outlining that J. Leclerc as early as 1686 put forward the theory that D originated from one of the two editions of Acts issued by Luke. Then, F. Blass in 1884 argued that the "Western" text is the rough draft and the "non-Western" text is the polished copy. The works of M. Boismard and A. Lamouille from 1978 to 1984 presented a case that the first version, echoing the "Western" text, was modified in the second, then they were fused together resulting in our present text. Moreover, E. Delebecque from 1980 to 1986 contended that Acts' secondary longer text is a development of a shorter text. For the details of the preceding chronological summary concerning the development of the double-version theory of the text of Acts see the review of Strange, *Problem*, 1-34.

¹⁶⁸Wensinck, "Semitisms", 47-8, in following the theory of F. Blass in Acts also suggested a double version of Luke's Gospel where Luke corrected his first text of the Gospel producing a second text.

¹⁶⁹J. G. Heimerdinger, "The Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism: A Study of the Bezan Text of Acts (Ph.D. thesis, University of Wales, 1994). Heimerdinger's dissertation was revised, updated and published as Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism*, JSNTSup 236 (Sheffield Academic Press/Continuum Imprint 2002).

¹⁷⁰Vaughn Eric CroweTipton, "*Ad Theophilum: A Socio-Rhetorical Reading of Peter in Acts in Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*" (Ph.D. diss., Baylor University, 1999).

¹⁷¹For the treatment of Luke in consideration of a larger literary feature in antiquity see Mees, "Lukas 1-9", 89-110. See also Michael Mees, "Sinn und Bedeutung literarischer Formen für die Textgestalt des Codex Bezae in Lukas 10-11", *VC* 7 (1970): 59-82; and "Jesusworte in Lukas 12 und ihre Komposition nach Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis", *VC* 7 (1970): 285-303.

¹⁷²Holmes, "Early Editorial".

text.¹⁷³ There is an apparent indirect agreement, whether one is using a linguistic, theological or any other approach, wherein the textual interpretation of D in the process of textual transmission is always at the front of the discussion. In connection with the interpretative process within the text of D, the known ancient convention was allegorical method.¹⁷⁴ It is possible to see the plausibility of the idea that in a certain layer of the D textual tradition, allegorical readings of the text made their way into D as part of the process of the development of the transmission of D's textual tradition. The interpretative process in reading and understanding the meaning of the text and the attitude towards the words of Jesus and the apostles is crucial in understanding the nature of the D puzzle. This kind of understanding should be put in context where the meaning of the accepted text of the Christian community reflects their situation. As Donald W. Riddle points out, there should be an acknowledgement that "every significant variant records a religious experience that brought it into being" as well as an appreciation that "the various forms of the text are sources for the study of Christianity".¹⁷⁵ Here is where the ancient theory of mimesis comes in. If it can be established that the D reading of the words of Jesus, as a case in point, experimented with special emphasis in the Lukan parables as recorded in the D text, is actually an interpretation in itself,¹⁷⁶ then, the earlier text forms of D and the interpretative

¹⁷³The methodology in approaching the textual puzzle in D is always an avenue for a textual critic to see the defect of the work of other scholars. See e.g. Parker, *Codex Bezae*, in his chapter 12, "The codex and the critics". See also Ehrman, "Text", 98-102, as he reviews the approaches in New Testament textual criticism and their difficulties. Ehrman, "Text", 100, suggests that D is a principal case in point in taking "a solitary witness and establish that the basic form of its text was available in the period from which we have so few surviving remains". Cf. the conclusion of Yoder, "Language" (diss.), 533, rejecting approaches on D that takes "the idiosyncrasies of one portion of the manuscript have often been allowed to represent the whole".

¹⁷⁴Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 20-2, puts a short section on the issue of allegorical interpretation among the Fathers dealing very briefly on how the Fathers decide on the textual meaning of a scripture passage on hand. Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 123-4, also gives a quick illustration on how Gnosticism used allegorical method in understanding standard Christian confession. His interest though is not to apply a direct investigation on how allegorical method of interpretation has penetrated the New Testament text.

¹⁷⁵Donald W. Riddle, "Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline", *ATHR* 18 (1936): 221.

¹⁷⁶The plausibility of this theory of interpretation is based on Dawson, *Allegorical*, 129, citing both Cornutus and Heraclitus in their expositions of allegorical literature composed by Homer or a mythmaker

commentaries or glosses¹⁷⁷ of scribes and readers¹⁷⁸ were fused together and no longer distinguishable.¹⁷⁹ It would therefore further elucidate the nature of the long held opinion of textual transmission in D readings as formed by a kind of theological proclivity¹⁸⁰ or as recently suggested is shaped by an early Jewish exegetical technique.¹⁸¹ What was happening in the setting where the text was transmitted actually reflects what has been preserved in the tradition of the text. This processing of the textual tradition was known in antiquity as

emphasise that “they are simply trying to elucidate what the composers of the allegories intended to say. Neither writer offers his interpretations as the creative or idiosyncratic product of his own imagination, but simply as a clearer version of what ancient authors sought to communicate in myth or epic poetry”. Thus in this case the allegorical interpretation is meant to be a simple clarification and not a creative imagination.

¹⁷⁷Dawson, *Allegorical*, 129, claims further that “allegorical interpretation sometimes takes the form of new composition: the allegorical interpreter gives ‘other’ meanings to the narrative he is interpreting, but at the same time makes those other meanings represent characters and events in a new story, into which he surreptitiously weaves the old story”.

¹⁷⁸For the role of the scribes in producing copies of manuscript texts and the readers in conveying the right interpretation see Gamble, *Books*. He devoted his whole book in discussing and documenting the scribal production of books. Furthermore, Gamble, *Books*, also surveys the readers’ role in interpreting the text which they orally read in public. Cf. the critical review of Gamble’s book by Eldon J. Epp, “The Codex and Literacy in Early Christianity and at Oxyrhynchus: Issues Raised by Harry Y. Gamble’s *Books and Readers in the Early Church*”, *CRBR* 10 (1997): 15-37. See also Millard, *Reading*.

¹⁷⁹E.g. Dawson, *Allegorical*, 128, cites Valentinus as one who “erases the line between text and commentary, as interpretation becomes new composition” and that “his mode of allegorical interpretation is also distinctive because it is authorized by his claim for personal authority”. Dawson, *Allegorical*, 129, also points out how “ancient allegorical interpreters did not always maintain such a clear distinction between text and commentary”. Cf. the treatment of Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 57-69, on how Justin, Marcion and Valentinus handled “the embodiment of ‘teaching’ in ancient authoritative literature”.

¹⁸⁰This particular view is represented by Epp, *Theological Tendency* and Rice, “Alteration of Luke”. Other scholars also applied Epp and Rice’s approach to other manuscripts. See this kind of perspective on theological or doctrinal tendency traceable in certain papyrus manuscripts, e.g. K. W. Clark, “Textual”, 52-65, even before Epp and Rice had already demonstrated that P⁴⁶ acquired “textual-doctrinal variants”. See also Howard Eshbaugh, “Textual Variants and Theology: A Study of the Galatians Text of Papyrus 46”, *JSNT* 3 (1979): 60-72; and Mikeal C. Parsons, “A Christological Tendency in P75”, *JBL* 105 (1986): 463-79. For a more general treatment of theological bias examined in the text of the New Testament see Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*. Cf. C. K. Barrett, “Is There a Theological Tendency in Codex Bezae?” in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*, eds. Ernest Best and R. McL. Wilson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 15-27. Cf. also Black, *Holy Spirit*, 159-70, in his analysis of the “Western” “Holy Spirit” textual variants in D where he ends up classifying the readings that he investigated as: “(1) where the Holy Spirit inspires utterance; (2) where it directs action; and (3) where it is the pre- (or post-) baptismal Holy Spirit”.

¹⁸¹See my review of Read-Heimerdinger’s proposal that some of the deviating readings in the D text of Acts were due to Jewish exegetical technique in Chapter 2 beneath.

mimetic representation of the text.¹⁸² Thus the ancient theory of mimesis became relevant to the occurrence of allegorising variant readings in D. Linguistic analysis would still be useful in comparison with the parallel passages from other sources in antiquity. In this way such a proposal as the double version of Luke would not be necessary. This study, however, in the Gospel parables would give new light on how a conventional interpretation, like using allegorical approach, has also been influenced by a theological bias of the text. In the same manner, the allegorical reading of the text by an interpreter, that is presumed as well by the scribes, editors or readers¹⁸³ in their own respective relationship and interaction with the textual tradition that they inherited, would then have penetrated the text of the New

¹⁸²The sentiment that a text reflects the setting of the Christian community where it developed is well articulated by Eric Lane Titus, “The Motivation of Changes made in the New Testament Text by Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria: A Study in the Origin of New Testament Variation” (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1942), 8-9:

To the men who dealt with it in this early period, the text was more than a succession of words and letters. Their interest was not that of modern textual criticism on its more mechanical side. For them, the text was a thing of meaning, and that meaning met their own experience at certain points. The text expressed itself on themes running all the way from the doctrine of the divine Logos to injunctions on how to act in the Christian assembly. Between the extremes of sublime and prosaic utterance the text gave expression to a wealth of thought and experience touching life at almost every point. On the other side of the picture, the people of the second century enjoyed an experience as broad as the cosmopolitan character of their environment would signify. It was almost inevitable, therefore, that their experience should not always coincide with that expressed in the New Testament books. These points of difference, the result of cultural influences, the necessity of coming to terms with the world about them, and the development of dogma within the group, represent the points of conflict with the sacred writings.

These early Fathers probably illustrate in their writings the way in which these difficulties were overcome, for they recognized no discrepancy within Scripture itself or between Scripture and the essential facts of their own experience. To appreciate how this gap was bridged it must be borne in mind that this was a period of spontaneity, an era in the history of the text before it had achieved a high degree of fixity, before scholarship had begun its work of introducing some semblance of order.

¹⁸³Holmes, “Codex Bezae”, 142-52, outlines the role of the scribes, editors and readers in textual recension as he defines what recension is all about whether one is talking about “text type; radical alteration; redaction; and thoroughgoing revision”. Further, Holmes, “Codex Bezae”, 150-2., claims that “the early layer of variants in Codex Bezae...represents the results of a vigorous and intentional process of διόρθωσις” which can be attributed more to the work of an unknown “diligent Christian reader, well-schooled in the Greco-Roman literary culture, still in touch with non-canonical gospel traditions, who sought to ‘improve’ his text in the direction of greater readability” instead of a mere scribe who produce the manuscript text or an editor who revise the text reflecting a theological bias. Cf. Aland and Aland, *Text*, 69, who maintain that the text of the New Testament was a “living text” and that scribes who make copies “felt themselves free to make corrections in the text, improving it by their own standards of correctness, whether grammatically, stylistically, or more substantively”.

Testament.¹⁸⁴ Hence, probing D with a serious consideration of the literary context of its period would be more fruitful than the previous studies made concerning the language and the style of its text. Allegory, as literary composition or allegorical interpretation, as a conventional approach to text, in antiquity would bring new light in understanding D. Consequently, the allegorising variants as evidence of the conventional allegorical interpretation of text have contributed to the development of textual tradition behind the text of D. This theory is a potential addition to or even an alternative explanation of D's unique readings. Documenting such allegorical readings, using the Fathers' interpretation of the parables in Luke, would make the proposal more plausible. Interpreting the text of the parables allegorically in D contributes to the putting together of the pieces of D's puzzle. Thus allegorical readings of parables in the D text of Luke could have become allegorising variants within the allegorised parables' textual tradition. These allegorising variants could have made their way as one layer of tradition that has been fossilised in the layers of traditions within the text of D.

Delimitation of the Textual Investigation

Although there are still quite a few scholars who are trying to see the possibility of extracting the ipsissima verba of Jesus from the Gospel narratives,¹⁸⁵ particularly in the

¹⁸⁴See the discussion of Ehrman, "Use and Significance", 118-35, on how patristic exegesis is influenced by the textual reading that they use, why would scribes change the reading of the text they are transmitting and where would corruption most likely to occur. It is worth quoting Ehrman, "Use and Significance", 127, in full:

To be sure, scholars of a more historical bent may be concerned as well to establish the earliest form of a tradition for purposes of exegesis: one can scarcely understand what Paul, or Mark, or James meant unless it is known what they said. Nonetheless, from the historian's point of view, *it is important to know not only what an author wrote, but also what a reader read*. These texts have played an unparalleled role in the history of our civilization. And what is remarkable is that throughout this history, *virtually no one has read them in their original form. The history of exegesis is the history of readers interpreting different forms of the text. For the historian of Christianity, it is important to know which form of the text was available to Christians in different times and places*. And here again, the patristic evidence is of unparalleled significance. (The italics are mine.)

¹⁸⁵A recent collection of articles on this kind of attempt is reflected in Bruce D. Chilton and Craig A. Evans, eds., *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*, NTTTS 28/1 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999). A particular interest among the seventeen articles in this volume for textual criticism of the Gospels is that of Porter and O'Donnell, 105, who legitimise their study by pointing out that "there does not appear to be any inclusive study of the

parables spoken by Jesus,¹⁸⁶ the interest and assumption of this present research are in the opposite direction.¹⁸⁷ This writing argues to the contrary in the test case of D as a textual tradition that preserves what Jesus said and did. Textual critics even have difficulty in identifying the text type of D among the corpus of textual witnesses. The old way of classifying the D text as “Western” text type has already been abandoned. That is why whenever the expression “Western” is used it is always in quotation marks. J. K. Elliott notes that the D text “seems not to have been the representative of a type of text that gained or

variants in the sayings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, [none are thorough], systematic or complete”. Further, Porter and O’Donnell, 117, also recognise that “knowledge of patterns of variants among manuscripts” has been broadly overlooked in the study of the New Testament text in relation with the tradition of Jesus. See Stanley E. Porter and Matthew B. O’Donnell, “The Implications of Textual Variants for Authenticating the Words of Jesus”, in Chilton and Evans, 97-133. See also Maurice Casey, *An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); and Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript and Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*, 2 Vols. in one, trans. E. J. Sharpe, Biblical Resources Series (repr., Livonia: Dove Booksellers, 1998). Cf. Stanley Porter’s response to Casey’s Aramaic Approach to the words of Jesus in “Excursus: A Response to Maurice Casey on the Languages of Jesus” in Stanley E. Porter, *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research: Previous Discussion and New Proposals*, JSNTSup 191 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 164-80; and Peter Davids’ review of Gerhardsson’s thesis in Peter H. Davids, “The Gospels and Jewish Tradition: Twenty Years After Gerhardsson”, in *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*, Vol. 1, eds. R. T. France and David Wenham (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), 75-99.

¹⁸⁶The Gospel parables are a major source of the reconstruction of the authentic words of Jesus if they are put into the original life setting of Jesus as maintained by Jeremias, *Parables*. See especially 20-88 of Jeremias’ second chapter, “The Return to Jesus from the Primitive Church”. See also the discussion of Joachim Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, Part 1: *The Proclamation of Jesus*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1971), 1-41, on the reliability of “the tradition of the sayings of Jesus” in the Gospels and the issue of distinction between the ipsissima vox and the ipsissima verba of Jesus. Cf. Black, *Aramaic*, passim, in studying the text of the Gospels and Acts which brings the plausibility in recovering at least the ipsissima vox Jesu, if not the ipsissima verba. For a more recent discussion on the genuineness of the Gospel parables going back to Jesus see Philip Barton Payne, “The Authenticity of the Parable of the Sower and Its Interpretation”, in *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*, Vol. 1, eds. R. T. France and David Wenham (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), 163-207; and Philip Barton Payne, “The Authenticity of the Parables of Jesus” in *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*, Vol. 2, eds. R. T. France and David Wenham (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), 329-44. See also N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God*, Christian Origins and the Question of God, Vol. 1 (London: SPCK, 1992), 6-10, 74-7, 433-4; and N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, Christian Origins and the Question of God, Vol. 2 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 174-82, 229-43. Cf. Gerd Theissen and Annette Merz, *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1998, 316-46. Cf. also John Dominic Crossan, *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus*, 2nd ed. (Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1992); and Marcus J. Borg, *Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994), especially 147-8, 167-8.

¹⁸⁷Cf. the conclusion of D. C. Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 286, that highlights the “the earliest Christian transmission and its attitude to the sayings of Jesus” which is an instructive point concerning the nature of the Bezan text’s recording of the words of Jesus.

maintained influence in the Greek Church”.¹⁸⁸ Elliott, nevertheless, maintains that for sure there is no necessity to “diminish our regard for this manuscript as a witness to an important text-type or rule it out of court for its eligibility to preserve on occasion even uniquely the original text”.¹⁸⁹ The peculiar readings found in D pose a problem because of its deviating characteristic from other manuscript witnesses.¹⁹⁰ The discrepancies between the Alexandrian text type and the “Western” witness become much wider and difficult to reconcile when the text of D is seriously considered in the reconstruction of the original words and works of Jesus in the Gospels. D. C. Parker declares on page one of his magnum opus, *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and Its Text* :

Although some years of frequent communion have given me a peculiar affection, which would often seek to exculpate, for this manuscript, the fact is that the longer I have studied it, the more I have become convinced that its many unique readings only very rarely deserve serious consideration if one is trying to establish the best available text.¹⁹¹

Accordingly, it is neither the purpose of this work to argue for the “original text” of the Gospels, nor to investigate what would be the superior reading, or the more reliable manuscripts to reconstruct what was original.¹⁹² Rather this study examines the manner of interpretation used to understand the D text in the process of its textual transmission. It claims that the tradents who transmitted the text could only sensibly have transmitted the text

¹⁸⁸Elliott, “Codex Bezae”, 181.

¹⁸⁹Elliott, “Codex Bezae”, 181.

¹⁹⁰E.g. Scrivener, *Bezae*, viii, tells of Theodore Beza’s suggestion to Cambridge University that for D “to avoid giving offence through its extensive deviations from all other documents, however old, it was more fit to be stored up than published”. Cf. Aland and Aland, *Text*, 109-10.

¹⁹¹Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 1.

¹⁹²For a study on sorting and appraising the witness of manuscripts to the text of Luke see Frederik Wisse, *The Profile Method for the Classification and Evaluation of Manuscript Evidence as Applied to the Continuous Greek Text of The Gospel of Luke*, SD 44 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1982).

of the Gospels if they understood what they reproduced in the process of the making of their inherited textual tradition.¹⁹³

Assumptions of the Working Hypothesis

It is assumed in this current dissertation, that the D text of the Gospel of Luke as well as the rest of the books in the D manuscript has a free text genre as persuasively demonstrated and argued recently by Parker,¹⁹⁴ and as observed previously by Frederick H. Scrivener.¹⁹⁵ Although D is taken as a more loose text in contrast to the Alexandrian text type, it should be reiterated as well, that there are observable patterns of consistency in the surface of the text that may even indicate a possible careful editorial attempt that touched D with a traceable theological issue or doctrinal bias that are seemingly or even purposely crafted in the text when variant readings are evaluated.¹⁹⁶ A fundamental working hypothesis of this thesis is that the first Christian tradents who transmitted the early textual form where the D textual tradition originated, were in a Syro-Jewish environment.¹⁹⁷ Later, however, the shift of gravity in the growth of the New Testament text that would include D, came within a

¹⁹³Cf. Sanders, "Hermeneutics", 45-8.

¹⁹⁴See especially Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 284.

¹⁹⁵ Scrivener, *Bezae*, lxiii, describes the result of his examination of the D manuscript as notably "the excessive freedom of the Greek text and the anxious strictness of the Latin betokens for their respective births at different ages, actuated by very different principles of criticism".

¹⁹⁶Rice, "Alteration of Luke", 260-3, maintains that D is "the work of more than a mere copyist" who carefully edited the Gospel of Luke "in compliance with his theological biases". Holmes, "Codex Bezae", 141, observes a "deliberate" modification of "someone who was thoughtfully and intentionally" doing it and a "consistency" in improving the text in Matthew. Heimerdinger, "Contribution of Discourse", 267-70, in her discourse analysis of the D text of Acts, finds that there is "a high degree of inner coherence and remarkably close to the linguistic patterns" discernable in the text which is similar to that of Codices Sinaiticus and Vaticanus (see her summary of the thesis). Further, Heimerdinger, "Contribution of Discourse", 381, has shown by the use of discourse analysis in Acts that D is "a careful and knowledgeable reviser who had a specific purpose in mind". One of the important conclusions of Yoder's dissertation, 536, in his thorough study of "The Language of the Greek Variants" is "that alterations in the text were not made promiscuously". Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 285, concludes that definite broad indication is apparent on "the care taken in copying".

¹⁹⁷The acknowledged early date of the D text led Read-Heimerdinger in her reconstruction of the history of the D text to maintain a Syro-Palestinian origin of D. Birdsall, "Origin", 113-4, concludes that D was from Jerusalem. Kenneth E. Panten, "A History of Research on Codex Bezae", *TynBul* 47 (1996): 187, indicates that D came "somewhere in the East" and that "Syria or Jerusalem cannot be discounted".

Graeco-Roman literary milieu.¹⁹⁸ The Christian tradents did not depart from the ancient literary criticism practised by their predecessors. Instead they took hold of what was available for them to use.¹⁹⁹ Since the growth of the text of the New Testament became fruitful among the Gentiles, the literary conventions that influenced the text of the New Testament later in antiquity were to be more Graeco-Roman, than Syro-Jewish.²⁰⁰ Accordingly, the New Testament text did not develop in isolation from the Graeco-Roman literary convention.²⁰¹ Rather, the tradents who transmitted the text of the New Testament, such as that of D, utilized the literary convention of their time.²⁰²

Furthermore, it is also assumed in this writing that the tradents' role was to be faithful to the received Christian textual tradition in their transmission.²⁰³ However, this is not according to the letter but according to the spirit of the text as understood in the interpreted tradition.²⁰⁴ The tradents of the Gospels' text also made the transmission of the text relevant

¹⁹⁸See Streeter, *Four Gospels*, especially "Part I—The Manuscript Tradition", 25-148, on how the text of the New Testament grew and developed.

¹⁹⁹For both Jewish and Greek methods known in antiquity see Karlfried Froehlich, trans. and ed., *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church*, SECT (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).

²⁰⁰This perspective is contrary to Read-Heimerdinger's reconstruction of the Jewish background of the D text that has been shaped by Jewish exegetical technique.

²⁰¹For the primary texts in the ancient Graeco-Roman literary critical approaches see D. A. Russell and M. Winterbottom, eds. *Ancient Literary Criticism: The Principal Texts in New Translations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972).

²⁰²See G. D. Kilpatrick, "Literary Fashions and the Transmission of Texts in the Graeco-Roman World," in Kilpatrick, *Essays*, 63-72; repr. from *Protocol of Colloquy* 19 (1976): 1-8.

²⁰³William Henry Paine Hatch, *The 'Western' Text of the Gospels: The Twenty-third Annual Hale Memorial Sermon, Delivered March 4, 1937* (Evanston: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1937), 41, points out how D's unique readings would take for granted an earlier subsisting underneath text that has been modified: "This [existing text of D] implies revision, and revision in turn presupposes a previously existing text. Unfortunately this ancient base can be detected in only a few cases".

²⁰⁴W. H. P. Hatch, 'Western', 42-4, points out that both the Alexandrian and "Western" texts were edited. The difference, however, is that whereas the Alexandrian text was a "conservative" edition, and thus "superior", the Western text, although includes "early readings", was loosed edition and as a result is inferior. In this study Hatch traces the difference of the D text against that of the other text types, particularly the Alexandrian.

to the current circumstances of their community.²⁰⁵ The ancient theory of mimesis comes in the process of the dynamic and living²⁰⁶ textual transmission of the Gospels: First, the theory of mimesis took for granted that the text reflects real life conditions. Life, as it exists, is the model of arts and literature that creatively interpret it to make an aesthetic representation of what it offers.²⁰⁷ As a result, patristic exegesis approached the sacred text, such as the Gospel parables, with expectation that it should depict what is happening in the real world.²⁰⁸ Secondly, the authority in antiquity is the tradition received by a community. The literary approach to the transfer of textual tradition is the imitation of the established textual tradition. Literary imitation should be faithful to the traditional model that has been imitated in new circumstances and topics.²⁰⁹ Subsequently, for the Fathers, the employment of an allegorical approach of interpreting the Scripture text has a natural consequence of contributing to Christian mimesis.²¹⁰ An allegorical reading of text is capable of making a text directly

²⁰⁵See e.g. Richard I. Pervo, “Social and Religious Aspects of the ‘Western’ Text”, *The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders*, eds. Dennis E. Groh and Robert Jewett (Lanham: University Press of America, 1985), 229-41, especially 235-6, for his discussion of the variant readings of D in Luke. Cf. Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 29-45, on his analysis for the occurrence of “local” and “standard” texts.

²⁰⁶Cf. Parker, *Living Text*.

²⁰⁷See Halliwell, *Aesthetics*, 287-312.

²⁰⁸This concept is pertinent to the central thesis of my work. In particular, based on the two books of Young, *Biblical Exegesis and Art*, I maintain that the written Gospel parables can be presumed as mimetically understood by the early Fathers. My concept of ancient exegesis of the parables of Jesus that has been informed by the theory of mimesis has been explored in contemporary debate on parable interpretation by David P. Parris, “Imitating the Parables: Allegory, Narrative and the Role of Mimesis”, *JSNT* 25 (2002): 33-53. Parris, “Imitating”, 53, concludes that since the differentiation between allegory and parable is “not always clear” the parables should be allocated after a contemporary interpreter has “participated in the mimetic representation of the parable”. What Parris has tried to accomplish in the current debate on the interpretation of the parables of Jesus, I attempt to achieve in my study of the parables in the D text of Luke. I depict that the distinctive reading of the parables in Luke could have been informed by “mimetic representation” as well as “mimetic composition” shaped by allegorical interpretation of the tradents of D.

²⁰⁹Gert J. Steyn, “Luke’s Use of *ΜΙΜΗΣΙΣ*?: Re-opening the Debate”, in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*, ed. C. M. Tuckett, BETL 131 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 553.

²¹⁰See the reconstruction of Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 161-85, 248-64; and *Art*, 134-59, on how the Fathers’ assumption of the theory of mimesis has been highly informed by their use of allegorical and typological approaches that make “figural representation” due to mimesis become “both being so interwoven that a firm differentiation is very hard to make”. Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 161-2, succinctly states:

address theological issues. This kind of reading has an extensive border of context and with a wider understanding of the reference of the words within the text of Scripture.²¹¹ It is not just simply an indiscriminate kind of approach to interpreting the sacred text as has been supposed, but rather it has an exegetical framework of its own which is the received tradition of the community of faith.²¹² Hence, allegorical approach could be useful to make an interpretation of the Scripture text that is faithful to the received tradition, and informative of the doctrinal issues of then patristic age.²¹³

Moreover, it is also assumed in this study that the text of the New Testament as a Christian textual tradition, originated and was received and transmitted in such a manner that became useful for the early Christians in their dissemination of the Christian texts.²¹⁴ Thus the textual tradition of D is reasonably thought to have been transmitted according to the conventions of its time.²¹⁵ Therefore, if there could be parallels drawn from both Syro-Jewish and Graeco-Roman sources in the manner of how the peculiar D textual readings were

Allegory ceases to be story and becomes propositional; typology, on the other hand, retains the narrative and sequence... What I now propose is a distinction between ikonic and symbolic *mimēsis*, associating the first with Antiochene exegesis, the second with Alexandrian allegory. The distinction lies in a different perception of how the text related to that to which it was taken to refer: what I call ikonic exegesis requires a mirroring of the supposed deeper meaning in the text taken as a coherent whole, whereas allegory involves using words as symbols or tokens, arbitrarily referring to other realities by application of a code, and so destroying the narrative, or surface, coherence of the text. This would account for the Antiochene acceptance of typology even as allegory was criticised and rejected. (The italics are original.)

²¹¹So with Moisés Silva, *Has the Church Misread the Bible?: The History of Interpretation in the Light of Current Issues*, FCI 1 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987), 74, in his argument for a more balanced understanding of Origen's allegorical interpretation of Scriptures: "But we do an injustice to Origen and to most subsequent so-called allegorizers if we fail to note that they perceived their method as a broad approach to Scripture, one that was sensitive to the Bible's many figurative expressions, prophetic announcements, and suggestive associations".

²¹²Young, *Art*, 45-65.

²¹³As Hanson, *Allegory*, 97-129, surveys the primary Christian texts in antiquity in their use of allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures, what surfaces is that the allegorical reading of the patristic literature is fundamentally doctrinal in nature instead of being preoccupied with ethical matters.

²¹⁴See the theory of Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 53-108, on how the text of the New Testament developed, spread and witnessed by the Fathers.

²¹⁵So also Holmes, "Codex Bezae", 148.

received and transmitted they would bring fresh knowledge and a better understanding of the case of D.²¹⁶ By considering the early versions of the New Testament, together with the patristic witness and interpretation of the Gospel parables, the textual transmission of the parables in the D text of Luke with some of their peculiar readings, could be better informed.²¹⁷ By investigating how these parables were interpreted and how these interpretations influenced their copying would explain how the D text of Luke, as copied, was distributed, received and read among early Christian adherents.²¹⁸ Certainly the parables of Jesus were interpreted christologically by the Fathers whose allegorical interpretation was the well-known backbone of the early Christian exegesis of the Scripture text.²¹⁹ The foundation and constraint of the patristic allegorical interpretation of the parables, and the rest of the Christian Scripture as the early Fathers faced their opponents with their competing teachings, was the Church tradition that they trace from the apostles themselves,²²⁰ but was also

²¹⁶What becomes obvious when the intentional textual modifications are observed in D in its textual transmission is that there is that lack of constancy and irregularity of adjustments made by whoever was responsible for the unique readings. The crucial observation of W. H. P. Hatch, *Western*, 36, is instructive: “General consistency was often neglected by the ‘Western’ reviser or revisers, but contextual consistency was desired. Lack of the latter was more obvious and objectionable”. Moreover, W. H. P. Hatch, *Western*, 41, points out that: “When a change of some sort was introduced in one Gospel, very often the same alteration was not made in the parallel passages of the other Gospels”. Cf. Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 129-48, in his assessment on how interpolation and assimilation of readings may had happened in the D text as well as the Alexandrian text of the Gospels that has affected all streams of textual transmission.

²¹⁷Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 82-9, cites Origen’s curiosity on matters of textual criticism where he makes his textual decision and marking of glosses based on his familiarity of other extant manuscripts and variant readings, his knowledge of the scribal tendencies, his understanding of the context, his “cross-referencing” from other parts of the Scripture, his etymological reasoning, his comparison of words to help him in “the spiritualising process”, his understanding of “the elements, actions, characters or background” of the text, and his attitude toward the sacredness of the text.

²¹⁸The emphasis here is on the reception of Luke. In as much as this study is done in the manner on how the D text of Luke has been transmitted, it is also significant to consider the way Luke as a Christian text has been received by the early Church. The transmission and reception of the text are not separated in this investigation. The available knowledge for understanding the dynamics of the textual tradition, the transmission practice and the reception pattern of a text should be presupposed. Again, may I refer to the fine researches of Gregory, *Reception*, and Bellinzoni, “Gospel”, for the way Luke was received by the early Church.

²¹⁹See Robert H. Stein, *An Introduction to the Parables of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981), 42-7.

²²⁰A. F. Walls, “Papias and Oral Tradition”, *VCRECLL* 21 (1967): 137-40.

certainly shaped by the polemical and apologetic controversies in the early period of Christianity.²²¹ With this manner of responsibility, it is important to remember, lest it may be forgotten, that the Fathers of the Church consider themselves as the guardians of the apostolic tradition as well as the text of the New Testament. Thus a comparison of the writings of the Fathers on what they have to say about the parables of Jesus as recorded in the account of the third Gospel with that of the D text of Luke is used to explain the occurrence of the unique readings in D as part of the preferred methodology of this present thesis which will be discussed in the following chapter.²²²

²²¹Bart D. Ehrman, *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), calls the Fathers who won the doctrinal conflicts of their days as “proto-orthodox”. These Fathers according to Ehrman represents the stream of Christian tradition that later became known as the orthodoxy that dominated the Christian tradition throughout the history of Christianity. See also the magisterial classic work of Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, NTL, trans. and ed. Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel et al. (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1972) on his concept of heterodoxy in early Christianity. It is not the purpose of this thesis to interact with the issues that Ehrman (recently) and Bauer (previously) raised. Whether their reconstructions and theories of the ancient Church and the Scripture text are in right direction or improperly misleading it does not affect the central argument of this thesis. Suffice it is to say that if Ehrman and Bauer are correct, the allegorising and mimetic variant readings that could have penetrated in the Lukan parables in the D text could have been informed by the tradents who were acquainted or even interacted with the dogmatic questions that the Fathers and their adversaries debated.

²²² However, see especially the fourth and fifth chapters of this current volume for an actual comparison of the patristic writings with the distinctive readings of the D text in the parables of the Gospel of Luke.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES AND ANCIENT EXEGESIS

Contributions of the Various Approaches

A quick review of the pertinent approaches that have direct implications to this current dissertation and which have already been employed in the study of the D text is appropriate. The purpose is to highlight the methodological issues in examining D's textual problems. The intention of this present study of the D text of Luke to investigate the influence of allegory and mimesis on the New Testament text aims to take its place and its contribution to the ever-increasing interest in both the D text and the Gospel parables.¹ There is a special attention given to D by the textual critics due to the issue of "establishing a correct method" on approaching this enigmatic manuscript.² For this reason, a description and an evaluation of the most relevant methodologies to this research, as have been developed by those who have already examined D, is vital. In this way the perspective taken in this inquiry: that the archaic exegetical approach of allegory and the ancient literary theory of mimesis combined with the interpretation of the parables by the Fathers, can be put in the proper context of the development of research in the D text.³

¹I am indebted to Prof. Frances M. Young to see the connections between allegory, mimesis and the text in relationship with the parables and their interpretation. Most helpful is her section on "The Question of Method", in Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 186-212. The method that I developed in my study of the D text and the possible influence of allegory and mimesis in the Lukan parables is highly influenced by her theory on allegory and mimesis in the patristic literature.

²Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 183.

³To my knowledge only Parris, "Imitating", 33-53, has applied the combination of allegory and mimesis on the interpretation of the parables, albeit not in the D text. Before I obtained his article, I had already investigated the idea that allegory and mimesis could have penetrated the D text of the Lukan parables. I already explored Young's theory of allegory and mimesis to explain the unique readings of the D text in the third Gospel. I did not limit my investigation on mimetic representation based on the debate of Plato and Aristotle as Parris did in his article. Instead I have also examined the mimetic composition factor of the practice of literary imitation in antiquity. In particular, I see the plausibility of the harmonisation tendency of Luke in the D text as an attempt to have a literary imitation of Matthew. Perhaps, the third Gospel's harmonising tendency with Matthew is meant to bring the first Gospel's authority on Luke's text when used in a liturgical and a catechetical setting as well as a base text for a homily or a sermon in the ancient Church.

Tracing the progress of understanding this unique early fifth-century manuscript would articulate the status quaestionis of D.⁴ There is a perennial challenge to develop a suitable ancient model for reading D to put the development of its text in its own textual tradition and transmission in antiquity. An evaluation of the methodologies already used by others who studied D, albeit some of them in other books than Luke, would refine the method applied here.⁵ To explain that not a few odd readings of the Lukan parables in D are due to the penetration of allegorising and mimetic variants in its textual tradition is an exegetical approximation of understanding the deliberate changes made in the text of D. Hence, an understanding of the antiquated way of doing exegesis is crucial to comprehending how the ancient text of D has been interpreted and transmitted by the tradents who handled its textual tradition.

Search to Develop an Appropriate Coherent Method

Most of these various methodologies that are applied in D were tested in Acts for the obvious reason that it has the most number of variants in comparison with the four Gospels.⁶ The work that has been controversial and attracted attention is Epp's *The Theological*

⁴This kind of review in the research of the D text has been exemplified well by J. Neville Birdsall, *After Three Centuries of the Study of Codex Bezae: The Status Quaestionis*, in *Lunel Colloquium*, xix-xxx.

⁵Of particular interest is the doctoral work of Kenneth E. Panten, "A History of Research on Codex Bezae, with Special Reference to the Acts of the Apostles: Evaluation and Future Directions" (Ph.D. thesis, Murdoch University, 1995), 2-216, whose comprehensive survey starts from James Ussher (1657) and ends with D. C. Parker (1992). The rest of the thesis is an assessment of the previous works in the D text.

⁶For general and broad surveys of various methods and opinions on the D text see Albertus Frederik Johannes Klijn, *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts* (Utrecht: Drukkerij v. h. Kemink en Zoon N. V., 1949); and "A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts (1949-1959)", *NovT* 3 (1959): 1-27, 161-73; CroweTipton, "Theophilum", 8-19; Heimerdinger, "Contribution of Discourse", 3-19; Strange, *Problem*, 1-34; Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 183-93; Holmes, "Early Editorial", 1-32; Epp, *Theological Tendency*, 1-12; Ian M. Ellis, "Codex Bezae and Recent Enquiry," *IBS* 4 (1982): 82-100; and Birdsall, "Three Centuries", xix-xxx. Cf. a convenient evaluation of the history of research on the "Western" text of Acts and the current debate by Peter Head, "Acts and the Problem of Its Text", in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*, eds. B. W. Winter and A. D. Clarke, BAIFCS 1 (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993), 415-44; and a quick survey of the previous studies accomplished on the D text of the Gospels by W. H. P. Hatch, 'Western', 7-15. See also the bibliographical list collected by J. K. Elliott, *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts*, 2d ed., SNTSMS 109 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 49-53, for D.

Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts.⁷ Epp's approach is not really new.

Although the concept of theological tendency in D is usually associated with Epp, an earlier scholar, J. Rendel Harris, actually preceded Epp when he insinuated an unrelenting Latinism⁸ of the Greek side of the codex together with a theological tendency in D by pointing out that there are Montanist and Marcionite readings in the manuscript text.⁹ Although Epp did not get much support in his hypothesis,¹⁰ his monograph opened up the way for further inquiry in examining the unique readings of the D text in the Gospels.¹¹ There are two doctoral dissertations that were impelled by Epp's work, namely the studies of George E. Rice in Luke and Michael W. Holmes in Matthew. Two other important works that have gone beyond the theological tendency approach of Epp, i.e. the anti-Judaic tendency of D in Acts, made their important contributions on the way the D text could have been read in antiquity. The first one is that of Jenny G. Read-Heimerdinger, and the second one, that of Eric V. CroweTipton. Whilst Read-Heimerdinger used discourse analysis methodology and placed the D text of Acts as influenced by a Jewish exegetical tradition, CroweTipton used reader response theory and investigated Peter's reception by the community that used D. A review of Holmes and Rice is necessary to articulate their contributions on the editorial alterations on the D text of

⁷See page 10, footnote 53 of Chapter 1 in the section "Value of the Intended Approach".

⁸Harris, *Codex Bezae*, 107, states that "the Greek text has been thoroughly and persistently Latinized".

⁹ See Harris, *Codex Bezae*, particularly 148-59, 191-214, 226-8 for his exploration of Montanist evidence and 226-234, 235-240 for his discussion of Marcionite readings in D. Nonetheless, it is Epp, *Theological Tendency*, who has really treated D in the most thorough and careful way using a theological tendency approach in explaining the unique readings in Acts.

¹⁰For reviews of Epp, *Theological Tendency*, see H. J. Cadbury, *JBL* 86 (1967): 112-4; G. B. Caird, *ExpTim* 78 (1967): 237; R. P. Martin, *EvQ* 39 (1967): 174-6; A. R. C. Leaney, *Theol* 70 (1967): 461-3; I. A. Moir, *JTS* 19 (1968): 277-81; R. P. C. Hanson, *NTS* 14 (1968): 282-6; Z. C. Hodges, *BSac* 125 (1968): 79-80; R. H. Fuller, *CBQ* 30 (1968): 447-8; G. D. Kilpatrick, *VC* 24 (1970): 166-70; and Barrett, "Is There", 15-27.

¹¹To my knowledge nobody followed Eldon J. Epp in his "anti-Judaic tendency" theory on the D text of Acts, except his student George E. Rice who has written his dissertation on the anti-Judaic tendency of D in Luke. Michael W. Holmes was prompted by the works of Epp and Rice in D to investigate the anti-Judaic tendency in his dissertation on the D text of Matthew. However, unlike Rice he did a wider application and study of the early editorial activity in the D text of Matthew.

the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, respectively. A note of evaluation of Read-Heimerdinger and Crowe-Tipton's exegetical approach on the unique readings of D in Acts contributes to the editorial reasons argued by Holmes and Rice. The next works on D for reconsideration are a shorter study by A. J. Wensinck on the linguistic Semitism and the literary approach by Michael Mees on the D text of Luke. Their works also contribute to the search for an appropriate approach to understand the unusual variant readings in the D text of the third Gospel. Furthermore, the work of H.-W. Bartsch on the localised readings of the D text due to tradents' interference is also significant as well as D. C. Parker's thorough study of D as a physical manuscript representation of a bilingual textual tradition.

Holmes on Matthew

One of the few works and a very important contribution to the study of the Gospels in D is the doctoral dissertation of M. W. Holmes carried out in the Gospel of Matthew.¹² Holmes locates the number of variants he observes within a context of different kinds of editorial activity such as harmonisation, expansion and improvement of the D text.¹³ He acknowledges that "the evidence of the early editorial activity" of D in Matthew shows that "while some (e.g. Matt. 5:11) may be editorial constructions, most appear to reflect a process of selection and preservation rather than creation".¹⁴ He further contends that "the conclusion seems inescapable that many of the variant readings found in the Matthean textual tradition, including many of the more significant ones, are the result of intentional alterations" of the D text in Matthew.¹⁵ Holmes also deals with the issue of theological proclivity in the variant readings in the D text of Matthew. He maintains that there are variants that seemingly show a

¹²It is a pity that Holmes' significant doctoral dissertation written at Princeton Theological Seminary under Prof. Bruce M. Metzger has not been published for a wider audience.

¹³Holmes, "Early Editorial", 32-35. Cf. W. H. P. Hatch, '*Western*', 16-44, in his examination of the D text of the Gospels where he deals with the "addition, omission, substitution, and improvement" made by the scribes in the text.

¹⁴Holmes, "Early Editorial", 102.

¹⁵Holmes, "Early Editorial", 200.

possible “anti-Judaic” inclination and could be a product of “early editorial” work.¹⁶ Nevertheless, when all variants are gathered, those that are supposedly “anti-Judaic” or “Christological [in] nature” are “at best a tenuous possibility only”.¹⁷ Hence, Holmes argues that, setting aside Mt 26 and 27 that seemingly put the blame on the Jews for Jesus’ death, substantiation that D in Matthew has been influenced by a “theologically-motivated alterations” is meagre.¹⁸ Moreover, he asserts that: “Whatever other motives or causes may be discerned behind the editorial variations discussed in the present study, dogmatic or theological bias is not one of them”.¹⁹ Holmes’ work is a most balanced application in understanding the editorial activity of D in Matthew and makes a case that Matthew has not been influenced by bias in the way Luke and Acts were affected and raises the question of homogeneity of the text of the five books in D.²⁰

Holmes’ wide variant analysis shows that theological tendency in the D text of Matthew is not as evident as in Luke and Acts. His use of “editorial activity” to describe the alterations is appropriately used because the variants he surveyed are indeed “intentional” instead of simply being “accidental” in occurrences. He maintains the conscious endeavour in the part of an “early editor” to improve the text that he was transcribing.²¹ In another work Holmes insinuates that the over zealous editor of the D text of Matthew is actually a reader and not really a mere scribe who smoothed the text.²² He is careful in pointing out that this διόρθωσις which is representing “the results of a vigorous and intentional process” of

¹⁶Holmes, “Early Editorial”, 204-23.

¹⁷Holmes, “Early Editorial”, 223-36.

¹⁸Holmes, “Early Editorial”, 235-6.

¹⁹Holmes, “Early Editorial”, 236.

²⁰Holmes, “Early Editorial”, 236.

²¹See Holmes, “Early Editorial”, 238-58.

²²Holmes, “Codex Bezae”, 150-2.

editing, should be taken as an “early layer” of the D textual tradition.²³ Holmes opens up a whole new issue to investigate, i.e. the role of the reader in the process of διόρθωσις. Since his dissertation (written in 1984) he has qualified (in 1994) the result of his previous research that the editorial activity would be probably a work of a reader who edited the D text of Matthew.

The result of Holmes’ work leads to the necessity of further investigation on the early reader-editor responsible for the D text in Matthew in order to have a better understanding of the full extent of the implication of his touch on the recension of D. He asserts that his investigation leans toward “a single editor” instead of a series of scribes or editors responsible for this “early editorial activity”. His dissertation and article depict the activity of the early editor-reader of D in Matthew as a quality of a “second century διορθωτής” that discloses a loose way of treating the text of the Gospels.²⁴ Holmes’ contention—which is indebted to E. C. Colwell—is to view the early reader-editor as one person whose work is represented in the D text of Matthew, depicting a “text-type” that is a result of an “uncontrolled editorial activity”.²⁵ The sum of Holmes’ study is as follows:

If one were to characterize the “Western” text-type, the term “uncontrolled editorial activity” might be thought appropriate. All text-types are the result of a process; what distinguishes them is the kind of process involved. While the Alexandrian and Byzantine traditions had a particular scholarly or ecclesiastical standard that served more or less successfully as a means by which to control those two text-types, a leading characteristic of the “Western” text-type is precisely the apparent absence of any standard or control. Lacking any external guidelines, scribes and editors each followed his own proclivities, taste (or lack thereof), and judgment; the result is a text-type noted for diversity rather than homogeneity, for being unusual or unexpected rather than consistent. The present study has focused on one of these editors, whose efforts are preserved chiefly in Codex D. His work and that of

²³Holmes, “Codex Bezae”, 152-60. See also Black, *Aramaic*, 6-7, who notes that different “great texts had passed through the process of διόρθωσις; their more polished Greek is the work of later editors”.

²⁴Holmes, “Early Editorial”, 241-3; and “Codex Bezae”, 159-60.

²⁵See Holmes, “Early Editorial”, 257, in his reference to Colwell’s discussion on “Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts”, 45-55, especially 53-4, in Colwell, *Studies*.

unnumbered others, in ways sometimes conflicting, sometimes complementary, over the centuries is preserved in the witnesses to what is called today the “Western” text of Matthew.²⁶

Holmes, in his emphasis of the text-type developed or represented by D, took for granted the “Western” text type.²⁷ Whilst he does not intend to deal with the “Western” text type he is hesitant to study D as a manuscript on its own but feels the necessity that the “Western” text type should still be in view when one studies D. This attitude of keeping the “Western” text type in view is abandoned in my investigation of the D text of Luke. In addition, Holmes did not include variant readings that he considers errors committed by scribes, for he prefers to commit mistakes “on the side of caution” than to incorporate unrelated data in his investigation.²⁸ The problem with his over caution is that the variants in D—known for so many independent unique readings—would be limited in scope. The variants that would be included in the study are only those he judges as legitimate ones for investigation. One may judge a variant as scribal error, because of the assumption of a careless transmission, and yet Parker notes the scribe who copied D as a careful copyist. So, any unique reading in D could be potentially deliberate and should not be immediately dismissed as a mere scribal oversight. Likewise, although Holmes sees an over zealous reader-editor who made an uncontrolled revision of the D text of Matthew, he limits his editorial work to the improvement of the text.²⁹ However, as I follow the lead of Holmes, I stretch the role of the reader not only to smoothen the D text, particularly of Luke. The reader may gloss his interpretation of the text at the margin of the manuscript he is using, for

²⁶Holmes, “Early Editorial”, 257-8.

²⁷Holmes, “Codex Bezae”, 123-42, recognises that D is not a homogenous manuscript and that its text in Matthew has singular D readings. However, Holmes, “Early Editorial”, 7, presupposes that:

While Codex Bezae is the single most important witness to the ‘Western’ text-type, it must not simply be equated with that text-type; to do so is to commit a methodological error. Certainly any study of Bezae will have much to do with the ‘Western’ text-type, and the relation between the two will constantly be kept in view.

²⁸Holmes, “Codex Bezae”, 126-8.

²⁹Holmes, “Codex Bezae”, 151; and cf. “Early Editorial”, 252-4.

a reader usually gives an explanation of what he reads before his congregation during the Christian gatherings.³⁰

Rice on Luke

Aside from Holmes' work another major contribution in the study of the Gospels in D is the doctoral dissertation of G. E. Rice on the D text of Luke's Gospel.³¹ To put it simply, what E. J. Epp did to Acts, G. E. Rice did to Luke. The work of Rice on Luke about the alteration of the Lukan tradition in the variants of D follows Epp's approach very closely on the anti-Judaic bias of Acts in D.³² Rice practically argues that the preoccupation of textual criticism with collation of manuscript and identification of text types do not help in understanding the theological scope of a textual reading of a particular manuscript. Thus he went beyond simply the identification of the text types and examined the theological tendency of D in Luke especially the "Western" non-interpolations of Westcott and Hort in the light of "all" the detected variants readings in the Gospel of Luke.³³

It is noteworthy that the way Rice developed his thesis focuses much on the characters of the Gospel of Luke for the development of his main theory of anti-Judaic bias. Chapter 2 of his dissertation deals with Mary the mother of Jesus, John the Baptist, Peter and the close disciples of Jesus where he points out that they were promoted above their real importance in the typical Lukan readings.³⁴ A chapter follows on his analysis of the D amplification of Jesus in Luke³⁵ and another chapter deals with the healings of Jesus as proof of the

³⁰See my definition of an early Christian "reader" above on 28.

³¹Although like Holmes the dissertation of Rice, "Alteration of Luke", supervised by Prof. Eldon J. Epp at Case Western Reserve University, has not been published for larger accessibility, he came up with published articles that are revised materials from his thesis chapters and heavily dependent on his dissertation.

³²See the abstract of Rice, "Alteration of Luke", ii-iv. See also his conclusion on 260-3.

³³Rice, "Alteration of Luke", 1-13. (The underlined word is original.)

³⁴Rice, "Alteration of Luke", 14-87.

³⁵Rice, "Alteration of Luke", 88-122. Cf. Rice, "Luke 3:22-38," 203-8.

kingdom's presence and the Son of Man pictured to come in glory.³⁶ After a quick look at the Gentiles, with reluctance on the part of D to permit Jews and Gentiles to be under the same judgement of God and delivering the Roman soldiers from the guilt of crucifying Jesus,³⁷ Rice spends the rest of his remaining two chapters in expounding on the anti-Judaic standpoint in D.³⁸

Rice also spends a good number of pages in his article on the question of D's homogeneity on the anti-Judaic proclivity in Mark.³⁹ The assumption and method that he applies in his study of Mark's text in D are the same as he used in Luke. Rice challenged the claim of Ian M. Ellis⁴⁰ that the D text of "the Synoptic Gospels does not display the same highly distinctive characteristics" of Acts and that instead of "introducing his own expansions and alterations in order to convey his own particular theological bias", D actually reproduced the manuscript "from two separate sources, one—that of Acts—being a much freer text than the other".⁴¹ Rice argues that the anti-Judaic tendency "discovered by Epp in Acts are prevalent in Luke".⁴² But in Matthew, as investigated by Holmes,⁴³ "has not been affected by this bias in the same way or to the same extent as have Luke and Acts".⁴⁴ Rice's examination of D in Mark brings him to the conclusion that: "There is clear evidence of a bias lying

³⁶Rice, "Alteration of Luke", 123-58.

³⁷Rice, "Alteration of Luke", 159-73.

³⁸Rice, "Alteration of Luke", 174-259. See also Rice, "Anti-Judaic Bias", 51-7.

³⁹Rice, "Is Bezae Homogenous", 39-54, after giving a short recap of his work in Luke and Holmes in Matthew, particularly chapters 26 and 27, about the anti-Judaic passages they both investigated spent the rest of his article on the anti-Judaic tendency in Mark.

⁴⁰Ellis, "Codex Bezae", 86.

⁴¹Rice, "Is Bezae Homogenous", 39.

⁴²Rice, "Is Bezae Homogenous", 40.

⁴³See Holmes, "Early Editorial", 236.

⁴⁴Rice, "Is Bezae Homogenous", 41.

behind a limited number of variants in the D text of Mark. Whether a bias can be isolated behind a small number of other variants in D is tenuous”.⁴⁵ He affirms Ellis’ claim that there are not much unique readings in Matthew and Mark as in Acts and Luke.⁴⁶ Nevertheless, he corrects the view of Ellis by maintaining that although Matthew and Mark could have been reproduced from another source, “Luke must be placed with Acts”.⁴⁷ In any case, Rice clarifies that D is not a homogeneous one. Each book’s variants must be studied on their own. A generalisation of results from one book to include all would be misleading in providing conclusions.

To the credit of Rice is his depiction of the intentional changes in D—whether by addition, omission, alteration of words or phrases, transposition of words or phrases and so forth—presents a different reading of Luke. Simply doing the conventional analysis of the D text and counting of variants will never accomplish the same result as the study of Rice. Nonetheless, like Epp, Rice is criticised for methodological faults and anachronistic interpretation.⁴⁸ Rice, like Epp, also fails to provide a parallel explanation from the Fathers to support his anti-Judaic theory in the D text of Luke. Rather, his support comes from the modern theory of Hans Conzelmann.⁴⁹ D. C. Parker’s critique of Rice is incisive:

⁴⁵Rice, “Is Bezae Homogenous”, 41.

⁴⁶Rice, “Is Bezae Homogenous”, 53-4.

⁴⁷Rice, “Is Bezae Homogenous”, 54.

⁴⁸See Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 190-1.

⁴⁹The work of Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper & Row, 1961; repr., Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982) apparently influenced Rice, “Alteration of Luke”, for his use of Conzelmann’s work is notable in the footnotes of his dissertation that reflects Conzelmann’s theological ideas. Rice’s indebtedness to Epp, *Theological Tendency*, 41, also assumes that: “Hans Conzelmann has emphasized the tendency of Lucan writings to place all the blame for the crucifixion of Jesus to the Jews. This tendency is clearer in the Gospel of Luke than in Acts, and in fact, as Conzelmann admits, the book of Acts leaves no room for the Jews to be excused on the grounds of ignorance”. Epp, *Theological Tendency*, 41-2, further explores the dilemma of Conzelmann about the apparent contradiction of the “guilt” of the Jews against their “ignorance” in Luke-Acts. Epp, *Theological Tendency*, 42, argues that in D “these two attitudes no longer stand in sharp conflict, for in D the element of excuse is virtually absent, while that of guilt finds more emphasis”. So also is Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 190, who criticises both Epp and Rice for their use of Conzelmann as an anachronistic approach.

A further problem with the approach is that it fails to provide a history of the text to support itself. The idea enunciated by Rice, that the copyist of D, working with a manuscript of the ‘Western’ text, was an editor not a copyist, is at variance with what we know about ancient scribes, and with what we have found so far in this study. The lack of textual history is exacerbated by the fact that those who find theological tendencies seem to ignore the Latin text altogether.⁵⁰

Rice sees the importance of “examining all the variants” contending that it is necessary “to understand adequately the thinking and biases that may have led to some variant readings that exist in New Testament witnesses”.⁵¹ Yet in his work he just focuses on the textual variants in D that would support his anti-Judaic theory in Luke. Rice’s treatment of the D text of Luke falls into the trap of including only those readings that are favouring his theory.

Wensinck’s Linguistic Approach

In studying D, A. J. Wensinck followed the result of research that Acts has two versions and pursued the view of semitic influence in its text. A shorter study of A. J. Wensinck suggests, based on the lead of F. Blass,⁵² that Luke himself had issued a second edition of an earlier draft of his Gospel represented by D.⁵³ Wensinck concludes: “As to the reason why St. Luke wanted to correct his first text—of the Gospel as well as of the Acts—I may refer to Blass’ enquiry”.⁵⁴ The double-version-hypothesis is not necessary to explain the peculiar readings of D in Luke. This theory is easier to defend in Acts, as W. A. Strange has done in his monograph.⁵⁵ Many have already formulated the double version text of Acts,

⁵⁰Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 191.

⁵¹Rice, “Alteration of Luke”, 4. (The underlined word is original.)

⁵²The reference of Wensinck is Friedrich Blass, “Die Textüberlieferung in der AG”, *ThStKr* 67 (1894): 86-119. See also Friedrich Blass, “On Acts xv.34 and xviiiif.”, *ExpTim* 10 (1898-99): 88-90. Due to his thesis Blass published an edition of Acts: Friedrich Blass, ed., *Acta Apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter. Editio Philologica* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895).

⁵³Wensinck, “Semitisms of Codex Bezae”, 11-48.

⁵⁴Wensinck, “Semitisms of Codex Bezae”, 48.

⁵⁵See Strange, *Problem*, especially 167-89. A paragraph on the last page (189) of his monograph summarises his whole argument:

albeit in different forms, to explain the unparalleled difference between the D text and non-“Western” text.⁵⁶ Nonetheless, because only a substantial redaction of the D text in Luke compared to Acts is observed, there are enough explanations available from scholars that would not require the double-version-hypothesis.⁵⁷

Wensinck, together with F. H. Chase and Matthew Black, concludes as well that the Semitisms in Luke represent the Aramaic background of the tradition used in the Gospels.⁵⁸ Chase argues that Syriac idiom is reproduced in the D text of Luke and the other Gospels and certainly in Acts.⁵⁹ Black locates several readings in the D text of Luke and the other Gospels as well that several of these distinctive readings are due to Aramaism in the text.⁶⁰ J. D. Yoder, however, points out that the proof of Semitisms is not “homogeneous throughout the codex” and that the sorts he studied transpire most often in the vernacular Greek showing telling similarities with the Septuagint.⁶¹ Black also admits that because every “translation involves interpretation...then often we can only conjecture the nature and sense of the original Word”.⁶² The linguistic approach opens the plausibility of the influence of the original language of Jesus and the apostles in the formation of the peculiar readings in D.

The enigma of the text of Acts has produced a wide variety of interpretations and proposed solutions. The solution proposed here is that Acts suffered the fate, not uncommon in antiquity, of posthumous publication. The uncertain state of the draft copy from which its editors worked has given rise to the two great textual traditions present in our witnesses, both of which have Lucan traits, but neither of which is Lucan in all its readings. Our access to Luke’s second volume is by way of his editors, who were also his earliest interpreters.

⁵⁶See the review of the double-version theory of Acts by Strange, *Problem*, 3-34.

⁵⁷So also is Black, *Aramaic*, 278-9, who rejects the double-version approach to Luke.

⁵⁸See Wensinck “Unpublished Work”, in Black, *Aramaic*, 296-304. See also Wensinck, “Semitisms of Codex Bezae”, 9-48.

⁵⁹Chase, *Syro-Latin Text*.

⁶⁰Black, *Aramaic*, investigates both the Aramaic and Syriac elements that would have affected the text of the New Testament in his exploration of the Semitic influence in the text of the Gospels and Acts.

⁶¹Yoder, “Semitisms in Codex Bezae”, 317-21. The substantiation of Yoder’s findings is discussed in his doctoral dissertation.

⁶²Black, *Aramaic*, 275.

However, Yoder's conclusion that homogeneity is not present throughout Codex D, and Black's recognition that the original language can only be conjectured, diminish the possibility of Semitism as an explanation for the peculiar readings in D. Thus, Wensinck's linguistic approach to explain the distinct readings of Luke's D text becomes weak and harder to defend.

The case for a linguistic reason as an explanation for the odd readings of the D text of Luke is an important check and balance to an exegetical approach in order to explain the distinct readings of pertinent Lukan parable passages. Since Jesus spoke and taught in parables using Aramaic originally and not Greek or Latin the possibility of Semitic influence in the unusual readings of the D text in Luke cannot be discounted. Perhaps, instead of jumping to a quick conclusion that a reading is an allegorising variant, the possible etymology of a variant reading could be investigated in terms of the Semitic influence. In this way, the linguistic approach represented by Wensinck could be a caution in order to avoid an "ancient exegetical fallacy" based on the allegory and mimesis approach to the Lukan parables in the D text.

Mees' Literary Methodology

An important work using the literary approach contributed by Michael Mees is also pertinent to this discussion on the tendency of D. The wider approach of M. Mees locates the D text within the framework of the ancient literary context. He considers the nature of D's textual problem by putting it in a literary environment such as the *Gospel of Thomas*, rhetorical practice, the consequence of a Semitic shape of writing and Targum tradition.⁶³ Mees also places the message of Christ in the setting of liturgy and catechism.⁶⁴ Moreover, he also mentions the possible influence of the Diatessaron of Tatian and the *Gospel of*

⁶³Mees, "Lukas 1-9", 90.

⁶⁴Mees, "Lukas 1-9", 90.

Thomas pointing to a common tradition in D.⁶⁵ The Gospel quotations of the Syriac Fathers might have shared similar principles with D in quoting the message of the Evangelists.⁶⁶ As Mees cautiously investigates the total structure and appearance of the narrative, he shows how D variant readings fit in as one in the manner in which Luke's Gospel account is redone.⁶⁷ He deals with the distinctive readings in D that could be related to the Q source and suggests that the extra canonical sources could be another provider of these unusual readings of the D text.⁶⁸ Furthermore, Mees maintains that:

Es ist daher nicht ohne Belang, auf seine Quellen zu achten, wobei man allerdings weniger von literarischer Abhängigkeit wird sprechen können, als vielmehr von gemeinsamer Tradition. Noch wichtiger wird es allerdings sein, auf die von ihm geübte Veränderung innerhalb der Komposition zu achten.⁶⁹

Mees' approach is a significant development in the history of the investigation of D because of the way he puts his study in the literary form and the way Luke is retold. For Mees it is not without importance to pay attention to the possible sources of D whereby one will be able to see the parallels between them. Nonetheless, his emphasis is less of literary dependence. Rather, he highlights the commonality of the tradition of D and its sources. It will be still more important, however, for Mees to pay attention to the changes practised by D within its composition. It would be potentially fruitful to carry on his approach to other portions of the D text in Luke. Although Mees has carried out a methodical evaluation of variant readings in D in about half of Luke's Gospel and his preliminary sections to every journal article underscore the difficulties confronting a student of the Gospel of Luke in D,

⁶⁵Mees, "Lukas 1-9", 91.

⁶⁶Mees, "Lukas 1-9", 91.

⁶⁷See the specific examples discussed in a literary narrative manner in Mees, "Lukas 1-9", 93-110. See also Mees, "Lukas 10-11", 62-82; and Mees, "Lukas 12", 288-303. In these examples Mees explores how D's unique readings retell the narrative of Luke in a different way.

⁶⁸Mees, "Lukas 12", 285-8.

⁶⁹Mees, "Lukas 12", 288.

his assessment of the textual variants falls short in building up the retelling arrangement that provides a comparatively confident solution for the survival of abundant variant readings that have been fossilised in the D text. At times it seems that Mees entirely jumps over readings that are significant to the perception of the thoughts of D and which help to account for the occurrence of prior or subsequent variant readings in the entire narrative sections that he studies.

If Mees focuses only on Luke, using a wider application of his method, Bart D. Ehrman looks at broad textual variants and focuses on a single issue in the early Church, Christology. Because of Ehrman's closeness of technique with Mees, a quick comparison of the two is vital. In Ehrman's *Orthodox Corruption of Scriptures* he notes the theological tendencies in the reading of D in some pertinent christological passages.⁷⁰ He demonstrates the occasion and reason why alterations were made by the scribes of the New Testament text in the light of the debate about the person and nature of Christ.⁷¹ For him there is a crucial theological reason for intentional modifications that happened in the New Testament text. On the one hand, Mees in his work in D presupposes a "vielschichtig" text.⁷² The multilayered text of D, Mees notes, poses a problem in locating the original text. However, with the help of the Latin and Syriac texts it can be approximated and this kind of study leads to a debate as to whether the second-century text was actually a "Western" form of text.⁷³ On the other hand, what Ehrman has accomplished is that the synthesis of analysing the variant readings and the knowledge of the issues in the early church do not only provide an understanding of the reason for being of the textual variants but help to create a framework where textual

⁷⁰Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*.

⁷¹See e.g. Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 61-7, in his treatment of D's reading in Lk 3.22. He argues that in Lk 3.22 D's reading is the original.

⁷²Mees, "Lukas 10-11", 59.

⁷³Mees, "Lukas 10-11", 59.

readings of specific manuscripts can be analysed in terms of their theological magnitude.⁷⁴ He also puts the theological variants in a specific context where they may occur and situated the possibility of occurrences in the light of the scribal habits known to be practised in antiquity because of their theological proclivity which for some involved their sense of interpreting the texts as they reproduced them.⁷⁵ But Mees points out that if the original text cannot be reconstructed and that extra-canonical texts and extra-biblical tradition have replaced the New Testament text, the interdependence and degrees of the relationship of the text should be explored.⁷⁶ He proposes that, perhaps, early textual criticism found in ancient grammar and rhetoric could help in understanding the composition technique of the past.⁷⁷ Whilst Ehrman sees theological reason for Christological passages that he discussed, Mees goes to extra-canonical traditions and harmonisations just as Justin Martyr has done.⁷⁸ Thus Mees asserts that setting out the Christian kerygma with the help of extra-canonical tradition and ancient composition technique, may approximately present the nature of the D text that has shown harmonisations and additions as well as peculiar readings in Luke.⁷⁹

The ancient textual criticism and composition technique that Mees is talking about could be helpful in terms of understanding the Gospels in the manner of their diffusion. Perhaps, at first, the material behind the Gospels were oral lectures, and then learned by heart; later the acts and words of Jesus were orally transmitted and written down from memory.⁸⁰ It would be possible that the floating traditions, oral or written, could have been

⁷⁴See Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 47-273.

⁷⁵Cf. Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 274-83.

⁷⁶Mees, "Lukas 10-11", 60.

⁷⁷Mees, "Lukas 10-11", 60-1.

⁷⁸Mees, "Lukas 10-11", 61.

⁷⁹Mees, "Lukas 10-11", 62.

⁸⁰Mees, "Lukas 12", 285.

incorporated in the text of D later in the transmission of its text.⁸¹ In this particular suggestion of Mees the text of D is subjected to the kind of textual critical analysis and literary textual method used by the classical authors as well as the patristic writers. Although Mees suggests the use of ancient textual criticism and composition technique, he fails to identify and elaborate the heritage the Christian Fathers assumed from the classical literature.

Read-Heimerdinger's Discourse Analysis

Jenny Read-Heimerdinger⁸² employs “internal linguistic criticism” on the D text of Acts.⁸³ Linguistic discourse analysis has been applied by Read-Heimerdinger to gain a better understanding of the “origin” and “purpose” of the D text of Acts.⁸⁴ Her collation bases against D are **ℵ** and B which help her to argue that the D textual tradition was a little earlier in date than the Alexandrian text type. That the D text is an earlier text than the Alexandrian **ℵ** and B is the basic assumption of Read-Heimerdinger's work.⁸⁵ Her utilisation of discourse analysis leads her to conclude that whilst the Alexandrian witnesses present Acts as a historical record, the “Western” D is practically depicting a coded theological representation of the accounts.⁸⁶ She argues that the D text exhibits an outstanding measure of linguistic regularity and a lucidity of purpose that is inherently theological, with a striking Jewish

⁸¹Mees, “Lukas 12”, 285-7.

⁸²J. G. Heimerdinger is the name written on her thesis whilst in her monograph it is Jenny Read-Heimerdinger. Her earlier journal articles are named Heimerdinger and her later published writings use Read-Heimerdinger. For convenience sake, since the reference is on the same author, Read-Heimerdinger will be used in the text of this dissertation throughout, whilst footnotes citations will use whatever name she used in her works that are being cited.

⁸³Heimerdinger, “Contribution of Discourse”, is a doctoral thesis supervised by Prof. J. K. Elliott at the University of Wales, Bangor. Read-Heimerdinger also published some updated chapters of her dissertation with her recent published articles as a monograph, *The Bezan Text of Acts*.

⁸⁴Heimerdinger, “Contribution of Discourse”, 1.

⁸⁵The view that the textual tradition of D is earlier than the Alexandrian textual tradition is sustained and further expounded in Josep Rius-Camps and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition*, Vol. 1, *Acts 1.1-5.42: Jerusalem*, JSNTSup 257 (London: T. & T. Clark International/Continuum Imprint, 2004).

⁸⁶Read-Heimerdinger, *Bezan Text*, 24-5, 351, 353.

attention. Thus Read-Heimerdinger concludes that D is earlier than the Alexandrian witnesses.⁸⁷ She points out that because some of the readings of D, although not substantiated by Greek witnesses, are well authenticated by the early translations it may well have been that the D text was very early indeed. The ancient versions that disclose parallel readings with D show that the D textual tradition is ahead of time than the Alexandrian text type. Probably, because the D text was narrowly transmitted having been prepared to serve a definite Christian body, it did not have the character to be reproduced and applied for other church settings, conserving it in its earliest form.⁸⁸

Read-Heimerdinger's argument for the coherence of D also leads her to believe that the reading of the D text in Acts is the work of a single editor.⁸⁹ She unlocks another door for the issue of inner biblical exegesis in the D text of Acts by the editor.⁹⁰ Read-Heimerdinger maintains that an editor improved the D text to convey a coded message using a coded language.⁹¹ She develops this kind of approach to enlighten some of the distinct readings of D. This then brings the issue of interpretative method up front. She draws on the category of an editor who has internally edited D. Read-Heimerdinger shifts the debate on theological

⁸⁷Read-Heimerdinger, *Bezan Text*, 355; cf. 201.

⁸⁸Read-Heimerdinger, *Bezan Text*, 353.

⁸⁹Read-Heimerdinger, *Bezan Text*, 32-3, 94, 115, 200, 273, 338, 348, 350, 352.

⁹⁰See her examples of Jewish exegetical technique applied to pertinent passages in the D text in Heimerdinger, "Contributions of Discourse", 272-380. See also three of her articles based on her dissertation: Jenny Heimerdinger, "The Seven Steps of Codex Bezae: A Prophetic Interpretation of Acts 12", in *Lunel Colloquium*, 303-10; Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, "Barnabas in Acts: A Study of His Role in the Text of Codex Bezae", *JSNT* 72 (1998): 23-66; and the section "Le Portrait de Paul" in Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, "Les Actes dans le Codex de Bèze: Leur intérêt et leur valeur", *DA* 279, *Saint Luc Évangéliste et historien*, (Dec 2002-Jan 2003): 44-55. Cf. J. Read-Heimerdinger, "Where is Emmaus? Clues in the Text of Luke in Codex Bezae", *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts*, ed. D. G. K. Taylor, TS 3rd Series 1 (Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1999): 229-44, where she applies the same principles that she used in her articles in Acts. Moreover, see Jenny Heimerdinger, "La foi de l'eunuque éthiopien: le problème textual d'Actes 8/37", *ETR* 63 (1988): 521-8; and Jenny Heimerdinger, "La tradition targumique et le Codex de Bèze: Actes 1:15-26", in *La Biblia i el Mediterrani: actes del Congrès de Barcelona, 18-22 de setembre de 1995*, 2 Vols., ed. Agusti Borrell, Alfonso de la Fuente and Armand Puig, Scripta biblica 1-2 (Barcelona: Associació Bíblica de Catalunya: Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat, 1997), 2:171-80.

⁹¹Read-Heimerdinger, *Bezan Text*, 24, 310; and Heimerdinger, "Contributions of Discourse", 384-5.

tendency of D to the plane of hermeneutical technique in order to explain the origins and reasons of the D variant readings. She sets the discourse of the D text of Acts in the Jewish context when D was in early transmission. Although Read-Heimerdinger contends that the possible background for the D text of Acts is Jewish thereby identifying its implications in D, she fails to clearly define what kind of Jewish hermeneutical system was used in the D textual tradition to supplement its supposedly theological reading against the plain historical reading of **ℵ** and B.⁹²

Read-Heimerdinger insists that her use of linguistic method is an indispensable element of that feature of textual criticism identified as ‘internal criticism’ that is generally related with “the eclectic method whereby readings are evaluated according to how well they match an author’s habitual use of language”.⁹³ Her method is the applied linguistics of discourse analysis, which she combined with the modified theological approach in using a Jewish hermeneutical model.⁹⁴ The wider application of her discourse analysis and the retelling of the story in Acts are jointly applied to the D text.⁹⁵ Read-Heimerdinger’s work is heuristic to my interest in the influence of allegorical interpretation in the D text because she

⁹²Read-Heimerdinger, “Barnabas in Acts”, 66, simply describes her analysis of the inner biblical Jewish exegesis in the D text of Acts as “traditional Jewish techniques of exegesis”. She explains that the representation of the D text is Jewish in perspective “with sustained use of methods of scriptural interpretation typical of those found in early Jewish literature”. See Read-Heimerdinger, “Barnabas in Acts”, 29-34. However, it is premature for Read-Heimerdinger, “Barnabas in Acts”, 33, to claim without any strong basis in her “initial explorations” in Luke that the results of her study in Acts “indicate that the same [pattern] is true” in the third Gospel. Nevertheless, she is cautious in her admission that “it is not possible yet to say more about the Bezan text outside that of the book of Acts”. Her basis here apparently is her article “Where is Emmaus?” which is her exploration of the D text’s reading of Lk 24:13 with a deviating spelling of Οὐλαμμοῦς from P⁷⁵ and B’s Ἐμμοῦς. The particular problem of this D reading is treated by Chase, *Syro-Latin Text*, 109, giving two options of dealing with the problem. Chase points out that this is either a textual corruption traceable in the Syriac or a “reminiscence of the LXX reading in Gen. [28:19]”.

⁹³Heimerdinger, “Contribution of Discourse”, 1-2, acknowledges G. D. Kilpatrick as the one who advanced the [thoroughgoing] eclectic method.

⁹⁴See my full review of Read-Heimerdinger’s monograph in Roli G. dela Cruz, review of Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism*, RRT 10 (2003): 385-7.

⁹⁵dela Cruz, review of Read-Heimerdinger, 386.

applies typological categories in relationship with her result in discourse analysis. However, her understanding of typology and her assumption of the Jewishness of the D text are too narrow. She neglects to consider that the text of the New Testament, including D, developed in Gentile soil.⁹⁶ For this reason, Greek literary, textual and hermeneutical methods cannot be simply set aside in favour of the Jewishness of the D text. Read-Heimerdinger's preoccupation with the arrangement of words, connectives in the sentences and clauses, use of prepositions and other grammatical points leads to her claim of the textual coherence of D in Acts.⁹⁷ This claim, nonetheless, is not a claim of homogeneity of the text of D, for Yoder and others have already exhibited that D is not a homogenous codex even in every book. The claim for the coherence of the D text could be attributed to the polishing made by an editor in the process of textual transmission as Read-Heimerdinger supposed to have been made by a single editor. Nevertheless, the homogeneity of the D text can be measured, based on the sources of the existing D text compared with other text types as W. H. P. Hatch has done in his study of the D text of the Gospels.

CroweTipton's Reader Response

V. E. CroweTipton has written another significant dissertation on the D text of Acts.⁹⁸ He used a socio-rhetorical reading of Peter in Acts.⁹⁹ His approach in using the modern theory of reader response criticism is able to stress the importance of understanding how D is read in its own general context of textual tradition. The application of CroweTipton's

⁹⁶See Aland and Aland, *Text*, 48-71.

⁹⁷See Roderic L. Mullen, review of Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism*, *JTS* 55 (2004): 262-6, whose perceptive critique of Read-Heimerdinger's proposal of the "marked" and the "unmarked" forms of words in the D text highlights the issue of the "variable scribal habits" that are related to syntactical features, the use of article, the appropriate prepositions, proper connectives, spelling of words and other grammatical points. Cf. Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, "The 'Long' and the 'Short' Texts of Acts: A Closer Look at the Quantity and Types of Variation", *RCatT* 22 (1997): 245-61.

⁹⁸CroweTipton's doctoral dissertation, "*Theophilum*", written at Baylor University, was supervised by Prof. M. C. Parsons.

⁹⁹Cf. J. Crehan, "Peter According to the D-Text of Acts", *TS* 18 (1957): 596-603.

hypothesis is narrowly applied to Peter as a major character in Acts. CroweTipton reconstructed the socio-political symbolic world of the third and fourth centuries and applied the contemporary theories of reader response criticism.¹⁰⁰ His study is “to heed Epp’s call by providing a comprehensive treatment of the concept of reader(s) and offer plausible reading(s)” in the D text of Acts.¹⁰¹ He places the reading perspective of D in a more general Christian community context in the fifth-century and analyses the “reading experience” of Peter in the D text of Acts by the broader reading community that he reconstructed.¹⁰² The interesting part in CroweTipton’s work is his application of his reconstructed world and reader of the D text in terms of “the innertexture, the intertexture, and the extratexture”¹⁰³ perception of Peter based on the “horizons” of the reader that are “distinct yet intertwined”.¹⁰⁴ CroweTipton aims to elucidate the question on “how a general community, given its context and ideological commitments, would have understood” the peculiar text of D in Acts.¹⁰⁵ He concludes that since Christians were no longer persecuted and the Church was already stable “[r]eaders in that context would have well understood the popular, or maybe better, *orthodox* understanding of the text”.¹⁰⁶ CroweTipton also deduces how in the D text “Peter is the protagonist of the first half of the story” and that there is a definite “literary role [that] is

¹⁰⁰See his reconstruction of the world of D in CroweTipton, “*Theophilum*”, 26-71.

¹⁰¹CroweTipton, “*Theophilum*”, 2.

¹⁰²For the reconstruction of the reader of D, see CroweTipton, “*Theophilum*”, 72-116.

¹⁰³CroweTipton, “*Theophilum*”, i, defines his usage of his three big terms:

The innertexture focuses on the level of the text itself and how the text teaches the authorial audience to read. The intertexture focuses on the use of significant intertexts, progenitors that have both influenced and were adapted by Codex Bezae and the authorial audience. The extratexture focuses on the cultural and social texts—social norms—that comprise the baggage the authorial audience brings to the reading process. These three horizons are intertwined to provide a holistic reading that attempts to account for each of these unique levels reading response.

¹⁰⁴See CroweTipton, “*Theophilum*”, 117-278, in his reading of the reader’s reading of Peter in the D text of Acts.

¹⁰⁵CroweTipton, “*Theophilum*”, 280.

¹⁰⁶CroweTipton, “*Theophilum*”, 280. (The italics are original.)

confirmed” that he plays in the narrative.¹⁰⁷ Further, he points out how D was “meant to be read inclusively, not variant by variant or by theological lines of thought, but from beginning to end” so that the reading “emphasizes not what was in the mind of the author/editor(s), but what those individuals wanted to place in the mind of the reader” that would effect “an unmistakable emphasis on Peter as a witness of Jesus and on his role in bringing about a new ideological revival in the people of God”.¹⁰⁸ CroweTipton, moreover, reckons that the D text is “self-sustained and has given us the evidence we need to decipher its meaning” and that “Peter’s narrative function was to provide for the authorial audience an example of what it meant to be a witness, to reveal how Jesus could work through a witness, and to accomplish the mission Jesus called Peter to, the redefinition of the people of God”.¹⁰⁹ The way CroweTipton seriously took the broad readership of the D text of Acts is crucial in his argument. Thus the result of his reading of Acts in D anticipates how the text has been girded by the “author/editors” to be perceived by the targeted broader audience of the D text. The most important contribution of CroweTipton’s dissertation is the way the reader of D would have perceived Peter as represented in the unique text of Acts. In other words he answers how the unique text of D depicts Peter for the audience’s delight and benefit. A secondary contribution of his work is that by recognising D as a scripture for its broad audience and Peter’s role as a “metonymic witness” for its general readership it makes “ancient manuscripts”, such as D, contain “greater value than their textual variants” for it was “read by real readers”.¹¹⁰

There are several defects, however, in the approach developed by CroweTipton. First of all, he collated D against the Greek New Testament of the United Bible Society (UBS⁴)

¹⁰⁷CroweTipton, “*Theophilum*”, 280-2.

¹⁰⁸CroweTipton, “*Theophilum*”, 282.

¹⁰⁹CroweTipton, “*Theophilum*”, 282-3.

¹¹⁰See CroweTipton, “*Theophilum*”, 283-4, for his evaluation of his work’s contribution to the store of knowledge in the understanding of the D text of Acts.

which is the same text as that of Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece (NA²⁷). Although he himself recognised the problem that UBS⁴ and NA²⁷ did not exist in any textual tradition because of their eclectic nature he still fell into the trap of using it as a control text to elucidate the peculiar reading of D that would help him to articulate his socio-rhetorical reading of Peter. He should have chosen another manuscript as a collating base instead.¹¹¹ Secondly, he makes the reading of D too narrow and has forgotten the fact that as a New Testament text it had at least about four hundred years of transmission and development until it became extant as it is. The variant readings that he has discussed could plausibly occur during the socio-political context of the history of the late ancient Graeco-Roman world. It is difficult to be precise about the period where the variant readings in D occurred. Nonetheless, it should be remembered that the fluidity of the text of the New Testament is particularly traceable during the early period and yet at this time D was not yet extant.¹¹² Thirdly, although his work is instructive in that the D text should be read in a certain context of the church in crisis he falls into an anachronistic approach. He read Peter in the D text of Acts in the lenses of current theories of reader response approach to texts. Nonetheless, having criticised CroweTipton's anachronistic approach, it should be stated that his argument that D should be read in a context where its textual tradition could have arisen in order to understand the reason for being of the peculiar readings preserved in its text, is valid. He opens anew the issue of how D was read publicly and the impact of this reading to the Christian communities that might or might not have been aware of other readings of Peter in Acts.¹¹³ CroweTipton's isolation of the reading of Peter in the D text of Acts, although a

¹¹¹See the warning of Epp, *Theological Tendency*, 35-7, on using an eclectic text as a base text for collating D because it never existed and cannot represent the original. See also Holmes, "Early Editorial", 35-8, on the problem of using an eclectic text as a base for collation of D in Matthew.

¹¹²See Birdsall, "Western Text", 3-17.

¹¹³Note, however, that Parker and Heimerdinger have different interpretations than CroweTipton in explaining the reason for the existence of the celebrated distinct reading of the D text in Ac 12.10, κατέβησαν τοὺς ζ' βαθμοὺς καί. Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 190, suggests that perhaps the reading "could conceivably be claimed as a theological variant providing some mystical or allegorical sense to the passage". Heimerdinger,

narrow reading of the Acts narrative, elucidates not only the development of the New Testament text but also contributes much more to our knowledge of how Peter was known in the early Church.

Bartsch's Localised Reading

The work of Hans-Werner Bartsch, although only a short article, is very significant in understanding the nature of the D text.¹¹⁴ Thus, it is justifiable for me to spend several pages in making a thorough review of his one article that made an impact to the shaping of my understanding of the D text of Luke. Bartsch describes how the early Christians handled the text of the Gospels. The specific manuscript that he used is D. Bartsch argues how the unusual readings in D could have been localised in the sense that the editors or tradents freely modified the text of the Gospels after their own needs.¹¹⁵ He also points out that:

Der Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis, für die Erstellung eines Urtextes zurecht wenig geachtet, läßt uns einen Einblick in diesen Umgang der frühen Christenheit mit dem Evangelientext tun, weil er uns eindeutig erkennen läßt, daß der uns vorliegende Codex selbst eine längere Geschichte von Abschriften hinter sich hat.¹¹⁶

The significant thing that Bartsch has established is the way D has been transmitted and preserved as a Christian text. In the production of the D text there is little respect for the

“Seven Steps”, 309, thinks that it is due to an allusion to “Ezekiel’s vision” on the “temple symbol” where “exact specifications are given concerning the number of steps which are to be built at each of the doors of the Temple” which “the three outer doors, and at those alone, there are to be seven steps”. CroweTipton, “*Theophilum*”, 249, explains it due to an “ideological facet” that could be “a literary focalizing device that changes the scene and points toward freedom”. Further, CroweTipton, “*Theophilum*”, 261, contends that: “Going down ‘seven steps’ Peter literally left behind any doubt that God was with him and brought salvation to him. This physical movement also represents an ideological move for Peter. He leaves behind any doubt as he descends those seven steps”. Cf. Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*, trans. Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 384, who in his discussion of D’s reading in Ac 12.10 points out that although there could be “local knowledge” or ‘topological knowledge’ of D about Peter’s imprisonment, we simply “do not know the place of captivity”. C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, 2 Vols., ICC (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994-1998), 1:581, with similar comment to Haenchen adds a note as well that “it is hard to see what theological or other point could be served by the addition. Reference to Ezk 40.22, 26 provides no explanation”.

¹¹⁴Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 285-6, commends Bartsch’s work as something that should be followed up because of his recognition that D has little respect for the production of the original text of the Gospels. See Bartsch, “Cantabrigiensis”, 167.

¹¹⁵Bartsch, “Cantabrigiensis”, 167.

¹¹⁶Bartsch, “Cantabrigiensis”, 167.

original form (the Urtext). This should be the appropriate view concerning the early Christian handling of the text of the Gospels. D should be recognised as having a longer history of transmission behind its tradition as a manuscript. The text of D has been frequently modified through the repeated copying of its prototype (the Urform).¹¹⁷ Bartsch in this short journal essay examines three representative factors that determine the nature of the available text of D as it exists now:

1. Abschreibfehler, die auf verschiedene Abschriften der Urform des Textes zurückgehen.
2. Gesonderte Überlieferung, die dem ersten Schreiber des Textes vorgelegen hat, und
3. Selbständige Eingriffe des ersten Schreibers in den ihm vorliegenden, überlieferten Text.¹¹⁸

In each of the factors listed, Bartsch gives specific examples. In the first factor Bartsch explores the copying errors, which go back to different copies of the prototype of the text. He describes how errors could have been corrected in the process of copying during the textual transmission.¹¹⁹ Having given a few examples from Mt 10.25, Lk 6.45 and Mk 6.21, he argues that D's distinct readings are not always senseless.¹²⁰ Bartsch gives further examples of obvious mistakes in copying and misunderstanding of readings but cites an example in Lk 2.13 wherein a mechanical mistake and conscious alteration cannot always be clearly differentiated.¹²¹ He also cites instances where a clear interpretation of the text was decided in the D reading such as in Mk 3.21, Lk 2.8, 10 and John 7.5.¹²² Thus Bartsch maintains that in terms of the sociological structure of early Christian communities, to which

¹¹⁷Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 167.

¹¹⁸Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 168.

¹¹⁹See Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 168-72.

¹²⁰Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 168.

¹²¹Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 169.

¹²²Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 169-70.

those different copies of the text go back, these communities belonged to the lower layer of the textual strata.¹²³ He further points out that these copies were not done professionally and yet their use was rather continuous which then developed in single copies after the main collection.¹²⁴ Moreover, he maintains that the tiredness of the scribes is the simplest reasonable explanation for some of the peculiar readings.¹²⁵ Bartsch challenges the linguistic explanation and sees a possibility of discerning a theological reason for unique readings:

Kontraktionen von Wörtern und grammatischen Formen weisen zudem auf eine Umgangssprache hin, die sogar mundartliche Züge tragen könnte, obwohl wir dies nicht belegen können, weil die damals gesprochene Mundart sich literarisch nicht niedergeschlagen hat. Wenn wir jedoch trotz manchmal sinnentstellender Fehler ein Mitdenken des Abschreibers feststellen konnten, so dürfen wir darin ein Zeugnis des Glaubens dieser frühen Christenheit erkennen.¹²⁶

Another factor that Bartsch deals with is the separate traditions, which were present in the first scribe of the D text. He gives good examples to illustrate his point. As his primary example, he deals with the celebrated enigma of the additional logion in Lk 6.4 of D. Bartsch argues that even at first sight it is already noticeable that the form of the logion is strange to the New Testament, particularly within the Synoptic Gospels' tradition.¹²⁷ The logion is a matured literary form that could have been developed by a Graeco-Roman rhetoric and that παραβάτης τοῦ νόμου and ἐπικατάρατος can be met only in Paul.¹²⁸ Moreover, Bartsch gives examples of longer passages from D such as the addition in Mt 20.28 that corresponds to Lk 14.8-10. Bartsch points out that although the contents are parallel the wordings used are not; and that several words used in Mt 20.28 of D are not even in the New

¹²³Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 171.

¹²⁴Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 171.

¹²⁵Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 171-2.

¹²⁶Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 172.

¹²⁷Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 172.

¹²⁸Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 172.

Testament but only to be found in the classical writers.¹²⁹ He further observes that there is also a parallel in the Lk 22.26-28 text of D to that of Mt 20.28 but in comparison with NT²⁶ (i.e. NA²⁶) it has a different reading.¹³⁰ Thus Bartsch maintains that this kind of reading in Mt 20.28 is an interference of the scribe into the textual tradition from a separate tradition and not from Lk 14.8-10 neither from Lk 22.26-28.¹³¹ Some other examples by Bartsch are from Lk 5.3 showing that there is a singular idiom used in D similar only to Aristophanes, *Vespae* 213 and Lk 5.5 demonstrating that there is a verbal parallel with Mt 18.17 and yet more likely to be from an independent tradition.¹³² He points out that the whole pericope has a different D text characteristic. The stress of Peter's obedience is remarkable.¹³³ The other passages he cites in Luke such as the Gethsemane pericopae in 22.43f. where D's reading could be older, but due to a developed Christology the other manuscripts deleted it.¹³⁴ The crucifixion scene in Lk 23.35-38 is different in D. Bartsch suggests that the tradition shown by D is original (ursprünglich) in relation to the Synoptic parallels.¹³⁵ The last example that he gives is Lk 23.53 where earlier in verse 37 the D reading is a parallel in adding a separate tradition that enhances the story and shows the development.¹³⁶

Lastly, Bartsch tackles the independent interferences of the first scribe into the transmitted textual tradition that is available to him. However, Bartsch admits that:

¹²⁹Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 173.

¹³⁰Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 173-4.

¹³¹Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 174.

¹³²Lk 5.3 in D has ὅσον ὅσον against the Alexandrian ὀλίγον. In Lk 5.5 D reads οὐ μὴ παρακούσομαι (—σομεν D²): καὶ εὐθὺς χαλάσαντες τὰ δίκτυα. Mt 18.17 uses the verb παρακούσῃ twice. See Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 174.

¹³³Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 174-5.

¹³⁴Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 175.

¹³⁵Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 176.

¹³⁶Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 176.

Selbständige Eingriffe des Autors von Codex Bezae lassen sich selbstverständlich mit Sicherheit nicht nachweisen. Sie werden jedoch implizit von der Textforschung immer dann angenommen, wenn man von einer Angleichung des Textes an synoptische Parallelen spricht.¹³⁷

In other words, free intrusions of the tradent of D cannot be confirmed with certainty.

Nevertheless, these free interferences are implicitly granted in textual criticism whenever an adjustment of the text is made to Synoptic parallels. Bartsch also points out that there are cases such as Lk 5.17f. and 7.17-19 that show gaps that cannot be explained simply by homoioteleuton. Rather, it can be explained that the shortness of the D text is characteristic of the independent tradition.¹³⁸ However, Bartsch cautions that a question should be asked whether the adjustment for harmony at parallel passages in the Synoptic Gospels in D is the motive.¹³⁹ When harmonisation is presupposed as a motive for the adjustment of the Synoptic text it is also assumed that D has a good knowledge of the entire synoptic material. Nevertheless, the Gospels were transmitted individually until the second-century as proven by P⁵². Also Bartsch contends how a comparison of Mk 1.40ff. with Papyrus Egerton 2 shows that the Synoptic material is also available from extra canonical Gospel writings but with clear differences.¹⁴⁰ Moreover, the variant reading of D in Lk 3.22 comes also in Justin (*Dialogue* 88.8; 103.6) and that Epiphanius (*Heresies* 30.13.7f) quotes the Ebionite Gospel.¹⁴¹ Bartsch points out the fact that the D reading is still in use in the fourth-century and that the sayings of Jesus were developed as in the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas*.¹⁴²

What Bartsch has shown in his short study is that the D text has acquired readings from separate traditions and that the way early Christianity handled the text of the Gospels

¹³⁷Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 176-7.

¹³⁸Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 177-8.

¹³⁹Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 178.

¹⁴⁰Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 179-80.

¹⁴¹Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 179-80.

¹⁴²Bartsch, "Cantabrigiensis", 180.

was not “heiliger Text”, whose genuineness must be preserved, and that even the Christological readings corresponded to the contemporary picture of Jesus.¹⁴³ In conclusion Bartsch maintains that if the tradition of the old knowledge is later received, it must be accepted that the tradents of early Christianity who have passed on their tradition to the next generation handed it on to them with the mixture of the old generation’s interpretation of the tradition which goes with the transmission process.¹⁴⁴

Parker’s Manuscript Tradition

D. C. Parker is another textual critic who has provided an especially important contribution for the study of the bilingual Greek-Latin text of D.¹⁴⁵ Parker made an investigation of the physical features of this diglot manuscript, and for the first time D is comprehensively studied as a manuscript in itself.¹⁴⁶ He has advanced his research on the nature of the bilingual tradition of the manuscript.¹⁴⁷ He takes D as a physical textual tradition seriously.¹⁴⁸ He explores the nature of the physical evidence that can be found in the manuscript from its Greek and Latin palaeography to its codicology tracing the tradition of the manuscript by investigating the sense lines, layout of the text, the scribe of D and the correctors and the character of the bilingual tradition of D. Parker is intolerant:

But I am impatient of a textual criticism that discusses variant readings but not the scribes who made them, textual history but not the manuscripts in which it is contained. It would be unwise to confuse textual criticism with palaeography and codicology. There are in fact different skills to each of these disciplines. But it is

¹⁴³Bartsch, “Cantabrigiensis”, 180.

¹⁴⁴Bartsch, “Cantabrigiensis”, 181-2.

¹⁴⁵Parker, *Codex Bezae*.

¹⁴⁶I am not aware of any other work that thoroughly examined D as a manuscript in itself except Prof. D. C. Parker.

¹⁴⁷Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 191, disapproves of the textual critics who do injustice to the bilingual Greek-Latin textual tradition of D.

¹⁴⁸Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 2, states: “The point is that the individual text must be taken seriously as a physical object”.

necessary to study a text in conjunction with its material representatives. Thus, for example, the *text* of Codex Bezae is affected by the way in which it is laid out on the page.¹⁴⁹

Because of the approach taken by Parker he avoided the term “Western text” (“with or without inverted commas”) because he does not seek to evaluate D with other textual witnesses of the New Testament.¹⁵⁰ Parker’s investigation of D finally ends the myth of the “Western” text type, advancing the approach that D should be understood as a manuscript on its own with its own developed bilingual manuscript tradition.

Although he did not come up with a solution on how to explain the deviating readings of the D text, Parker came up with a proposal on how to approach its textual problem. He makes a case that the Church Fathers are the ones that should be consulted for they are the witnesses for the development of the text of the New Testament.¹⁵¹ The understanding of the textual tradition of D is what he prefers, rather than exploring the text type of this bilingual manuscript in order to understand its distinctive variant readings. Parker is also very much sceptical about the current theological tendency approach to the D text based on a contemporary theological reconstruction because it is anachronistic.¹⁵² However, he points out that, perhaps, some of the distinctive readings that cannot make sense in the context of a passage in D could have been an allegorical or mystical kind of reading the text.¹⁵³ In this particular advancement Parker laid new foundations for the study of D as a manuscript on its own that developed from its own tradition. Since the Latin text of the Gospel has a “unity of origin”¹⁵⁴ and D is “the third-generation manuscript of its bilingual tradition of the

¹⁴⁹Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 2-3. (The italics are original.)

¹⁵⁰Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 3.

¹⁵¹Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 190.

¹⁵²Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 189-93.

¹⁵³Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 190.

¹⁵⁴Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 192, cf. 118.

Gospels”,¹⁵⁵ the unusual readings in the Greek side could have been entered in any layer of the multi-layered text.¹⁵⁶ It would be hard to identify in which layer an odd reading has come into the textual tradition of D. However, Parker establishes an important conclusion that the peculiar readings of D cannot be attributed to only one scribe or redactor but were a result of a process of accumulation in its textual history.¹⁵⁷

Challenge to Find an Applicable Reading Model

When D is read, what is distinctive in the different retellings of the narrative, particularly the parables in Luke’s Gospel, that would be obvious to the reader? What is being conveyed and becomes obvious when there are variant readings surfacing in the process of the collation of D against the reading of P⁷⁵ (and B)? In other words, how do we figure out the peculiar readings of D and make sense of them? A corollary to the question of the distinctiveness of the D readings is how well organised and clearly purposeful is this

¹⁵⁵Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 118, cf. 278.

¹⁵⁶Cf. Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 285-6. Although I assume that the text of D in the different books are multi-layered like Parker, Bartsch and Mees, I also acknowledge the work of scholars like Christian-Bernard Amphoux who reject this theory of multi-layered text. Amphoux maintains in his work that D as a whole codex embodies a coherent text and its exemplar could be traced in the second-century. See C.-B. Amphoux, “Schéma d’histoire du texte grec du Nouveau Testament”, *NTTRU* 3 (1995): 41-6; and Stuart R. Pickering, “An Appreciation of the Survey of Early New Testament Textual Transmission by C.-B. Amphoux”, *NTTRU* 3 (1995): 47-51. See also Christian-B. Amphoux, “Les premières éditions de Luc”, *ETL* 67 (1991): 312-27; and “Les premières éditions de Luc”, *ETL* 68 (1992): 38-48. Cf. Christian-Bernard Amphoux, “Le texte”, in *Lunel Colloquium*, 337-54; and C.-B. Amphoux, *L’évangile selon Matthieu: Codex de Bèze (L’Isle-sur-la-Sorgue: Le Bois d’Orion, 1996)*. Cf. also Léon Vaganay and Christian-Bernard Amphoux, *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*, 2nd ed., trans. Jenny Heimerdinger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 91-7, who insinuate that the New Testament text in the second half of the second-century was predominantly “Western” variants which is represented by D and that the “Western” text, at least some of its representatives, were even “pre-recensional”. Amphoux is followed by Read-Heimerdinger who takes his conclusion as an assumption for the coherence of the D text in addition to her own study and conclusion about the coherence of the text. Read-Heimerdinger, “Barnabas in Acts”, 26, footnote 7, points out that “the textual evidence that [Amphoux] puts forward to support his claim needs to be considered separately from his particular reconstruction of the history of the text of the Gospels and Acts which rests on a highly subjective interpretation of the documentary evidence”. See Parker’s reply to Amphoux’s article in D. C. Parker, “Professor Amphoux’s History of the New Testament Text: A Response”, *NTTRU* 4 (1996): 41-5. See also the rebuttal of C.-B. Amphoux, “À propos de l’histoire du texte grec du Nouveau Testament. Réponse à David C. Parker”, *NTTRU* 6 (1998): 1-8. Cf. as well the critique of J. Neville Birdsall, “After Three Centuries of the Study of Codex Bezae: The *Status Quaestionis*”, in *Lunel Colloquium*, xxviii-xxx, of Amphoux’s exegetical methodology and reconstruction of the history of the D text.

¹⁵⁷Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 280.

distinctiveness that D is offering? If the notable readings are much more chaotic it is sensible to conclude that there is no coherence in the odd readings. Hence, D in Luke has not shown clarity and intention in its distinctive readings. The understanding of the commonality of the variant readings of D, whether at random or integrated or both, at times chaotic but sometimes with coherence, would be tested in the Lukan parables as preserved in the D text.

The D variant readings in Luke's parables of Jesus should be treated as intentional. I already made a case in the previous chapter that the primary reason for an alteration of text is arbitrary to what fits the reading of the one who uses the text. Although this preferred attitude towards the reading of the D text should be cautioned by the reality of scribal oversights and different sorts of unintentional copying errors, the possibility of intentional motivation for the textual modification should not be diminished by the slips of mechanical copying. Comparative study of the peculiar readings in D with parallel literature in antiquity is instructive when this method is situated within the development of the D text tradition in the context of the patristic use of the Gospels. For example, the contribution of J. Rendel Harris is his method of comparing D with Montanist documents and Marcionite material to show a theological agenda in the D text. Harris who first suggested this theological tendency, preceding Epp, by showing parallel readings with the extra canonical literature should be followed in his approach in examining D. Harris fails, however, to establish his Montanist view of D because he provides very few examples in his selected passages. Epp and Rice are ingenious in providing the idea that there is an inner theological agenda going on in the text reflected by the anti-Judaic readings unique to D. Nevertheless, their failure is the lack of parallel examples from other early Christian sources of this sort of usage of additional words, phrases and clauses or by omitting, changing term/s or modifying their structural position to show a definite theological intention. However, the approach of Harris, Epp and Rice when combined would be very helpful. The issue of Montanism and Marcionism raised by Harris and the anti-Judaic attitude of the early Christians argued by Epp and Rice are both valid

observations that could have conceivably influenced the D text of the New Testament. So, the issue of theological tendency in D should be brought further to the level of tendential exegesis just as Read-Heimerdinger developed in her approach to the D text of Acts.

Read-Heimerdinger's contribution is sensible and conceivably closer to the D phenomenon of inner biblical exegesis. Nonetheless, she neglects an important aspect of establishing an argument in claiming an inner biblical exegesis in D for she has not supplied any parallel interpretation from the early Christian sources to show that the passages she treated actually were understood in the way she claimed they were understood by D.¹⁵⁸ But CroweTipton and Ehrman offer a reasonable direction to pursue in looking at the possible reading tradition of D. On the one hand, CroweTipton uses an approach of socio-historical reading of Peter in the D text of Acts. Although very restricted, his reconstruction of the possible socio-political milieu of the time when the D tradition was in the process of being formed is useful. He puts the reading of D in the context of the patristic period. However, CroweTipton fails to give parallel passages from the early extra Christian literature that would support his conclusion of how Peter was known in the early Church. On the other hand, although Ehrman's study is not specifically on D, it opens fresh questions about the nature of the scribal motivation for early scribal textual alterations on passages about the identity of Christ. His main contribution is the setting up of a scenario that would allow deliberate changes in the text of the New Testament because of a theological tendency or scribal motivation in the backdrop of the patristic theological disputes. Consequently, by

¹⁵⁸Typical of Read-Heimerdinger's problem of the neglect of the patristic evidence is what Mullen, *Cyril of Jerusalem*, 399, points out in his critique of Birdsall's theory of the provenance of D:

What is notable about Cyril's text of the New Testament is the general absence of Western textual affinities. The Syriac witnesses to the gospels have often been understood as "Western" witnesses from the Eastern end of the Mediterranean basin. Yet Cyril's evidence suggests that "Western" influences were not operative within the Greek textual tradition of Roman Palestine. The lack of Western influence on Cyril's text bodes ill for Nevill (sic) Birdsall's hypothesis that ms. D (the principal Western witness to the gospels and Acts) was produced in the environs of Jerusalem. Nevertheless, there is clear merit in the inner biblical exegesis applied by Read-Heimerdinger, albeit in a Jewish setting. Her approach to the text of D in Acts is a heuristic attempt to explain the unusual readings that she found in her use of discourse analysis.

combining the approaches of Read-Heimerdinger, Crowe-Tipton and Ehrman, the exegetical reason for a textual alteration in D within the framework of the patristic theological debate and socio-historical setting of the patristic age could be carefully discerned.

Mees and Holmes are most helpful in providing a broader understanding about the phenomenon of the unique readings of the D text. Mees by setting D within the literary context of early Christianity and Holmes by taking seriously the early scribal editorial activity, open the plausibility that the D textual tradition in its own literary context had developed an inner textual interpretation which was transmitted by the scribes in the process of their editorial activity. The contributions of Bartsch and Parker are in laying down the foundations on the attitude of the tradents of the D text. Bartsch articulates well how the tradents who handled D interfered with the readings of the text for their own local community. Parker's extensive work on the manuscript is particularly important in understanding the bilingual Greek-Latin tradition of D because of a local reading necessity. Bartsch argues that for the tradents of D the original form of the text is not necessary for reproduction in its transmission. Parker is adamant that the only possible manner to ascertain changes made in the text that exhibit a theological tendency is by comparison with the patristic appreciation of the text. Bartsch provides a model of comparing a D reading with parallel texts in antiquity, especially from the Fathers. Finally, Parker's view of the theological character of D is based on an attitude towards the text itself. For the transmitters of D handle its text very loosely, even the words of Jesus and the apostles in the process of transmission were altered without any reservation. Parker claims that the significance of "this theology consists in its continuity with the earliest Christian transmission and its attitude to the sayings of Jesus".¹⁵⁹

What is important is to understand how the Fathers, being our primary witnesses, interpreted the Scripture and to see the parallel phenomenon of handling the Scripture and the

¹⁵⁹Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 286.

D text amongst them. Here, the work of Mees counts. It means that the Fathers' appropriation of the ancient literary theory should be applied to the study of D. Bartsch's approach in understanding the interference of the tradents in the multilayered text should be used in connection with Mees' approach of reading the text of D. There are two fundamental approaches of the Fathers in handling the text of the New Testament that can be taken for granted which would be useful for the study of the odd readings in the D text. The first one is allegorical interpretation and the second one is the catena of references.¹⁶⁰ Both of these could be rightly viewed as the Fathers' inherited hermeneutical model of reading the sacred texts—from the Graeco-Roman classical exegetes of Homer—to get the applicable spiritual meaning of life.¹⁶¹ Thus, Holmes' approach of looking at the various ways in which the unique readings occur in the D text of Matthew could be joined with Parker's understanding of the way the Fathers could have witnessed the growth of the text within the context of the loose transmission of the textual tradition of D. To put it differently, there should be a clear understanding of the patristic stance that could have influenced the attitude of the tradents who judiciously interpreted and transmitted the text of D within the literary theory and textual understanding of approaching a text in antiquity.

There is an observable pattern in the unique readings of the D text in Luke where the reader/s owned the text and appropriated it for his/their own usage.¹⁶² The two observable patristic exegetical approaches that were widely used in the early Church were allegorical interpretation, to get the spiritual sense of the text, and chain referencing, to clarify the meaning of one passage using another passage. The D text of Luke probably has variants that could be allegorising to elucidate the spiritual meaning of the text, and harmonising to infer

¹⁶⁰See Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, especially 9-28, 97-116, 119-85.

¹⁶¹See Guy G. Stroumsa, "The Christian Hermeneutical Revolution and Its Double Helix", in *The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World*, eds. L. V. Rutgers et al., CBET 22 (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 9-28.

¹⁶²Cf. Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 9-11.

intertextually the catena reference of the text.¹⁶³ In this manner, the chain referencing that was probably placed at the margins of a manuscript such as one that is exemplified by Codex Zacynthius (Ξ) in the Gospel of Luke, has come into the text not just as plain harmonisation, but an intertextual explanation.¹⁶⁴ This view is not negating the plain harmonisation tendency of tradents but explaining the plausible reason for the harmonisation that is due to intertextuality.¹⁶⁵

¹⁶³Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 130, gives two comments that are highly relevant to the seemingly subtle, short and few worded alterations in D due to “self-conscious referencing [that] belongs to the pervasive intertextuality of ancient literature”:

(1) It was not customary to produce extended quotations from literature. It was regarded as unnecessary since any educated person would recognise the quotation. The important thing was to adapt it, to provide reminiscences, to emulate the way in which the great classical authors wrote, to put it how they would put it if they were addressing the topic in hand—in other words, to engage in *mimēsis* of the great classics. (2) The point of such intertextual reference was not primarily ornamental—quotation and allusion are not discussed in the books on style. It was recognised that such material might enhance the diction, but principally the point was to enlist the authority of the great poet, or to utilise classic examples of the virtue being extolled, in order to reinforce the content of the speech. (Italics are original.)

The reason why the D text of Luke has the tendency to be harmonised with the Matthean readings is because of Matthew’s influence as the most prominent Gospel in the early Church. It is possible that the tradents of the D text of Luke, because of Matthew’s recognised authority, applied mimetic compositional approach of literary imitation. It is highly possible that the use of mimesis of the Lukan D was due to solicit the influence of a great Gospel. The use of mimesis is not entirely in Luke. Rather, it can be seen in bits and pieces scattered all over the Gospel. The most viable explanation for this is that when Luke is read for catechism or liturgy and then a homily or instruction would follow, the portion of Luke’s earlier form of text could have been glossed and later in the D textual tradition of the Gospel the marginal reading due to mimetic reason has been inserted because the reading is familiar to the scribes who copied the text. For the pre-eminence of Matthew in the early Church see Édouard Massaux, *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature Before Saint Irenaeus*, Book 1: *The First Ecclesiastical Writers*; Book 2: *The Later Christian Writings*; Book 3: *The Apologists and the Didache*, trans. Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht, ed. with intro and add. Arthur J. Bellinzoni, NGS 5/1-3 (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1990-93).

¹⁶⁴The example of Ξ is a plausible model of what transpired in the development of the textual tradition of D. According to Greenlee, “Corrected Collation”, 238-9, Ξ has interesting features:

Numerous passages of Luke are repeated in this MS. The catena accompanying a given passage of Luke is sometimes continued extensively on the following page; in such instances the text of Luke to which the catena refers is often repeated as well. Such repeated passages must of course be collated separately for each repetition, since they may not be textually identical.

Perhaps, the ancestral text of D experienced the same catena glosses that were “not textually identical” with Luke but instead with Matthew’s readings at times, that later copied into the text because of their familiarity.

¹⁶⁵Tatian’s Diatessaron is a different case for the four Gospels were interwoven to have just one Gospel. The suggested intertextuality in the Lukan D text, particularly the seeming harmonisation in the parables, is more of a chain reference interpretation that has come into the body of text from glosses that were meant to be a separate catena commentary. However, the attitude to the text of the Gospels by Tatian and the tradents of D is similar to what Bartsch and Parker describe as not concerned to produce the original text.

The matter of an exegetical approach using the ancient allegorical manner of interpretation should also be understood within a particular context of patristic interpretation.¹⁶⁶ There are two common settings that immediately come to mind that are observable in the writings of the Fathers:¹⁶⁷ First, the doctrinal genre of interpreting the Scripture that was typically in the context of apologetics and polemics.¹⁶⁸ Secondly, the catechetical genre of interpreting the Scripture that was typically in the context of homily and commentary.¹⁶⁹ Frances M. Young contends that there was no difference at all with the accepted convention during antiquity in the way the Fathers practised their exegetical activity, and that the source of their exegetical technique was the grammatical and rhetorical schools.¹⁷⁰ In addition, Young contends that the matter of exegetical approach should also be understood in a context of the hermeneutical issues of the period.¹⁷¹ The concern of drawing out the spiritual meaning of the text was crucial to early patristic interpreters. Thus the spiritual approach in understanding the Gospel narratives thrived. This can be best illustrated

¹⁶⁶The challenge of the Antiochene school of interpretation against the Alexandrian allegorical approach to Scripture was a later disputation in the fourth-century led by Eustathius of Antioch (d. before 337), Diodore of Tarsus (d. before 394), John Chrysostom (ca. 344-407) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (ca. 352-428). Although these Fathers from Antioch were disputing the Alexandrian allegorical school other Fathers from both the West and the East continued to use allegorical means of interpretation with full utilisation of catena of scripture references to extract meaning from the biblical text. See Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 161-85. See also Froehlich, *Biblical Interpretation*, 19-23, 82-132.

¹⁶⁷Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 240-6.

¹⁶⁸For the “philosophical” and “scientific” interpretation of the Fathers within the apologetical and polemical issues see Torrance. See also Leonard V. Rutgers, “The Importance of Scripture in the Conflict between Jews and Christians: The Example of Antioch”, in *The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World*, eds. L. V. Rutgers et al., CBET 22 (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 287-303.

¹⁶⁹For the patristic use of Scripture in preaching and liturgical purposes see Old, *Patristic*, 2: passim. See also Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 228-35.

¹⁷⁰Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 246. See also Frances M. Young, “Exegetical Method and Scriptural Proof: The Bible in Doctrinal Debate”, *StPatr* 24 (1989): 291-304. Young recognises that Edwin Hatch originally suggested the emphasis on grammar and rhetoric of the educational system of the Graeco-Roman world in his important book *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*. See Lecture II, “Greek Education” in E. Hatch, *Influence*, 25-49.

¹⁷¹Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 217-47.

by what Eusebius (*Ecclesiastical History* 6.14)¹⁷² has to say about Clement of Alexandria's recognition of the Gospel of John as a "spiritual" Gospel since the other three Gospels already gave the account of the outward life of Christ.¹⁷³

On the one hand, the Greek classical authors made use of certain intertextual referencing to explain Homer by Homer and employed allegorical interpretation to get spiritual meaning for life to make their written sacred text alive.¹⁷⁴ On the other hand, the patristic writers used catena of Scripture (cross-referencing or intertextuality) to let the Scripture explain Scripture and applied allegorical reading to the Christian text to extract the spiritual meaning of the written Word of God.¹⁷⁵ The parallel point of the use of mimesis and allegory is crucial for the interpretation of the sacred written text, for the classical authors or the patristic writers, because the interpretation of the revered text should be made alive. The text at hand should reflect life. This is the principle of mimesis of life or mimetic representation. The connection of the text to life is theoretically direct. There is no such thing as the "otherness" of the text when it is especially interpreted orally before an audience. The interpreters of the Scripture text were involved in the text that they were interpreting and transmitting orally or written. So much so, that the process of communication of the ancients through sacred books were not read silently, but aloud, whether in private or in a

¹⁷²See Eusebius 2, LCL 265:47-51, especially 49.

¹⁷³The discussion of Titus, "Motivation", 9-10, is most helpful in understanding John as a "spiritual" Gospel in the perspective of Clement of Alexandria. He emphasises the point that: Clement, then, was approvingly aware that the author of the Fourth Gospel spiritualized the factual items of the life of Christ. To Clement, as to John, the real Gospel consisted not in the outward life of Christ, but in the deeper meanings to be drawn from it. We may therefore expect to find this point of view reflected in Clement's use of Scripture. He, too, stresses the importance of the "spirit" as over against the literal word.

¹⁷⁴For more discussion of what Ὁμήρου ἐξ Ὁμήρου σαφηνίζειν, i.e. "to interpret Homer by means of Homer", means to the ancient scholars see Pfeiffer, *Classical Scholarship*, 225-7.

¹⁷⁵An example of patristic catena glossed at the margins of a manuscript is that of Codex Zacynthius. See Parker and Birdsall, "Zacynthius", 122-30, for their discussion of the identity of the Fathers who were the sources of the marginal comments on Ξ.

congregation.¹⁷⁶ The debate for the classical writers and the patristic authors for understanding their own sacred texts revolved around the proper approach in the allegorical interpretation of the text that reflects the mimesis of life.¹⁷⁷

When we consider the distinctive variant readings of several Lukan parables in the D text, what becomes apparent in the works already published to address the continuing enigma of this manuscript, is that the peculiar readings in one way or another could have come from the situation of the readers or scribes, even bishops and deacons, who glossed these unusual readings in the margins of its textual parent which later penetrated the D text that we have now. It is very important to admit that there should be clear correspondences with the other literature in antiquity that could have connections with the odd readings that we are concerned about in D. However, the problem is in identifying these connections—historical, theological, literary or interpretative correspondences. In any case, one of the established characteristics by which we view these distinctive readings in D is the acknowledgement that there should be a correlation between the readings that were placed in the text of D. The components, personalities or the milieu of the readers or scribes who put the glosses and/or incorporated them onto the D textual tradition could have assumed the mimetic representation or emulation and expanded textual allusion to what was current in their times. And thus the allegorical level of meaning when applied to the reading of the parable produced the allegorising and mimetic variant readings. As David P. Parris points out concerning the interpretation of the Gospel parables:

When we classify a text as an allegory, one of the features by which we make this distinction is that we recognize a strong correspondence between the elements or characters in the mimetic representation and extra-textual referents. This correspondence does not operate primarily at the vehicle level of the parable (the literary level) but at the level of the tenor... These correspondences may be relationships the author and the original audience would have recognized (mimesis₁)

¹⁷⁶William A. Graham, *Beyond the Written Word: Oral Aspects of Scripture in the History of Religion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 33.

¹⁷⁷Cf. Dawson, *Allegorical*, 34-5.

or they may have been created in the successive readings (a result of mimesis₃) of the parable and, thus, different from the ‘original’ correspondences.¹⁷⁸

Perhaps, Parris is right in his theory of the correlations between the allegorical components in the parable symbols and what they stand for beyond the scope of the reference of literary content of the Gospel parable, that the original author and primary audience identify as the general sense of the text. The formation of quite different mimetic correspondences during the subsequent readings of parables, of the Fathers as a case in point, is due to the conception of mimesis in a different setting from the reading of the original text by the initial audience. The difference of the correspondences between the original reading of the text and of the subsequent readings could be anticipated because the broad meaning of something read becomes different in correlation to the subsequent audience’s symbolic world and pre-understanding than the first audience.

Advantages of the Theoretical Framework

The Gospel parables were meant to represent the realities of life.¹⁷⁹ Ancient readers due to the assumption of mimesis would appropriately take life’s representations for granted and expect this literary theory to be at work in the rhetoric of antiquity. The parabolic understanding of the Fathers and their allegorical approach would take representative mimesis as a functional bridge to fill the gap of the text and the subsequent audience. Thus, it could be that the allegorical approach of the Fathers to the parables of Jesus could have been employed in the D text of Luke. In this way, the subsequent readers of the parables in Luke

¹⁷⁸Parris, “Imitating”, 49.

¹⁷⁹See Drury, *Parables*, especially 7-38, and M. D. Goulder, “Characteristics of the Parables in the Several Gospels”, *JTS* 19 (1968): 51-69, who both view the Gospel parables as inherently naturalistic and representing realities. See also Amos N. Wilder, *The Language of the Gospel: Early Christian Rhetoric* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), especially 79-96, who argues that parables are so human and lifelike with natural genuine links with the reality of life. Cf. Hultgren, *Parables*, 5-11, on the way he treats the “distinctive elements in the parable of Jesus”; and Dan O. Via, *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimensions* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967) on his analysis of “low mimetic” or “realistic comedy/tragedy” characteristic of the parables of Jesus. Cf. also William R. Herzog II, *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), who sees the parables of Jesus as addressing the reality of the circumstances of the poor; and Charles W. Hedrick, *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1994), who argues that the parables were poetic fictions with realistic aspects of life in Palestine which Jesus taught to arouse thinking.

could have appropriated the allegorical interpretation and the mimetic transmission of the D text into their own lives, as they read and expounded the text of the third Gospel for their congregations. To put it simply, the combination of allegorical interpretation and representative mimesis in reading the parables of Luke could be taken for granted in the early Christian community since this was the basic assumption of the process of reading text in antiquity. By placing the investigation of the distinctive readings of the D text in the Lukan parables within the context of ancient literary criticism—using allegorical interpretation and mimetic reading of texts—and looking at the patristic interpretation of the parables make the theoretical framework of this research balanced. For the observations of the Lukan parables in the D text using the lenses of allegory and mimesis would be confirmed or denied by the witness of the Fathers in their interpretation of the Gospel parables. Furthermore, the theoretical framework of this investigation is a synthesis of the methods already used by others in their study of the D text, as reviewed above.

Although the theories of mimesis are various even from the time of Plato and Aristotle, there is an agreement among scholars that the assumption of mimesis in Graeco-Roman arts and literature was inherent. The use of paraphrase is one of the mimetic approaches to an established ancient literary tradition.¹⁸⁰ According to George Converse Fiske “Hermogenes, the Stoic rhetorician, indicates two methods of paraphrase, (1) τὰξιν μεταβολή, (2) καὶ μήκη καὶ βραχύτητες, that is either variation of the sequence in story, or argument, or amplification and condensation”.¹⁸¹ Further, Fiske points out that: “To attain this *solum* and *summum bonum* of literary art is the goal of paraphrase”.¹⁸² Westcott and Hort claim that: “The chief and most constant characteristic of the ‘Western’ readings is

¹⁸⁰Brodie, “Imitation”, 20.

¹⁸¹George Converse Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace: A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation*, UWSLL 7 (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1920; repr., Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966), 37.

¹⁸²Fiske, *Lucilius*, 37. (The italics are original.)

a love of paraphrase".¹⁸³ Furthermore, Kirsopp Lake mentions an odd paraphrase in the D text of Lk 23.53—καὶ θέντος αὐτοῦ ἐτέθηκεν τῷ μνημείῳ λίθον, ὄν μόνως εἴκοσι ἐκύλιον—suggesting something of resemblance to Homer's classical epic fashion.¹⁸⁴ The D text of the Gospels has so many unique readings and one of its most striking features is its allusiveness due to improvements and harmonisations.¹⁸⁵ This feature of allusiveness in D is clearly seen in the Lukan parables.¹⁸⁶ The allusiveness of the Lukan parables in the D text could be a good lens to view that paraphrasing for clarity is happening in the text.¹⁸⁷ There is a long-recognised, exceptionally high frequency of harmonisations of and allusions to the other Synoptic Gospels by Luke, especially with Matthew. These harmonisations should not be seen as a mark of scribal carelessness or artistic immaturity. Rather, they should be seen as an exercise intended to engage other Synoptic Gospels' voices in the expression of the Lukan text's meaning.¹⁸⁸ The amplification of Luke's parables using Matthew's account could be seen as an aspect of structural and thematic strategy. The pattern of the D text of Luke's engagement with the words of the other Synoptic Gospels, such as Matthew's, reveals a remarkable, and hitherto unregarded, coherence.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸³Westcott and Hort, *Introduction*, 2:173.

¹⁸⁴Kirsopp Lake, *The Text of the New Testament*, 5th ed. (London: Rivingtons, 1922), 74-5.

¹⁸⁵Cf. W. H. P. Hatch, 'Western', 16-44.

¹⁸⁶See the fourth and fifth chapters of this current thesis for examples.

¹⁸⁷Cf. Hooley, *Knotted*, ix, who thinks that the allusiveness of Persius is mimetic in nature.

¹⁸⁸See Finkelpearl, "Pagan Traditions", 79-81, for the role of memory in intertextuality and the intent of allusion in interpretation of ancient literature.

¹⁸⁹The informed comment followed by a rhetorical question from Finkelpearl, "Pagan Traditions", 82, about the effect of compositional mimesis' text to the source text is instructive:

Literary allusion becomes a kind of literary criticism, exploring meanings available in the source text beyond the obvious. This notion of new texts incorporating and negotiating their way through the old texts is suggestive in the case of Christian narratives; does the new text altogether discard the values of the old, or does it not sometimes reshape and redefine those values and events in a non-oppositional way?

Perhaps, in reference to Finkelpearl, the mimetic use of the Matthean materials in the D text of Luke reflects the interpretative cross-referencing purpose of the tradents who were responsible for the harmonisation.

The patristic allegorical approach to the parables of Jesus should be evaluated neither at the level of their hermeneutical method nor historical presupposition, as modern parable scholarship since Adolf Jülicher's work has emphasised, in understanding the one point of the parable.¹⁹⁰ From Jülicher onwards much debate occurred whether parables have one-point or more.¹⁹¹ The one-point meaning of the Gospel parables is now largely abandoned.¹⁹² And as Michael P. Knowles takes it for granted with the contemporary commentators: "[T]he meaning of any given parable need not be limited to a single main point", and if Jesus wants to "make a single point" his inclination is to prefer "the precision of propositional language".¹⁹³ Nevertheless, the Fathers should be assessed in their spiritual exegesis in extracting the "divine meaning" and their understanding of the nature of the sacred text.¹⁹⁴ Thus the assumed concept of mimesis in antiquity would be necessary because the parables were meant to represent life. Although there were competing theories of mimesis, the assumption of reality represented in arts and literature was inherent. Hence the fundamental assumption of correspondence in mimesis between the world of the Gospel parable and the world of the reader would lead to the rhetorical device used to make the text of the narrative

¹⁹⁰For a fine review of Jülicher's contribution to the understanding of the parables and the scholarly criticism and following that he received see Kissinger, *Parables*, 71-230.

¹⁹¹Jülicher was followed, although with distinct variations, by the influential works of C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, rev. ed. (London: Nisbet & Co., 1961), in Britain; Jeremias, in his significant book *The Parables of Jesus*, in Germany; and Norman Perrin, *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976), in America through his teacher Jeremias.

¹⁹²See the discussion of Craig L. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables* (Leicester: Apollos, 1990), 13-69, on the issue of "one-point theory" or "several lessons apiece" of the parables. See also Mary Ann Tolbert, *Perspectives on the Parables: An Approach to Multiple Interpretations* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979); and John W. Sider, *Interpreting the Parables: A Hermeneutical Guide to Their Meaning* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1995). Cf. Madeleine I. Boucher, *The Mysterious Parable: A Literary Study*, CBQMS 6 (Washington, D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1977); and Bernard Brandon Scott, *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989). Cf. also Snodgrass, "Allegorizing", 19-22; Herzog, *Subversive*, 40-73; and Hultgren, *Parables*, 12-4.

¹⁹³Michael P. Knowles, "'Everyone Who Hears These Words of Mine': Parables on Discipleship (Matthew 7:24-27//Luke 6:47-49; Luke 14:28-33; Luke 17:7-10; Matthew 20:1-16)", in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000), 287.

¹⁹⁴See Torrance, *Divine*, 161-4.

represent the world of the reader. The catena referencing and the harmonising tendency in the text of the Gospels, with special reference to D, could be due to the concept of mimesis to appropriate the text to the extra textual referents, in this case the subsequent reader of the text such as that of D.

A reminder that the ancients treat the text as words being read orally and appreciated as living, against the modern assumption that texts are documents, brings a dynamic understanding of the tradent's treatment of text.¹⁹⁵ What Augustine has to say about Ambrose is instructive. Ambrose, claims Augustine in *Confessions* 6.3, "As he read, his eyes scanned the pages and his heart searched out the meaning, but his voice and tongue were silent".¹⁹⁶ This statement from Augustine is a reminder that reading the text orally as words, publicly and privately, was the convention of antiquity and indicates that Ambrose is an exception. However, this point has been challenged worthily. Yun Lee Too argues:

While scholars have used this passage as evidence for the thesis that reading was voiced in antiquity, I suggest that Augustine's comment should not be taken *only* literally. The author speculates that silent reading prevents students and onlookers from interrupting the bishop's perusals and helps to save the bishop's frail voice for preaching, but he also concludes the chapter by admitting his uncertainty for the latter's actual motives (6.3.3). A further implicit reading beyond this gloss is available, and perhaps invited in light of the passage's narrative of non-literal reading. The overall context of the narrative offers silent reading as a mode of textuality which appropriates itself to a prior text—here the scriptures—and then represents Christian discourse as one which is non-physical despite, or since, producing desire for God. It figures the separation of Christian language from the body and from the conventional rhetorical situation in which eloquence serves as a mode of seduction.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁵However, not all are convinced that every reading in antiquity was oral in nature. See the discussion and debate of Paul Achtemeier, "Omne verbum sonat: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity", *JBL* 109 (1990): 3-27; and Michael Slusser, "Reading Silently in Antiquity", *JBL* 111 (1992): 499; with Frank Gilliard, "More Silent Reading in Antiquity: *Non Mone Verbum Sonabat*", *JBL* 112 (1993): 689-94. See also G. L. Henderson, "Ancient Reading", *CJ* 25 (1929-30): 182-96; W. P. Clark, "Ancient Reading", *CJ* 26 (1930-31): 698-700; W. B. Stanford, *The Sound of Greek: Studies in Euphony* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967); and W. P. Clark and B. M. W. Knox, "Silent Reading in Antiquity", *GRBS* 9 (1968): 421-35.

¹⁹⁶Augustine 5, *FC* 21:133.

¹⁹⁷Too, *Idea*, 232. (The italics are original.)

The argument of Too is well taken. At any rate the obvious matter is that reading aloud, as a “kind of performance”, was the convention of time.¹⁹⁸ It was expected that a person reading a text read it aloud even for himself. When the Scripture was read even privately, it is read aloud such as the reading of the Ethiopian eunuch of the prophet Isaiah in Ac 8.30 that was heard by Philip. The point made by Maria Boulding is well taken:

This famous passage [from Augustine’s *Confession*] has sometimes been taken to imply that Ambrose invented silent reading. It was undoubtedly known earlier, see Cicero: *Tusc.* 5.40.116 on the advantage the deaf may derive from reading poetry. Augustine himself silently peruses scripture at VIII,12,29. But reading aloud or in a muttered undertone was the more common practice and long continued so. Saint Benedict’s *Rule* reminds monks who read while lying on their beds to do so without disturbing their neighbours, *Reg.* 48.5. Until at least the end of the middle ages the reading of scripture was understood as an activity involving the whole person, physical as well as mental and spiritual; gastronomic metaphors of mastication such as chewing the cud were commonly used for it, as Augustine does a few lines above.¹⁹⁹

The texts assumed as words for oral purposes were designed by authors as such to be read in the way they composed the text.²⁰⁰ The readers who will actually read it as words, as well as the tradents who will transmit it, presuppose that they are free to put their hands on the text to achieve its purpose in the setting where it is read.²⁰¹ Thus, making glosses to the text, as well as διόρθωσις, was an established ancient process where a manuscript went through. In the process of textual development, the glosses, alterations and improvements of the text by the readers, copyists and tradents become a part of the textual tradition that grows whilst the text is being used actively, as happened to the D text.²⁰² This perspective of the growth of the bilingual Greek-Latin tradition of the D text as used for its designated purpose

¹⁹⁸Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 77.

¹⁹⁹Maria Boulding, trans., *The Confessions by Saint Augustine: Introduction, Translation and Notes*, ed. John E. Rotelle (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1997), 137.

²⁰⁰Graham, *Beyond*, 123.

²⁰¹Cf. E. G. Turner, *Typology*, 84.

²⁰²See Strange, *Problem*, 107-66.

explains why it acquired unique readings. Modern textual critics take it for granted that this textual phenomenon occurred in the second-century, and perhaps even up to the third-century. The spoken nature of the text in antiquity also presupposed that the layout of the text in the scrolls and codices was presented for oral reading.²⁰³ Hence, the cutting of words in copying is not presupposing a recent document style of text. Words were cut in what modern readers would think as inappropriate or even unreadable ways.²⁰⁴ It could be that the convention of writing and copying presupposes the job of the reader to make sense of the text. There is liberty among the tradents of the New Testament to introduce changes to “improve” the readability and usefulness of the text at hand to make sense out of it.²⁰⁵

However, the discipline of New Testament textual criticism in general, and the investigation of D in particular, have been absorbed by the quest of reconstructing the history of the text. The shift from textual history centred methods to the history of exegesis approach to the Lukan parables in order to explain the unusual readings in the D text holds a lot of potential due to the available patristic parallel interpretations of the parables. At the same time the nature of the D text of Luke should be further informed by the understanding of the reception of the third Gospel in the early Church. There are three advantages in taking an interpretative approach: First, the D text can be investigated as it appears now in the manuscript. Secondly, the patristic influence in the text of the New Testament, represented by D, can be studied more comprehensively and in a much broader way. Finally, the investigation of the development of the textual tradition of D is not fragmented because the combination of textual criticism, literary criticism and the history of the interpretation of the Lukan parables would be equally used in the study.

²⁰³Cf. Edward Maunde Thompson, *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912), 44-53, 58-64, 67-71.

²⁰⁴See Thompson, *Palaeography*, especially 55-8.

²⁰⁵Cf. Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians*, 105-27.

Methodology of the Interpretative Approach

The traditional task of textual criticism is to establish the original text and at the same time reconstruct the history of the text of the New Testament. These two emphases lead to the hands-on work of textual criticism in collating the textual variants and computing the outcomes. The purpose is to identify and isolate individual witnesses within text types and manuscript families and so on. Although this work of manuscript collation and text type classification is indeed useful for preparing a critical apparatus, simply computing the result of textual variation would not contribute to the knowledge of the extent of deviation between what is the typically accepted textual tradition and a certain manuscript's variant readings. As K. W. Clark points out succinctly:

Counting words is a meaningless measure of textual variation, and all such estimates fail to convey theological significance of variable readings. Rather it is required to evaluate the thought rather than to compute the verbiage. How shall we measure the theological clarification derived from textual emendation where a single word altered affects the major concept in a passage?...By calculating words it is impossible to appreciate the spiritual insights that depend upon those words.²⁰⁶

The Westcott and Hort notion is that the changes in the text were not due to scribal motives to intentionally perform the alterations.²⁰⁷ The theological motive as an explanation for a variant reading has been less studied pre and post World War II. Nevertheless, there are voices that suggest the significance of a method that will consider the theological motives of those who transmitted the text of the New Testament. Before the war Donald W. Riddle had already challenged the traditional goal of textual criticism in restoring the original text:

²⁰⁶Kenneth W. Clark, "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament", *JBL* 85 (1966): 4-5.

²⁰⁷Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *Introduction, Appendix*, Vol. 2 of *The New Testament in the Original Greek* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1896), 282-3, asserts:

Even among the numerous unquestionably spurious readings of the New Testament there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes. Accusations of wilful tampering with the text are...not unfrequent in Christian antiquity: but, with a single exception [Marcion], wherever they can be verified they prove to be groundless, being in fact hasty and unjust inferences from mere diversities of inherited text.

The legitimate task of textual criticism is not limited to the recovery of approximately the original form of the documents, to the establishment of the “best” text, nor to the “elimination of spurious readings.” It must be recognized that every significant variant records a religious experience which brought it into being. This means that there are no “spurious readings”: the various forms of the text are sources for the study of the history of Christianity.²⁰⁸

Although the popular assumption that textual modifications were not due to intention and motivation on the part of the scribes used to be followed by some,²⁰⁹ however, generally speaking it was already abandoned.²¹⁰ Even the supposedly spurious readings should not simply be set aside but should be evaluated accordingly. Merrill M. Parvis a few years after the war took the spurious readings and suggested:

All are part of the tradition; all contribute to our knowledge of the history of Christian thought. And they are significant contributions because they are interpretations which were highly enough thought of in some place and at some time to be incorporated into the Scripture itself.²¹¹

However, because of the concern for the reconstruction of the original text there is the myopia of taking a manuscript and its readings as it is and to study it without considering its text type but instead its scribal characteristic or theological proclivity. Textual criticism is not just a matter of noting textual corruptions and scribal oversights. Frederic G. Kenyon having collated texts notes:

²⁰⁸Donald W. Riddle, “Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline,” *ATHR* 18 (1936): 221.

²⁰⁹See Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield, *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 5th ed. (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1896), 96; Caspar René Gregory, *Canon and Text of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907), 485, 504; and Robertson, *Introduction*, 158-60.

²¹⁰See Friedrich Blass, *Philology of the Gospels* (London: MacMillan & Co., 1898), 89; Kirsopp Lake, *The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1904), 10-1; Klijn, *Survey* (1949), 163-4; C. S. C. Williams, *Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951), 5-6; Epp, *Theological Tendency*, 1-3; K. W. Clark, “Theological Relevance”, 4-7; Rice, “Alteration of Luke”; and Holmes, “Early Editorial”. See also Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*; and Parker, *Living Text*. Cf. Metzger, *Text*, 195-7; and Royse, “Scribal Tendencies”, in *TNCR*, 239-52. See as well James Ronald Royse, “Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri” (Th.D. diss., Graduate Theological Union, 1981).

²¹¹Merrill M. Parvis, “The Nature and Tasks of New Testament Textual Criticism: An Appraisal”, *JR* 32 (1952): 172.

Anyone who examines the samples given above, which include the more important and characteristic variations between the b and d texts, will see that no theory of accidental omissions will account for them. Some of them are omissions and additions of clauses, in which accident is distinctly less probable than intention; others are paraphrases, of which accident is not even a possible explanation.²¹²

The make-up of the D text has a proclivity to recapture its reading in a more vernacular form. Another quality of D is the harmonisation in the Gospels. There is also the strong influence of the context—particularly the immediate context—all over the text of D. It has no hesitation to include non-canonical readings in its text. The interaction between the columns is notable and so is the unrestrictive way of transmitting the text freely that is a stance that has influenced every leaf of the D text.²¹³ This postulation in developing a method of interpretative approach is not new. Ernest C. Colwell believes that “most variations...were made deliberately” by those who transmitted the text of the New Testament. Furthermore, he maintains that “the majority of the variant readings in the New Testament were created for theological or dogmatic reason”. And the reason for the changes is religious in nature:

The paradox is that the variations came into existence because they were religious books, sacred books, canonical books. The devout scribe felt compelled to correct misstatements which he found in the manuscripts he was copying...The importance of the Book in their religious life led them to ‘correct’ the mistakes. Unfortunately, they thought they knew more than they actually did, and thus, with the best intentions in the world, they corrupted the text of the New Testament.²¹⁴

Thus the method of an interpretative approach in dealing with the peculiar readings in the text of D is a legitimate one based on our recent understanding of the scribal habits or tendencies. The approach is taken widely in considering the alterations due to the understanding of the transmitters of the text of the New Testament that includes the readers and the editors and not only the scribes who copied them for reproduction.

²¹²Frederic Kenyon, “The Western Text in the Gospels and Acts”, *PBA* 24 (1938): 307.

²¹³See Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 257-8.

²¹⁴Ernest C. Colwell, *What is the Best New Testament?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952), 52-3.

The outline of procedure in examining the selected Lukan parables in the D text is as follows: First, D²¹⁵ will be collated primarily against P⁷⁵.²¹⁶ In cases where there is a lacuna in P⁷⁵ a similar text-type of B²¹⁷ will be used to fill the gap but because the two manuscripts are of similar text type one or the other will be useful to fill in the gap.²¹⁸ P⁷⁵ and B are both dated earlier than D with their “text proved to be so close,”²¹⁹ that P⁷⁵ “could almost be regarded as [its] exemplar” (i.e. B) in Luke and John,²²⁰ and that as a collating base their text type is established and generally recognised as more superior because they represent a “strict” text.²²¹ P⁷⁵ and B are real New Testament texts and not an eclectic text (like the

²¹⁵Besides the use of the D Cambridge facsimile and Scrivener’s transcription H.-W. Bartsch’s *Bezae vs Sinaiticus* is also consulted. I am also aware of Antonio Ammassari, *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis* (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996); and Antonio Ammassari, *Il Vangelo di Luca nella Colonna Latina del Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis* (Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996). However, see the negative review of J. K. Elliott, review of Antonio Ammassari, *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis* and *Il Vangelo di [Matteo/Marco/Luca/Giovanni] nella Colonna Latina del Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis* [4 Vols.], *NovT* 42 (2000): 284-6. In Elliott’s observation the work of Ammassari is unreliable due to disappointing carelessness and contains too many errors.

²¹⁶Victor Martin and Rodolphe Kasser, eds., *Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV: Evangiles de Luc et Jean* (Cologny-Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961) is the facsimile and transcription used for P⁷⁵.

²¹⁷The B facsimile checked with is that of *Bibliorum Sacrorum Graecorum: Codex Vaticanus B*, Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae, Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1209 (Roma: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1999). The transcription used is that of Constantinus Tischendorf, ed., *Novum Testamentum Vaticanum, post Angeli Maii aliorumque imperfectos labores ex ipso codice* (Lipsiae: Giesecke et Devrient, 1867). Reuben Swanson, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts, Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Luke*, foreword by Bruce Metzger (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) is consulted for the comparison of D against that of P⁷⁵ and B.

²¹⁸This pattern of using P⁷⁵ and B together in viewing Luke’s text is taken as an analogy for the use of B & A C 81 by Ropes, *Text of Acts*, ccxcviii-cccii, in his attempt to establish the purer text of Acts against D. Thus P⁷⁵ and B are taken as the purer text than D, particularly when they agree against D.

²¹⁹Aland and Aland, *Text*, 87. See also Fee, “Significance”, 213-20, for the discussion of the textual relationship and of P⁷⁵ and B in Luke as well as their textual character.

²²⁰Aland and Aland, *Text*, 14. See also Calvin L. Porter, “Papyrus Bodmer XV (P75) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus”, *JBL* 81 (1962): 363-76.

²²¹Aland and Aland, *Text*, 93. See also L. W. Hurtado, “Beyond the Interlude? Developments and Directions in New Testament Textual Criticism”, in *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts: The Papers of the First Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. D. G. K. Taylor, TS 3rd Series 1 (Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1999), 38-40.

modern critical versions of NA²⁷ or UBS⁴).²²² P⁷⁵ and B are a “strict” Alexandrian text type not seeking harmonisation and modification of the text in contrast to the “free” D text.²²³

Secondly, variants between D against P⁷⁵ and B will be isolated. Then these different kinds of variants will be evaluated.²²⁴ Harmonisation, resulting from a bias or theological motivation, and addition, omission²²⁵ or alteration of wordings or word order²²⁶ will be examined to determine whether there is intentionality and consistency due to a scribal motive, or just an error.²²⁷ The possibility of textual corruption, such as any scribal error or misunderstanding of all sorts, will also be considered.²²⁸

²²²See Holmes, “Early Editorial”, 35-8.

²²³See Frederic G. Kenyon, *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible*. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1932 (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), 85. Cf. also Metzger, *Text*, 215-6.

²²⁴With Swanson’s edited text on Luke’s Greek manuscripts the following works will also be consulted in isolating and analysing the variant readings: Reuben J. Swanson, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts, Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Matthew*, foreword by Bruce Metzger (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); *New Testament Greek Manuscripts, Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Mark*, foreword by Bruce Metzger (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); and *The Horizontal Line Synopsis of the Gospels: Greek Edition*, Vol. 1, *The Gospel of Matthew* (Dillsboro: Western North Carolina Press, Inc., 1982). Kurt Aland, *Synopsis of the Four Gospels: Greek English Edition*, 10th ed. (Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1993). The website of Sylvie Chabert d’Hyerres, “L’Évangile au risque du Codex Bezae”, n.p. [cited 22 April 2004], online: <http://www.ifrance.com/bezae> is also visited.

²²⁵The omissions made by scribes are also important to consider, for these omissions were intended to make a difference in the meaning of the text. Head, “Observations”, examines the isolated variant readings of “the fourteen smaller fragments of the gospels”. Head, “Observations”, 246, in his description of scribal tendencies in his study, although in a relatively restricted framework, observes that spelling is the main reason for independent variants, and that the harmonisation and the transposition to the context and to matching passages are also habitual. Nevertheless, he succinctly concludes: “Most fundamental is the support given to the conclusion that omission is more common than addition”. See also Colwell’s earlier study on this matter of scribal omissions in Colwell, “Scribal Habits”, 118-23.

²²⁶See G. J. C. Jordaan, “The Word-Order Differences between the Greek and the Latin Texts in Codex Bezae”, in *A South African Perspective on the New Testament: Essays by South African New Testament Scholars Presented to Bruce Manning Metzger during His Visit to South Africa in 1985*, eds. J. H. Kobus Petzer and Patrick J. Hartin (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986), 99-111.

²²⁷For scribal tendencies see the short article of Royse, “Scribal Tendencies”, 239-52. For a more detailed discussion see the doctoral dissertation of Royse, “Scribal Habits”, which is the basis of his short article.

²²⁸Among the many surveys of scribal errors see Metzger, *Text*, 186-206.

Thirdly, versional authentication of variants gleaned in the collation, if there are any, will be compared to the Greek D and Latin d readings.²²⁹ The variants gathered will be compared to patristic citations and their interpretations of texts on hand.²³⁰ The result of this final analysis will be compared to the model of reading proposed above, i.e. the classical Graeco-Roman usage of mimetic referencing and allegorical interpretation, with the patristic appropriation of this method in their harmonisation or catena of Gospel texts and the allegorical interpretation of the parables in the D text of Luke.²³¹

The use of the principle of allegory in understanding the dynamics of textual variations in the parables of Jesus is not really new. The influence of allegorical interpretation in understanding Gospel parables has been, for example, suggested in solving the textual problem of The Parable of the Two Sons in Mt 21.28-32.²³² Why use Lukan parables in the D text as the sampling for this current methodology of employing allegorical approach in solving textual problems? The obvious answer is that the popularity of the parables of Jesus left much patristic material to explore in relationship with the textual

²²⁹The main tool for this is *The New Testament in Greek III, The Gospel According to St. Luke*, eds. the American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project, Part One Chapters 1-12 [1984] and Part Two Chapters 13-24 [1987] (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984-87).

²³⁰Read-Heimerdinger's work in general is heuristic in the sense that her use of discourse analysis in evaluating the variant readings in D provides solid ground for her test cases of inner biblical exegesis applied to certain personalities, e.g. Barnabas and Paul, and some other Acts passages. Nevertheless, her indirect parallel support for her inner biblical exegesis model from Old Testament and Jewish literature, although plausible, is not convincing because it lacks evidence to sustain her view that any Father has used the kind of inner biblical exegesis that she is advancing. See Fishbane, *Biblical*, on inner biblical exegesis.

²³¹CroweTipton, "*Theophilum*", is instructive in his model of reading the character of Peter. He gives a holistic focused reading of a very important person in the early church in comparison to D's perspective of Peter in the late Graeco-Roman world. CroweTipton gives a focused model that is also applicable to the study of the Gospel parables in Luke. Nonetheless, his failure to provide patristic parallel understandings of Peter makes his arguments weak.

²³²See Metzger, *TCGNT* 1971¹, 55-6. See also Hultgren, *Parables*, 218-25. Cf. Elliott, "Thoroughgoing Eclecticism", 114-5, who recognises the difficulty of establishing the original text of this parable; and J. K. Elliott, "The Parable of The Two Sons: Text and Exegesis", in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*, ed. A. Denaux, BETL 161 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 67-77, for a more detailed discussion of the textual problem. Cf. also Aland and Aland, *Text*, 312-6.

problems of the Lukan parables in the D text.²³³ The starting point of my assumption is that an inner biblical exegesis was inherent in the transmission of the D text of Luke, as well as other New Testament manuscripts. When a tradent of any sort, copyist, clergy, reader or editor, transmits a text he or she interprets it so that he or she can understand and thereby transmit the text intelligibly.²³⁴ The intelligibility of the text of the Gospels for the tradents, who influenced their shape and form, is necessary in the transmission process, as they come up with a reliable copy of the textual tradition that they inherited.²³⁵ To transmit Luke's textual tradition of the parables, it was necessary that the tradents generally interpret the texts of the parables allegorically, for it was the accepted convention in antiquity that would dictate them to do so.

It should be remembered, however, that whether one takes a parable as an utterance of Jesus or a later tradition from the Church, a parable was used originally within a particular context.²³⁶ At least, the assumption that the initial use of a Gospel parable has a specific setting is the widely held view.²³⁷ However, the Gospel writers employed the authentic parables of Jesus within the contexts of their own Gospel narratives,²³⁸ and may have also

²³³Two good examples to start with are the works on the Gospel Parables by Wailes, *Medieval*, among the Greek and the Latin Fathers, and Valavanolickal, *Use*, among the Syriac Fathers.

²³⁴The central thesis of Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians*, that the transmitters—male or female—of the text of the New Testament were responsible for its modification and manipulation, even though she limits them to scribes and the constraints of private Christian networks, is very instructive. However, I place the transmission of the D text of Luke in a much broader setting of the Graeco-Roman ancient literary criticism. Moreover, I maintain that the transmitters of the textual tradition of Luke cannot be limited to scribes alone. I use the broader term tradents because I am also including the oral transmission of the Lukan parables in the D text with the written textual transmission within the liturgical and catechetical context of the early Christian communities in antiquity.

²³⁵See William L. Petersen, "The Genesis of the Gospels", in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*, ed. A. Denaux, BETL 161 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002), 33-65.

²³⁶So also recently upheld by Geza Vermes, *The Authentic Gospel of Jesus* (London: Penguin Books, 2004), 114-72.

²³⁷This interpretative position goes back to Jülicher, Dodd and Jeremias.

²³⁸Graham Stanton, *The Gospels and Jesus*, 2nd ed., OBS (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 219-22.

developed and included some more elaborations of parables that were not originally from Jesus.²³⁹ Most likely the contexts of the Gospel writers were totally different from that of Jesus and it could be that the Gospel parables put in the mouth of Jesus by the Gospel writers were from different contexts.²⁴⁰ Accordingly, the interpretations of the parables of Jesus in their original environment could be totally different from the settings of the Gospel narratives that employ them with specific intentions and expected interpretations of their own. Not a few scholars admit that parables such as The Great Banquet or The Marriage Feast in Lk 14.16-24 and Mt 22.1-14 (cf. *Gospel of Thomas* 64) are allegorical parables through and through.²⁴¹ Likewise, The Wicked Tenants that is used by the three Synoptic Gospels, in Mt 21.33-46, Mk 12.1-12 and Lk 20.9-19 (cf. *Gospel of Thomas* 65-66), has been interpreted allegorically from the time of Fathers until now by contemporary scholars.²⁴² The allegorical interpretation of the parables within their immediate contexts, as in the cases of The Sower, The Tares and The Net, is given in Matthew chapter 13. It is most interesting that the parable of The Sower in Mt 13.1-9, Mk 4.1-9 and Lk 8.4-8 appear on the three Synoptic Gospels. It is also telling that The Sower has an allegorical interpretation as well in Mt 13.18-23, Mk 4.13-20 and Lk 8.11-15. Since Jesus was from the Galilee of the Gentiles, his assumption of parable interpretation would not only be rabbinic but could even be allegorical in approach and influenced by the Graeco-Roman rhetoric. There are enough evidences among the Jews

²³⁹Recently reiterated by Vermes, *Authentic*, 172.

²⁴⁰The articles of Hooker, Hagner and Longenecker could very well illustrate this notion. See Morna D. Hooker, "Mark's Parables of the Kingdom (Mark 4:1-34)" [79-101]; Donald A. Hagner, "Matthew's Parables of the Kingdom (Matthew 13:1-52)" [102-24]; and Richard N. Longenecker, "Luke's Parables of the Kingdom (Luke 8:4-15; 13:18-21)" [125-47]; in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000), 79-147.

²⁴¹See the discussion of Blomberg, *Parables*, 233-40; and Hultgren, *Parables*, 331-51.

²⁴²B. T. D. Smith, *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels: A Critical Study* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937), 22, maintains that the parable "in its present form is allegory". Jeremias, *Parables*, 55, also admits that The Wicked Tenants "exhibits an allegorical character which is unique among the parables of Jesus" and that "the whole parable is evidently pure allegory". See Wailes, *Medieval*, and Valavanolickal, *Use*, for the patristic interpretation of the parable. See also the latest treatment of the parable by Blomberg, *Parables*, 247-51; and Hultgren, *Parables*, 351-79.

how the Old Testament *mashal*,²⁴³ the Qumran community²⁴⁴ and the rabbinic literature²⁴⁵ exhibit features of allegorising interpretation of texts, not to mention Philo and Paul.²⁴⁶ It is even difficult to differentiate if there was a distinction for Jesus between parable and allegory, in terms of their figurative features. To make a distinction between a genuine parable of Jesus—in its closest reconstructed rabbinic form and the parable’s possible ipsissima verba—as uttered by Jesus, and then set this distinction against an allegorical Gospel parable and its meaning attributed to the Church tradition is misleading. The parables of Jesus were preserved through the tradition of the early Christian community, oral and written alike. Gregory J. Riley’s argument that in the early church the precise wording of Jesus was not taken seriously is valuable:

[Jesus] certainly taught and his message was essential, but many of his words were curiously transformed by his own followers, placed in different contexts and given different meanings, while new sayings were composed and attributed to him. People, apparently, did not follow Jesus for his words. For all the attention given in the modern era to the sayings of the historical Jesus, his precise words seem hardly to have mattered at all.²⁴⁷

Questioning the authenticity of the apparent allegorical interpretations that are given by Jesus to at least three of his Gospel parables as noted above is based only on the assumption that parables are not allegories.²⁴⁸ Some of the parables with their defined

²⁴³See Drury, *Parables*, 7-38. Cf. Claus Westermann, *The Parables of Jesus in the Light of the Old Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

²⁴⁴See Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999), 32-3.

²⁴⁵See Geza Vermes, *The Changing Faces of Jesus* (London: Penguin Books, 2000), 241-6. Cf. David Stern, *Parables in Midrash: Narrative and Exegesis in Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991), 9-13.

²⁴⁶Longenecker, *Biblical*, 30-2, 109-13.

²⁴⁷Gregory J. Riley, *One Jesus, Many Christs: How Jesus Inspired Not One True Christianity, But Many, The Truth About Christian Origins* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997), 17.

²⁴⁸The assumption that parables do not contain allegorical attributes has been challenged already. The case for the allegorical character of the parables is a very strong one. See for example the work of Drury, *Parables*, that argues for the Gospel parables containing historical allegories. Other important works which

interpretations may not be the *ipsissima verba* Jesu,²⁴⁹ but to say that their tradition is not from Jesus himself and rather absolutely from the Church is too much of a claim and is not self-evident.²⁵⁰ If there is evidence for the specific allegorical interpretations of some of the parables of Jesus, they are in the Gospels that claim Jesus himself gave the interpretations.²⁵¹ It is now recognised that the allegorical interpretations given by Jesus for the meaning of the parables he used are authentic.²⁵² It is currently acknowledged by students of parables that in the Semitic mind there is no distinction between the metaphorical comparison of *mashal* and allegory.²⁵³ The Fathers would have picked up the way the Gospel parables were allegorically interpreted²⁵⁴ for it could be that Jesus himself coming from the Galilee of the Gentiles²⁵⁵ even intended some, if not all, of his parables to contain allegorical features.²⁵⁶

argue that the parables consist of allegorical elements are Boucher, *Mysterious*; Tolbert, *Perspectives*; Blomberg, *Parables*; and Sider, *Interpreting*.

²⁴⁹Scott, *Hear*, 72-6, is a good representative of the notion that the Gospel parables if not memorised in their original words were at least remembered by their initial structures.

²⁵⁰See Geraint V. Jones, *The Art and Truth of the Parables: A Study in Their Literary Form and Modern Interpretation* (London: SPCK, 1964), 80-109. See also Goulder, "Characteristics", 58-62, 66-9; Blomberg, *Parables*, 71-163; Stanton, *Gospels*, 218-31; and Hultgren, *Parables*, 424-9, 453-64.

²⁵¹Raymond E. Brown, "Parable and Allegory Reconsidered", *NovT* 5 (1962): 36-45.

²⁵²See C. F. D. Moule, "Mark 4:1-20 Yet Once More", in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*, eds. E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969), 95-113. See also the conclusion of Blomberg, *Parables*, 165-7, on the authenticity of the parables of Jesus.

²⁵³See Brown, "Parable", 37-8; Drury, *Parables*, 8; and Blomberg, *Parables*, 36-7. See also Kissinger, *Parables*, 77-83. Cf. Stanton, *Gospels*, 219; and Vermes, *Authentic*, 114-5. Cf. also Scott, *Hear*, 3-62.

²⁵⁴Stanton, *Gospels*, 224, points out that because the Gospels themselves as written by the evangelists incorporate allegories it should not be unexpected that the early Church Fathers supposed the parables of Jesus as allegories.

²⁵⁵The words of Lee Martin McDonald and Stanley E. Porter, *Early Christianity and Its Sacred Literature* (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 2000), 578, are enlightening:

It was into this Greco-Roman world that Jesus was born. Although he used Aramaic predominantly, he apparently employed Greek as well, and it was Greek that became the language of the early church. This linguistic unity helped create ecclesial unity...It was in Greek that not only the NT writings but virtually all the apocryphal NT materials were preserved. The earliest church fathers were Greek writers. It is therefore reasonable that one should learn something of both the Greek language, in which the NT was written, and the larger conceptual, intellectual, and linguistic world in which this language was used.

²⁵⁶Allegorical features, due to the metaphorical use of language in literature, are not uncommon in antiquity. Hence, an allegorical approach to interpretation of text is generally known to both the western and

The influence of the foreign power in Palestine would give Jesus a totally different kind of milieu from that of preexilic Israel.²⁵⁷ Perhaps, Jesus transformed or adapted the rabbinic type of parables to popular metaphorical form with allegorical elements²⁵⁸ because of his Galilee of the Gentiles environment.²⁵⁹ Who would know?²⁶⁰ Although it may be argued to the contrary that Jesus could have given allegorical interpretations to his parables, still, when the early Christian communities interpreted his parables they would have certainly understood them with allegorical features.²⁶¹

The harmonisations of Luke with Matthew in D are well known.²⁶² These harmonisations are generally taken by contemporary scholarship as due to embarrassment of the scribes who saw contradictions on the Gospel accounts. If the use of an allegorical approach to explain variations of texts in the parables is not new, the use of the ancient theory of mimesis to solve textual riddles is something that I introduce here in my thesis.²⁶³ In the next chapter I will argue that these harmonisations in the D text of Luke are a sort of mimetic referencing or intertextuality for interpretative purpose. If there is any available parallel passage in Matthew, it is most likely that the D text of Luke would harmonise its text and

eastern societies. See my discussion of the concept of allegory in the first chapter, 19-21, especially footnote 100, as practised in the ancient Chinese literature. See also Matthew Black, "The Parable as Allegory", *BJRL* 42 (1959-60): 273-87.

²⁵⁷Riley, *One Jesus*, 20-21.

²⁵⁸See the discussion of Blomberg, *Parables*, 58-69, on "The Rabbinic Parables". See also Craig A. Evans, "Parables in Early Judaism", in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000), 51-75.

²⁵⁹Cf. Theissen and Merz, *Historical Jesus*, 162-84.

²⁶⁰See the discussion of the issues relating to the Gospel parables and the historical Jesus in Ben Witherington III, *The Jesus Quest: The Third Search for the Jew of Nazareth* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995), 52-5. See also Herzog, *Subversive*, 14-6, 46-51; and Theissen and Merz, *Historical Jesus*, 337-43.

²⁶¹The works of E. Hatch, *Influence*; Hanson, *Allegory*; Dawson, *Allegorical*; Torrance, *Divine*; and Young, *Biblical Exegesis*; in their studies of patristic hermeneutics, generally verify this assumption.

²⁶²See Vogels, *Harmonistik*, especially 87-105.

²⁶³I am not aware of any work in New Testament textual criticism that employs the ancient theory of mimesis to explain a textual problem.

conform to the reading of Matthew. However, if there is no parallel passage that can be found in Matthew, it is observable that the D text of Luke may allow itself to harmonise its text with Mark. This is the general principle that I deduced from my study of the harmonising tendency of the D text of Luke.²⁶⁴

²⁶⁴See the fourth and fifth chapters of this present work for examples and verification of the way this fundamental principle applies in the D text of Luke in relationship with the texts of Matthew, as the primary source for harmonisation, and Mark, as a secondary source.

CHAPTER 3

GOSPEL HARMONY AND ALLEGORISING READING

Gospel Harmonisations Fitting to Mimetic and Polemic Purposes

It is widely recognised that Irenaeus (ca. 180 CE) in *Against Heresies* 2.22.3-5 and 3.11.3-8 was the first one to use the expression “four Gospels” in the sense of canonised collected works of the apostolic writings.¹ Nonetheless, it was actually Justin (post 150 CE) in his *Apology* 1.66 who was the earliest one to employ the plural for the Gospels.² The tendency of Justin was to harmonise readings and combine accounts of the Gospels and he was free in working with the tradition of the Gospels being more concerned with the questions that he needed to address than rigid in verbatim quotation of text.³ This attitude of Justin to Gospel citation and use of Christian texts would probably have been picked up by his students, such as Tatian from Syria who later produced the Diatessaron.⁴ Tatian’s Diatessaron,⁵ which is a sort of medley of the four Gospels into one non-stop Gospel

¹Irenaeus 1, *ANCL* 5:198-202, 289-95. For further discussion on Irenaeus’ utilisation of the four canonical Gospels see Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 4-5, 34-8. See also Ehrman, *Lost Christianities*, 238-40, on patristic motivations for developing a canon of the four Gospels. Cf. the perceptive article of Annette Yoshiko Reed, “ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ: Orality, Textuality, and the Christian Truth in Irenaeus’ *Adversus Haereses*”, *VCRECLL* 56 (2002): 11-46.

²Justin Martyr, *FC* 6:105-6. See Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 4-5, 19-20, for the consideration of Justin’s knowledge of several Gospels. See also Koester, “Text”, 28-33, on his discussion of Justin’s knowledge of the “Synoptic parallels” of Matthew and Luke and also his lack of their “full harmony”. Koester, “Text”, 33, also poses an important question: “Is Justin a witness for the early existence of the Western Text, especially for the Gospel of Luke? Or is the Western text a testimony for the influence of Justin’s Gospel harmony?”.

³See the conclusion of A. J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*, *NovTSup* 17 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), 139-42, in his investigation on how Justin employed the maxims of Jesus in his extant text.

⁴As Bellinzoni, *Sayings*, 142, concludes that “a gospel harmony did not originate with Tatian” for he was a student in Justin’s school wherein “gospel harmonies were apparently commonplace”.

⁵Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 4.29.6, cites Tatian as the chief among others who made harmonies of the Gospels for his Diatessaron was the most popular harmony in antiquity. See Eusebius 1, LCL 153:397. For a detailed discussion on Tatian’s Diatessaron see William L. Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship*, *SupVigChr* 25 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994). For a shorter consideration of harmonisation of the Gospels in the Diatessaron see Baarda, “Factors”, 29-47.

narrative,⁶ was for a very long period used in the liturgy of the Syrian Church.⁷ Ephrem, the Syrian poet, even wrote a commentary on the Diatessaron in about 360 to 370.⁸ It was not until about the fifth-century that the four canonical Gospels overshadowed the Diatessaron.⁹ It is conjectured that Tatian's harmony of the four Gospels was originally made in Greek and later translated into Syriac.¹⁰ However, there is no certainty in the opinion of an original Greek Diatessaron,¹¹ instead the evidence points to the Diatessaron circulating in Greek and

⁶Tjitze Baarda, "The Diatessaron of Tatian and Its Influence on the Vernacular Versions: The Case of John 19:30", in *Essays on the Diatessaron*, CBET 11 (Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1994), 23, points out how Tatian was ingenious in his harmony of the Gospels and that he picked up their accounts "for memorabilia, memories and memoirs" and transformed them into "a credible account about Jesus". Tatian was compelled "to suppress the historical discordancies and the stylistic (sic) imperfections of these sources in order to create the unique and true Life of Christ".

⁷Although the original of the Diatessaron, Syriac or Greek, did not survive, it was extant in the early translations. To quote Frederic Kenyon, *The Bible and Archaeology* (London: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1940), 239: "We now, know therefore, the Diatessaron, but only through the medium of Arabic, Armenian, Latin, and Dutch versions, the accuracy of which is hard to prove". The English translation of Diatessaron is readily available in J. Hamlyn Hill, *The Earliest Life of Christ Ever Compiled from the Four Gospels: Being the Diatessaron of Tatian Literally Translated from the Arabic Version and Containing the Four Gospels Woven into One Story, With an Introduction and Notes*, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910; repr., New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2001).

⁸An English translation of Ephrem's commentary on the Diatessaron is provided by Carmel McCarthy, *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron: An English Translation of Chester Beatty Syriac MS 709 with Introduction and Notes*, JSSSup 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

⁹Williams, *Alterations*, 19-20; and Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 25-6. Kenyon, *Archaeology*, 237-40, however, notes that the influence and usage of the Diatessaron was not totally lost since it has been translated into other significant ancient languages apart from its Syriac and Greek forms.

¹⁰See McCarthy, *Commentary*, 3-9, particularly 5. Baarda, "Influence", 22, went even further in his view from the commonly held opinion that Diatessaron could be originally in Greek and later translated into Syriac and declares that:

In my opinion Tatian had already composed it in Rome, in the first place for use in his school. It is very probable that before him Justin had already composed a kind of harmony based on the synoptic gospels and certain other sources. The novelty of Tatian's composition is that he also integrated the Gospel of John, whose canonical status was in those days still in dispute in Rome. For use in his school Tatian had to compose his Diatessaron in Greek, the literary language of Rome, and not in Latin. To be able to create a harmony he must have made a synopsis of the Greek gospels. It remains possible that he, like Justin, incorporated some extra-canonical traditions. This way he became the first author of a Life of Jesus that combined the synoptic gospels and other traditions with the fourth gospel.

¹¹The evidence points to the contrary according to Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 390-7, who examines the problem of an original Greek Diatessaron using the parable of The Good Samaritan as an example to make his case. Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 397, contends:

If the original Diatessaron were composed in Greek, then it is inexplicable how—while leaving its mark on the Syriac separated gospels and more than a half-dozen vernacular harmonies from

Syriac alike.¹² This view of the Greek original of Diatessaron, it is claimed, is supported by the Dura fragment¹³ discovered in Syria on 5 March 1933¹⁴ and catalogued as New Testament Greek manuscript 0212.¹⁵ Although this fragment of Gospel harmony has been rejected as from Tatian's Diatessaron, it still maintains its witness for the popular use of Greek Gospel harmony in the East during the second and third-centuries.¹⁶ Thus, the Diatessaronic kind of text form of Gospel harmony¹⁷ in Greek—and not only in Syriac, such as what the Dura fragment indicates, was probably widely used in Syria and Mesopotamia area at that period.¹⁸

Diatessaronic Model and Intertextual Reading as Interpretative Tool

When the full harmony of the Gospels by Tatian became popular in the early Eastern Christianity, its form of text, if not its original text, even became the basis of the works of Aphrahat and Ephrem who both became very influential and productive expositors of the

the Netherlands to Persia—these distinctive readings should have left nary a trace in the canonical Greek (or Latin) manuscript tradition. Furthermore, the distinctive features found in the Diatessaronic tradition are contrary to Greek style and usage. On the other hand, the hypothesis of a Syriac original Diatessaron explains not only the genesis of the additions (they are the products of Semitic style and syntax), but also the distribution of the readings (confined to Diatessaronic witness). The evidence indicates that the Diatessaron was originally composed in a Semitic language, almost certainly Syriac.

¹²Matthew Black, "The Syriac Versional Tradition", in *Alten Übersetzungen*, 120.

¹³See the opinion survey about the Dura fragment by Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 196-203.

¹⁴Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 196.

¹⁵Aland and Aland, *Text*, 58, 104, 125, categorise 0212 as "Diatessaron fragment" or "Diatessaric text".

¹⁶See D. C. Parker, D. G. K. Taylor and M. S. Goodacre, "The Dura-Europos Gospel Harmony", in *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts*, ed. D. G. K. Taylor, TS 3rd Series 1 (Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1999), 192-228.

¹⁷For a good background study of the significant Gospel harmonies in the early Church see Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 9-34.

¹⁸As Parker, Taylor and Goodacre, "Dura-Europos", 228, conclude that although the Dura fragment is certainly not a part of the Diatessaron, "it emphasises the need apparently felt in Syria and Mesopotamia in the second and third centuries for a harmonised text of the Gospels, a need that was to lead to the later success, indeed dominance, in the region of Tatian's Diatessaron". For a late second-century dating of the fragment see Parker, Taylor and Goodacre, "Dura-Europos", 193-9. See also Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 196, footnote 151, for first-half of the third-century dating.

Gospel accounts.¹⁹ However, it is unfortunate that Tatian was pronounced a heretic later in his life.²⁰ Hence, Diatessaron's popularity was affected by the fate of Tatian.²¹ Given the circumstances of the later life of Tatian, there is an ambiguity—and hence a scholarly debate—as to whether Tatian's Diatessaron has influenced the harmonisation tendency of the Gospel readings in the Western Church.²² But whether the Diatessaronic model was influential or not,²³ what is a pertinent feature of the similar harmonies of the Gospels, however, is the way the Gospels were interpreted and became interpretative tool in understanding the words of Christ, such as in Justin.²⁴ Of course, another significant example

¹⁹Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 44-5. Black, "Syriac", 122, notes the way Aphrahat and Ephrem quoted the Diatessaron in their works: "The Oriental Fathers' attitude towards the text seems to have been a somewhat liberal one, concerned with its content rather than with precise quotation; quotations, e.g., are adapted to give a general application". But cf. Tjitze Baarda, *The Gospel Quotations of Aphrahat The Persian Sage I: Aphrahat's Text of the Fourth Gospel* (Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 1975), 322-4, 340-2, who points out that there is no evidence that Aphrahat and Ephrem could have used the original version of Diatessaron in Syriac. Rather, it is more likely that they have used Gospel harmonies' text forms as well as texts of the Four Gospels. In any case the work of Petersen, Black and Baarda confirms the use of harmonies, Diatessaronic text form or other Gospels' text harmonies, by the two important Syriac Fathers.

²⁰For the account of Tatian's life, his rationale for creating the Diatessaron and the influence of his heresy upon his harmonised text see Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 67-83. See also the introductions of Hill, *Earliest*, vii-xiv; and McCarthy, *Commentary*, 3-4.

²¹Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.28.1, was the first one who charged Tatian of heretical propensity. See Irenaeus 1, *ANCL* 5:100-1. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, 4.29.6, did not have any direct familiarity with the Diatessaron. See Eusebius 1, *LCL* 153:397. Theodoret, *History of Heresies* 1.20, banned the Diatessaron and replaced them with the four individual Gospels. See Theodoret of Cyrhus, *PG* 83:372.

²²See Ulrich B. Schmid, "In Search of Tatian's Diatessaron in the West", *VCRECLL* 57 (2003): 176-99, who contends that although scholars thought that the "Old-Latin harmony" could be an independent witness in reality this reconstruction of the Latin witness based on Western medieval vernacular harmonies goes back to the same source, which is Codex Fuldensis. Accordingly, it is sensible to assume with Schmid that the totality of the supposedly Western harmony tradition is traceable only to the single witness of Codex Fuldensis. See also Williams, *Alterations*, 20-4. Cf. Arthur Vööbus, *Early Versions of the New Testament: Manuscript Studies*, PETSE 6 (Stockholm:[Estonian Theological Society in Exile], 1954), 22-6.

²³Concerning the relationship of Tatian's Diatessaron with the individual Syriac Gospels' textual traditions see the discussion of Black, "Syriac", 121-8. See also the patristic witness to Tatian and the condemnation of his Diatessaron in Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 35-51.

²⁴In Justin's quotations, harmonisation and interpretation of the sayings of Jesus from the Gospels I refer to Bellinzoni, *Sayings*. See especially Bellinzoni's examples in 76-106 which indicate that harmonisation became an interpretative tool for Justin in understanding and representing the words of Jesus in the memoirs of the apostles.

is Ephrem's commentary on the Diatessaron.²⁵ Although the Diatessaron is the only known fully harmonised account of the Gospels that may have been composed in the third quarter of the second-century and may have been prepared by Tatian to solve the contradiction problem of the Gospels,²⁶ it was not unique but just one among other attempts to make harmony of the Gospels.²⁷ In preparing Gospel harmonies such as the Diatessaron, the choices of what material to include and exclude²⁸ were made on the basis of interpretative purposes to understand the words and deeds of Jesus in a better way.²⁹ Tjitze Baarda is helpful when he observes that “the sayings of Jesus as quoted by Justin not only show a harmonistic pattern, but must also derive from a kind of post-synoptic harmony, or at least from some sort of Church manuals or catechisms in which the sayings of Jesus were thematically collected in a harmonised form”.³⁰ This means that the harmonising tendency of Justin was used in a thematic interpretative manner.³¹ Also, for Clement of Rome, Barnabas an epistle writer and

²⁵McCarthy, *Commentary*, 9-36, provides the mechanics and principles of Ephrem's approach in his commentary on the Diatessaron.

²⁶Baarda, “Factors”, 36-46, discusses the motive of Tatian in creating the Diatessaron. Cf. Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 72-6.

²⁷Baarda, “Factors”, 31-7, points out the reason for the rise of the harmonies of the Gospels in terms of reconciling the contradictory accounts of one Gospel to another.

²⁸See Vööbus, *Early Versions*, 15-22, on the nature of the text of Diatessaron and what guided Tatian on the choices that he made on what to include and exclude in his harmonised text of the four Gospels. See also D. Plooiij, *A Further Study of Liège Diatessaron* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1925), 18-24, on the methodology of Tatian in producing the text of the Diatessaron.

²⁹Cf. Young, *Art*, 109, who maintains that although knowledge of historical data may have assisted “to provide proper constraints”, it is also valid in the narrative that “the ‘interpretative’ process inevitably involved in producing a narrative went largely unremarkable in the ancient world, and even where they took note of different versions, they rarely raised critical questions about which was closer to the facts—Herodotus just assembled the different stories he collected side by side”.

³⁰Baarda, “Factors”, 36.

³¹See Oskar Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition; Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*, NovTSup 56 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1987), 256-88, on “the setting of Justin's exegesis” and “the Christological testimonies” he cited. Skarsaune, *Proof*, 287, points out on how Justin's treatment of “Gospel narratives in the fulfilment reports represent a fusion of Matthean and Lukan elements, with some extra-canonical features added—these are paralleled in the *Gospel of Peter* and the *Protevangelium of James*”.

Ignatius of Antioch, who predate Justin, by primarily citing Matthew with Lukan parallels, provide a conflated source for their understanding of Jesus' teachings as harmonised from other sources as shown by the classic work of Édouard Massaux.³² Moreover, there are some "Western" readings in the D text of the Gospels that can be considered Diatessaronic in nature as demonstrated by William Petersen.³³ It was widely popular in both East and West to harmonise the Gospels' account³⁴ "if a unitary version was preferred".³⁵ The works of Baarda, Massaux and Petersen may suggest a mere simple harmonisation for our contemporary understanding of the conflicts of accounts in the Gospels, but for the Fathers harmonisation was an interpretative tool that we currently call intertextuality, to interpret the text of the Gospels.³⁶

³²Massaux, *Influence*, Book 1. See especially his examples in 33-5, 74-7, 97-100, and conclusions in 57, 82, 118-20. It should be noted that Massaux has no interest in seemingly elusive sources that cannot be traced and no longer extant.

³³See the cases given by Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 378-425. Cf. Schmid, "In Search", 176-99, who traces the Western harmonies to a single witness of Codex Fuldensis.

³⁴See Baarda, "Factors", 33-5. Cf. Williams, *Alterations*, 20-4. For the process of the harmonisation of the Gospels see Gordon D. Fee, "Modern Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem: On the Problem of Harmonization in the Gospels", in *STMNTTC*, 174-82, especially 174-80; repr. from Bernard Orchard and T. R. W. Longstaff, eds., *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776-1976*, SNTSMS 34 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 154-69, especially 161-7.

³⁵Young, *Art*, 109.

³⁶To maintain that the harmonisation tendency of the Gospels is an interpretative tool for the early Fathers does not deny that it is also used as a polemic to bring into line the seemingly contradicting narrative accounts or Jesus' sayings. It is rather like a two-edged sword when harmony is taken as both interpretative tool and conflict solution, for the context of the early Church is both polemic and apologetic. See as a case in point Parker, *Living Text*, 75-94, especially 80-9, in his treatment of the harmonisation and textual interpretation of the marriage and divorce sayings of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels. Cf. Michael W. Holmes, "The Text of the Matthaean Divorce Passages: A Comment on the Appeal to Harmonization in Textual Decisions", *JBL* 109 (1990): 651-64. See also Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 62-7, who argues that Lk 3.22 as harmonised with Mk 1.11 is not mere harmonisation but a polemic interpretation of the original reading in D from Ps 2.7 against the Christian adoptionists. Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 108 footnote 105, further asserts: "The reason for conforming the text to Mark rather than Matthew is self-evident: in both Mark and Luke the heavenly voice addresses Jesus in the second person; in Matthew it uses the third person. It was therefore easiest simply to keep the second person pronoun and harmonize the words to the familiar form of the second Gospel".

Textual Cross-reference and Interpretative Allegory as Variant Readings

Tatian's Diatessaron and similar Gospel harmonies could be instructive to the understanding of the harmonising tendency of variant readings in D.³⁷ The pattern of harmonisation and allegorical reading of the texts of the Four Gospels to get the spiritual meaning of what Jesus taught, using his parables, is the pattern that has a coherence in the D text of Luke.³⁸ Perhaps, it was Marcion who first cited an allegorical interpretation of a parable, i.e. The Good Samaritan, where it says in a seventh-century Syriac manuscript identified with Marcion that: "Our Lord was not born from a woman, but stole the domain of the Creator and came down and appeared for the first time between Jerusalem and Jericho, like a human being in form and image and likeness, but without our body".³⁹ Although the authenticity of this Marcionite interpretative tradition of the parable is contested, Marcion's interpretation of The Good Samaritan is in a Christological doctrinal sense that is common in the patristic period.⁴⁰ If the allegorical citation of the parable in Marcion is authentic then the

³⁷Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 84-356, provides not only a survey of a few textual harmonies similar to Tatian's (9-34) but also a full length study of the scholarship on the Diatessaron, Gospel harmonies of different sorts and the "Western" witness with its "Eastern" counterparts to the Diatessaronic type of readings in the textual traditions of the Gospels.

³⁸See my exhibits of Lukan parables in the D text with allegorising and mimetic variant readings that are coherent with the parable interpretation of the Fathers in the following two chapters.

³⁹This quotation is taken from Riemer Roukema, "The Good Samaritan in Ancient Christianity", *VCRECLL* 58 (2004): 57. According to Roukema the British Museum keeps this seventh-century Syriac manuscript (cod. Add. 17215 fol. 30) and cited by A. von Harnack.

⁴⁰See Werner Monselewski, *Der barmherzige Samariter: Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lukas 10,25-37*, BGBE 5 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Siebeck, 1967), 18-21, for the defence of the authenticity of this interpretative tradition assigned to Marcion as well as his discussion on how Marcion allegorises the good Samaritan as Jesus. Contra Roukema, "Good", 57-8, who rejects the authenticity of the Marcionite allegorical interpretation of The Good Samaritan, the strength of Monselewski's acceptance of the tradition as Marcionite is based on an extant ancient document, albeit quite late in dating, against the reconstructed text of Marcion by von Harnack—which Roukema used as his source. Further, the doctrinal emphasis of the tradition is docetic and fits well with Marcion. Roukema's argument that Marcion rejects allegorical interpretation is hardly an argument at all in the ancient Church. Some Fathers would say they reject the allegorical interpretation, yet they allegorise the Scriptures as well, as seen in their writings. For Marcion, who will gain a docetic doctrinal benefit by an allegorical allusion to the parable, to equate the person of the good Samaritan to Jesus is not surprising at all. As always among the Fathers, the doctrinal factor in approaching the Scriptures overrules. Roukema, quoting A. Orbe, cites the contradiction between the extant manuscript reading as "the Lord appeared for the first time between Jerusalem and Jericho" and von Harnack's reconstruction of Marcion's

equation of the good Samaritan as Jesus is Christologically significant.⁴¹ As Robert Stein argues:

It is not important for us to know exactly why or how Marcion came to such an allegorical interpretation, but such an interpretation did fit well with his docetic teachings because it permitted him to deny the incarnation and true humanity of Jesus. What is important to note is that the earliest known reference to the parable of the good Samaritan treated the parable allegorically as teaching a Christological doctrine rather than literally as teaching an ethical attitude!⁴²

The allegorical interpretation of the parables of Jesus as recorded in the accounts of the canonical Gospels in the days of the Christian Fathers could be doctrinal in nature, specifically Christological, as represented here by one of their opponents, the heretic Marcion.⁴³ However, as Maurice Wiles describes the canons of parable interpretation the Fathers developed them as an anti-heretical reading of the Gospel parables where they argued that the parables of Jesus could not be a basis of doctrine.⁴⁴ It should not be surprising because the parables were readily accepted as sayings of Jesus that need interpretation.⁴⁵ Justin used harmonisation or conflation of the sayings of Jesus from different sources to

claim that “Christ came down from heaven to Capernaum in the fifteenth year of the emperor Tiberius”. Although at the outset it seems that there is a contradiction on Marcion’s part if the reference to parable is taken as authentic, it should not be forgotten that the ancient document is a clear allegorical interpretation. The allegorical allusion to the parable of The Good Samaritan in the appearance of the Lord between Jerusalem and Jericho is a referential necessity that Capernaum as an exact location of Christ’s appearance cannot provide. Therefore, it is more favourable to view the Marcionite allegorical interpretative tradition of The Good Samaritan as preserved in the Syriac manuscript kept in British Museum is authentic.

⁴¹Thus, to strike a balance to Marcionite tendency the point of Wiles, “Early”, 289, is telling wherein one of the canons of “orthodox interpretation” is the affirmation that “parables are not to be used as a source for the determination of doctrine, but rather that established doctrine is to be used as a guide for their right interpretation”.

⁴²Stein, *Introduction*, 43.

⁴³Cf. Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 20-2, 123-4, who detects how the Fathers charged the heretics, Gnostics in particular, of their erroneous allegorical interpretation that led them to doctrinal heresy. For a full treatment of Valentinian allegorical interpretation of the Christian Scriptures and doctrinal construct of Gnostic mythology see Dawson, *Allegorical*, 127-82. Ehrman and Dawson maintain that allegorical interpretation of the biblical text was used by the Gnostics doctrinally.

⁴⁴Wiles, “Early”, 288-92.

⁴⁵See Hultgren, *Parables*, 1-19.

interpret his teaching for catechism.⁴⁶ This pattern of harmonisation based on cross-referencing, in order to develop an allegorical approach to the Gospels thrived among the Church Fathers.⁴⁷ Origen (*Commentary in John* 10.14), for example, talked about κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἄσυμφωνία to explain his interpretation of the διαφωνία text of the Gospel,⁴⁸ as he attempted to deal with the issue by getting into an allegorical or spiritual meaning.⁴⁹ Eusebius (*Ecclesiastical History* 3.24) for his part made widespread harmonising version of the Gospels.⁵⁰ Aphrahat and Ephrem utilised the Diatessaronic harmony or a related Gospel harmony text form of the Gospels in their interpretation of the parables of Jesus.⁵¹

It is also noteworthy at the outset, that in the critical apparatus of NA²⁷ there are indications that the harmonised variant readings of the D text in the Synoptic Gospels were supported either by the Syriac or by the Latin translations, or many times by both, that perhaps can be traced to Diatessaronic textual tradition.⁵² This significant Diatessaronic witness of Syriac and Latin in support of D implies that the Syrian as well as the Latin congregations⁵³ would have known the D readings through the Old Syriac and the Old Latin

⁴⁶Bellinzoni, *Sayings*, 141, adds as well the thought that the harmonisation made by Justin in his use of the Gospels led to the later corruption of the textual tradition of the Gospels due to harmonising tendency that he introduced.

⁴⁷See some examples given by Massaux, *Influence*, 2: passim, especially on the parables.

⁴⁸Cf. Baarda, “Factors”, 32-3.

⁴⁹Origen, *FC* 80:257. See Hengel, *Four Gospels*, 223, endnote 98.

⁵⁰Eusebius 1, LCL 153:249-57.

⁵¹Valavanolickal, *Use*, 344-61, however, points out that the use of Diatessaron by Aphrahat and Ephrem was not exclusive, instead they used other sources such as the Old Syriac and some others that are untraceable in origin.

⁵²See also Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 84-356, on his survey of the Diatessaronic textual witnesses to the text of the New Testament as well as a historical account of the scholarship on the Diatessaron; and his “Appendix II—A Stemma of the Diatessaronic Tradition” on 490.

⁵³As Bruce M. Metzger, *The Bible in Translation: Ancient and English Versions* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001), 26, claims that “for the next several centuries Christian congregations throughout the Middle East made use of [Tatian’s] harmony, known as the Diatessaron”.

text forms.⁵⁴ In this regard it is pertinent to consider that, on the one hand, the possibility of the harmonisation in the D text was due to the influence of the Latin, Syriac or Greek Diatessaronic textual form of Gospel harmony⁵⁵ that would have been available and accessible to the tradents⁵⁶ who transmitted the D Greek textual tradition.⁵⁷ On the other hand, it is also highly possible indeed that it was an acceptable literary convention in Graeco-Roman antiquity to take lines from several related narratives—making a textual cross-reference, then string them to make a new reading of a text like what Justin made that may have influenced variant readings in the D text of the Gospels, especially Luke.⁵⁸ Although it may be contended on historical, textual, sequential, theological and compositional grounds that the Coptic *Gospel of Thomas* was dependent on Tatian's Syriac

⁵⁴See the discussions of Matthew Black, "The New Testament Peshitta and Its Predecessors", *BSNTS*, Nos. I-III (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963; repr. from *SNTS Bulletin*, No. 1 [1950]), 51-62, in his treatment of the influence of the Diatessaron in the Old Syriac and the Peshitta; and Fischer, "Neue Testament", 41-9, on the relationship between the Old Latin and Vulgate that could have been affected by Diatessaronic harmonisation. See also Bruce M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 3-82, 285-362, especially 10-25, for the Eastern and Western witnesses to the Diatessaron; and Vööbus, *Early Versions*, 1-131, especially 6-22, for a survey of the Diatessaronic extant material and their textual character.

⁵⁵Chase, *Old Syriac*, especially 137-49; and *Syro-Latin Text*, especially 76-100, would be the classic studies of the relationship of the Syriac with the Greek and Latin text of D/d as well its possible shaping of the text by the Diatessaronic reading. For a more recent assessment of the contribution of Chase see Petersen, *Diatessaron*, 140-4.

⁵⁶Cf. Hans von Campenhausen, *The Formation of the Christian Bible*, trans. John Austin Baker (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1972), 104-5, who even goes back much earlier to the oral traditions of the Gospels and their material arrangement by their "collectors", "tradents" and "hearers".

⁵⁷See Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 256-8, 279-80; and Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 3-7. Cf. the conclusion of Chase, *Syro-Latin Text*, 128-42. Cf. also the discussion of the role of the Diatessaronic text in the early Church by Vööbus, *Early Versions*, 22-6.

⁵⁸Cf. Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 284-5, who maintains that "there are theological ramifications of some interest with regard to the way the teaching of Jesus could be viewed and handed on by the early church" and that D is "our most eloquent witness to the fact that the early church could and did alter the transmitted sayings of Jesus". Cf. also Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 19-21, who cites Irenaeus condemning the conventional practice of Homeric "centos" applied by the Valentinians to the Scriptures. "The word 'cento' is thought to have meant a 'patchwork cloak', and the idea was to take a series of discrete poetic lines from the classic epic and put them together so that they made sense as a new narrative". Elizabeth A. Clark, *Ascetic Piety and Women's Faith: Essays on Late Ancient Christianity*, SWR 20 (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1986), 124-71, cites a cento where she presents an early Christian woman used Virgil to compose a poem that teaches the Christian tradition from the creation and fall to the advent of Christ.

Diatessaron,⁵⁹ it is too much of a claim because as D. C. Parker points out the piece of evidence available is that the *Gospel of Thomas* exists in Coptic whilst the Diatessaron of Tatian survives only in an indirect manner.⁶⁰ In any case, the investigation of the allegorical reading of the parables of Jesus in the D text should be studied in the framework of this sort of Gospel harmonisation (or cross-referencing) that could possibly have been used as interpretative tool and not only a means of resolving contradictions in the accounts of the Gospels.⁶¹ The way the Fathers received the parable sayings of Jesus was connected with

⁵⁹See Nicholas Perrin, *Thomas and Tatian: The Relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the Diatessaron*, SBLAB 5 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002). It would be helpful to refer to the interesting conclusion of Perrin, *Thomas*, 188-9, in its entirety:

If one begins with the premise that GT [*Gospel of Thomas*] is an originally Syriac text consistently integrated by the use of catchwords, it is not a very large step toward surmising both the unity of the document and the nature of the sources behind the document. In comparing GT to the biblical text (as a rough approximation of the Diatessaronic tradition), it becomes clear that many of the differences between the two originated with Thomas himself. On a general level, this kind of redaction invites the hypothesis that the author's sources were literary, not oral; the rigorous and rather complex procedure of sorting and comparing materials suggests likewise. In this instance, it is also most probable that the *Diatessaron* (the early Syriac speaking Christians' only gospel account) was foremost among these sources. This conclusion is confirmed not only by certain historical and text-critical analyses of the texts, but also by an argument from sequence. It appears that the author of GT relied on a text whose sequence of pericopes, though sometimes following the biblical order, more closely followed the order of the *Diatessaron*. The affinities between Thomas's theology and Tatian's encrastic beliefs are significant, as are the textual peculiarities shared by their compositions. But it is the shared sequence of sayings that I find strong confirmation that GT is dependent on the *Diatessaron*. Thomas had written sources, and among these were the *Diatessaron*.

The possible approach of Thomas, according to Perrin, in collecting the sayings that he has arranged in the sequence of the Diatessaron in order to develop his own Gospel sayings of Jesus is comparably coherent with the Virgilian cento that E. A. Clark, *Ascetic*, presented in her book. Thus the stringing of words together from the Diatessaron and other sources in the case of the *Gospel of Thomas* is not surprising for it is a convention that thrived in antiquity. Suffice it is to say that this kind of approach to the sayings of Jesus is a sort of intertextual cross-referencing to derive a meaning that is being brought into the text. Whether the theory of Perrin that the Coptic *Thomas* was based on the Syriac Diatessaron is true or not, his work supplies another piece of evidence that the stringing of words together for interpretative purpose was employed by its author.

⁶⁰For a critical evaluation of Perrin see D. C. Parker, "Review of Nicholas Perrin, *Thomas and Tatian: The Relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the Diatessaron*", *TC* 8 (2003): n.p. [cited 8 April 2004]. Online: <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol08/Perrin2003rev.html>. See also R. McL. Wilson, review of Nicholas Perrin, *Thomas and Tatian: The Relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the Diatessaron*, *JTS* 54 (2003): 758-60.

⁶¹Although citing a totally different instance of reading harmonisation in the case of the divorce and remarriage sayings of Jesus (certainly the reference is neither to an allegorical interpretation nor to a parable interpretation), the reminder of Parker deserves a serious consideration when any kind of harmonisation in the Gospels is considered. Parker, *Living Text*, 87, induces that "we have to remember the tendency to harmonise, both within a Gospel and between Gospels".

their reception of the Gospels that contained them.⁶² The main criterion for the boundary of proper interpretation of Jesus' sayings, not only his parables, but even the whole of the Scripture, was the received tradition of the early Church.⁶³

Mimesis Theory of Literary Imitation as Intertextual Authority Referencing

It is indeed fascinating to observe the way the Christian Fathers utilised both the Old and New Testaments in their writings hence producing a catena of scripture quotes.⁶⁴ The chain referencing that they developed in the process, apparently not intending to create a formal literature as such, raises a significant question on why they took for granted intertextuality in their use of Scripture references.⁶⁵ As Peter Gorday succinctly describes the character of the patristic catenae: "By their very nature the catenae are simply an instrument of preservation and transmission, through which we now have access to the exegesis of certain of the Greek fathers, but they reveal also the broken and often bowdlerized form in this exegesis was used".⁶⁶ It would be helpful to understand that the Fathers' use of catenae in their writings represent the realities of their time whether in their apologies, homilies, epistles or any other writings.⁶⁷ Mimesis is assumed among the classical writers that was inherent in antiquity and could have shaped the patristic catenae.⁶⁸ The literary theory of

⁶²See Young, *Art*, 99 141, 151.

⁶³See G. W. H. Lampe, "Scripture and Tradition in the Early Church", in *Scripture and Tradition*, ed. F. W. Dillistone (London: Lutterworth Press, 1955), 23-52.

⁶⁴Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 29-45, narrates the way Athanasius employed textual citations from Old and New Testaments in his debate against Arius pointing out that the assumption of this kind of reasoning is on the confidence of the unity of the Scriptures.

⁶⁵See C. H. Turner, "Greek Patristic Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles", in *A Dictionary of the Bible Dealing with Its Language, Literature, and Contents Including the Biblical Theology*, Extra Volume, eds. James Hastings and John Selbie (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904), 484-531.

⁶⁶Peter Gorday, *Principles of Patristic Exegesis: Romans 9-11 in Origen, John Chrysostom, and Augustine*, SBEC 4 (New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1983), 16.

⁶⁷Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 217-47, calls these as "the contexts of interpretations".

⁶⁸Cf. Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 130-7.

mimesis though has conflicting views among the ancient Greeks and Romans that goes back to the debate between Plato and Aristotle.⁶⁹ The underlying assumption of the freedom in doing intertextuality within the accepted canon of the Scriptures among the Fathers was taken for granted as they take the Scriptures as a whole.⁷⁰ For the classical authors and the patristic writers, allusion to an older and established literary authority is an intertextual allusion or cross-referencing to borrow authoritative support to a newly produced literature to be received by the readers.⁷¹

⁶⁹It should be acknowledged without any reservation that there were incompatible attitudes between Plato and Aristotle on the concept of mimesis. Halliwell, *Aesthetics*, 15-6, is helpful in clearly describing the critical issues between the two philosophers:

Our evidence for pre-Platonic instances of mimesis terminology...cannot be reduced to a chronologically neat semantic development. It does establish, however, that we need to allow for its usage in relation to at least five categories of phenomena: first, visual resemblance (including figurative works of art); second, behavioural emulation/imitation; third, impersonation, including dramatic enactment; fourth, vocal or musical production of significant or expressive structures of sound; fifth, metaphysical conformity, as in the Pythagorean belief, reported by Aristotle, that the material world is a mimesis of the immaterial domain of numbers. The common thread running through these otherwise various uses is an idea of correspondence or equivalence—correspondence between mimetic works, activities, or performances and their putative real-world equivalents, whether the latter are taken to be externally given and independent or only hypothetically projectable from the mimetic works themselves. Although there is little surviving evidence for the theorizing of mimesis before Plato himself, it is nonetheless worth underlining that the pre-Platonic material does not uniformly imply that the object or model of mimetic entity need be either particular or actual, as opposed to type, a general or universal substance, or an imaginary-hypothetical state of affairs (what Aristotle was later to call “things that *could* occur,” *Poetics* 9.1451b5). I make this point partly in order to signal an issue...[of] the possibility that works or acts of artistic mimesis need not (always) be thought of as corresponding to specific, empirical “originals.”

⁷⁰See Gorday, *Principles*, 34-9.

⁷¹Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 130, maintains that: “Self-conscious cross-referencing belongs to the pervasive intertextuality of ancient literature”. Moreover she identifies two very important point on the use of mimesis for citing authorities:

(1) It was not customary to produce extended quotations from literature. It was regarded as unnecessary since any educated person would recognise the quotation. The important thing was to adapt it, to provide reminiscences, to emulate the way in which the great classical authors wrote, to put it how they would put it if they were addressing the topic in hand—in other words, to engage in *mimēsis* of the great classics. (2) The point of such intertextual reference was not primarily ornamental—quotation and allusion are not discussed in the books of style. It was recognised that such material might enhance the diction, but principally the point was to enlist the authority of the great poet, or to utilise classic examples of the virtue being extolled, in order to reinforce the content of the speech.

Elsewhere, Young, *Art*, 101, argues the point as well in the Old Testament quotation of the New Testament when she says: “Key Old Testament narratives prefigured by *mimēsis* the events of the New, and the deeds of key scriptural heroes provided examples to be imitated in the lives of Christians”.

Disapproving Plato and Sympathetic Aristotle on Representational Mimesis

Serious discussion of mimesis goes back to Plato and Aristotle with a particular interest on the role of poetry in mimesis.⁷² According to Julia Annas “poetry is the most important art form” because poetry shaped “an extensive part of children’s education, especially Homer, which was learned and recited in children’s formative years”.⁷³ Moreover, Homeric poetry is dramatically re-enacted when performed where it becomes the form of representative mimesis.⁷⁴ It is in Plato’s *Republic* that first glimpse of mimesis is associated with the ancient poetic literature.⁷⁵ Plato challenges artists and poets in their influence to the society.⁷⁶ The philosopher did not only observe the peril of the popular poetry of his time⁷⁷ but he also castigates particular forms or styles of poetry as well.⁷⁸ Aristotle, however,

⁷²For a meaningful discussion of poetry and mimesis in Plato and Aristotle see Else, *Plato and Aristotle*. For a quick sketch of Plato’s views on the mimetical relationship of arts and poetry with realities of life see J. W. H. Atkins, *Literary Criticism in Antiquity: A Sketch of Its Development*, Vol. 1, *Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934; repr., Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1961), 51-5; and for Aristotle, 78-83.

⁷³Julia Annas, *An Introduction to Plato’s Republic* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 94. See also Brodie, “Imitation”, 22-32 passim, on the role of poetry in mimesis.

⁷⁴See the fine treatment of Homeric poetry and representative mimesis in the process of “dramatic re-enactment” in Gregory Nagy, *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

⁷⁵See Plato, *Republic*, Books 2-3, 10 in Plato 1, LCL 237:108-313, and Plato 2, LCL 276:418-521.

⁷⁶See the discussions of the concept of mimesis in relationship with the artists and poets in Plato, *Republic* 595C-605C (Plato 2, LCL 276:420-59). Cf. the discussion of Atkins, *Greek*, 1:45.

⁷⁷The following quote is the very interesting dialogue between Socrates and Plato in the tenth book of the *Republic* 595B (Plato 2, LCL 276:419-21):

“What do you mean?” “Why, between ourselves—for you will not betray me to the tragic poets and all other imitators—that kind of art seems to be a corruption of the mind of all listeners who do not possess as an antidote a knowledge of its real nature.” “What is your idea in saying this?” he said. “I must speak out,” I said, “though a certain love and reverence for Homer that has possessed me from a boy would stay me from speaking. For he appears to have been the first teacher and beginner of all these beauties of tragedy. Yet all the same we must not honour a man above truth, but, as I say, speak our minds.”

⁷⁸Plato in the third book of his *Republic* 394 B-C (Plato 1, LCL 237:231) describes the kinds of poetry that he rejects:

‘This too I understand,’ he said, ‘—it is what happens in tragedy.’ ‘You have conceived me most rightly,’ I said, ‘and now I think I can make plain to you what I was unable to before, that there is one kind of poetry and tale-telling which works wholly through imitation, as you remarked, tragedy, and comedy; and another which employs the recital of the poet himself, best exemplified, I presume, in the

strives to form a system of investigation in order to decide the worth of an individual work of art and poetry.⁷⁹ The reflection of art and poetry in life is important for mimesis is “clearly the centrepiece of Aristotle’s poetic theory”.⁸⁰

Plato’s rejection of mimesis is due to moral reasons.⁸¹ However, the most possible intent of Plato’s rejection of mimesis is because a fictional character in a person’s mind is being imitated and not that art or poetry imitates life.⁸² Thus Stephen Halliwell’s view is correct, that “mimesis was a concept that led Plato to place and appraise mimetic art within an intricate framework of issues about relationship between human thought and (mind-independent) reality”.⁸³ The philosopher was successful in his use of a judicious approach as

dithyramb; and there is again that which employs both, in epic poetry and in many other places, if you apprehend me.’

From 394 D of Plato’s *Republic* the philosopher frowns at the poets’ mimesis. Plato criticises the poets severely and rejects their concept of mimesis. See Plato 1, LCL 237:230-45.

⁷⁹See Leon Golden, *Aristotle on Tragic and Comic Mimesis*, APAACS 29 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 63-103.

⁸⁰Else, *Plato and Aristotle*, 74.

⁸¹See Annas, *Introduction*, 97-100. Cf. Russell, *Criticism*, 102-6.

⁸²At the start of Book 10 of the *Republic* (595A) Socrates in his dialogue with Plato was surely convinced that mimetic poetry should be thrown away. See Plato 2, 276:418 ff. Further Socrates and Plato in the same tone (607A) finally rejected poetry and would not allow it in their city. See Plato 2, 276:464 ff. However, Melberg, *Theories*, 11, point is telling because from the *Republic* “we learn that *part* of poetry is mimetic or presupposes *mimesis*—meaning that other parts of poetry could be something else entirely, indicating that *mimesis* is a manner of poetry, on of several possible means of expression”. (The italics are original.) Further, Melberg, *Theories*, 11, citing the dialogue of Plato and Aristotle in Book 10 of the *Republic* (especially 595B) argues that: “If we only had better knowledge of poetry as a cure against mimetic poetry—a knowledge of its real nature ‘as an antidote [*pharmakon*]’ (595B)—Plato/Socrates seems to consider the possibility that we could resist the mimetic seduction and maintain morals”. Nonetheless, we do not have the familiarity with a “better knowledge of poetry as a cure against mimetic poetry”. Melberg’s case is vital in understanding Plato’s rejection of mimesis in poetry. Plato’s concern was making poetry the basis of the reflection of truth for a person to identify with—to imitate. In other words, Plato rejects the poet’s imitation of life’s reality for the poetry is distant away from the truth. Annas, *Introduction*, 96, solution to why Plato rejected mimesis is most helpful:

What [Plato] dislikes is that in imitating I am putting myself in the place of another. Plato thinks that this is dangerous and morally dubious, and I think that he would hold this even if the character imitated were real and not fictional. He is not concerned with the dangers of life imitating art, but with what happens when I identify with another person. Imitating fictional characters is dangerous only because fiction is the context where this usually happens. We can appreciate Plato’s concern because, although we do not often ‘imitate’ aloud the way the Greeks did, we are encouraged in our reading of novels, biographies, and some poetry to ‘identify with’ characters, and this is his great target.

⁸³Halliwell, *Aesthetics*, 65.

well as his employment of analytical procedure in “stripping poetry of the extraneous qualities and powers with which the current thought of his day endowed it, and putting it forth as poetry alone, in and for itself”.⁸⁴ Most important, however, as Allan Gilbert claims, was that Plato actually “prepared the way for Aristotle, who was able to turn his scientist’s eye on poetry as an autonomous activity of man having its own particular function and giving its own peculiar pleasure”.⁸⁵

Aristotle’s positive outlook on the concept of mimesis in poetry is due to “the pleasure we take in *all forms of mimesis* [which] is that the act of learning is not only most pleasant to philosophers but to all other human beings as well, even though their share in it is more limited”.⁸⁶ The philosopher who is known for his incredibly optimistic attitude towards the ancient theory of mimesis considers that “the purpose, pleasure, and origin of all *mimesis* is, however, the same and is rooted deeply in human nature”.⁸⁷ Aristotle notably insists that every person yearns to know the things in life and regards that mimetic art is one of the essential strategies where people utilise to increase real knowledge for humans relate well with works of art.⁸⁸ Further the philosopher also stresses the cognitive gratification of mimesis.⁸⁹ Moreover, Aristotle maintains that human action is situated into language by

⁸⁴See Allan H. Gilbert, *Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1962), 6.

⁸⁵Gilbert, *Literary Criticism*, 6.

⁸⁶Golden, *Aristotle*, 71. (The italics are original.)

⁸⁷Golden, *Aristotle*, 18.

⁸⁸See Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 980a21-982a in Aristotle 1, LCL 271:2-9.

⁸⁹Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.11.23 (Aristotle, LCL 193:125), declares his positive perspective on the value of mimesis in the work of arts and poetry:

And since learning and admiring are pleasant, all things connected with them must also be pleasant; for instance, a work of imitation, such as painting, sculpture, poetry, and all that is well imitated, even if the object of imitation is not pleasant; for it is not this that causes pleasure or the reverse, but the inference that the imitation and the object imitated are identical, so that the result is that we learn something.

poetry.⁹⁰ For Aristotle then mimesis originated from “mankind’s ‘desire to know’”.⁹¹

Consequently, Aristotle perceives the representation of reality in art and poetry as bringing not only pleasure but also knowledge thereby showing a more positive reception of poetic mimesis.⁹²

Latin Writers and Mimesis Theory on Classical Rhetoric

The main influence of Plato and Aristotle by Hellenistic time is that “the vocabulary of mimeticism had become part of the lingua franca of Greek criticism and philosophical aesthetics”.⁹³ Plato critiqued Homeric repetition, although “*repetition*, is the version of *mimesis* that Plato never comments upon but, instead, uses in his writing”.⁹⁴ What is helpful

⁹⁰Aristotle, *Poetics*, 4.1-18 (Aristotle 23, LCL 199:37-9), presents his case on the necessity of imitation process in human existence:

It can be seen that poetry was broadly engendered by a pair of causes, both natural. For it is an instinct of human beings, from childhood, to engage in mimesis (indeed, this distinguishes them from other animals: man is the most mimetic of all, and it is through mimesis that he develops his earliest understanding); and equally natural that everyone enjoys mimetic objects. A common occurrence indicates this: we enjoy contemplating the most precise images of things whose actual sight is painful to us, such as the forms of the vilest animals and of corpses. The explanation of this too is that understanding gives great pleasure not only to philosophers but likewise to others too, though the latter have a smaller share in it. This is why people enjoy looking at images, because through contemplating them it comes about that they understand and infer what each element means, for instance that “this person is so-and-so.” For, if one happens not to have seen the subject before, the image will not give pleasure *qua* mimesis but because of its execution or colour, or for some other such reason.

Apparently, Aristotle did not intend to dispute the generally held belief that an exact imitation of the reality is not possible to attain. The philosopher instead describes mimesis as an imaginative exercise of inclination, transformation, and adaptation from one means of expression into another.

⁹¹Golden, *Aristotle*, 64, clarifies the Aristotelian appreciation of mimesis; and his discussion is significant enough for a citation in order that we may have a clearer understanding of his argument:

For Aristotle, *mimesis* is a tightly structured process involving, in different arts, different means of representation, different manners of communicating that representation to an audience, and different moral and ethical states as the object of artistic representation. Thus some arts use words, rhythm and harmony, and others color and form to communicate to an audience; some arts require a stage and actors for their presentation and others only as single narrator; and some arts represents noble, and others ignoble, characters and actions. All forms of *mimesis*, however, have a common origin in mankind’s “desire to know,” a common means of satisfying that desire by leading us to perceive the universal principles inherent in the particulars of every significant work of art. They provide a common pleasure—the intellectual pleasure of learning and inference (μανθάνειν καὶ συλλογίζεσθαι)—which is the highest human pleasure.

⁹²Cf. Russell, *Criticism*, 106-8, on Aristotle’s affirmation of mimesis.

⁹³Halliwell, *Aesthetics*, 263.

⁹⁴Melberg, *Theories*, 37. (The italics are original.)

for our purpose, however, is that the Homeric scheme of repetition in his narrative makes an intertextual referencing within the same narrative.⁹⁵ Furthermore, the Homeric repetition is not only an “allusive style”, albeit also functions “as the matrix of epic poetry, shapes not only phrases but also poetic conceptions and ideology”.⁹⁶ This kind of Homeric repetition, apparently, is analogous to the kind of Diatessaronic harmonising tendency.⁹⁷ Apart from these repetitions there is also the “Homeric cross-referencing”⁹⁸ or “intertextual readings in the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*”.⁹⁹ Here, according to Gregory Nagy, the usage of “Odyssean cross-reference to the Iliadic Tradition” whether only a word, a phrase, or a clause is “a matter of performance, not just composition” of poetics.¹⁰⁰ For Nagy “the cross-reference

⁹⁵Melberg’s treatment of the Homeric repetition in terms of its function in the narrative is instructive. Melberg, *Theories*, 37, points out that:

The Homeric version of narrative repetition could, in this case, be characterized as a mirroring or circular structure: the last song of the *Iliad* (or parts of it) is symmetrically inverted to the first.... When Achilles makes his speech in the last song, it is to give a positive answer to King Priam, who has come with the ransom for his dead son Hector. In the first song it is the priest Chryses who makes a speech in order to ransom his still living, but captured daughter. The negative answer to Chryses is famously pronounced by Agamemnon, which means then that Agamemnon is “repeated” by Achilles, Chryses by Priam, the captured girl by the dead hero and – above all – the negative answer by the positive. Repetition repeats what has been, but turns it into something else: repetition re-presents and overcomes its origin.

⁹⁶Pietro Pucci, *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad*, CSCP 46 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987), 19. See also Pucci’s discussion of Homeric repetition in 18-20, 29-30, 78-82, 236-45.

⁹⁷Plooi, *Further*, 18-24, talks about the harmonising methodology in the Diatessaron. Moreover, Plooi, *Further*, 18, observes the extant manuscripts of the Diatessaron have “the tendency to combine all the Evangelical matter, taking Matthew as the leading Gospel and interweaving the matter from the other Gospels into the narrative of Matthew”. Additionally, Plooi, *Further*, 19, notes on occasion where “the Texts are conformed to a canonical Text...in numerous cases the Harmonisation of the various parallels has been replaced by a quotation merely from Matthew”. (The use of capital letters is original.) See also the discussions of Dom Connolly, “A Side-light on the Method of Tatian”, *JTS* 12 (1911): 268-73; and F. C. Burkitt, “Tatian’s Diatessaron and the Dutch Harmonies”, *JTS* 25 (1924): 113-30.

⁹⁸See Gregory Nagy, *Homeric Responses* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003), 7-19, who maintains the orality of Homer. Hence, Nagy, *Homeric*, 7-8, argues that the cross-references in Homer “predates the writing down of the Homeric traditions” and “that the mechanics and esthetics of Homeric cross-referencing are compatible with oral poetics”.

⁹⁹See Pucci, *Polutropos*, especially 29 footnote 30, whose observation the same cross-referencing in Homer, albeit in contrast with Nagy, *Homeric*, overtly favours the use of the notion of “intertextuality” that he basically equates to “allusion” in evaluating the Homeric phenomenon.

¹⁰⁰Nagy, *Homeric*, 13-5.

represented in this story-within-a-story is performative as well as compositional” and therefore it should be understood as “composition-in-performance” of Homeric oral poetics.¹⁰¹ Moreover, later, the Latin writers utilised mimetic poetry in their literary rhetoric¹⁰² and fused different texts to produce a literary imitation.¹⁰³ Tony Woodman’s observation of Tacitus’ application of mimesis in *Annals* is instructive: “Sometimes, it is true, a writer will produce correspondences from which he wishes some particular significance to emerge”.¹⁰⁴ Later Roman writers, because of their interest in the investigation of literature and aesthetics, commented on the works of Plato and Aristotle on the character and purpose of poetry.¹⁰⁵ The employment of mimesis in antiquity varies from word-for-word imitation to allusion of concepts and ideas.¹⁰⁶ Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in the fragments of his treatise on mimesis defined mimesis as: “an activity reproducing the model by means of theoretical

¹⁰¹Nagy, *Homeric*, 15. The pattern of mimetic harmonisation in ancient literature is traceable in what Nagy calls “composition-in-performance”. His argument is crucial due to the commonly held understanding that Homer as well as other poetries or narratives in antiquity were meant to be orally performed because of their oral nature. Nagy, *Homeric*, 15-6, also depicts the process in which the dynamics of the acquisition of cross-referencing occurs in the performance of poetry thereby making it a “composition-in-performance”:

From an evolutionary point of view, the actual sequencing of themes in the oral poetics of composition-in-performance becomes a tradition in and of itself. Such a tradition affects the phenomenon of cross-reference. Once the sequencing of Homeric “episodes” becomes a tradition in its own right, it stands to reason that any cross-referencing from one episode of the sequence to another will also become a tradition. It is from a diachronic as well as synchronic perspective that I find it useful to consider the phenomenon of Homeric cross-references, especially long-distance ones that happen to reach for hundreds or even thousands of verses: it is important to keep in mind that any such cross-reference that we admire in our two-dimensional text did not just happen one time in one performance, but presumably countless times in countless reperformances within the three-dimensional continuum of a specialized oral tradition. The resonances of Homeric cross-referencing must be appreciated within the larger context of a long history of repeated performances.

¹⁰²See Russell, *Criticism*, 97-147, in his perceptive discussion of “mimesis”, “rhetoric” and “theories of style”.

¹⁰³Brodie, “Imitation”, 21, calls this mimetic approach as “contamination”.

¹⁰⁴Tony Woodman, “Self-imitation and the Substance of History: Tacitus, *Annals* 1.61-5 and *Histories* 2.70, 5.14-15,” in *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, ed. David West and Tony Woodman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 154.

¹⁰⁵Russell, *Criticism*, 65-7.

¹⁰⁶See Brodie, “Imitation”, 19-22.

principles”.¹⁰⁷ For the ancient Latin writers it is necessary to employ a literary imitation of classics. Quintilian (*Orator’s Education* 10.2.3) said it well: “We must, in fact, either be like or unlike those who have proved their excellence. It is rare for nature to produce such resemblance, which is more often the result of imitation”.¹⁰⁸ For Quintilian literary imitation is necessary for there are few who have innate capacities actually to match the classical models of antiquity.¹⁰⁹ The ancients take it for granted that mimesis is a conventional literary device. According to George Converse Fiske:

But ancient rhetoric did not attain its purpose merely by the study of the general principles of composition as codified by philosophic and aesthetic theory. It insisted equally upon the pursuit of two closely related practical disciplines, and incidentally lent further reinforcement to the classical tradition. These are (1) the reading and interpretation of the great masters; (2) the unremitting practice of the paraphrase and translation of masterpieces.¹¹⁰

The corollary issue then is the occurrence of plagiarism in ancient literature which was condemned and explicitly unacceptable to the ancient rhetoricians.¹¹¹ Nevertheless, Greeks and Romans in their aesthetic theories “never condemned imitation *per se*, provided the result was a work of art”.¹¹² As David West and Tony Woodman points out: “*Imitatio* is neither plagiarism nor a flaw in the constitution of Latin literature. It is a dynamic law of its

¹⁰⁷Usener, Hermannus and Ludovicus Radermacher, eds. *Dionysii Halicarnasei Opuscula*, 2 Vols., BSGRT (Lipsiae: B.G. Teubneri, 1899-1929), 2:200, as quoted and translated by Russell “*De imitatione*”, 10. Fragment text of Dionysius, *De imitatione*, fragment vi, and ET is as follows:

μίμησις ἐστὶν ἐνέργεια διὰ τῶν θεωρημάτων ἐκματτομένη τὸ παράδειγμα· ζῆλος δὲ ἐστὶν ἐνέργεια ψυχῆς πρὸς θαῦμα τοῦ δοκοῦντος εἶναι καλοῦ κινουμένη.

Mimēsis is an activity reproducing the model by means of theoretical principles. Zēlos is an activity of the mind, roused to admiration of something believed to be beautiful.

(The italics are original.)

¹⁰⁸Quintilian 4, LCL 127:75.

¹⁰⁹Russell, “*De imitatione*,” 6.

¹¹⁰Fiske, *Lucilius*, 35.

¹¹¹See the informative treatment of plagiarism in antiquity by Pinner, *World of Books*, 38-40.

¹¹²Fiske, *Lucilius*, 26-7.

existence”.¹¹³ The process of mimesis as argued by Longinus on section 13 of *On the Sublime* is not plagiarism:

Here is an author who shows us, if we will condescend to see, that there is another road, besides those we have mentioned, which leads to sublimity. What and what manner of road is this? Zealous imitation of the great prose writers and poets of the past. That is the aim, dear friend; let us hold to it with all our might. For many are carried away by the inspiration of another, just as the story runs that the Phytian priestess on approaching the tripod where there is, they say, a rift in the earth, exhaling divine vapour, thereby becomes impregnated with the divine power and is at once inspired to utter oracles; so too, from the natural genius of those old writers there flows into the hearts of their admirers as it were an emanation from those holy mouths. Inspired by this, even those who are not easily moved to prophecy share the enthusiasm of these others' grandeur. Was Herodotus alone Homeric in the highest degree? No, there was Stesichorus at a still earlier date and Archilochus too, and above all others Plato, who drew off for his own use ten thousand runnels from the great Homeric spring. We might need to give instances, had not people like Ammonius drawn up a collection. Such borrowing is no theft; it is rather like the reproduction of good character by sculptures or other works of art. So many of these qualities would never have flourished among Plato's philosophic tenets, nor would have entered so often into the subjects and language of poetry, had he not striven, with heart and soul, to contest the prize with Homer, like a young antagonist with one who had already won his spurs, perhaps in too keen emulation, longing as it were to break a lance, and yet always to good purpose; for, as Hesiod says, "Good is this strife for mankind." Fair indeed is the crown, and the fight for fame well worth the winning, where even to be worsted by our forerunners is not without glory.¹¹⁴

The ancient theory of literary imitation as described by Longinus is a “borrowing” of literary material from the established textual tradition of the previous authorities. There was enough literature in antiquity about plagiarism.¹¹⁵ What is obvious is that making use of another one's work should be recognised.¹¹⁶ For example Cicero (*Brutus* 76) addressed Ennius:

¹¹³This quotation is from the prologue of David West and Tony Woodman, eds., *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 1979, ix. (The italics are original.)

¹¹⁴Longinus, LCL 199:211-3.

¹¹⁵I am indebted to Russell, “*De imitatione*”, 11-3, for references from the classical literature.

¹¹⁶Russell, “*De imitatione*”, 12, in his explanation of how a recognition of an author's indebtedness to another is most helpful in the following citation:

But how is this acknowledgement to be made? Not in footnotes, as with Gray's *Pindarick Odes* or Eliot's *The Waste Land*, but by making it clear by the tenor of your writing that you are working in a certain tradition, and are fully aware of the resources of your medium, which you assume also to be known to your readers. This is how Alexandrian and Augustan poets worked. They assumed in the

Grant that Ennius is more finished, as undoubtedly he is; yet if Ennius had already scorned him, as he professes, he would not in undertaking to describe all our wars have passed over that stubbornly contested first Punic War. But he tells us himself why he does so: ‘Others’, he says, ‘have written the theme in verse’—yes, and brilliantly too they wrote, even if with less polish than you, sir; and surely you ought not to think otherwise, you who from Naeuius have taken much, if you confess the debt, or if you deny it, much have stolen.¹¹⁷

Another example is Seneca (*Suasoriae* 3.7) who quotes Gallio and perceives that Ovid used Virgil’s work in his own writing:

Gallio said that his friend Ovid had very much liked the phrase: and that as a result the poet did something he had done with many other lines of Virgil—with no thought of plagiarism, but meaning that his piece of open borrowing should be noticed.¹¹⁸

There is a clear reference to the general assumption of mimesis against plagiarism of any kind in antiquity. Nonetheless, the foundation of the imitative nature of the textual tradition behind the Graeco-Roman literature raises the importance of a successful mimesis. Hence, literary imitation that borrows from the masters of the past was also created first in the mind, and then the execution was well planned by the ancient rhetoricians.¹¹⁹ Something of Plato’s legacy on mimesis is essential to consider at this point. In the evaluation of Plato,

reader a sufficient understanding of Alcaeus or Hesiod or Theocritus to feel sure that he would not bring a charge of κλοπή out of pedantic half-knowledge, and would know when the *mimēsis* had been successfully executed. Quintilian in a passage already quoted (10.1.69) clearly attributes this sort of tacit acknowledgement to Menander, when he alleges that that poet *saepe testatur*, ‘often testifies to’, his admiration for Euripides.

But acknowledgement, of course, must be combined with appropriation: a paradoxical but essential point. You must make the thing ‘your own’, *priuati iuris* (Horace, *Ars Poetica* 131), and the way to do this is to select, to modify, and at all costs to avoid treading precisely and timidly in the footprints of the man in front.

¹¹⁷Cicero 5, LCL 342:71.

¹¹⁸Seneca 2, LCL 464:545.

¹¹⁹Russell, “*De imitatiione*”, 16, summarises the main criteria that he perceives in ‘Longinus’ for a successful mimesis:

- (i) The object must be worth imitating.
- (ii) The spirit rather than the letter must be reproduced.
- (iii) The imitation must be tacitly acknowledged, on the understanding that the informed reader will recognize and approve the borrowing.
- (iv) The borrowing must be ‘made one’s own’, by individual treatment and assimilation to its new place and purpose.
- (v) The imitator must think of himself as competing with his model, even if he knows he cannot win.

Melberg argues that Plato has Socrates to state “that *mimesis* comes in handier than *diegesis* when it comes to telling a story”.¹²⁰ This handiness of *mimesis* in telling a story has been carried over in both the Greek and Latin literature.¹²¹ The usage of *mimesis* in Plato and Aristotle against that of Latin rhetorical critics is a broadening of the application of the theory of imitation in art and literature.¹²² In spite of this wide employment of *mimesis* in antiquity, as D. A. Russell contends, “there is an important point of resemblance in the insistence on the need for general understanding of the model, rather than mechanical or (as we might say) photographic copying”.¹²³ It may be pointed out as well, that the usage of the word *mimesis* is just the same whereas the implication to literature as a work of art is different.¹²⁴ The

¹²⁰Melberg, *Theories*, 27.

¹²¹This character of Greek and Latin literature is described by Russell, “*De imitatione*,” 1, in the following manner:

One of the inescapable features of Latin literature is that almost every author, in almost everything he writes, acknowledges his antecedents, his predecessors—in a word, the tradition in which he was bred. This phenomenon, for which the technical terms are *imitatio* or (in Greek) *mimesis*, is not peculiar to Latin; the statement I have just made about Latin writers would also be true very generally of Greek. In fact, the relationship between the Latin genres and their Greek exemplars may best be seen as a special case of a general Greco-Roman acceptance of imitation as an essential element in all literary composition.

¹²²See Russell, *Criticism*, 110-3.

¹²³Russell, *Criticism*, 113.

¹²⁴Russell, “*De imitatione*”, 4, describes and clarifies the tenuous relation between representational *mimesis* and literary imitation:

Now it is, I suspect, natural to think that the sense of *mimesis* in which the philosophers tried to use it to describe the kind of human activity of which literature is an instance has nothing to do with the imitation of one author by another. It is surely just a homonymous use of the word. But I fear this may be too simple. Of course, the notion of literary copying is perfectly well conveyed by *mimesis* and its cognates in their everyday sense. But once these terms had been used in an attempt to explain what in general poetry does and is, their later literary uses could not fail to be affected by the associations they had thus acquired. Words have this sort of power to influence ways of thinking. At any rate, there are features in the Hellenistic and Roman concept of literary imitation which strongly recall the apparently homonymous use of these terms in general poetic theory. The analogy between the mimetic relationship of works of literature to each other and their mimetic relationship to the outside world proved suggestive. In one sense, all poets were *imitators*, in another this was true only of those who did not (like Homer) stand at the beginning of a tradition. It was possible even to play with the two senses. In the line of the *Ars poetica* quoted above – *nec desilies imitator in artum* (133) – it is difficult to believe that Horace did not mean us to have both senses in mind. Again, there is the assumption sometimes made that the copy is bound to be inferior to the model. Plato had always emphasized this; for him, the product of imitation (the *mimema*) was less ‘real’, just as the visible world was less ‘real’ than the world of Forms on which the creator modelled it. So in literature also, *semper citra ueritatem*

preceding discussion leads to the conclusion that the execution of a good compositional mimesis is the proper imitation or reproduction of the model used from the preceding masters in one's work, which acknowledges indebtedness from the source, and yet represents or emulates the beauty of the model with the imitating author's artistic individuality.

Patristic Assumption and Chain Referencing on Literary Imitation

The Fathers' allegorising the Scripture text and their use of mimesis in cross-referencing—taking intertextuality for granted—created the catena of Scripture references that became evident in their writings.¹²⁵ Apparently, allegory and mimesis were their basic approaches—assumed from the classics—in appreciating the meaning of the Christian Scripture, if they wanted to go beyond the literal or plain meaning of the text.¹²⁶ The Fathers

est similitudo (Seneca, *Controversiae I praefatio* 6; cf. Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 10.2.11), a reflection which naturally struck a responsive chord in generations habitually looking back to a greater past. However, there were at all periods those who did not despair of surpassing their predecessors. They had to think of countervailing considerations. Acquiescence in inferiority is an impossible attitude.

¹²⁵As Frances Young, "Alexandrian and Antiochene Exegesis", in Hauser and Watson, *History*, 339, claims that *methodikon* as used by Origen as a case in point "dealt with the practical problems of reading texts". Since Origen paid attention to the text of the "letter" on hand in "its 'physical' form", he "engaged in [it] when he compiled the Hexapla, made comments on variant readings in his commentaries, traced the 'idioms' of the Bible by compiling catenae of texts (using the Bible to interpret the Bible as Porphyry used Homer to interpret Homer), or engaged in etymological explanations or identified 'tropes,' that is, figures of speech". See also Ronald F. Hock, "Homer in Greco-Roman Education", in *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*, ed. Dennis R. MacDonald, SAC (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001), 56-77, on the role of Homer in ancient practice of intertextuality. Cf. Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 119-39. Cf. also Dennis R. MacDonald, *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 1-14, who made a special emphasis on the study of mimesis as being applied to the Gospel of Mark.

¹²⁶This notion is not to deny that the Fathers did not approach the Scripture with an interest in the plain meaning of the text. See Thomas C. Oden and Christopher A. Hall, eds., *Mark*, ACCSNT (London: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1998), xxix-xxxii. The best critical discussion on patristic hermeneutic can be referred to Young's magisterial book *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. The claim that is being made here, however, is that allegorical interpretation is applied side by side with the use of intertextuality or scripture chain references by patristic exegetes to illuminate the meaning of the Christian texts. For a shorter study of patristic hermeneutic see Young, "Alexandrian", 334-54.

The case presented by Oden and Hall, *Mark*, xxxii-v, in their introduction to Mark explains how allegory played its part, as well as the chain referencing among the Fathers. Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:xxxix, points out that the conventional means of understanding Scriptural texts using other Scripture references is a switch of the grammatical procedure that read Homeric passages using Homer as source of explanation. In the exegesis of the Gospels the correspondence of a specified passage to other Gospel texts are instantaneously explained with the matching passages of the different texts of the Gospels. The approach was "passage-by-passage" in elucidating the text and there was a broad variation based on the knowledge of the expositor. Cf. Russell, *Criticism*, 42, 44, 66, who cites the Stoics allegorising Homer with "both moral and scientific" concerns (42); and that "the Shield of Achilles as the kosmos" interpreted allegorically by Crates (44) as well as Proclus

were heirs to the educational system of grammar and rhetoric of the Graeco-Roman world,¹²⁷ and together with these two they utilised allegorical interpretation and chain referencing in studying the biblical text that flourished in the Gentile soil.¹²⁸ Catenae of Scripture became a key in understanding a text with its parallel texts.¹²⁹ Justin with his conflation of his quotations and collection of sources led the way in catena referencing.¹³⁰ The catena references of Origen and Chrysostom that have been preserved supply a key to understanding their exegetical approach to the Scripture.¹³¹ As C. H. Turner puts it well:

The Catenae, then, have a special and unique value as preserving, however imperfectly, no small mass of the work of authors on whose writings, as a whole, a ban was set by later generations; and the study of Catenae is therefore an indispensable preliminary to intelligent acquaintance with the development of Patristic exegesis.¹³²

A good representative to look at on the full utilisation of allegory and mimesis is Augustine.¹³³ Augustine employed signs and symbols to get spiritual meaning from the

whose “system is based on Neoplatonist metaphysics” made an effort “to establish acceptable principles of allegorical interpretation, which can save Homer from Plato’s attack” (66). Moreover, Russell, *Criticism*, 95-98, utilising Heraclitus in his employment of Homer and Virgil in his use of symbolism gives a concise description of the plausibility of the allegorical system in antiquity. See Russell, *Criticism*, 99-113, furthermore for the treatment of mimesis and intertextuality among the classical authors.

¹²⁷ See Lecture II, Greek Education, of E. Hatch, *Influence*, 25-49. See also Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 81, 171-2, 246. Cf. Russell, *Criticism*, 44-51, 114-28.

¹²⁸ See Lecture III, Greek and Christian Exegesis, of E. Hatch, *Influence*, 50-85. Oden, in Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:xxiv, is correct in asserting that “patristic writers [who] assumed that readers would not even approach an elementary discernment of the meaning of the text if they were not ready to live in terms of its revelation, that is, to practice it in order to hear it, as was recommended so often in the classic tradition”. See also Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 119-39, 161-85, 186-212.

¹²⁹The “catena tradition” developed in a way where it was the “ancient style of commentary in which a chain of excerpts from patristic exegesis was used to elucidate a scriptural text”. Oden and Hall, *Mark*, xxxii.

¹³⁰In Part 2 of his book Skarsaune, *Proof*, 135-242, sketches and demonstrates Justin’s use of his sources as well as the procedure and gathering of citations from the Scriptures that articulated his argument in his proof-text tradition of interpretation.

¹³¹Gorday, *Principles*, 16-7.

¹³²C. H. Turner, “Greek Patristic”, 488.

¹³³An important point is further elaborated by Too, *Idea*, 223, about Augustine’s masterpiece, the *Confessions*:

text.¹³⁴ Apparently, in antiquity almost all approaches to interpretation of texts were “affected by the search for symbolical meanings”.¹³⁵ Yun Lee Too claims how Augustine in *Confessions* relates the signs and the significance of the signs:

Augustine further develops the idea that the reception, the reading, and the reciting, of literature is in itself a form of social activity. According to his analysis, literature involves the reader in a re-enactment of its narrative and emotions. Reception of a text so reifies language that reading about sexual immorality is itself a form of sexual immorality, and such that the association between pagan discourse and passion or desire is affirmed. Augustine’s narrative of reading acknowledges that traditional, pagan education emphatically enacts the Hebraic understanding of ‘word’ as synonymous with ‘thing’, although in such a way that ‘thing’ is far from ideal. It also reveals as an additional problem the failure of the secular teachers of rhetoric to recognize the relationship between the sign and what the sign signifies.¹³⁶

Augustine applied mimesis and allegory in his *Confessions* where he used Aeneid as the mimetic pattern of the presentation of his life.¹³⁷ Augustine, better known for the use of

If the discussion of literary reception and production that takes place in the work [i.e. *Confessions*] is not essentially different from what we find in the classical tradition of ‘literary criticism’ as represented by Hesiod’s *Theogony*, Plato’s *Republic*, Aristotle’s *Poetics*, or *On the Sublime*, what is particular to Augustine is the prioritisation of a specific Christian textuality.

For an analysis of Augustine’s approach to the interpretation of Scriptures see the fine article of Richard A. Norris, Jr., “Augustine and the Close of the Ancient Period of Interpretation”, in Hauser and Watson, *History*, 380-408.

¹³⁴See Markus, *Signs*, 71-124.

¹³⁵Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 170.

¹³⁶Too, *Idea*, 225-6.

¹³⁷The combination of allegory and mimesis as employed by Augustine is a good example of patristic witness to these two textual approaches at work in ancient literary criticism. Too, *Idea*, 226-7, summarises Augustine’s mimetic approach to *Aeneid*:

Augustine’s subsequent narrative [in *Confessions*] makes more explicit the way in which literature determines the sort of person its recipient becomes through inevitable enactment of it. The author reinforces the Platonic view that language can be a stimulus to negative desires (e.g. *Republic* 2 and 3, *Phaedrus*, *Ion*) as he characterizes his subsequent rhetorical career. Book 2 establishes the literal and metaphorical erotics of rhetorical language...

The following book of Augustine’s narrative exhibits the specific way in which literary texts can offer a negative paradigm for an individual’s actions and character. The beginning of book 3 finds Augustine arriving at Carthage (‘Cartago’) where a cauldron (‘sartago’) of ‘illicit loves’ seethes (3.1.1). The similarity of the Latin words *Cartago* and *sartago* reminds the reader of the *Confessions*—and many readers have remarked on the pun—that in this poetics of verbal construction, language is instantiated either for good or for bad outcomes. Accordingly, Augustine now presents his own desire for love, and the emotions that this desire entails, as the chains and rods which constitute this linguistic bondage: ‘I was glad to be in bondage, tied with troublesome chains, with the result that I was flogged with the red-hot iron rods of jealousy, suspicion, fear, anger and contention (3.1.1). His sojourn at Carthage and the development of his rhetorical skills and his sexuality are actualisations of the *Aeneid*,

allegory, assumed mimesis by his application of intertextuality, thereby producing series of cross-referencing.¹³⁸ Erich Auerbach describes Augustine's use of chain referencing in the way mimesis functioned as assumed in literary works in antiquity.¹³⁹ It is also notable that this kind of cross or chain referencing of Augustine is a convention of "quotation" and "allusion" in ancient literary criticism.¹⁴⁰

Manlio Simonetti's claim is instructive in understanding the origin and nature of patristic hermeneutics that uses chain referencing intertextuality:

The traditional method of interpreting Scripture with Scripture, a transposition of the grammatical technique that interpreted Homer with Homer, in Gospel exegesis consisted above all in linking a given passage of the Gospels directly interpreted with the parallel passages of the other Gospels. This was done for two purposes. First, the author sought to explain the divergences among the Gospels in the recounting of the same episodes, when read in the most literal sense (e.g. post-Easter stories). Second, a detail present in one Gospel was used to better clarify the meaning of another, in which that detail did not appear.¹⁴¹

This important claim of Simonetti is coherently parallel to the pattern of intertextual catena of referencing that is observable in the peculiar readings of D in Luke in terms of what Vogels has established in his work on harmonisation in D.¹⁴² The two observable exegetical

especially of the voyage of Aeneas to Carthage and of his ill-fated affair with Dido. Augustine's journey to Carthage makes patent the consonance of linguistic and sexual desire. The author moreover recounts how he found himself infected (cf. 'turpi scabie foedarer') by the theatre and the emotions it produced. He points to the pleasure that its enactments of pain produced, observing that he loved to mourn ('dolere amabam', 3.2.4). In this, Augustine clearly rejects Aristotle's ideal of tragic pleasure as a superior one, in order to elaborate the earlier Platonic critique of drama as a spectacle that now satisfies the perverse, fallen desires which do an individual harm rather than good.

The preceding analysis of Augustine's *Confessions* by Too is not only fascinating but also properly appropriated in the context of literary criticism in antiquity. The *Confessions* of Augustine was actually a mimesis of *Aeneid* of Virgil. This means that the popular classic has been emulated by Augustine to tell his own story. Augustine appropriated Virgil in his experience and put Christian content on his work to bring about his Christian message to his readers.

¹³⁸See Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 265-84.

¹³⁹Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953), 74-6.

¹⁴⁰Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 169-70.

¹⁴¹Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:xxxix-xl. Cf. Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation*, 121-37.

¹⁴²Particularly relevant is Vogels' Liste der harmonistischen Lesarten, 62-107, in Vogels, *Harmonistik*. See especially Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 87-105, in his list of D's harmonisation of the Gospel readings in Luke.

techniques, as it has been reiterated many times already, that were widely used in the early Church by the Fathers were allegorical interpretative method, to get the spiritual sense of the text, and chain intertextuality for explanation referencing, to clarify the meaning of one passage using another passage.¹⁴³ It is accurate to maintain that even if the allegorical interpretation among the early Fathers was not dominant in every exegetical endeavour as they expound the sacred Christian texts, it was an interpretative approach taken for granted, in any case and at any rate. For it was a conventional hermeneutical exercise at that time to be used confidently with the application of intertextuality among the catena of scriptural references.¹⁴⁴ Frances Young points out that the component of “*mimesis* makes the ‘types’, but their effect is produced by collage” of chain references.¹⁴⁵ D’s text in Luke exhibits the phenomenon of odd readings, which are plausibly allegorising to elucidate the spiritual meaning of the text, and harmonising variants, which are an intertextual phenomenon, conceivably applied to illuminate the meaning of the text.

Patristic Harmonisation of Gospel Parables as Allusive Mimetic Composition

The first canonical Gospel was popularly received in Christian antiquity. It has been widely held that Matthew’s Gospel was the most admired among the Synoptic Gospels for

¹⁴³Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:xl, cites how Cyril of Alexandria (fragment 290) can simply borrow a reading from John on the details of the Last Supper and “transferred it in order to illustrate the text of Matthew”.

¹⁴⁴It is vital to recognise the combination of allegorising and intertextual approaches as an undisputed piece of information of patristic hermeneutics. Allegorical interpretation was applied side by side with the use of intertextuality or scripture chain references by patristic exegetes to illuminate the meaning of the Christian texts or passages that they were dealing with. See the case presented by Oden and Hall, *Mark*, xxxii-v.

¹⁴⁵Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 232. Additionally, Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 233, taking the contexts of interpretation in understanding the types of Christ in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, argues that:

Rabbinic parallels often cast light on extra-biblical details which are drawn into the development of these mimetic clues, but can hardly be the direct source of these particular typological insights. So such exegesis is neither a straight inheritance from Jewish exegetical precedent, nor can it be clearly separated out, at least in this text, from the range of other methods used to unpack texts treated as oracles or prophetic riddles: gematria, etymology, deduction, and the recognition of symbol, mimetic sign or type imprinted in ancient narratives—all had precedents outside the Christian context, all served the same ends of discerning prophetic reference.

Church use in the early Christian communities.¹⁴⁶ Hence, the Matthean parables were also popular and consequently the Lukan parables were harmonised with their counterpart in Matthew's parables in the citations of early Christian writers.¹⁴⁷ It is not surprising, therefore, that the D text of Luke has a consistent tendency to harmonise more with the established Matthean text.¹⁴⁸ It should be maintained, however, that the issue of harmonisation and conflation of accounts of Matthew and Luke may be applied to the interpretation of the words of Jesus, such as the parables that were believed as stories told by Jesus.¹⁴⁹ The analysis of J. Hamlyn Hill about the Diatessaronic arrangement of the parables of The Sower is instructive:

We have to consider Tatian's treatment of any subject that is related in more than one Gospel, *e.g.* the Parable of the Sower, from two points of view, the *internal* harmonisation of the several accounts with each other, and the *external* harmonisation of the result, or the place assigned to it in the general narrative. As regards internal harmonisation, the *Diatessaron* leaves little to be desired. It has been carried out in the fullest detail, and the greatest care has been taken not to omit the slightest comment of any one Evangelist, unless it was substantially preserved in the words of another. Taking a general review of the external harmonisation, there seems no reason to doubt that Tatian carefully arranged all the *events* and the *movements* of our Lord in what he believed to be their chronological order, but did not consider it necessary in all cases to record parables and other *discourses* in their strictly historical places, preferring sometimes to insert them where they would best serve to illustrate the narrative, or to bring out points of comparison or contrast in the teaching of Christ. This freedom of treatment seems startling to us; but, if Tatian intended his

¹⁴⁶See *e.g.* Heinrich Greeven, "Erwägungen zur synoptischen Textkritik", *NTS* 6 (1959-60): 289. Cf. Massaux, *Influence*, 3:183, who observes that "the same more or less literal citations from Mt. appear frequently, as though certain passages of the first gospel enjoyed preferential treatment in the Christian community in its early times".

¹⁴⁷See *e.g.* Massaux, *Influence*, 2:113-9, 270-2, 279-80; cf. 2:128; cf. also 3:86, 151-2, 168.

¹⁴⁸Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 279, notes how Matthew's text is "the most secure" from the harmonising tendency of the Gospels in D and that it "was harmonized least of the Synoptists" when D and d columns are compared, 248. See the collation of Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 87-105, where there are many readings in D showing Luke has been harmonised with Matthew.

¹⁴⁹Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 256, observes that a distinct mark of D is that "harmonization, not only between precise parallels, but also between similar phrases and within Gospels; the influence of the context; writing in an intentionally colloquial style".

work to be used along with the Gospels, not to supersede them, the chief objection is removed.¹⁵⁰

Hence, the harmony of the Gospels, such as Tatian's Diatessaron, can be an intertextual approach to the interpretation of the Gospels.¹⁵¹ Frances Young's argument is telling: "For such people [i.e. the early Christians] what we now call 'intertextuality' was an important feature of literature, one text achieving its status by its allusive and mimetic relationship with others that had the status of classics".¹⁵² A good example of how Luke is being harmonised with Matthew is the synchronisation of the Lukan genealogy of Jesus with that of Matthew's in D.¹⁵³ It would lead us to think that since Matthew's narrative is popular his genealogy would be a classic one.¹⁵⁴ Thus, for the D text of Luke to attain a mimetic relationship with Matthew it could have been harmonised with the first Gospel's recognised genealogy. Édouard Massaux's claim is telling because "certain passages of the works [he] examined reflect a literal dependence on Matthew, they disclose that, in its use of this gospel, the early patristic tradition is very often in agreement with the common text (the Western text) as opposed to the Eastern text".¹⁵⁵ On the one hand, the simplest explanation is that Luke is harmonised with Matthew because of Matthew's popularity and that Luke, as it has been used liturgically, should be heard as not deviating from expected Matthean tradition which was the one that was known to the people. On the other hand, when one looks at the kind of

¹⁵⁰Hill, *Earliest*, xiii-iv. (The italics are original.)

¹⁵¹Metzger, *Early Versions*, 28, citing the result of the investigation of I. Ortiz de Urbina, "Trama e carattere de Diatessaron di Taziano", *OCP* 25 (1959): 326-57, points out that: "When, however, one considers that sequence of material within the Diatessaron, it is obvious that Tatian grouped passages from the four Gospels that pertain to the same context, whether of episode, parable, dialogue, or preaching of Jesus". Metzger, citing Ortiz, continues his case that the whole intention for the production of the Diatessaron was practically to provide "a convenient text for liturgical usage as well as catechetical instruction of the faithful".

¹⁵²Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 11.

¹⁵³See Lk 3.23-31 and Mt 1.6-16 in the D text.

¹⁵⁴However, Tatian omitted the genealogies of Matthew and Luke in the Diatessaron. See Vööbus, *Early Versions*, 15.

¹⁵⁵Massaux, *Influence*, 3:184.

harmonisation, which is obviously not applied to all common pericopae, sayings and parables of Jesus, a kind of pattern is obvious. In relationship to the tendency of harmonising Luke to that of Matthean account it can also be cited that scholars believe that Tatian in his Diatessaron based his harmony on the Gospel of Matthew, which would be sensible for him to do, because Matthew's account became most popular in early Christianity. Through harmonisation and alteration of readings, the D text brings a different reading which gives a different meaning, apparently not intended by the Gospel writers. This view of the harmonising tendency in the D text of the Gospels is attested by the findings of Parker who reckons that: "In the Gospels, material that is strictly additional, rather than harmonizing or added for the purpose of clarification, is rarer".¹⁵⁶ He also observes that "Mark, however, regarded in the early church as a digest of Matthew, comes in for the most alteration, and is subsequently put at the end of the Gospel sequence".¹⁵⁷ Parker's comment about the additional material in John and Luke and their implication is worth citing at this point:

A few *logia*, notably Jn 7.59-8.11; Lk. 6.4; 22.44; 23.53, show that the transmitters of the text were not wholly averse to adding material. But at the end of Luke the tradition was so restrained as actually to *omit* material that opinion today would encourage it to have retained. The point here is that, even in this free textual tradition, there is a certain restraint.¹⁵⁸

Because of the harmonising tendency in D, among other characteristics of its text, Parker maintains that, "the Gospel texts do not have the same kind of fixed form that is found elsewhere".¹⁵⁹ Notably, "distinctions between the four Gospels (harmonizations) and between them and other traditions about Jesus (additions) are not clearly observed".¹⁶⁰ The harmonisation would help in reading the words of Jesus and what his sayings meant in the

¹⁵⁶Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 257.

¹⁵⁷Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 257.

¹⁵⁸Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 257. (The italics are original.)

¹⁵⁹Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 257.

¹⁶⁰Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 257.

Gospels. The harmonised reading in the D text, from the other Gospels or within the same Gospel, could become a hermeneutical key to unlock the meaning of an allegorising variant that penetrated the text for this type of interpretative system developed from the Fathers.¹⁶¹ In particular, as it could be imagined, the harmonised textual form that is fossilised in the D text of Luke could have been enhanced further by an allegorised manner of reading the text.¹⁶² Thus the fossilised harmonised text with the help of an allegorised reading of a parable could lead to an allegorising textual variant reading that actually expresses a spiritual meaning beyond what is provided in the mere text.¹⁶³

Perhaps, these supposedly allegorical readings in the D text could have been incorporated in the process of transmission as glosses previously written by tradent/s of the Greek manuscript codex, that would have been the ancestor of the exemplar of Codex D, by the scribe/s who later produced manuscript copies.¹⁶⁴ The glosses were placed by the tradent/s, who were also the ones giving the interpretation or exposition of the text read. In Mk 13:14 the reading of D inserted τι ἀναγεινώσκει after ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω, thus states “let the reader understands what he reads,” which is most likely referring to the reader of the current Gospel.¹⁶⁵ In the D reading, the emphasis has been shifted from the

¹⁶¹See for example how the reading of D in Lk 6.48 is harmonised with Mt 7.25 where both read τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν. The reading in D is a clear harmonisation. Furthermore, the Fathers as referring to either Christ or his teaching have allegorically read πέτρα. See Chapter 5, 250-5, for further discussion of the harmonisation and allegorised reading of this passage.

¹⁶²Allegorised reading to enhance the mimetic value of the text was not uncommon in the ancient exegetical endeavour. Dawson, *Allegorical*, 3, cites how the ancient interpreters in avoiding “an unending thrill of indeterminate [allegorical] interpretation” employed “apophatic [or ‘negative’ theological sensibilities] claims rhetorically” which substantiates their use of allegory. Thus, one of the results of their acknowledgment of apophatic restrictions “allowed them to declare the literal meaning of precursor texts to be mimetically inadequate (thus justifying their own application of allegory)”.

¹⁶³Cf. the concept of my proposed accumulation of the allegorising readings in the D text of Luke with Dawson, *Allegorical*, 65-6, in his discussion of the Alexandrian textual editors who “preserved the allegorical readings by others”.

¹⁶⁴See the discussion of my hypothesis on this matter in the first chapter of this present dissertation.

¹⁶⁵Another clue on the role of the reader in the New Testament text itself comes from Rev 1:3 and the other reference is in 1 Tim 4:13.

phenomenon of the reader's understanding of Jesus' prediction of the "abomination of desolation" to the content itself of what has been read. Here, the role of the reader, as the one who explains his understanding of what he read, assumes that the explanation or exposition will follow later afterwards.¹⁶⁶ The possible phenomenon of this theory of textual interpolation can be best illustrated by using the parables of Jesus. The development of Christian theology and doctrine about Christ was clearly heterodox in nature, and only later after the Council of Nicaea were orthodoxy and heresy defined and distinguished in one's Christology.¹⁶⁷ The tendency to understand the historical Jesus in the light of Judaism of the second temple period is prevalent in New Testament scholarship. The debate in understanding Jesus as a Jew is based on the presupposition that the key in understanding this great Galilean figure and his teaching is through Judaism of his time. However, the difficult question that scholars fail to answer is in what kind of Judaism does Jesus fit. A further concern is that the Gospel writers portray Jesus beyond his plain Jewishness for their Gentile audiences. It seems that in the Gospel account Jesus would be a total misfit in any sect of Judaism in his day. Christian faith, instead, "found its real home and fertile ground for expansion among Greeks and Romans. Soon, and in the mainstream, the Church was gentile".¹⁶⁸

Textual Alterations Fitting to Allegorical and Mimetic Readings

The charge of textual alteration was made against the Christian text of the Gospels.¹⁶⁹ The changes that were made occurred because of the interpretation of what was fitting

¹⁶⁶See Graham, *Beyond*, especially 45-66, for the relationship of the orality and literary dynamics of the reading of the text in an ancient Christian community.

¹⁶⁷See Ehrman, *Lost Christianities*, 91-157. See also Frances Young, *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and Its Background* (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1983), especially 57-91, for detailed discussion of the Arian controversy in the fourth-century.

¹⁶⁸Riley, *One Jesus*, 9.

¹⁶⁹See Baarda, "Factors", 29-31, in his analysis of Celsus' complain about the text of the Gospels.

reading to the tradents, which penetrated the Gospels' textual tradition.¹⁷⁰ It is important to recognise as well that the Fathers assumed the conventional approaches of mimesis and allegory as they approached the text of the Gospels.¹⁷¹ From Plato onwards there has been a continuing debate on the relationship between the work of art and the artist with the world of external matters.¹⁷² The concept of mimesis is well known as being loaded with several perplexities and uncertainties.¹⁷³ Nevertheless, D. A. Russell is correct in maintaining that mimesis or imitatio "was hardly ever questioned in antiquity" and was properly understood as "a general description of what poets and artists do".¹⁷⁴ Further, Russell asserts that the meaning of mimesis includes a manner of "copying" or a kind of "representation" wherein the mimema, the creation of the artist, "could not come into existence without a corresponding object outside, on which it depends for its structure and characteristics".¹⁷⁵ In ancient literary criticism "the discourse about *mimēsis* suggests that literature should be perceived most obviously as a product, an image, of its particular ideological or historical

¹⁷⁰Textual critics and biblical scholars correctly assume that the heretics tampered the text of the Gospels to propagate their teachings. See for example Baarda, "Factors", 30, on Origen's defence to the accusation of Celsus. Cf. Ehrman, *Lost Christianities*, 203-46. However, Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, and Parker, *Living Text*, established the view that it is not only the heretics that modified the text of the Gospels but the orthodox as well.

¹⁷¹For a full discussion on how allegory and mimesis have been appropriated by the early Fathers see Kennedy, "Christianity", 330-46.

¹⁷²For a convenient presentation of the "Cosmological Concept of Mimesis" in Plato see the discussion of W. Michaelis, "μιμέομαι, μιμητής, συμμιμητής", *TDNT*, 4:661-3.

¹⁷³Mimesis performed an essential part in most of the theories in art and literature from antiquity to present time. Yet in the development of the concept of mimesis its precise meaning has been debated over and over again. For a quick discussion on the influence of mimesis in art and literature see the introduction of John D. Lyons and Stephen G. Nichols, Jr., eds., *Mimesis: From Mirror to Method, Augustine to Descartes* (Hanover: University Press of New England, 1982), 1-19. The most recent work and most helpful discussions on the archaic texts and contemporary dilemmas is Halliwell, *Aesthetics*, 369, who points out that "the definition and interpretation of mimesis have always been a locus of argument and contestation".

¹⁷⁴Russell, *Criticism*, 99.

¹⁷⁵Russell, *Criticism*, 99.

context”.¹⁷⁶ Simply put, at the risk of being repetitive, mimesis was “taken for granted” in the ancient world and requires an external entity for imitation.

The activity of interpreting the sacred text did not involve the Fathers in doing “historical” exegesis as contemporary scholars would do. The product of the Fathers’ scriptural approach was their exegetical construct of “new texts” and “retelling of stories” in many different ways within the boundaries of the accepted Christian tradition, as when Justin used proof-text and Tatian prepared a complete-harmony of the Gospels.¹⁷⁷ The question of the patristic attitude toward the scriptural text—when they interpret it—as they have a theological encounter in their understanding is a matter of hermeneutical epistemology.¹⁷⁸ Jon Whitman points out that “our language is constantly telling us that something is what it is not” and the way we employ language, as in fiction, in showing “truth by departing from it in some way”.¹⁷⁹ Further, Whitman argues that similarly “the ancient dislocation of words from their objects will keep the language at one remove from what it claims to present”.¹⁸⁰ Thus, as Frances Young picks up the contention of Whitman she states that:

If we take this [i.e. Whitman’s claim] seriously, all reading of texts which involves entering the text-world, appropriating the perspective of the text, or reading ourselves into the text, is in some sense allegorical. Just as drama involves its audience, so the scriptures demand response. Ancient literary critics recognised that this process depended on *mimēsis*—imitation or representation. Once admit this and the dialectic between similarity and difference is inevitable, and allegory becomes an extreme form of all forms of reading.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁶Too, *Idea*, 6.

¹⁷⁷The harmonising tendency of Justin and Tatian cannot simply be judged as due to embarrassment of the seeming contradiction in the accounts of the Gospels. Rather, it should be taken more than due to embarrassment. Harmonisation developed for interpretative purposes and could have been influenced by the catena referencing. This form of harmonisation tendency is coherently parallel to the cento approach described by E. A. Clark, *Ascetic*, 124-71.

¹⁷⁸E. Hatch, *Influence*, passim.

¹⁷⁹Whitman, *Allegory*, 1.

¹⁸⁰Whitman, *Allegory*, 2.

¹⁸¹Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 191. See also Young, *Art*, 134-59.

For the early Fathers, the Christian scripture is neither simply “historical constructs” with meanings nor “accepted myths” with morals, rather the Christian scripture is a dynamic tradition and not a static text but is alive and authoritative in its applicability among the Christian communities as they were read.¹⁸² Hence, for them the spiritual meaning matters most and the allegorical approach to interpretation was the convention that suited their purpose.¹⁸³ The Fathers assumed that sacred literature, especially the Christian Scripture, should provide a moral lesson that is Christologically shaped.¹⁸⁴

Patristic Understanding of Gospel Parables as Obscure Figurative Language

All Christians, then and now, believe that Jesus was crucified on the cross and that he taught in parables. The centuries-long argument about the nature and person of Jesus the Christ understood in the light of his death and resurrection was bitter. Nevertheless, no one doubts the historical statement that Jesus was crucified. The writings of the early Christian Fathers undeniably blame the crucifixion of Jesus on the unbelieving Jews in Jerusalem who also rejected him as the Old Testament’s promised Messiah.¹⁸⁵ The teaching of Jesus on the kingdom of this promised Messiah is also known as mostly parabolic in nature. Hence, the interest in the Gospel parables, then and now, among Christians, although always in dispute, thrives not because they were parables but because they came from the mouth of Jesus. In the midst of centuries of Christian debates about the nature and person of Jesus Christ two

¹⁸²See Graham, *Beyond*, 122-5.

¹⁸³Cf. Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation*, passim.

¹⁸⁴Von Campenhausen, *Formation*, 62-102, 328, exhibits clearly that the reason for the crisis of the Old Testament as Christian Scripture in the second-century was “christologically determined, and precipitated by the Law: it is discovered that its prescriptions are incompatible with the moral and religious ‘teachings’ of Christ”. This dilemma was overcome by the Church when the accent was placed on the prophetic nature of the Old Testament and the same God as the giver of the old covenant through the Law that has been fulfilled by Christ in the new covenant is upheld. Von Campenhausen, *Formation*, 103-326, 328, also depicts how the New Testament was not a result of a need to continue the Old Testament. Rather, the substance of the New Testament is “the historical message about Christ, and its purpose is to safeguard the oral tradition of the Church in its original form against the threat of distortion”.

¹⁸⁵See Chapter 4 for the anti-Judaic tendency of the Fathers.

factual truths were not disputed. As Arland J. Hultgren puts it at the beginning of his commentary on *The Parables of Jesus*:

“Two things are generally known about Jesus of Nazareth that are beyond historical doubt, and they are known around the world by Christians and non-Christians alike. The one is that Jesus was crucified in the first century of the Common Era. The other is that he taught in parables”.¹⁸⁶

The opening statement of Hultgren in his book is correct and crucial for the study of allegorising and mimetic variant readings in D. The Fathers who interpreted the parables of Jesus have shown an anti-Judaic tendency in their allegorical and mimetic readings of the Gospel parables. The work of Epp and Rice on the anti-Judaic tendency of Acts and Luke in the D text, respectively, reflects the sentiment of the patristic literature on the interpretation of the parables. It is also pertinent to reiterate that Jesus’ teaching was disputed in the primitive heterodox Church as is clear in patristic literature. In the New Testament times, as seen in Mt 24.24, Mk 13.22, Ac 20.29-30, 2 Cor 11.13-15 and 2 Pet 2.1-3, there are already hints of people and groups that were regarded as having misleading views of the tradition of Jesus and the apostles.¹⁸⁷ In the words of Irenaeus (*Against Heresies* 1.3.6), the second-century Gnostics who were followers of Valentinian “endeavour to derive proofs for their opinions by means of perverse interpretations and deceitful expositions” from the Gospel stories,¹⁸⁸ and they tailored the parables of Jesus to coincide with their particular doctrines (*Against Heresies* 1.8.1).¹⁸⁹ Nevertheless, as already noted above, no Christian in antiquity disputed that Jesus taught in parables. Like the bitter patristic Christological debates due to the difficulty of understanding the nature of Christ’s divinity, the perception of the parables of Jesus was already acknowledged as difficult to comprehend. In the confines of the New

¹⁸⁶Hultgren, *Parables*, 1.

¹⁸⁷For penetrating insights and several references I am in debt to Hultgren, *Parables*, especially 456-7, in this section of my thesis.

¹⁸⁸Irenaeus 1, *ANCL* 5:15.

¹⁸⁹Irenaeus 1, *ANCL* 5:31-2.

Testament and various ancient Christian writings, many sections already mentioned the ambiguity of the parables and figurative features of the Gospels. In the Gospel of John Jesus makes a full use of figurative language in a manner that the disciples did not comprehend. Here, Jesus is said to have spoken figuratively in such a way that his disciples do not understand him (Jn 10:6), and he announces that the hour is coming when he will no longer speak in figures but will tell them ‘plainly’ (παρρησίᾳ) of the Father (Jn 16:25-29).

It is also significant to point out how later Christian literature followed the Synoptic Gospels’ traditional parabolic theme in Mt 13.13-14, Mk 4.11-12 and Lk 8.10. The following citations from the extra-biblical literature indicate that the parables were incomprehensible to those who are outside the fold. It is most interesting how the *Epistle of Barnabas* (17.2) puts across the obscurity of parables: “For if I should write to you about things present or things to come, you would not understand, because they are set forth in parables (διὰ τὸ ἐν παραβολαῖς κεῖσθαι).”¹⁹⁰ Commenting on the mystifying concept of parables in his examination of Barnabas, Édouard Massaux contends that in connection with the perspective of the Synoptic Gospels the “reality is illustrated not only through parables, but it is also often hidden in parables”.¹⁹¹ Furthermore, Massaux affirms that for Barnabas parables present a riddle that necessitates an illumination because it holds “a profound reality which must be penetrated with the help of explanations from the one who proposed it”.¹⁹² The description of parables as difficult to understand is found in the works of Justin (*Dialogue with Trypho* 52.1; 68.6)¹⁹³ and Irenaeus (*Against Heresies* 1.3.6)¹⁹⁴ of the second-century. Among the Gnostic authors of the second and third centuries (*Apocryphon of James* 7.1-6,

¹⁹⁰*Epistle of Barnabas*, LCL 25:74-5.

¹⁹¹Massaux, *Influence*, 1:76.

¹⁹²Massaux, *Influence*, 1:76.

¹⁹³Justin, *FC* 6:226, 258.

¹⁹⁴Irenaeus 1, *ANCL* 5:15.

7.35-8.11;¹⁹⁵ *Pistis Sophia* 1.1-6;¹⁹⁶ cf. Irenaeus *Against Heresies* 1.3.6¹⁹⁷), the secrecy of the parables is celebrated. The Gnostic *Apocryphon of James* (8.1-10) of the second-century claims that it was essential for Jesus to make use of eighteen days illuminating his parables to his disciples following his resurrection from the dead.¹⁹⁸ Irenaeus (*Against Heresies* 1.3.2) declares that a number of Valentinian Gnostics of his time alleged that Jesus talked with his own disciples for about eighteen months subsequent to his resurrection from the dead so that he could clarify his teachings.¹⁹⁹ It is also fitting to observe how Justin (*Dialogue with Trypho* 90) asserts that:

What the prophets said or did they often expressed in parables and types [παραβολαῖς καὶ τύποις], thus hiding the truth they held. Consequently, it is not easy for the multitude to understand most of what they taught, but only those who take the trouble to find out and learn.²⁰⁰

If it is indeed correct to postulate that for the Greeks the very mention of parable implies allegorical interpretation and to view that a type could be seen as representative mimesis, then Justin's employment of the combination of parables and types, i.e. allegory and mimesis, is a precedent in attitude towards understanding the words of the prophets in the Scriptures. It is also telling to observe that the preceding references and opinions from antiquity have found a parallel in Ps 77.2 of the Septuagint: "I will open my mouth in parables (παραβολαῖς): I will utter dark sayings (προβλήματα) which have been from the

¹⁹⁵“Apocryphon of James”, trans. Francis E. Williams, in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*, 3rd rev. ed., ed. James M. Robinson (San Francisco: HarperCollins Publishers, 1990), 32-3. See also the discussion of Ron Cameron, *Sayings Traditions in the Apocryphon of James*, HTS 34 (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 12-7 & 120.

¹⁹⁶*Pistis Sophia*, ed. Carl Schmidt, trans. Violet MacDermot, The Coptic Gnostic Library, NHS 9 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978), 1-9/2-19, especially 8-9/16-19.

¹⁹⁷Irenaeus 1, *ANCL* 5:15.

¹⁹⁸“Apocryphon of James” in *Nag Hammadi*, 33.

¹⁹⁹Irenaeus 1, *ANCL* 5:12-3.

²⁰⁰Justin, *FC* 6:291.

beginning”.²⁰¹ Moreover, the *Epistle of Barnabas* 6.8-15²⁰² used the terms παραβολή and τύπος freely showing “characteristic of the exegetical terminology”.²⁰³ In turn the treatment of the Gospel parables in terms of allegorical interpretation and representational mimesis in antiquity is not new if applied in the D text of Luke.

Having outlined the attitude of the early Fathers toward the Gospel parables it is appropriate to apply the patristic attitude to explore the theological moulding of Luke’s parables in D. Perhaps, it was at the same period, when the Fathers struggled in understanding the Gospel parables, that the mimetic readings and allegorising variants entered into the text of D. Irenaeus (*Against Heresies* 4.26.1) believes that “Christ is the treasure which was hid in the field, that is, in this world (for ‘the field is the world’); but the treasure hid in the Scriptures is Christ, since He was pointed out by means of types and parables”.²⁰⁴ “Christ is truly the treasure hidden in the Scriptures, since he was signified by types (*typoi*) and parables (*parabolai*)”.²⁰⁵ The text of D gives an impression that a study of selected parables in Luke has the same looseness of transmission of the words of Jesus with a massive harmonisation of different accounts in the Gospels depicting layers of imageries and implications for its reading merit.²⁰⁶ The interpretations of the Fathers that show coherence

²⁰¹*The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*, ed. Lancelot C. L. Brenton (London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, Ltd., 1851; repr., Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1999), 744. (The italics are original in the English translation.)

²⁰²*Epistle of Barnabas*, LCL 25:33-5.

²⁰³Joseph Trigg, “The Apostolic Fathers and Apologists”, in Hauser and Watson, *History*, 315.

²⁰⁴Irenaeus 1, *ANCL* 5:461.

²⁰⁵See the discussion of Trigg, “Apostolic”, 327-31.

²⁰⁶The claim of Harry Gamble, “The Formation of the New Testament Canon and Its Significance for the History of Biblical Interpretation”, in Hauser and Watson, *History*, 420-1, is instructive for the plausibility of the Lukan parables in the D text as theologically moulded by the influence of patristic interpretative tradition:

Most of all, it was the ideational substance of Scripture—its central message as distinct from its exact textual scope—that determined the approach of patristic exegetes. This basic thrust of the Scriptures, the plot that gave coherence and continuity to the whole...provided the interpretative framework and was in all essentials identified with the rule of faith, that which was articulated in the baptismal creeds and which stressed the creative activity of the one God and the redemptive work of

with the peculiar D readings of Gospel parables could mean that they may have come from similar interpretative Christian tradition that simply follows apostolicity in reading the text of the Gospels.²⁰⁷ For both the Fathers and D could have been in the same line of exegetical understanding of the parables of Jesus that used mimetic and allegorical approaches in reading the Gospel parables.

Allegorising Reading of Gospel Parables as Symbolic Mimetic Representation

Although the later Antiochene Fathers who preferred *theoria* questioned the Alexandrian allegorical interpretation, there are indications that they also employed allegory in their own interpretation of the Scriptural text and the interpretative “problems were dogmatic rather than historical”.²⁰⁸ David Dawson argues that formalist perspectives of allegory should be ignored in order to focus more on “the historically specific ways allegory’s essential conflict of meanings actually engaged social and cultural practice in the ancient world”.²⁰⁹ Dawson’s emphasis in understanding allegorical interpretation in antiquity helps to put the perspective of the influence of allegorical meaning into a context for “allegorical compositions and interpretations constituted fields on which struggles between competing proposals for thought and action took place”.²¹⁰ Moreover, Dawson points out

the incarnate Christ. This rule of faith, like the Scriptures themselves, was held to be received from the apostles, transmitted through their disciples and successors, and preserved in the episcopate. This is not to say that the fathers merely found what they sought in Scripture; rather, they believed the Scriptures and the tradition of faith were in ultimate accord and that a proper interpretation of Scripture could be gained only within the believing community under the leadership of apostolic successors....At the same time, however, the interpretation of a particular passage, or even of a whole book, was undertaken with a view to its relations to those other passages and books which also had scriptural standing and thus had hermeneutical relevance. As diverse as those texts were, they were all approached as parts of a larger whole, the story of Scripture, within which were found consistency, direction, and sense.

²⁰⁷Cf. Von Campenhausen, *Formation*, 282-3, in his discussion of Marcion and Tertullian on the apostolic message and interpretation of the Gospels.

²⁰⁸Young, “Alexandrian”, 343.

²⁰⁹Dawson, *Allegorical*, 2.

²¹⁰Dawson, *Allegorical*, 2.

how “tensions between literal and nonliteral readings that characterized ancient allegory stemmed from efforts by readers to secure for themselves and their communities social and cultural identity, authority and power”.²¹¹ Additionally, Dawson points out as well that although there is a “traditional claim that allegory discovers a deeper, hidden meaning”, it is not “professing absolute meaning and truth”.²¹² Frances Young points this matter out well when she maintains that “all literary texts imply some expectation that the reader will correlate his or her world with the world of the text, so that its *mimēsis* implies and evokes some measure of *allēgoria*”.²¹³ Young further argues that “insights arising from imaginative engagement with the text are implied by the text’s existence to survival” where a certain mark of “allegory is inevitable”.²¹⁴ The full allegorical approach of interpretation as used by the Fathers can be clearly traced to Clement of Alexandria where Philo’s allegorical approach to the Scripture²¹⁵ found its way to the patristic interpreters through Clement.²¹⁶

²¹¹Dawson, *Allegorical*, 2.

²¹²Dawson, *Allegorical*, 2.

²¹³Young, *Art*, 151.

²¹⁴Young, *Art*, 151.

²¹⁵See Peder Borgen, “Philo of Alexandria as Exegete”, in Hauser and Watson, *History*, 114-43.

²¹⁶It is significant to take note of Clement’s attitude about the tradition and its relationship with the interpretation of the written Scriptures. The discussion of Stewart, “Doctrinal Influence”, 97-9, is worth quoting in its entirety because of the information that it provides:

Thus the Savior has taught the apostles “the unwritten rendering of the written [τῆ τῆς ἐγγράφου ἄγροφος]” which “has been handed down to us also” [*Strom.*, VI, xv, 131, 5]. The unwritten tradition is not a contradiction to the written, since they were both delivered through the same apostles. There is, nevertheless, in scripture, hidden under the veil of allegory, secret things (ἀπόρρητα) which, though in agreement with the writings, go beyond the simple rudiments of faith. It is in this realm of traditional interpretation that the battle ground of Clement and his adversaries is found. The argument is not so much what the text says as what it means. The true meaning depended upon true teaching, and true teaching sought its authority in true tradition. The concern is the identification of the Tradition among the traditions. For both Clement and his immediate adversaries the writings which in general constitute the present New Testament were accepted as a part of the Tradition. Since these writings are not grounds of serious debate, their exact text is not a question of deep concern. The question was: which tradition?

What is understood in our day as interpretation of the writings was seen in Clement’s time as a presentation of true teachings received from the apostles and authenticated by their writings. The text of these writings might suffer in quotation as a result of being used to authenticate or illustrate the

The allegorised readings of the parables of Jesus could have become symbolic in their mimetic representation in the D text of Luke.²¹⁷ It is noteworthy that the reading of the Gospel parables reflects an anti-Judaic tendency in the part of the Fathers, as we will see later in the examination of the Lukan parables in D, hence the central thesis of Epp and Rice about the anti-Judaic tendency of D is still valid.²¹⁸ Dawson's thesis on how an allegorical reading of texts makes a "cultural revision" in Alexandria is telling for the readers appropriated the texts within their own paradigm.²¹⁹ Young's theory that patristic exegesis led to "the formation of Christian culture" in the Graeco-Roman world made interpretation symbolic and represented the Christian view in the ancient literature with progressive and understandable impression.²²⁰ Thus Dawson and Young are helpful in assuming that mimetic reading turns

teaching. This would be more natural and even more insidious form of doctrinal influence upon the text (in quotation) than the theory that a doctrinal bias was first held, then the text was deliberately changed and an interpretation was drawn from the more agreeable reading. The latter would have been patently fraudulent and would have been so declared by both friends and enemies. It would have defeated the purpose for which the writings were actually used. It would be quite another thing if in presenting the correct teaching a reference was made to a written portion of this teaching in a paraphrastic fashion. Since the higher meaning lay in the teaching and since this meaning was concealed allegorically in the text, a slight rewording or paraphrase would be no more than a teacher's effort to bring out the true meaning and intent of the original writer.

Such an understanding of tradition and scripture would reflect not so much the state of Clement's text as the presuppositions of his doctrine. While peculiar readings in Clement may have affected later texts, they may indicate more of what Clement delivered than of what he received.

Clement's authority was the true tradition which he had received from the Lord through the apostles and their true successors. Scripture constituted the written part of this tradition. Since the higher truth was not for all men, the written part of tradition was commonly preserved in parabolic form. This was true of both the Old and New Testament. Correct interpretation consisted in the presentation of the true teachings concealed within the scripture. The most frequently used principle for associating the higher meaning of secret tradition with the parabolic meaning of written tradition was allegory. For the initiated to substitute the higher meaning into the text was not to alter the text. This practice simply made clear what the text in its hidden meaning had already said.

(The underlined words are original.)

²¹⁷D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 19, in his study of the sociology of texts reflects the sentiment on how "readers inevitably make their own meanings". Moreover, he asserts that "each reading is peculiar to its occasion, each can be at least partially recovered from the physical forms of the text, and the differences in readings constitute an informative history".

²¹⁸For the review of Epp and Rice see Chapter 2.

²¹⁹Dawson, *Allegorical*, passim.

²²⁰Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, passim.

to allegory for legitimate use in explaining the prevailing world-view in the sociology of the readers. As Young maintains that because of “the ‘oracular’ approach to Scripture, which, from the earliest days of Christianity, had treated texts as riddles pointing to Christ” early Christian interpreters were “encouraged” to employ allegorical interpretation.²²¹ The recognition of the obscurity of the parables and the necessity of their proper allegorical interpretation could have led the tradents of D to develop a tradition²²² that would have left the marks of allegorising and mimetic readings of the D text of Luke.²²³ The variants that are fossilised in the Lukan parables of the D text could be indicators on how the parables were read allegorically by the early Christian tradents. The allegorising variant readings, moulded by the allegorical interpretations of the parables, became a clue for mimetic representations of the early Christian reading of Scripture. These allegorical readings and mimetic representations saw the Jewish rejection of Christ as coded in the spiritual meaning of the

²²¹Young, “Alexandrian”, 336.

²²²Cf. Von Campenhausen, *Formation*, 329, who highlights that the written text of the Scripture was “never regarded as the sole source of Christian faith” but consistently attended by “the living preaching and teaching about Christ”. The Church, in other words, “always lives by *tradition* as well as the Bible, just as in the first instance she lived by tradition alone”. (The italics are original.)

²²³The marks of allegorising and mimetic readings accumulated by the D text in Luke could be taken as scribal errors and therefore should be edited out in the critical editions of the Greek New Testament. However, they could not really be considered error *per se* if they are taken as readings produced in the process of the reception of the text. The unique readings in D are not mechanical errors of copying but intentional modifications for an appropriate reading that reflects the history of the text. The argument of Jerome J. McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992), 118-9, is telling:

Clearing ancient texts of their accumulated errors was an operation which required at once great technical skill and purpose, as well as a deep and humane sympathy for the work. Both the material form of the work and its aesthetic force and meaning developed as a function of its imbedded social and cultural nature. To understand and appreciate Homer, or to edit his work, required that you study both with as full a sympathetic consciousness of the social context as it was possible to gain: because authors, their works, and their texts were not isolate phenomena. All were part of a continuing process, a changing and sometimes even a developing history of human events and purposes.

Further McGann, *Critique*, 121, correctly points out that:

The chief difficulties emerge when textual criticism has the effect of desocializing our historical view of the literary work. When we make decisions about the condition and significance of various texts on the simple criterion of author’s (final) intentions we foster serious misconceptions about the nature of literary production. Too many relevant aspects of the literary work are de-emphasized, or even abstracted from the critical view altogether, when we operate on such a principle.

parables.²²⁴ The chain referencing that provides the hermeneutical key reflects the mimetic compositional reading approach of the tradents²²⁵ based on the living tradition on how the text is to be read.²²⁶ The harmonisation, cross-referencing, repetition or cento mark in the D text of Luke could be seen as interpretative help in understanding the text.²²⁷ For one thing stands out, whether the ancient techniques of Homeric repetition or cross-referencing, Virgilian cento, Tatianic harmonisation or full use of literary imitation were employed, the influence and assumption of the theory of mimesis in literary criticism is taken for granted. Apparently, *allegoria* and *mimesis* were their basic approaches in appreciating the meaning of the Christian Scripture if they wanted to go beyond the literal or plain meaning of the text that led Origen to formulate “traditional ‘types’ and Messianic interpretations into his spiritual sense”.²²⁸

²²⁴Oden in Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:xxv, clarifies that the Fathers’ “arguments [against the Jews] were not framed in regard to the hatred of a race, but rather the place of the elect people of God, the Jews, in the history of the divine-human covenant that is fulfilled in Jesus Christ”. Further he maintains:

In my view, the patristic texts that appear to modern readers to be anti-Semitic in most cases have a typological reference and are based on a specific approach to the interpretation of Scripture—the analogy of faith—which assesses each particular text in relation to the whole trend of the history of revelation and which views the difference between Jew and Gentile under christological assumptions and not merely as a matter of genetics or race.

²²⁵Oden and Hall, *Mark*, xxx, point out how the early Christian exegetes as they interpret “characteristically weaved many sacred texts together” and they also “seldom limited themselves to comment on a single” but rather “constantly related one text to another by analogy” to extract the meaning of the Scripture text on hand.

²²⁶Graham, *Beyond*, 6, is right as he points out that when a text is examined as Scripture the focus of study should be on “its contextual meaning, interpretation, and use—that is, the ongoing role the text has played in a tradition, not only in formal exegesis, but in very sector of life”. This point of Scripture as relational to the community it serves is crucial for “‘Scripture’ is not a literary genre but a religiohistorical one, and it must be understood as such”.

²²⁷Cf. Arthur A. Just, Jr., ed., *Luke*, ACCSNT 3 (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2003), xxi.

²²⁸Young, “Alexandrian”, 336.

Variant Readings Fitting to Allegorising and Mimetic Indices

It was in the patristic period when allegorical interpretation was the primary way of understanding classical Greek literature as well as the Christian Scriptures.²²⁹ This was also the era of the early stages of the collection and transmission of the books of the New Testament and especially the text of the Gospels.²³⁰ The consensus among the textual critics concerning the fluidity of the text of the New Testament in the early Christian centuries has been stretched not only in going “behind the variations in textual traditions of the early Christian writings so as to reconstruct the autographs”, but more on taking the data of textual variations “to see what they can tell us about the social worlds of the scribes who produced them”.²³¹ Recently it has been acknowledged by textual scholars that for certain “it is important to know not only what an author wrote (i.e., in the autograph), but also what a reader read (i.e. in its later transcriptions)”.²³² Thus the celebrated unique readings of D in the Gospels and Acts have been approached as a kind of theological tendency or a sort of textual recension girded for a situation in the history of the use of the text based on this assumption regarding the fluidity of the text.²³³ Yet a couple of fundamental questions arise as to what led to such development of the unique readings of the D text: (1) What kind of patristic interpretative assumption (or even perhaps an alternative ancient approach)

²²⁹Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, argues well in her entire book that the Christian Scripture did not only become under the scrutiny of ancient scholarly investigation as the Greek classics but eventually replaced them. Patristic exegesis assumed the ideology, methods and compositions taken from the classical rhetoric.

²³⁰See Von Campenhausen, *Formation*, especially 147-209.

²³¹Ehrman, “Text of the Gospels”, 122. Ehrman, “Text of the Gospels”, 95-122, further explores some selection of the various forms of Christian groups and relate their major teachings to textual variations in the text of the New Testament, particularly in D, with the Christological modifications, anti-semitic tendency, women repression, apologetic reflection and ascetic elevation depicting “the symbiotic relationship that existed between the surviving texts of early Christianity and the social world within which they were transmitted”. This “symbiotic relationship” between texts and society that Ehrman mentioned is the same as the mimetic relationship of the text to the world of its reader.

²³²Bart D. Ehrman, “The Text as a Window”, 361.

²³³See the second chapter of this present thesis for the review of the previous works on the D text.

sociologically influenced the cause of such a textual tradition that would have resulted to a certain tendency or decided recension? (2) How such a patristic reading or early hermeneutic would allow that kind of alteration to penetrate the Christian texts as a witness of its textual history? These problems have not been dealt with adequately.²³⁴ This is the case because the question of ancient literary criticism and textual criticism that could have influenced D at best is a subject discussed under a linguistic analysis of the text.²³⁵ The penetration of the allegorising reading or variants in the text of the New Testament that became fertile in the Gentile soil, represented by D, is the main question that this thesis seeks to answer.²³⁶ Their allegorising is their use of mimesis made obvious in their application of intertextuality that created the catena of Scripture references evident in their writings.²³⁷

²³⁴These important questions have been highlighted by McKenzie, *Bibliography*, 28-9, as he discusses on how in “bibliography as a sociology of texts” the book is seen as “an expressive form” that can “resurrect authors in their own time and their readers at any time”. This view of the text is helpful in approaching the D text. To explain the peculiar readings in the D text of Luke, specifically the recorded parables of Jesus, the historical, literary and sociological contexts of the readers should be taken seriously. McKenzie, *Bibliography*, 29, highlights my attitude towards the text in the same way as he argues that texts should be understood sociologically:

One of its [i.e. bibliography] greatest strengths is the access it gives to social motives: by dealing with the facts of transmission and the material evidence of reception, it can make discoveries as distinct from inventing meanings. In focussing on the primary object, the text as a recorded form, it defines our common point of departure for any historical or critical enterprise. By abandoning the notion of degressive bibliography and recording *all* subsequent versions, bibliography, simply by its own comprehensive logic, its indiscriminate inclusiveness, testifies to the fact that new readers of course make new texts, and that their new meanings are a function of their new forms. The claim then is no longer for their truth as one might seek to define that by an authorial intention, but for their testimony as defined by their historical use.

(The italics are original.)

²³⁵The work of Read-Heimerdinger exemplifies this kind of current investigation making the linguistic tool the priority in looking at the distinctive readings of D.

²³⁶This primary thesis question is of course based on the working assumption that the literary form known to the Graeco-Roman world where the transmission of the Gospel text flourished was allegory. The allegorical interpretation is the fundamental hermeneutical approach for the ancients to interpret, particularly religious texts such as Homer. Even Jews like Philo of Alexandria used allegorical interpretation to explain the Jewish scripture to the Gentiles. This literary context and hermeneutical process is what the early Fathers assumed in their attitude toward the Gospels’ text.

²³⁷ See Dawson, *Allegorical*, 29-31, 34-5, 62, 87-90, 283-4 endnote 45.

It is appropriate at this point to identify functional indices, i.e. indicators or markers to determine the demonstrability of the claims made, in discerning the degree of probability within the unique readings in the D text of Luke.²³⁸ Indices in what should be included in the investigation for systematic analysis are necessary in probing the relevant unique readings of the D text of Lukan parable passages.²³⁹ The levels of probability of the variant readings due to allegorising and mimetic reasons will be considered based on these identified indices.²⁴⁰ The extent of probability is determined on the stipulated indices based on the discernible changes made to the text and the parallel reading of that text to patristic citation or allusion.²⁴¹ The scale and indices of the demonstrability of the suggestions are as follows:

Probable degree of confidence in the occurrence of allegorising and/or mimetic modification in the Lukan text of D means that the variant reading/s in a parable under investigation identified is/are sensibly deliberate and could be explained due to patristic

²³⁸Yoder, *Concordance*, v, points out how important it is to have “the evidence” of the unique readings of D presented in a concordance to ascertain “its textual and linguistic data” so that conclusions such as the suggested Semitism of D could be qualified based on “all the evidence”. Thus, creating indices as a measuring device for the claims made—although not as linguistic as that of Yoder—based on the “physical make-up of the manuscript text to the “letter” will aid the understanding of the distinctive readings of D. Parker, *Codex Bezae*, has already made this kind of study of the D text as manuscript examined as a manuscript.

²³⁹My decisions in identifying the unusual readings in the D text of Luke are guided by Yoder, *Concordance*, in the Greek side of D, and Stone in the Latin side of d.

²⁴⁰I have based my indices below and the degree of the probability of my examples on the establishment of coherent parallels between the Fathers and the D text of Luke as I analysed the relevant parables that are examined in this thesis. I also put the investigation in the ancient setting of the classics and patristics, as well as in the perspective of the physical form of the D manuscript that has been placed in the circumstances of the tradents that used its text. See my definition of the term “tradent” in Chapter 1, 23-5.

²⁴¹My documentation will not be verbatim parallel passages from the Fathers and other early Christian texts. Rather, the interpretations and allusions that the Fathers and other early Christian literature that show coherent connection with the variant readings of D will be taken as witness to the reason for the alteration of the text. The tradents of D are not identifiable as one of the Fathers or anybody from the ancient Christian writers. Thus to push the parallel reading in a verbatim index is impossible. However, because of the shared interpretative tradition of the Gospel parables by the early Christians, the variant readings of Lukan parables in the D text could be conceivably viewed as showing coherence of reading with the interpretation of the Fathers and other early Christian writers because of their possible influence to the tradents of the D text. Hence, insights using imagination in the dynamic of textual transmission of D would be necessary to envision the distinctive textual witness of D in the Lukan parables as theologically shaped by the allegorical and mimetic reading of the Gospel parables by the Fathers and other early Christian authors.

exegetical influence.²⁴² The indices for a probable degree of certainty are first of all, that the variant reading is recognisably harmonised with other Gospels or same Gospel reading. Secondly, the unique reading, whether different or additional word/s where spotted, cannot be simply evaluated and dismissed as due to a scribal mistake in the reproduction process of the manuscript. Thirdly, the omission of word/s that can be explained as intentional other than just a plain copying error due to homoioteleuton or homoioarchton.²⁴³ Thus, an evident parallel correspondence with the reading from other Gospels or within the same Gospel is clearly intended or the distinct reading is intentionally altered is what the probable indices are based on. The assumption of representative mimesis strengthens the probability of the allegorical and mimetic influence on the text. In this case the anti-Judaic attitude of the early Church is taken as the mimetic representation that influences the reading of Lukan parables in the D text.²⁴⁴

Plausible level of certainty of a variant reading is allegorical or mimetic when a different spelling of word/s, modified verb forms or tenses and utilisation of unusual terms produce a different but sensible meaning in the D text of the Lukan parables. It should be noted, however, that itacism could be an explanation for the difference of spelling, a scribal copying error as an alternative reason for spelling variation, and addition or omission of letter/s as the cause of dissimilarity in reading. However, if the word/s noted is/are grammatically and contextually appropriate it would be taken for granted as legitimate

²⁴²Rice in his dissertation and articles has already demonstrated that the D text of Luke is full of intentional alterations that bring a big difference in reading the text when it is compared to the contemporary accepted critical edition of Greek New Testament. With Epp in Acts, Rice calls it anti-Judaic tendency in the D text. In the same line of thought as that of Rice, I view the deliberate modifications in the Lukan parables of the D text as due to allegorising-mimetic reading tendency.

²⁴³The study of Albert C. Clark, *The Primitive Text of the Gospel and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914), especially 50-112, on the phenomenon of omissions in the D text gives me insights in deciding whether an omission of word, phrase, clause or sentence is accidental or intentional.

²⁴⁴I am following the lead of Epp, *Theological Tendency*; and Rice, "Alteration of Luke".

variant reading.²⁴⁵ Accordingly, the merit of uniquely spelled word/s in the Lukan text of D is its implied gist that changes the stance of the meaning of the text observed. This index is helpful in assessing the plausibility structure of the faith-seeking appreciation of the Lukan parables in the D text as that which theologically moulded their readings. Accordingly, the parables in this category are taken at the level of a plausible influence by allegory and mimesis because the available patristic support is less and the representative mimetic assumption on the meaning of these parables in Christian faith is a truism that can be taken for granted as part of the original intent of Jesus or the Gospel writers. Nonetheless, the broad sense of the Fathers' exegesis of the parables investigated is reflected in the variant readings of the D text and could be explained as being influenced by their allegorical and mimetic approaches to the parables that Jesus told.

The possible extent of the demonstrability of the occurrence of an interpretative variant reading is considered when the words of the text are unusually spelled, or a totally different word is employed or even the word order is oddly structured in the D text. The confidence on the possibility of my views would be based on the indices that the deliberate alteration of words could be: First of all, indicating a reading emphasis where an apparent stress is placed on something or someone in the text. This emphasis could be due to the *methodikon*²⁴⁶ that worked out its way to make the meaning clearer because of the honest difficulty of reading the undivided words in texts. This primary concern in this third index attends to the "letter" of the text in its "physical" appearance as a manuscript.²⁴⁷ Secondly, a parallel reading with other Gospels or another passage on the same Gospel could be the cause

²⁴⁵The exclusion of what are seemingly itacisms and scribal errors is the main weakness of the word list on the distinctive text of D that was prepared by Yoder, *Concordance*. He does not include some readings that are distinct in the D text because there is the possibility of mistake in the transmission based on his judgement. This is the same case in NA²⁷ entries in the critical apparatus. Many readings in D are not included for one reason or another. However, Swanson, *Luke*, has included all the unique readings in the D text and is the most helpful.

²⁴⁶See Young, *Art*, 96-9.

²⁴⁷Young, "Alexandrian", 339.

of the harmonisation of the word arrangement. Third, a grammatical smoothening of the text may have brought the necessary alteration in the display of the word order in the D text of Luke. Fourth, the vernacularisation of the textual structure and/or the influence by a popular version may have led to the textual variation. Hence, the different word forms used that may not fit grammatically, or the unusual arrangement of words, or the additional readings for apparent clarification—for whatever reason—make this category at least a possibility that it has been influenced by allegorical interpretation and/or mimetic reading.

Lastly, if a variant reading has a theological connotation of any sort that parallels with a patristic interpretation, the proposed explanation for the occurrence of the variant reading due to allegory and mimesis would not be an impossible one. The assertion of some variant readings as influenced by allegory and mimesis could be argued logically, but the support of the Fathers is not evidentially strong. However, it is still helpful to pursue the case of variant readings in a cited parable, that although an explanation is improbable, yet it could not be impossible that an existing variant in the D text of Luke could be due to the influence of allegory and mimesis, especially if there is at least a coherent parallel that can be observed from the Fathers.

Certainly, the patristic witness should support the credibility of the indices that are itemised above. The Fathers' use of the parable investigated in Luke and its parallel in other Gospels, whether this parable is clearly quoted verbatim or simply alluded to in passing, or fully interpreted and expounded, is the primary substantiation for the allegorising and/or mimetic reading analysis of a Lukan parable in the D text. The secondary authentication is the parallel reading that can be observed from the non-canonical ancient Christian literature and extra-biblical writings in antiquity.²⁴⁸ It should be further acknowledged that not all

²⁴⁸The ancient Christian literature consulted is not limited to the “orthodox” authors, especially in the second-century. All sorts of Christian literature will be employed as much as possible. As Bauer, *Orthodoxy*, and Ehrman, *Lost Christianities*, maintain, the early form of Christianity was more heterodox. It was only later when orthodoxy and heresy were defined. Further, the parables of Jesus were popular and well quoted, alluded and interpreted in antiquity by both orthodox and heretics alike. In other words, any reference to the parables of

Lukan parables in D have distinct readings that can conceivably be allegorical or mimetic in nature. Moreover, the application of the indices given is arbitrary to the support that can be gleaned from the patristic material and other relevant accounts in early Christianity.²⁴⁹

Jesus that is traceable in any ancient document will be explored in relationship with the peculiar readings of Lukan parables in the D text. The conclusion of Craig A. Evans, “The Interpretation of Scripture in the New Testament Apocrypha and Gnostic Writings”, in Hauser and Watson, *History*, 452, is informative in understanding the similarity of the approach of the Church Fathers with that of the Apocryphal Gospels and Gnostic writings in understanding the Scripture:

We find in the apocryphal Gospels and the writings of the Gnostics an employment of Old Testament Scripture that is not significantly different from its use by early Jewish and Christian groups. As with the latter, proof-texting, spiritualization, and moralizing were common practices. The methods of scriptural exegesis do not, therefore, in themselves demarcate boundaries between the bifurcating communities of faith, some moving toward what would eventually be recognized as “orthodoxy” and others toward what would eventually be condemned as “heresy.”

²⁴⁹This approach can be illustrated best by the following. If it is correct that D has been influenced by mimesis, then it is fascinating to know that some modern scholars such as Brodie, “Imitation”, and Steyn, “Luke”, thought that Luke’s narrative was influenced by mimesis. This then reflects that the tradents of D were faithful to the tradition of Luke and that they have used mimesis to articulate the Gospel tradition. The tradition that D is representing provides an important link to the continuation of what Luke developed in his Gospel. The Gospels in D were harmonising, adding and altering the text and there is that interpretative intent in making the deliberate changes to the text. But how did the peculiar readings penetrate the text? It can be explained by the scribal phenomenon observed in the manuscript used in this thesis.

This possible reader and scribal or editorial phenomenon can be illustrated in the case of the scribal or reader gloss at the bottom of the text of Lk 17.3-15 in P⁷⁵ (Papyrus Bodmer XIV is generally dated as a third-century papyrus manuscript) which is intended to be inserted after εἶπεν αὐτοῖς on Lk 17.14 which reads θέλω καθαρίσθητε καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθησαν. This marginal reading in P⁷⁵ is a direct harmonisation or allusion with Mt 8.3 which B (Codex Vaticanus is a major uncial manuscript generally dated in the fourth-century) reads as θέλω καθαρίσθητι καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη making a clear correspondence of the account of Jesus healing a leper to that of Luke when Jesus cleansed the ten lepers. There is also a kind of repetitive intertextuality here with Lk 5.13. Thus there is the other Gospel and same Gospel mimetic cross-referencing where D reads θέλω καθαρίσθητι καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη where D has a unique reading with exactly the same reading with that of B in Mt 8.3. There is no direct manuscript evidence that this P⁷⁵ glossal reading has penetrated the text of Lk 17.14. Nonetheless, indirectly this phenomenon becomes conceivable when P⁷⁵ marginal gloss is compared to D (Codex Bezae is taken to have been produced at about fifth-century) which has a unique reading inserted after Lk 17.14 which reads τεθεραπεύεσθε. It is unfortunate, however, that Mt 8.3 is part of the lacuna in the D text of Matthew to verify if the insertion of τεθεραπεύεσθε came as a result of harmonisation of Luke with Matthew in D. In any case there is a likelihood that glosses, who ever may have placed them at the margins of the text, could have infiltrated the main body of the text.

It is telling that the Matthean text has been interpreted allegorically by the Fathers, such as Cyril of Alexandria (Fragment 93) and Ephrem the Syrian poet (*Diatessaron Commentary*). The emphasis of the patristic commentators is in the healing and its allegorical meaning. See Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:160; and Oden and Hall, *Mark*, 26. Cf. Just, *Luke*, 90-1, 268-9. No wonder why in D the emphasis is on the healing too. The mimetic intertextual cross-referencing of the Lukan account with Mt 8.3 would indicate how the text of Luke has been harmonised with Matthew, rather than a co-text in Lk 5.13. The process of the penetration of the marginal reading within the main text of a manuscript should be appreciated in Nagy’s view of “composition-in-performance” that actually makes itself as “a tradition in and of itself” just like the development of the textual tradition of D. See Nagy, *Homeric*, 15-6.

CHAPTER 4

ANTI-JUDAIC READING AND LUKAN PARABLES

Not all parables of Jesus that Luke records in his Gospel have significant variant readings in the D textual tradition. Hence, parables in the D text of Luke that are without any sort of variant readings do not merit exploration in terms of them being influenced by allegory and mimesis.¹ Nevertheless, the Lukan parables with intentional alterations in D that present harmonising and allegorising variants will be identified in the course of this study.² The probability of allegorising and representative mimetic readings that have been theologically moulded by anti-Judaic³ readings of Lukan parables is examined in this chapter.⁴ The approach in deciding what variant readings developed due to an anti-Judaic bias attitude of the tradents and thereby fossilised in the D text of Luke rests on the coherent parallel readings with the Fathers, who are cited as much as possible, in their interpretation of

¹The absence of any sort of variant readings in many parables of Luke in D does not mean that they were neither read allegorically nor mimetically harmonised by the Fathers. Rather, the patristic allegorising or mimetic readings of these parable texts that did not develop any variant reading simply indicates that any allegorising variant or mimetic reading did not penetrate the textual tradition of D. Notably, the only three extant patristic homily-commentaries devoted entirely to Luke—by Origen, Ambrose and Cyril of Alexandria—clearly exhibit that the Fathers expounded almost all the parables in the third Gospel allegorically. Furthermore, the Lukan parables were interpreted by the Fathers employing their Matthean parallels and at times with the use of the Markan accounts as well. Moreover, any passage from the Old or New Testament that may help in elucidating the meaning of a parable was taken advantage of by the Fathers. See Origen's *Homilies on Luke*—written in third-century—SC 87, GCS 35 and ET *HLFL*; Ambrose's *Exposition of the Gospel of Luke*—written in fourth-century—SC 45 & 52, CCSL 14 and ET *EHGSL*; and Cyril of Alexandria's *Commentary on Luke*—written in fifth-century—PG 72, *SCAACLE* and ET *CGSL*; for the originals and English translations, respectively, of these surviving patristic works on the Gospel of Luke.

²The readings of D that are explored in the cited parables are evaluated as secondary readings—due to allegorical and/or mimetic influence—based on the patristic citation of the parables examined. The interpretation of the Fathers that explains the probable reason for the existence of the variant readings in D is the single index on viewing the reading of the D text as secondary in comparison with P⁷⁵ and B.

³Bercot, *Dictionary*, 373-9, provides a list of primary texts extracted from the patristic writings illustrating the anti-Judaic attitude of the early Church.

⁴Rice, "Alteration of Luke", and Epp, *Theological Tendency*, have already explored the anti-Judaic tendency of the D text in Luke and Acts, respectively. See Chapter 2 for the assessment of the contributions of Epp and Rice. See also the section "Anti-Judaic Modifications" in Bart D. Ehrman, "Text and Tradition: The Role of New Testament Manuscripts in Early Christian Studies—Lecture Two: Text and Transmission: The Historical Significance of the 'Altered' Text", *TC* 5 (2000): n.p. [cited 20 May 2004]. Online: <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol05/Ehrman2000b.html>.

the Gospel parables. Tertullian (*On Resurrection* 33) contends that the parables in the gospels were focussed on the Jews.⁵ As M. F. Wiles points out that for Tertullian the Gospel parables “do not exist for the Christian, because in the Gospels all the parables are either interpreted by Jesus Himself or explained by the evangelist’s introduction or are obvious in meaning”.⁶

The order of parables treated in this current chapter follows their sequence of presentation in the Gospel of Luke.⁷ The exceptions, however, are the parables of The Barren Fig Tree in Lk 13.6-9 and The Rich Man and Lazarus in Lk 16.19-31. They are placed and treated toward the end of the chapter, as a different category, due to their harmonising readings that are not from a parallel parable from the other Synoptic Gospels. Thus, their mimetic harmonisations and allegorising variants are treated as cross-referencing or intertextual interpretation differently from the other Lukan parables discussed in this chapter. The Lukan parables in the D text below are parables that have shown a consistent harmonising tendency, particularly with Matthew, as well as distinctive readings that have coherence with the patristic allegorical interpretation.⁸ In another sense, these parables were paraphrased in the D text of Luke. Accordingly, there is a strong probability that the following Lukan parables in D could have deposited mimetic readings and allegorising variants in its textual tradition, especially from marginal readings, in the process of its

⁵Ernest Evans, ed., *Tertullian’s Treatise on the Resurrection: The text edited with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (London: SPCK, 1960), 88-91.

⁶Wiles, “Early”, 288.

⁷For the identification of the parables I followed the list given by B. T. D. Smith, in his important book *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels*, 237-8; and A. M. Hunter, *Interpreting the Parables* (London: SCM Press Ltd, 1960), 121-2.

⁸As Oden, in Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:xxix, asserts that it is “most important” to see the Fathers in their practice of “*intertextual exegesis*, seeking to discern the meaning of a text by comparing it with other texts”. (The italics are original.) Cf. Wiles, “Early”, 296, who sees the patristic manner of clustering parables jointly as valuable “if used with due caution in [a] general kind of way for the overall comparison of kindred parables”.

reading performance.⁹ Nonetheless, not all observable peculiar readings in the D text among the Lukan parables can be claimed as having been spiritually interpreted thus causing it to be shaped as allegorising variants or mimetic readings.¹⁰ Not all of these examined distinctive variants of the Lukan parables in the D text are maintained to be probable as some of them could be at best only plausible or possible, and perhaps not impossible as allegorising variants or mimetic harmonisations. Only those variant readings that are specifically viewed as allegorising and mimetic are argued as such because there are parallels from the patristic interpretations and other early extra-biblical literature that would make the claim credible.¹¹ Hence, the claim of representative mimesis in them if read using the Fathers' lenses are most probable than not. The summary of J. Neville Birdsall on the shift of New Testament textual criticism approach to serious undertaking of the "context of history" of text forms provides a reminder on the nature of the text of New Testament manuscripts such as the D text:

In the field of New Testament textual criticism, as in the study of the text of classical and post-classical Greek authors with which it is so intimately related, a great change of approach and method has taken place in the course of the present century. This may be described, without going into intricate detail, as a change from treating texts in abstraction as literary entities, to a method which views them in the context of

⁹See the previous chapters for my discussions on how the marginal readings could have penetrated a textual tradition such as that of the D text. Although it is correct to assume that the D text like any other ancient text was read orally, it is also significant and proper to postulate that texts such as D and its predecessors that gave its textual tradition have gone through innumerable reading performances. In the process of the employment for congregational recitations of D's predecessors, including its exemplar, the marginal readings, scribal corrections and readers' alterations accumulated. In this progression as the textual tradition of D was reproduced it was also actively being performed. Hence, what has been in the margins, with the rectifications and modifications became part of the textual tradition of D that has been finally preserved in the D text that we have now. Cf. Kim Haines-Eitzen's important volume called *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* on her discussion of the scribal activity in the process of textual transmission. For the dynamics of reading performance in the Graeco-Roman antiquity see Gregory Nagy's *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond*. See also Whitney Shiner, *Proclaiming the Gospel: First-Century Performance of Mark* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2003), for the reading performance of a Gospel account in the early Church.

¹⁰Many of them are unintentional mistakes as well as the corrections of all sorts to clarify and rectify the readings of the text. Cf. Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 207-15.

¹¹See Wiles, "Early", 293-5, on his fine discussion on how the Fathers were guided by "a tradition of the elders" in their readings of the parables as well as the probable "influence of Gnostic interpretations" in the development of patristic understanding of the Gospel parables.

history, and relates the changes observable in them to known points in the history of their study and interpretation. The former method tended to seek the existence of specific different text-forms, and to explain their relationship by the hypothesis of definite acts of recension which either preserved or corrupted the original work of the author in question: hence one text was good, and the rest corrupt. The method which is supplanting it very often sees change coming about more imperceptibly, less at some given moment than over a period of time, and recensional activity as always a mixture of insight and error, so that the textually good and bad are to be found in all traditions, and spread in distribution over a far wider period.¹²

In line with Birdsall's description the following study of Lukan parables in the D text is put in a historical context showing how a textual tradition developed within the framework of the ancient literary criticism and how the influence of the early Christian attitude against Judaism left their marks, from marginal catenae to manuscript text, to this distinctive New Testament manuscript.¹³ The Lukan parables in the D text that are treated below are those that are regarded as moulded by mimetic readings and permeated with allegorising variants that could have been influenced with an anti-Judaic tendency in the D text of Lukan writings (i.e. Luke and Acts) in line with the earlier proposition of Epp and Rice.¹⁴ The wide citations of patristic exegeses of the parables in Luke, and at times of Matthew and Mark, to support my

¹²J. Neville Birdsall, "The New Testament Text", in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, Vol. 1, *From the Beginnings to Jerome*, eds. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 308-9.

¹³Cf. Birdsall, "Text", 325-6.

¹⁴Cf. Rice, "Alteration of Luke", and Epp, *Theological Tendency*. My suggestion in Chapter 1 on the use of "tradents" instead of "scribes" as the best description of those who transmitted the text of the New Testament found an ally in Ulrich Schmid, "Review of Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*", *TC* 7 (2002): n.p. [cited 12 June 2004]. Online: <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol07/Haines-Eitzen2002rev.html>. Schmid makes his critique of Haines-Eitzen's central thesis:

The overarching problem is that [Haines-Eitzen] concentrates so much on the scribes that she almost completely neglects other agents in early Christian churches, such as bishops, presbyters, deacons, and readers, who also played important roles in the care and transmission of the text. Although it is quite understandable from the focus of the study that scribes and their "world" are brought to the fore, other social networks within Christianity have not received sufficient attention. As a result, a meaningful picture of the purported scribal networks cannot be placed in a realistic historical context, and this failure is detrimental to the author's argument.

Thus the anti-Judaic tendency that shaped some of the Lukan parables in D was due to the influence of these tradents that would include "bishops, presbyters, deacons and readers" in line with Schmidt's view. My view would make a lot of sense since the clergy of the early Church were the ones who were at the forefront in approaching the Gospel parables in an allegorical manner as well as reading them in a mimetic harmonious way and with an anti-Judaic proclivity.

views are intended to make the claims I formulated with a compelling probability as to their degree of demonstrability.¹⁵

The Wedding Guests, The Cloth Patch and The Old Wineskins (Lk 5.34-39)

It is noteworthy that every one of the Synoptic Gospels—Matthew, Mark and Luke—employs the series of three parables commonly known as The Wedding Guests (Mt 9.14-15, Mk 2.19-20 and Lk 5.34-35), The Cloth Patch (Mt 9.16, Mk 2.21 and Lk 5.36), and The Old Wineskins (Mt 9.17, Mk 2.22 and Lk 5.37-39) in each of their accounts of Jesus teaching in parables. The immediate context of this series of parabolic sayings is all the same when read in the text of NA²⁷ or UBS⁴ in all of the Synoptic Gospels—Jesus utters the parabolic sayings in his response to the question of fasting as a spiritual discipline. Nonetheless, there is a variation of Jesus’ audience who heard the series of parabolic sayings among the Synoptic Gospels. In the context of Lk 5.33 the Pharisees were commenting that the disciples of Jesus were not fasting like the disciples of John the Baptist and the disciples of the Pharisees. However, in Mt 9.14 the disciples of John the Baptist were the ones asking the question and not merely commenting as in Luke. In Mk 2.18 it reads the comment of the Pharisees which is similar in Luke on how the Pharisees and the disciples of John the Baptist are fasting. This is made as part of the narration and not as utterance of the Pharisees as in Lk 5.33. The people in Mk 2.18 pose the question asked by the disciples of John the Baptist in Mt 9.14.

¹⁵I made a full utilisation of the five “canons of interpretations” of the Gospel parables and the five “implicit tendencies in the actual work of exegesis” of the Fathers, which Wiles, “Early”, 288-99, identified, in his important article “Early Exegesis of the Parables”. The five canons are: (1) “It is the principle that the likenesses in parables are not intended to be complete in every detail”. (2) “[The] parables are not to be used as a source for the determination of doctrine, but rather that established doctrine is to be used as a guide for their right interpretation”. (3) “[There] is the need to take note of the historical context of the parables in the Gospel themselves”. (4) “[We] ought not to be satisfied with the surface meaning of the parables, but should expect to find some deeper meaning in them”. (5) “[A] true understanding of the parables cannot be attained except by the help of Christ and the gift of the Spirit of God”. The five tendencies are: (1) “[There] is the fatal tendency towards allegorical interpretation”. (2) “[There] is a tendency to generalise the significance of the parables”. (3) “[There] is the habit of grouping parables together and seeking to interpret them in the light of one another”. (4) “There is also a strong tendency to think of the Kingdom of God as likened to the main item in the parable rather than to the situation as a whole”. (5) “[There] is the effect of the immediate needs of Church life or current controversy upon the interpretation of parables”.

Although before and after the pericope of Mk 2.18-22 the context clearly mentions the Pharisees questioning Jesus, the possibility that the reference to the subject of the verbs ἔρχονται and λέγουσιν could be referring to the common people as translated in the RSV. The translation of RSV in Mk 2.18 could be right if the pericope is taken as independent from the preceding and following paragraphs. In any case what is clear and pertinent is that the listeners and presentations of The Wedding Guests, The Cloth Patch and The Old Wineskins in each of the Synoptic Gospels are different from each other.

It is unfortunate that the text of this pericope in Lk 5.33-39 in P⁷⁵ did not survive so that B becomes the default collating base of this section of Lukan parables in the D text. Nevertheless, the distinctive reading of D favours the view that the harmonisation that has been done followed Matthew instead of Mark. The unusual readings of D in this pericope of Lk 5.33-39 that talks about the practice of fasting are noteworthy even from the very beginning of its textual rendition. In verse 33 there is the insert διὰ τί after αὐτόν and before of μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου in D. The parallel reading of διὰ τί of D in d is quare, “why”. The reading of D finds its support from other witnesses such as **ℵ***.² A C Θ Ψ f^{1.13} **ⲙ** latt sy bo^{pt}.¹⁶ Thus, whilst the criticism of the Pharisees in B is in the declarative statement, in D it is in an interrogative one.¹⁷ The use of διὰ τί is more likely an intertextual harmonisation with the popular reading of Mt 9.14 than with Mk 2.18. This is so, because Mk 2.18 reading in both B and D reflects the double statements from Lk 5.33 and Mt 9.14 on fasting. The first is the narration that the disciples of John and the Pharisees were fasting. The second is the question thrown to Jesus about the disciples of John and the disciples of the Pharisees fasting but his own disciples are not doing it. The Lk 5.33 reference to of δὲ σοὶ ἐσθείουσιν καὶ πείνουσιν in B is simply replaced by of δὲ μαθηταὶ σου οὐδὲν

¹⁶NA²⁷, 170. Augustine supports the insertion of διὰ τί as well. See the textual apparatus of UBS⁴ in verse 33, footnote 3, 216.

¹⁷See Metzger, *TCGNT* 1994², 115.

τούτων ποιούσιν in D where νηστεύουσιν πυκνὰ καὶ δεήσεις ποιῶνται is clearly the antecedent. The reading in Mt 9.14 in both B and D (οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ σου οὐ νηστεύουσιν) and Mk 2.18 in both B and D (οἱ δὲ σοὶ μαθηταὶ] – οὐ νηστεύουσιν in B) are very close. Thus the compositional mimetic harmonisation of Lukan reading of D with Matthew is more apparent than with Mark as Matthew's parallel reading could have influenced the insertion of διὰ τί.¹⁸

The B text of Luke mentions οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πείνουσιν in association with what the disciples of Jesus were doing instead of fasting and praying. However, B's reading is replaced in D not with the Matthean or Markan parallel reading. The reading of D is but a side comment that the disciples do not do the fasting and praying like the disciples of John the Baptist and the disciples of the Pharisees. The strong criticism against the disciples οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πείνουσιν is obliterated in D. It is also an important feature of the D reading in Lk 5.33 that the reference to the μαθηταὶ of John the Baptist, the Pharisees and Jesus were all explicitly stated repeating the word μαθηταὶ three times—οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου, οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων and οἱ μαθηταὶ σου.¹⁹ The Latin side d supports this reading of D. What is notable in the D text is the clear emphasis on the expected discipleship practice of fasting and praying among the disciples of John the Baptist, the Pharisees and Jesus. In D the disciples of Jesus do not do the spiritual discipline but were not charged with eating and drinking as in B. The emphasis on the question about fasting and prayer asked of Jesus in the D text is apparently highlighting the Jewish customary tradition. The disciples of any religious teacher, including the followers of Jesus, are obliged to fast and pray. The response of Jesus to the question about fasting and praying directed to him is given

¹⁸Cf. Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 90. Contra Metzger, *TCGNT* 1994², 115, who thinks that the influence of harmonisation in the D text of Lk 5.33 is from Mk 2.18.

¹⁹Note the significance of the repetition of μαθηταὶ. (The italics are mine for emphasis.)

through the three parable sayings of The Wedding Guests (Lk 5.34-35), The Cloth Patch (Lk 5.36), and The Old Wineskins (Lk 5.37-39).

Looking at the D text's distinctive readings and comparing them with what the Fathers have to say about these three parable sayings would give a better view of the dynamic preservation of the unusual variants in D. The Wedding Guests in the D text of Lk 5.34-35 puts the reading of the main verb in the third person plural, *δύνονται*, against the second person plural, *δύνασθε*, of the B text. The reading of d is *possunt*, supporting D. Other witnesses to the reading of D are **ℵ*** *it sa^{ms} bo^{pt}*; (Mcion^T).²⁰ The difference is quickly recognisable and cannot be missed. Whilst B takes the implied second person plural “you” as the subject of the verb *δύναμαι* with the negative *μή*, D uses the explicit subject of *ὅτι οὐκ ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφῶνος* that is well defined by the additional prepositional phrase *ἐφ’ ὅσον ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφῶνα μεθ’ ἑαυτῶν*. Again d supports D in its reading *cum habeant sponsam secum*. In addition, whilst B puts *νηστεύσαι* in the infinitive aorist tense, D has *νηστεύειν* in the present active infinitive. Once again d, with the reading *ieiunare* in the present active infinitive, supports D. What the D text has for its reading is a cross-referencing harmonisation with the reading of Mt 9.15 with the addition of *ἔχουσιν* in Lk 5.34 in D and a few more changes such as *ἑαυτῶν* of D for *αὐτῶν* of B in the same verse. There is also the omission of *ἔστιν* and the spelling of *νυμφῶνος* in Lk 5.34 in D is different from the *νυμφίος* of Mt 9.15. The style of the sentence rendition and arrangement of words are also different in Matthew and Luke. The negative used in Luke is *μή* but in Matthew it is *μήτι*. The crucial question about the difference of word arrangement between Matthew and Luke is what word ends the question thus drawing attention to that word. Whilst Mt 9.15 ends with the word *ὁ νυμφίος*, that places the emphasis on the bridegroom (put in nominative), Lk 5.34 ends with the present active infinitive *νηστεύειν* that possibly

²⁰NA²⁷, 170.

highlights the act of fasting.²¹ It shows, then, that although there is a mimetic harmonisation of Luke with Matthew in the D text the distinct emphasis is retained—the familiarity of the established and popular reading of Matthew is tapped by D in Luke but the highlight on ὁ νυμφίος in the Matthean reading is not followed.²² The Lukan emphasis in the spiritual discipline of νηστεύειν is retained in D with B. Perhaps, it is not too much to claim that fasting as a spiritual discipline is highlighted in the paraphrased D text. Since asceticism was a vital pious practice in the early Church even at the time when D was going through its textual transmission and forming its own textual tradition νηστεύειν in Lk 5.34 could have been much explored by the tradents of the D text. This is so because the followers of Jesus according to the Gospels are not fasting. Thus, an explanation for the disciples not fasting becomes much more important in the context of the ancient Church that places prayer and fasting in the higher plane of the Christian faith and practice.²³

There is the issue of fasting raised by the Pharisees in Lk 5.33. The explanation of Jesus on why his disciples do not fast is through the parabolic sayings of The Wedding Guests (Lk 5.34-35), The Cloth Patch (Lk 5.36), and The Old Wineskins (Lk 5.37-39). The changes made in the reading of these three parabolic sayings in the D text lead to a better understanding and focus on the practice of fasting—when and not to fast. The reason for the

²¹On the one hand, the reading of Lk 5.34 in D is ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς, Μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐφ’ ὅσον ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφίον μεθ’ ἑαυτῶν νηστεύειν;. On the other hand, the reading of D in Mt 9.15a is καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Μήτι δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφίου νηστεύειν ἐφ’ ὅσον μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ὁ νυμφίος;. According to the Greek grammarian Robertson, *Grammar*, 417, since the composition of words in the Greek language is loosed and the arrangement of word order could be instituted according to the reason of the speaker there is one of the ruling ideas in the order of words: “This emphasis may be at the end as well as at the beginning of the sentence, or even in the middle in case of antithesis. The emphasis consists in removing a word from its usual position to an unusual one”.

²²Cf. Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 90.

²³See Massaux, *Influence*, 2:224, for an example in his discussion of the mention of fasting in the *Gospel of Peter* 26-27. He describes this reference on fasting as an allusion to the parable of The Wedding Guest. According to Massaux, in the *Gospel of Peter*: “Peter and his companions were fasting”. The reason for their fasting is because “Christ had prescribed fasting (Mt. 6:16-18), and had announced that his disciples would fast when the bridegroom would be taken away from them (Mt. 9:14-15; Mk. 2:18-20; Lk. 5:33-35)”.

disciples of Jesus not fasting as stressed in the D text of Luke is because the hunger and thirst could be spiritualised as the word of God that the listeners feed themselves with to be satisfied. The *Epistle of Barnabas* (11.11b) that is known for allegories, for example, declares: καὶ ὃς ἂν φάγη ἀπὸ τούτων, ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. τοῦτο λέγει· ὃς ἂν, φησὶν, ἀκούσῃ τούτων λαλουμένων καὶ πιστεύσῃ, ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.²⁴ The implication of the preceding quotation is that the Christian who listens and believes spiritually eats the words of Jesus and will have eternal life.²⁵ This interpretation has coherence in what the Fathers have to say in their interpretation of the three parable sayings. The patristic reference to these parabolic statements of Jesus generally relates the context of the question on fasting allegorically to the spiritual nourishment of Christian disciples. According to Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 5.19) the reason why they cannot go fasting is that:

Ieiunant hi quibus abest Christus bonorumque meritorum copiis egent: at uero cui uirtus sua uoluptatem sufficit, qui recipit domo Christum conuiuium, quo diues populus eget, pauper epulatur. Et ideo, inquit, ieiunare non possunt filii sponsi, quamdiu cum illis est sponsus.²⁶

Besides his stress on Christ's great feast of spiritual banquet of good works, Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 5.22) further points out how Christians enjoy the feasting on the body and blood of Christ in the eucharist because of God's grace.²⁷ Ephrem (*Diatessaron Commentary* 5.22a-22b) highlights the Christian responsibility to serve in the feasting table of the Lord and invite others to join them so that they cannot fast.²⁸ Cyril of Alexandria (*Commentary on Luke*, Homilies 21-22) also points out how Christ allowed

²⁴The *Epistle of Barnabas*, LCL 25:54.

²⁵For further discussion see Massaux, *Influence*, 1:77-8.

²⁶Ambrose, SC 45:189-90. ET *EHGSL*, 161.

²⁷Ambrose, SC 45:191. ET *EHGSL*, 162-3.

²⁸ET McCarthy, *Commentary*, 105. See also *Saint Ephrem*, CSCO 291:45-6.

Christians not to fast as they celebrate a spiritual feast, but clarifies that fasting, as a spiritual discipline, should not to be totally abandoned, for Christ also mentions that they will fast when the bridegroom is gone:

Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀπαξ τοῖς τοῦ νυμφῶνος υἱοῖς συγκεχώρηκε τὸ ὡς ἐν καιρῷ καὶ χρεῖα μὴ χρῆναι πονεῖν, ὡς ἑορτὴν τελοῦντας πνευματικὴν, ἵνα μὴ ἀπόβλητος ἢ νηστεία γένηται παρ' ἡμῖν εἰς ἅπαν, οἰκονομικώτατα λίαν ἐπιφέρει λέγων·

Ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι καὶ ὅτε ἀπαρθῆ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος· τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις.²⁹

Likewise Gregory of Nazianzus (*Theological Orations* 30.10) asks a rhetorical question in allusion to the question asked of Jesus about fasting: εἴτε ὁ σωματικῶς ὀρώμενος· οὐ γὰρ κακοπαθείας, ἀλλ' εὐφροσύνης καιρὸς ὁ τῆς ἐπιδημίας· εἴτε ὁ ὡς Λόγος νοούμενος. Τί γὰρ δεῖ νηστεύειν σωματικῶς τοὺς Λόγῳ καθαιρομένους;³⁰ Accordingly, the patristic understanding of prayer and fasting has a broad agreement that bodily fasting is effectively superseded by Christ's presence during his incarnation and that in his presence those who believe should enjoy a spiritual feast that he provides. In other words, the Fathers view that spiritual indulgence is vital to Christian nurture.

Lk 5.35 has the same reading in D and B as well as Mt 9.15 with a slight variation where Luke employs the word ἀπαρθῆ although Matthew has ἀρθῆ. There is also the omission of the conjunction καὶ after the word ἡμέραι in D and the insertion of αὐ before the word ἡμέραι that has been deleted later by a corrector in Mt 9.15 in D. Further whilst B omits ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, D retains the whole prepositional phrase in Mt 9.15 making it parallel with Lk 5.35 in D. The reading of D in Lk 5.35, ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι καὶ ὅταν ἀπαρθῆ ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, τότε νηστεύσουσιν ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, has the support of d and is identical to B and ties in well with what the Fathers

²⁹Cyril of Alexandria, *PG* 72:573. ET *CGSL*, 116.

³⁰Gregory of Nazianzus, *SC* 250:244. ET Oden and Hall, *Mark*, 34.

expressed concerning this parabolic saying of Jesus. Cyril of Alexandria (*Commentary on Luke*, Homilies 21-22) explains that the reference to the bridegroom leaving means that Christ goes up to heaven: Πάντα γὰρ καλὰ ἐν καιρῷ αὐτῶν. Τί δέ ἐστι τὸ ἀρθῆναι ἀπ’ αὐτῶν τὸν νυμφίον; Τὸ ἀναληφθῆναι δηλονότι.³¹ It is also interesting that the *Apostolic Constitutions* declares that to fast on the Lord’s Day is sin and fasting during Pentecost is guilt. The clergy who fast on the Lord’s Day should be deprived whilst the laity who fast should be suspended.³² The early Church took fasting seriously but it was practised at the proper time with a purpose.³³ Maybe the insertion of διὰ τί in the D text of Luke reflects the Matthean emphasis on the direct question to Jesus about fasting.³⁴ So in the Lukan presentation of D the alterations made to the text do not only mimetically harmonise with the Matthean emphasis that goes with the popularity of its reading but also put the reading into an interrogative form that requires an answer. Hence, the interpretation of the three parable sayings can be given as a kind of spiritually interpreted answer to the question on why the disciples of Jesus were not fasting. Hilary of Poitiers (*On Matthew* 9.3) points out how Jesus replied with a spiritual answer to the question of the disciples of John the Baptist in Matthean the account:

Ieiunabant Pharisei et discipuli Ioannis et apostoli non ieiunabant. Sed istis spiritaliter respondit sponsumque se Ioannis discipulis ostendit. Ioannes enim repositam in Christo omnem uitae spem spondit et recipi a Domino discipuli eius, adhuc eo praedicante, non poterant. Vsque in eum enim lex et prophetae sunt et, nisi lege finita, in fidem euangelicam eorum nemo concederet. Quod uero praesente sponso ieiunandi necessitatem discipulis non esse respondit, praesentiae suae gaudium et sacramentum sancti cibi edocet, quo nemo se praesente, id est in conspectus mentis Christum continens indigebit. Ablato autem se, ieiunatos esse dicit, quia omnes non credentes resurrexisse Christum habituri non essent cibum uitae. In fide

³¹Cyril of Alexandria, *PG* 72:573; ET *CGSL*, 116.

³²See Bercot, *Dictionary*, 276.

³³See Bercot, *Dictionary*, 82-3, 274-6, 402.

³⁴For the use of διὰ τί “in direct questions” see BDAG, 225.

enim resurrectionis sacramentum panis caelestis accipitur et quisque sine Christo est, in uitae cibi ieiunio relinquetur.³⁵

The comment of Hilary of Poitiers on the answer of Jesus about the question of fasting becomes helpful when put in the perspective of spiritualising the three succeeding parable sayings of Jesus. The D text then becomes mimetically associated with the Matthean interrogative reading as “authoritative word” with the insertion of διὰ τί.³⁶ The reference to fasting becomes the mimetic representation of what Christian disciples should do. Thereby there comes a need for an allegorical interpretation that goes beyond the literal meaning of why the disciples of Jesus were not fasting, since that fasting was recognised among the ancient Christians as vital spiritual discipline. The unified allegorical interpretation of the Fathers on the question of fasting addressed to Jesus is generally understood that the non-fasting charge to the disciples of Jesus was due to their eating and drinking of the Gospel of Christ or the Word of God.

The parable of The Cloth Patch in Lk 5.36 as rendered in D has a very slight alteration in the arrangement of words. Perhaps, the stress on the word ἐπίβλημα, as the subject, is made obvious in D by putting it at the very end of the statement, separating it from its definite article which is placed at the beginning. Isolation of τὸ and ἐπίβλημα would bring stronger emphasis on the cloth patch in the poetic language of the parable. As Blass, Debrunner and Funk puts it: “Poetic language and that rhetorically stylised in any way frequently pulls them apart in order to give greater effect to the separated elements by their isolation”.³⁷ This reading of D is also supported by d as it places in missura at the end of the

³⁵Hilary of Poitiers, SC 254:206. ET Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:179-80.

³⁶Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 90, notes that the parallel of D’s reading of Lk 5.33a is more with Mk 2.18 when μαθηταί is mentioned by the D text of Luke three time in the same verse. However, Vogels also acknowledges that the changes of D from οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν to οἱ δὲ μαθηταί σου οὐδὲν τούτων ποιοῦσιν in Lk 5.33b could have been influenced by Mt 9.14. In any case the influence of the Matthean reading in the whole pericopae is most likely because the intentional modifications made in the D text were done in conformity with the Matthean reading as also indicated by Vogels.

³⁷BDF, 249.

verse. The reference to the cloth patch made from the new fabric is accented in the construction οὐ συμφωνήσει τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ ἐπίβλημα of D against οὐ συμφωνήσει τὸ ἐπίβλημα τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ of B. To quote Blass, Debrunner and Funk, once again: “Such a word, torn out of its natural context and made more independent, is emphatic even when placed at the end of the sentence (whereas an early position in the sentence carries emphasis with it in any case)”.³⁸ The weight of the stress of the D text in the cloth patch made from the new fabric is important for it has been allegorically interpreted with the new wineskins in the parable of The Old Wineskins in Lk 5.37-39 as the gospel that the Jews cannot observe. For example Peter Chrysologus (*Sermons* 31.4) argues:

Adiecit dominus dicens: *Nemo immittit commissuram panni rudis in uestimentum uetus. Antiquae legis supplectilem dicit Iudaicis studiis adtritam, corruptam sensibus, sectis scissam, impuris actibus obsoletam; pannum rudem euangelii nuncupat indumentum. Sed audis pannum: non scissurae partem, sed principium texturae. Tunc enim primum regalis indumenti tela de Christi uellere texebatur, de uellere quod dabat agnus, agnus dei qui tollit peccata mundi. Texebatur autem regium uestimentum, quod in purpureum fulgorem cruor tingeret passionis. Merito ergo Christus hunc pannum rudem Iudaicae uetustati prohibebat immitti, ne peior scissura fieret, si Iudaicam uetustatem nouitas scinderet christiana.*³⁹

The comment of Chrysologus is made on the Matthean text. His emphasis on the “shrunk cloth of the gospel”, however, shows coherence on the inclination given by D in its reading of Lk 5.36 on the ἐπίβλημα. For John Chrysostom (*Statues*, Homily 16.4 [165]) he sees that: Ἡ ψυχὴ ἢ τούτου ἱμάτιόν ἐστι παλαιόν, καὶ ἀσκὸς παλαιός· οὐκ ἀνενεώθη τῇ πίστει, οὐκ ἀνεκαινίσθη τῇ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτι, ἀσθενής ἐστὶν ἔτι καὶ γήϊνος.⁴⁰ For Chrysostom the soul of a Gentile or an unbeliever is likened to an old garment that is yet to be renewed by faith. The broad agreement between Chrysologus and

³⁸BDF, 249.

³⁹Peter Chrysologus, CCSL 24:180. ET Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:181. (The italics are original. Unless otherwise stated, henceforth, all the italics in the primary source quotes are original.)

⁴⁰John Chrysostom, *PG* 49:167. ET Saint Chrysostom, *NPNF* 9:449.

Chrysostom is that the old garment mimetically represents those who are outside the Christian faith.

Whilst the modification of the parable of The Cloth Patch in Lk 5.36 is minimal, the intentional changes in the parable of The Old Wineskins in Lk 5.37-39 are several and are clearly intertextually harmonised with Matthew. The first significant change in D is in verse 37. There is the addition of the articular adjective τούς παλαιούς after τούς άσκούς that makes the reference to the wineskins as old containers where the ό οἶνος ό νέος is not expected to be placed. This reading of D is also preserved in d that reads utres ueteres. It is predictable that the new wine will cause the old wineskins to burst and therefore the wine will spill for the wineskins will be destroyed. Here, D has a clearer description than B. The old wineskins will burst due to the new wine. Next two vital changes in D are notable in verse 38. D transformed the word βλητέον of B into βάλλουσιν and added καὶ άμφότεροι τηροῦνται producing a reading that is in harmony with Mt 9.17b.⁴¹ The arrangement of words in B and D in Mt. 9.17b are identical except that though B utilised αλλά, D used δέ as the disjunctive conjunction. Also B employed the compound verb συντηροῦνται against the simple verb τηροῦνται. In any case the variant reading in D as it currently appears certainly mimetically harmonised with Matthew. Lastly, the last words of Jesus in Lk 5.39 as recorded in B, οὔδεις πῶν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ό παλαιὸς χρηστός ἔστιν, are omitted in D making it clearly parallel with Matthew who did not include them in his account. Or, alternatively, it was Luke's addition to Matthew's account but excised in D to harmonise it with the popular Gospel's account.⁴² The Itala and Eusebius support this excision in D.⁴³ The harmonised reading of D in Luke that is parallel with Mt 9.17 reflects a

⁴¹So is the observation of Metzger, *TCGNT* 1994², 115; and Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 90.

⁴²Metzger, *TCGNT* 1971¹, 138-9, opines that "its omission from several Western witnesses may be due to the influence of Marcion, who rejected the statement because it seemed to give authority to the Old Testament".

⁴³NA²⁷, 170.

compositional mimesis of the Matthean account that would help to unlock the spiritual meaning of the text for its readers and expositors. The patristic allegorical readings of the The Cloth Patch and The Old Wineskins also reflect the representative mimetic reading of the D text that could have been influential to the tradents in modifying the text of the parables for a better expression of their mimetic reading and interpretation.

Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke 5.23*) for example explains in the same context of The Parable of the Wedding Guests how in this passage he thinks that:

Denique etiam hoc loco ieiunium uestimentum adpellauit uetus, quod exuendum apostolus aestimauit dicens: *exspoliare uos ueterem hominem cum actibus eius*, ut induamus eum qui baptismatis sanctificatione renouatur. In eandem igitur formam series conuenit praeceptorum, ne actus ueteris et noui hominis misceamus, cum ille corporalis exterior opera carnis operetur et hic interior qui renascitur non uersicolore speciem ueterum nouorumque debeat habere gestorum, sed concolor Christo illum studiomentis imitari, cui renatus est in lauacro.⁴⁴

Ambrose makes a link between The Wedding Guests and The Patch Cloth and emphasises the renewal in a Christian's life "by the sanctification of Baptism" (qui baptismatis sanctificatione). In the same context he also alludes to the Matthean parable(s) of The Wedding Feast and The Wedding Garment (Mt 22.11-14).⁴⁵ Likewise, the comments of Cyril of Alexandria (*Commentary on Luke*, Homilies 21-22) shows coherence with the changes noted above in D:

ἽΟτι δὲ ἀπαράδεκτα τοῖς τὴν νομικὴν ἔχουσιν ἀγωγὴν τὰ διὰ Χριστοῦ θεσπίσματα, καὶ ἀχώρητὰ πῶς εἰσιν ἀνθρώπων καρδίαις οὐπω λαχούσαις τὸν διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἀνακαινισμόν, διαδείκνυσι λέγων ὁ Κύριος, μὴ δύνασθαι ῥάκος ἱματίου καινῷ προσβάλλεσθαι· μήτε μὴν ἀσκουὺς παλαιοὺς οἶνον νέον δύνασθαι χωρεῖν. Πεπαλαίωται μὲν γὰρ ἡ πρώτη διαθήκη, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἀμεμπτος· οὐκοῦν οἱ ταύτη προσκαθήμενοι, καὶ τὴν γηράσασαν ἐντολὴν εἰς νοῦν ἔχοντες, ἀμέτοχοι μὲν εἰσι τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ καινότητος· Πάντα γὰρ

⁴⁴Ambrose, SC 45:191-2. ET *EHGSL*, 163.

⁴⁵Ambrose, SC 45:192. ET *EHGSL*, 163.

Quod dicit hoc est: donec renatus quis fuerit et ueteri homine deposito per passionem meam nouum induerit hominem, non potest seueriora ieiunia et continentiae sustinere praecepta, ne per austeritatem nimiam etiam credulitatem quam nunc habere uidetur amittat. Duo autem exempla posuit uestimenti et utrius ueterum et nouorum. Veteres debemus intellegere scribas et Pharisaeos. Plagula uestimenti noui et uinum nouum praecepta euangelica sentienda quae non possunt sustinere Iudaei ne maior scissura fiat.⁵⁰

The view that what is “old” should be abandoned in Ambrose, Cyril of Alexandria, Tertullian and Jerome provides a key in explaining why Lk 5.39 as recorded in B, οὐδεὶς πινὼν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστίν, was excised in D. The patristic interpretations of the three parable sayings of Jesus as presented above have shown unity with the distinctive reading of D. Perhaps the harmonising tendency of D with the Matthean text does not only draw on the popularity or authoritative reading of Matthew through mimetic cross-referencing. It also unlocks the spiritual meaning of the text through the use of paraphrasing. It could be due to familiarity with the allegorical interpretations of the parables by the tradents that used and transmitted the textual tradition of D. Thus the tradents of D in its paraphrased text probably tailored the anti-Judaic representation of these three parables among the early Christian writings.

The Return of Unclean Spirit (Lk 11.24-26)

The influence on the textual tradition of D of the patristic allegorical exegesis and the cross-referencing or intertextual mimetic harmonisation of Luke with Matthew in the theological moulding of Luke’s parables in D, can be illustrated further by another parable. The Return of the Unclean Spirit in Lk 11.24-26 with a parallel passage in Mt 12.43-45 is the next parable to be examined. Stephen L. Wailes significantly observes that as soon as the parable is verbalised its interpreters “usually joined in exegesis of the texts in Matthew and Luke” from the patristic time to the medieval period.⁵¹ The most crucial and relatively

⁵⁰Jerome, SC 242:174. ET Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:181.

⁵¹Wailes, *Medieval*, 93.

puzzling reading of the parable in the D text is the variant διὰ τῶν ὑδρῶν τόπων against that of P⁷⁵ and B's δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων in Lk 11.24. The unclean spirit passes “through ‘waterless’ places” in P⁷⁵ and B but in D it goes “through the ‘watery’ places”. The lexical form of D's variant reading ὑδρῶν is ὑδρ-ώδης, ες, which literally means “watery” and this word only occurred in the classics.⁵² The reading of d is per arida loca, “through ‘dry’ places”. In this particular variant reading D lacks the support of any other Greek manuscript or early version.⁵³ Immediately dismissing this variant in D because it can be easily explained by a scribal error is an easy solution. This particular variant reading in Lk 11.24 could be because of the slip of an eye. What is supposedly copied as δι' ἀνύδρων was copied as διὰ τῶν ὑδρῶν.⁵⁴ However, another explanation for the existence of D's reading as deliberate modification is more probable than simply taking the variant reading as unintentional copying mistake.

The D text seemingly divided the parable into two parts by the omission of τότε in verses 24b, supported by P⁴⁵ Ⲛ* A C W Ψ f^{1,13} ̄̄̄ lat sy^{s, c, p}, and 26a, supported by sy^c bo^{ms}.⁵⁵ As a result D in verse 24 has the first part dealing with the journey of the unclean spirit coming out from a man, passing διὰ τῶν ὑδρῶν τόπων to find rest but gets no rest so that it needs to go back to the house where it came from. The second part, then, is connected, but yet clearly distinguished as another section of the story by καί in verse 25 and it is immediately connected with another καί in verse 26. The narration of verses 25-26a is distinguished from the plight of the unclean spirit in verse 24 and underscores its journey to

⁵²LSJ, 1845.

⁵³It is unfortunate that in Lk 11.24 both NA²⁷, 197, and UBS⁴, 250, do not include this variant of D in their apparatus critici. It is also surprising that even the IGNTP's *Luke*, 1:255, does not list the reading of D in its critical apparatus.

⁵⁴This is explained by Bartsch, in *Bezae vs Sinaiticus*, 106 footnote 2, as: “Diese Verschreibung geht auf die Lesart zurück: δι' ἀνύδρων und wird durch die Einfügung des Artikels entstanden sein”. If it is indeed a scribal mistake and not an inherited textual tradition why is it that with so many correctors of D nobody has corrected this mistake? See Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 123-79, for the correctors and corrections in D and d.

⁵⁵NA²⁷, 197. See the comment of Metzger, *TCGNT* 1994², 134.

the rediscovery of the place where it used to stay that is now convenient. Hence it brings seven evil spirits even more evil than itself which enter together. Accordingly, the account of the story in D is visibly divided into two episodes: the leaving and the coming of the unclean spirit to the house. These two episodes make D distinct from the three episodes in P⁷⁵ and B that is indicated by τότε. The first episode is verse 24a, narrating the plight of the unclean spirit. The second episode is verses 24b and 25, reporting its return and rediscovery of the empty house. The third episode is verse 26a, informing its bringing of seven other worse spirits. Therefore the whole point of the parable of The Return of Unclean Spirit is stated by Jesus in 26b as καὶ γέινεται τὰ ἔσχατα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου χείρονα τῶν πρώτων. Perhaps, the parable of The Return of Unclean Spirit in Lk 11.24-26 is another case of mimetic paraphrasing in the D text of Luke as suggested by the discussion in an earlier chapter.⁵⁶

The allegorical exegesis of the Fathers, that includes the works of Origen, Ephrem, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose and Cyril of Alexandria, shows a consistent agreement that the man whom the unclean spirit left and came back to with seven other more evil spirits is Israel or the Jews. The Law of Moses cleansed the bad spirit which the Fathers convincingly equate with the uncleanness caused by the evil one as represented by the Egyptian customs that defiled the Jews who were enslaved in the land of Egypt. The “waterless places” (ἀνύδρων τόπων) of P⁷⁵ and B or “the watery places” (τῶν ὑδρων τόπων) of D in Lk 11.24 are the Gentiles that received baptism when they believed in Christ. The patristic interpretation also widely follows the two episodes of the parable in the D text of Luke, i.e. the departure and the return of the unclean spirit. Origen in his *Homilies on Luke* (Fragment 77—Ra 185) expresses the anti-Judaic sentiment of the early Church like the other Fathers. He expounds, on the one hand, how the Gentiles, who are previously dry places, are now

⁵⁶See the section “Advantages of the Theoretical Framework” in the second chapter of this volume where the mimetic paraphrasing of text in antiquity is treated.

enjoying the divine water of baptism. On the other hand, the unclean spirit, due to the Jewish rejection of Christ, once again inhabits Israel who was once delivered by Moses from the uncleanness of Egypt. Origen's allegorical exegesis of The Return of Unclean Spirit in Lk 11.24-26 speaks for itself:

Τί ἐστι τὸ <<διέρχεσθαι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων, ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ μὴ εὐρίσκον>>; ἀνυδροὶ τόποι ὑπῆρχον οἱ ἐξ ἔθνῶν τὸ πρότερον, νυνὶ δὲ πεπλήρωνται ὕδατος θείου καὶ οὐκέτι παρέχουσιν ἀνάπαυσιν αὐτῶ. Ποιεῖται τοίνυν ἐπιστροφήν πρὸς τὸ πρότερον αὐτοῦ δοχεῖον, τοὺς ἐξ Ἰσραήλ, ὁ Σατανᾶς· οὗτοι γὰρ ἐν Αἴγυπτῳ ὄντες, ἔνοικον ἢν αὐτοῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ πονηρὸν διὰ τὸ ἠθεσί τε καὶ νόμοις τῶν Αἴγυπτίων συναναστρέφεισθαι, ἐπειδὴ δὲ λελύτρωνται διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐλέει θεοῦ, <ἐξῆλθεν>. Νῦν δὲ ἐπειδὴ οὐ πεπιστεύκασιν εἰς Χριστόν, ἀλλ' ἀπώσαντο τὸν λυτρωτὴν, ἐπεπήδησεν πάλιν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς <<τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα>>, καὶ ὡς εὗρεν αὐτοὺς οὐκέτι θεῖον ἔχοντας ἐν αὐτοῖς οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ἐρήμους ὄντας καὶ σχολάζοντας αὐτῶ πρὸς ἐνοίκησιν, κατακῆσατο δηλαδὴ μετὰ πάσης αὐτοῦ τῆς δυνάμεως. Τοῦτο γὰρ φαίνεται δηλοῦν <<ἐπτὰ λέγων ἕτερα πνεύματα>> μετ' αὐτοῦ, καθάπερ εἶωθεν ἐπὶ πλήθους ὀνομάζειν ἢ θεία γραφή τὸν τοσοῦτον ἀριθμὸν, ἐπειδὴν λέγει, ὅτι <<σπεῖρα ἕτεκεν ἐπτὰ καὶ ἡ πολλὴ ἐν τέκνοις ἠσθένησεν>>. Οὐδὲ γὰρ <<τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον>>, ὁποῖον ἔσχον ἐν Αἴγυπτῳ, τοιοῦτο ἔχουσιν οἱ εἰς τὸν υἱὸν μου ἀπιστήσαντες, πεπλήρωνται δὲ καὶ ἄλλων πνευμάτων πονηρῶν, καὶ γέγονεν αὐτοῖς <<τὰ ἔσχατα χεῖρονα τῶν πρώτων>>. χεῖρονα γὰρ τῶν ἐν Αἴγυπτῳ νῦν πάσχουσιν, ἐπειδὴπερ εἰς Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν οὐ πεπιστεύκασιν, ἀλλὰ <<τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἀπέκτειναν>>, ὅθεν ἐστερήθησαν τῆς ζωῆς· καὶ οὐκέτι λέγει ἐν αὐτοῖς προφήτης, τάδε λέγει κύριος, οὐκέτι σημεῖον ἐν αὐτοῖς, οὐκέτι τέρας, οὐκέτι σημεῖον ἐπίφανείας καὶ παρουσίας τοῦ θεοῦ· μεταβέβηκε γὰρ τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἐξ ἔθνῶν κατὰ τὸν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λόγον εἰρηκότος· <<ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ δοθήσεται ἔθνει ποιοῦντι τοὺς καρποὺς αὐτῆς>>· ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν τὸ ἔθνος, οἷς ἐδόθη <<ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ>>, ἢ εὐαγγελικὴ πολιτεία.⁵⁷

Origen's interpretation coheres with the unique readings noted in the D text earlier. In the first place Origen's use of the clause πεπλήρωνται ὕδατος θείου parallels D's διὰ τῶν

⁵⁷Origen, SC 87:528-30.

ὕδρων τόπων. The unclean spirit cannot find rest in the previously “waterless places” that are now “watery places” for they are now filled with divine water. Secondly, the emphasis of Origen on the exit and arrival of the bad spirit as a kind of historical allegory of Israel fits with the two parts reading of D’s rendition of the parable. Moreover, Origen employs the parable of The Return of Unclean Spirit to articulate the belief that since the Jews rejected Christ, that caused the wicked spirit to return to them with seven others, God’s kingdom is taken away from Israel and given to a nation that will bear fruits. Christianity is that nation to which the kingdom of God is given.

Similar to Origen’s interpretation of the parable, the allegorical interpretation of Ephrem (*Diatessaron Commentary* 11.5-8) makes a revealing parallel in the way the D text renders The Return of Unclean Spirit wherein Ephrem (*Diatessaron Commentary* 11.6) explains that Israel became the habitation of the unclean spirit.⁵⁸ During Christ’s time on earth he was a physician who healed them and the idolatry of the Jews took off among the Gentiles.⁵⁹ But after Christ’s ascension the Jews went back to their previous affairs and thus seven other bad spirits came back with the previous unclean one that made it worst for them.⁶⁰ Furthermore the notion that the “waterless places” are the Gentiles that became “watery places” and the historical allegory of Israel in Egypt delivered by God as represented by the spirit leaving the madman is similar to that of Origen’s comment and coheres with the D text. The two episodes of going out and coming back of the unclean spirit are in accordance with Origen and D. Ephrem (*Diatessaron Commentary* 11.7) talks about The Return of Unclean Spirit in line with Origen:

⁵⁸See *Éphrem: Commentaire*, 54-8. ET McCarthy, *Commentary*, 177-9. See also the discussion of Valavanolickal, *Use*, 41-2.

⁵⁹*Éphrem: Commentaire*, 54-6. ET McCarthy, *Commentary*, 177-8.

⁶⁰*Éphrem: Commentaire*, 56. ET McCarthy, *Commentary*, 178.

interpretation of The Return of the Unclean Spirit. In any case the valuable close match between D, Origen and Ephrem should not be simply ignored as a mere coincidence.

It is also enlightening that Hilary of Poitiers, who is a contemporary of Ephrem, has a similar sort of interpretation of this particular parable in his commentary *On Matthew* (12.22B-23) that also carries the same perspective as that of Ephrem's in the *Diatessaron Commentary* and Origen in his commentary on Luke.⁶³ Hilary of Poitiers makes an interesting comment:

Ergo insidentem plebis istius pectoribus spiritum immundum lex quae postea data est interuentu suo eiecit et ueluti quadam custodia circumiectae potestatis exclusit. Qui illinc exiens circum gentes desertas atque aridas oberrauit domum ueterem derelinquens, ut in his usque in diem iudicii non inquietata habitatione requiesceret.

Sed rursus Dei gratia impertita gentibus, postquam in aquae lauacrum fons uiuus effluxit, habitandi cum his locus nullus est, et cum iam in his requiem non habet, intra se reputans optimum credit regredi in eam ex qua profectus est domum. Haec emundata per legem et prophetarum ornata praeconiis et Christi aduentu praeparata uacua inuenitur, a qua et custodia legis abscesserit—quia omnis lex usque ad Ioannem est—et ad habitandum non receptus sit Christus, atque ita et habitatore uacua est et deserta custodibus, cum tamen uenienti habitatori praeuntium sollicitudine et mundata sit et ornat. Septem igitur spiritus nequiores adsumuntur, quia tot erant gratiarum munera destinata cum Christo, quae in eo multiformis illa Dei sapientia septiformi gloria collocauit, ut tanta iniquitatis fieret possessio, quanta futura fuerat gratiarum. Atque ita nouissima hominis illius peiora erunt prioribus, quia ex eo immundus spiritus metu legis excesserat, nunc autem in eos cum ultione repudiatae ab eis gratiae reuertetur.⁶⁴

Hilary of Poitiers' interpretative expression in aquae lauacrum fons uiuus effluxit captures the variant reading διὰ τῶν ὑδρῶν of D. His allegorical exegesis of the parable that is similar to Origen's and Ephrem's could have contributed to the formation and reception of this interpretative reading of Lk 11.24. The two parts of the leaving and homecoming of the wicked spirit in the parable are notable in the way Hilary of Poitiers interprets The Return of Unclean Spirit, similar to what already noted in D and argued in the exegesis of Origen and Ephrem. In addition, the allegorical interpretation of Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of*

⁶³See Hilary of Poitiers, SC 254:292. See also the fine discussion of Wailes, *Medieval*, 93-4.

⁶⁴Hilary of Poitiers, SC 254:292. ET Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:259-60.

Luke 7.95) further elucidates the anti-Judaic motif, i.e. the notion of watery places among the Gentiles and the two episodes of the departure and return of the unclean spirit:

Cum immundus spiritus exierit de homine, ambulat per loca quae non habent aquam quaerens requiem et non inueniens. Hoc de Iudaeorum plebe dictum ambigi non potest, quam dominus a regno suo in superioribus segregavit. Vnde omnes quoque haereticos et schismaticos a regno dei et ab ecclesia intellege separatos. Et ideo non dei, sed inmundi spiritus omnis schismatum haeticorumque liquido claret esse conuentus. Itaque in uno homine totius Iudaici populi comparatio est, a quo per legem spiritus immundus exierat. Sed quia in nationibus et gentibus per fidem Christi requiem repperire non potuit—inmundis enim spiritibus Christus incendium est, qui in pectoribus gentilium, quae ante arida erant, postea per baptismum rore spiritus umescebant, iacula aduersarii ignita restinxerat—ideo regressus ad plebem est Iudaeorum, quae forensi et perfunctoria specie comta animo manet interiore pollutior. Neque enim sacri fontis inriguo aut abluebat aut restinguebat ardorem, meritoque ad eam spiritus redibat immundus adducens secum septem spiritus nequiores. Quoniam in ebdomada legis et octavae mysterium sacrilega mente commisit. Itaque ut nobis multiplicatur septiformis spiritus gratia, ita illis immundorum spirituum omnis cumulatur iniuria; uniuersitas enim hoc numero aliquoties comprehenditur, propter quod septimo die conclusis mundi operibus requieuit deus. Ideo et *sterilis septem peperit et populosa in filiis infirmata est.* Denique ut scias synagogae populum deformari, ubi ecclesia beatitudo laudatur.⁶⁵

The clause *per baptismum rore spiritus umescebant* is the expression that Ambrose used to express how the dry places of the Gentiles became watery. Like the views of the previous Fathers already discussed, Ambrose also follows the concept that the unclean spirit left the Jews because of the Law of Moses, but came back again because their hearts are defiled for not believing in Christ.

Therefore, if the scribe of D is not a careless copyist, as Parker⁶⁶ carefully and thoroughly demonstrated, and if the parallel interpretations of the parable by Fathers who are already cited supply a hint that the reading of D could be considered as an authentic allegorical textual tradition, it should be maintained that the variant reading *διὰ τῶν ὑδρῶν* in Lk 11.24 is not a textual corruption due to a scribal error. Lastly, Cyril of Alexandria

⁶⁵Ambrose, SC 52:41-2. ET *EHGSL* 275-6.

⁶⁶Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 285, convincingly concludes that: “Codex Bezae is a free text, but is essentially not a careless one”.

(Fragment 163) on his extant fragment commentary on the first Gospel is much influenced by the thought of Origen, Ephrem, Hilary of Poitiers and Ambrose in showing that the Israelites were possessed by the unclean spirit when they were in Egypt and that there are basically two parts in Israel's allegorical history, their deliverance from the unclean spirit and its return with seven more wicked spirits:

Καὶ μάλα εἰκότως· ὅταν γὰρ ἅπαξ τις ἐλευθερωθεὶς τῶν κακῶν μὴ σωφρονισθῆ, πολλῶ χαλεπώτερα πείσεται τῶν προτέρων· διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο εἶπεν· οὐχ εὐρίσκει ἀνάπαυσιν, ἵνα δείξῃ, ὅτι πάντως καὶ ἐξ ἀνάγκης λήψεται τὸν τοιοῦτον ἢ τῶν δαιμόνων ἐπιβουλή· καὶ γὰρ ἀπὸ δύο τούτων τὸν τοιοῦτον σωφρονισθῆναι ἔδει, ἀπὸ τε τοῦ παθεῖν πρότερον, ἀπὸ τε τοῦ ἀπαλλαγῆναι. μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ τρίτον πρόσεστιν ἢ τοῦ χείρονα πείσεσθαι ἀπειλή, ἀλλ' ὅμως οὐδεὶς τούτων ἐγένοντο βελτίους. ἦν μὲν αὐτοῖς ἔνοικον τὸ πονηρὸν πνεῦμα καὶ ὅτε ἐν Αἴγυπτῳ ἐθήτευον καὶ τοῖς Αἴγυπτίοις διαζῶντες ἔθεσάν τε καὶ νόμοις μεστοὶ ἦσαν πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας. ἐπειδὴ διὰ Μωσέως λελύτρωνται καὶ νόμον ἐσχῆκασιν παιδαγωγὸν πρὸς τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς θεογνωσίας καλοῦντα φῶς, ἀπελήλατο τὸ βέβηλον καὶ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα. ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐ πεπιστεύκασιν εἰς Χριστόν, πάλιν αὐτοῖς ἐπεδήμησε τὸ δαιμόνιον· εὗρε γὰρ αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν γυμνὴν καὶ σχολάζουσαν ἀπὸ πάσης εὐσεβείας καὶ οἴονει σεσαρωμένην καὶ κατώκησεν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὅταν ἴδῃ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου σχολάζουσαν ἀπὸ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας καὶ ἐναυλίζεται καὶ κατοικεῖ καὶ ἐπαναπαύεται ἐν αὐτῷ, οὕτω καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ψυχαῖς ἀνόμων ἐνδικοιτᾶσθαι φιλεῖ.⁶⁷

Another notable feature is the harmonisation of Lk 11.24 with Mt 12.43 in D by inserting δέ, supported by P⁷⁵ with P⁴⁵ W 1241 2542 *al* *aur* *b* *sy*^h *sa* *bo*^{pt}, but not B.⁶⁸ This makes a comparison and contrast with the previous Lukan pericope about Jesus having cast out a demon when he was charged by the Jews as casting demons by Beelzebul (Lk 11.14-23). The point of this previous pericope is the judgement of Jesus in Lk 11.20 asserting that

⁶⁷Cyril of Alexandria, "Cyrill von Alexandrien Fragment", in *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche: aus Kettenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben*, ed. Joseph Reuss, TUGAL 61 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), 205-6. ET Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:260-1. Cf. also The Syriac version of Cyril of Alexandria's Homily 81 in *SCAACLE*, 200-1. ET *CGSL*, 332-3.

⁶⁸NA²⁷, 197.

if his casting out of demons is from God the Jews have not received the kingdom. Perhaps, the harmonisation of inserting δέ is not just a mere conjunction. Rather, it is a disjunctive that has a strong contrasting purpose to highlight that the man in the parable has already been cleansed just as the Fathers cited above would say about Israel being cleansed when they were delivered from Egypt and Moses gave them the law. Mimetically speaking, δέ is harmonised with Matthew's account in D, with d reading autem.⁶⁹ Another harmonisation in D is the placing of the phrase ἐπὶ πνεύματα as two words together in Lk 11.26 with Mt 12.39 against P⁷⁵ and B that read these two words apart from each other in the word order of their clause.⁷⁰ These two cases simply indicate that the Lukan D text is cross-referenced with that of the Matthean text. Cyril of Alexandria (*Commentary on Luke* 11.24 [274-5]) gives a hint on how early Christian interpreters of The Return of Unclean Spirit employed the Matthean account of the parable in interpreting Lk 11.24-26:

Ὅτι δὲ εἰς Ἰουδαίους ἐστὶ τὸ σύμπαν τοῦτο παράδειγμα, δεδήλωκεν ὁ Ματθαῖος, ἐπιφωνήσας· Οὕτως ἔσται καὶ τῇ γενεᾷ τῇ ποιηρᾷ ταύτῃ. Ἔως μὲν γὰρ ἦσαν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ θητεύοντες, καὶ τοῖς Αἰγυπτίων διαζῶντες ἔθεσί τε καὶ νόμοις, μεστοὶ πάσης ὑπῆρχον ἀκαθαρσίας, ἔνοικον ἦν αὐτοῖς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ποιηρὸν. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ λελύτρωνται διὰ Μωϋσέως, κατοικτεῖροντος Θεοῦ, καὶ νόμον ἐσχῆκασιν παιδαγωγόν, πρὸς τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς θεογνωσίας καλοῦντα φῶς, ἀπελήλατο τὸ βέβηλον καὶ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα· ὅτε δὴ καὶ τεθύκασιν τὸν ἀμνὸν εἰς τύπον Χριστοῦ, κατεχρίσθησαν τε τῷ αἵματι, καὶ διέδρασαν τὸν ἀλοθρευτήν. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐ πεπιστεύκασιν εἰς Χριστὸν, ἀλλὰ παρώσαντο τὸν Λυτρωτήν, ἰδοὺ δὴ πάλιν εἰσπέπτωκε τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα, καὶ πολὺ χειρόνως ἢ πάλαι· εὗρε γὰρ αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν γυμνήν, καὶ σχολάζουσιν ἀπὸ πάσης εὐσεβίας, καὶ οἶον σεσαρωμένην, καὶ κατώκησεν ἐν αὐτοῖς.

Ὡσπερ γὰρ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὅταν ἴδῃ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου σχολάζουσιν ἀπὸ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας, ἐναυλίζεται καὶ κατοικεῖ καὶ ἐπαναπαύεται αὐτῇ οὕτω καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ψυχᾷς ἀνόμων ἐνδαιτᾶσθαι φιλεῖ. Σχολάζουσι γὰρ, ὡς ἔφην, ἀπὸ πάσης

⁶⁹Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 96.

⁷⁰Cf. Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 96.

ἀρετῆς. Γέγονε τοίνυν τὰ ἔσχατα τῶν ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ χείρονα τῶν πρώτων. Ὡς γὰρ ὁ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἔφη μαθητῆς· Κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς ἀληθείας. ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν, εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω ἀνακάμψαι ἀπὸ τῆς παραδοθείσης αὐτοῖς ἀγίας ἐντολῆς. Συμβέβηκε γὰρ αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας· Κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέρασμα, καὶ ὕς λουσαμένη εἰς κύλισμα βορβόρου. Ἐξ αὐτῶν δὲ τῶν τετολμημένων καταθρήσαιτό τις ἄν, ὅτι τῶν ἰδίων ἐμέτων ἤπτοντο πάλιν, καὶ τοῖς ἄνωθεν ἐγκαλινδεῖσθαι βορβοροῖς ἐξ ὑποστροφῆς ἐμελέτων, καὶ πεπτώκασιν εἰς τὴν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ πλάνησιν. Εἰσέφρησε γὰρ πάλιν τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα, καὶ γέγονεν αὐτοῖς, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Σωτῆρος φωνήν, χείρονα τῶν πρώτων τὰ ἔσχατα.⁷¹

Cyril of Alexandria did not only use the Matthean account of The Return of Unclean Spirit but he also generally follows the two-part interpretation of the parable, like the other Fathers, that the bad spirit left and came back again to the Jews because they rejected Christ. It is notable that D deviates from both Matthew and the Alexandrian tradition of Luke. There is an observable mimetic paraphrasing in the D text of Lk 11.24-26 to tie in with Mt 12.43-45. It omits τότε twice as already mentioned above. Moreover, in Lk 11.26 it also eliminates ἐκεῖ with the support of C*^{vid} 33 it.⁷² Furthermore, in going back to verse 25, σχολάζοντα, that is present in B but not in P⁷⁵, is obliterated as well in the D text. The fact that σχολάζοντα is not in P⁷⁵ but occurs in B is puzzling. In relationship with its elimination from the D text it neither provides any indication of harmonisation with Matthew nor a conceivable allegorical reading of Lk 11.25.⁷³ Thus, the mimetic harmonisation with

⁷¹Cyril of Alexandria, *PG* 72:705-8. Cf. ET *CGSL*, 332-3.

⁷²NA²⁷, 197.

⁷³Ephrem ignores the description of the house in the homecoming of the unclean spirit. Ambrose allegorised the new look of the house as quae forensi et perfunctoria specie comta animo manet interiore polluitur. Whereas Ambrose sees the newly adorned house of the Jews as superficial, Origen simply indicates the vacancy of Israel. Origen's quick comment is informed by the Matthean account and/or B's text of Luke since D eliminates σχολάζοντα. Cyril of Alexandria spiritualises the implication of the clean house without saying anything in detail about σχολάζοντα σεσαρωμένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον of Mt 12.44. However, in his *Commentary on Luke*, Cyril of Alexandria allegorises the new appearance of the house as εὔρε γὰρ αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν γυμνήν, καὶ σχολάζουσιν ἀπὸ πάσης εὐσεβίας, καὶ οἶον σεσαρωμένην. Likewise, Hilary of Poitiers who allegorises the three participles by interpreting haec emundata per legem et prophetarum ornata praeconiis et Christi aduentu praeparata uacua inuenitur. Despite of the informative allegorical exegesis of the Fathers it is unexplainable why D with P⁷⁵ in Lk 11.25 omits σχολάζοντα.

Matthew of the D text of Luke, although focused only in *δέ* and *ἑπτὰ πνεύματα*, has been enhanced by the omission of *τότε* and *ἐκεῖ*. The allegorising variant *διὰ τῶν ὑδρῶν* makes it probable that allegory and mimesis were working together in the development of D's textual tradition, to enhance the spiritual sense of the parable when it was transmitted by the early Christian tradents.

Finally, the probable stress of the D text on the coming back of the unclean spirit with other seven more wicked ones is observable. The reading of D in Lk 11.26 is *καὶ παραλαμβάνει ἄλλὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ*, whereas the reading of P⁷⁵ and B is *καὶ παραλαμβάνει ἕτερα πνεύματα πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ ἑπτὰ*. Probably, D stresses the point of the unclean spirit taking seven other spirits being more evil than it by using *ἄλλος* instead of *ἕτερος* before *ἑπτὰ πνεύματα* against the P⁷⁵ and B's accent on the number *ἑπτὰ* by putting it at the end of the clause.⁷⁴ Although the use of *ἄλλος* and *ἕτερος* in the New Testament is generally indistinguishable,⁷⁵ it is not impossible that a distinction between *ἄλλος*, “another”,⁷⁶ and *ἕτερος*, “different”,⁷⁷ is made here in this case by D if viewed using the lenses of classics and patristics.⁷⁸ If it is granted that there is a distinction in the usage of *ἄλλος* against that of *ἕτερος* in D, there could be an implication that there is similarity of the type of unclean spirit that returns with another seven.⁷⁹ The situation of Israel as represented by the madman did not become better

⁷⁴Cf. Robertson, *Grammar*, 417; and BDF, 249.

⁷⁵See *TDNT* 1:264 and 2:702.

⁷⁶*TDNT* 1:264 suggests that *ἄλλος* is “often used where only two are in question”.

⁷⁷*TDNT* 2:702 points out that *ἕτερος* “may also be used to introduce another kind” and that its employment in “a definite number it is used when two specific things or groups are compared or contrasted”.

⁷⁸In comparison with the use of *ἄλλος* the employment of *ἕτερος* according to *TDNT* 2:702 is “as a distinguishing adjective or adverb [that] denotes something which is not identical with what has been referred to previously”.

⁷⁹The distinction of *ἕτερος* from *ἄλλος* according to *TDNT* 2:702 “may involve a more or less pronounced qualitative distinction, in which case the term acquires theological significance”.

but worse. Consequently, in D the reading that the unclean spirit takes the same kind of unclean spirits with it, albeit more evil, creates a better sense in connection with the exegeses of Origen, Ephrem, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose and Cyril of Alexandria. For in the two episodes of the exit and return of the unclean spirit the latter was worse. Further, the adverb ἐκεῖ that is omitted in D, is referring to the house. The highlight in the removal of ἐκεῖ with allusion to οἶκος is the shifted focus of D to the act of dwelling of the unclean spirits rather than the place of dwelling itself. The evilness that comes into the man is worse than previous as concluded in verse 26b. Perhaps, the Fathers would say that because God delivered the Jews from Egypt they were cleansed and the unclean spirit left. However, when they rejected Christ they became worse than before for seven more wicked similar spirits came back with the previous one that left them. Thus to call this parable The Return of the Unclean Spirit is more appropriate in D than to give it its traditional title The Empty House.

The Great Banquet (Lk 14.16-24)

The Great Banquet in Lk 14.16-24 has an equivalent in Mt 22.1-14, albeit with some differences in detail. Right from the beginning of the parable, deliberate changes can be observed in the D text of Luke. In Lk 14.16 D reads οὗ instead of simply the definite article ὁ in P⁷⁵ and B. Hence, the reading of D with its use of οὗ directly connects the parable as a response of Jesus to statement of one of the dinner guests in verse 15: μακάριος ὃς φάγετε ἄρτον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. Furthermore, in the same verse D reads ἐποίησεν which is a direct harmonisation with Mt 22.2.⁸⁰ The reading of D is diverse from that of P⁷⁵ and B which is ἐποίει. Moreover, still in the same verse, whilst D reads μέγαν, P⁷⁵ and B have μέγα, but a later hand of B corrected it to μέγαν. In verse 17, D employs the infinitive ἔρχεσθαι, making the invitation part of the narration, whereas P⁷⁵ and B utilise the use of second person plural imperative ἔρχεσθε, putting the call in the mouth of

⁸⁰Cf. Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 98.

the master. In addition, πάντα is inserted before ἔτοιμα making it harmonised with Mt 22.4.⁸¹ The dative pronoun αὐτῷ in verse 18 is taken away in D. What's more is that D reverses the word arrangement of P⁷⁵ and B which is ἔχω ἀνάγκην to ἀνάγκην ἔχω.⁸² Besides P⁷⁵ reads σοι against D and B's σε. So far a few of D's unusual readings cited from Lk 14.16-18 could probably be explained by mimetic harmonisation with Matthew's account and the other alterations are simply due to grammatical style. However, Lk 14.19-20 shows how D could have preserved some allegorising variants. The reading of D in verse 19 uses ἡγορα against ἡγόρασσα of P⁷⁵ and B. Again, this difference could only be due to grammatical style. On the contrary, the identical reading διὸ οὐ δύναμαι ἐλθεῖν of D in verses 19 and 20 could be due to an allegorical reading of the parable and will be discussed below. In verse 19, P⁷⁵ and B have ἐρωτῶ σε, ἔχε με παρητημένον, but in verse 20 they read καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ δύναμαι ἐλθεῖν. Hence, the replacement of P⁷⁵ and B's καὶ διὰ τοῦτο with just simply διὸ in verse 20 of the D text is making the reading identical with that of verse 19. Further changes in verse 20 are the utilisation of ἄλλος and ἔλαβον in D against the usage of ἕτερος and ἔγημα in P⁷⁵ and B. More variations of reading in D that indicate deliberate alterations are observable in Lk 14.21-24. In verse 21 D inserts πάντα before ταῦτα. In addition the original hand of D reads καὶ ὀργεῖς but later corrected to καὶ ὀργισθεῖς making it nearer to P⁷⁵ and B's τότε ὀργισθεῖς. Once again, there is a word arrangement alteration in D as it has the reading τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ εἶπεν against P⁷⁵ and B's εἶπεν τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ. Moreover, in the same verse the article τοῦς before πτωχοῦς is obliterated in D. Besides that, D also replaces P⁷⁵ and B's εἰσάγαγε with ἐνέγκε. Notably, D in Lk 14.22 yet again reverses the word of order of P⁷⁵ and B from εἶπεν ὁ δούλος to ὁ δούλος εἶπεν. It also deletes κύριε and has γέγον, which is later corrected to γέγονεν, making its reading the same as P⁷⁵ and B. In verse 23 D and the

⁸¹Cf. Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 98. Cf. also Metzger, *TCGNT* 1971¹, 164.

⁸²See Yoder, "Language" (diss.), 481-506.

original hand of P⁷⁵ inserts αὐτοῦ after τὸν δούλον, but later it is crossed out in P⁷⁵, making the reading the same as B. Finally, in Lk 14.24 D substitutes ἀνδρῶν of P⁷⁵ and B with ἀνθρώπων and obliterates ἐκείνων.

The *Gospel of Thomas* also has the account of the parable that occasioned the dinner banquet because of the presence of the man's guest-friends. In *Thomas* 64 the parable account is as follows:

ΠΕΧΕ ΙC ΧΕ ΟΥΡΩ ΜΕ ΝΕΥΝΤΑϩ ΖΝΨΜΜΟ ΑΥΩ ΝΤΑΡΕϩCΟΒ ΤΕ
 ΜΠΔΙΠΝΟΝ ΑϩΧΟΟΥ ΜΠΕϩΖΜΖΑΛ ΨΙ ΝΑ ΕϩΝΑΤΩΖΜ ΝΝΨΜΜΟΕΙ
 ΑϩΒΩΚ` Μ ΠΨΟΡΠ` ΠΕΧΑϩ ΝΑϩ ΧΕ ΠΑΧΟΕΙC ΤΩΖΜ ΜΜΟΚ`
 ΠΕΧΑϩ ΧΕ ΟΥΝΤΑΕΙ ΖΝΖΟΜΤ` ΑΖΕΝΕΜΠΟΡΟC CΕΝΝΗΥ ΨΑΡΟΕΙ
 ΕΡΟΥΖΕ †ΝΑΒΩΚ` ΝΤΑΟΥΕΖCΑΖΝΕ ΝΑΥ †ΡΠΑΡΑΙ ΤΕΙ ΜΠΑΙΠΝΟΝ
 ΑϩΒΩΚ` ΨΑ ΚΕΟΥΑ ΠΕ ΧΑϩ ΝΑϩ ΧΕ ΑΠΑΧΟΕΙC ΤΩΖΜ ΜΜΟΚ`
 ΠΕΧΑϩ ΝΑϩ ΧΕ ΔΕΙΤΟΟΥ ΟΥΗΕΙ ΑΥΩ CΕ ΡΑΙΤΕΙ ΜΜΟΕΙ
 ΝΟΥΖΗΜΕΡΑ †ΝΑCΡϩΕ Α ΑϩΕΙ ΨΑ ΚΕΟΥΑ ΠΕΧΑϩ ΝΑϩ ΧΕ ΠΑΧΟ
 ΕΙC ΤΩΖΜ ΜΜΟΚ` ΠΕΧΑϩ ΝΑϩ ΧΕ ΠΑΨΒΗΡ ΝΑΡ ΨΕΛΕΕΤ ΑΥΩ
 ΑΝΟΚ` ΕΤΝΑΡ ΔΙΠΝΟΝ †ΝΑΨ Ι ΑΝ †ΡΠΑΡΑΙΤΕΙ ΜΠΑΙΠΝΟΝ` Αϩ`
 ΒΩΚ` ΨΑ ΚΕΟΥΑ ΠΕΧΑϩ ΝΑϩ ΧΕ ΠΑΧΟΕΙC ΤΩΖΜ ΜΜΟΚ` ΠΕΧΑϩ
 ΝΑϩ` ΧΕ ΔΕΙΤΟΟΥ Ν ΟΥΚΩΜΗ ΕΕΙΒΗΚ` ΑΧΙ ΝΨΩΜ †ΝΑΨ Ι ΑΝ
 †ΡΠΑΡΑΙΤΕΙ ΑϩΕΙ ΝΒΙ ΠΖΜΖΑΛ ΑϩΧΟ ΟC ΑΠΕϩΧΟΕΙC ΧΕ
 ΝΕΝΤΑΚ`ΤΑΖΜΟΥ Α ΠΑΙΠΝΟΝ ΑΥΠΑΡΑΙΤΕΙ ΠΕΧΕ ΠΧΟΕΙC Μ
 ΠΕϩΖΜΖΑΛ ΧΕ ΒΩΚ` ΕΠCΑ ΝΒΟΛ ΑΝΖΙΟ ΟΥΕ ΝΕΤΚΝΑΖΕ ΕΡΟΟΥ
 ΕΝΙΟΥ ΧΕΚΑΑC ΕΥΝΑΡΔΑΙΠΝΕΙ ΝΡΕϩΤΟΟΥ ΜΝ ΝΕΨΟ [ΤΕ
 ΕΥΝΑΒΩ]ϫ ΑΝ` ΕΖΟΥΝ` ΕΝΤΟΠΟC ΜΠΑΙΩΤ`⁸³

It is immediately apparent that the accounts of Luke and *Thomas* have more similarities than the Matthean account.⁸⁴ It is also notable that *Thomas* could have mixed the accounts of Matthew and Luke as his sources.⁸⁵ Contrary to the contemporary scholarly treatment of The Great Banquet, the Greek and Latin Fathers generally consider the accounts of the parable in Luke and Matthew as different parables.⁸⁶ However, the Eastern Fathers, Aphrahat

⁸³*CopTh*, 34-6. ET *CopTh*, 35-7.

⁸⁴For a fine comparative study of the accounts of Matthew, Luke and *Thomas* see the commentary of Hultgren, *Parables*, 332-9.

⁸⁵See the discussion of Hultgren, *Parables*, especially 334-5.

⁸⁶Wailes, *Medieval*, 155.

and Ephrem conflate the Matthean and Lukan account in their expositions.⁸⁷ In the first place the invitation in both Luke and *Thomas* comes from an ordinary man instead of a king who gave a marriage banquet for his son as in Matthew. In addition, whilst Matthew's account does not give any detailed reason for the invited guests' negative responses to the invitation of the king, Luke and *Thomas*, although different in particulars, supply the excuses of those who cannot come. Yet *Thomas* has similarities with Matthew's exits of the invited people to their farm and business, with the meeting of merchants—for business, and collecting of rent—from the newly bought farm.

The dynamics of the parable(s) in the Lukan and Matthean account certainly support allegorical meanings to patristic interpreters.⁸⁸ Aphrahat (*Demonstrations* 6.6) employs the parable in Matthew's account as he alludes to the Eucharist.⁸⁹ Ephrem (*Diatessaron Commentary* 5.9) also follows the Eucharist motif of the parable as he hints at the Matthean account.⁹⁰ Augustine (*Sermon* 90.1) equates the invitation of the king to dine in Matthew's account of the parable as an open invitation for any person to participate in the Lord's Table in an approved manner.⁹¹ It could be that, as noted above, since Lk 14.16-18 has been mimetically cross-referenced with Mt 22.2-4, the invitation and refusal thrust of the parable is stressed. Aphrahat, Ephrem and Augustine's allegorical interpretations of the parable in Mt 22.1-14 see an invitation for the Eucharist. This invitation, however, is stretched by Ambrose's interpretation of Lk 14.16-24 to the eschatological banquet. Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 7.197-206) expounds The Great Banquet using Mt 22.1-14 as a cross-

⁸⁷See Valavanolickal, *Use*, 148-57.

⁸⁸See Wailes, *Medieval*, 153-66 and Valavanolickal, *Use*, 151-7.

⁸⁹Aphrahat, *PS* 1:268.1-6.

⁹⁰See ET McCarthy, *Commentary*, 98.

⁹¹Augustine, *PL* 38:559. ET Simonetti, *Matthew 14-28*, 1b:145.

reference.⁹² The D text of the Lukan account when compared with the commentary of Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 7.197-200) is instructive:

Sed ut in gratiam, ut supra cum uiduis, ita nunc etiam cum coniugibus reuertamur, non refugimus opinionem, quam sequuntur plerique, ut tria genera hominum a consortio magnae illius caenae aestimemus excludi, gentilium Iudaeorum haereticorum. Et ideo apostolus auaritiam dicit esse fugiendam, ne inpediti more gentili iniquitate malitia impudicitia auaritia ad regnum Christi peruenire nequeamus; *omnis enim auarus aut immundus, quod est idolorum seruitus, non habet hereditatem in regno Christi et dei*. Iudaei autem corporali ministerio iuga sibi legis inponunt et ideo secundum prophetam *disrumpamus uincula eorum et abiciamus a nobis iugum ipsorum*; Christum enim recepimus, qui ceruicibus nostris pietatis suae iugum mite suspendit. Quinque autem iuga sunt uerborum decem uel quinque libri ueteris legis, de quibus in euangelio uidetur Samaritanae dicere: *quinque enim uiros habuisti*. At uero haeresis uelut Eua femineo rigorem fidei temtat adfectu et lubrica facilitate prolabens lenocinia falsi decoris adfectat, intemeratam neglegens pulchritudinem ueritatis. Ideo igitur excusant, quia nemini intercluditur regnum nisi ei quem suae professio uocis exluserit, dominus autem omnes clementer inuitat, sed nos aut desidia nostra aut error auertit.⁹³

In relating what the Fathers have to say about The Great Banquet, first, perhaps, the reason why, at the end of the parable in Lk 14.24, D replaces ἀνδρῶν of P⁷⁵ and B with ἀνθρώπων and omits ἐκείνων, so that the reference could easily be made to humankind in an allegorical interpretation, as Ambrose sees that God's grace is to everyone and yet there are those who will be excluded, the gentiles, the Jews and the heretics. Aphrahat, Ephrem and Augustine's equation of the parable to the open invitation for the Eucharist would also support the alteration in D. In other words it is easier for an ancient interpreter of Lk 14.16-24 to allegorise the meaning of the parable in the line of thought of Ambrose and the other Fathers using D's ἀνθρώπων than ἀνδρῶν of P⁷⁵ and B. Further, the employment of the one and the same διὸ οὐ δύναμαι ἐλθεῖν of the D text in verses 19 and 20 could be explained to mean that the Jews and the heretics may not be able to come to the great banquet after all. Verse 20 utilises ἄλλος in D against the usage of ἕτερος in P⁷⁵ and B. Whilst in verse 19 D retains ἕτερος, in verse 20 it employs the word ἄλλος. A distinction is made,

⁹²Ambrose, SC 52:83-6. ET *EHGSL*, 316-9.

⁹³Ambrose, SC 52:83-4. ET *EHGSL*, 316-7.

therefore, between the first man by using ἕτερος in verse 19 who has an “excuse”, and the other two men, taken as different from the first one, but two of the same kind by the employment of the word ἄλλος. The latter two men who cannot come are made a different case from him who makes an excuse. So, the use of the identical confession διὸ οὐ δύναμαι ἐλθεῖν of the latter two men, one who bought five yokes of oxen—Jews under the Law’s yoke, and the other who took a wife—the heretics who are enticed, fits to the notion that they cannot come to the banquet after all. They are put together in the same category as ἄλλος as being of the same kind.⁹⁴ Accordingly, in verse 18 where the man who bought a field says ἔχε με παρητημένον to the servant is the reading retained in D with P⁷⁵ and B. Ambrose equates this person who just acquired a home, to the Gentiles. Furthermore, Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 7.201-202) mentions that the invitation went to the Gentiles, who sinned, but may be forgiven by the mercy of the Lord.⁹⁵ Thus, Gentiles could have been excused—although they do not have excuse, but the Jews and the heretics will not be able to join and enjoy the messianic dinner because of their inexcusable avoidance of the invitation of the master. Hence, D puts in their mouth the confession διὸ οὐ δύναμαι ἐλθεῖν. *Thomas*, on the other hand, explicitly states that the tradesmen and merchants will not make it to the presence of God. Although the account of *Thomas* is not helpful for the allegorical interpretation of the parable, it is helpful to see how *Thomas*’ mixture of the parables from Matthew and Luke supports the conflated interpretation of the parables by the Eastern Fathers and Ambrose against that of the other Greek and Latin Fathers.⁹⁶ In the eyes of the patristic interpreter this perspective could be assumed as a

⁹⁴For the discussion of the words ἕτερος and ἄλλος see my treatment of the employment of these words in The Return of Unclean Spirit (Lk 11.24-26) above.

⁹⁵Ambrose, SC 52:84-5. ET *EHGSL*, 317-8.

⁹⁶As a case in point, in the comments of Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 7.201) about the excuses given by those who were invited his mention of ergo et ille qui uillam emit alienus a regno est is parallel with ΛΕΙΤΟΥΡΓΟΥ ΟΥΓΗΙ of *Thomas* 64.20. See Ambrose, SC 52:84. ET *EHGSL*, 317. See also *CopTh*, 36. ET *CopTh*, 37. It should be noted that there is no mention of an excuse of a man who just bought a house in both Matthean and Lukan accounts of the parable.

representative mimesis of God's mercy for the Gentiles as Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 7.202) states: *Itaque post diuitum resupina fastidia contulit se ad gentes.*⁹⁷ Furthermore, Ambrose gets the support of both Cyril of Alexandria (*Commentary on Luke* 14.23 [334-5], Homily 104)⁹⁸ and Augustine (*Questions on the Gospels* 2.30 and *Sermon* 112)⁹⁹ in equating those who were invited from the streets and alleys as Gentiles.¹⁰⁰ Hence, once again, it could be maintained that D's text in Lk 14.16-24 could have been shaped by the influence of allegory and mimesis. There is the representative mimesis of an anti-Judaic understanding of the parable. The D text of Lk 14.16-24 is obviously paraphrased to give a different meaning. When D is read with just an observation of its peculiar readings, the allegorising variants and mimetic harmonisation may not be seen as anti-Judaic at the outset. But when The Great Banquet is read in the eyes of the Fathers these unusual readings in D would make a lot of sense when seen as due to an anti-Judaic reading of the parable that could have been fossilised in the D text of Luke.

The Pounds (Lk 19.11-27)

Although contemporary scholarship sees that The Pounds in Lk 19.11-27 and The Talents in Mt 25.14-30 are accounts of the same parable of Jesus, there is yet a clear considerable disparity in their presentation, language and particulars. However, the D text of Lk 19.11-27 has substantially utilised the Matthean account. Consequently, The Talents in Matthew is conflated with The Pounds in Luke in the D text thereby creating an interesting paraphrase of the parable. Luke's introduction of the parable of The Pounds is modified in D.

⁹⁷Ambrose, SC 52:84. ET *EHGSL*, 318.

⁹⁸Cyril of Alexandria, *PG* 72:792-3. ET *CGSL*, 420.

⁹⁹Augustine, *PL* 35:1343; and *PL* 38:647.

¹⁰⁰Although Cyril of Alexandria and Augustine have different moral allegorical interpretations of The Great Banquet, nevertheless, with Ambrose, both of them identify the people from the streets and alleys as Gentiles.

Again it is unfortunate that Lk 19.11-27 is not preserved in P⁷⁵. Hence, B becomes the default collating base for D. In Lk 19.11 D changes the word sequence of B's ἐγγύς εἶναι Ἱερουσαλήμ αὐτόν to εἶναι αὐτόν ἐγγύς Ἱερουσαλήμ, omits αὐτούς and reverses B's order of words from παραχρήμα μέλλει to μέλλει παραχρήμα. These modifications in D, although they do not change the meaning of the text, indicate that the D text has been adjusted according to what is fitting style for its tradents. In verses 12 and 13 there are more minor adjustments observable in the D text. Whilst B has οὖν D has δέ in verse twelve. In the same verse B has ἐπορεύθη whereas D has ἐπορεύετο and D also omits ἑαυτῶ. In the following verse B has ἑαυτοῦ but D has αὐτοῦ and that B reads πραγματεύσασθε whilst D reads πραγματεύεσθαι. Verse 14 becomes interesting in the reading of D for αὐτοῦ after πολεῖται is omitted. Thus in D the citizens are neutrally described and not as citizens of the nobleman. Also whereas B has ἀπέστειλαν the original hand of D has ἐνέπεμψαν which a later hand rectifies to ἔπεμψαν. Lk 19.15 in D deletes ἐν τῷ and τούτους. D also changes B's dative αὐτῷ to genitive αὐτοῦ. Again the alterations in D at this point do not have any allegorising bearing on the meaning of the text, except that tradents apparently left their imprints on the D text. In verse 16 once again D changes the word arrangement of B's ἡ μνᾶ σου δέκα προσηργάσατο μνᾶς to ἡ μνᾶ σου δέκα μνᾶς προσηργάσατο. The reading μνᾶ in B is corrected to μνᾶς. At the beginning of verse 17 D reads ὁ δέ against καί of B. The alterations in verses 16 and 17 are just a matter of style. On the one hand, Lk 19.18 in D's reading is καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἐλθὼν εἶπεν, Κύριε, ἡ μνᾶ σου, πεντε ἐποίησεν μνᾶς. On the other hand, B's reading is καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ δευτερος λέγων, Ἡ μνᾶ σου, κύριε, ἐποίησεν πέντε μνᾶς. Again what is perceptible in the difference of reading between B and D in verse 18 is a matter of style. This matter of style in the ordering of words is also notable in verse 19 where B has καὶ σὺ ἐπάνω γείνου and D has γείνου καὶ σὺ ἐπάνω. Verse 21 has an obvious difference of style between B's ἐφοβούμην γάρ σε, ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ἀύστηρός εἰ and

D's ὅτι ἐφοβήθην σε, ἄνθρωπος γὰρ εἶ ἀύστηρός. In the preceding analysis of the text the adjustments in D are basically stylistic in nature. What is obvious, nonetheless, is that the alterations in D indicate intentional changes to the text.

When Lk 19.22-27, however, is analysed, the reading of D in the parable of The Pounds is intentionally harmonised or intertextually cross-referenced with the Matthean parable of The Talents. This part of the Lukan parable of The Pounds in which the master castigates the useless servant, is a compositional mimetic harmonisation with the account of the Matthean parable of the Talents.¹⁰¹ In verse 22, D follows the reading of Mt 25.26 in using εἶπεν instead of λέγει as in B. Hence, D reads as ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ against simply λέγει αὐτῷ of B. Likewise, in the same verse in Luke, D is harmonised with Mt 25.26 by putting αἶρω and θερίζω in the first person present active indicative form against B's αἶρων and θερίζων in the present active participle form. However, Mt 25.26 uses the first person verbs θερίζω and συνάγω and does not have αἶρων. Furthermore, in Lk 19.23 once again, the reading διὰ τί οὖν of D against καὶ διὰ τί of B is a harmonising reading from Mt 25.27 that uses the postpositive οὖν and the word arrangement τὸ ἀργύριον μου as well. There is also a minor change of word order in D as it has ἔπραξα αὐτό against αὐτὸ ἔπραξα of B. At the beginning of verse 24 there is a difference of word sequence between B and D and the replacement of B's καὶ to δέ by D. Accordingly B reads καὶ τοῖς παρεστῶσι εἶπεν but D has εἶπεν δὲ τοῖς παρεστῶσι. In addition D has ἀπενέγκατε whereas B has δότε. It is also notable how D omits Lk 19.25 in B—καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ, [κύριε,]¹⁰² ἔχει δέκα μνᾶς—which is likely due to the influence of Mt 25.29 where it says in D τῷ γὰρ ἔχοντι δοθήσεται καὶ περισσεύσεται· τοῦ δὲ μὴ ἔχοντος καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.¹⁰³ In Lk 19.26 of the D text, the insertion

¹⁰¹See Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 100.

¹⁰²Inserted by a corrector.

¹⁰³Cf. Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 100. Cf. also Metzger, *TCGNT* 1994², 144.

of γάρ once again could have been due to its use in Mt 25.29. But D's alteration of B's δοθήσεται to προστιθέται is intriguing because the D text of Luke in this case deliberately differs from Mt 25.29 in its use of δοθήσεται as the verb employed by B in Lk 19.26. What is significant here is that although Lukan D has the tendency to harmonise with Matthean reading it also freely departs from Matthew's text. This kind of distinction is expected in a successful mimesis.¹⁰⁴ Thus, it would appear that although the D text of Luke cross-references with Matthew for an interpretative purpose, it also provides an independent interpretation of its own. Finally, in Lk 19.27, although D has minor style variations in the first part of the verse, the second part is an insertion from Mt 25.30—making the conclusion of the Lukan parable of The Pounds as the Matthean parable of The Talents. The way D renders Lk 19.27a as πλὴν ἐκείνους τοὺς ἐχθρούς μου τοὺς μὴ θέλοντάς με Βασιλεύειν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἀγάγατε ὧδε καὶ κατασφάξατε ἔμπροσθέν μου it does not really give any substantial difference in meaning when compared with B as it puts πλὴν τοὺς ἐχθρούς μου τούτους τοὺς μὴ θελήσαντάς με βασιλεύσαι ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἀγάγετε ὧδε καὶ κατασφάξατε αὐτοὺς ἔμπροσθέν μου. However, the D text of Lk 19.27 adds καὶ τὸν ἀχρεῖον δοῦλον ἐκβάλετε εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων from Mt 25.30. It should be remarked also that D in Lk 19.27 completely follows B in Mt 25.30. There is a textual variation in D that employs βάλεται ἔξω explaining how the useless slave will be thrown out. Nevertheless, D takes the imperative ἐκβάλετε from B. For this reason the command given by the master is for those who are surrounding the useless slave to cast him out to the darkness where there is gnashing of teeth.

There is a notable close resemblance between the Lukan parable of The Pounds in Lk 19.11-27 and the Matthean parable of The Talents in Mt 25:14-30. The mimetic harmonisation to Matthew's The Talents is a clue to the way the D text interprets Luke's The

¹⁰⁴See the section "Latin Writers and Mimesis Theory on Classical Rhetoric" in Chapter 3, 120-7.

Pounds. In other words, The Pounds is seemingly read in D through the eyes of The Talents. The Lukan and Matthean accounts have basically the same plot of a master who has slaves. Viewing the narration in the D rendition the Lukan parable pictures a person of noble birth entrusting his possessions to his slaves as he departs from them. The noble man in Luke's version is leaving his estate so that he can receive a kingdom for himself and then return to rule. At the same time an embassy from the populace of his territory came along to petition against his future dominion of the kingdom he was about to receive. When he returned, the newly crowned king considered the kind of work his slaves accomplished. He also castigates the people of his new kingdom who did not want his authority over them in the first place. Luke's account in The Pounds varies from Matthew's version in The Talents in each of the preceding particulars. The details of the slaves' report concerning the outcome of what has been entrusted to them and the master's appreciation and giving of rewards to the slaves differ also in Matthew and Luke. On the one hand, in the Matthean narrative the wicked slave is chastised in two manners: (1) that which he has received is taken away from him and passed on to another, and (2) he is cast out to outer darkness.¹⁰⁵ Although Luke in B maintains that the useless slave's pound is taken from him and given to another it does not say that the bad slave is thrown into outer darkness. However, in the D text of Luke the fate of the worthless slave is made similar to that of Matthew's where not only was the entrusted property of the master taken from him but also he ends up into τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.

Origen (*Commentary on Matthew* 68) gives his allegorical commentary on the Matthean account of the parable of The Talents about the slave who hid the one talent that was entrusted to him:

Videtur mihi iste *qui unum talentum accepit* fuisse inter credentes quidem, non autem et fiducialiter agentes in fide, sed latere volentes et omnia facientes, ut non cognoscantur quasi Christiani. forsitan autem et alii mores eorum non satis erant

¹⁰⁵Cf. the treatment of Rice, "Alteration of Luke", 190-3.

culpabiles, et quod acceperunt custodiunt quidem non autem et addunt, neque negotiantur neque fiducialiter agunt in eo; propterea verbum in eis non profecit ad maius neque alios adquisivit. adhuc videntur mihi qui huiusmodi sunt, timorem dei habere et sapere de eo quasi de aliquo austero et duro et implacabili; sic enim ipsa verba significant respondentis et dicentis: *sciebam quia durus es*, et quasi qui sciebat eum metere *ubi non seminavit et congregare ubi non sparsit*. propter quod *respondens ei dominus eius* et arguens eum quasi malum servum et pigrum, non quidem confessus est se esse hominem durum, sicut ille arbitrabatur, ceteris autem sermonibus eius consensit dicens ei: *sciebas quia meto ubi non seminavi, et congrego ubi non sparsi?*

Quomodo autem intellegamus quod vere dominus noster metit ubi non seminavit, et congregat ubi non sparsit? mihi hoc videtur in loco isto: quoniam iustus “seminat in spiritu”, ex quo et “metet vitam aeternam”. omnia autem quae ab altero (id est a iusto viro) seminantur et metuntur ad vitam aeternam, metit deus; dei enim est possessio iustus, qui metit, ubi non ipse seminavit sed ille iustus. consequenter et illud dicemus, quoniam iustus “dispersit, dedit pauperibus”, dominus autem in se colliget universa quantacumque iustus “dispersit et pauperibus dedit”. metens autem quae non seminavit et congregans ubi non sparsit, sibi computat et sibi arbitrat esse conlata, quaecumque pauperibus fidelibus fuerint seminata vel sparsa, dicens ad eos qui bene proximis suis fecerunt: “venite. benedicti patris mei, hereditate regnum quod vobis paratum est. esurivi enim et dedistis mihi manducare” et cetera. et quia vult metere ubi non seminavit et congregare ubi non sparsit, cum non invenerit, dicet ad eos qui ei non praebuerint metere et congregare: “discedite a me, maledicti, in ignem aeternum, quem praeparavit pater meus diabolo et angelis eius. esurivi enim et non dedistis mihi manducare” et cetera.¹⁰⁶

The above interpretation of Origen on the parable of The Talents could have influenced the theological moulding of The Pounds in the D text of Lk 19.22. On the one hand, D's harmonisation of the reading $\theta\epsilon\rho\rho\zeta\omega$ (with $\alpha\lambda\rho\omega$ in the first person) in Lk 19.22 with Mt 25.26 would help an interpreter of the D text of The Pounds to get a clue from Matthew's The Talents. Origen allegorises the Lord harvesting what he did not sow as the righteous providing for the poor. On the other hand, in verse 24 of the Lukan version of the parable the useless slave forfeits what he has, for it was taken away from him like in the Matthean version. But in D the protest $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\epsilon, \xi\chi\epsilon\iota \delta\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\alpha \mu\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ stated in verse 25 is omitted. The similarity here with Matthew's account is that in D there is no word of protest. Nonetheless, the bad slave gains no further retribution in the B text of Luke. But at the end of verse 27 in the D text, the good for nothing slave receives castigation. For as Origen sees it, the Lord wants to reap from what he has not sown. Therefore, the person who has failed to harvest

¹⁰⁶Origen, GCS [38.2]:159-60. ET Simonetti, *Matthew 14-28*, 1b:225-6.

לכך לה זלזול. אלא כן. כי כפי מה שכתבנו
 והענין. והענין. והענין. והענין. והענין.
 ללכך לה זלזול.¹⁰⁷

According to Cyril of Alexandria the Jews are the ones who represent the citizens who rejected the Lord in the Lukan version of The Pounds. The D text, however, is not content to leave matters in the story there where the unproductive slave forfeits what his master gave him. D has gone further by continuing to relate how the new king chastises the worthless slave as already noted above. The D text instead concludes the parable with an intertextual harmonisation of the conclusion of the Matthean version in 25:30. Besides Mt 25.30 the two other Matthean references of punishment by casting εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων are in 8.12 and 22.13. This gnashing of teeth alludes to Ps 112.10 where the sinner is judged to destruction. Other Matthean verses such as 13.42, 50 and 24.51 relate ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων to casting into the furnace of fire and with the hypocrites, respectively. The allusion of βαλοῦσιν αὐτούς εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός is Dn 3.6 where the three Hebrew children were thrown. Perhaps, the point of the allusion of the furnace is the fiery heat. This insertion of Matthean conclusion of The Talents provides a key to the way the reading of the D text renders the parable of The Pounds. It is just appropriate to point out that once again there is that mimetic cross-reference to Matthew's mention of ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων several times in his Gospel with an allegorical understanding of this additional passage in Lk 19.27b. Perhaps, the slave that is punished in the D text of The Pounds is meant to represent both the Jews—the sons of the Kingdom as in Mt 8.12 and the Christian—who does not have true faith as in Mt 22.13. Moreover, in Jesus' explanations of the parables of The Wheat and the Tares (Mt 13.36-43) and The Drag Net (Mt 13.49-50) the reference to the βαλοῦσιν αὐτούς εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός:

¹⁰⁷SCAACLE, 353-4. ET CGSL, 510.

ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων is the eschatological judgement of God upon sinners. The same point is made in Mt 24.51 where the slave will be surprised at the return of his master and will be castigated with the hypocrites because of his maltreatment of his fellow slaves.

Augustine substantiates this view of God's judgement in his interpretation of the horror of the gnashing of teeth in darkness. His interpretation of Mt 8.12 and 22.13 are coherent in terms of their emphasis on the judgement of those who reject Christ as being thrown out to suffer. Augustine (*Sermon* 62.6) sees Jesus' statement about the sons of the kingdom as the Jews who will be eijicientur in tenebras exteriores as in Mt 8.12 because they did not acknowledge Christ.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, Augustine (*Sermon* 90.4) presents his understanding of Mt 22.13 in terms of the retribution of the unprepared as interrogatus obmutescit: ligatur, projicitur, damnatur unus a multis.¹⁰⁹ Other parallel references in Matthew that talk about the weeping and gnashing of teeth in the fiery furnace are 13.42, 50 and 24.51. Origen (*Commentary on Matthew* 10.3) sees the terrible punishment for the sinners as βληθῶσιν εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός and the eternal glory for the righteous as λάμπουσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν in Mt 13.42-43.¹¹⁰ Furthermore, Origen (*Commentary on Matthew* 10.12) also presents his opinion on the interpretation of The Drag Net in Mt 13.49-50 as referring to the final judgement where the wicked will be βαλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρός· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.¹¹¹ Lastly, the other parallel reading in Mt 24.51 that is similar to D's additional reading in Lk 19.27 further clarifies how D's variant functions. Cyril of Alexandria (Fragment 277) once again emphasises the terrible torture of

¹⁰⁸Augustine, *PL* 38:417. ET Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:163.

¹⁰⁹Augustine, *PL* 38:561. ET Simonetti, *Matthew 14-28*, 1b:147.

¹¹⁰Origen, *SC* 162:150-1. ET Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:284.

¹¹¹Origen, *SC* 162:186-8. ET Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:289.

the retribution where the gnashing of teeth is the severe nature of the chastisement:

κολάζονται τοίνυν ἀνθ' ὧν ἐγέλων, βρύξουσι δὲ “τοὺς ὀδόντας” λογιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τοῦ πόνου καὶ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς κολάσεως.¹¹² In sum, what is apparent in Augustine, Origen and Cyril of Alexandria is the sure retribution of the wicked outside in darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth. The patristic interpretation of the Matthean parallel passages that were discussed above probably explains the implication of the inserted reading in the D texts's The Pounds from Matthew's The Talents. This insertion from Matthew that deals with the punishment of the useless slave in the parable of The Pounds in Lk 19.11-27 would not only be a mimetic harmonisation with Matthew but could also be an allegorising variant at the same time.

Notably, D's harmonisation of the Lukan ending of the parable of The Pounds with the conclusion of the Matthean parable of The Talents brings a totally different impact in comparison with the B rendition. If the harmonisation of the conclusion creates a telling impression in the D reading, all sorts of alterations all over the text of the parable contributes to its totally different effect. There is a strong emphasis in the paraphrased D text of Lk 19.27 on the punishment of the wicked slave against that of the B text by adding the reading from Mt 25.30. There is also a significant stress on the reward of the good slave in Lk 19.25. For the stated protest in B that the good slave has ten pounds already is omitted in D. The focus therefore is the sharp contrast between the faithful slave who receives reward from a generous master and the useless slave who is deprived of anything he has and is castigated because of something that he has not done for his strict master. The reason is that the talent or the pound, in the Matthean and Lukan parables respectively, is broadly equated to faith or the manner in which the message of gospel is received by the Jews and Gentiles as viewed by

¹¹²Cyril of Alexandria, “Fragment”, 248. ET Simonetti, *Matthew 14-28*, 1b:213.

the Fathers.¹¹³ Justin (*Dialogue with Trypho* 125) alludes to the parable of The Talents as he talks about the words of the gospel:

Ἐλπίδι οὖν τοῦ εἰναί που καλήν γῆν, λέγειν δεῖ· ἐπειδή γε ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἐμὸς Κύριος, ὡς ἰσχυρὸς καὶ δυνατὸς, τὰ ἴδια παρὰ πάντων ἀπαιτήσει ἐλθὼν, καὶ τὸν οἰκονόμον ἑαυτοῦ οὐ καταδικάσει, εἰ γνωρίζοι αὐτὸν διὰ τὸ ἐπίστασθαι ὅτι δυνατὸς ἐστὶν ὁ Κύριος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐλθὼν ἀπαιτήσει τὰ ἴδια, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τράπεζαν διδόντα, ἀλλ' οὐ δι' αἰτίαν οἰανδηποτοῦν κατορύξαντα.¹¹⁴

As early as Justin the meaning of talent in the parable is already associated with the reception of the gospel's message. Hilary of Poitiers (*On Matthew* 27.6-11) generally equates the talents to the gospel.¹¹⁵ Ephrem (*Diatessaron Commentary* 8.20) relates the talent with faith.¹¹⁶ Origen (*Commentary on Matthew* 66-69) broadly sees the talents as doctrina.¹¹⁷ Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 8.91-96) views the pounds gained by the good slaves in Luke's account as well as the talents in Matthew's account to have mysticum atque morale, but he sees the pound of the useless slave to be rationem.¹¹⁸ In any case the apparent coherent interpretation of the Fathers is that the talents or pounds mean the message of faith that is given and how one responds to it.

Accordingly, when the worthless slave's only possession is taken away from him and it is given to the faithful slave, the objection made by those standing by is eradicated in the D text of Luke. The talents or pounds as taken by the Fathers to mean faith, reception of the gospel or knowledge of Christian doctrine and morals could easily be accepted as an addition to the

¹¹³According to Wailes, *Medieval*, 188, there is certainly a "broad agreement among several authorities [among the Fathers] that 'The Talents' in Matthew and Luke tells of the gospel's reception by Jews and gentiles". See also Valavanolickal, 198-218.

¹¹⁴Justin, *PG* 6:765. *ET FC* 6:342. See also Massaux, *Influence*, 3:86.

¹¹⁵Hilary of Poitiers, *SC* 258:210-7.

¹¹⁶See *ET* McCarthy, *Commentary*, 281. Cf. *Saint Ephrem*, *CSCO* 291:21-8.

¹¹⁷Origen, *GCS* [38.2]:154-63. *ET* Simonetti, *Matthew 14-28*, 1b:223-8. *Passim*.

¹¹⁸Ambrose, *SC* 52:139-40. *ET EHGSL*, 372-3.

It is also noteworthy to mention that Aphrahat (*Demonstrations* 9.8) clarifies elsewhere in the same work that since the foolish people did not receive Christ as king, his enemies will be destroyed before him:

ܘܢܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܥܝܣܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܝܠܡܐ ܕܥܝܠܡܐ ܕܥܝܠܡܐ ܕܥܝܠܡܐ
 ܘܢܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܥܝܣܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܝܠܡܐ ܕܥܝܠܡܐ ܕܥܝܠܡܐ ܕܥܝܠܡܐ
 ܘܢܘܨܘܢܐ ܕܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܥܝܣܝܘܬܐ ܕܥܝܠܡܐ ܕܥܝܠܡܐ ܕܥܝܠܡܐ ܕܥܝܠܡܐ.¹²¹

The above quotations show that Aphrahat recognises that the parable is to be understood according to the economy of God. He is also overlapping the accounts of Matthew and Luke. For Aphrahat, the populace who rejects the noble are the Jews who reject Christ. Thus, as these subjects who reject their new king are punished by execution in his presence, the Jews will be destroyed forever as well. Perhaps, the allegorical intent of using the demonstrative *ἐκείνους* and the present participle *θέλοντας* with the present infinitive *βασιλεύειν* in Lk 19.27 of the D text is to make the employment of words wider and contemporary referring to the Jews. Thus, the judgement on those who reject the kingship of the master in the parable could be equated to the Jews who reject Jesus as their Messiah. Ambrose follows Aphrahat in equating the citizens of the kingdom who reject their rightful king as the Jews. Thus, the Jews will be destroyed because of their rejection of Christ. Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 8.91) states:

Bonus ordo, ut uocaturus gentes et Iudaeos iussurus interfici, qui noluerunt regnare supra se Christum, hanc praemitteret comparationem, ne diceretur: <<nihil dederat populo Iudaeorum, unde potuit melior fieri>> aut: <<quid ab eo qui nihil recepit exigitur?>>¹²²

Origen (Fragment 227) agrees with Aphrahat and Ambrose, that the noble who left to get a kingdom for himself is Christ, and after his ascension he will come for the second time:

¹²¹Aphrahat, *PS* 1:428.13-17. ET Valavanolickal, *Use*, 203.

¹²²Ambrose, *SC* 52:139. ET *EHGSL*, 372.

Ἐπορεύθη εἰς χώραν μακρὰν λαβεῖν ἑαυτῷ βασιλείαν ὁ Χριστὸς μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν· ὑποστρέφει δὲ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ παρουσίᾳ.¹²³

The survey of the patristic interpretation of the parables of The Talents in Matthew and The Pounds in Luke brings together the unique readings of the D text in Lk 19.11-27 in proper context, where they become both mimetic harmonisation and allegorising variants. The peculiar readings in D would conveniently facilitate an allegorical reading of the parable in line with the interpretation of the Fathers. Once again both mimesis and allegory could have been at work in the development of the distinctive reading of the D text of the Lukan parable of The Pounds that is anti-Judaic representative mimesis.

The Barren Fig Tree (Lk 13.6-9)

The D text of the parable of The Barren Fig Tree in Lk 13.6-9 shows clear indications that it has developed a textual reading that is not identical with the Alexandrian P⁷⁵ and B. The distinctive readings in the D text of Luke that could be due to mimetic cross-referencing gathered in this parable as well as The Rich Man and Lazarus in Lk 16.19-31 are not from a parallel parable from another Synoptic Gospel for both of them are uniquely Lukan parables. In verse 6 D transposed its wording from *συκῆν εἶχεν τις* of P⁷⁵ and B to *συκῆν τις εἶχεν* that indicates a deliberate change but a common feature of the D text.¹²⁴ Furthermore, in the same verse whilst P⁷⁵ and B have the reading *ἐν αὐτῇ*, D has *ἀπ' αὐτῆς*. However, d does not back up the reading of D with the reading in ea. Rather, it follows the reading *ἐν αὐτῇ* of P⁷⁵ and B. Apparently, D's emphasis in verse 6 is obviously the same as the rest of textual traditions in Lk 13.6, i.e. on the *καρπός* that is due which is expected by the man who planted the fig tree. Notably, D uses the negative participial form *μὴ εὐρώων* against the

¹²³Origen, GCS 35:325. ET *HLFL*, 218.

¹²⁴Perhaps, the transposition of word order in this case is either due to an "Attic practice" or "Hebraic influence". See Yoder, "Language of the Greek Variants", 481-506, for a helpful study of the Greek word order in the D text.

negative finite verb οὐχ εὗρεν of P⁷⁵ and B. This time d upholds D with the reading non inueniens which is also in the negative participial form. The choice of words of the D text of Luke has underscored the continuing search of the master for the expected καρπός from the fig tree. It is interesting that verse 7 further shows, that indeed, the tradents of the D text of Luke made clear-cut alterations to its text. Again, D's text reverses the word order from τρία ἔτη of P⁷⁵ and B to ἔτη τρία.¹²⁵ The scribe of D, however, made an error of scribbling the negative οὐκ instead of the correct οὐχ that precedes the word εὕρισκω. A crucial insertion is placed in the D text in verse 7. The imperative φέρε τὴν ἀξείνην is placed in the mouth of the man who owns the fig tree. This insertion in D is also in d and reads adfers securem. However, adfers is not in the imperative but in the present active indicative second person singular form. In any case the insertion of φέρε τὴν ἀξείνην is most probably a deliberate cross-reference harmonisation with Mt 3.10 and/or Lk 3.9. The insertion in D is perhaps an indication placed by tradents for a better understanding of the passage. It is also notable that whilst P⁷⁵ has the postpositive οὖν both B and D do not have it after ἔκκοψον.¹²⁶ In addition P⁷⁵ and D has τὴν γῆν but B has τὸν τόπον that was later corrected by another tradent to τὴν γῆν. The reading of d is terram. Hence, it supports D. Another important reading in D is in verse 8 where D reads ἔτι τοῦτον τὸν ἐνιαυτόν. The word ἐνιαυτός implies the meaning “any long period of time” or “cycle”¹²⁷ and entails the connotation of “a period of time other than a calendar year”.¹²⁸ The reading adhuc hunc annum of d parallels that of D. The reading of P⁷⁵ and B καὶ τοῦτο το ἔτος would be essentially the same as that of D when taken literally. However, the change in the text of D underscores the long extent of time than just the literal sense of it for just one year. Together

¹²⁵See Yoder, “Language” (diss.), 481-506.

¹²⁶See Metzger, *TCGNT* 1994², 137, concerning the problem of οὖν.

¹²⁷LSJ, 567.

¹²⁸BDAG, 337.

with this longer emphasis on time given to the fig tree before being cut is the alteration of κόπρια in P⁷⁵ and B to κόφινον κοπρίων of D. The emphasis is from the placing of manure as fertilizer to the measure of the fertilizer as a basket of manure. The reading qualum stercoris of d follows D. Finally, although D's reading καὶ ἔαν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπὸν εἰ δὲ μὴ γε εἰς τὸ μέλλον, ἐκκόψεις αὐτήν is against the reading κἄν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπὸν εἰς τὸ μέλλον· εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, ἐκκόψεις αὐτήν of P⁷⁵ and B in terms of word order, it does not really change the meaning of Lk 13.9.¹²⁹ The D text has the support of other important text witnesses such as P^{45vid} A W Θ Ψ f^{1.13} ̄̄̄ latt sy¹³⁰ with d whose word arrangement is et si quidem fecerit fructum si quominus in futurum euellis eam. At any rate, as far as textual support for D is concerned, what is significant is that there is a clear indication that there is an intentional adjustment or lucid paraphrasing that shaped the reading of the D text of Luke in the parable.¹³¹

The commonly held patristic interpretation of the parable of The Barren Fig Tree in Lk 13.6-9 is placed in the context of the relationship of Christ and his gospel with the Jewish people and their unfruitfulness due to their rejection of the Christian faith. For Ephrem (*Diatessaron Commentary* 14.26) The Barren Fig Tree supplies a historical allegory for the life of the Jews:

.מחיה כחיה מל דינת כחיה מל דינת כחיה מל דינת כחיה
 מל דינת כחיה מל דינת כחיה מל דינת כחיה מל דינת כחיה
 מל דינת כחיה מל דינת כחיה מל דינת כחיה מל דינת כחיה
 מל דינת כחיה מל דינת כחיה מל דינת כחיה מל דינת כחיה
 מל דינת כחיה מל דינת כחיה מל דינת כחיה מל דינת כחיה

¹²⁹See Yoder, "Language" (diss.), 481-506.

¹³⁰NA²⁷, 205.

¹³¹Metzger, *TCGNT* 1994², 137, thinks that because the reading εἰς τὸ μέλλον· εἰ δὲ μὴ γε is "the more difficult reading (attested by P⁷⁵ ̄̄ B L al), which involves aposiopesis (a sudden breaking off in the middle of a sentence), [it] was ameliorated in most witnesses [including D] by transposing so as to read εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, εἰς τὸ μέλλον".

Cyril of Alexandria is in general agreement with Ephrem that the captives were pruned to bear fruit through the Jerusalem captivity and the slaughter of the Jews by their enemies. Nonetheless, these Jewish captives still did not bear fruit. Cyril of Alexandria and Ambrose join Ephrem in explicitly equating the fig tree to the Jewish synagogue. However, Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 7.166) follows a different equation of the three years as Abrahamic covenant, Mosaic covenant and Christ's incarnation:

Venit ad Abraham, uenit ad Moysen, uenit ad Mariam, hoc est uenit in signaculo, uenit in lege, uenit in corpore. Aduentum eius ex beneficiis recognoscimus: alibi purificatio, alibi sanctificatio, alibi iustificatio est. Circumcisio purificauit, sanctificauit lex, iustificauit gratia: unus in omnibus et unum omnia. Nemo enim mundari potest nisi qui metuit dominum. Nemo legem meretur accipere nisi purificatus a culpa, nemo accedit ad gratiam nisi nouerit legem. Ergo populus Iudaeorum neque purificari potuit, quia circumcisionem non animi, sed corporis habuit, neque sanctificari, quia uirtutem legis ignorauit, qui carnalia magis quam spiritalia sequebatur—*lex autem spiritalis est*—neque iustificari, quia delictorum suorum paenitentiam non gerebat et ideo gratiam nesciebat.¹³⁴

It is interesting to note as well that whilst Ephrem views the additional year before the fig tree is cut down as the interim period until Christ comes back, Ambrose takes the dispensation of the Church or the preaching of the Gospel as the equivalent of this additional year given by the master.¹³⁵ In the same context Ephrem (*Diatessaron Commentary* 14.27) relates the three years of Christ's ministry and his current intercession with the three years of unfruitfulness of the fig tree and another year of opportunity for the fig tree to bear figs.¹³⁶ What is important for Ephrem is that Israel, then—during the exilic period and now—when Christ has been revealed, had sufficient time and opportunity to be fruitful.¹³⁷ Nevertheless, since there is no fruit found in Israel, just as the master did not get any fruit from the barren fig tree, Ephrem

¹³⁴Ambrose, SC 52:69-70. ET *EHGSL*, 303.

¹³⁵Cf. Wailes, *Medieval*, 221-2.

¹³⁶See *Éphrem: Commentaire*, 136-8. ET McCarthy, *Commentary*, 227.

¹³⁷Cf. Valavanolickal, *Use*, 260-4.

(*Diatessaron Commentary* 12.20) declares that the fig tree is cut down for it is thwarting the worship of God in the whole world:

כדיכדיה ופופפ כדילש כדומ כד'ק וכלה כד'ה ו'גוק
¹³⁸.כדילש וכלה

If Ephrem, Cyril of Alexandria and Ambrose look at the vineyard as representing the Jewish people and the fig tree as the synagogue, Origen and Augustine interpret the reference of fig tree in a broader way in terms of the fallen humanity. Both imply that the extra year chance given to the fig tree to bear fruit refers to the proclamation of the gospel. On the one hand, Origen (Fragment 204) sees the fig tree as representing Jerusalem, synagogue or humanity. For the three year visits of the master, Origen presents a variety of equivalents, broadly equates the periods from Adam to Moses, from the prophets to John the Baptist and the gospel:

Διαγράψωμεν οὖν καὶ ὡς ἐν συντόμῳ τὸν λόγον·
 συκῆ ἦτοι ἢ πόλις Ἱερουσαλήμ
 ἢ ἡ τῶν Ἰουδαίων συναγωγὴ
 ἢ ἡ ἀνθρωποτικῆς πᾶσα·
 οἰκοδεσπότης, οὗ τινος καὶ ἡ συκῆ ἦν,
 ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ
 ἦτοι αὐτὸς ὁ σωτήρ·
 ὁ δὲ ἀμπελουργὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.
 τρίτον δὲ λέγει ἐληλυθῆναι αὐτόν,
 τοῦτ' ἔστι διὰ Μωϋσέως, διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, δι' ἑαυτοῦ·
 ἦτοι πρῶτον ἔτος, καθ' ὃ πρῶτον τῷ Ἀδὰμ ἐνετείλατο λέγων· >ἀπὸ
 παντὸς ξύλου τοῦ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ βρώσει φάγη<
 καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς·
 δεύτερον, καθ' ὃν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ διὰ Μωϋσέως τῷ Ἰσραὴλ
 δέδωκεν ἐντολὰς·
 τρίτον, καθ' ὃ αὐτὸς δι' ἑαυτοῦ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τὸν τέλειον
 δέδωκε νόμον.
 ἢ πρῶτον ἔτος φησὶν, καθ' ὃν ἦν Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἀαρών·
 δεύτερον, καθ' ὃν ἦν Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ καὶ οἱ κριταί·

¹³⁸ *Ephrem: Commentaire*, 94. ET McCarthy, *Commentary*, 201.

τρίτον δέ, καθ' ὃν γεγονάσιν >οί προφηται μέχρις Ἰωάννου<
 τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ·
 τέταρτον τὸν τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως χρόνον, καθ' ὃν αὐτὸς διὰ
 τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τὴν τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείαν πᾶσιν
 εὐηγγελισατο.¹³⁹

On the other hand, the interpretation of Augustine (*Sermon* 254.3) is explicitly associated with the fall of humanity and the three years are the visits of God through the patriarchs, the law and the prophets and the gospel. His allegorical interpretation of the parable generally agrees with Origen:

Infructuosae arbori stercus adhibitum figura paenitentiae. Merito etiam Dominus dicit in Evangelio de quadam arbore infructuosa: *Jam ecce triennium est quod venio ad eam, et fructum in ea non inuenio: praecidam illam, ne mihi agrum impediatur.* Intercedit colonus: intercedit jam securi imminente infructuosis radicibus, et pene feriente; intercedit colonus, quomodo intercessit Deo Moyses; intercedit colonus, et dicit: *Domine, dimitte illam et hoc anno; circumfodio ei, et adhibeo cophinum stercoris: si fecerit fructum, bene; si quo minus, praecides eam* (*Luc.* XIII, 6, 9). Arbor ista genus est humanum. Visitavit istam arborem Dominus tempore Patriarcharum, quasi primo anno. Visitavit eam tempore Legis et Prophetarum, quasi secundo anno. Ecce in Evangelio tertius annus illuxit. Jam quasi praecidi debuit: sed interpellat misericors misericordem. Qui enim se volebat exhibere misericordem, ipse sibi opposuit intercessorem. Dimittatur, inquit, et hoc anno: circumfodiatur ei fossa; signum est humilitatis: adhibeatur cophinus stercoris, si forte det fructum. Imo quia dat fructum, ex parte non dat fructum, veniet Dominus ejus, et dividet eam (*Luc.* XII, 46). Quid est, dividet? Quia sunt boni, et sunt mali: modo autem in uno coetu, tanquam in uno corpore sunt constituti.¹⁴⁰

The D variant reading μὴ εὐρώων in Lk 13.6 could then underscore the continuing frustration on the part of the master in trying to find fruit from the fig tree as the Fathers consistently highlighted in their reading of the parable. Along any line of interpretation for the equivalent of the fig tree, whether the synagogue of the Jews—as that of Ephrem, Cyril of Alexandria or Ambrose, or the fall of humanity—as that of Origen and Augustine, the continuous frustration of the master for not getting any fruit is coherent with the reading of D. Thus, μὴ εὐρώων could be an allegorising variant that indicates the continuing fruitlessness of the fig

¹³⁹Origen, GCS 35:315-6. ET *HLFL*, 210.

¹⁴⁰Augustine, *PL* 38:1183. ET Augustine, *FC* 38:343-4.

tree that yet received another chance. For the Fathers see the barren fig tree as either the Jewish synagogue or fallen humanity that yet has a chance until Christ comes back. The Fathers' widely agreed interpretation of The Barren Fig Tree in Lk 13.6-9 as a historical allegory of Jewish people or human beings suggests that the text of The Barren Fig Tree in D reflects a representative mimesis either of the Jews or alternatively of all sinners. In any case the peculiar variant $\mu\eta\ \epsilon\upsilon\rho\omega\nu$ of D in Lk 13.6 is a convenient reading to allegorise the text when expounded in a sermon as referring to a continuous failure of the fig tree to give fruit. Hence, it should be cut down.

The additional imperative statement $\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\ \tau\eta\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\xi\epsilon\iota\nu\eta\nu$ in the D text of Lk 13.7 is an intentional allusive harmonisation with Mt 3.10 and/or Lk 3.9 that gives a clue as to how the passage should be understood. Perhaps, as this inserted variant is read in D, the audience will be reminded of John the Baptist's declaration on how every tree that does not provide the expected fruit will be axed and cast into the flames. Origen (*Homilies on Luke* 23.1) expresses this point of God's judgement as referring to unbelieving Israel in his comment on Lk 3.9:

Ioannes illo iam tempore loquebatur: *ecce, securis ad radicem arborum posita est*. Et si quidem iam ingrueret consummatio et temporum finis instaret, nulla mihi quaestio nasceretur. Dicerem enim hoc, quod ait: *ecce, securis ad radicem arborum posita est*, et illud: *omnis ergo arbor, quae non facit fructum bonum, praecidetur et in ignem mittetur*, propterea prophetatum, quia illo tempore complebatur. Cum autem tanta post saecula fluxerint et tam innumerabiles anni ab illo tempore usque ad praesentem diem transierint, quomodo Spiritus sanctus in propheta dicat: *ecce, securis ad radicem arborum posita est*, debemus inquirere. Ego puto Israhelitico populo prophetari, quod praecisio eius vicina sit. *His enim, qui egrediebantur ad eum, ut baptizarentur*, inter cetera loquebatur: *facite fructus dignos paenitentiae*, et quasi Iudaeis dicebat: *ne incipiatis dicere in vobismetipsis: patrem habemus Abraham*. *Dico enim vobis, quia potest Deus de lapidibus istis suscitare filios Abraham*. Hoc ergo, quod ait: *ecce, securis ad radicem arborum posita est*, Iudaeis loquitur.¹⁴¹

It would be plain, then, for an early Christian expositor to point out John the Baptist's words because the text is harmonised with an intertextual interpretative clue in order to understand

¹⁴¹Origen, SC 87:312. ET *HLFL*, 97.

And the Master answered and said to me, ‘Do you not understand that the fig-tree is the house of Israel? It is a like a man who planted a fig-tree in his garden and it brought forth no fruit. And he sought the fruit many years, and when he did not find it he said to the keeper of his garden, “Uproot this fig-tree so that it does not make our ground unfruitful.” And the gardener said to his master, “Let us rid it of weeds and dig the ground round about it and water it. If then it does not bear fruit, we will straightway uproot it from the garden and plant another in place of it.” Have you not understood that the fig-tree is the house of Israel?’¹⁴³

What is important here is that the three years of Lk 13.7 has been interpreted as

“many years” in the *Apocalypse of Peter* 2 and that the fig tree is Israel that has received its chance. In other words, as Origen (Fragment 203) points out, there was the last opportunity given before the tree is cut and the Gentiles were grafted:

Ἐοικε συκῆ παραβάλλειν (Titus v. B.) — πάντα τὰ ἔθνη· ἄλλως τε· συκῆ ἦν ἡ ἀνθρωπότης (Isid. v. P.) — ἐκτεμῶν αὐτούς. ἡ οὖν πρώτη ἀθέτησις (Isid. v. P.) — χάριτι παραίτησις. ἄλλοι δὲ τὸ τρισσῶς (Kyr. v. A.) — καὶ ἀπόβλητος γέγονεν. ἕτερον δὲ τέταρτον νοῆσαι τὴν τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως χρόνον, καθ’ ὃν νύττει καὶ περιορύττει τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, καταθερμαίνων αὐτόν, ἵνα ζέοντα τῷ πνεύματι ἀποτελέσῃ. ἐπειδὴ δὲ μετὰ τοσαύτας ἀπειλὰς ἔμειναν ἀκαρποὶ, ἐξεκόπη ἡ συκῆ καὶ ἐνεκεντρίσθη τὰ ἔθνη >εἰς τὴν ἐκείνων ῥίζαν<· ἔμεινε γὰρ ἡ ῥίζα· ἢ γεωργὸν δεῖ νοῆσαι ἀγγελὸν τινα παρὰ θεοῦ προσταχθέντα προΐστασθαι τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἣ καὶ συκῆ ἀκάρπῳ παραβάλλεται.¹⁴⁴

Both the *Apocalypse of Peter* and Origen have picked up the long period of time given to the fig tree to bear fruit, as emphasised in D. Thus the text of D could have been shaped by the concept of a longer time interval both in understanding the three years the master has been seeking fruit from the fig tree, as a symbolic period meaning “a long time” and that the one year the vinedresser requested to indicate another length of time. Perhaps, the representative

¹⁴³J. K. Elliott, ed., *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 601. See the discussion of Massaux, *Influence*, 2:109-10, on the literary dependence of *Apocalypse of Peter* 2 to Lk 13.6-9.

¹⁴⁴Origen, GCS 35:315. According to Rauer, the editor of GCS 35: “Das Scholion in d (D*) C ist aus den Autoren Orig., Titus, Kyrill und Isidor zusammengesetzt; der nich belegte Rest von 4 ἕτερον an dürfte dem Origenes gehören (das Lemma in D steht am Anfang des 2. Isidor-Scholions); in C folgt Fragm. 204”. This is not a real concern. For even if Origen is not the original source of the interpretative tradition cited, the fact that it is in the catena of patristic exegesis is sufficient enough to establish the parallel reading it provides for the reading of the D text. ET *HLFL*, 209.

mimetic implication of the D text of Lk 13.6-9 is that that the Jews have received a long period of time already, then and now, to bear fruit, but they have not done so.

Finally, Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 7.168-169) mentions *cofinum stercoris* which has a probable connection with *κόφινον κοπρίων* of D in Lk 13.8.¹⁴⁵ The highlight of D's reading is the mention of the measure of the fertilizer in a container. Perhaps, Ambrose simply transliterated the Greek *κόφινον* as Latin *cofinum*. Theodosia Tomkinson translates this phrase from Ambrose as "a basket of dung".¹⁴⁶ This view becomes more probable as Augustine (*Sermon* 254.3) puts it as *cophinum stercoris*.¹⁴⁷ Arthur Just translates the phrase from Augustine as "a load of manure",¹⁴⁸ whilst Mary Sarah Muldowney renders the phrase as "a quantity of dung".¹⁴⁹ The Itala supports the parallel reading *qualum stercoris* in d.¹⁵⁰ Probably, this is another form of allegorising variant reading. The general meaning of *κόφινον* is "probably a large, heavy basket for carrying things".¹⁵¹ The Latin *qualum* in d generally means "a wicker basket, or hamper, for various purposes".¹⁵² Both Ambrose and Augustine equate the dung that is placed to fertilise the fig tree as humility. It could be that the reference to *κόφινον κοπρίων* of D in Lk 13.8 as with Ambrose and Augustine is to accent the necessarily big measure of humility, i.e. a huge amount of dung, of Jews and sinners alike before God in order to be fruitful.¹⁵³ If the parable of The Barren Fig

¹⁴⁵Ambrose, SC 52:70-1. ET *EHGSL*, 304-5.

¹⁴⁶ET *EHGSL*, 304.

¹⁴⁷Augustine, *PL* 38:1183.

¹⁴⁸ET Just, *Luke*, 223.

¹⁴⁹ET Augustine, *FC* 38:344.

¹⁵⁰See the critical apparatus of *Luke*, IGNTP ed., 2:5.

¹⁵¹BDAG, 563.

¹⁵²Lewis and Short, *Latin*, 1504.

¹⁵³Two of the major Latin dictionaries in English do not have an entry for *cofinum*. See *OLD*, 1:343 and Lewis and Short, *Latin*, 360.

Tree in the D text of Lk 13.6-9 is read through the Fathers' eyes, D's distinctive readings could be explained as due to the influence of mimetic harmonisation and allegorising variants. The paraphrased reading of D makes it convenient for an ancient Christian expositor to expound on the parable's spiritual meaning as he takes for granted allegory and mimesis in his exposition of its text before the congregation.

The Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk 16.19-31)

The parable of The Rich Man and Lazarus in Lk 16.19-31 is another uniquely Lukan parable like The Barren Fig Tree in Lk 13.6-9. The reading of D specifies clearly that The Rich Man and Lazarus is a parable when it inserts εἶπεν δὲ καὶ ἑτέραν παραβολήν at the beginning, i.e. in verse 19, to introduce another parable in the narrative. The reading of D is supported by d when it reads dixit autem et aliam parabolam. In the obliteration of δέ in D and d they have the support of Δ* Θ 579 pc lat sy^{s.c} as they also delete δέ after ἄνθρωπος.¹⁵⁴ Both P⁷⁵ and B do not contain the introductory sentence to the parable in Lk 16.19, but P⁷⁵ provides a name for the rich man by inserting ὄνόματι Νευῆς.¹⁵⁵ The original scribe of D made a mistake by writing πλούσιον. A later hand corrected the error to πλούσιος. In the parallel Latin text it is diues. There is another mistake, this time uncorrected, in D within the same verse. Whilst D has the wrong spelling ἐνεδεδύσκετο both P⁷⁵ and B have the right spelling of the verb ἐνεδιδύσκετο. The insertion of καί between βύσσον and εὐφραινόμενος brings a direct grammatical connection between what the rich man wears and eats daily. In d, however, the conjunction is absent. An important insertion, τῶν ψιχῶν, in verse 21 is placed by D between ἀπό and τῶν πιπτόντων. This is another case of paraphrasing in the D text of Luke that intends to be a

¹⁵⁴NA²⁷, 214.

¹⁵⁵Metzger, *TCGNT* 1994², 140, suggests that Νευῆς could be a scribal mistake for Νινευῆς since there is a predominant Egyptian tradition that the name of the rich man in the parable was Nineveh which is included in the Sahidic version that could have been reflected by P⁷⁵.

mimetic cross-referencing with Mt 15.27.¹⁵⁶ The parallel d text reads *micis* supporting the insert in D. The other manuscripts that back up the reading of D and d, albeit with the spelling *ψιχίων* are \aleph^2 A W Θ Ψ *f*^{(1).13} 33 \aleph lat sy^{p,h} sa^{ms} bo^{pt}.¹⁵⁷ Both D and B has *πειπτόνων* whereas P⁷⁵ has *πιπτόνων*. The difference is only in spelling due to itacism in D and B. There is another difference but a minor one in verse 21. D has *ἔλειχον*, but B has *ἐπέλειχον*. Perhaps, the reading of D which has *ἔλειχον* simply refers to the “licking” of dogs,¹⁵⁸ whilst *ἐπέλειχον* pictures the “licking over” of wounds.¹⁵⁹ Unfortunately a clear reading of P⁷⁵ has not survived. However, because of the nature of the affinity of the Alexandrian manuscripts P⁷⁵ and B with one another it is more possible that they both read *ἐπέλειχον*. In verse 22, P⁷⁵ makes the deaths of the poor man and the rich man simultaneous by putting *ἐν τῷ* before *ἀποθανεῖν*. However, B and D, by not having *ἐν τῷ* before *ἀποθανεῖν*, read the story with an understanding of the death of the poor man occurring first and then later the rich man. Here, d supports D. In addition D reversed the word arrangement that apparently stresses the destination of Lazarus by placing *εἰς τὸν κόλπον Ἀβραάμ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων* instead of *ὑπο τῶν ἀγγέλων εἰς τὸν κόλπον Ἀβραάμ* of P⁷⁵ and B. Once again d follows the word arrangement of D. It is also notable that D, with the support of d and B, inserted *δέ* whereas P⁷⁵ omits it. The plural prepositional phrase *ἐν τοῖς κόλποις αὐτοῦ* of P⁷⁵ and B in verse 23, is put in the singular *ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ αὐτοῦ* in D, with the addition of the present passive participle *ἀναπαύμενον*. The reading in *sinus eius requiescentem* of d follows the D text. The addition of *ἀναπαύμενον* in D explains that Lazarus is not only with Abraham, but he is receiving comfort unlike the rich man who is experiencing anguish. The insertion of *ἀναπαύμενον*

¹⁵⁶So also is Metzger, *TCGNT* 1994², 141, who sees that the insertion of *τῶν ψιχίων* as a “more picturesque expression” brought in by the scribes from Mt 15.27. Cf. Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 99.

¹⁵⁷NA²⁷, 214.

¹⁵⁸See *λείχω* in LSJ, 1037.

¹⁵⁹See *ἐπιλείχω* in LSJ, 643.

in D is also supported by Θ l 2211 it.¹⁶⁰ In verse 24, D has ἐνφωνήσας instead of simply φωνήσας as in P⁷⁵ and B. Another minor grammatical difference is that the original hand of D has ὕδατον instead of the correct ὕδατος of P⁷⁵ and B. The reading of the last clause in Lk 16.26 of the D text is μητὲ ἐκεῖθεν ὧδε διαπεράσαι against μηδὲ ἐκεῖθεν πρὸς ἡμᾶς διαπερῶσιν of P⁷⁵ and B, however minor, still exhibits the alteration that has been acquired by the D text. It is notable, nonetheless, minor as it is, that Latin reading neque inde hic transmeare of d upholds the D text. In verse 27, D adds Ἄβραάμ to Πάτερ whereas in verse 28 D omits Ἰνα with τοῦτον put before τὸν τόπον, modifying the word arrangement of P⁷⁵ and B, and in verse 29 D changes the simple reading λέγει δὲ Ἄβραάμ of P⁷⁵ and B, to εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ Ἄβραάμ. Once again the reading of d follows D all the way through.

Finally, in the last two verses of Luke chapter 16, a couple of important textual alterations in D are noteworthy. The first one is in verse 30, where D is supported by B in using the verb πορευθῆ against ἐγερθῆ of P⁷⁵. The reading ierit of d backs up the reading of D. The second one is at the end of verse 31 where D reads ἀναστῆ καὶ ἀπέλθῆ πρὸς αὐτοὺς πιστεύσουσιν, whilst P⁷⁵ reads ἐγερθῆ πεισθήσονται, and B has ἀναστῆ πεισθήσονται. The parallel Latin text of d sustains the reading of D, as it has surrexerit et ierit ad eos credent. The reading πιστεύσουσιν of D in Lk 16.31 has the support of lat sy^{s.c.p} Ir^{lat}.¹⁶¹ Although P⁷⁵ and B in the parable of The Rich Man and Lazarus are diverse in reading at times, D exhibits more elaboration and diversion from them. It is notable how the variant readings of Lk 16.31 leads F. H. Chase to maintain that “the interpolated words are clearly a context-supplement, and come from verse 30, πορευθῆ πρὸς αὐτούς. But the variation in the verb (ἀπέλθῆ, πορευθῆ) implies the intervention of a [Sinaitic Syriac]

¹⁶⁰NA²⁷, 215.

¹⁶¹ NA²⁷, 215.

version”.¹⁶² Richard Bauckham argues that the reading could have been influenced by the reference to the resurrection of Jesus and thus the change from P⁷⁵’s ἐγερθῆ in 16. 30 and 31 to D’s πορευθῆ in verse 30 and ἀναστῆ καὶ ἀπελθῆ πρὸς αὐτούς πιστεύουσιν (instead of simply ἐγερθῆ πεισθήσονται).¹⁶³ In any case, whatever is the original text of Lk 16.31, it is not important for the purpose of the argument that the reading of D is an allegorising variant to make the parable a representative mimesis of Jesus, who resurrected from the dead and was yet refused by the Jews. Both ἐγείρω¹⁶⁴ and ἀνίστημι¹⁶⁵ were used by the Fathers to describe the resurrection of Jesus. However, ἀνίστημι in the patristic use has a connotation of the “resurrection of the body”.¹⁶⁶ The allegorical interpretations of Aphrahat, Ambrose and Augustine as well as Origen could be helpful to discern the presence of mimetic cross-referencing and allegorising variants in the paraphrased D text of the parable of The Rich Man and Lazarus as reflecting a Christological representative mimesis.

Aphrahat (*Demonstrations* 2.1) connects the Law and the Prophets to the parable of The Rich Man and Lazarus when he alludes to the words of Abraham emphasising:

¹⁶⁷.ܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ

Aphrahat is clearly referring here in this context to the law and the prophets, as equivalent to the twin commandment of loving God and neighbour. He asserts that the people who pursue the way of life of the rich man and his five brothers are those who are not won over by these twin commandments.¹⁶⁸ Aphrahat (*Demonstrations* 20.8) also equates the pauper Lazarus

¹⁶²Chase, *Syro-Latin Text*, 52.

¹⁶³Richard Bauckham, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, NovTSup 93 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 114-5.

¹⁶⁴See Lampe, *Patristic Lexicon*, 398-9. Cf. the New Testament use of ἐγείρω in *TDNT*, 2:333-7.

¹⁶⁵See Lampe, *Patristic Lexicon*, 145-6. Cf. the New Testament use of ἀνίστημι in *TDNT*, 1:368-72.

¹⁶⁶See Lampe, *Patristic Lexicon*, 146. Cf. Bauckham, *Fate*, 114-5.

¹⁶⁷Aphrahat, *PS* 1:48.3-4. ET Valavanolickal, *Use*, 290.

¹⁶⁸See Valavanolickal, *Use*, 290-1, for more detailed discussion.

Even Augustine (*Questions on the Gospels Book II* 38) follows the line of Aphrahat's interpretation in taking the rich man as the arrogant Jews and the poor man as the incarnate Christ. Augustine further sees the sores of Lazarus as the sufferings of the Lord's flesh over which the tongues of the Gentiles pass, with devotion, for it is the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ:

Aliter etiam intelligi potest ista narratio, ut per Lazarum Dominum significari accipiamus, jacentem ad januam illius divitis, quia se ad aures superbissimas Judaeorum incarnationis humilitate dejecit: *cupiens saturari de micis quae cadebant de mensa divitis*, quaerens ab eis vel minima opera justitiae, quae suae mensae, hoc est, suae potestati per superbiam non usurparent; quae opera misericordiae atque humilitatis, quamvis minima et sine disciplina et perseverantia vitae bonae, saltem interdum vel casu facerent, sicut micas de mensa cadere solent. Ulcera, passiones sunt Domini ex infirmitate carnis, quam pro nobis suscipere dignatus est. Canes ergo qui ea lingebant, Gentes sunt, quos homines peccatores et immundos dicebant Judaei, et tamen passiones Domini in Sacramentis corporis et sanguinis ejus, per totum jam orbem suavitate lambunt devotissima. Jam sinus Abrahae intelligitur secretum Patris quo post passionem resurgens assumptus est Dominus: quo eum portatum ab Angelis ideo dictum puto, quia ipsam receptionem qua in secretum Patris abscessit, Angeli annuntiaverunt discipulis intuentibus.¹⁷²

Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 8.13)¹⁷³ with Augustine (*Questions on the Gospels Book II* 38)¹⁷⁴ and Aphrahat look at the brothers of the rich man as figures of Jews, and after them the heretical people, who had Moses and the prophets as witnesses to the deity of Christ and the true existence of his resurrection from the dead, but yet rejected both Moses and the prophets.¹⁷⁵

The probable reference to the Gentiles in D's reading in the Fathers' eyes as referring to the dogs is highlighted by the mimetic harmonisation of the insertion of τῶν ψυχῶν in 16.21 which is an intertextual cross-referencing to the response of the Canaanite woman in

¹⁷²Augustine, *PL* 35:1352.

¹⁷³Ambrose, *SC* 52:105-6. ET *EHGSL*, 339-40.

¹⁷⁴Augustine, *PL* 35:1351-2. Cf. also Just, *Luke*, 260-4.

¹⁷⁵See Wailes, *Medieval*, 255-8, for the details of the allegorical interpretations of Ambrose and Augustine.

Mt 15.27. The notion of τῶν ψυχῶν in parallel verses of Mk 7.28 and Mt 15.27 is the same as Lk 16.21 as for the dogs to enjoy. This harmonising tendency in D is unique in comparison with the previous mimetic intertextual use of parallel parable readings that were expounded above. Another notable thing is that the Syro-phoenician Gentile woman in Mk 7.26 is made Phoenician only in D. The interpretation of the Fathers concerning this pericope is consistent. There is agreement among the patristic sources that the Canaanite woman represents the Gentiles.¹⁷⁶ Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 8.15) is a good example of this kind of mimetic harmonisation or intertextual cross-referencing:

Vtrumque ergo qui uolet tamquam Lazarus colligat. Cui similem illum puto, qui caesus saepius a Iudaeis ad patientiam credentium et uocationem gentium ulcera sui corporis lambenda quibusdam uelut canibus offerebat, quia scriptum est: *conuertentur ad uesperum et famem patientur ut canes*. Quod agnouit Chananitis illa mysterium, cui dicitur: *nemo tollit panem filiorum et mittit canibus*. Agnouit hunc panem non panem esse qui uidetur, sed illum qui intellegitur, et ideo respondit: *utique, domine; nam et catelli edunt de micis quae cadunt de mensa dominorum suorum*. Micae istae de illo pane sunt. Et quia panis uerbum est et fides uerbi est, micae uelut quaedam dogmata fidei sunt. Vnde respondit dominus, ut ostenderet fideliter dictum: *O mulier, magna est fides tua*.¹⁷⁷

Ambrose commends the Gentile woman who sees the crumbs as the tenets of faith. Like the D text, Ambrose connects Lk 16.21 with Mt 15.27. However, Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 8.16) unlike Aphrahat, equates Lazarus to Paul and the bread crumbs as the words of the Scriptures that nourish the Gentiles—those who ministered to Paul’s needs and who licked his sores:

O felicia ulcera, quae perpetuum excludunt dolorem! O uberes micae, quae repellitis ieiunium sempiternum, quae colligentem pauperem aeternis expletis alimentis! Abiciebat uos de mensa sua archisynagogus, cum prophetarum scripturarum et legis interna mysteria refutaret; micae enim sermones sunt scripturarum, de quibus dicitur: *et proiecisti sermones meos post te*. Abiciebat uos scriba, sed Paulus diligentissime colligebat in iniuriis suis legens plebem. Lambebant ulcera eius qui morsu serpentis intrepidum excusso serpente uiderunt et crediderunt. Lambebat ille carceris custos, qui uulnera Pauli lauit et credidit. Beati canes, in quos ulcerum talium destillat umor,

¹⁷⁶See Simonetti, *Matthew 14-28*, 1b:26-31. See also Oden and Hall, *Mark*, 100-2.

¹⁷⁷Ambrose, SC 52:106-7. ET *EHGSL*, 340-1.

form of the prepositional phrases in reference to Abraham's bosom. Origen (Fragment 223) gives his comment on the significance of the presence of Lazarus in Abraham's bosom:

Ἡβουλήθη τις ἀθετήσαι τὴν περὶ τοῦ πλουσίου καὶ τοῦ πένητος διήγησιν κατ' ἄγνοιαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὕτως ἐπαπορῶν· εἰ γὰρ ἀνέκειτό, φησιν, εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ὁ Λάζαρος, ἕτερος πρὸ τοῦ τοῦτον ἐχελθεῖν τὸν βίον ἀνέκειτο ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ καὶ πρὶν ἐκεῖνος ἄλλος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλου, φησὶν, δικαίου ἐξελθόντος ὁ πτωχὸς ὑπαναστήσεται. οὐ γὰρ ἐώρα τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ὁ περὶ τούτων ἐπαπορῶν, καὶ ὅτι δυνατὸν ἐστὶ μυρίους ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἅμα ἀναπαύεσθαι κοινωνοῦντας τῶν ἀποκαλυφθέντων αὐτῷ. καὶ γὰρ καὶ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀγαπητός, εἰ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐν τῷ δεῖπνῳ >εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ Ἰησοῦ< ἀνέκειτο, τοῦ γέρωσ τούτου ἀξιωθεὶς ὡς ἐξαιρέτου ἀγάπης κριθεὶς ἄξιος τῆς παρὰ τοῦ διδασκάλου, ἀλλὰ τοῦτο συμβολικῶς παρίστησιν, ὅτι τῷ λόγῳ Ἰωάννης ἀνακείμενος καὶ τοῖς μυστικωτέροις ἐναναπαυόμενος, ἀνέκειτο ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ λόγου, ἀνάλογον τῷ καὶ αὐτὸν εἶναι τὸν >μονογενῆ< λόγον >ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ πατρὸς< ἀναγεγράφθαι.¹⁸⁰

Perhaps, Origen's interpretation of Abraham's bosom is something that has been revealed and partaken by those who believed with Abraham. It could be, therefore, that the allegorical interpretation of Lazarus is Jesus and that the dogs who lick his body are to be seen as the Gentiles, as mimetically harmonised with the comment of the Canaanite woman in Mt 15.27. The poor man who is interpreted as Jesus is now resting in the place where Abraham comforts those who believed with him. As Origen puts it John is in the bosom of Jesus and the Son is in the bosom of the Father. Hence, Lazarus, as Jesus, is in the bosom of Abraham, which is the kingdom of heaven, according to Aphrahat.

It is appropriate at this point to end this current chapter with a summary-conclusion. The patristic theological epistemology and hermeneutics with the classical textual assumption and practice when combined together to understand the development of the textual history of the D text is rewarding. The reading process that moulded the Lukan parables of the D text appears to be dogmatic in nature. It is evident in the early Christian writings that the Fathers

¹⁸⁰Origen, GCS 35:324. ET *HLFL*, 217-8.

generally held an anti-Judaic attitude. This kind of dogmatism has been developed due to the ancient readers' source of knowledge and their perception of the meaning of the Gospel parables as the New Testament text thrived in the Gentile soil.¹⁸¹ There is an indication that the early Christian tradents of the D text showed a commitment to the exegetical tradition they received from the Fathers. Consequently, this manner of reading commitment of Lukan parables were informed by their historical conditioning and determined by their social prejudices as well. It should be mentioned again for the sake of clarification that I employ the terms variants and readings interchangeably and at times I combine them to put weight into the distinctiveness of what is preserved in the D text. What I call allegorising variants and mimetic readings or harmonisations function, apparently, as interpretative tools that could be fundamental for the earliest textual perception, literary meaning and hermeneutical principles assumed by the Christian tradents who transmitted the D text of Luke. It is equally important to stress, on the one hand, the way I use the expressions "allegorising" or "allegorical" as to a fixed reference to an understanding of meaning that denotes metaphorical, representational, or figurative. In case of the early Church allegorical meaning is taken for granted as spiritual in nature. On the other hand, my use of the terms "mimesis" or "mimetic" is very fluid. As I defined mimesis in the first chapter the reference entails the relationship of a text with other texts and the reality of life. Consequently, the connotation of the word mimesis when employed to the interface between texts would include harmonisation, intertextuality or cross-referencing. In broad description this textual practice is literary imitation, albeit cannot be strictly limited to written text alone. It also embraces the art form of representation and the oral aspect of texts. Likewise, the concept of mimesis in a written text such as D presupposes a representation of the realities in the life of a society. This chapter presents the parables in the D text of Luke that could have been shaped by an

¹⁸¹See the fine monograph of Roderic L. Mullen, *The Expansion of Christianity: A Gazetteer of Its First Three Centuries*, SupVigChr 69 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2004).

anti-Judaic bias of the early Christian tradents. Therefore the tradents of the D text of the third Gospel represent the attitude that the early Church had toward the Jews. The examples taken here are utilised to depict the answer to the question of the penetration of allegory and mimesis into the New Testament text as well as the theological moulding of the parables in the D text of Luke in the early Christian liturgical setting.¹⁸² The generally held anti-Judaic attitude of the early Church is taken for granted as the prime reference of the mimetic representation in the identified Lukan parables in the D text.

¹⁸²See the instructive article of Patrick McGoldrick, "Liturgy: The Context of Patristic Exegesis", in *Scriptural Interpretation in the Fathers: Letter and Spirit*, eds. Thomas Finan and Vincent Twomey (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1995), 27-37.

CHAPTER 5

FAITH-SEEKING UNDERSTANDING AND LUKAN PARABLES

This chapter seeks to depict the effect of the homilies of the early Christian tradents in a liturgical setting, that were preached from the Gospel of Luke in the D text.¹ The three extant commentary-homilies on the Gospel of Luke by Origen, Ambrose and Cyril of Alexandria will be the limit of parallels from patristic sources.² The aim of this restriction is to exhibit how the Lukan parables in the D text have been theologically moulded by the influence of the patristic type of allegorical interpretation and the mimetic intertextual reading as well as the representative mimesis of life in the process of the textual tradition's transmission in liturgy, catechism or sermon. The selection of Lukan parables, as preserved in the D text, that are investigated in this chapter pertain to matters related to the Church's assurance and conviction. As Wiles succinctly puts it: "Writers who are anxious to find scriptural arguments in support of their own particular understanding of Christian duty or Christian truth at that moment are only too ready to turn the parables to their own advantage".³ On the one hand, all the parables examined in this chapter are good illustrations

¹Holmes argues that the harmonisation, expansion and improvement of the Matthean D text were editorial activity. However, it is probably different in the case of the D text of Luke. The localised contextual exegeses of the Lukan parables, in the fashion of Bartsch's proposal, could have germinated marginal catenae earlier in the ancestry of the D text of Luke. Later, these glosses penetrated the D text of Luke in the process of its reading performance in the local congregations who possessed the text in the manner that Mees conceived. CroweTipton's use of reader-response criticism in Acts to explain the unusual reading in the D text would be useful. Perhaps, his use of a socio-rhetorical reading of Peter in Acts to illuminate the D text's unique variants would inform the socio-rhetorical reading of the parables examined in this chapter. The difference, however, between CroweTipton's approach and mine is that whilst he reconstructed a restricted symbolic world that would fit to his thesis on Peter, I set my inquiry in a broader literary mimetic context of Christian-Jewish conflicts and Christian-pagan ethics. My assumptions are reflected in the patristic literature that probably shaped the readings of the Lukan parables in the D text. The approach that I have taken is similar to the manner that Ehrman does in his broader application of alterations in the text of the New Testament in the light of the issues and conflicts of the early Church. Likewise, Read-Heimerdinger's approach in Acts where she assumed a Jewish exegetical technique to explain the unique readings of the D text is further explored. However, the difference in my assumption with Read-Heimerdinger is that I take the D text of Luke as shaped by the Graeco-Roman literary setting than that of the Syro-Palestinian. See the literature review in Chapter 2.

²See footnote 1 of Chapter 4, 156.

³Wiles, "Early", 299.

of how they were allegorically interpreted by the three Fathers in their commentaries on Luke.⁴ However, only half of them are harmonised with their Matthean counterpart in the D text of Luke.⁵ The materials discussed in this chapter could easily be judged as a truism of what believers in Jesus accept as doctrinal truth and also as revealing the Christian devotion. Thus, the treatment of these parables as mimesis of Christian life and their received allegorical interpretation as reflected in the D text, are presented as credible enough for the theory advanced in this dissertation, with the help of the three Fathers. However, in discerning the degree of probability on the influence of mimesis and allegory on the parables in the D text of Luke, it should be admitted that this pair more probably influenced some parables than the others. Some examples given are at best only to be taken as not impossibly influenced by this pair of ancient approaches to interpretation.⁶

The early tradents who interpreted and transmitted the Gospel parables could have contributed to the altered form of the D text of Luke. However, this supposed corruption of the Lukan text, which is evident in D, provides data for understanding and reconstructing the history of the third Gospel's text. What modern textual critics view as a distortion⁷ of Luke was actually a representation of how the early tradents of the Gospel understood what the text is all about.⁸ The variant readings developed in the process project the dynamic life of the

⁴The basis of this approach is according to the manner that Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, and Dawson, *Allegorical*, describe.

⁵The practice assume here is either due to oral—Nagy, *Homeric Responses*, or textual—Pucci, *Polutropos*, or both. The bottom line is the correct postulate that there was cross-referencing for interpretative purpose in the development of harmonisation of Luke's account of the parables with Matthew's.

⁶This is a supposition on mimetic reading of the Gospel parables in line with the debate between Plato and Aristotle as discussed earlier in 117-20.

⁷Cf. Wisse, *Profile*, 134-6.

⁸Bart D. Ehrman, "Text and Tradition: The Role of New Testament Manuscripts in Early Christian Studies. Lecture One: Text and Interpretation: The Exegetical Significance of the 'Original' Text", *TC* 5 (2000): n.p. [cited 4 July 2004]. Online: <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol05/Ehrman2000a.html>, asserts that a proper understanding of textual variations is crucial:

8. No one knows for sure *how many* differences there are among our surviving witnesses, simply because no one has yet been able to count them all. The best estimates put the number at around

textual tradition that eventually fossilised in the D text of Luke. The formation of the interpretation of the text is influenced by oral tradition. Perhaps, the analogy of the Hebrew Bible's dynamic interaction between the *ketib*, i.e. what is "written", and the *qere*, i.e. what is "said", can illustrate the plausible process of how the marginal reading and the textual tradition correlated. The function of *ketib* and *qere* does not necessitate any discussion here for it is very familiar and can be taken for granted. It is plausible enough to adopt the view that perhaps since the gloss is pronounced with or instead of the text itself, this side reading from the margin established itself as the true meaning of the text. An allegorising gloss or mimetic harmonising reading could have been placed at the margin of a grandparent of the D text. The model provided by the marginal catena of Codex Ξ that was discussed earlier makes this reconstruction of the D text's history plausible enough. The function of the marginal note could be generally regarded as interpretative in nature and thereby orally performed. But later on, the gloss could have displaced the original text. Hence, the glossal interpretative reading or marginal catena reference turns into the received orally performed text and becomes the text, or part of the text itself. As soon as this happens a marginal reading penetrates the textual tradition. Therefore, the exegetical reading, understood as the true meaning of the text, became the text that is orally performed before the exposition of the text is made in Christian meetings.

300,000, but perhaps it's better to put this figure in comparative terms. There are more differences among our manuscripts than there are words in the NT.

9. As one might expect, however, these raw numbers are somewhat deceptive. For the vast majority of these textual differences are easily recognized as simple scribal mistakes, errors caused by carelessness, ineptitude, or fatigue. The single largest category of mistake is orthographic; an examination of almost any of our oldest Greek manuscripts will show that scribes in antiquity could spell no better than most people can today. Scribes can at least be excused on this score: they lived, after all, in a world that was for the most part without dictionaries, let alone spell check.

10. Other textual variants, however, are significant, both for the interpretation of the NT texts and for our understanding of the social world within which these texts were transmitted. The importance of establishing a hypothetically "original" text has always been fairly self-evident to historians; you can't know what an author *meant* if you don't know what he or she *said*. The importance of *variant* readings, however, has rarely been as self-evident to historians, although it is now becoming the most exciting area of study in this field. For once it is known what an author wrote, one can ask why the text came to be changed by later scribes living in different circumstances. Is it possible that Christian scribes in the second, third, and fourth centuries, for example, modified the texts they copied for reasons of their own, possibly to make them *say* what they were supposed to *mean*?

Joël Delobel's reminder that textual criticism and exegetical analysis of a biblical text are "Siamese twins", although referring to contemporary issues in textual criticism, is applicable even to the ancient tradents who shaped the readings of the D text of Luke. For as Delobel sharply argues, on the one hand, a chosen reading by a textual critic from among the extant variants of a passage is based upon his exegesis of that passage; but on the other hand, one's exegetical examination of a passage relies arbitrarily on his preferred variant reading.⁹ In connection with Delobel's point, the parables in the third Gospel investigated below in the light of their spiritual interpretations by the Church Fathers and other early extra-biblical literature are an attempt to show that some of the variant readings that are fossilised in the D text were due to the influence of allegorical interpretation of the parables cited. In this manner the D text of Luke has been localised in the performance reading of its fluid textual tradition as suggested previously by Hans-Werner Bartsch.¹⁰ The readings of these popular parables of Jesus in the Lukan account with that of the Matthean account were harmonised through their hermeneutical role in the history of understanding of the D text, as these Gospels were circulated among the early Christian communities. To put it differently, the allegorising variants and the mimetic readings in the D text of Luke were formed through exegetical intentions and not because of philological reasons (as against A. J. Wensinck's suggestion).¹¹ The exegetical influence of the reading of the D text, is connected (as suggested by Michael Mees) within the framework of Luke's literary context, and the mimetic harmonisation of Luke and Matthew, as well as the message of Christ in the setting of liturgy and catechism.¹² In the setting of liturgy and catechism, the faith-seeking

⁹Joël Delobel, "Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Siamese Twins?", in *Textual Criticism*, 98-117.

¹⁰See Chapter 2 on Bartsch, 69-74.

¹¹See Chapter 2 on Wensinck, 56-8.

¹²See Chapter 2 on Mees, 58-62.

understanding of allegorical interpretation and interpretative harmonisation of parable readings from Luke could very well be developed to edify and guide the faithful.¹³

Eight parables are examined in this chapter. It is necessary to present the claim that these parables in the D text of Luke are influenced by mimesis and allegory with different levels of probabilities. The practical reason is the availability of evidence to support the claims for the parables examined in this chapter. The distinctive readings in the following Lukan parables in D are explained with the aid of the extant commentaries of Origen, Ambrose and Cyril of Alexandria. It is appropriate to use their commentaries because they were actual expositions of Luke's text that were delivered side by side with the oral reading of the third Gospel. These eight parables are taken as representative of the unique Lukan parables recorded only in the third Gospel and the parables in Luke with parallel Synoptic accounts. The chosen examples of variant readings attempt to show in different ways how allegory and mimesis could have moulded the parables in the D text of Luke. The order of the parables probed in this chapter is presented according to their degree of probability. Two parables, one with double or triple accounts in the Gospels and another, peculiar only to Luke, are investigated for each degree of probability based on the indices stated earlier. The exception is the parable of The Harvest and Labourers in Lk 10.2 placed at the end of this chapter. Although this parable saying has a parallel at Mt 9.37-38, there is no attempt at all in the D text to harmonise them. As the text of Luke was read in different socio-cultural contexts its readers' understanding varies. Thus, the parables in the D text of Luke were interpreted to meet the needs of the particular community that reads them.¹⁴

¹³Cf. Graham, *Beyond*, 122-5. Graham, *Beyond*, 124, notes that usually "in connection with the liturgical reading, the scriptural word was also constantly spoken and heard in the sermon, which most often took the form of either a cento from scripture or exegesis of a scriptural passage". For a full discussion on the use of Scripture in the liturgy and catechism see J. A. Lamb, "The Place of the Bible in the Liturgy", in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, Vol. 1, *From the Beginnings to Jerome*, ed. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 563-86.

¹⁴This includes even the Gnostics. The article of Henriëtte W. Havelaar, "The Use of Scripture in the Coptic Gnostic Apocalypse of Peter (*NHC* VII, 3), in *The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World*, eds. L. V. Rutgers et al., BET 22 (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 221-33, especially 225-30, which investigates on how the

Parables Probably Influenced by Allegory and Mimesis

The influence of representative mimesis with allegorical interpretation and mimetic harmonisation in the parable of The Sower (Lk 8.4-15) is most probable. This parable is well used by the Fathers such as Origen, Ambrose and Cyril of Alexandria. Furthermore, the *Gospel of Thomas* also preserved a parallel account of The Sower. Although The Servant's Reward (Lk 17.7-10) does not show any mimetic cross-referencing, it is probably shaped by allegorical interpretation. Nonetheless, it is more probable than not that this parable is oriented as a representative mimesis of Christian life for the early Church. Ambrose and Cyril of Alexandria cite this parable in reference to God who demands from believers the service of slaves and rewards them with generosity.

The Sower (Lk 8.4-15)

Another interesting Lukan parable is The Sower in Lk 8.4-8. This parable is most interesting because it also appears in Mt 13.1-9, Mk 4.1-9 and the *Gospel of Thomas* 9. Jesus himself also provides the interpretation of The Sower in all the three Synoptic Gospels (Mt 13.18-23, Mk 4.13-20 and Lk 8.11-15). The Matthean and Markan accounts of The Sower place the setting where Jesus told the parable at the seashore. However, Luke abandons the setting of the two other Synoptic Gospels and places it in a town setting. In all the Synoptic accounts there is an interlude where Jesus explains to his disciples why he is teaching in parables and that they as his followers have access to the meaning of his parables. The text of The Sower in Lk 8.4-15 in P⁷⁵ is almost as full as in B. Only a couple of verses, 4 and 5, are not complete in P⁷⁵, although some words and traces of them survived in the manuscript copy. When B is compared with what is left of P⁷⁵ in Lk 8.4-5 it is apparent that their texts

Gnostics utilised the parables in Luke and Matthew to give light to their doctrines is telling. Havelaar describes how Apocalypse of Peter uses many materials from the New Testament but only in an allusive way where the Gnostic commentary becomes part of the quoted text. The words of Jesus, the parables in particular, were taken by the author of the Apocalypse of Peter as a source of authority, albeit interpreted differently than the mainstream Gospel writings in the New Testament.

are very close, although not identical. The few differences between them will be discussed as the analysis of their differences with the D text progresses.

Even in the introduction to the parable in Lk 8.4, the very first word in D is already altered. Whilst B uses *συνιόντος*, D employs *συνελθόντος*. Although B and D employed different words, they are nonetheless synonymous in their usage.¹⁵ The crucial point here is that there is an indication from the very beginning of The Sower that the D text is adjusted to what is fitting to the eyes of the tradents that transmitted its textual tradition. In addition, B has the preposition *κατά* to go with *πόλιν* in the same verse. The use of B of *κατά πόλιν* is consistent with Lk 8.1. However, D uses a definite article and makes the reading *τὴν πόλιν*. The difference is that B describes Jesus' audience when he utters The Sower as gathering from many places, but D just specifies the people as coming from the town where Jesus was at that moment. Additionally in the same verse, B spells out the means of Jesus in teaching by rendering *εἶπεν διὰ παραβολῆς*.¹⁶ But D amends its reading to *εἶπεν παραβολὴν τοιαύτην πρὸς αὐτούς*. Perhaps, the D text's utilisation of *παραβολὴν τοιαύτην* reflects an emphasis on the following parable of The Sower as a form of Jesus' teaching.¹⁷ Unlike B that accents The Sower as an instrument to convey the message of Jesus in its use of *διὰ παραβολῆς*, D is specific in indicating that The Sower is a parable of Jesus. The prepositional phrase *πρὸς αὐτούς* is D's attempt to make its reading parallel to the reading of Mt 13.3, *ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς*, and Mk 4.2, *ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς*.¹⁸ The reading *congregato autem populo multo et qui ad ciuitatem iter faciebant ad eum dixit*

¹⁵See BDAG, 968, for *σύνειμι*; and BDAG, 969-70, for *συνέρχομαι*. Cf. LSJ, 1705, for *σύνειμι*; and LSJ, 1712, for *συνέρχομαι*. Cf. also Lampe, *Patristic Lexicon*, 1317, for *σύνειμι*; and Lampe, *Patristic Lexicon*, 1324, for *συνέρχομαι*. Note that Mt 13.2 employs *συνήχθησαν* in B and D, whereas Mk 4.1 uses *συνάγεται* in B and *συνήχθη* in D.

¹⁶Both Mt 13.3 and Mk 4.2 has *ἐν παραβολαῖς*. This is understandable because the allusion is not only on The Sower. The reference in Matthew and Mark is more inclusive of the totality of the parables of Jesus.

¹⁷See the nuances of meaning of the word *τοιούτος* in BDAG, 1009-10.

¹⁸See Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 93.

parabolam talem ad eos of d in Lk 8.4 clearly supports D. What is vital in this verse is that it indicates the setting of The Sower. Moreover, there is a clear indication in D of intentional textual changes and that the text is paraphrased to conform to Matthew's account, even from the very beginning of the pericope.¹⁹

In Lk 8.5, D has three omissions. The first one is D's omission of τοῦ before σπεῖραι. This omission is to make the reading parallel to Mt 13.3 in D. Although it is also possible that Mk 4.3 influences D, it is more likely that the influence is from the D text of Mt 13.3.²⁰ Mk 4.3 in D totally deletes τοῦ σπεῖραι whilst B has only σπεῖραι without τοῦ. Both Mt 13.3 and Lk 8.5 in D reads ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων σπεῖραι.²¹ Secondly, αὐτόν after σπείρειν is deleted in D. Perhaps, this is due to homoioteleuton. Since both σπείρειν and αὐτόν end with ν there could have been a scribal oversight. Again, although both Mk 4.4 and Mt 13.4 could have influenced D, it is more likely that it is the Matthean account that has influenced Lk 8.5.²² Mk 4.4 in B reads καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπείρειν without αὐτόν and obliterates τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. This seems to be similar reading to that of Lk 8.5. But since Mk 4.4 is a shorter narration of the seeds on the path that are taken by the birds, it is highly improbable that it influenced the longer description of Lk 8.5. Besides, Mk 4.4 is the verse in the Synoptic Gospels that has the verb ἐγένετο. No manuscript of Matthew and Luke employs the Markan ἐγένετο. Furthermore, the D reading of Mk 4.4 makes it unlikely that it shapes the reading of Lk 8.5 in D. Mk 4.4 in D reads καὶ ἐν τῷ σπεῖραι but inserts τοῦ οὐρανοῦ after τὰ πετεινά. Therefore, assuming that the omission of αὐτόν in D is due to

¹⁹It is more likely that the D text of Luke harmonises with Matthew than with Mark as the work of Massaux, *Influence*, 3 Vols.: passim, has shown in his work broadly. It is just proper to assume that Matthew was more popular than Mark in the ancient Church. See more of the discussions on readings in Lukan D that harmonise with Matthew below.

²⁰Contra Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 93.

²¹Mt 13.3 in B inserts τοῦ before σπείρειν.

²²Contra Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 93, whose only basis of assuming that Mk 4.4 is what the D text of Lk 8.5 follows due to the non existence of αὐτόν in Mark's account against its presence in Mt 13.4 in the readings of both B and D.

unintended scribal error, Lk 8.5b harmonises well with Mt 13.4. Granting that αὐτόν is really intended by D to be part of its reading, in Lk 8.5b it would read καὶ ἐν τῷ σπείρειν [αὐτόν] ὃ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ κατεπατήθη καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ κατέφαγεν αὐτό. Mt 13.4 in D reads καὶ ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτόν ἃ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, καὶ ἦλθον τὰ πετεινὰ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτά. Indeed, it is Matthew that shapes the reading of the D text of Luke in this particular case instead of Mark. Thirdly, D obliterates τοῦ οὐρανοῦ and it is supported by W *pc* it sy^{s.c.p.}.²³ Bruce M. Metzger gives his balanced opinion on the matter:

The absence of τοῦ οὐρανοῦ from several witnesses, chiefly Western (D W it^{a, b, d, e, ff², l, q} syr^{c, s, p}), is due either to scribal assimilation to the parallels in Mt 13.4 and Mk 4.4, or to deliberate excision because the words seemed inappropriate in an allegorical reference to the devil (compare ver. 12). In any case, Luke always adds τοῦ οὐρανοῦ to τὰ πετεινὰ (9.58; 13.19; Ac 10.12; 11.16).²⁴

As argued above, the harmonising pattern of the Lukan text of D is to assimilate the familiar and popular reading of Matthew in its textual tradition. Accordingly, if it is because of direct harmonisation that shaped the reading of D in deleting τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, it is Mt 13.4 that the D

²³NA²⁷, 180.

²⁴Metzger, *TCGNT* 1971¹, 144. The comment of Cyril of Alexandria (Fragment 168) is most helpful in seeing the plausibility of Metzger's suggestion:

Ἴδωμεν ὡς ἐν παχέσι πράγμασι, τί ἐστὶ τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ εἶναι. σκληρὰ καὶ ἀνόνητός πῶς ἐστὶ πᾶσα ὁδὸς διὰ τὸ τοῖς ἀπάντων ὑποκεῖσθαι ποσὶ καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῇ ἐγγώνυται τῶν σπερμάτων, κείται δὲ μᾶλλον ἐπιπολῆς καὶ τοῖς ἐθέλουσι τῶν πτηνῶν ἔτοιμα εἰς διαρπαγὴν. οὐκοῦν οἱ τὸν νοῦν ἔχουσιν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς σκληρὸν καὶ οἶον πεπιλημένον, οὗτοι τὸν θεῖον οὐ παραδέχονται σπόρον, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασι πεπατημένη γέγονασιν ὁδός· ταῦτα γὰρ ἐστὶ >>τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ<<. οὐρανὸν δὲ ἐνταῦθα τὸν ἄερα νοοῦμεν, ἐν ᾧ τὰ τῆς πονηρίας πνεύματα στρέφονται, ὑφ' ὧν καὶ τὸ καλὸν σπέρμα διαρπάζεται καὶ ἀπόλλυται. τίνες δὲ καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας; εἰσὶ τινες ἀπεριέργως ἔχοντες τὴν πίστιν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς, τὸν δὲ νοῦν οὐ καθιέντες εἰς τὴν τοῦ μυστηρίου βάσανον. οὗτοι κούφην τε καὶ ἀνάριζον ἔχουσι τὴν εἰς θεὸν εὐσέβειαν. κἂν μὲν ἐξ οὐρίας φέρηται τὰ Χριστιανῶν πράγματα οὐδενὸς αὐτὰ καταχειμάζοντος πειρασμοῦ, σφύζουσι τῆνικάδε μόλις ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐκείνοι τὴν πίστιν, θορυβήσαντος δὲ διωγμοῦ ἀφιλοπρόλεμον ἔχουσιν τὴν ψυχὴν.

Cyril of Alexandria, "Fragments", 207-8. ET Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:265. Cf. also Cyril of Alexandria, *PG* 72:625 and *SCAACLE*, 40. ET *CGSL*, 178. Cyril in his commentary on Luke mentions the role of the unclean spirits to make the hearts of people unfruitful, albeit there is no specific equation made to the birds of heaven with demonic activity that takes the word of God from those who heard it. But since Cyril of Alexandria makes an exhortation to drive the fowls away from the heart in order that the seed of the word may remain in one's heart he implies that the fowls are equated with demons that he mentioned earlier in his commentary.

text of Lk 8.5 has followed. The D text of Luke is unlikely to have followed Mk 4.4 because as noted above Markan D has τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Nevertheless, it is more likely that τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is obliterated in the D text of Lk 8.5 as Metzger already noted because of an allegorical interpretative reason. The second alternative of Metzger fits well with the harmonising tendency of the Lukan D text with Matthew's reading for mimetic and allegorising reasons. It is also noteworthy that d follows the reading of D and does not contradict it. Furthermore, *Gospel of Thomas* 9 also supports the obliteration of τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.²⁵ In Lk 8.6-8, D is consistent in replacing P⁷⁵ and B's ἕτερος with ἄλλος in referring to the different seeds that fell in different grounds.²⁶ Once again Mt 13.5-8, in its use of the plural ἄλλα in both B and D could have influenced Lk 8.6-8 in D.²⁷ It is interesting that Mk 4.5-8 is not consistent in using the singular or plural form of ἄλλος in both B and D. In verse 5, B has the singular ἄλλο but D has the plural ἄλλα. Both D and B reads the singular ἄλλο in verse 7. However, B employs the plural ἄλλα whilst D uses the singular ἄλλο in verse 8.²⁸ In any case the consistency of the Matthean use of the plural ἄλλα in both D and B fits well among other harmonised readings with Matthew in the D text of Luke. The singular reading ἄλλο of Luke in D is also grammatically consistent with the verb ἔπεσεν as well as with ἕτερον of P⁷⁵ and B. Hence, although there is an obvious harmonisation in the D text of Luke, the reader can still immediately distinguish it from Matthew's text. This textual phenomenon, as already discussed earlier, is one of the indications of the compositional mimesis, i.e. a literary imitated text should still reflect a

²⁵See the reading of *Thomas* 9 below on 241.

²⁶For the discussion of the use of ἕτερος and ἄλλος see Chapter 4, 184.

²⁷Except for ἄ in D at the beginning of Mt 13.5 that could be another homoioteleuton both B and D utilise the plural form ἄλλα all throughout. Even if ἄ is a result of an intentional modification it is still in the plural that makes its use grammatically consistent.

²⁸See Metzger, *TCGNT* 1994², 71, on the discussion of the assimilation of ἄλλα to ἄλλο in Mk 4.5, 7 and its bearing on the textual problem of ἀύξανόμενα in verse 8. The reading followed by NA²⁷ and UBS⁴ in Mk 4.8 is ἄλλα.

clear distinction from its source.²⁹ Additionally, in verse 6, whilst P⁷⁵ and B have the compound verb κατέπεσεν, D has the simple verb ἔπεσεν. Further, D also inserted the definite article τὴν before πέτρων. In verse 7, P⁷⁵ with B employs the prepositional phrase ἐν μέσῳ whereas D uses the adverb μέσον. Moreover, in the same verse, P⁷⁵ with the reading συμφύσαι spells it differently from B which has συμφυεῖσαι and D which has συνφυεῖσαι. Another spelling differences in verse 8 is P⁷⁵'s ἑκατονταπλασίονα and B's ἑκατονταπλασεῖονα wherein D follows the spelling of P⁷⁵. In the preceding evaluation of variations in word forms and dissimilar spellings the meaning of any of the texts cited is not affected. However, in the D text of Lk 8.8 another harmonisation with Mt 13.8 is evident when P⁷⁵ and B's εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν is modified and expanded in D to become ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν καὶ καλήν.³⁰ This reading has the support of d which reads super terram bonam et uberam. The reading ἀγαθὴν καὶ καλήν of D finds support also among a few other Latin manuscripts and the Syriac Peshitta which reads ܩܘܿܕܿܫܿܐܿܐ ܩܘܿܕܿܫܿܐܿܐ.³¹ Mt 13.8 reads ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλήν. What is apparent here is that the replacement of εἰς with the preposition ἐπὶ and the addition of the adjective καλήν in the D text of Lk 8.8 are deliberate changes and an attempt to harmonise with the Matthean reading. What is observable in this Lukan D's harmonisation with Matthew is that there is consistency throughout the whole parable that extends to the interlude in verses 9 and 10 until the interpretation of The Sower in verses 11 up to 15. Furthermore it is also observable that there is a shift of wordings in Lk 8.8 and 8.15 in the D text, where D adds καὶ καλήν after ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν in 8.8, but obliterates καλήν καὶ between ἐν καρδίᾳ and ἀγαθῇ in 8.15.³²

²⁹See 120-7 in Chapter 3. Cf. my treatment of the parable of The Pounds, especially 193-5.

³⁰See Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 93.

³¹See George Anton Kiraz, ed., *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels: Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshittâ and Harklean Versions*, Vol. 3, *Luke*, NTTs 21.3 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996), 139.

³²See further discussion of this textual variation of D against P⁷⁵ and B below.

In Lk 8.9 the difference between P⁷⁵ and D is just the arrangement of words and an insertion of a neuter article. Thus whilst P⁷⁵ renders the text as τίς αὕτη εἶη ἡ παραβολή D presents the reading as τὸ τίς εἶη ἡ παραβολή αὕτη. B in this case follows the reading of P⁷⁵ but deletes ἡ. Although there is not much difference in the meaning between P⁷⁵ and D, it could help the following verse 10 in its emphasis on the enigma of the parable, perchance, by putting the optative εἶη after τίς in this verse.³³ This insinuation is not impossible, especially if the change of word arrangement is understood in the context of reading the text aloud and an accent on key words can be verbalised. Perhaps, this stress on the riddle of The Sower is further enhanced by the rearrangement of words in D locating τὰ μυστήρια at the beginning of the clause and positioning γνῶναι at the end of verse 10. As a result whereas P⁷⁵ and B present Lk 8.10 as γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, D sets its reading τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ γνῶναι in a notable order of words with a possible emphasis on the notion of mystery. This flow of thought about the mystery of the parable is further supplemented by D's harmonisation with Mt 13.14.³⁴ Unlike the reading βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν of P⁷⁵ and B, the D text in Lk 8.10, with the support of L W Ξ 1. 700. 2542 *pc*, reads the text as βλέποντες μὴ ἴδωσιν.³⁵ This is a probable intertextual harmonisation with Mt 13.14 which reads βλέποντες βλέψεται καὶ οὐκ μὴ ἴδητε in D. The reading of B is similar except that it has βλέψετε in the place of βλέψεται. The reading of d uses the verb video throughout in both the Lukan and Matthean accounts. Thus the Latin does not make any distinction between βλέπω and ὄρώ. Once more the verbal similarity and yet different morphological forms of Lukan D's

³³For the discussion of the emphasis of a reading through word arrangement see 168-9 of this present volume.

³⁴Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 93.

³⁵See NA²⁷, 180.

ἴδωσιν and Matthean ἴδητε shows an apparent mimetic harmonising effort in the part of the D text of Luke.

It is significant that Lk 8:11 makes it explicit that ὁ σπόρος is the word of God whether the text read is P⁷⁵, B or D. It is most significant, however, to observe that D further emphasises the usage of the metaphor by drawing attention to the importance of having a good heart in hearing the τὸν λόγον by adding τοῦ θεοῦ in 8:15. The Latin side d upholds the reading of D and has uerbum dei. Although the addition of τοῦ θεοῦ in 8:15 could simply be seen as an emphasis of what was already stated in 8:11, the mention of λόγος in two other places in reference to the seed that fell on the path and the λόγος taken by the devil (v. 12) and those that fell in the rocks (v. 13) is noteworthy. It is also significant that D changes the P⁷⁵ and B reading οἱ ἀκούσαντες εἶτα ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος to οἱ ἀκολοθοῦντες ὧν ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος in Lk 8.12. Thus making the clause οἱ ἀκολοθοῦντες ὧν simultaneous to the coming of the devil by omitting εἶτα and letting ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος stand for itself as a main clause. It should be mentioned, however, that d does not support D's employment of οἱ ἀκολοθοῦντες ὧν. Rather, the reading of d is audiunt quorum, οἱ ἀκούσαντες. This sentence construction in D also avoids the emphasis on the hearing first and then being overcome by the devil. For the devil takes the seed of the word from the heart. D reorders the reading καὶ αἶρει τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν of P⁷⁵ and B to καὶ αἶρει ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν τὸν λόγον. Even if there is no difference in meaning, the intentional modification of the text is apparent and that perchance D is able to underscore that the heart which decides to follow the way of the word of God is the target of the devil. The change from ἀκούω to ἀκολουθέω in verse 12 is important to the reference of hearing the word of God. In verse 13, the reference to hearing is in the conditional sense οἱ ὅταν ἀκούσωσιν and stands without variation in the readings of B, P⁷⁵ and D. This analysis of the D reading is supported by the change of P⁷⁵ and B's ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας to ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν showing that D is aware of the textual significance and

modified the reference to the rock (perhaps just in style in comparison to Lk 7:1 and Mt 7:25). D has the support of d that reads *super petram* in Lk 8.13. However, D retains the reference to the hearing since it is in the conditional sense. Another significant alteration, which shows that D paraphrases the text, is its omission of οὗτοι in verse 13. Whilst P⁷⁵ has οὗτοι, B's alteration is made much more explicit as referring to people hearing the word by using αὐτοί. The reading of D in Lk 8.13 which deletes οὗτοι is a harmonisation of the reading with Mt 13.21 and Mk 4.17.³⁶ The text of d *et radicem non habent* supports D's καὶ ῥίζαν οὐκ ἔχουσιν in obliterating this demonstrative adjective. Yet again it is more likely that the influence for Lk 8.13 in D to obliterate οὗτοι came from Mt 13.21 since there is a clear consistency of the Lukan D text parable of The Sower to conform its readings with Matthew's account of the same parable. The other mention of ἀκούσαντες besides verse 12 in P⁷⁵ and B is in verse 14 wherein D and d upholds this reading but without any direct reference to λόγος. The allusion of D here in this case, however, is implicitly made to λόγος. It is also a kind of vague reference. Thus the reference to the hearing of the word does not assume understanding of what is heard. It is also notable that the quotation of Lk 8.10 from Is 6:9 changes the verb βλέπωσιν to ἴδωσιν in accordance with the Matthean reading. This shows that D is adjusting the text once again to the reading of Mt 13:14, but with modification from second person plural in Matthew (ἴδητε) to third person plural in Luke (ἴδωσιν). Thus the reference to the allusion from Is 6:9 becomes vital to the understanding of the changes made in D when finally the reference to λόγος in the parable explanation is made explicit by adding τοῦ θεοῦ. This reading then clearly refers to the good heart that receives the τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ. D becomes much more interesting, but puzzling. For whilst in Lk 8:8 D reads ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν καὶ καλὴν, however, in 8:15 it reads εἰς τὴν καλὴν γῆν...ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀγαθῇ. Once again this reading in Lk

³⁶Cf. Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 93, who only notices Mk 4.17 and missed Mt 13.21.

8.15 has the support of d and is harmonised with Mt 13.23.³⁷ Perhaps, the solution to the puzzle is not only the mimetic nature of the harmonisation of Lk 8.15 with Mt 13.23. It is also not impossible that the allegorical reading of the text overlaps with its representative mimetic references to the application of the adjectives ἀγαθός and καλός. This could imply then that καρδία is ἀγαθός for those who received the word and become fruitful; and that γῆ is καλή where the seeds grew and produce fruits.³⁸ Since γῆ is representing the heart of the recipient of the word of God, the D variant reading ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν καὶ καλήν in 8:15 is a kind of allegorising variant reading overlapping with a representative mimesis of the heart of a follower of Jesus.³⁹

The parable of The Sower (Mt 13.1-9, Mk 4.1-9, Lk 8.4-8) is supposedly told by Jesus with himself giving a defined meaning of the details of the parable (Mt 13.18-23, Mk 4.13-20, Lk 8.11-15), as indicated in the texts of all three Synoptic Gospels. Whether this specified allegorical interpretation was originally from Jesus or provided by the Church is not an interest here. The interest is rather that all three Synoptic Gospels preserved their texts of The Sower with the same allegorical interpretation.⁴⁰ However, The Sower as it was

³⁷Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 93.

³⁸For example God's acts that is made known in Christ as presented in Odes of Solomon 17.14a as fruits that are sowed in the hearts. Massaux, *Influence*, 2:78, points out that scholars interpret its allusion to The Sower.

³⁹It is interesting that an allusion to fruitfulness linking to the combination of the words γῆ ἀγαθή καὶ καλή in the D text of Lk 8.15 is to be found as well in the Gnostic writing *The Letter of Ptolemy to Flora* 7.10. Ptolemy wrote his sister Flora: ἐάν γε ὡς καλή γῆ καὶ ἀγαθὴ γονίμων σπερμάτων τυχοῦσα τὸν δι' αὐτῶν καρπὸν ἀναδείξῃς. (The italics in Greek are mine.) Although Massaux, *Influence*, 2:286, is not certain of Ptolemy's literary dependence on Matthew, Mark or Luke, he asserts that it is "a reminiscence of the parable of the sower". At any rate of literary dependence to the Synoptic Gospels the combination is used metaphorically to emphasise fruitfulness. οἰκοδομηθέντι, ὃς ἐν καρπῷ

⁴⁰The parable of The Sower and its interpretation is quite popular in the early Church. See the many patristic interpretations of The Sower in Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:262-75; Oden and Hall, *Mark*, 49-57; and Just, *Luke*, 130-5. See also Massaux, *Influence*, 2:121-6, in his discussion on how The Sower and its given interpretation were used in the Shepherd of Hermas as a case in point of this Jesus' parable influence in an early Christian literature.

rendered in the text of the *Gospel of Thomas* 9 is relatively shorter compared to that of Matthew, Mark and Luke and has no allegorical interpretation given with it:

ΠΕΧΕ ΙϞ ΧΕ ΕΙC ΖΗ ΗΤΕ ΑΦΕΙ ΕΒΟΛ Ν̄ΒΙ ΠΕΤ`CΙΤΕ ΑΦΜΕΖ ΤΟΟΤῶ
 ΑΦΝΟΥΧΕ ΑΖΟΕΙΝΕ ΜΕΝ ΖΕ ΕΧ̄Ν ΤΕΖΙΗ` ΑΥΕΙ Ν̄ΒΙ Ν̄ΖΑΛΑΤΕ
 ΑΥΚΑΤΦΟΥ Ζ̄ΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΑΥΖΕ ΕΧ̄Ν ΤΠΕΤΡΑ ΑΥΩ Μ̄ΠΟΥΧΕ ΝΟΥΝΕ
 ΕΠΕCΗΤ` ΕΠΚΑΖ ΑΥΩ Μ̄ΠΟΥΤΕΥΕ ΖΜϞ ΕΖ ΡΑΪ ΕΤΠΕ ΑΥΩ
 ΖΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΑΥΖΕ ΕΧ̄Ν Ν̄Ωῶ ΤΕ ΑΥΩΒΤ` Μ̄ΠΕΒΡΟΒ ΑΥΩ ΑΠΦ̄ΝΤ
 ΟΥΟΜΟΥ ΑΥΩ ΑΖ̄ΝΚΟΟΥΕ ΖΕ ΕΧ̄Ν ΠΚΑΖ ΕΤΝΑΝΟΥΦ· ΑΥΩ ΑΦΤ
 ΚΑΡΠΟC ΕΖΡΑΪ ΕΤΠΕ ΕΝΑΝΟΥΦ· ΑΦ ΕΙ Ν̄CΕ ΕCΟΤΕ ΑΥΩ ΩΕ
 ΧΟΥΩΤ· ΕCΟΤΕ⁴¹

The mention of the birds in *Thomas*' account unlike P⁷⁵ and B does not include τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in Lk 8.5 thus making it parallel with D. However, a few things in the account of *Thomas* are unique. The mention of the seeds eaten by the worm that fell among the thorns that choked them is unique in *Thomas*. Moreover, the reference to the seeds that fell on the good ground and as described as producing "good" fruit, is also a unique description of the produce harvested in *Thomas*' account of the parable. Even if *Thomas* 9 brings doubt to the allegorical sense of The Sower as specified in the Synoptics, the meaning attached to the seed in the parable is taken for granted as the word of God. The allusion to The Sower's seed as the word of God among the Fathers speaks for itself.⁴² Origen (Fragment 157) expounds on the meaning of plowing and sowing:

Ἐκαστος ἡμῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἀρότης ἐστὶν γῆν ἔχων τὴν ἰδίαν ψυχὴν, ἣν ὀφείλει νεοῦν ἀρότρῳ λογικῶ συναγαγῶν τοὺς βοῦς τοὺς ἐργάτας ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν τῶν καθαρῶν· τότε γὰρ νέαν ποιήσει τὴν ὑπὸ πολλῆς ἀργίας τῆς ἐν τῷ παρελθόντι χρόνῳ παλαιωθεῖσαν ψυχὴν καὶ πολλὴν ἐξενεγκοῦσαν κακίαν καὶ ἔργα ἀκαρπα, ἃ ἐκτεμῶν τῷ ἀρότρῳ τοῦ λόγου καὶ ποιήσας νέωμα σπερεῖ ἀπὸ τῆς θείας διδασκαλίας σπέρματα νομικά, προφητικά, εὐαγγελικά, μεμνημένος καὶ μελετῶν αὐτά. διὸ φησι καὶ διὰ Ἰερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου ὁ τῶν ὄλων θεός· >νεώσατε ἑαυτοῖς νεώματα, καὶ μὴ σπείρετε ἐπ' ἀκάνθαις<· οὐ γάρ

⁴¹CopTh, 6. ET CopTh, 7.

⁴²See Wailes, *Medieval*, 98, and Valavanolickal, *Use*, 43-58.

ἔστι θεῖον ἀπλῶς δέξασθαι σπόρον καὶ καρποφορῆσαι, μὴ πρότερον ἐκκαθάραντας τὰς ψυχὰς καὶ πᾶν ἐκβαλόντας πάθος καὶ τὰς βιωτικὰς μερίμνας καὶ ἡδονάς, αἳ εἰσιν αἱ ἄκαινοι· διό φησιν· >ἔκκλινον ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποίησον ἀγαθόν<.⁴³

Origen understands the seed as the word sown in the soul as ἀπὸ τῆς θείας διδασκαλίας and it is indeed a θεῖον σπόρον. Origen accentuates the bearing of fruit with the casting off of the earthly cares that are the thorns, as well as the renewal and the purification of the soul. An analysis of the D text's alteration of The Sower in Luke's account makes it clear that the parable is taken as an allegory. Among other details, Lk 8.11 makes it explicit that the seed is God's word when it says ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ. It is only in Luke that this definition is made. In Mt 13.19 the λόγος is τῆς βασιλείας whilst in Mk 4.14 it simply states ὁ σπείρων τὸν λόγον σπείρει. If Mark was written first and Luke is the one that was written last, then among the Synoptic Gospels the allegorical interpretation of λόγος has developed even within the process of their literary dependence to one another. Thus D, in comparison with P⁷⁵ and B, further accentuates the allegorical dimension of λόγος linked with καρδιά ἀγάθη in hearing τὸν λόγον by adding τοῦ θεοῦ in 8.15. Among other alterations in D the insertion of τοῦ θεοῦ, with d reading uerbum dei and a sa^{ms} reading supporting it.⁴⁴ The insertion of τοῦ θεοῦ becomes significant in D as the emphasis on ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ that has been sowed in a good heart has produced fruit. The harvest is expected to follow because of the good production of what has been sowed. Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 7.45) associates the harvest to the sowing of the word of God and states:

Mittens ergo discipulos in messem suam, quae licet uerbo dei insita tamen culturae laborem et sollicitum munus operarii requirebat, ne aues caeli sparsa semina dissiparent...⁴⁵

⁴³Origen, GCS 35:289. ET *HLFL*, 186.

⁴⁴NA²⁷, 181.

⁴⁵Ambrose, SC 52:23. ET *EHGSL*, 258.

Here Ambrose is clear when he used the phrase *uerbo dei* equating it to the *insita* which made the implanting of the Word of God as producing *messem suam*. If this reading is taken as an allegorising variant as read with the lenses of Ambrose it can affirm the already stated meaning of *λόγος* as the Word of God. Could there be any other better explanation of the additional reading of *τοῦ θεοῦ* in 8.15 than an insertion of an allegorising variant? Perhaps, at first *τοῦ θεοῦ* was just a gloss that has a hermeneutical function. Since in the other section of the parable text in Luke, *λόγος* is spiritually interpreted to mean that of *ὁ θεός* then it could have been read orally during liturgy or catechism. Using the analogy of the *ketib* and *qere* it could have been that later on it turned out to be that *τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ* became the received reading of the text because its reading supplies the true spiritual meaning of *λόγος*.

It may be objected that the claim for an allegorising variant in D for *τοῦ θεοῦ* is inappropriate, if not in error. Rather, a proper explanation for the occurrence of the variant is just a plain clarification of meaning. This objection is right in its own merit of claiming that the addition of *τοῦ θεοῦ* is to clarify the meaning of *λόγος* in 8.15. That clarification, that is appropriate to be argued in this reading of D, is an allegorical reading as already indicated in verse 11. In this regard what we may call an allegorising variant would have been viewed perhaps by the reader or the scribe or the clergy who inserted it in the text as a further literal clarification of the sense of the meaning of *λόγος* in 8.15. This change of an allegorising variant for our contemporary perspective should have been the literal enhancement of the meaning of the word *λόγος* as in 8.11. “But should a community of such ‘literalists’ subsequently come to embrace the allegorical meaning as the obvious, expected meaning, that allegorical meaning would have become, in effect, the new ‘literal sense’”⁴⁶ The example given by David Dawson in his argument on how an old allegorical reading may become an acceptable new literal reading is instructive:

⁴⁶Dawson, *Allegorical*, 8.

New literal meanings are often simply old allegorical innovations that have succumbed to the “lethargy of custom.” For example, if a Christian community agrees with Paul that the rock in the wilderness struck by Moses is actually Christ (1 Cor. 10.4), then the literal meaning of the word “rock” is in fact “Christ”; the initial allegorical sense has become literal, now domesticated as the sense universally accepted, as customary and obvious as the “arm” of a chair. But before such domestication, an allegorical sense challenges the obvious sense. When the second-century Christian interpreter Marcion resisted the attempt of other Christians to give offensive passages of Hebrew scripture “other” meanings, he was defending his own “literal sense” in the face of the strong revisionary challenge that Christian allegorical readings presented. In the Pauline example, the literal sense is indistinguishable from allegorical readings that gain acceptance as the “actual,” rather than the “other,” meaning of a text, while in the Marcionite example, the reading that produces a potentially emerging plain sense (such as Paul’s), before communal acceptance, plays the adversarial role characteristic of fresh allegorical interpretations.⁴⁷

It is important, therefore, to recognise that there is the possibility of a tradent’s marginal gloss of τοῦ θεοῦ that was meant to be a clarification of λόγος. This explanation for the existence of τοῦ θεοῦ in the D text of Lk 8.15 is plausible enough, even with our contemporary antagonism towards allegory. In this case, it could be that D’s understanding of λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, although at first was just a marginal allegorical reading, it later became the standard spiritual meaning of the text. This explanation could be best exemplified by Cyril of Alexandria (*Commentary on Luke*, Homily 41 [220]) who takes for granted the meaning of ὁ σπόρος as λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ as well as the interchangeable reference of ἀγαθός and καλός with γῆ and καρδία:

Εἶη δ’ ἂν γῆ πίων καὶ εὐτοκος, ποιούσα καρπὸν ἑκατονταπλασίονα, ψυχὰ καλαί τε καὶ ἀγαθαί, εἰς βάθος δεχόμεναι τὰ τοῦ λόγου σπέρματα, καὶ κατέχουσαι, καὶ γενναίως τρέφουσαι. Περὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἂν λέγοιτο καὶ μάλα δικαίως, τὸ δι’ ἐνὸς τῶν ἀγίων προφητῶν εἰρημένον παρὰ θεοῦ· Καὶ μακαριοῦσιν ὑμᾶς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, διότι ἐγένεσθε ὑμεῖς γῆ θελητή. Ὅταν γὰρ εἰς νοῦν καθαρὸν τῶν παρενοχλεῖν εἰωθότων θεῖος ποτὲ λόγος κατενεχθῆ, τότε δίδωσι ρίζαν εἰς βάθος, καὶ ἀστάχυος δίκην ἐπιπηδᾷ, καὶ τελεσφορεῖται καλῶς.⁴⁸

⁴⁷Dawson, *Allegorical*, 8.

⁴⁸Cyril of Alexandria, *PG 72:628*. ET *CGSL*, 180.

Furthermore, as Cyril of Alexandria (*Commentary on Luke*, Homily 41) expounds the spiritual meaning of the parable of The Sower in the Syriac version of his commentary on Luke, he calls the seed that fell along the path and was devoured by the birds as “sacred seed” (ܠܘܡܢܐ ܠܥܝܢܐ); where he is actually exhorting his audience to “receive the sacred seed” (ܠܘܡܢܐ ܠܥܝܢܐ ܕܠܘܡܢܐ) so that they can be productive.⁴⁹ He also calls the seed that fell upon the rocks as “mysteries from Him”(ܕܘܡܝܢ ܠܘܡܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ).⁵⁰ Likewise, Cyril of Alexandria states that “the divine seed is choked”(ܠܘܡܢܐ ܠܥܝܢܐ ܕܠܘܡܢܐ) among the thorns.⁵¹ Finally, he mentions that like the seed that fell on the good ground “the divine seed may blossom well in us” (ܥܝܢܐ ܠܘܡܢܐ ܕܠܘܡܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ ܕܠܘܡܢܐ ܕܥܝܢܐ).⁵²

The process and moment of the entrance of mimetic harmonisation in the D text of Luke could be depicted with the help of Cyril’s homily, presumably after the reference text of his exposition is read from the third Gospel. The use of Matthew’s account to interpret The Sower is also used by Cyril of Alexandria (*Commentary on Luke*, Homily 41 [220]) to enhance his exposition of Luke’s account:

Πλὴν ἐκεῖνο χρήσιμον οἶμαι χρηστομαθεῖν ἐλομένοις εἰπεῖν. Ὁ γὰρ τοι Ματθαῖος αὐτὸ δὲ τουτὶ τὸ κεφάλαιον ἡμῖν ἐξηγούμενος, τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἔφη γῆν ἐκδοῦναι καρπούς ἐν τρισὶ διαφοραῖς. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ, φησὶν, ἐποίησεν ἑκατὸν, ἡ δὲ ἐξήκοντα, ἡ δὲ τριάκοντα. Ἄθρει δὴ οὖν ὅπως τρεῖς ἔφη Χριστὸς εἶναι τὰς βλάβας, καὶ ὁμοίως ἰσαρίθμους αὐταῖς τὰς εὐδοκιμήσεις. Τὰ μὲν γὰρ εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν πίπτοντα τῶν σπερμάτων, ὑπὸ πτηνῶν διαρπάζεται· τὰ δὲ ἐν τοῖς πετρώδεσιν ἐξανθήσαντα μόνον, οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν ξηραίνεται. Τὰ δὲ ταῖς ἀκάνθαις, ἐναποπιγεται. Γῆ δὲ ἡ θελητὴ καρπούς ἀποτίκτει, τοὺς ἐν τρισὶν, ὡς ἔφη, διαφοραῖς, ἑκατὸν καὶ ἐξήκοντα, καὶ τριάκοντα· ὡς γὰρ ὁ πάνσοφος γράφει Παῦλος, ἕκαστος ἡμῶν ἴδιον ἔχει χάρισμα ἐκ θεοῦ, ὁ μὲν οὕτως, ὁ δὲ οὕτως. Οὐ γὰρ ἐν ἴσῳ μέτρῳ πάντῃ τε καὶ πάντως τὰς

⁴⁹SCAACLE, 40. ET CGSL, 178.

⁵⁰SCAACLE, 40. ET CGSL, 179.

⁵¹SCAACLE, 42. ET CGSL, 179.

⁵²SCAACLE, 42. ET CGSL, 180.

τῶν ἁγίων εὐδοκίμησεις γεγενημένας εὐρίσκομεν. Πλήν ζηλοῦν ἀναγκαῖον τὰ μείζονά τε καὶ ὑπερκείμενα τῶν χθαμαλωτέρων.⁵³

Cyril of Alexandria provides a clue that Matthew's account has been used to explain the meaning of Luke's account of the parable. With the hermeneutical approach of Cyril of Alexandria in mind, what has been articulated in the survey of the parallel readings of The Sower with Origen, Ambrose and Cyril of Alexandria, is the manner in which the seed sowed was equated to the Word of God. These Fathers took the equation for granted. And so, Cyril of Alexandria's method of utilising Matthew in his interpretation of Luke helps to explain the way mimetic cross-referencing could have taken place in the D text of Luke. The popular Matthean reading and interpretation could indeed have made its way to the text of D in the way the *ketib* and *qere* function. In other words, it could be that at first the Matthean reference was just read orally instead of, or side-by-side, with the original text of Luke. Later, because it was taken for granted as the true spiritual reading of the text, it was transmitted no longer as an oral tradition but also incorporated in the written textual tradition of D. This is the instance when, perhaps, the harmonised reading of Luke with Matthew, such as has been analysed above, occurred in the D text. The process of the penetration of the Matthean readings and the insertion of allegorising variants such as τοῦ θεοῦ in Lk 8.15 might have been smoothly received by the congregations, which witnessed the reading performance of the D textual tradition for a period of time. Then, maybe, as the parallel readings from Matthew are read regularly with Luke's account of The Sower and the reading ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ already became a representative mimesis that equates this reading with the reception of the proclaimed Gospel, it would not be implausible that the D textual tradition incorporated these readings. Likewise the insertion of τοῦ θεοῦ could be considered as an allegorising variant reading that penetrated the D text in the process of its transmission through reading performance. Perhaps, for the tradents to make it easier to use the text in liturgy, catechism or sermon, later on in the development of textual tradition, what

⁵³Cyril of Alexandria, *PG* 72:628. ET *CGSL*, 180-1.

eventually became the D text acquired these unique readings which were originally glossed as marginal interpretative notes. Perchance, these peculiar readings entered into the D text of Luke from those tradents who were influenced by patristic interpretations which came from some early traditions, where the Fathers based their commentary homilies.

The Servant's Reward (Lk 17.7-10)

The parable of The Servant's Reward in Lk 17.7-10 is a parable unique to Luke. It has its own distinctive readings but they do not have parallel readings with Matthew. The most notable feature of the D text in this parable is that the use of the negative is reversed. The reverse use of the negatives in The Servant's Reward could conceivably be something that is due to allegorised reading. Although there are other variations in the readings of P⁷⁵ and B against that of D the swapping of the statement negations in verses 7-8 and the addition, obliteration and modification of words in 9-10 are the most obviously intentional. On the one hand, in verse 7, D inserts the negative μή before ἐρεῖ αὐτῶ, thus expecting a positive answer, whilst P⁷⁵ and B expect a negative answer and do not include it. On the other hand, in verse 8, anticipating yet another positive answer D deletes the negative οὐχ or οὐχί before another ἐρεῖ αὐτῶ of P⁷⁵ and B. The reading of d supports D with d having num in verse 7 and does not have negative in verse 8. Hence, Lk 17.7-8 in the reading of P⁷⁵ and B is expecting the servant that just came home from his work in the field not to dine for a meal but expects him to prepare the food and drink of his master. This flow of thought in The Servant's Reward is overturned in D. For D clearly directs the development of the notion that the master in the parable will certainly invite the tired slave from the field to eat dinner but prepare the meal first so that the master can dine first. In other words, P⁷⁵ and B do not provide the notion of the servant invited to eat but instead asked to immediately prepare the master's meal. But D gives the impression that the master calls the slave both to dine and serve him his meal first. Another noteworthy variation of reading in D is the

addition of αὐτῶ; οὐ δοκῶ after τὰ διαταχθέντα in verse 9.⁵⁴ The other remarkable difference is the omission of πάντα and ὑμῖν in verse 10. Moreover, in verse 10, D replaces the reading τὰ διαταχθέντα of P⁷⁵ and B into ὅσα λέγω. Again, d upholds the reading of D with ei non puto in verse 9 and quae dico in verse 10. What D implies in its rendition of the text is that Jesus openly indicates that he is the master who does not think that he should thank a servant who does whatsoever he asks him to do but instead this slave should simply recognise his unworthiness and do his duty.

Perhaps, Ambrose (*Exposition on the Gospel of Luke* 8.31) would help in following the reading of D in Lk 17.7-8:

Sequitur ut nemo in operibus gloriatur, quia iure domino debemus obsequium. Nam si tu non dicis seruo aranti aut oues pascenti: *transi, recumbe*—ubi intellegitur quia nullus recumbit, nisi ante transierit; denique et Moyses ante transiuit, ut magnum uisum uideret—si ergo tu non solum non dicis seruo tuo: *recumbe*, sed exigis ab eo aliud ministerium et gratias ei non agis, ita nec in te patitur dominus unius usum esse operis aut laboris, quia, dum uiuimus, debemus semper operari.⁵⁵

What Ambrose is saying is that nobody should take any glory because of works. Christians properly owe their obedience to God. The parable talks about the relation of the servant to the master where the servant does not expect his master to thank him. Hence, the Lord expects labour from believers, because as long as they live, they should always work for their master. In addition, Cyril of Alexandria (*Commentary on Luke*, Homilies 113-116 [365-366]) also exhorts that:

Εἰ γέγονας τοίνυν εὐδόκιμος, καὶ τὰς θεΐας τετήρηκας ἐντολὰς, καὶ ὑπήκουσας τοῦ Δεσπότου, μὴ ἀπαιτεῖ θεὸν ὡς ὄφλημα τὰς τιμὰς, πρόσιθι δὲ μᾶλλον τὰ ἐκ φιλοτιμίας αἰτῶν· ἐννόησον ὅτι οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς δεσπότηται οὐχ ὁμολογοῦσι χάριν, ὅταν τινὲς τῶν οἴκετῶν τὴν τεταγμένην αὐτοῖς ἀποπεραίνωσι θεραπείαν, ἐκ φιλοτιμίας δὲ πολλάκις τὰς τῶν γνησίων εὐνοίας ἀνακτώμενοι, ἀδροτέραν αὐτοῖς τὴν προθυμίαν τίκτουσιν. Οὕτω καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἀπαιτεῖ μὲν ἡμᾶς τὴν

⁵⁴See Metzger, *TCGNT* 1994², 141.

⁵⁵Ambrose, SC 52:113.

δουλείαν, λόγω τῆς δεσποτείας χρώμενος· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἔστιν ἀγαθὸς καὶ φιλότιμος, καὶ γέρα τοῖς κάμνουσιν ἐπαγγέλλεται· ὑπερνήχεται δὲ τοὺς ἰδρωῶτας τῶν ὑποζευγμένων, τῆς φιλοτιμίας τὸ μέγεθος.⁵⁶

Like Ambrose, Cyril of Alexandria perceives that God requires from those who believe, the service of slaves. For God uses the prerogative of his sovereign authority. However, because the Lord is good and generous, he also promises rewards to those who labour for him. Accordingly, it is probable that the unique readings of this parable in the D text began to be moulded by oral expositions and the expectation that Christians would work for the Lord as long as they live. Since the D textual tradition is free, it could be that the readers, or the bishops that read and expounded on the meaning of the text, put marginal annotations that provided the practice that is similar to *ketib* and *qere*. In this way it would be easier for them to read and expound the text according to the generally held tradition that believers should serve the Lord as his slaves and expect his reward, for he is generous. Later, these glosses that were mentioned to the congregation, became the received reading of the D text. Eventually, this process leads to the incorporation of these readings in the D text of Luke for its allegorical meaning and mimetic representation became the received tradition for understanding the parable of The Servant's Reward.

Parables Plausibly Influenced by Allegory and Mimesis

The plausibility of the effect of representational mimesis with the help of allegorical interpretation of the parables of The Two Houses (Lk 6.47-49) and The Dishonest Steward (Lk 16.1-9) could be observed in the way their variant readings function in the D text. Perhaps, a certain tradent employed a mimetic harmonisation of Luke's account with that of Matthew in The Two Houses as he expounded the text allegorically and added Matthew's reading as a gloss to a grandparent manuscript of D. Later, a scribe could have incorporated the Matthean reading in Luke that became the reading of D's textual tradition. Likewise, it could be that as The Dishonest Steward was read allegorically to mimetically represent the

⁵⁶Cyril of Alexandria, *PG* 72:837. ET *CGSL*, 465.

reality of Christian practice of charity the textual tradition of D acquired a variant reading that would better facilitate the received interpretation of this controversial parable in Luke.

The Two Houses (Lk 6.47-49)

The manuscript of P⁷⁵ in Lk 6.47-49 has many gaps. The entire text has not survived in P⁷⁵. Nonetheless, P⁷⁵ and B are very closely related, if not identical.⁵⁷ By default B becomes the collating base again in examining the D text of Lk 6.47-49. The parable of The Two Foundations or The Two Houses in Lk 6.47-49 has a parallel in Mt 7.24-27. Here, the Lukan text of D harmonises with its Matthean counterpart unlike B (and P⁷⁵) that maintains the accustomed Lukan reading of the parable of Two Houses. In Lk 6:48b the reading of B (and P⁷⁵) is the familiar διὰ τὸ καλῶς οἰκοδομηῆσθαι αὐτήν.⁵⁸ However, D has a paraphrased reading in harmony with Mt 7:25 which reads τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτρων as in the B and D texts of Matthew.⁵⁹ The reading of D in Lk 6.48b is not only fully backed up by d that reads fundata enim erat super petram, but also receives support from A C Θ Ψ f^{1.13} ℣^l latt sy^{p,h} (bo^{pt}).⁶⁰ Even if there is a difference in the spelling of the reading of P⁷⁵ having προσέρρηξεν and B having προσέρηξεν, B is later corrected to προσέρρηξεν conforming its spelling with P⁷⁵ in verse 49. The reading of D with συνέρηξεν in Lk 6.49 is different from P⁷⁵ and B. The Latin in d is consistent in using adlisisit, “it dashed against”, for both προσέρηξεν in verse 48 and συνέρηξεν in verse 49. Notably, whereas the usage of προσέρρηξεν in Lk 6.48 by P⁷⁵, B and D is consistent as the verb moves the action to ὁ

⁵⁷A couple of variations in spelling are sighted. Whilst the original hand of B* in Lk 6.48 has πλημμύρης, later changed to πλημμύρας by a corrector, P⁷⁵ has πλημύρης. In the same verse and verse 49 the original hand of B* has προσέρηξεν, corrected later to προσέρρηξεν, but P⁷⁵ has προσέρρηξεν. Moreover, there is another kind of difference in tenses in verse 48. Whilst the original hand of B* reads οἰκοδομηῆσθαι, later changed to οἰκοδομεῖσθαι, what is left in the reading of P⁷⁵ has probably ω at the beginning of the word and ι at the end of it. Perhaps, P⁷⁵ uses the aorist form. Lastly, B does not have the article τὴν for οἰκίαν in Lk 6.49 whereas P⁷⁵ has it. See further discussion below.

⁵⁸According to Metzger, *TCGNT* 1994², 118, the clause is “distinctively Lukan” but later it was “supplanted by copyists who preferred the reason given by Matthew”.

⁵⁹See Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 92.

⁶⁰NA²⁷, 175.

ποταμός that “struck against” ἢ οἰκία, D in the following verse replaced προσέρρηξεν with συνέρρηξεν, “it dashed together”.⁶¹ Perhaps, the change in the D text reflects the emphasis that both the house and the soil had been carried away together by the river water. This reading in D is parallel with συνέπεσεν, “it fell together” in the same verse. Another indication of harmonisation of Luke with that of Matthew is the omission of εὐθύς in D. As a conclusion of the parable of The Two Houses, D once again in Luke harmonises its reading with Matthew.⁶² The reading of B (and P⁷⁵) in Lk 7:1 is ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν πάντα τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς τοῦ λαοῦ, εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναούμ. It is modified by D into καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα λαλῶν ἦλθεν εἰς Καφαρναούμ. The reading of d which supports D is et factum est cum consummasset omnia uerba loquens uenit cafarnaum. This reading is the close reading of Mt 7:28 in B that reads καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους. At least the resemblance between Matthean B and Lukan D of the first part of the clause is visible and the difference between the reading of Luke and Matthew is still quickly and clearly recognisable. It is significant how D tries to fit in the Lukan narrative by replacing the Matthean τοὺς λόγους τούτους with ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα. This makes the harmonisation flowing smoothly with that of Luke’s wording and presentation in the narrative. It is also tempting to point out that since this section of Matthew in D is a lacuna, perhaps, D has a similar reading with B in Mt 7.28. The compositional mimetic cross-referencing brings an allusion to Jesus’ conclusion on his sermon on the mount in Mt 5-7. Consequently, the altered reading of D in Luke is noticeably reflecting a reference to the teaching of Jesus as the solid foundation like a rock like that of the Matthean emphasis. The Diatessaron (10.44-11.1) has basically followed the Matthean reading of the parable.⁶³ Since the Syriac Peshitta supports the D text in Lk

⁶¹BDAG, 977.

⁶²See Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 92.

⁶³See Hill, *Earliest*, 43-44.

6.48b the textual tradition that the Syrian Fathers would be familiar with could be the reading ܠܘܘ ܠܘ ܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܝܘܢܐ which is similar to that of the D text τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν.⁶⁴ Using the model of Codex Ξ, it could be that this reading from Matthew was placed as a marginal catena to guide in interpreting Luke's account of the parable. Later on in the process of reading this marginal reference that comes from the popular Gospel of Matthew became the received text of Luke as well. As a result what was originally read in the oral performance of the text of The Two Houses from Matthew became part of the written textual tradition of the D text in Luke.

The reference to “the rock” as Christ or God, sound teaching and Christian virtue with fundamental stress on the strength and solid foundation is not uncommon as this is also true with Origen, Ambrose and Cyril of Alexandria. Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 5.82) reads the parable on a different plane and puts it in the context of obeying the Lord's teachings:

Omnium autem fundamentum docet esse uirtutum oboedientiam caelestium praeceptorum, per quam domus haec nostra non profluuiis uoluptatum, non nequitiae spiritalis incursum, non imbre mundano, non haereticorum possit nebulosis disputationibus commoueri.⁶⁵

What Ambrose points out is that Christ instructs his disciples that the foundation of the virtues of life is the obedience of heavenly teachings. When there is that foundation of virtues our house could not be unsettled by the surge of lusts. The attack of spiritual malice will not succeed. Even the driving rain that comes to this earth as well as the dim wiles of the heretics will not accomplish anything at all. Likewise, the Syriac version of the commentary on Luke of Cyril of Alexandria (*Commentary on Luke*, Homily 34) collaborates with Ambrose when he states that:

⁶⁴See Kiraz, *Comparative*, 112.

⁶⁵Ambrose, SC 45:212-3. ET *EHGSL*, 184.

Perhaps, enough has already been said about “the rock”. The Fathers have commonly interpreted πέτρα in a christological sense as the foundation where the wise man built his house. Thus the alterations in Lk 7.1 by D into καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα λαλῶν which is the near reading of Mt 7:28 in B which reads καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους would strengthen the mimetic representation and allegorical reading of the Fathers. The Matthean textual tradition as mimetically borrowed by the D text in Luke provides a further clue that the reference to “the rock” as the foundation is the words of Jesus, that have just been concluded. Even Origen (*Homilies on Luke* 1.3) in his allusion to Luke’s version of the parable combines it with Matthew’s and his metaphor on building and foundation mingles with Paul’s tree and root imagery when he remarks that:

[Affectum suum Lucas indicat ex sermone, quo ait: *in nobis manifestissime sunt ostensae*, id est <<πεπληροφορημένων>>, quod uno verbo latinus sermo non explicat. Certa enim fide et ratione cognoverat neque in aliquo fluctuabat, utrum ita esset an aliter. Hoc autem illis evenit, qui fidelissime crediderunt et id, quod propheta obsecrat, consecuti sunt et dicunt: *confirma me in sermonibus tuis*. Unde et Apostolus de his, qui erant firmi atque robusti, ait: *ut sitis radicati et fundati in fide*.] Si quis enim radicans in fide est atque fundatus, licet tempestas fuerit exorta, licet venti flaverint, licet se imber effuderit, non convellitur, non corruet, quia *super petram* aedificium solida mole fundatum est. Nec putemus [oculis istis carnalibus firmitatem fidei dari, quam mens et ratio tribuit. Infideles quique credant signis atque portentis, quae humana acies contuetur. Fidelis vero et prudens atque robustus rationem sequatur et verbum et sic diiudicet, quid verum quidve falsum sit.]⁶⁷

Thus, mixing the Lukan rendition of the foundation as well built to the Matthean description that the foundation is upon “the rock”, such as what Origen has done could easily get into the D text through a tradent who is familiar with the allegorical interpretation of the foundation rock as Christ or his teachings.⁶⁸ Luke’s reading of The Two Houses in the D text

⁶⁷Origen, SC 87:102-4. ET *HLFL*, 6-7. Origen conflates the metaphors found in Mt 7.25; Lk 6.48; Eph 3.17; Col 1.23, 2.7.

⁶⁸Cf. Origen, GCS 41.1:76. ET Simonetti, *Matthew 1-13*, 1a:157. Origen in Matthew Fragment 153 argues that the winds of the pseudo-prophets beat the house founded upon rock. The house cannot be harmed even with the flood of temptations and persecutions. The house collapses only if it does not have the foundation

preserved the mimetic harmonisation or literary imitation of the Matthean account. In this way the textual harmonisation becomes an allegorising variant. Thus the tradents of D like the Fathers could functionally use the harmonised and altered text for an allegorical exposition and mimetic representation of the message of the parable of The Two Houses in Lk 6.47-49. The distinctive readings in D made their way into the text's body due to the oral performance of Matthew's account with Luke's. Perhaps, the Matthean readings of the parable were placed in the margin of a grandparent of D. Later, because the Matthean reading became the interpretative chain reference for the understanding of Luke in the process of oral reading in the liturgy or in catechism, the D textual tradition took the Matthean reading for granted and it ended up as a textual variant of the D text.

The Dishonest Steward (Lk 16.1-9)

The Dishonest Steward in Lk 16.1-9 is another parable that is exclusive to Luke. Consequently, there is no parallel passage that corresponds with it from the other Synoptic Gospels. Nonetheless, it is interesting to note in Lk 16.6 that whilst P⁷⁵ and B have the word βάτος for the liquid measurement, D has the word κάρδος which is utilised as a container for water or wine and for collecting votes or funerary urn.⁶⁹ The word was also used with reference to souls.⁷⁰ The term κάρδος has the concept of container unlike βάτος and κάρβος that are basically referring to measuring system.⁷¹ Hence, as a container for liquid, votes or ashes κάρδος could also be used for collecting alms for the poor as practised in the early Church. The reading of d is siclos.⁷² There are other variant readings in D, but they are not significant. However, in verse 6, D's original hand that has the reading κάρδους is most

of Christ. So, a wise person puts the foundation of his house upon Christ the rock. The Lord even builds his Church upon the rock that has firmness and depth.

⁶⁹See LSJ, 848, for the different uses of κάρδος.

⁷⁰Lampe, *Patristic Lexicon*, 681.

⁷¹Cf. BDAG, 171 and 487.

⁷²Perhaps, siclos came from sicilicus or siciliquus which generally used for measurement. See Lewis and Short, *Latin*, 1693.

interesting, although a later hand altered it to κάρβους. It is plausible enough to think that the use of κάρδος is due to the allegorical reading of the parable. This is so because Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 7.245) as an interpreter of The Dishonest Steward allegorises the reading of the parable as he applies it to the giving of alms to the poor:

Et ideo ait: *facite uobis amicos de iniquo mamona*, ut largiendo pauperibus angelorum nobis ceterorumque sanctorum gratiam conparemus. Nec reprehenditur uilicus, in quo discimus non ipsi esse domini, sed potius alienarum uilici facultatum. Et ideo licet peccauerit, tamen quia sibi in posterum ex indulgentia domini quaesiuit auxilia, praedicatur. Pulchre autem iniquum mamona dixit, quia uariis diuitiarum inlecebris nostros auaritia temptabat adfectus, ut uellemus seruire diuitiis.⁷³

What Ambrose is arguing is that by providing alms to the poor, the grace of the angels and the saints are matched. He also notes that the shrewd steward is not rebuked and instead praised by the Lord because he was a custodian of the riches of others. However, Ambrose affirms that money brings malice for covetousness and tempts people's integrity with various beguiling of riches. It is also interesting that Cyril of Alexandria (*Commentary on Luke*, Homily 108 [348]) in his exposition of the parable of The Dishonest Steward focuses on the giving of alms to the poor and that the rich should not just store for themselves riches but distribute them to the needy:

Ἄρ' οὖν οὐδὲ μία τοῖς πλουτοῦσι σωτηρίας ὁδὸς, ἀλλὰ πῦρ αὐτοῖς ἠὺτρέπιστα, τὸ τῷ διαβόλῳ πρέπον καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ; Οὐ μὲνον· ἴδου γὰρ, ἴδου πρόφασιν αὐτοῖς σωτηρίας ἀνέδειξεν ὁ Σωτὴρ διὰ ταύτης τῆς παραβολῆς· ἐθαύρηθησαν, τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πλοῦτον ἀφέντος αὐτοῖς ἀνεξικακῶς τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων θεοῦ· πλὴν κατὰ γε τὸν ἐνόητα σκοπὸν αὐτῷ οἰκονόμοι τινὲς τίθενται τῶν πτωχευομένων· οἰκονόμοι δὲ λέγονται παρὰ τῷ τὰ οἰκεία ἐκάστω νέμειν· ἀλλ' οἰκονομοῦσιν οὐκ ὀρθῶς, οἷονεὶ σκορπίζοντες τὰ δοθέντα αὐτοῖς παρὰ τοῦ Δεσπότη· μόνας γὰρ ταῖς ἐαυτῶν δαπανῶσι τρυφαῖς, καὶ προσκαίρους ὠνοῦνται τιμὰς, ἀμνημονοῦντες θεοῦ λέγοντος· Ἄνοιγν' ἀνοίξεις τὰ σπλάγχνα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου, τῷ ἐπιδομένῳ ἐν σοί. Ναὶ μὴν καὶ αὐτοῦ πάντων ἡμῶν Σωτῆρος

⁷³ Ambrose, SC 52:99. ET *EHGSL*, 332.

Χριστοῦ· Γένεσθε οἰκτείρμονες, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος οἰκτείρων ἐστίν.⁷⁴

The allegorical interpretations of Ambrose and Cyril of Alexandria enhance the notion that the use of κᾶδος is likened to giving alms.⁷⁵ Furthermore, the content of the κᾶδος in the parable is ἔλαιον which is a symbol equated for mercy by the Fathers.⁷⁶ What is suggested here is that κᾶδος is an allegorising variant associated with the container for depositing alms of mercy for the poor, and this is plausible enough as an explanation for its occurrence. It could be that the reading of D has developed as a result of the text's employment in sermons, catechism or liturgy. The text of The Dishonest Steward could be rightly assumed to have been orally performed, first in the midst of the congregation, before it was interpreted and expounded. Thus the resemblance of *ketib* and *qere* reading practice could have similarly happened in the proper choice of word, either βᾶτος or κᾶδος that would provided a spiritual meaning for an allegorical interpretation. Perhaps, what happened is that the allegorical meaning was acquired by the latter and then was verbalised from the margin since it was just a matter of spelling difference from βᾶτος to κᾶδος. Moreover, both are words for containers. However, βᾶτος as utilised for quantity of liquid, could easily be replaced by κᾶδος which is also used similarly with βᾶτος as a container, but was also associated for collecting alms to the poor. Hence, replacing βᾶτος with κᾶδος in the reading of parable is not difficult. Therefore, the reference meaning of κᾶδος could be easily spiritualised to the giving alms to the poor.

Parables Possibly Influenced by Allegory and Mimesis

Although with a lesser degree of probability, it could be maintained that the D text of the next two parables of The Servant in Authority (Lk 12.41-48) and The Good Samaritan

⁷⁴Cyril of Alexandria, *PG* 72:812. ET *CGSL*, 440.

⁷⁵Cf. Wailes, *Medieval*, 247-51, on other patristic interpretations of the parable as primarily referring to alms giving among the poor.

⁷⁶See Wailes, *Medieval*, 251-2, on oil as symbol of mercy.

(Lk 10.30-37) have been theologically moulded. With the influence of the allegorical interpretation and the accepted mimetic representation of these two parables the Fathers were able to articulate the standards expected in the Christian conduct. The suggestion that the insertion of ὁ ἀγαθός in Lk 12.42 and the variant reading ἔλεον in Lk 10.34 could be due to an allegorical interpretation is only a possibility as these variant readings could have been simple clarification and copying error, respectively. The argument that they are deliberate modification of the text due to allegorical reading and mimetic representation is based on a patristic parallel that still brings the possibility of the claim.

The Servant in Authority (Lk 12.41-48)

The parable of The Servant in Authority in Lk 12.41-48 has a corresponding parallel in Mt 24.45-51. Their similarity of narration is a good case to study as representative of a similar parable told by Jesus in both Matthew and Luke. The odd readings of the parable in D would suggest that an allegorical reading has possibly penetrated the textual tradition of D. At the very start in verse 41, reading variations between D and P⁷⁵ and B are already outstanding. The conjunction δέ is employed in P⁷⁵ and B, whereas καί is used in D. Further, D reverses the order of words putting λέγεις before the phrase τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην, although P⁷⁵ and B place the verb at the end of it. In addition D obliterates ἢ καὶ πρὸς πάντα. In verse 42, D inserts ὁ ἀγαθός which could be another mimetic harmonisation with Mt 25.21, 23 (cf. Lk 19.17) where this adjective is used to commend a useful slave—whether δοῦλος or οἰκονόμος. Furthermore, in the same verse, whilst P⁷⁵ and B employ the prepositional phrase ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας in the genitive, D replaces it with ἐπὶ τὴν θεραπείαν. Likewise, a difference of spelling between P⁷⁵ with σιτομέτριον and B with σειτομέτριον against D's σιτομέτριον is noted. There is another insertion in verse 43 of D with the word αὐτόν. Also, whereas P⁷⁵ has the word order οὕτως ποιοῦντα, B and D follow the same word order against P⁷⁵ with the reading ποιοῦντα οὕτως. The alteration of the word ἀληθῶς of P⁷⁵ and B with D's ἀμήν is a

direct harmonisation of Lk 12.44 with Mt 24.47.⁷⁷ In verse 45 several words in D have modified forms. Whilst P⁷⁵ reads ἐαυτοῦ, D with B have αὐτοῦ. Additionally, although P⁷⁵ and B utilise the infinitive forms ἐσθίειν, πίνειν] πείνειν and μεθύσκεσθαι, D employs the participle forms ἐσθίων, πείνων and μεθυσκόμενος. In the same clause whilst P⁷⁵ uses the indefinite pronoun τι, the particle τε is used by D and supported by B for emphasis. Moreover, the last conjunction καί in verse 45 used in P⁷⁵ and B is deleted in D. There is an alteration in Lk 12.46 as the longer reading τοῦ δούλου ἐκείνου of P⁷⁵ and B is replaced in D with a shorter reading of simple personal pronoun αὐτοῦ. It is also notable that the reading δοχοτομήσει of P⁷⁵ could be a scribal mistake. Rather, the correct reading is διχοτομήσει which is what D and B have. Likewise, the word arrangement μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων θήσει of P⁷⁵ and B is replaced by putting the verb θήσει before μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων in D. What is more is that D obliterates ἐτοιμάσας ἢ in verse 47. Finally, in verse 48b, P⁷⁵ and B read παντὶ] + δὲ ὧ ἐδόθη πολὺ, πολὺ ζητηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὧ παρέθεντο πολὺ, περισσότερον αἰτήσουσιν αὐτόν. However, D has an unusual reading of παντὶ δὲ ὧ ἔδωκαν πολὺ, ζητήσουσιν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, περισσότερον καὶ ὧ παρέθεντο πολὺ, πλεον ἀπαιτήσουσιν αὐτόν. To put it in another way, Lk 12.41-48 has been obviously paraphrased in the D text.

Of particular interest is the view that an allegorising variant possibly penetrated this Lukan parable in the D text, as in the case of verse 42, where D inserts ὁ ἀγαθός. It could be an allegorising variant at the same time a mimetic harmonisation with Mt 25.21, 23 (cf. Lk 19.17). This is so because Origen (Fragment 200) gives a hint on the commendation of a useful slave:

ἐπεὶ οὖν πολλοὶ εἰσιν οἰκονόμοι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν πιστοὶ μὲν, οὐ μὴν καὶ πρόνιμοι καὶ τινες τούναντίον, διὰ τοῦτο ἐπαπορητικῶς προὔνεγκατο τὴν φωνὴν ὁ κύριος ὑπὲρ τοῦ τρανότατα ἐμφῆναι τὸ σπάνιον καὶ δυσεύρετον τῶν ἅμα πιστῶν καὶ φρονίμων οἰκονόμων· τὸν γε μὴν

⁷⁷So also Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 98.

εὐρεθέντα κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῶν θεραπόντων αὐτοῦ, ὡς καὶ τὸν Ἰούδαν ὁ σωτὴρ ἐξελέξατο, οὐκ ἀγνοῶν μὲν τὸ ὕστερον ἀπαντησόμενον, συγχρώμενος δὲ αὐτοῦ τῷ πρὸ τῆς παραβάσεως χρόνῳ καὶ τῇ τότε ὀδευούσῃ ἐπ' ἀρετὴν προαιρέσει εἰς τὸ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς διακονίας ἔργον. *μείζον δὲ τὸ ἀποκείμενον ἀγαθὸν τῷ πιστῷ καὶ φρονίμῳ παρὰ τὸ λεγόμενον πρὸς τὸν δεκαπλασιάσαντα τὴν μνᾶν ἢ πενταπλασιάσαντα*. καὶ οὐ θαυμαστόν, ὅπου γε καὶ τῶν παρὰ τούτους διαφερόντων μείζον· ὠρισμένοι γὰρ πόλεις τοῖς τὰς μνᾶς ἐπεξεργασαμένοις παραδίδονται, πλήθη δὲ τοῖς τὰ τάλαντα διπλασιάσασιν. πολλῷ δὲ μείζον καὶ τούτων ἐστὶ τὸ μὴ μόνον ἐπὶ πολλῶν καθίστασθαι, ἀλλ' >ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπάρχουσι< τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅπερ ἀπόκειται τῷ πιστῷ καὶ φρονίμῳ οἰκονόμῳ ἄξιον ἑαυτὸν πάντων τῶν ὑπαρχόντων <διὰ> τῆς πίστεως καταστήσαντι. ζητήσεις δὲ εἰ πλειόνων εὐρισκομένων πιστῶν καὶ φρονίμων ἕκαστον αὐτῶν δυνατὸν >ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπάρχουσι< τοῦ κυρίου καθίστασθαι· εἰ γὰρ >ἐπὶ πᾶσι<, πῶς ἕτερος χῶραν ἔχει ἐπὶ τοῖς δέκα πόλεσι καὶ μᾶλλον εἰ πλείους; διὸ εἰς προτροπὴν εἰρήσθω.⁷⁸

What Origen has to say in the quotation above is rather similar to Lk 12.42 where the D text inserts ὁ ἀγαθός and this articular adjective is used to commend a useful servant. For Origen sees that many in the churches are faithful, although not wise. It is rare to find someone faithful and wise. So in the parable when the Lord found one, he put him in charge of the servants. Origen also alludes to the parable of The Pounds and contends that τὸ ἀποκείμενον ἀγαθὸν is greater for the faithful and wise than what was mentioned to the one who adds to his pounds tenfold or fivefold (μείζον δὲ τὸ ἀποκείμενον ἀγαθὸν τῷ πιστῷ καὶ φρονίμῳ παρὰ τὸ λεγόμενον πρὸς τὸν δεκαπλασιάσαντα τὴν μνᾶν ἢ πενταπλασιάσαντα). And it is no surprise that the reward of those who differ from them is greater. By using the interpretation of Origen it is possible that the concept of the good servant could come into the D text of Luke that has been also allegorically read.

The added allegorising variant ὁ ἀγαθός in Lk 12.42 is also a representational mimetic reading of the D text that has been cross-referentially harmonised and allegorically interpreted according to a more popular parallel reading of a text or two in Matthew that talks

⁷⁸Origen, GCS 35:313. ET *HLFL*, 207-8. (The italics and bold fonts are mine for emphasis.)

about being a servant, albeit not the parallel parable account in Mt 24.45-51. It is certainly possible that the D text inserts ὁ ἀγαθός originally a marginal reading that functions as an intertextual chain referencing in the oral presentation of the text just like in Codex Ξ. The possibility of the view advanced here is also due to the observable description in the Gospels of a servant that pleases his master as ὁ ἀγαθός. The analogy of *ketib* and *qere* is once more applicable to this situation where ὁ ἀγαθός was possibly first voiced out from the margins but later became part of the textual tradition since it has been included in the orality of the D text. Although it is most unlikely to pinpoint the precise mimetic harmonising cross-reference of the variant ὁ ἀγαθός in Lk 12.42, Origen's interpretation above makes it possible to take the view that it has been put in the D text as interpretative in function. Thus it is possible rather than improbable that this example is another case of a variant reading that was purposely preserved by the tradents of the D textual tradition because of its usefulness in the oral performance of reading the text.

The Good Samaritan (Lk 10.30-37)

The peculiar readings of the D text in Lk 10.30-37 are essentially an improvement of the text of the parable of The Good Samaritan. Since this parable is a sole Lukan parable, harmonisation with a Matthean parallel does not exist. However, it is noteworthy that the Jewish lawyer's declaration of the two great commandments in Lk 10.27 that is prior to Jesus' narration of the parable, is harmonised with its parallel passage in Mt 22.37 where it is Jesus who recites the passages from Dt 6.5 and Lv 19.18. In Lk 10.27 P⁷⁵ and B read ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας σου whereas D reads ἐν ὅλη τῆ καρδίᾳ σου. Thus, although there is no harmonisation with Matthew in the parable proper, its immediate context, before the parable is narrated, is harmonised with one of the popular Matthean sayings of Jesus. What is notable though is that there are deliberate changes in the D text of Luke even from the beginning of verse 30. There are the insertions of δέ and αὐτῷ for the smooth flow of the narrative as the parable is told by Jesus. P⁷⁵ and B spell the destination of the man robbed and beaten as

Ἱερειχώ but D spells it as Ἱεριχώ. It is just a matter of another itacism. It is also observable that D against the readings of P⁷⁵ and B omits αὐτόν after ἐκδύσαντες in verse 30 but inserts αὐτόν both in verses 32 and 33 after the same participle ἰδών. These insertions make it parallel to the retention of αὐτόν in verse 31 after the similar participle ἰδών also. Additionally, in verse 30, whilst P⁷⁵ has ἀπῆλθον, both D with B has ἀπῆλθον. Verse 31 has further unique readings in D against those of P⁷⁵ and B. These include τυχά contrary to συγκυρείαν of the original hand of P^{75*} and συγτυχείαν of a corrector of P^{75c} and συγκυρίαν of B; the participle καταβαίνων against the imperfect κατέβαινε of B and most probably of P⁷⁵ as well;⁷⁹ and the insertion of the preposition ἐν in D, albeit finds its way in P⁷⁵, but is omitted in B. Besides the insertion of αὐτόν in both verses 32 and 33 the other distinctive readings of D are the insertion of γενόμενος and the obliteration of ἐλθών in verse 32.⁸⁰ It is also notable that there is a spelling difference between Σαμαρίτης of D and Σαμαρείτης of P⁷⁵ and B. Yet again this spelling variation is another example of itacism. In verse 34 D and P⁷⁵ read κατέδησεν whereas B has κατέδησε. There is no difference at all but that B drops the movable ν. Furthermore, the reading ἔλαιον of P⁷⁵ and B is replaced by D with ἔλεον. The use of the conjunction δέ is substituted with the conjunction καί after οἶνον, which is just a matter of style. In addition, whilst P⁷⁵ and D agree with the reading ἐπεμελήθη, the original scribe of B puts ἐμεμελήθη and a later corrector makes it ἐπεμεμελήθη. The word arrangement δηνάρια δύο ἔδωκεν of D in verse 35 is different from P⁷⁵ and B's ἔδωκεν δύο δηνάρια. Also, in the same verse D's original reading πανδοκεῖ is conformed to πανδοχεῖ by a later corrector which is the reading of P⁷⁵ and B. What is more is that whereas P⁷⁵ and B have ἐὰν προσδαπανήσης, D has ἄν προσδαπανήσεις. Continuing

⁷⁹What has been clearly preserved in the text of P⁷⁵ is κ as the beginning letter of the last word of the third line from the bottom. The next letter is apparently an α, but it is not as clear as the κ. The first word of the second line from the bottom is βαίνεν that fits well to be conjectured as κατέβαινε.

⁸⁰See the discussion of the textual problem in Lk 10.32 in Metzger, *TCGNT* 1994², 128-9.

in verse 35, it can be observed how the first person personal pronoun ἔγωγ is transposed in D after με before and closer to its verb ἀποδώσω. This is against the reading of P⁷⁵ and B that places ἔγωγ in front of ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρχεσθαί με. The dative personal pronoun σοι which is the direct object of ἀποδώσω is also removed in the D text. As Jesus applies the parable in Lk 10.36 by asking the lawyer who asked him, “Who is my neighbour?”, D puts the question as τίνα οὖν δοκεῖς πλησίον γεγονέναι contrary to a more elaborate rendition of P⁷⁵ and B as τίς τούτων τῶν τριῶν πλησίον δοκεῖ σοι γεγονέναι. Finally, in verse 37 D omits αὐτῷ but P⁷⁵ and B retains it. Besides, a later corrector inserted the article ὁ in B text for Ἰησοῦς making its reading similar to P⁷⁵ and D. Also, the reading of P⁷⁵ uses the dative σοι, but B supports D with the reading συ.

As the variant reading of D in The Good Samaritan is analysed this parable as reflected in D gives emphasis to the fact that the wounded man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho needed help. The emphasis on seeing the wounded man by the priest, the Levite and the Samaritan is due to the addition of αὐτόν in D in instances that the three saw him in his situation. As noted above that whilst D obliterates αὐτόν after ἐκδύσαντες in verse 30, it places αὐτόν both in verses 32 and 33 after the same participle ἰδών which makes it parallel to the retention of αὐτόν in verse 31 after the similar participle ἰδών. Origen (*Homilies on Luke* 34.5-6) highlights that the three men saw the victim, albeit he reiterates how the priest and the Levite saw him:

Hunc enim vidit [sacerdos, puto lex, vidit levites, ut reor sermo propheticus;] et cum vidissent, transierunt et reliquerunt. Servabat quippe seminecem providentia ei, qui fortior erat lege et prophetis, [Samaritano videlicet, qui interpretatur *custos*. Iste est, qui *non dormitat neque dormit custodiens Israhel*.]

Propter seminecem profectus est iste Samarites, non *de Hierusalem in Hiericho* sicut sacerdos et levita descendens, aut si descendit, idcirco descendit, ut salvaret custodiretque moriturum, ad quem locuti sunt Iudaei: *Samaritanus es tu et daemonium habes* et qui, cum negasset se habere daemonium, Samariten negare se noluit; sciebat enim se esse custodem. Itaque cum venisset ad seminecem et vidisset eum in suo sanguine volutari, misertus accessit ad eum, ut fieret eius proximus, *ligavit vulnera, infudit oleum vino mixtum* neque dixit, quod in propheta legitur: *non est malagma imponere neque oleum neque alligaturas*. Iste est Samaritanus, cuius cura et auxilio omnes, qui male habent, indigent, cuius vel maxime Samaritani indigebat

auxilio, qui *de Hierusalem* descendens *inciderat in latrones* et vulneratus ab eis semianimis fuerat derelictus.⁸¹

It is possible, then, that the reiteration of αὐτόν in verses 32 and 33 after ἰδών causing it to be parallel with αὐτόν in verse 31 after ἰδών in the light of Origen's interpretation provides a clue that D's reading performance orally could accent the visibility of the wounded victim that calls for an act of mercy. It is also observable that whilst B reads κατὰ συγκυρίαν, P^{75*} has the reading κατὰ συγκυρείαν. A corrector of P^{75c} changes the reading to κατὰ συγτυχείαν. The readings of P^{75*} and B with a bit of variance in spelling carry the general meaning of a coincidental seeing of the priest.⁸² The corrector of P^{75c} in employing the prepositional phrase κατὰ συγτυχείαν still supplies a plain reference to chance.⁸³ However, D's use of κατὰ τυχᾶ although used in a similar sense as to that which B and P⁷⁵ imply has a connotation of divine providence.⁸⁴ This matter of emphasis has been reiterated at the end when in D Jesus asked τίνα οὖν δοκεῖς πλησίον instead of making a choice among the three characters who encountered the wounded man as in P⁷⁵ and B with the reading τίς τούτων τῶν τριῶν πλησίον δοκεῖ σοι. Perhaps the alteration of words in D could provide an avenue in the oral performance of the text similar to the Hebrew Bible's *ketib* and *qere* before the congregation that receives its reading that would help to articulate the allegorical meaning and representative mimesis of the text of The Good Samaritan as the experience of the wounded victim allegorically interpreted as humanity that is within the protection of the divine providence.

⁸¹Origen, SC 87:404-6. ET *HLFL*, 139-40.

⁸²BDAG, 953. Cf. the definition of συγκυρέω in terms of "coincidence" in LSJ, 1668; and Lampe, *Patristic Lexicon*, 1275.

⁸³BDAG, 976. See also BDAG, 953.

⁸⁴LSJ, 1839, cites usage of τύχη understood as "the act of a god". There is a broad nuance in the word when used as implying divine destiny. Furthermore, LSJ, 1839, defines the employment of the word when something is "regarded as an agent or cause beyond human control". So is the definition of BDAG, 1021.

to the gesture of the Levite indicates a case on how the oil and mercy became closely used in explaining the good thing that the Samaritan fulfilled. It is worth noting the comment of Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke 7.74-75*) about the equation of oil with mercy:

Non mediocris iste Samaritanus, qui eum quem sacerdos, quem leuita despexerat, non etiam ipse despexit. Nec uocabulo sectae despicias quem uerbi interpretatione mirabere; Samaritani etenim uocabulo custos significatur. Hoc habet interpretatio. Quis est custos nisi ille de quo dictum est: *custodiens paruulos dominus?* Itaque sicut Iudaeus alius in littera, alius in spiritu, ita et Samaritanus alius foris, alius in occulto. Hic ergo Samaritanus descendens—quis est, *qui descendit e caelo, nisi qui ascendit in caelum, filius hominis qui est in caelo?*—uidens semiuiuum, quem nemo potuerat ante curare, sicut illa quae fluxu sanguinis profluens in medicis erogauerat omne patrimonium suum, *uenit secus eum*, hoc est: factus compassionis nostrae susceptione finitimus et misericordiae conlatione uicinus.

Et alligauit uulnera eius infundens oleum et uinum. Multa medicamenta medicus habet iste, quibus sanare consueuit. Sermo eius medicamentum est: alius eius sermo constringit uulnera, alius oleo fouet, alius uinum infundit: constringit uulnera austeriore praeepto, fouet remissione peccati, sicut uino conpungit denuntiatione iudicii.⁸⁶

Ambrose sees an extraordinary Samaritan who becomes a neighbour to the wounded man and shows him the gift of mercy. As he refers to Christ as the Good Samaritan he notes that as a physician Christ has many remedies and that his word is a remedy. Additionally, Ambrose believes that Christ's sayings bind up wounds, stimulate with oil and pour in wine. Christ binds up wounds with an accurate instruction and stimulates with the cleansing of iniquities. Moreover, Ambrose metaphorically associates the judgement of the Lord with the effect of wine. Thus it is immediately noticeable when the two citations from Cyril of Alexandria and Ambrose are juxtaposed, the reference to the oil would be referring to mercy (D) in terms of oil of compassionate love (Cyril of Alexandria) or the oil that deals with sin (Ambrose). The emphasis in Cyril of Alexandria is the effect of the anointing of oil, allegorised as love showing compassion. In Ambrose it is in the fashion that oil is associated with forgiveness of sin. Perhaps, in D the use of ἔλεον points to the act that shows not only compassion but also forgiveness. What could have been a gloss explanation later became a reading that

⁸⁶Ambrose, SC 52:34. ET *EHGSL*, 268-9.

penetrated the D text because the gloss explanation becomes the legitimate spiritual meaning of the original text in the process of its reading performance that is similar to the *ketib* and *qere* reading practice and sermonic exposition.

Another notable reading in D is in Lk 10.35. Whilst P⁷⁵ and B read ἐκβαλὼν ἔδωκεν δύο δηνάρια D reads ἐκβαλὼν δηνάρια δύο ἔδωκεν. At first glance the difference seems to be just a matter of arrangement of words but the meaning of the participial phrase is the same. Nonetheless, a second look for the difference of the nuance of meaning is distinguishable. On the one hand the reading of P⁷⁵ and B ἐκβαλὼν ἔδωκεν δύο δηνάρια literally means “having taken out he gave two denarii.” On the other hand the reading of D that reads ἐκβαλὼν δηνάρια δύο ἔδωκεν that can be translated as “having taken out the denarii he gave two.” This distinction of meaning is quite subtle because in P⁷⁵ and B the Good Samaritan after taking out two denarii gave them to the innkeeper, but in D the word arrangement suggests the nuance that the Good Samaritan brought out some denarii and he gave two of them to the innkeeper. Perhaps, the allegorical interpretation of Origen and Ambrose would shed light in this matter. On the one hand Origen (*Homilies on Luke* 34.8) views that: Duo denarii notitia mihi videtur esse Patris et Filii et scientia sacramenti, quomodo Pater in Filio et Filius in Patre sit.⁸⁷ On the other hand Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 7.80) suggests: Qui sunt isti duo denarii nisi forte duo testamenta, quae imaginem in se habent aeterni Regis expressam, quorum pretio uulnera nostra curantur?⁸⁸ Moreover, Origen (*Homilies on Luke* 34.8) equates the inn-keeper to the angel of the Church who has the knowledge and responsibility to care for the person entrusted to him.⁸⁹ But Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 7.81-82) thinks that the inn-keeper is referring to

⁸⁷Origen, SC 87:408. ET *HLFL*, 140.

⁸⁸Ambrose, SC 52:35. ET *EHGSL*, 269.

⁸⁹Origen, SC 87:408. ET *HLFL*, 140.

those who preach the gospel, particularly the apostle Paul.⁹⁰ In any case the changes of word order in the D text of Lk 10.35 could be due to an allegorical interpretation. It is possible that the equation of the two denarii to either the two testaments of the scripture or the two persons in the Godhead influenced the way the text is rendered in the D text of Luke. Further through the different word arrangement in D, the spoken text before the Christian community could accent through the tone of voice and the needed emphasis in the rearranged word order which could also be analogous to the *ketib* and *qere* rendition of the text.

Parables Not Impossibly Influenced by Allegory and Mimesis

It is not impossible that allegory and mimesis together could have influenced the D text of the parables of The Defendant (Lk 12.57-59) and The Harvest and the Labourers (Lk 10.2). Origen, Ambrose and Cyril of Alexandria allegorically interpret the Defendant. Thus even if the indications of the impact of mimesis and allegory as observed in the D text are only implicit it is still a good example to present. The Harvest and the Labourers in Lk 10.2 has a parallel account in Mt 9.37-38. Yet there is no indication that it has been harmonised with the popular Gospel just like the other examples given. Hence, the weight of the influence of mimetic intertextuality is not apparent. It is not impossible that its variant τοῦ θεοῦ in D could be due to the allegorical interpretation and mimetic representation of this parable saying in the early Church. It may be dismissed as a simple scribal decision for an appropriate choice of word in D. Nevertheless, the notion that the use of τοῦ θεοῦ in D is due to the parable saying's allegorical interpretation and mimetic representation of the Christian duty is not impossible due to a parallel interpretation of Cyril of Alexandria.

The Defendant (Lk 12.57-59)

The parable of the The Defendant in Lk 12.57-59 is about the settling with an accuser and has a corresponding parable in Mt 5.25-26. The readings of D and d omit τί δέ in Lk 12.57. It is also notable that although P⁷⁵ and B have κρίνετε and κρείνετε, respectively,

⁹⁰ Ambrose, SC 52:35. ET *EHGSL*, 269-70.

D has κρίνεται. The statement καὶ ἄφ' ἑαυτῶν οὐ κρίνεται τὸ δίκαιον of D is not sustained by et a uobis non iudicatis iustum reading of d. What d supports then is neither the interrogative question of P⁷⁵ and B nor the declarative statement of Jesus in D. Rather, d has its own indicative reading. The reading of D should be translated as “even the right thing is not judged by yourselves”. The reading of d is “and you do not judge the right thing by yourselves” is a variation. The reading of D makes sense when the previous verses before Lk 12.57 are considered. Verses 54-56 talk about the signals that come from the weather. Jesus rebukes his audience by asserting that they do not know how to ascertain the current time of his presence among them. In this regard the variant reading of D in verse 57 reinforces the claim of verses 54-56 that the audience does not know how to evaluate the time of Jesus’ presence and consequently unable to make righteous judgement. This reading is different from what P⁷⁵ and B that asks the question τί δέ καὶ ἄφ' ἑαυτῶν οὐ κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον; which is a rhetorical one. In D τὸ δίκαιον becomes the subject of the passive κρίνεται whereas in P⁷⁵ and B τὸ δίκαιον is the object of the active κρίνετε. In other words the reading of D reflects Jesus’ declaration to the crowds that they are not able to judge what is right. It is not impossible then that this interpretation could be easier to be articulated during the reading performance of the text and thereby receive an exposition later.

In the next verse D has two variant readings that could bring different implications to the meaning of the parable. The first one is the alteration of the perfect passive infinitive ἀπηλλαχθαι of P⁷⁵ and B to the aorist infinitive passive ἀπαλλάγηναι in D. Both forms are from ἀπαλλάσσω, “to be set free, released or delivered”. The change of tense from perfect to aorist shows an intentional alteration in D. Although the general meaning is not changed the stress on the point of action in the use of aorist is rather emphasised. Perhaps during the reading presentation of the text before the congregation the point of action that calls for the immediate deliverance from the adversary is accented that can later followed up with an exegetical explanation. The second one is the alteration of the verb κατασύρη, “he

[may] drag”, of P⁷⁵ and B to κατακρίνει (the itacism should be corrected to καταρίνει), “he [may] condemn, convict, sentence”, in D. The parallel d text supports the reading of D. It has discedere for ἀπαλλάγηται, and condemnet for κατακρίνει. The other altered readings are just minor. The text of D shows consistency in its word arrangement by reversing the order of words in Lk 12.58. Whilst P⁷⁵ and B reads σε παραδώσει and σε βαλεῖ D reads παραδώσει σε and βαλεῖ σε. B omits ἀπ’ and D used the wrong article τῷ instead of the correct one τῇ for the dative noun ὄδῳ. Although minor modifications such as these do not affect the familiar meaning of the text they leave an imprint of evidence that there are deliberate transformations made to the text. However, it is not impossible that as the analogy of *ketib* and *qere* may be at work where the variant readings were first, a marginal reading uttered when the parable was read and spiritual meaning was expounded after it has been read. Lastly, the paraphrase in D, at the last verse of the parable, to read λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν ἕως οὐ ἀποδοῖς τὸν ἔσχατον κοδράντην is harmonisation with Mt 5.26 but with the retention of its distinctness.⁹¹ Once again d supports D by reading dico tibi non exies inde usque quo reddas nouissimum quadrantem. The Matthean text reads ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν ἕως ἂν ἀποδῶς τὸν ἔσχατον κοδράντην in both B and D. Yet again a literary imitative character of the D text in Luke has been observed here where Lk 12.59 is harmonised with Mt 5.26 to employ its popular reading. Both Origen (*Homilies on Luke* 35.1-2, 10-11)⁹² and Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 7.149-158)⁹³ employ the Matthean account to interpret Luke’s version of the parable. Wailes provides an insight on how the Matthean reading of The Defendant was influential:

⁹¹So also is Vogels, *Harmonistik*, 98.

⁹²Origen, SC 87:412-4, 424-6. ET *HLFL*, 142-3, 147-8.

⁹³Ambrose, SC 52:63-6. ET *EHGSL*, 297-300.

For earlier authorities, notably Origen and Ambrose, the texts in Matthew and Luke are different parables embodying different allegories, but the influence of the former text on interpretation of the latter seems very strong from Augustine onward. The salient differences—the presence of a ruler as well as a judge in Luke, Luke’s idea of being freed from rather than coming to terms with an opponent, and the different coins named in the final phrase—all tend to be merged in readings most easily supported from Matthew’s wording.⁹⁴

The harmonised Lukan reading of D with Matthew’s is quite different from P⁷⁵ and B which reads λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν ἕως καὶ τὸ ἔσχατον λεπτὸν ἀποδώσῃς. This Lukan reading of P⁷⁵ and B is not what most of the Fathers have followed when they talked about the parable. Wailes’ observation above is a predictable because of Matthew’s known popularity and recognised authority in the ancient Church. Thus with the assumption that Matthew’s version and patristic interpretations of The Defendant shaped the reading and interpretation of Luke’s version, it is not impossible that the allegorising variants could collaborate in providing a clue from the harmonising reading of D that gives a mimetic key for the understanding of its unique text. The allegorical patristic interpretations of The Defendant in both Lk 12.57-59 and Mt 5.25-26 could shed light on the readings cited above. The Fathers could confirm that the distinctive readings in D, are allegorising variants that its tradents developed through the years when it has been transmitted and received by Christian congregations. A possible case of a marginal chain referencing is placed in this part of the D text of Luke. Because the Matthean reading is employed and voiced out so that it can be a hermeneutical tool to expound the parable, this harmonised reading came into the D text of Luke.

Origen’s Homily 35 on Lk 12.57-59 is fully preserved. Origen’s allegorical interpretation of The Defendant in Lk 12.57-59 gives several telling insights on the probability of the allegorising variants in the D text, especially when the Christian is taken as the representative mimesis of the person addressed in the parable. Origen (*Homilies on Luke* 35.5-6) identifies the accuser as an evil spirit designated to afflict a believer’s life that when

⁹⁴Wailes, *Medieval*, 86.

this evil spirit becomes triumphant it will bring casualty to the ruler who is a fallen angel who controls the part of this earth where it overshadows.⁹⁵ Origen (*Homilies on Luke* 35.10) equates the judge as the Lord Jesus Christ and the debt collector as somebody that we owe something. Ambrose's allegorical interpretation has coherence with that of the Origen and identifies the adversary in The Defendant as the devil. Origen (*Homilies on Luke* 35.9) declares that the believer should be set free from the devil because if not Christ's judgement will come to him and that he will turn him to the angels for retribution:

*Da ergo operam, ut libereris ab adversario tuo sive a principe, ad quem te trahit adversarius. Da operam, ut habeas sapientiam, iustitiam, fortitudinem, temperantiam, et tunc complebitur: ecce homo et opera eius ante faciem suam. Nisi dederis operam, non poteris adversarii pactum infringere, cuius amicitia inimicitia est in Deum. Quando vadis cum adversario tuo ad principem in via, da operam. Latitat in hoc loco nescio quid, et secretum est: in via da operam. Salvator ait: Ego sum via et veritas et vita. Si dederis operam, ut libereris ab adversario, esto in via; et cum steteris in eo, qui dicit: ego sum via, stetisse non sufficit, sed da operam, ut libereris ab adversario. Nisi enim dederis operam, ut ab adversario libereris, quae te sequantur, ausculta. Trahit te ad iudicem adversarius sive princeps; cum te susceperit ab adversario, trahit te ad iudicem. Quam elegans sermo: trahit, ut ostendat quodammodo retractantes et nolentes ad condemnationem trahi et ire compelli! Quis enim homicida concito gradu pergit ad iudicem? Quis gaudens ad condemnationem suam ire festinat, et non invitus trahitur ac repugnans? Scit enim se ad hoc ire, ut sententiam mortis accipiat.*⁹⁶

The immediate deliverance from the adversary as the aorist point of action could have been shaped by the notion that Origen suggests as a mysterious point is concealed in the phrase in via da operam and then quoting Jn 14.6 he explains that even if a person is standing on him who is ego sum via he still needs to exert effort to be liberated from the adversary. Ambrose also names the Father as the ruler in the parable. What Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 7.149-155) has to say is similar to that of Origen's. Perhaps, the change of the perfect passive infinitive ἀπηλλάχθαι of P⁷⁵ and B to the aorist infinitive passive ἀπαλλάγηναι in D meant to focus on the time that deliverance from the adversary is significant. This is so because Ambrose, with Origen, emphasise the necessity for a person to be liberated from the

⁹⁵Origen, SC 87:418-20. ET *HLFL*, 144-5.

⁹⁶Origen, SC 87:422-4. ET *HLFL*, 146-7.

adversary. Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 7.153) interprets Luke's account of the parable by using Matthew and underscoring the necessity of being delivered from the fetter of the devil:

Ideo et secundum Matthaeum ait: *esto consentiens aduersario tuo, cum es cum illo in uia*; εὐνοῶν autem Graecus dixit, hoc est beniuolens. Si enim, dum sumus in hac uita, exsoluamus nos a uinculis diaboli, nec ille propter nos damnabitur et nos a uinculis eius erimus alieni. Vnde et pro Assyrio psalmus scribitur LXXVIII. Bene enim consulis aduersario et pro illo Assyrio, hoc est uano, facis, si eius laqueis exutus praestes hanc beniuolentiam, ut poenam tui lapsus et mortis euadat. Quodsi uinculis eius haereas, tradet te tamquam reum magistratui, idem accusator et proditor.⁹⁷

Also the modification of the verb κατασύρη, “he [may] drag”, of P⁷⁵ and B to κατακρίνη (the itacism should be corrected to καταρίνη), “he [may] condemn, convict, sentence”, in D may apply to a Christian's condemnation because of sin. It is also interesting that Cyril of Alexandria (*Commentary on Luke*, Homily 95 [312]) supports the preceding possible interpretation and identified both the accuser and the officer as Satan and exhorts:

Οὐκοῦν ἐνοχοὶ μὲν πλημμελήμασί ἐσμεν ἅπαντες οἱ ὄντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Ἐκάστου γε μὴν ἀντίδικος καὶ κατήγορος, ὁ Σατανᾶς· ἐχθρὸς γὰρ ἐστί καὶ ἐκδικητής. Ἔως τοίνυν ἐσμεν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, τουτέστιν ἕως οὐπω πρὸς τὸ τῆς ἐνθάδε ζωῆς κατηντήσαμεν τέλος, ἀπαλλαγῶμεν αὐτοῦ· λύσωμεν τὰς καθ' ἑαυτῶν αἰτίας· τὴν διὰ Χριστοῦ χάριν ἀρπάσωμεν, ἐλευθεροῦσαν ἡμᾶς παντὸς ὀφλήματος, καὶ δίκης ἔξω τιθεῖσαν, κολάσεώς τε καὶ φόβου. Μὴ ἄρα πῶς ἀναπόνητον ἐσχηκότες τὸν μολυσμὸν, ἀπενεχθῶμεν πρὸς τὸν κριτὴν, καὶ παραδοθῶμεν τοῖς πράκτορσιν, ἧτοι τοῖς κολασταῖς, ὧν οὐκ ἂν τις διαφύγοι τὸ ἀπηνές, ἀπαιτηθήσεται δὲ μᾶλλον τὰς ἐπὶ παντὶ πλημμελήματι δίκας μικρῶ καὶ μεγάλῳ. Τούτων ἔσονται μακρὰν οἱ τὸν τῆς Χριστοῦ παρουσίας καιρὸν δοκιμάζοντες, καὶ τὸ ἐπ' αὐτῷ μυστήριον οὐκ ἠγνοηκότες.⁹⁸

With Cyril of Alexandria, it is not impossible that D could have been theologically moulded by the thought that the accuser, who is the wicked Satan, also condemns. Furthermore, like Origen and Ambrose, Cyril of Alexandria picks up on the deliverance from the accuser in this

⁹⁷Ambrose, SC 52:65. ET *EHGSL*, 298-9.

⁹⁸Cyril of Alexandria, PG 72:760. ET *CGSL*, 383.

lifetime and takes advantage of the grace of Christ. For if a person's impurity is not washed away he will be brought to the judge and handed to the tormentors from whom no one can escape. But those who are looking forward for Christ's coming are not only delivered without blame but also blessed with happiness.

Lastly, Ambrose (*Exposition of the Gospel of Luke* 7.156-158) expounds on the meaning of the last mite in the parable:

Superest nunc ut intellegamus quid sibi uelit figura quadrantis. Et uidetur usualis rei expressum nomine intellectus spiritalis arcanum. Nam sicut qui pecuniam soluunt debitum reddunt, nec prius euacuatur faenoris nomen quam totius sortis ad nummum usque quocumque solutionis genere quantitas uniuersa soluatur, sic compensatione caritatis actuumque reliquorum uel satisfactione quacumque peccati poena dissoluitur. Non otiosum etiam quia non aera sicut alibi duo, non assem, non denarium, sed quadrantem hoc posuit loco; quadrantaria enim permutatio uelut quaedam est compensatio, cum aliud redditur et aliud significatur solutum. Ita et hic aut pretio caritatis redimitur iniuria aut iniuriae aestimatione poena laxatur. Quadrantem autem in balneis dari solere reminiscimur, cuius oblatione ut illic unusquisque lauandi accipit facultatem ita hic accipit eluendi, quia uniuscuiusque peccatum supra scriptae genere condicionis eluitur, cum tamdiu exercetur noxius poenis, ut commissi supplicia erroris expendat.⁹⁹

Obviously, Ambrose spiritualises the meaning of the last mite. He argues that just like money is paid for a debt, sin is pardoned by charity. Further, He thinks that the reference to the exchange relating to a mite is the recompense when the one is paid back, and the other signifies a discharged debt. Thus, Ambrose believes that either the transgression is bought by charity or the penalty is cancelled by transformation of the offence. He makes an analogy that just as in the baths, the right to wash is by payment, the sin of each person is cleansed by the manner of the given punishment. As already noted above Cyril of Alexandria (*Commentary on Luke*, Homily 95) equates the payment of the last mite as deliverance from our sins before the earthly life of a person is over.¹⁰⁰ Additionally, Origen (*Homilies on Luke* 35.11) equates the payment of the last "farthing" in Luke or "penny" in Matthew to pro

⁹⁹ Ambrose, SC 52:66. ET *EHGSL*, 299-300.

¹⁰⁰ See Cyril of Alexandria, *PG* 72:760. ET *CGSL*, 383.

qualitate et quantitate peccati that should be paid.¹⁰¹ Origen (*Homilies in Luke* 35.12-14) explains how each person has a debt collector who will come to get his due. So, as Origen argues, if a person owes the debt collector nothing he can resist him but if he owes him he will be in jail until payment is paid by toil or by chastisement. The debt collector does not have power to cancel debt. Only the Lord can forgive debts.¹⁰² Origen (*Homilies in Luke* 35.15) affirms the view that there are degrees of sin and that the mention of the last farthing refers to small sin yet still to be paid:

Et inter ipsa quoque tenuia atque subtilia est diversitas peccatorum. Nisi enim inter tenue atque subtile peccatum esset aliud subtilius, nunquam diceretur: *non exies inde, donec reddas novissimum quadrantem*.

Quomodo, si pecuniam diceret *novissimum minutum*—minutum, quod est denarius sive nummus sive obolus sive stater—; quid, si magnam pecuniam debuerimus sicut ille, qui scribitur decem milia talenta debuisse; quanto tempore claudamur in carcere, donec reddamus debitum, non possum manifeste pronuntiare. Si enim, qui parum debet, non egreditur, nisi exsolvat *minutum quadrantem*, utique, qui tanto debito fuerit obnoxius, infinita ei ad reddendum debitum saecula numerabuntur. Quapropter *demus operam, ut liberemur ab adversario*, dum sumus in via, et iungamur Domino Iesu: *cui est gloria et imperium in saecula saeculorum. Amen.*¹⁰³

What Origen argues for is that it does not matter whatever the degree of sin committed. What is important is to be delivered from sin so that a person could join Jesus in his glory. Since Origen cannot calculate how long is the time a person can stay in jail until the last penny is paid, one who owes much will pay for eternity, he concludes with the same thought that he said earlier in the homily: *Quapropter demus operam, ut liberemur ab adversario*, dum sumus in via.

In sum what we can observe from the interpretations of Origen, Ambrose and Cyril of Alexandria is a coherence of reading with the D text of Luke. It is not impossible that the distinctive readings in the D text of Lk 12.57-59 reflect allegorising variants as well as

¹⁰¹Origen, SC 87:424. ET *HLFL*, 148.

¹⁰²Origen, SC 87:426-8. ET *HLFL*, 148-50.

¹⁰³Origen, SC 87: 428-30. ET *HLFL*, 150.

mimetic harmonisation with the Matthean account. The use of ἀπαλλάγηνοι in D could have come into the D text because of the allegorical interpretation of the parable such as that of Origen. Origen as cited above exhorts a believer to be set free from the adversary. Another significant textual variant in this parable is the alteration of the verb κατασύρη of P⁷⁵ and B to κατακρείνη in D. Again, as Origen has pointed out above that the person referred to is “in a sense dragged reluctantly and unwillingly, and forced to be condemned”. This interpretation could have been absorbed by κατακρείνη in D. Instead of just simply using κατασύρη D used the purpose of the dragging in before the judge and interpreted it as κατακρείνη. With Ambrose, the exegetical traditions that are familiar with Origen and Cyril of Alexandria could have influenced the shaping of the D text in Lk 12.59 in the parable of The Defendant to read λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐχέλθης ἐκεῖθεν ἕως οὐ ἀποδοῖς τὸν ἔσχατον κοδράντην. The harmonisation with Mt 5.26, albeit with the retention of its distinctness, and with d’s support by reading dico tibi non exies inde usque quo reddas nouissimum quadrantem the allegorical overtone becomes strong. Thus the mimetic reflection of the κοδράντης in Mt 5.25 can be easily allegorised to mean sin. Therefore, whilst the harmonisation with Mt 5.25 is a mimetic composition in Lk 12.59, that is practising literary imitation, at the same time it is also an allegorising variant from the D text that could have been a representative mimesis as well. Maybe in the process of the oral reading the D text of the parable the familiar mimetic cross-reading from Matthew became the received interpretation that led to its incorporation to the main body of the text. This could be a case of a familiar reading from Matthew that developed to be the accepted meaning of the Lukan text which later fossilised in the D text of Luke’s parable of The Defendant.

The Harvest and the Labourers (Lk 10.2)

It is proper to give The Harvest and the Labourers in Lk 10.2 as the last example of this chapter, as it has a very close parallel in Mt 9.37-38. The parabolic saying of The

אָפּ דער אַרבעט. דער אַרבעטער האָט געזאָגט: אַלע אַרבעטער
 האָבן אַרבעט. ¹⁰⁴האָט דער אַרבעטער געזאָגט: אַלע אַרבעטער

Cyril of Alexandria is basically reiterating that the Lord of the harvest who is referred to in this parabolic saying, is by nature truly divine. It is sensible then to view that the use of $\tau\omicron\upsilon\hat{\theta}\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in Lk 10.2 in D against that of $\tau\omicron\upsilon\hat{\kappa}\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$ in B is not merely a casual alteration of word due to a scribal preference. Rather, the use of $\tau\omicron\upsilon\hat{\theta}\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in D has a tradition behind it. Perhaps, a tradent deliberately modified D in Lk 10.2 so that the exposition of the text as relating to the Lord of the harvest as no other than who by nature is truly God as Cyril of Alexandria puts it: אַלע אַרבעטער האָבן אַרבעט, אַלע אַרבעטער האָבן אַרבעט. It would be smoother and much easier to expound allegorically and mimetically represent the task of doing the work of the Lord who is God in a homily. Maybe the reference to God who gives the mandate to the Christian believers in the way D renders its reading, originally came from a gloss that could be mentioned by a reader in the process of the oral reading of the text. Thus, it could as well have contributed to the shaping of this supposedly allegorising variant of The Harvest and the Labourers. The support of the exegesis of Lk 10.2 by Cyril of Alexandria substantiates the claim that the alteration of $\tau\omicron\upsilon\hat{\kappa}\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$ in B and P⁷⁵ with $\tau\omicron\upsilon\hat{\theta}\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in D suggests that it is not impossible that the primary reason is interpretative in nature. Tradents could have preserved a previously allegorising gloss $\tau\omicron\upsilon\hat{\theta}\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ as an allegorical interpretation and mimetic representation of the divine Lord of the harvest. Later, the marginal $\tau\omicron\upsilon\hat{\theta}\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ that became a popular exegetical equation for the Lord of the harvest in the parable saying supplanted $\tau\omicron\upsilon\hat{\kappa}\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$ in the D textual tradition. Again, using the analogy of *ketib* and *qere*, may be $\tau\omicron\upsilon\hat{\theta}\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ was verbalised when Lk 10.2 was read instead of or with $\tau\omicron\upsilon\hat{\kappa}\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$. Then $\tau\omicron\upsilon\hat{\theta}\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ finally entered into the D text as an allegorising variant reading of Lk 10.2 and that it became an appropriate representative mimesis reading of the divine one who is in charge of the harvest since it became very familiar to the hearing

¹⁰⁴SCAACLE, 121-2. ET CGSL, 261.

of the congregation. As a result it is not impossible that it could have been performed orally since when the reading τοῦ θεοῦ finally entered into the D textual tradition.

Perhaps, it is justified to maintain that although it is difficult to demonstrate explicitly how and when the allegorising variants and mimetic readings entered the D text of Luke, it can nevertheless be clearly depicted by using the analogy of the *ketib* and *qere* and the model provided by the marginal catena of Codex Ξ as what has been done above. The theoretical description of the manner in which the distinctive variant readings in the D text of Luke evolved throws brighter light to the central argument of this research. The existence of allegorising variants and mimetic readings in the Lukan parables of the D text were primarily interpretative in function. The extant commentaries of Origen, Ambrose and Cyril of Alexandria supply the parallel materials from the early Church practice of allegorical exegesis and the use of Matthew to interpret Luke that would corroborate the claims made above. It would be appropriate to end this chapter, that attempts to paint how and when the supposedly allegorising variants and mimetic readings entered into the D text of Luke, with a line from Professor Julio Treballe Barrera: “Biblical tradition, however, is primarily the transmission of the actual text of the Bible in material form: the *meaning of Scripture* is contained in the *letters of the script*”.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁵Julio Treballe Barrera, *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible: An Introduction to the History of the Bible*, trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998), 13. (The italics are original.) Barrera, *Jewish*, 15, further suggests that the combination of literary criticism, textual criticism and the history of interpretation would be of much benefit for the study of the biblical texts:

Literary theory makes a crystal clear distinction between the process of the literary *formation* of a book and the *transmission* and *interpretation* of its text. In practice, analysis shows that these three fields constantly touch and overlap so that it is not possible to reach a satisfactory solution to the problems except through an *interdisciplinary dialogue among scholars studying literary criticism, textual criticism and the history of interpretation*. The principles and methods of textual criticism do not change, but their application varies depending on whether the history of the biblical text is viewed as a single straight line of transmission or as bundles of lines coming from very different sources and intersecting each other a great deal. The history of modern biblical criticism has known several movements and trends.

(The italics in the quote are original.)

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION: THEOLOGY INFLUENCES EXEGESIS WHICH SHAPES THE TEXT

Contemporary biblical scholarship does not share a common assumption with those who produced the Holy Writ and the earliest generations who received it as their own spoken book. The emphasis of the present understanding of the text is its “otherness” from the reader. There is a strong detachment of the reader from the text. The prevailing scholarship of the time looks at an ancient text, with the employment of current historical and literary tools, with the expectation not to read it, based on present day experiences that may relate to what is represented in its text. Rather, every contemporary interpreter should distance him/herself away from the text and read it approximating to the way the original author intended the text to be read by its original recipient as well as its probable affect on this first audience and their response to what is said in the text. However, the attitude of the generations of ancient readers toward the text that they receive is dynamic. They are involved in the text that they read and inherited. As they make sense out of it, they try to fit in what is the best way to understand the text on their hands, even to alter the wordings of a manuscript used whilst they are committed and faithful to the tradition of interpretation that moulded it.

The early tradents of the D text would probably have this kind of accepted plausibility structure for reading and transmitting the text of the Gospels. They did not distance themselves from the text of Luke’s Gospel that they received. The tradents of the D text of Luke “owned” the text and developed a textual tradition that was distinct from the Alexandrian textual tradition. The tradents have their theology with them that shapes the textual tradition that has been interpreted and reinterpreted for succeeding generations. These early Christian tradents understood the spiritual meaning of their received text of the third Gospel in their very letters by the use of allegorical approach of interpretation. Probably, this is the reason why even spelling variations and different word arrangement in the D text could

mean something important to its generations of users. Furthermore, the material form that these tradents interpreted and transmitted in script and in speech were taken for granted as capable of interpreting other scripts and other speeches in an intertextual or cross-referential manner.

The view of this study on the reason for the harmonising tendency of the Gospel accounts is based on this principle of interpreting the text by the letter and catena references in the process of transmission. The standard transmission of an antiquated text implies proper understanding of its letters that carries the spiritual meaning of the received textual tradition. Moreover, the manuscripts that safeguard the script of a text characterise the physical embodiment of the textual tradition that is shaped by the interaction with it by those who transmitted it. Thus, the text of Luke for the early Christian tradents could be used by the Church congregations to represent what was happening in real life thereby providing them spiritual meaning and practical insights. Therefore, the interpretative approach that recognises the interface between the oral tradition and written letters in the process of textual transmission is legitimate in examining the distinctive readings of the D text in Luke for the material form of the Gospel narrative is taken for granted as a spoken book.

Outcome of the Alternative Study

And so what are those things that have been carried out in the writing of this thesis? A vital question has been formulated as explicitly as possible in the light of the generally accepted knowledge on contemporary textual scholarship, in general, as well as the issue of distinctive readings in the D text, in particular. The main problem is placed in the ancient literary context of textual transmission. Allegorical interpretation and mimetic intertextuality were identified as standard practices in literary criticism in antiquity that the Church Fathers, the guardians of the text of the Gospels, assumed from classical writers in their transmission and interpretation of the text of Luke that they received. It has been argued as well that the best way to define those that could have been responsible for the transmission of the D text

that produced the distinctive readings found in the manuscript of D is to call them tradents. A tradent is a person whose role and functions are fluid enough to incorporate anybody who transmits the text of the New Testament in both oral and written forms. In addition, an alternative approach from the philological study of words to the accepted practice of exegesis of text in antiquity is pursued. To put it differently, the text is taken as a form of material that is a product of a tradition that is exegetically moulded by periods of theological reflections. The dynamics of the relationship of oral and written transmissions that shaped the text of the Gospels are recounted in the light of the patristic witnesses. It is maintained that the generations of tradents of D read the textual interpretation that they inherited from their Christian communities. Therefore, a basic assumption taken in the research is that the classical literature bears witness to the broadly held notions of allegory and mimesis that were taken for granted in ancient literary criticism and their application to the interpretation of the Gospels is evident among the Fathers.

Synthesis of Theological and Hermeneutical Approaches

It has been shown in the presentation on the nature of the D text's puzzle that the nature of the riddle of the text of D for a long time has been investigated with a focus on the question of the source of or the reason for its variant readings against that of the Alexandrian textual tradition. The methods used to answer the problem of the unusual readings of D were basically philological, literary, and lately, theological and hermeneutical. For some time the query was defined by the question of where to locate the source or what brings the variation of the different reading of the D text. By putting the problem of the D text, with special reference to the parables in Luke, in the ancient practice of allegorical interpretation and mimesis attention is brought to the question of the how and the when did the unique readings occur. The lead of Read-Heimerdinger on investigating the problem of the D text hermeneutically is followed. Furthermore, the theological tendency hypothesis as developed by Epp and Rice in D is assumed as one of the valid explanations for intentional alteration of

its textual tradition. Although the idea of employing the hermeneutical method of Read-Heimerdinger is followed, her utilisation of the ancient Jewish interpretative technique is not followed. Rather, the Graeco-Roman ancient literary criticism is taken up with the anti-Judaic theory of Epp and Rice. The synthesis of the hermeneutical and the theological methods are transformed into an exegetical approach practised in antiquity.

The exegeses of the Lukan parables by the Fathers bring rationality to the readings of D and testify to the understanding of how allegory and mimesis were broadly taken for granted in the patristic period. It should also be reiterated that the combination of other previous approaches used by scholars to explain the peculiar readings of the D text such as the philological and the literary tools could be compatible with the synthesised theological and hermeneutical methods applied in this thesis. Furthermore, by placing the analysis of the development of the D text in the context of ancient literary criticism and textual transmission practices the dynamic life of its text is better appreciated. It is vital to say as well that the results gathered and the inferences formed as to the import of the peculiar readings of the parables in the D text of Luke were presented as having a coherent correspondence with the Church Fathers and other early Christian literature to substantiate any interpretation of the meaning of these unusual readings in the D text of Luke. The research also depicts how the interpretative approach that the Fathers assumed from their own literary environment that is traceable in the D text is exegetical in nature. This means that the utilisation of the notions of mimesis and allegory as the tradents transmitted the text made them faithful to the interpretative tradition that they received from the Fathers. It is noteworthy as well that as a result of this faithful handing over of the text that they safeguarded and passed on to the next generations developed its own textual tradition preserved in D. Apparently, this thesis represents the result of combining the theological and hermeneutical methods in approaching the textual problem of D in Luke. It is relatively effective. It produced a fruitful enquiry. For the “textual tradition” is not only understood as a transmission of the “letters” of the

“text” understood within the context of a language—the general working assumption of philological approach—but rather as a “tradition” that could only be passed on with the accepted “interpretation”. The textual tradition of the former generations would only be handed on properly when it is re-interpreted for the next generations that will receive their predecessors’ text as their own text. Hence, the consideration of theology and hermeneutic of the guardians of the tradition would be helpful in understanding the text of the third Gospel.

Yet there are other textual issues in the D text opened due to the outcome of this study. One example is appropriate. What would be the status of the variant readings in D like the familiar riddle of the inserted saying in Lk 6.4? Should it be considered apocryphal material, an interpretative gloss, or a developed tradition of the spiritual meaning of the passage that contains it in the D textual tradition? How could such logia survive in the D text and not in other textual traditions? If the method applied in this work were successful, as claimed, would it be similarly helpful if applied in the study of these logia? To put the pertinent issue in another way, could the method be expandable to the rest of Luke or the study of the Gospels in the D text? Perhaps, someone else can follow up my study and apply my methodology to other parts of Luke or the other Gospels.

Traditioning of Textual and Oral Materials

A working knowledge of the dynamics of the textual transmission in antiquity should require an understanding of the tradents’ necessary faithfulness to their received textual tradition and its correct transmission executed within the bounds of the interpretative tradition. The Fathers had a different condition of doctrinal “traditioning”, literary environment and textual assumptions from ours. The handling of tradition is very important for them to be faithful to its source. Accordingly, it is widely held that in antiquity the tradition, oral or written, was transmitted with care of the content. The emphasis on the passing on and the continuation of the discovered knowledge should not simply be set aside. Any kind of tradition of information of some sort was valued deeply and viewed to be in need

of scrutiny and improvement. Therefore, the element of preservation as being faithful to the original source was important to early tradents. By way of analogy, the claim of D. C. Parker, that the textual transmission of the D text is free but not careless, is validated by this kind of textual faithfulness argued in this thesis. The concept of preserving the original source or being faithful to the textual tradition, however, is alien to contemporary students and scholars. The present-day approaches to the study of antiquity emphasise the originality of one's research work. The expectation for the current students of the ancient texts such as that of the New Testament is to interact with the existing literature in the subject of their research and contribute to modern debate on the existing knowledge of the problem.

The students in antiquity wanted to follow and preserve the work of their scholar-teachers, which they imitated, emulated and transformed in their own works. The tradition of knowledge handed by the teacher to his disciples was preserved and transmitted to others faithfully by those who adhered to the tradition of his school. As a result the written work of a poet, like Homer, has been imitated, emulated and transformed into another dimension by an adherent, as Virgil. The content of the work has been appropriated as well. The way the content of the work has been applied to the life of those who inherited it is through the manner of allegorical interpretation. In this way the text handled by its tradents was not taken in terms of its "otherness" as already pointed earlier. The text, instead, was taken for granted as owned by its reader. But owning of the text means its faithful preservation in its past textual tradition and its present understandable transmission. It is reasonable to say as part of this conclusion that the "how" question is answered as to the probable process of textual transmission that is explored in the light of ancient literary criticism. It is depicted in this work that the impact of theological tendency and exegetical understanding enters the text when the active interface between the traditional allegorical sense of the text and the mimetic representation of reality happens. The significance of this interaction brings the text's

significance to Christian life for the product of this interaction now becomes part of the tradition that explains the meaning of text.

The textual tradition of the D text of Luke reproduces the tradition in text form whereas the patristic interpretation of Luke represents a probable oral form of the meaning of the text of Luke. This is indeed faith-seeking understanding of the text which the whole of Chapter 5 was devoted. Hence, to study the textual history of Luke, it is necessary to understand the traditioning of textual and oral materials, which means the correct perception of the history of the exegesis of the third Gospel. However, there is a question of establishing a correct traditioning that is well illustrated by the parable of The Two Sons in Mt 21.28-32. Whilst in the investigation of the anti-Judaic and faith-seeking tendencies in the Lukan parables of the D text are identifiably secondary textual tradition in their variant nature, the textual traditions of The Two Sons until now are still in big dispute. The opinions of the textual critics are as divided as the manuscript witnesses of this parable. What is the correct tradition of this parable that is accurately preserved? Would the method applied in this research work, when tried to provide an answer on what is the fitting Matthean text of The Two Sons?

Description of Transmission and Reception Procedures

The “when” question is placed at the cutting edge of textual criticism as serious emphasis to put the spoken aspect of textual transmission at the same level as that of the written script, especially in the early stages of the history of the text that was yet fluid. Insights on a moment of textual transmission that allowed the entrance of metaphorical readings and harmonising cross-references are deduced from the study of the interpretative nature of handing and receiving the spoken book. The examples used to portray the moment that variant readings are inserted into the text are what I identified as the faith-seeking parables in Luke. It has been argued in this writing that the D text has this kind of milieu when it went through its own evolution as a textual tradition. The way Luke has been

received in the early Church, as demonstrated by Bellinzoni and Gregory (whom I cited in footnotes 66, 78, 163 and 218 of Chapter 1), has traces to that of Justin, Tatian and even Marcion's handling of their texts as presented in Chapter 3. This kind of reception of the D text of Luke has been described in the previous chapters by harmonisation with Matthew, assimilation and cross-referencing or intertextuality, and interweaving of text and excision of words or portions of the document. D. C. Parker captures the picture that I have attempted to describe in this writing:

We take up the story in the second century, at the period when four Gospels were given particular recognition in at least some churches. We are in the second half of the century. It is out of the combined authority of four Gospels, and comparison between them, that harmonization of the text arises. The debate over Marcionism, with the issue of *one* Gospel, may have been a significant factor. The Diatessaron of Tatian is the most significant result of such comparison; the text of Codex Bezae is another consequence. Besides the harmonizing, this text was characterized by a number of other features: the introduction of material about Jesus from elsewhere, and the tendency to rewrite the text in a more colloquial style. In general the text was fluid and susceptible of any number of changes. The text of Matthew was probably the most secure, while John (for obvious reasons) was the least harmonized. Acts was treated the most freely. At this period Latin versions were being produced which, apart from that of the Greek texts, had their own fluidity.¹

What has been added by this research to what Parker clearly expressed above is an alternative understanding of the nature of some of the alterations in the D text of Luke, especially that of the parables. The Lukan text on parables in particular has shown the practice of mimesis at work. This is reflected by the literary reproduction of what the text of Matthew provides as being assimilated into Luke through mimetic harmonisation. This is not a mere harmonisation but rather a reproduction of Matthew's text in Luke, a sense of compositional mimesis. This textual phenomenon has been observed by both Nagy—in an oral form, and Pucci—in a textual manner, in Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Matthew, being the recognised authority and the most popular Gospel in the early church, has been attempted by the early tradents to be appropriated in Luke. Zetzel has argued this kind of appropriation of what is fitting to the text by the literary and textual critics in antiquity in the Latin textual tradition.

¹Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 279-80.

Dawson depicted this kind of appropriation in his studies of Alexandrian allegorical interpretation that transforms culture.

The similarity of the practice in reading the Hebrew Bible utilising the *ketib* and the *qere* oral performance of the text exemplifies the progression on how the marginal glosses and the established textual tradition interacted. Perhaps, the gloss as orally read later displaced the text itself. Then, what were allegorising and harmonising readings from the margins were understood as the representative mimetic meaning of the textual tradition that became known as D. As a result, if a traditional reading differed from the glossed reading that becomes the received orally performed text and now the text itself, the variation is decided by appealing to the existing tradition of interpretation of the text. The moment that this dynamic interaction with the text occurs, the marginal allegorising gloss or the mimetic cross-referencing establishes itself in the established textual tradition. It should be underscored that although the established text of the Hebrew Bible will not allow the *qere* reading to replace the written *ketib*, the fluidity of the text of D would allow the analogy of the dynamic interaction between what is there in the text and what is a gloss that is orally performed in addition to or in the place of the text. Thus this theory of the process of the penetration of the allegorising variants and mimetic harmonisations in the D text of Luke among the parable accounts is plausible enough to a fluid textual tradition.

The Fathers could be cross-referencing or practising intertextuality when they did mimetic harmonisation of Luke with Matthew as in the case argued for the D text of the Lukan parables. The commentaries of Origen, Ambrose and Cyril of Alexandria used Matthew's account as they expound Luke. They also employ other biblical references in both the Old and New Testaments. It is vital that the earliest evidence of the patristic catena based on intertextual cross-referencing is Codex Ξ where the identified marginal commentaries have been attributed to Origen, Severus, Apollinaris and others.² Parker and Birdsall's study

²See Parker and Birdsall, "Zacynthus", 122-31.

is instructive as they argued that the catena in Ξ were not “composed” by the scribe “on his own initiative at the moment of transcription”.³ Rather, they have already a textual tradition traceable to the patristic authorities. With this in mind, the dating of the D text and the patristic literature that provides coherent parallels for the observations gathered from the variant readings of this controversial codex, do not matter. Both the Fathers’ words and the D text follow much earlier traditions.

The compositional mimetic reading of the text in a congregational setting and the allegorical interpretation of the parables in a sermon or catechism could have been put into the margins of the text of the codices and they may have been incorporated later into the body of the text. In the process of the performance reading a compositional mimesis or a paraphrase of the text is produced. This view is made plausible by the example of Codex Ξ . It is not too much then to claim that the textual tradition of the Lukan parables in D when viewed with the eyes of the Fathers would show that it is shaped by allegorical exegesis and compositional mimesis. But there is a further problem, however, in the transmission and reception procedure model that I articulated that should be pursued. The good examples are the longer ending of Mark and the adultery pericope of John or appendix of Luke. If my claim is valid and there is an appropriate equation of the oral and written level of the transmission of text, especially at an early stage of the textual tradition, what is being recovered and should be part of the present printed Greek New Testament that must set aside the later acquired traditions? Should it be the autograph that textual critics attempt to reconstruct, and thereby the basis of understanding the meaning of text, which in turn will lead to the authorial intent? Could the autograph be the original, that is, the published circulated text, used by the first recipients? Would the oldest form or standardised version of the text be the basis to make a decision to include or exclude the longer ending of Mark and

³Parker and Birdsall, “Zacynthus”, 122.

the adultery pericope of John or appendix of Luke in the Gospels that they purportedly belong?

Reappropriation of Travelling and Living Texts

What happens when a Gospel text leaves a primary context for where it was originally written and transported into a secondary context where it should be interpreted using different lenses in order that it may be understood? The story of Jesus and his parables travelled from one context to another. When the text that contains Jesus' narrative and the Gospel parables travels, it is bound to be newly appropriated by the latest readers in their own setting. The text of the Gospels has travelled. It reached the community of D. However, D has not been universalised. The free text nature of D made it localised and so it was transmitted to meet the need of the community that received it, following Bartsch hypothesis. This is the main argument for the inevitable occurrence of the theological moulding of the D text of Lukan parables.

The travel of the D text of Luke also brings dynamic life to its textual tradition. For example, the parables that are investigated in chapter four are utilised to argue that anti-Judaic representative mimesis can be discerned among them if read through the lenses of the Fathers. If these odd readings are placed in the interpretative setting of the Fathers it would make sense only when read in the socio-cultural context of the late antiquity between Jews and Christians. The journey of the D text of Luke also brought mimetic harmonisation or intertextual cross-referencing of its account of the parables with their counterparts in Matthew. Its voyage brought awareness of how the popular Matthean parables and their interpretation are influential enough to have shaped its own reading of the Lukan parables. However, the outcome of this research should admit that the anti-Judaic theological moulding of some Lukan parables in the D text might not be detected by merely looking at the unique readings they display. Hence, the D text of Luke needs company in its trip to bring out the acquired theological moulding of its text of the Lukan parables. It found its company with

the Fathers who were helpful enough to provide parallels of allegorical exegesis and mimetic cross-referencing, harmonisation or otherwise. As a result, when D shows coherence with the patristic interpretation of the Lukan parables and the parallel patterns between D's reading and patristic interpretation coordinate in thoughts and sense, its accumulation of allegorical variants and mimetic readings becomes evident.

However, other issues come along with the idea of the travelling D text of Luke. For one, the cases of parables examined in chapter five are related to the faith-seeking kind of spiritual reading of the parables in Luke. This claim is a more fluid one because in any Christian setting many of the parables of Jesus are metaphorically employed to edify the seeking faithful believers. It should be admitted that it could be a truism in a sense to argue that these parables as discussed in Chapter 5 have faith-seeking understanding tendency. What is not clear, furthermore, is the nature of the spiritual meaning that is expected by the author or the Christian community that preserved and handed his or their textual tradition to be understood by those who inherit it. The issue of the superiority and inferiority of a text type comes along. Since texts travel and along their travel are reappropriated ideas, knowledge and experience that make them living texts, should any text type takes the priority among others in recovering the text of the New Testament? The currently held assumption is that the Alexandrian text type is superior and should be the base of the text of the New Testament. It is even reflected in this writing that I utilised the combination of Alexandrian manuscripts P⁷⁵ and B as my collating base because of the currently held assumption of their textual superiority over D. This issue becomes more pointed when the issue of double versions of Acts as originally published or the "Western" non-interpolation theory that is developed due to the assumption of the Alexandrian text type's superiority. The debate is generally centred on the genuineness of the reading of D when it looks favourable against the Alexandrian text type. If the parables in the D text of Luke as claimed in this work with Bartsch were localised due to their theological moulding that is influenced by their

performance reading in catechism and liturgy, Luke left one textual deposit that became known as the D text. Nevertheless, it does not mean that Luke's text did not continue to travel and left other deposits as well, such as the Alexandrian text type. So, what then should be given as a role to the D text of Luke in the recovery of Luke's "original" text in relationship with the third Gospel's textual deposit in the patristic literature? Granting that the oldest text of Luke could be identified, as the standardised Byzantine text type is known, would the sense of the task of comparing the oldest, the standardised, the generally held superior Alexandrian and other independent text types to get to the original be understood as the autograph? Or what is believed as the recovered original is actually an eclectic reconstructed text, and therefore just another deposit of the text of the third Gospel to our contemporary time? Could it be that we would never recover the original, but rather we make another or additional deposit like the Alexandrian, Byzantine, "Western" or so and so independent text types? Would it be that at time though, this additional deposit of the New Testament text comes from the interest of its travel "business" profit with the socio-politically and ideo-dogmatically communities, including the present day community of textual scholars? Is the result of my study of the Lukan parables in the D text a good object lesson to bear in mind for the continuing quest for the text of the New Testament? The Fathers could be our good company in this quest, just like they have given support for the observations gathered from the study of the Lukan parables in the D text, for they could also provide the similar instances and insights to that we are going through right now for our quest. They generally share their deposit of New Testament text for us to withdraw and use for our benefit. I hope that this work makes this reminder as one of its contributions.

Implications for Further Research

If the theory advanced in this writing is plausible enough to be a general assumption on the process of textual transmission in antiquity, then, even if the process of διόρθωσις occurred in a period of the development of any of Luke's text form, an editor is not solely

responsible for the changes made into a text, such as that of the D text. An editor just contributed to the changes already made by the previous tradents. His alterations, omissions, additions or change of words, to improve the text he is editing is bound by the textual tradition that he is acquainted with or the text of the manuscript that he is using to edit another manuscript. The readings of the text that he thinks are fitting would be based on his awareness of the textual issues at hand as well as his own preference for a tradition that is familiar to him. If a text, such as the D text of Luke keeps on changing, especially in the early stage of its existence, then there are implications that should be considered for more investigation in relationship with methods in New Testament textual criticism. Moreover, there is also a relevant consequence of the result of this research to the Synoptic studies. The debate on the necessity of the Q source hypothesis to explain the similarities with Matthew and Luke that are not in Mark should be reviewed. Furthermore, the result of this work has added data for scholars to reflect on the status of the current understanding of the parables of Jesus.

Method for Textual Criticism: Definition of Autograph and Original Readings

One of the predominant current approaches in getting the probable original reading is to identify the variant that could have produced the other variants. This approach is cause and effect oriented. The acquaintance of a textual critic on variant readings is guided by the phenomenon observed over the text. The starting assumption of the enquiry is that textual variations are due to the corruption of the text, made unintentionally or deliberately by the scribes in particular. Nevertheless, as the central thesis of this work has argued the text is made active in the tradition interacting with the reigning plausibility structure that makes it rational that mimesis and allegory bridge the text to reality. This would suggest then that a sense of purpose could identify the extent of the intention of the deliberate alteration of the text. Consequently, the quality of variant readings should be evaluated based on textual tradition that is correctly transmitted that shaped the nature of the text type that influences the

choice of the superior reading. Could it be possible to identify the stages of a textual tradition such as that of the D text of Luke? Whether it is possible or not to do this kind of investigation it leads to a principle that an existing variant reading preserved in any manuscript is potentially part of a textual tradition. It is only a certain copyist's mistake of an available extant manuscript that would make a variant reading a clear error of transcription. This observation is vital because the choice of reading is informed by the understanding of the cause that would explain the source of the variant readings whether it is omission, addition, alteration of words or change of word order. Here authorial intent and textual meaning is taken for granted as the guide to identify the probable original reading. Thus, methodology, reasoned or thoroughgoing eclectic methods, on how to arrive on the original reading matters so much for New Testament scholars whose access to the text of the New Testament is restricted to what the contemporary critical editions provide. Furthermore, for the textual critics the history of the text should be reconstructed to understand the process of the occurrence of the variant readings. I suggest that the understanding of the history of the text should start with a clear definition of what is meant by autograph and/or original readings. My suggestion in handling this task of definition is to tackle it with the appropriate understanding of textual corruption and copyist error. The starting point of the quest that I am suggesting is crucial for as it has been observed in this research a textual corruption may not be a real textual corruption in the mind of the tradents of the D text of Luke. How could it be a corruption for them if they correct mistakes of the text, which is expected in a literary environment where manual copying of manuscripts is the only means? And what would be the basis of a modern textual critic, even the editors of the current critical editions of the text of the New Testament to exclude a reading of the D text, as a case in point, because they are copyist errors? As it has been observed in this study that some supposedly spelling "errors" could be legitimate intentional variant readings preserved in the text of a later manuscript from a different textual tradition, other than the favourable Alexandrian text type. So, if the

starting point of a textual critic is that the identified intentional changes in the text are purpose-oriented, then the nature of the variant reading should be considered in the light of understanding patristic exegesis. The Fathers would give the clue in the way the text was read and received in the ancient Christian communities that could provide indications to the probable product of the developed text types. In other words, the text type product of a textual tradition would guide the textual critic in approximating the original and not the contemporary textual construct that is based on cause and effect phenomenon.

If the result of this writing is plausible enough a textual critic is forced to understand the history of exegesis of the text of the New Testament to understand its textual history. Then, there should be a shift of study from the perspective of history of the text to history of the exegesis of the text. The reminder that the theological debates in the early Church were not contested over the canon of the New Testament but from the very beginning there was the appeal to the established canon of the Old Testament that the Church took over and the apostolic witness about Christ and his words and deeds. As a result, quotations from the Old Testament were harmonised with the Septuagint and that the words and deeds of Christ, particularly in Luke, were affected by these debates. Three areas can be further explored to sharpen the current methods of New Testament Textual Criticism: (1) the patristic witness to the theological issues that could have penetrated the text and the nature of its penetration into the text of the New Testament; (2) the clues from the manuscripts themselves that represent the reception of the text and not only from the supposedly original “authors’ style” as the deciding factor for the correct reading which current practice is actually based on the eclectic text of the critical editions; and (3) the history of the exegesis and hermeneutics of the New Testament text and its textual history.

Reconsideration of Q Source: Implication of Harmonised and Eclectic Texts

The harmonisation of the Gospels’ accounts due to mimetic cross-referencing should be included to the contemporary study of the Synoptic problem. The starting point of general

Synoptic study is the synopses that are based on contemporary edited eclectic text editions. This kind of starting point is a major concern because as this research has found out the harmonising tendency could be interpretative in purpose. In the case of the D text of Luke the parable accounts have been harmonised with Matthew. It would be of benefit to New Testament scholars, Synoptic Gospels' specialists in particular, to have data on how much harmonisation is done in major manuscript witnesses that supply the textual base of the text of the New Testament. How could a critical study of the Synoptic problem be done if the main textual base of the investigation is a modern eclectic version of the text of the New Testament? Perhaps, the minority argument that Q can be dispensed with could be further elucidated by the theory advanced in this thesis that the harmonisation of readings in Luke with Matthew is not only because of embarrassment due to different Gospel accounts but rather interpretative in nature. The phenomenon of harmonisation in the Gospels should not be seen as an endemic disease of antiquity, instead it should be viewed as a conventional remedy to solve the textual problem of meaning. Moreover, the thoroughgoing eclectic practice and reasoned eclectic approach should be reconsidered when they are employed in the reconstruction of the text of the Synoptic Gospels. The fruitful investigation of the Q theory would benefit more with a good functional critical edition of a Synopsis than attempting to go back to the "Aramaic source" of the sayings of Jesus.

Although the character of the text of D manuscript has been diversely described from erratic to carefully copied transcript, the reception of its text in the early Church is not adequately dealt with. What the early Church received in her New Testament canon of Scriptures were the books that have apostolic character. However, the words of the textual tradition within these accepted books were not canonised. The Fathers who were the guardians of the text of the New Testament were aware of variant readings in the text of the New Testament. Their decision for the appropriate reading is based on their exegesis of the text that in turn is guided by their commitment to apostolic tradition. The apostolicity of a

textual reading would be a useful principle for Synoptic study. Since this study has demonstrated how Luke is always harmonised with Matthew in the D text, perhaps due to the recognised apostolicity of his Gospel, it could be extended to other sayings of Jesus, not only in Luke but also the other Gospels, using manuscript witnesses. Computer programs cannot accomplish this kind of work. Although the computer is now an indispensable tool of New Testament studies in general, it cannot discern the motives behind the variant readings, thereby unable to provide the necessary data in understanding the purposes of harmonisation among the Synoptic Gospels and the use of Q. This task, I guess, can only be done by the laborious traditional way.

Exegesis of Gospel Parables: Fragmentation of Written and Oral Transmissions

The assertion made in this study is that the mimetic harmonisations and the allegorising variants, identified from the D text of Luke and examined within the context of ancient literary criticism, could be hermeneutical in nature. In this fashion the quality of variant readings of the D text of the Lukan parables are exposed, at least those passages that are examined as representative examples. As the parables in the D text of Luke were examined the anti-Judaic tendency of some of them, as discussed in Chapter 4, gives a socio-political picture of the relationship of the Christians to the Jews in the early Church history. Furthermore, as considered in Chapter 5 another group of parables were shaped by faith-seeking understanding that is shaped by an ideo-dogmatic tendency of understanding the teachings of Christ in parables. These results encourage further exploration.

The Christians of antiquity were interested in being faithful to the interpretative tradition of the text that they received, whereas the textual critics of today are drawn to recover the original text. The parables are studied in the light of this recovered text of the Gospels. The fundamental reason why early transmitters of texts were more alert to the interpretation of the content of the textual tradition that they received is because mistakes in manuscript copies and textual corruption are taken for granted. For the early tradents what

preserves the authenticity of a textual reading is the witness of the received reading behind it. When textual difficulty comes into the contemporary study of the parables textual decisions are not considered within any tradition of reception. It should also be noted that the approaches to the study of the parables are as numerous as the recorded parables of Jesus themselves. Generally speaking, the starting point of modern students of Gospel parables and modern practitioners of textual criticism is interested in the historical meaning of the text. Thus it is necessary for them to approximate as much as possible to what Jesus said and did in the available textual witnesses of the Gospels. They are neither faithful nor following any textual tradition like the ancient tradents. They use eclectic method in their attempt to reconstruct the first text written by the author. At the end of their quest with the consideration of manuscript evidence and internal witness of the text they are working on they choose the reading that which they think is superior according to what fits their understanding of the meaning of the text. So both of them make their textual decisions on their understanding of the meaning of the text. The difference, however, is that the exegesis of an ancient tradent is based on a tradition that he received where he tried to be faithful in handing over the text, whereas the modern scholar utilises the available modern historical and literary methods. But, with the result of my investigation, may be somebody should pursue a study of the parables from a perspective that starts with the authentication of the accounts and words used in these accounts as preserved in the manuscripts instead of the highly speculative Aramaic approach or the overworked historical methods. Perhaps, someone may be interested in pursuing the preceding suggestion. Parker's conclusion should provide a balance in understanding one of the major witnesses of the preserved text of the parables of Jesus. Parker maintains that the theological context that produced the D text does not have "the kind of authority" that necessitates an "accurate preservation" and that its textual tradition is only a component of other factors such as spoken beliefs that shaped the doctrines

of the Church.⁴ To his words, may I add, in direct reference to the text of the parables, “But who has preserved or what text contains the words that proceeded from the mouth of the master teacher who taught in parables. And who among us and what particular text could provide clues for the modest understanding of the parables of Jesus?”

⁴Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 258.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Texts

- Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *The Greek New Testament*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft and United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece*. 27th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.
- Aland, Kurt, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger and Allen Wikgren, eds. *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece*. 26th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
- Aland, Kurt. *Synopsis of the Four Gospels: Greek-English Edition of the Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum on the Basis of the Greek Text of Nestle-Aland 26th Edition and Greek New Testament 3rd Edition (Corrected). The English Text is the Second Edition of the Revised Standard Version*. 10th ed. Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1993.
- Ammassari, Antonio. *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis*. Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996.
- Bartsch, H.-W., ed. *Codex Bezae versus Codex Sinaiticus im Lukasevangelium*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1984.
- Bibliorum Sacrorum Graecorum: Codex Vaticanus B*. Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae, Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1209. Roma: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1999.
- Blass, Friderico, ed. *Acta apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter. Editio philologica. apparatu critico, commentario perpetuo, indice verborum illustrata*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895.
- Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis Quattuor Evangelia et Actus Apostolorum complectens Graece et Latine phototypice repraesentatus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1899.
- Ehrman, Bart D., Gordon D. Fee, and Michael W. Holmes. *The Text of the Fourth Gospel in the Writings of Origen*. SBLNTGF 3. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Hill, J. Hamlyn, *The Earliest Life of Christ Ever Compiled from the Four Gospels: Being the Diatessaron of Tatian Literally Translated from the Arabic Version and Containing the Four Gospels Woven into One Story, With an Introduction and Notes*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910. Reprint, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2001.

- Kipling, Thomas. *Codex Theodori Bezae Cantabrigiensis Evangelia et Apostolorum acta complectens quadratis literis Graeco-Latinus*. Cantabrigiae: E prelo Academico impensis Academiae, 1793.
- Kiraz, George Anton, ed. *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels: Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshîttâ and Harklean Versions*. Vol. 3. *Luke*. NTTTS 21.3. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Martin, Victor, and Rodolphe Kasser, eds. *Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV: Evangiles de Luc et Jean*. Cologny-Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961.
- Mullen, Roderic L. *The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem*. SBLNTGF 7. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- The New Testament in Greek III, The Gospel According to St. Luke*. Edited by The American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project. Part One Chapters 1-12 (1984) and Part Two Chapters 13-24 (1987). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984-87.
- Scrivener, Frederick H., ed. *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis, Being an Exact Copy, in Ordinary Type, of the Celebrated Uncial Graeco-Latin Manuscript of the Four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, Written Early in the Sixth Century, and Presented to the University of Cambridge by Theodore Bezae, A. D. 1581*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell and Co., 1864. Reprint, Pittsburg: Pickwick Press, 1978; and Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, n.d.
- The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*. Edited by Lancelot C. L. Brenton. London: Samuel Bagster & Sons, Ltd., 1851. Reprint, Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1999.
- Swanson, Reuben J. ed. *The Horizontal Line Synopsis of the Gospels: Greek Edition*. Vol. 1. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Dillsboro: Western North Carolina Press, Inc., 1982.
- Swanson, Reuben J., ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts, Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Luke*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Swanson, Reuben J., ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts, Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Mark*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Swanson, Reuben J., ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts, Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines Against Codex Vaticanus: Matthew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Tischendorf, Constantinus, ed., *Novum Testamentum Vaticanum, post Angeli Maii aliorumque imperfectos labores ex ipso codice*. Lipsiae: Giesecke et Devrient, 1867.

Westcott, B. F., and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. 2 Vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1881-82.

References

Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Revised and edited by Frederick William Danker based on previous English editions by W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2000.

Blass, F., and A. Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Glare, P. G. W., ed. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. 2 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968-76.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 Vols. Translated and edited by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964-76.

Lampe, G. W. H., ed. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

Lewis, Charlton T., and Charles Short. *A Latin Dictionary*. Reprint, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. Revised and Augmented by Henry Stuart Jones with Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.

Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. 3rd ed. New York: Hodder & Stoughton/George H. Doran Co., 1919.

Stone, Robert C. *The Language of the Latin Text of Codex Bezae With Index Verborum*. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 30. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1946.

Yoder, James D. *Concordance to the Distinctive Greek Text of Codex Bezae*. NTTS 2. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.

Periodicals

Achtemeier, Paul. "Omne verbum sonat: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity". *JBL* 109 (1990): 3-27.

- Amphoux, C.-B. “À propos de l’histoire du texte grec du Nouveau Testament. Réponse à David C. Parker”, *NTTRU* 6 (1998): 1-8.
- Amphoux, Christian-B. “Les premières éditions de Luc”. *ETL* 67 (1991): 312-27.
- Amphoux, Christian-B. “Les premières éditions de Luc”. *ETL* 68 (1992): 38-48.
- Amphoux, . C.-B. “Schéma d’histoire du texte grec du Nouveau Testament”. *NTTRU* 3 (1995): 41-6.
- Bammel, Ernst. “The Cambridge Pericope. The Addition to Luke 6.4 in Codex Bezae”. *NTS* 32 (1986): 404-26.
- Bartsch, Hans-Werner. “Über den Umgang der frühen Christenheit mit dem Text der Evangelien. Das Beispiel des Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis”. *NTS* 29 (1983): 167-82.
- Black, Matthew. “The New Testament Peshitta and Its Predecessors”. *BSNTS*, Nos. I-III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963. Reprint from *SNTS Bulletin*, No. 1 (1950), 51-62.
- Black, Matthew. “The Parable as Allegory”. *BJRL* 42 (1959-60): 273-87.
- Blass, Friedrich. “Die Textüberlieferung in der AG”. *ThStKr* 67 (1894): 86-119.
- Blass, Friedrich. “On Acts xv.34 and xviiiif.”. *ExpTim* 10 (1898-99): 88-90.
- Brown, Raymond E. “Parable and Allegory Reconsidered”. *NovT* 5 (1962): 36-45.
- Burkitt, F. C. “The Date of Codex Bezae”. *JTS* 3 (1901-1902): 501-513.
- Burkitt, F. C. “Tatian’s Diatessaron and the Dutch Harmonies”. *JTS* 25 (1924): 113-30.
- Cadbury, H. J. Review of Eldon J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. *JBL* 86 (1967): 112-4.
- Caird, G. B. Review of Eldon J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. *ExpTim* 78 (1967): 237.
- Chapman, J. “The Order of the Gospels in the Parent of Codex Bezae”. *ZNW* 6 (1905): 339-46
- Clark, Kenneth W. “The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament”. *JBL* 85 (1966): 1-16.
- Clark, W. P. “Ancient Reading”. *CJ* 26 (1930-31): 698-700.
- Connolly, Dom. “A Side-light on the Method of Tatian”. *JTS* 12 (1911): 268-73.

- Cruz, Roli G. dela. Review of Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism*. *RRT* 10 (2003): 385-7.
- Crehan, J. "Peter According to the D-Text of Acts". *TS* 18 (1957): 596-603.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. "Luke 6:5 Re-examined". *NovT* 37 (1995): 232-48.
- Elliott, J. K. Review of Antonio Ammassari, *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis and Il Vangelo di [Matteo/Marco/Luca/Giovanni] nella Colonna Latina del Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis [4 Vols.]*. *NovT* 42 (2000): 284-6.
- Ellis, Ian M. "Codex Bezae and Recent Enquiry". *IBS* 4 (1982): 82-100.
- Epp, Eldon J. "The Codex and Literacy in Early Christianity and at Oxyrhynchus: Issues Raised by Harry Y. Gamble's *Books and Readers in the Early Church*". *CRBR* 10 (1997): 15-37.
- Eshbaugh, Howard. "Textual Variants and Theology: A Study of the Galatians Text of Papyrus 46". *JSNT* 3 (1979): 60-72.
- Fuller, R. H. Review of Eldon J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. *CBQ* 30 (1968): 447-8.
- Gilliard, Frank. "More Silent Reading in Antiquity: *Non Mone Verbum Sonabat*". *JBL* 112 (1993): 689-94.
- Goulder, M. D. "Characteristics of the Parables in the Several Gospels". *JTS* 19 (1968): 51-69.
- Greenlee, J. Harold. "A Corrected Collation of Codex Zacynthius (Cod. Ξ)". *JBL* 76 (1957): 237-41.
- Greenlee, J. Harold. "Some Examples of Scholarly 'Agreement in Error'". *JBL* 77 (1958): 363-4.
- Greenlee, J. Harold. "The Catena of Codex Zacynthius". *Bib* 40 (1959): 992-1001.
- Greeven, Heinrich. "Erwägungen zur synoptischen Textkritik". *NTS* 6 (1959-60): 281-96.
- Gregory, Andrew. "The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period Before Irenaeus". *TynBul* 53.1 (2002): 153-6.
- Hanson, R. P. C. Review of Eldon J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. *NTS* 14 (1968): 282-6.
- Head, Peter M. "Observations on Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels, especially on the 'Scribal Habits'". *Bib* 71 (1990): 240-7.

- Heimerdinger, Jenny. "La foi de l'eunuque éthiopien: le problème textuel d'Actes 8/37". *ETR* 63 (1988): 521-8.
- Henderson, G. L. "Ancient Reading". *CJ* 25 (1929-30): 182-96.
- Hodges, Z. C. Review of Eldon J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. *BSac* 125 (1968): 79-80.
- Holmes, Michael W. "The Text of the Matthaean Divorce Passages: A Comment on the Appeal to Harmonization in Textual Decisions". *JBL* 109 (1990): 651-64.
- Kenyon, Frederic. "The Western Text in the Gospels and Acts". *PBA* 24 (1938): 287-315.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. Review of Eldon J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. G. D. Kilpatrick, *VCRECLL* 24 (1970): 166-70.
- Klijn, Albertus Frederik Johannes. "A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts (1949-1959)". *NovT* 3 (1959): 1-27, 161-73.
- Knapp, Henry M. "Melito's Use of Scripture in *Peri Pascha*: Second-Century Typology". *VCRECLL* 54 (2000): 343-74.
- Leaney, A. R. C. Review of Eldon J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. *Theol* 70 (1967): 461-3.
- MacKenzie, R. S. "The Latin Column in Codex Bezae". *JSNT* 6 (1980): 58-76.
- Martin, R. P. Review of Eldon J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. *EvQ* 39 (1967): 174-6.
- Mees, Michael. "Lukas 1-9 in der Textgestalt des *Codex Bezae*. Literarische Formen in Dienste der Schrift". *VC* 5 (1968): 89-110.
- Mees, Michael. "Sinn und Bedeutung literarischer Formen für die Textgestalt des Codex Bezae in Lukas 10-11". *VC* 7 (1970): 59-82.
- Mees, Michael. "Jesusworte in Lukas 12 und ihre Komposition nach Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis". *VC* 7 (1970): 285-303.
- Menoud, P. H. "The Western Text and the Theology of Acts". *BSNTS* Nos. 1-3 (1950-52 One Volume Reissue). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963. 2: 19-32. Reprint from *SNTS Bulletin* 2 (1951): 19-32.
- Moir, I. A. Review of Eldon J. Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. *JTS* 19 (1968): 277-81.

- Mullen, Roderic L. "Le codex de Bèze: Un témoin d'une version antérieure". *DA* 279, *Saint Luc Évangéliste et historien* (Dec 2002-Jan 2003): 34-43.
- Mullen, Roderic L. Review of Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism*. *JTS* 55 (2004): 262-6.
- Nicklas, Tobias. "Das Agraphon vom 'Sabbatarbeiter' und sein Kontext: Lk. 6:1-11 in der Textform des Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D)". *NovT* 44 (April 2002): 160-75.
- Panten, Kenneth E. "A History of Research on Codex Bezae". *TynBul* 47 (1996): 185-7.
- Parker, D. C. "Professor Amphoux's History of the New Testament Text: A Response". *NTTRU* 4 (1996): 41-5.
- Parker, D. C., and J. N. Birdsall. "The Date of Codex Zacynthius (Ξ): A New Proposal". *JTS* 55 (2004): 117-31.
- Parris, David P. "Imitating the Parables: Allegory, Narrative and the Role of Mimesis". *JSNT* 25 (2002): 33-53.
- Parsons, Mikeal C. "A Christological Tendency in P75". *JBL* 105 (1986): 463-79.
- Parvis, Merrill M. "The Nature and Tasks of New Testament Textual Criticism: An Appraisal". *JR* 32 (1952): 165-74.
- Pickering, Stuart R. "An Appreciation of the Survey of Early New Testament Textual Transmission by C.-B. Amphoux". *NTTRU* 3 (1995): 47-51.
- Pickering, Stuart R. "The New Testament. The Survival and Dating of Codex Bezae". *NTTRU* 1 (1993): 1-2.
- Pickering, Stuart R. "The Compiling of the Book of Acts and Its Separation from the Gospel of Luke". *NTTRU* 1 (1993): 31-8.
- Porter, Calvin L. "Papyrus Bodmer XV (P75) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus", *JBL* 81 (1962): 363-76.
- Read-Heimerdinger, Jenny. "Les Actes dans le Codex de Bèze: Leur intérêt et leur valeur". *DA* 279. *Saint Luc Évangéliste et historien* (Dec 2002-Jan 2003): 44-55.
- Read-Heimerdinger, Jenny. "Barnabas in Acts: A Study of His Role in the Text of Codex Bezae". *JSNT* 72 (1998): 23-66.
- Read-Heimerdinger, Jenny. "The 'Long' and the 'Short' Texts of Acts: A Closer Look at the Quantity and Types of Variation". *RCatT* 22 (1997): 245-61.

- Reed, Annette Yoshiko. "ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ: Orality, Textuality, and the Christian Truth in Irenaeus' *Adversus Haereses*". *VCRECLL* 56 (2002): 11-46.
- Rice, George E. "The Anti-Judaic Bias of the Western Text in the Gospel of Luke". *AUSS* 18 (1980): 51-7.
- Rice, George E. "Luke 3:22-38 in Codex Bezae: The Messianic King." *AUSS* 17 (1979): 203-8.
- Rice, George E. "The Role of the Populace in the Passion Narrative of Luke in Codex Bezae". *AUSS* 19 (1981): 147-53.
- Rice, George E. "Some Further Examples of Anti-Judaic Bias in the Western Text of the Gospel of Luke". *AUSS* 18 (1980): 149-56.
- Riddle, Donald W. "Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline". *AthR* 18 (1936): 220-33.
- Roukema, Riemer. "The Good Samaritan in Ancient Christianity". *VCRECLL* 58 (2004): 56-74.
- Schmid, Ulrich B. "In Search of Tatian's Diatessaron in the West". *VCRECLL* 57 (2003): 176-99.
- Slusser, Michael. "Reading Silently in Antiquity". *JBL* 111 (1992): 499.
- Snodgrass, Klyne. "Western Non-Interpolations". *JBL* 91 (1972): 369-79.
- Vogel, K. Sneyders de. "Le codex Bezae est-il d'origine sicilienne?". *BBC* 4 (1927): 10-3.
- Walls, A. F. "Papias and Oral Tradition". *VCRECLL* 21 (1967): 137-40.
- Wensinck, A. J. "The Semitisms of Codex Bezae and Their Relation to the Non-Western Text of the Gospel of Saint Luke". *BBC* 12 (1937): 11-48.
- Wiles, M. F. "Early Exegesis of the Parables". *SJT* 11 (1958): 287-301.
- Wilson, R. McL. Review of Nicholas Perrin, *Thomas and Tatian: The Relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the Diatessaron*. *JTS* 54 (2003): 758-60.
- Yoder, James D. "The Language of the Greek Variants of Codex Bezae". *NT* 3 (1959): 241-8.
- Young, Frances M. "Exegetical Method and Scriptural Proof: The Bible in Doctrinal Debate". *StPatr* 24 (1989): 291-304.

Books

- Aland, Barbara, and Joël Delobel, eds. *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Church History: A Discussion of Methods*. CBET 7. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1994.
- Aland, Kurt. "The Significance of the Papyri for Progress in New Testament Research". Pages 325-46 in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship: Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December 28-30, 1964*. Edited by James Philip Hyatt. London: Carey Kingsgate Press 1966.
- Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*. 2nd ed. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1989.
- Alexander, Loveday. "Ancient Book Production and the Circulation of the Gospels". Pages 71-105 in *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Ammassari, Antonio. *Il Vangelo di Luca nella Colonna Latina del Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis*. Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1996.
- Amphoux, C.-B. *L'évangile selon Matthieu: Codex de Bèze*. L'Isle-sur-la-Sorgue: Le Bois d'Orion, 1996.
- Amphoux, Christian-B. "Le texte". Pages 337-54 in *Codex Bezae: Studies from The Lunel Colloquium, June 1994*. Edited by D. C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux. NTTS 22. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Annas, Julia. *An Introduction to Plato's Republic*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- Atkins, J. W. H. *Literary Criticism in Antiquity: A Sketch of Its Development*. Vol. 1. *Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934. Reprint, Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1961.
- Atkins, J. W. H. *Literary Criticism in Antiquity: A Sketch of Its Development*. Vol. 2. *Graeco-Roman*. Cambridge University Press, 1934. Reprint, Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1961.
- Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.
- Baarda, Tjitze. "ΔΙΑΦΩΝΙΑ—ΣΥΜΦΩΝΙΑ: Factors in the Harmonization of the Gospels, Especially in the Diatessaron of Tatian". Pages 29-47 in Tjitze Baarda, *Essays on the Diatessaron*. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1994. Reprint from pages 133-54 in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions,*

- Text, and Transmission*. Edited by William L. Petersen. CJAS 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- Baarda, Tjitze. "The Diatessaron of Tatian and Its Influence on the Vernacular Versions: The Case of John 19:30". Pages 11-28 in *Essays on the Diatessaron*. CBET 11. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1994.
- Baarda, Tjitze. *Essays on the Diatessaron*. CBET 11. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1994.
- Baarda, Tjitze, *The Gospel Quotations of Aphrahat The Persian Sage I: Aphrahat's Text of the Fourth Gospel* (Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 1975).
- Barrera, Julio Trebelle. *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible: An Introduction to the History of the Bible*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. 2 Vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994-1998. Vol. 1.
- Barrett, C. K. "Is There a Theological Tendency in Codex Bezae?". Pages 15-27 in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*. Edited by Ernest Best and R. McL. Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Bauckham, Richard. *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. NovTSup 93. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998.
- Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. NTL. Translated and edited by Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel et al. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1972.
- Bellinzoni, Arthur J. "The Gospel of Luke in the Second Century CE". Pages 59-76 in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Richard E. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- Bellinzoni, A. J. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*. NovTSup 17. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.
- Bercot, David W., ed. *A Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs: A Reference Guide to More Than 700 Topics Discussed by the Early Church Fathers*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1998.
- Birdsall, J. Neville. "After Three Centuries of the Study of Codex Bezae: The *Status Quaestionis*". Pages xix-xxx in *Codex Bezae: Studies from The Lunel Colloquium, June 1994*. Edited by D. C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux. NTTS 22. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Birdsall, J. Neville. "The Geographical and Cultural Origin of the Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis: A Survey of the Status Quaestionis, Mainly from the Palaeographical Standpoint". Pages 102-14 in *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments*:

- Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Heinrich Greeven*. Edited by Wolfgang Schrage. BZNW. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986.
- Birdsall, J. Neville. "The New Testament Text". Pages 308-77 in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. Vol. 1. *From the Beginnings to Jerome*. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Birdsall, J. Neville. "The Western Text in the Second Century". Pages 3-17 in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*. Edited by William L. Petersen. CJAS 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- Bischoff, Bernhard. *Latin Palaeography: Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Translated by Dáibhí Ó Cróinín and David Ganz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967. Reprint, with an introduction by Craig A. Evans, Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1998.
- Black, Matthew. "The Holy Spirit in the Western Text of Acts". Pages 159-70 in *New Testament Textual Criticism, Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger*. Edited by Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- Black, Matthew. "The Syriac Versional Tradition". Pages 120-59 in *Die Alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare: der gegenwärtige Stand ihrer Erforschung und ihre Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte*. Edited by Kurt Aland. ANT 5. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1972.
- Blass, Friedrich. *Philology of the Gospels*. London: MacMillan & Co., 1898.
- Blomberg, Craig L. *Interpreting the Parables*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 1990.
- Bobertz, Charles A. "Prolegomena to a Ritual/Liturgical Reading of the Gospel of Mark". Pages 174-87 in *Reading in Christian Communities: Essays on Interpretation in the Early Church*. Edited by Charles A. Bobertz and David Brakke. CJAS 14. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002.
- Borg, Marcus J. *Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994.
- Borgen, Peder. "Philo of Alexandria as Exegete". Pages 114-43 in *A History of Biblical Interpretation*. Vol. 1. *The Ancient Period*. Edited by Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2003.
- Boucher, Madeleine I. *The Mysterious Parable: A Literary Study*. CBQMS 6. Washington, D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1977.

Boulding, Maria, trans. *The Confessions by Saint Augustine: Introduction, Translation and Notes*. Edited by John E. Rotelle. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1997.

Bradshaw, Paul F. *Ordination Rites of the Ancient Churches of East and West*. New York: Pueblo Publishing Co., Inc., 1990.

Brock, Sebastian P. "The Use of the Syriac Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism". Pages 224-36 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. SD 46. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1995.

Brodie, Thomas Louis. "Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke's Use of Sources". Pages 17-46 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1984.

Browning, W. R. F. *A Dictionary of the Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Cameron, Ron. *Sayings Traditions in the Apocryphon of James*. HTS 34. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Campanhausen, Hans von. *The Formation of the Christian Bible*. Translated by John Austin Baker. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1972.

Casey, Maurice. *An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Chadwick, Henry. *Early Christian Thought and the Classical Tradition: Studies in Justin, Clement and Origen*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Chase, Frederic Henry. *The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1893.

Chase, Frederic Henry. *The Syro-Latin Text of the Gospels*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1895.

Chilton, Bruce D., and Craig A. Evans, eds. *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*. NTTS 28/1. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999.

Clark, Albert C. *The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914.

Clark, Elizabeth A. *Ascetic Piety and Women's Faith: Essays on Late Ancient Christianity*. SWR 20. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1986.

Clark, Kenneth W. "Textual Criticism and Doctrine". Pages 52-65 in *Studia Paulina in Honorem Johannis de Zwaan Septuagenarii*. Edited by J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik. Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N. V., 1953.

Clark, W. P., and B. M. W. Knox. "Silent Reading in Antiquity". *GRBS* 9 (1968): 421-35.

Colwell, Ernest C. "Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of P⁴⁵, P⁶⁶, P⁷⁵". Pages 106-24 in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. NTTS 9. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969. Reprint from "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text". Pages 370-89 in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship: Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December 28-30, 1964*. Edited by James Philip Hyatt. London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1966.

Colwell, Ernest C. "Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts". Pages 45-55 in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. NTTS 9. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969. Reprint from "The Origin of Texttypes of New Testament Manuscripts". Pages 128-38 in *Early Christian Origins: Studies in Honor of Harold R. Willoughby*. Edited by Allen Wikgren. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961.

Colwell, Ernest C. *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. NTTS 9. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969.

Colwell, Ernest C. *What is the Best New Testament?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1952.

Colwell, Ernest C., and Ernest W. Tune. "Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings". Pages 96-105 in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. NTTS 9. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969. Reprint from "Variant Readings: Classification and Use". *JBL* 83 (1964): 253-61.

Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper & Row, 1961. Reprint, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.

Crossan, John Dominic. *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus*. 2nd ed. Sonoma: Polebridge Press, 1992.

Davids, Peter H. "The Gospels and Jewish Tradition: Twenty Years After Gerhardsson". Pages 75-99 in *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*. Vol. 1. Edited by R. T. France and David Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.

Dawson, David. *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

Delobel, Joël. "Luke 6,5 in Codex Bezae: The Man Who Worked on Sabbath". Pages 453-77 in *À cause de l'Évangile: Études sur les Synoptiques et les Actes, offertes au P. Jacques Dupont, O.S.B. à l'occasion de son 70^e anniversaire*. LD 123. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1985.

- Delobel, Joël. "Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Siamese Twins?" Pages 98-117 in *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis and Church History: A Discussion of Methods*. CBET 7. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1994.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Parables of the Kingdom*. Rev. ed. London: Nisbet & Co., 1961.
- Drury, John. *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory*. New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1985.
- Ehrhardt, Arnold. *The Apostolic Succession: In the First Two Centuries of the Church*. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *Lost Christianities: The Battles for Scripture and the Faiths We Never Knew*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Ehrman, Bart D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Ehrman, Bart D. "The Text of the Gospels at the End of the Second Century". Pages 95-122 in *Codex Bezae: Studies from The Lunel Colloquium, June 1994*. Edited by D. C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux. NTTS 22. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Ehrman, Bart D. "The Use and Significance of Patristic Evidence for NT Textual Criticism". Pages 118-35 in *New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History: A Discussion of Methods*. Edited by Barbara Aland and Joël Delobel. CBET 7. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House, 1994.
- Ehrman, Bart D., and Michael W. Holmes, eds., *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. SD 46. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1995.
- Elliott, J. K. *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts*. 2d ed. SNTSMS 109. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Elliott, J. K. "The Case for Thoroughgoing Eclecticism". Pages 101-24 in *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by David Alan Black. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2002.
- Elliott, J. K. "Codex Bezae and the Earliest Greek Papyri". Pages 161-82 in *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium, June 1994*. Edited by D. C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux. NTTS 22. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Elliott, J. K. "The Parable of The Two Sons: Text and Exegesis". Pages 67-77 in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*. Edited by A. Denaux. BETL 161. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.

- Elliott, J. K., ed., *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of his sixty-fifth Birthday*. NovTSup 44. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.
- Else, Gerald F. *Plato and Aristotle on Poetry*. Edited by Peter Burian. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986.
- Epp, Eldon J. "Issues in New Testament Textual Criticism: Moving from the Nineteenth Century to the Twenty-First Century". Pages 17-76. In *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism*. Edited by David Alan Black. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 2002.
- Epp, Eldon J. *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. SNTSMS 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966. Reprint, Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2001.
- Epp, Eldon J. "Toward the Clarification of the Term 'Textual Variant'". Pages 47-61 in Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993. Reprint from pages 153-73 in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 44. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.
- Epp, Eldon J., and Gordon D. Fee. *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993.
- Evans, Craig A. "The Interpretation of Scripture in the New Testament Apocrypha and Gnostic Writings". Pages 430-56 in *A History of Biblical Interpretation*. Vol. 1. *The Ancient Period*. Edited by Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2003.
- Evans, Craig A. "Parables in Early Judaism". Pages 51-75 in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000.
- Fee, Gordon D. "Modern Textual Criticism and the Synoptic Problem: On the Problem of Harmonization in the Gospels". Pages 174-82 in *STMNTTC*. Reprint from pages 154-69 in *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776-1976*. Edited by Bernard Orchard and T. R. W. Longstaff. SNTSMS 34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Fee, Gordon D. "On the Types, Classification, and Presentation of Textual Variation". Pages 62-79 in Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993.
- Fee, Gordon D. *Papyrus Bodmer II (P⁶⁶): Its Textual Relationships and Scribal Characteristics*. SD 34. Salt Lake: University of Utah Press, 1968.

- Fee, Gordon D. "P⁷⁵, P⁶⁶, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria". Pages 247-73 in *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993. Reprint from pages 19-45 in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974.
- Fee, Gordon D. "The Use of the Greek Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism". Pages 191-207 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. SD 46. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1995.
- Fee, Gordon D. "The Use of Greek Patristic Citations in New Testament Textual Criticism: The State of Question". Pages 344-59 in Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee, *Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism*. SD 45. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993. Reprint from pages II/26/1.246-65 in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Edited by Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1992.
- Ferguson, Everett. "Reader". Volume 2, Page 973 in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. 2nd ed. 2 Vols. Edited by Everett Ferguson, Michael P. McHugh and Frederick W. Norris. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1997.
- Finkelpearl, Ellen. "Pagan Traditions of Intertextuality in the Roman World". Pages 78-90 in *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*. Edited by Dennis R. MacDonald. SAC. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001.
- Fischer, Bonifatius. "Das Neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache. Der gegenwärtige Stand seiner Erforschung und seine Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte". Pages 1-92 in *Die Alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare: der gegenwärtige Stand ihrer Erforschung und ihre Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte*. Edited by Kurt Aland. ANT 5. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1972.
- Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.
- Fiske, George Converse. *Lucilius and Horace: A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation*. UWSLL 7. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1920. Reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1966.
- Frede, Hermann Josef. *Altlateinische Paulus-Handschriften*. AGLB 4. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1964.
- Froehlich, Karlfried, trans. and ed. *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church*. SECT Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

- Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Gamble, Harry. "The Formation of the New Testament Canon and Its Significance for the History of Biblical Interpretation". Pages 409-29 in *A History of Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2003.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. *Memory and Manuscript and Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*. 2 Vols. in one. Translated by E. J. Sharpe. BRS. Reprint, Livonia: Dove Booksellers, 1998.
- Gilbert, Allan H. *Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1962.
- Golden, Leon. *Aristotle on Tragic and Comic Mimesis*. APAACS 29. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Gorday, Peter. *Principles of Patristic Exegesis: Romans 9-11 in Origen, John Chrysostom, and Augustine*. SBEC 4. New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1983.
- Gowler, David B. *What are They Saying About the Parables?* New York: Paulist Press, 2000.
- Graham, William A. *Beyond the Written Word: Oral Aspects of Scripture in the History of Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Greenlee, J. Harold. *Nine Uncial Palimpsests of the Greek New Testament*. SD 39. Salt Lake: University of Utah Press, 1968.
- Gregory, Andrew. *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century*. WUNT 2. Reihe 169. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Gregory, Caspar René. *Canon and Text of the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Translated by Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971.
- Hagner, Donald A. "Matthew's Parables of the Kingdom (Matthew 13:1-52)". Pages 102-24 in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000.
- Haines-Eitzen, Kim. *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- Halliwell, Stephen. *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problem*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Hanson, R. P. C. *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture*. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959. Reprint, with an introduction by Joseph W. Trigg, Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- Harris, J. Rendel. *Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-called Western Text of the New Testament*. TS 2/1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891.
- Hatch, Edwin. *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church*. The Hibbert Lectures 1888. Edited by A.M. Fairbairn. London: Williams and Norgate, 1890. Reprint, *The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity*. Foreword with new notes and bibliography by Frederick C. Grant. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- Hatch, William Henry Paine. *The 'Western' Text of the Gospels: The Twenty-third Annual Hale Memorial Sermon, Delivered March 4, 1937*. Evanston: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1937.
- Hauser, Alan J. and Duane F. Watson, eds. *A History of Biblical Interpretation*. Vol. 1. *The Ancient Period*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2003.
- Head, Peter. "Acts and the Problem of Its Text". Pages 415-44 in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*. Edited by B. W. Winter and A. D. Clarke. BAIFFS1. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993.
- Heath, Malcolm. *Interpreting Classical Texts*. London: Duckworth, 2002.
- Hedrick, Charles W. *Parables as Poetic Fictions: The Creative Voice of Jesus*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1994.
- Heimerdinger, Jenny. "La tradition targumique et le Codex de Bèze: Actes 1:15-26". Vol. 2, pages 171-80 in *La Biblia i el Mediterrani: actes del Congrés de Barcelona, 18-22 de setembre de 1995*. 2 Vols. Edited by Agusti Borrell, Alfonso de la Fuente and Armand Puig, Scripta biblica 1-2. Barcelona: Associació Bíblica de Catalunya: Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat, 1997.
- Heimerdinger, Jenny. "The Seven Steps of Codex Bezae: A Prophetic Interpretation of Acts 12". Pages 303-10 in *Codex Bezae: Studies from The Lunel Colloquium, June 1994*. Edited by D. C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux. NTTS 22. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 2000.

- Herzog, William R., II. *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994.
- Hock, Ronald F. "Homer in Greco-Roman Education". Pages 56-77 in *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*. Edited by Dennis R. MacDonald. SAC. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001.
- Holmes, Michael W. "Codex Bezae as a Recension of the Gospels". Pages 123-60 in *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium, June 1994*. Edited by D. C. Parker and C.-Bernard Amphoux. NTTS 22. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Holzberg, Niklas. *The Ancient Fables: An Introduction*. Translated by Christine Jackson-Holzberg. SAFPC. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002.
- Hooker, Morna D. "Mark's Parables of the Kingdom (Mark 4:1-34)". Pages 79-101 in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000.
- Hooley, D. M. *The Knotted Thong: Structures of Mimesis in Persius*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997.
- Huey, F. B., Jr., and Bruce Corley. *A Student's Dictionary for Biblical and Theological Studies*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1983.
- Hultgren, Arland J. *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary*. BIW. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000.
- Hunter, A. M. *Interpreting the Parables*. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1960.
- Hurtado, L. W. "Beyond the Interlude? Developments and Directions in New Testament Textual Criticism". Pages 26-48 in *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts: The Papers of the First Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Edited by D. G. K. Taylor. TS 3rd Series 1. Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1999.
- Hyatt, James Philip, ed. *The Bible in Modern Scholarship: Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December 28-30, 1964*. London: Carey Kingsgate Press, 1966.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *New Testament Theology*. Part 1: *The Proclamation of Jesus*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1971.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus*. 3rd German ed. Translated by S. H. Hooke. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1954.
- Jones, Geraint V. *The Art and Truth of the Parables: A Study in Their Literary Form and Modern Interpretation*. London: SPCK, 1964.

- Jordaan, G. J. C. "The Word-Order Differences between the Greek and the Latin Texts in Codex Bezae". Pages 99-111 in *A South African Perspective on the New Testament: Essays by South African New Testament Scholars Presented to Bruce Manning Metzger during His Visit to South Africa in 1985*. Edited by J. H. Kobus Petzer and Patrick J. Hartin. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1986.
- Just, Arthur A. Jr., ed. *Luke*. ACCSNT 3. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2003.
- Kennedy, George A. "Christianity and Criticism". Pages 330-46 in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*. Edited by Peter Brooks, H. B. Nisbet and Claude Rawson. Vol. 1. *Classical Criticism*. Edited by George A. Kennedy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Kenyon, Frederic G. *The Bible and Archaeology*. London: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1940.
- Kenyon, Frederic G. *Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1901.
- Kenyon, Frederic G. *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscript*. 5th ed. Revised and enlarged by A. W. Adams. Introduction by G. R. Driver. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1958.
- Kenyon, Frederic G. *Recent Developments in the Textual Criticism of the Greek Bible*. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1932. London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. "Literary Fashions and the Transmission of Texts in the Graeco-Roman World". Pages 63-72 in *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays of G. D. Kilpatrick*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. BETL 96. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990. Reprint from *Protocol of the 19th Colloquy—Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture*, Graduate Theological Union and the University of California, Berkeley. *Protocol of Colloquy 19* (1976): 1-8.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays of G. D. Kilpatrick*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. BETL 96. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. "The Transmission of the New Testament and Its Reliability". Pages 3-14 in *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays of G. D. Kilpatrick*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. BETL 96. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990. Reprint from *Proceedings of the 945th Ordinary General Meeting of the Victoria Institute on 15 April, 1957*. Croydon: Victoria Institute, 1957, 92-101. Also *BT* 9 (1958): 127-36.

- Kilpatrick, G. D. "Western Text and Original Text in the Gospels and Acts". Pages 113-27 in *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays of G. D. Kilpatrick*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. BETL 96. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990. Reprint from *JTS* 44 (1943): 24-36.
- Kissinger, Warren S. *The Parables of Jesus: A History of Interpretation and Bibliography*, ATLA BibS 4. London: Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1979.
- Klijn, Albertus Frederik Johannes. *A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts*. Utrecht: Drukkerij v. h. Kemink en Zoon N. V., 1949.
- Knowles, Michael P. "'Everyone Who Hears These Words of Mine': Parables on Discipleship (Matthew 7:24-27//Luke 6:47-49; Luke 14:28-33; Luke 17:7-10; Matthew 20:1-16)". Pages 286-305 in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000.
- Knox, John. *Criticism and Faith*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1953.
- Koester, Helmut. "The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century". Pages 19-37 in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*. Edited by William L. Petersen. CJAS 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- Lake, Kirsopp. *The Influence of Textual Criticism on the Exegesis of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1904.
- Lake, Kirsopp. *The Text of the New Testament*. 5th ed. London: Rivingtons, 1922.
- Lamb, J. A. "The Place of the Bible in the Liturgy". Pages 563-86. In *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. Vol. 1. *From the Beginnings to Jerome*. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Lamberton, Robert. *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*. TCH. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.
- Lampe, G. W. H. "Scripture and Tradition in the Early Church". Pages 23-52 in *Scripture and Tradition*. Edited by F. W. Dillistone. London: Lutterworth Press, 1955.
- Lieberman, Saul. *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Literary Transmission Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in I Century B.C.E.—IV Century C.E.* 2nd ed. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1999.
- Longenecker, Richard N. "Luke's Parables of the Kingdom (Luke 8:4-15; 13:18-21)". Pages 125-47 in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000.

- Lowe, E. A. "The Codex Bezae and Lyons". Volume 1, Pages 182-6 in *Palaeographical Papers 1907-1965*. 2 Vols. Edited by Ludwig Bieler. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972. Reprint from *JTS* 25 (1924): 270-4.
- Lowe, E. A. "A Note on the Codex Bezae". Volume 1, Pages 224-8 in *Palaeographical Papers 1907-1965*. 2 Vols. Edited by Ludwig Bieler. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972. Reprint from *BBC* 4 (1927): 9-14.
- Lyons, John D. and Stephen G. Nichols, Jr., eds. *Mimesis: From Mirror to Method, Augustine to Descartes*. Hanover: University Press of New England, 1982.
- MacDonald, Dennis R. *The Homeric Epics and the Gospel of Mark*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.
- MacDonald, Dennis R., ed. *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*. SAC. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2001.
- McGann, Jerome J. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992.
- McKenzie, D. F. *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Markus, R. A. *Signs and Meanings: World and Text in Ancient Christianity*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1996.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *I Believe in the Historical Jesus*. Vancouver: Regent College Publishing, 2004.
- Martineau, Robert. *The Office and Work of a Reader*. Rev. ed. London: Mowbrays, 1980.
- Massaux, Édouard. *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus*. Book 1. *The First Ecclesiastical Writers*. NGS 5/1. Translated by Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht. Edited with an introduction and addenda by Arthur J. Bellinzoni. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1990.
- Massaux, Édouard. *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus*. Book 2. *The Later Christian Writings*. NGS 5/2. Translated by Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht. Edited with an introduction and addenda by Arthur J. Bellinzoni. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1992.
- Massaux, Édouard. *The Influence of the Gospel of Saint Matthew on Christian Literature before Saint Irenaeus*. Book 3. *The Apologists and the Didache*. NGS 5/3. Translated by Norman J. Belval and Suzanne Hecht. Edited with an introduction and addenda by Arthur J. Bellinzoni. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1993.

- McDonald, Lee Martin, and Stanley E. Porter. *Early Christianity and Its Sacred Literature*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 2000.
- McGoldrick, Patrick. "Liturgy: The Context of Patristic Exegesis". Pages 27-37 in *Scriptural Interpretation in the Fathers: Letter and Spirit*. Edited by Thomas Finan and Vincent Twomey. Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1995.
- Melberg, Arne. *Theories of Mimesis*, LCT 12. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *The Bible in Translation: Ancient and English Versions*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 1st ed. London: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary of the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. London: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Michaelis, W. "μυμέομαι, μιμητής, συμμιμητής". *TDNT*. 4:659-74.
- Millard, Alan. *Reading and Writing in the Time of Jesus*. BS 69. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Milligan, George. *The New Testament and Its Transmission: The Baird Lectures for 1929-30*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932.
- Monselewski, Werner. *Der barmherzige Samariter: Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lukas 10,25-37*. BGBE 5. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr Siebeck, 1967.
- Moule, C. F. D. "Mark 4:1-20 Yet Once More". Pages 95-113 in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*. Edited by E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969.
- Moulton, Harold K. *Papyrus, Parchment and Print: The Story of How the New Testament Text Has Reached Us*. WCB 3rd Series 57. London: Lutterworth Press, 1967.
- Mullen, Roderic L. *The Expansion of Christianity: A Gazetteer of Its First Three Centuries*. SupVigChr 69. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2004.

- Nagy, Gregory. "Early Greek Views of Poets and Poetry". Pages 1-77 in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*. Edited by Peter Brooks, H. B. Nisbet and Claude Rawson. Vol. 1. *Classical Criticism*. Edited by George A. Kennedy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Nagy, Gregory. *Homeric Responses*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003.
- Nagy, Gregory. *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Norris, Richard A., Jr. "Augustine and the Close of the Ancient Period of Interpretation". Pages 380-408 in *A History of Biblical Interpretation*. Vol. 1. *The Ancient Period*. Edited by Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2003.
- North, J. Lionel, "The Use of the Latin Fathers for New Testament Textual Criticism". Pages 208-23 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. SD 46. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1995.
- Oden, Thomas C. and Christopher A. Hall, eds. *Mark*. ACCSNT 2. London: Fitzroy Dearborn Publishers, 1998.
- Olbricht, Thomas H. "Analogy and Allegory in Classical Rhetoric". Pages 371-89 in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. Edited by J. T. Fitzgerald, T. H. Olbricht and L. M. White. NovTSup 110. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2003.
- Old, Hughes Oliphant. *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church*. Vol. 1. *The Biblical Period*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998.
- Old, Hughes Oliphant. *The Reading and Preaching of Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church*. Vol. 2. *The Patristic Age*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1998.
- Payne, Philip Barton. "The Authenticity of the Parable of the Sower and Its Interpretation". Pages 163-207 in *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*. Vol. 1. Edited by R. T. France and David Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.
- Payne, Philip Barton. "The Authenticity of the Parables of Jesus". Pages 329-44 in *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*. Vol. 2. Edited by R. T. France and David Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.
- Parker, D. C. *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and Its Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

- Parker, D. C. "A 'Dictation Theory' of Codex Bezae". Pages 66-80 in *New Testament Text and Language: A Sheffield Reader*. Edited by S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans. BS 44. Sheffield Academic Press, 1997. Reprinted from *JSNT* 15 (1982): 97-112.
- Parker, D. C. *The Living Text of the Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Parker, D. C., and C.-B. Amphoux, eds. *Codex Bezae: Studies from The Lunel Colloquium, June 1994*. NTTS 22. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1996.
- Parker, D. C., D. G. K. Taylor, and M. S. Goodacre. "The Dura-Europos Gospel Harmony". Pages 192-228 in *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts: The Papers of the First Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Edited by D. G. K. Taylor. TS 3rd Series 1. Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1999.
- Perrin, Nicholas. *Thomas and Tatian: The Relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the Diatessaron*. SBLAB 5. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- Perrin, Norman. *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- Pervo, Richard I. "Social and Religious Aspects of the 'Western' Text". Pages 229-41 in *The Living Text: Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders*. Edited by Dennis E. Groh and Robert Jewett. Lanham: University Press of America, 1985.
- Petersen, William L. "The Genesis of the Gospels". Pages 33-65 in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*. Edited by A. Denaux. BETL 161. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2002.
- Petersen, William L., ed. *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*. CJAS 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989.
- Petersen, William L. *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship*. SupVigChr 25. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.
- Pfeiffer, Rudolf. *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Pinner, H. L. *The World of Books in Classical Antiquity*. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1948.
- Plooiij, D. *A Further Study of the Liège Diatessaron*. Leiden: E. J. Brill Ltd., 1925.
- Porter, Stanley E. *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research: Previous Discussion and New Proposals*. JSNTSup 191. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

- Porter, Stanley E., and Matthew B. O'Donnell. "The Implications of Textual Variants for Authenticating the Words of Jesus". Pages 97-133 in *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*. Edited by Bruce D. Chilton and Craig A. Evans. NTTS 28/1. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999.
- Pucci, Pietro. *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad*. CSCP 46. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987.
- Read-Heimerdinger, Jenny. *The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism*. JSNTSup 236. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press/Continuum Imprint, 2002.
- Read-Heimerdinger, J. "Where is Emmaus? Clues in the Text of Luke in Codex Bezae". Pages 229-44 in *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts: The Papers of the First Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Edited by D. G. K. Taylor. TS 3rd Series 1. Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1999.
- Reynolds, L. D., and N. G. Wilson. *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974.
- Rice, George E. "Is Bezae a Homogeneous Codex?". Pages 39-54 in *Perspectives on the New Testament: Essays in Honor of Frank Stagg*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1985. Reprint from *PRSt* 11 (1984): 39-54.
- Rice, George. "Western Non-Interpolations: A Defense of the Apostolate". Pages 1-16 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. New York: Crossroad Publishing Co., 1984.
- Riley, Gregory J. *One Jesus, Many Christs: How Jesus Inspired Not One True Christianity, But Many, The Truth About Christian Origins*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997.
- Rius-Camps, Josep, and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger. *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition*, Vol. 1, *Acts 1.1-5.42: Jerusalem*. JSNTSup 257. London: T & T Clark International/Continuum Imprint, 2004.
- Roberts, C. H., and T. C. Skeat. *The Birth of the Codex*. London: Oxford University Press for The British Academy, 1983.
- Robertson, A. T. *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1925.
- Ropes, James Hardy. *The Text of Acts*. Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. Vol. 3. *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Part I: *The Acts of the Apostles*. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1926.

- Royse, James R. "Scribal Tendencies in the Transmission of the Text of the New Testament". Pages 239-52 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. SD 46. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1995.
- Russell, D. A. *Criticism in Antiquity*. 2nd ed. BCPS. London: Bristol Classical Press, 1995.
- Russell, D. A. "De Imitatione". Pages 1-16 in *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*. Edited by David West and Tony Woodman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Russell, D. A., and M. Winterbottom, eds. *Ancient Literary Criticism: The Principal Texts in New Translations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Rutgers, Leonard V. "The Importance of Scripture in the Conflict between Jews and Christians: The Example of Antioch". Pages 287-303 in *The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World*. Edited by L. V. Rutgers, P. W. van der Horst, H. W. Havelaar, and L. Teugels. CBET 22. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.
- Sanders, James A. *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism*. GBS-OTS. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Sanders, James A. "The Hermeneutics of Translation". Pages 43-62 in *Removing the Anti-Judaism for the New Testament*. Edited by Howard Clark Kee and Irvin J. Borowsky. Philadelphia: American Interfaith Institute/World Alliance, 2000.
- Scott, Bernard Brandon. *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Shiner, Whitney. *Proclaiming the Gospel: First-Century Performance of Mark*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2003.
- Sider, John W. *Interpreting the Parables: A Hermeneutical Guide to Their Meaning*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1995.
- Silva, Moisés. *Has the Church Misread the Bible?: The History of Interpretation in the Light of Current Issues*. FCI 1. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987.
- Simonetti, Manlio. *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: A Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*. Translated by John A. Hughes. Edited by Anders Bergquist, Markus Bockmuehl, and William Horbury. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994.
- Simonetti, Manlio, ed. *Matthew 1-13*. ACCSNT 1a. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2001.
- Simonetti, Manlio, ed. *Matthew 14-28*. ACCSNT 1b. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2002.

- Skarsaune, Oskar. *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition; Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*. NovTSup 56. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1987.
- Smith, B. T. D. *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels: A Critical Study*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1937.
- Snodgrass, Klyne R. "From Allegorizing to Allegorizing: A History of the Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus". Pages 3-29 in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000.
- Souter, Alexander. *The Text and Canon of the New Testament*. London: Duckworth, 1912.
- Stanford, W. B. *The Sound of Greek: Studies in Euphony*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.
- Stanton, Graham. *The Gospels and Jesus*. 2nd ed. OBS. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Stein, Robert H. "The Genre of the Parables". Pages 30-50 in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2000.
- Stein, Robert H. *An Introduction to the Parables of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981.
- Stern, David. *Parables in Midrash: Narrative and Exegesis in Rabbinic Literature*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Stewart-Sykes, Alistair, trans. *Melito of Sardis On Pascha with the Fragments of Melito and Other Material Related to the Quartodecimans*. SVSPPPS. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2001.
- Steyn, Gert J. "Luke's Use of *ΜΙΜΗΣΙΣ*?: Re-opening the Debate". Pages 551-7 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by C. M. Tuckett. BETL 131. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Strange, W. A. *The Problem of the Text of Acts*. SNTSMS 71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, and Dates*. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1964.

- Stroumsa, Guy G. "The Christian Hermeneutical Revolution and Its Double Helix". Pages 9-28 in *The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World*. Edited by L. V. Rutgers, P. W. van der Horst, H. W. Havelaar, and L. Teugels. CBET 22. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.
- Theissen, Gerd, and Annette Merz. *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM Press Ltd, 1998.
- Thompson, Edward Maunde. *An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912.
- Tolbert, Mary Ann. *Perspectives on the Parables: An Approach to Multiple Interpretations*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Too, Yun Lee. *The Idea of Ancient Literary Criticism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.
- Torrance, Thomas F. *Divine Meaning: Studies in Patristic Hermeneutics*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd., 1995.
- Trigg, Joseph. "The Apostolic Fathers and Apologists". Pages 304-33 in *A History of Biblical Interpretation*. Vol. 1. *The Ancient Period*. Edited by Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2003.
- Trobisch, David. *The First Edition of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Trobisch, David. *Paul's Letter Collection: Tracing the Origins*. Foreword by Gerd Theissen. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.
- Turner, Eric G. *The Typology of the Codex*. [Philadelphia:] University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977.
- Turner, C. H. "Greek Patristic Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles". Pages 484-531 in *A Dictionary of the Bible Dealing with Its Language, Literature, and Contents Including the Biblical Theology*. Extra Volume. Edited by James Hastings and John Selbie. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1904.
- Urbina, I. Ortiz de. "Trama e carattere de Diatessaron di Taziano". *OCP* 25 (1959): 326-57.
- Vaganay, Léon. *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Translated by B. V. Miller. London: Sands, 1937.
- Vaganay, Léon, and Christian-Bernard Amphoux. *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*. 2nd rev. ed. Translated by Jenny Heimerdinger. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

- Valavanolickal, Kuriakose Antony. *The Use of the Gospel Parables in the Writings of Aphrahat and Ephrem*. SRHEC 2. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1996.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Authentic Gospel of Jesus*. London: Penguin Books, 2004.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Changing Faces of Jesus*. London: Penguin Books, 2000.
- Via, Dan O. *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimensions*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- Vogels, Heinrich Joseph. *Harmonistik im Evangelientext des Codex Cantabrigiensis: Ein Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Textkritik*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, 1910.
- Vööbus, Arthur. *Early Versions of the New Testament: Manuscript Studies*. PETSE 6. Stockholm:[Estonian Theological Society in Exile], 1954.
- Wailes, Stephen L. *Medieval Allegories of Jesus' Parables*. UCLACMRS. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.
- Wan, Sze-Kar. "Allegorical Interpretation East and West: A Methodological Enquiry into Comparative Hermeneutics". Pages 154-79 in *Text and Experience: Towards a Cultural Exegesis of the Bible*. Edited by Daniel Smith-Christopher. BS 35. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Warfield, Benjamin Breckinridge. *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. 5th ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1896.
- Weigle, Luther A., ed. *An Introduction to the Revised Standard Version of the New Testament*. New York: International Council of Religious Education, 1946.
- Wensinck, A. J. "Appendix C: The Unpublished Work of the Late A. J. Wensinck of Leiden". Pages 296-304 in Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967. Reprint, with an introduction by Craig A. Evans, Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1998.
- West, David, and Tony Woodman, eds., *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Westcott, Brooke Foss, and Fenton John Anthony Hort. *Introduction, Appendix*. Vol. 2 of *The New Testament in the Original Greek*. London: Macmillan and Co., 1896.
- Westermann, Claus. *The Parables of Jesus in the Light of the Old Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Wilder, Amos N. *The Language of the Gospel: Early Christian Rhetoric*. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

- Witherington, Ben, III. *The Jesus Quest: The Third Search for the Jew of Nazareth*. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1995.
- Whitman, Jon. *Allegory: The Dynamics of an Ancient and Medieval Technique*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Williams, C. S. C. *Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1951.
- Wisse, Frederik. *The Profile Method for the Classification and Evaluation of Manuscript Evidence as Applied to the Continuous Greek Text of The Gospel of Luke*. SD 44. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1982.
- Wolfson, Harry Austryn. *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*. Vol. 1. *Faith, Trinity, Incarnation*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Woodman, Tony. "Self-imitation and the Substance of History: Tacitus, *Annals*, 1.61-5 and *Histories* 2.70, 5.14-15". Pages 143-55 in *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*. Edited by David West and Tony Woodman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God. Vol. 2. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Wright, N. T. *The New Testament and the People of God*, Christian Origins and the Question of God. Vol. 1. London: SPCK, 1992.
- Young, Frances. "Alexandrian and Antiochene Exegesis". Pages 334-54 in *A History of Biblical Interpretation*. Vol. 1. *The Ancient Period*. Edited by Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2003.
- Young, Frances. "Allegory and the Ethics of Reading". Pages 103-20 in *The Open Text: New Directions for Biblical Studies?* Edited by Francis Watson. London: SCM Press, 1993.
- Young, Frances M. *The Art of Performance: Towards a Theology of Holy Scripture*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, Ltd. 1990.
- Young, Frances M. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Young, Frances M. *From Nicaea to Chalcedon: A Guide to the Literature and Its Background*. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1983.
- Young, Frances. "Typology". Pages 29-48 in *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter, Paul Joyce and David E. Orton. BIS 8. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994.

Zetzel, James E. G. *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity*. MCS. Salem: Ayer Company, 1984.

Websites

Chabert d'Hyeres, Sylvie. "L'Évangile au risque du Codex Bezae". No pages. Cited 22 April 2004. Online: <http://www.ifrance.com/bezae>.

Ehrman, Bart D. "Text and Tradition: The Role of New Testament Manuscripts in Early Christian Studies—Lecture Two: Text and Transmission: The Historical Significance of the 'Altered' Text". *TC* 5 (2000). No pages. Cited 20 May 2004. Online: <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol05/Ehrman2000b.html>.

Parker, D. C. "Review of Nicholas Perrin, *Thomas and Tatian: The Relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the Diatessaron*". *TC* 8 (2003). No pages. Cited 8 April 2004. Online: <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol08/Perrin2003rev.html>.

Schmid, Ulrich. "Review of Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*". *TC* 7 (2002). No pages. Cited 12 June 2004. Online: <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/vol07/Haines-Eitzen2002reva.html>.

Unpublished

CroweTipton, Vaughn Eric. "*Ad Theophilum: A Socio-Rhetorical Reading of Peter in Acts in Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*". Ph.D. dissertation, Baylor University, 1999.

Donaldson, Amy M. "Were the Alexandrians Doing Textual Criticism on the New Testament in the Second Century?: An Examination of the Interplay of Textual Criticism and Exegesis in the Works of Origen in Response to Günther Zuntz". Unpublished paper read at The Third Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, The University of Birmingham, 7-10 April 2003.

Fee, Gordon D. "The Significance of Papyrus Bodmer II and Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV for Methodology in New Testament Textual Criticism". Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1966.

Gregory, Andrew F. "The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus". Ph.D. thesis, University of Oxford, 2001.

Heimerdinger, J. G. "The Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism: A Study of the Bezan Text of Acts". Ph.D. thesis, University of Wales, 1994.

Holmes, Michael W. "Early Editorial Activity and the Text of Codex Bezae in Matthew". Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1984.

- Panten, Kenneth E. "A History of Research on Codex Bezae, with Special Reference to the Acts of the Apostles: Evaluation and Future Directions". Ph.D thesis, Murdoch University, 1995.
- Rice, George E. "The Alteration of Luke's Tradition by the Textual Variants in Codex Bezae". Ph.D. dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1974.
- Royse, James Ronald. "Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri". Th.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 1981.
- Stewart, John W. "Doctrinal Influence Upon the New Testament Text of Clement of Alexandria". Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1966.
- Titus, Eric Lane. "The Motivation of Changes made in the New Testament Text by Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria: A Study in the Origin of New Testament Variation". Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1942.
- Yoder, James D. "The Language of the Greek Variants of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis". Th.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1958.

Antiquity

- Ambroise de Milan. *Traité sur L'Évangile de S. Luc: Texte Latin, Introduction, Traduction et Notes*. 2 Vols. Edited by Gabriel Tissot. SC 45 & 52. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1956-58.
- Ambrose. "Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam". In *Sancti Ambrosii mediolanensis opera: pars 4*. CCSL 14. Turnhout: Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii, 1957.
- Ambrose. *Exposition of the Holy Gospel According to Saint Luke, with Fragments on the Prophecy of Esaias*. 2nd ed. Translated by Theodosia Tomkinson. Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 2003.
- Aphraatis Sapientis Persae. *Demonstrationes*. PS 1. Edited by R. Graffin. Paris: Instituti Francisci Typographi, 1894-1926.
- Aphrahat. "The Demonstrations of Aphrahat the Persian Sage". Edited by John Gwynn. In *NPNF*. 2nd Series. Vol. 13. Oxford: James Parker & Co., 1898.
- "Apocryphon of James". Translated by Francis E. Williams. Pages 29-37 in *The Nag Hammadi Library in English*. 3rd rev. ed. Edited by James M. Robinson. San Francisco: HarperCollins Publishers, 1990.
- Aristotle. *The Metaphysics*. 2 Vols. Translated by Hugh Tredennick. LCL 271 & 287. London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1933-35.

- Aristotle. *The "Art" of Rhetoric*. Translated by John Henry Freese. LCL 193. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.
- Aristotle. "Poetics". Translated by Stephen Halliwell. Pages 1-141 in *Aristotle Poetics, Longinus on the Sublime, Demetrius on Style*. Aristotle 23. LCL 199. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Aristotle. *The Physics*. 2 Vols. Translated by Philip H. Wicksteed and Francis M. Cornford. LCL 228 & 255. London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1929-34.
- Augustine. *Confessions*. Translated by Vernon J. Bourke. FC 21. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1953.
- Augustine. "Quaestiones in Evangelium secundum Lucam". In "Quaestionum Evangeliorum Libri Duo". PL 35. Edited by J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1841.
- Augustine. "Sermones". In "Opera Omnia". PL 38. Edited by J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1841.
- Augustine. *Sermons on the Liturgical Seasons*. Translated by Mary Sarah Muldowney. FC 38. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1959.
- Barnabas. *The Epistle of Barnabas*. In *The Apostolic Fathers: Epistle of Barnabas, Papias and Quadratus, Epistle to Diognetus, The Shepherd of Hermas*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman. Vol. 2. LCL 25. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Cicero. *Brutus*. Translated by G. L. Hendrickson. In *Cicero V: Brutus, Orator*. LCL 342. London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1971.
- Chrysologus, Peter. "Sermones". In *Sancti Petri Chrysologi collectio sermonum: pars 1*. Edited by Alexander Olivar. CCSL 24. Turnhout: Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii, 1975.
- Chrysostom John. *Saint Chrysostom: On the Priesthood; Ascetic Treatises; Select Homilies and Letters; Homilies on the Statues*. In *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*. Edited by Philip Schaff. Vol. 9. Reprint, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1978.
- Chrysostom, John. "Homiliae XXI de Statuis ad populum Antiochenum habitae". PG 49. Edited by J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1857-86.
- Cyril of Alexandria. *Commentary on the Gospel of Saint Luke*. Translated by R. Payne Smith. Long Island: Studion Publishers, Inc., 1983.
- Cyril of Alexandria. *S. Cyrilli Alexandriae archiepiscopi commentarii in Lucae evangelium: quae supersunt syriace e manuscriptis apud Museum Britannicum*. Edited by Robert Payne Smith. Oxford: Typographeo Academico, 1858.

- Cyril of Alexandria. "Commentarius in Lucam". *PG* 72. Edited by J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1857-86.
- Cyril of Alexandria. "Cyrill von Alexandrien Fragment". In *Matthäus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche: aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben*. Edited by Joseph Reuss. TUGAL 61. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957.
- Cyril of Jerusalem. *The Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem*. 2 Vols. Translated by Leo P. McCauley and Anthony A. Stephenson. *FC* 61 & 64. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1969-70.
- Dionysius of Halicarnasus. *Dionysii Halicarnasei Opuscula*. 2 Vols. Edited by Hermannus Usener and Ludovicus Radermacher. BSGRT. Lipsiae: B.G. Teubneri, 1899-1929.
- Ephrem. *Saint Ephrem: An Exposition of the Gospel*. *Scriptores Armeniaci Tomus 5*. Edited by George A. Egan. *CSCO* 291. Louvain: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1968.
- Ephrem. *Saint Éphrem: Commentaire de l'évangile concordant. Texte syriaque (Manuscrit Chester Beatty 709)*. Edited by Louis Leloir. *Chester Beatty Monographs* 8. Dublin: Hodges Figgis & Co. Ltd., 1963.
- Ephrem. *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron: An English Translation of Chester Beatty Syriac MS 709 with Introduction and Notes*. Edited by Carmel McCarthy. *JSSSup* 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Eusebius. *The Ecclesiastical History*. 2 Vols. Translated by Kirsopp Lake, J. E. L. Oulton and H. J. Lawlor. *LCL* 153 & 265. London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1973-75.
- Gellius, Aulus. *The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius*. 3 Vols. Translated by John C. Rolfe. *LCL* 195, 200 & 212. London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1967-70.
- "Gospel of Peter". Pages 150-8 in *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation based on M. R. James*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Gregory of Nazianzus. *Grégoire de Nazianze Discours 27-31 (Discours Théologiques): Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Notes*. Edited by Paul Gallay and Maurice Jourjon. *SC* 250. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1978.
- Hilary of Poitiers. *Hilaire de Poitiers, Sur Matthieu: Introduction, Texte Critique, Traduction et Notes*. 2 Vols. Edited by Jean Doignon. *SC* 254 & 258. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1978-79.
- Irenaeus. *The Writings of Irenaeus*. Vol. 1. Translated by A. Roberts and W. H. Rambaut. *ANCL* 5. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1868.

- Isocrates. "Against the Sophists". Volume 2, pages 160-77 in *Isocrates*. 3 Vols. Translated by George Norlin. LCL 229. London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1929.
- Jerome. *Saint Jérôme Commentaire Sur S. Matthieu* 1. Edited by Émile Bonnard. SC 242. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1977.
- Justin. *Writings of Saint Justin Martyr*. Translated by Thomas B. Falls. FC 6. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1948.
- Longinus. "On the Sublime". Pages 143-307 in *Aristotle Poetics, Longinus On the Sublime, Demetrius On Style*. Translated by W. H. Fyfe and revised by Donald A. Russell. LCL 199. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Macrobe. *Les Saturnales*. 2 Vols. In One. Vol. 1 edited by Henri Bornecque. Vol. 2 edited by François Richard. Paris: Librairie Garnier Frères, n.d.
- Macrobius. *The Saturnalia*. Translated by Percival Vaughan Davies. RCSS 79. New York: Columbia University Press, 1969.
- Origen. *Commentary on the Gospel According to John Books 1-10*. Translated by Ronald E. Heine. FC 80. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1989.
- Origen. *Die Homilien zu Lukas in der Übersetzung des Hieronymus und die griechischen Reste der Homilien und des Lukas-Kommentars*. Edited by Max Rauer. Origenes Werke 9. GCS 35. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959.
- Origen. *Homilies on Luke, Fragments on Luke*. Translated by Joseph T. Lienhard. FC 94. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1996.
- Origène. *Homélie sur S. Luc: Texte Latin et Fragments Grecs, Introduction, Traduction et Notes*. Edited by Henri Crouzel, François Fournier and Pierre Périchon. SC 87. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1962.
- Origène. *Commentaire sur L'Évangile Selon Matthieu: Introduction, Traduction et Notes*. Vol. 1. Edited by Robert Girod. SC 162. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1970.
- Origen. "Commentariorum in Matthaëum libri 10-17". *Origenes Matthäuserklärung I: die griechisch erhaltenen Tomoi*. Edited by Erich Klostermann. In *Origenes Werke*. Vol. 10. GCS 40. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1935.
- Origen. "Commentariorum series in evangelium Matthaëi". *Origenes Matthäuserklärung II: die lateinische Übersetzung der Commentariorum Series*. Edited by Erich Klostermann. 2nd ed. Edited by Ursula Treu. In *Origenes Werke*. Vol. 11. GCS [38.2]. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1976.
- Pistis Sophia: English and Coptic*. Edited by Carl Schmidt. Translated by Violet MacDermot. NHS 9. The Coptic Gnostic Library. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978.

Plato. *The Republic*. 2 Vols. Translated by Paul Shorey. LCL 237 & 276. London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1969-70.

Quintilian, *The Orator's Education*. Books 9-10. Vol. 4. Translated by Donald A. Russell. LCL 127. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Seneca, The Elder. *Suasoriae*. Translated by M. Winterbottom. In *Declamations*. 2 Vols. *Controversiae Books 7-10, Suasoriae*. Vol. 2. LCL 464. London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1974.

Tertullian. "De oratione". In *Quinti Septimi Florentis, Tertulliani Opera: pars 1*. Edited by G. F. Diercks. CCSL 1. Turnhout: Typographi Brepols Editores Pontificii, 1954.

Tertullian. *Tertullian's Treatise on the Resurrection: The text edited with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Edited by Ernest Evans. London: SPCK, 1960.

Theodoret of Cyrrihus. "Compendium haereticarum fabularum". *PG 83*. Edited by J.-P. Migne. Paris: Migne, 1857-86.

Thomas. *The Gospel According to Thomas: Coptic Text Established and Translated*. Edited and translated by A. Guillaumont, H.-Ch. Puech, G. Quispel, W. Till and Yassah 'Abd Al Masih. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.