

WHERE IS EMMAUS? CLUES IN THE TEXT OF LUKE 24 IN CODEX BEZAE¹

Jenny Read-Heimerdinger

A number of scholars have drawn attention to the use made by Luke of the Jewish Scriptures and fresh discoveries continue to be made as more information about the nature and the function of the Scriptures in 1st century Judaism becomes known.² Scriptural reference is seen not just in the direct quotations which Luke makes but much more in his creative adaptation of texts or groups of texts to produce Midrashic-type narratives which rely on the devices of traditional Jewish exegesis for their interpretation. He thereby situates the events relating to the life of Jesus (in the Gospel), as indeed those relating to the first communities of his disciples (in Acts), in the stream of the continuing unfolding of the history of Israel.³

In the final chapter of his Gospel, there are overt references to the Jewish Scriptures which Luke portrays as made by the resurrected Jesus in order to interpret his Messiahship (vv.27; 44-7). There is, however, much more to Luke's use of Scripture in his account of Jesus' resurrection appearances than these obvious references. Our study will examine in detail this aspect, and will focus on the central section of the chapter (vv.13-25), where Jesus meets two disciples as they walk from Jerusalem to a village a certain distance away.

One of the indispensable tasks is to establish the text of Luke, for chapter 24 exists in two main forms, usually described as the Alexandrian text (AT) and the Western text (WT). The WT is often thought of as being characterized by its greater length in Luke-Acts,⁴ but in the final chapters of the Gospel the contrary situation exists. The traditional maxim of textual criticism, lectior breviar potior, has caused the shorter, so-called Western, form of the text to be regarded with exceptional favour with the series of longer readings in the AT of the end of Luke's Gospel being labelled by Westcott and Hort as 'non-Western interpolations'.⁵ Nevertheless, despite the approval granted to the WT, there has been little sustained analysis of it, most studies of Luke's Gospel being based on the AT. In fact, as has been argued on a number of occasions elsewhere,⁶ the WT, unlike the AT, is not a homogenous recension but a collection of witnesses (many of them versions) whose chief resemblance to each other is that they differ in some way or another from the AT. What is often meant by the 'Western text' is consequently a hypothetical reconstruction based on a variety of differing witnesses, most of them versional as opposed to Greek MSS. It is not sound methodology to compare a reconstructed, non-existent text with the AT which can be easily identified by consulting its two main

representatives, Codex Sinaiticus (S01, previously ζ) and Codex Vaticanus (B03). Independent analysis of extended passages in the only Greek witness which consistently differs from the AT in Luke's writings, Codex Bezae (D05), has demonstrated that the text of this manuscript regularly displays a high degree of linguistic and literary consistency. Some studies argue that its readings function together to communicate a particular theological intention on the part of the author.⁷ Such results challenge the view that the text of Codex Bezae as it now stands has been formed by successive layers of modification,⁸ or that it is the work of a slipshod and whimsical scribe.⁹

By consulting current editions of the Greek New Testament,¹⁰ it is possible to gain some impression of the variation which exists among the manuscripts used for the establishment of the text. This impression, however, is too vague to enable the text of any one manuscript to be reconstructed in detail. All kinds of readings are not cited in the critical apparatus; many are deemed insignificant by the editors and, in any case, limited space makes more frequent citings impractical. Furthermore, successive variant readings which occur within any one passage are generally treated by textual critics as independent instances of variation, with the result that the usefulness of acknowledging them all in a critical edition is not recognized. That said, the larger-scale edition of Luke's Gospel produced by the International Greek New Testament Project displays a comprehensive range of variant readings without being overly restricted by criteria of significance.¹¹ This edition, together with access to the text of certain manuscripts, means that it is not difficult to step outside the confines of the popular editions in order to make a more exact comparison of some of the different states of the New Testament text which have existed. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the study of manuscripts, as opposed to a string of selected variant readings, is an exercise which yields interesting information and valuable clues as to the history of the text of the New Testament.

What I aim to do here in this study of the central section of the final chapter of Luke's Gospel, is to comment on some readings of the 'short text' as it stands in D05, and to compare them with those of B03 which is essentially the text printed in the N-A²⁷/UBS⁴ editions. B03 will be taken as a representative of the AT but variants which arise in the text of S01 will be pointed out. I will seek to indicate reasons for the variation between the two main forms of the text and to consider how Luke's purpose as conveyed by the text in D05 differs from that conveyed by the text in B03.

A Theological Key.

The themes which run throughout Luke's narrative in the final chapter of his Gospel –a journey, an encounter with God, and the divine provision of food– are all

prominent themes in the earliest stories in the history of the Jewish people as told in the book of Genesis and there are verbal parallels in Lk 24 with several of these stories. Amongst them can be noted the visit by the oaks of Mamre of the three angels to Abraham who offers them bread before they continue with their journey (18:5); and the provision of Hagar with bread and water as she sets off on her wanderings in the wilderness of Beersheba (21:14). Most striking is the journey of Jacob to Bethel where he had his dream of the ladder between heaven and earth, an episode which will be examined in more detail here now to see how it illuminates the underlying theological meaning of the central episode in the sequence of resurrection appearances in Lk 24, Jesus' encounter with the two disciples.

The clue to the significance of the Jacob incident is provided the word by the name given in Lk 24:13 in Codex Bezae to the village for which they were heading, 'Oulammaous'. The text of the verse in each MS reads as follows:

Codex Bezae

¹³† Ἦσαν δὲ δύο πορευόμενοι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ εἰς κώμην ἀπέχουσαν σταδίους ἑξήκοντα ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ, ὄνοματι Οὐλαμμαοῦς.

Codex Vaticanus

¹³Καὶ ἰδοὺ δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἦσαν πορευόμενοι εἰς κώμην ἀπέχουσαν σταδίους ἑξήκοντα ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἢ ὄνομα Ἐμμαοῦς.

The name 'Oulammaous' is read only by the Greek and Latin sides of Codex Bezae. It is found only once elsewhere in Greek literature, in certain MSS of the LXX version of the story of Jacob's ladder in Gen 28.¹² It is worth looking at the Genesis passage to see the significance of the name there.

After tricking his father into giving him the birthright of Esau, his elder brother, Jacob was fleeing from his brother's anger (Gen 27:18-45). He was on his way from Beersheba to Haran when he stopped at nightfall at a place on the mountain road running north out of Jerusalem. There he dreamed that he saw a ladder reaching to heaven with angels of God ascending and descending on it, or on him.¹³ A voice spoke to him and assured him of God's protection and confirmed that the land on which he rested would be given to him and his descendants and that these would multiply and spread out over the earth. Arising in the morning, Jacob took the stone on which he had placed his head and set it up as a pillar over which he poured oil as a thanksgiving sacrifice. The name of the place which was formerly Luz was now called Beth-El, the house of God. The scene then concludes with Jacob making a vow that if God stays with him and look after him, providing him with bread and clothing so that he returns safely from his flight, back to his father's house, then the Lord will be his God and the pillar will be God's house; and he will give a tenth of everything back to God.¹⁴

In the LXX version of the story, the name 'Oulammaous' is said to be the former name of Bethel (Gen 28:19). Its form depends on a misunderstanding (probably involuntary, but possibly deliberate) of the explanation given in the Hebrew text, that it was 'formerly Luz' (zwl Mlw) [ulam luz]).

'Oulammaous' designates, in other words, the place Jacob called Bethel. It is important to be specific about the connotations of the name. Under the divided monarchy, Bethel became the place of opposition to true worship in Jerusalem and represented antagonism to the faithful prophets. It was the religious centre of the rebellious, northern kingdom. If, however, Luke had intended the reference to Bethel to evoke the associations of the place as a centre of idolatry, he could have more straightforwardly used the name 'Bethel'¹⁵. Instead, he gives the name of the place as 'Oulammaous' which makes an unquestionable connection with the scene of Gen 28 in which Jacob first set a monument to mark the place where God dwelt on earth.

When the two narratives of Lk 24 and Gen 28 are considered side by side, a rich weave of parallels can be noticed. These involve similarities of concepts but also depend in part on the wording of the LXX text. The elements in Lk 24 are concentrated in the central episode of vv.13-35 but the parallels spill over into the preceding and following episodes of the chapter. They can be seen most clearly when the Genesis account is taken step by step:

Genesis 28

Luke 24

v.10

Jacob is going on a journey to flee
journey,
from his brother

The two disciples are going on a

v.13, which is a journey of flight (see
below).

v.11

a. the sun sets when he gets to a certain
place
b. he sleeps

a. towards evening, the day declining, as
they approach the village, vv.28-9.
b. their eyes are darkened, v.16

v.12

a. he dreams

b. the ladder which connects heaven
and earth

a. the women said they had had a vision,
v.23
b. the day of ascension, Jesus goes to
heaven, Ac 1:10-11

c. angels ascending and descending	c. the women had a vision of angels, v.23
v.13	
a. God reveals himself out of heaven to communicates Jacob	Jesus, in resurrected form, with his disciples; he reveals himself from the Scriptures, vv.25-27, 44
v.14	
Promise that Jacob will be father of many descendants who will spread to the 4 corners of the earth	Jesus will order his disciples to go to the ends of the earth, and promises the Holy Spirit vv.47,49, cf. Ac 1:4,8. His 12 apostles represent the 12 sons of Jacob (22:30; Ac 1:17)
v.15	
a. God will be always with him (μετά σοῦ), typical journey motif	a. Jesus stayed with the disciples (μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν), v.29 (twice in D), v.30B
b. everything God has said will be accomplished	b. the fulfillment of the Scriptures in Jesus, vv.25,32,44
v.16	
a. Jacob awakens their	a.the disciples' eyes are opened, v.31; mind is opened, v.45
b. he realizes that the Lord was there	b. they recognize Jesus, vv.31,35; they realize that he has risen, v.34D
v.17	
he is afraid	the disciples gathered in Jerusalem are afraid when Jesus appears, v.37
v.18	
he gets up	the two disciples get up, v.33
v.20	
he asks for bread and clothing as a sign of the covenant being kept	the taking of the bread from Jesus is the sign which shows them who he is, v.31D (in B, it is the breaking of bread, cf.v.35)

In the B03 text, the clue to the identity of Jesus is in the *breaking* of the bread, commonly taken as a recollection of the 'last supper' of Lk 22. In the D05 text, it is the *taking* of the bread which serves as the sign for the disciples. Long before the distribution of bread became a Christian eucharistic symbol, it was a Jewish sign of hospitality and provision on the part of the master of the household. The D05 text

avoids making a connection with Jesus' farewell meal, but enables a wider application of the clue to be made, to God as provider of food, thus establishing a further parallel with Gen 28:20.¹⁶

The number of resemblances between the text of Gen 28 and Lk 24 is striking, and they are especially close in the Bezan account of the disciples' meeting with Jesus. They suggest that the author is presenting the meeting as a re-enactment of Jacob's encounter with Yahweh at Bethel. This is a reading of the Scriptures which is typically Jewish in that it demonstrates how the recent events concerning Jesus and his followers were already contained within the Torah. It is a use of Scripture which is confined neither to this instance in the writings of Luke nor indeed to Luke as a writer in the New Testament. The question is why the Jacob story is chosen as template in this case.

The reason becomes clearer when the motive for Jacob's journey is taken into consideration. He was fleeing from his brother whom he had just tricked into losing his inheritance due to him as the first-born son. He was running away to save his life.¹⁷ It was during this flight which resulted from such a crime that God came to meet with him. In the traditional teaching which grew up around the Jacob story,¹⁸ certain elements became considerably developed. In particular, great importance is attached to the setting of the sun: God is said to have miraculously advanced the hour of sunset because he wanted to speak with Jacob in private, and even that he took this action because 'the "Word" was burning to speak with him'.¹⁹

If Luke uses the Jacob story as a basis for the account of Jesus' resurrection appearance to the two disciples in his Gospel, it would seem that he wishes to portray the journey of the two disciples as a similar journey of flight, to show that they were running away. This interpretation is confirmed by a number of factors which are again more evident in the text of Codex Bezae. First of all, there is a reason for their flight which is to be found in the two-fold betrayal of Jesus which has taken place within the group, that of Judas (Lk 22: 3-6, 47-8) and that of Peter (22:54-62). It is of no little interest that in the Bezan text, the betrayal by Judas is a re-enactment of Jacob's betrayal of his brother. In the account of the sign of the kiss which Judas gives to Jesus (22:47-8), the D text of v.47 reproduces the exact wording with which the LXX text relates the betrayal of Esau by Jacob when he goes to claim the blessing from his father (Gen 27:27).²⁰ The result of this quotation here is that the parallel of the Jacob story is, in fact, already in place by chapter 24.

While it is true that in the summary which the disciples give to Jesus, they attribute the handing over (*παρέδωκαν*, the same verb as 'to betray') of Jesus to the 'chief priests and rulers' (v.20), this needs to be considered in the social context of a profoundly united community who share a corporate sense of responsibility for

wrong-doing. The religious authorities represent the people, and in so far as they have sinned by handing over the Messiah to be killed, then the people too have sinned.²¹ Even if the two disciples on the road had not played an individual part in the betrayal/handing over of Jesus, there is no doubt about their affinity with those who had done so. The theme of betrayal is an important one which also provides clues about the identity of the two disciples, but that is an aspect of the question which there is not time to develop here.

In fact, the particular word order of the Bezan text in v.13 gives to the sentence which introduces the account of the disciples' journey the sense that they were leaving the group to which they belonged: ἦσαν δὲ δύο πορευόμενοι ἐξ αὐτῶν. Furthermore, the sense of failure and disappointment which comes across in the explanation given by the disciples to Jesus as he walks with them is more acute in the text of D05:

v.19 - in place of the nationalistic form, 'Nazarenos' (Ναζαρηνός), D05 uses 'Nazoraios' (Ναζωραίος) which carries Messianic connotations in Luke's writings.²² According to the D05 text, the disciples had recognized Jesus as the Messiah, the ruler of Davidic descent, but he did not fulfil their expectations.

v.21 - the hope expressed by D05 is in the past tense: 'we were hoping that he was...'; S01 has the present for the first verb and both S01 and B03 have the present for the second. In D05, the hope that Jesus would free the nation of Israel has been abandoned because it has apparently come to nothing with the death of the Messiah. It will be rekindled once the resurrection of Jesus is understood (Ac 1:6; 2:36; 3:20-21; 5:31), although abandoned once more in a positive sense by Peter at least.²³

v.22 - the sense of time which has lapsed since his death is accentuated in D05 by the use of 'today is the third day...' rather than 'this is the third day...'.²⁴

Furthermore, D05 follows the time phrase with the perfect, '...since all these things happened', whereas the AT has the aorist, a difference which cannot be easily brought out in an English translation. The perfect is an aspect which expresses the idea that an event is viewed in its entirety with all the attendant circumstances, so here can be thought of as referring to the death of Jesus together with the betrayal and the trial; the aorist, on the other hand, focusses more narrowly on the event of the crucifixion.²⁵ The sense of bewilderment is again the greater in D05.

When all these features of variation between the MSS are considered together, it is interesting to note that the focus of interest in the version of the story told by the Bezan text is the inner thoughts and feelings of the disciples. The focus is given by the underlying motif of flight, and is maintained by the insistence on the despair and sadness of the disciples. Their sadness is not dispelled by the meeting with Jesus in D05, (cf. λυπούμενοι v. 33), but their comprehension of recent events begins to

change as he explains to them the meaning of the Scriptures. This change is again more subtle and progressive in the Bezan text (cf. the use of a simple verb rather than the perfective compound in the AT in vv. 27, 31, 32; the incomplete exposition of Scripture by Jesus in v.27; the adjective 'veiled' rather than 'burning' in v. 32).

In comparison with the version of Codex Bezae, the AT presents a less nuanced account of the meeting between the disciples and Jesus. The interest is more in the fact of the resurrection appearance than on the mental attitude of the disciples, and the encounter is related as a straightforward historical fact. The choice of the name 'Emmaus', a place already known if only because it was referred to as a place of battle in the Maccabean wars (I Macc 3:40,57; 4:3), sets the scene for an encounter which is envisaged as having only a literal reality and not a spiritual one.

The reference to the distance of the village from Jerusalem, sixty stadia which is equivalent to just over 11 km, gives further weight to the idea that the episode of the disciples' encounter with Jesus was included in Luke's Gospel primarily for its significance as a non-literal event. The place referred to as Emmaus in the first book of Maccabees is much further than sixty stadia from Jerusalem and corresponds more to the hundred and sixty of Codex Sinaiticus, suggesting that the S01 reading has arisen in order to overcome the problem of matching a place known as Emmaus to the given distance from Jerusalem.²⁶ It could be hoped that the understanding of the village as Bethel would provide a solution to the difficulty of the distance. Bethel, however, is not sixty stadia but more like ninety stadia from Jerusalem!

The implication, that being so, is that the distance mentioned by Luke was not intended to be a literal distance but a symbolic one. Of what is it a symbol? The meaning is found in the first chapter of Acts which develops the Gospel account of the resurrection appearances of Jesus.²⁷ In Ac 1:12, reference is made to the distance permitted to be travelled on the sabbath day when the narrative specifies that following the ascension of Jesus, the disciples returned to Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives which was a sabbath's day journey 'near (ἐγγύς) to the city (ὁ ἐστὶν ἐγγύς Ἱερουσαλήμ σαββάτου ἔχον ὁδόν). Many commentators point out that the reference to the sabbath day regulation is an anomaly since according to the data given in Luke's Gospel and Acts, the ascension did not take place on a sabbath. The distance detail is, in fact, yet one more instance in Luke's writings of information which has a purpose other than a factual one. The mention that the disciples' return journey to Jerusalem was no longer than a sabbath day's journey can be taken as a deliberate indication that, in their own minds at least, they remained within the sphere of the Jewish law as they returned to the capital city, the seat of religious authority.²⁸

The permitted sabbath day journey was 2000 cubits or roughly 1.1 km, that is about six stadia, and this is indeed the distance between the Mount of Olives and the

city of Jerusalem.²⁹ Sixty stadia, in contrast, corresponds to ten times the distance permitted to be travelled on the sabbath. This means that when in the Gospel account of the disciples' flight, they are portrayed as running away from Jerusalem, they intend to travel ten times a sabbath's day journey away (εις κώμην ἀπέχουσιν σταδίους ἑξήκοντα ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ –note the verb ἀπέχουσιν here, in contrast to the unusual use of ἔχον at Ac 1:12, which shows that there it is the idea of closeness rather than distance which is in the author's mind). In the light of what we have seen as the circumstances which prompted their journey, the detail of the distance (given first, even before the name of the village in 24:13) may be taken as a metaphor signifying that they were attempting to get out of the sphere of Jewish law.

Conclusions.

The reading of 'Oulammaous', with its significance derived from the Genesis story of Jacob, is consistent with other readings of the text in Codex Bezae. The combination of readings in the Bezan text is so complex, and they are so closely woven together, that it would hardly have been possible for a later editor to have introduced them into a more simple text. There are, on the other hand, reasons why the name 'Oulammaous' may have been altered. It may be that the name 'Oulammaous' was not recognized as the name of a place, and so it was replaced with a like-sounding substitute name. On the other hand, the name 'Oulammaous' and its connotations may have been only too well recognized. For a later generation of Christians who were no longer so conscious of their origins in Judaism as were the first generation, such rooting of their faith in Jewish tradition can have been a difficulty. The reminiscence of the Jacob story in Judas' kiss is already absent in chapter 22; it may well be that this further allusion in chapter 24 was therefore likewise deleted and the indications in the story of the dimension of spiritual history were modified so as to produce a simple, factual account.

It is the more straightforward account which has been handed down to us today, through the successive printed editions of the Greek New Testament. It is one which has been particularly cherished by Christians because of its strong note of joyful hope and because it is unique among the New Testament accounts of the resurrection appearances of Jesus. When the story is read in the version of Codex Bezae, it becomes all the more interesting for the detailed attention which is paid to the state of mind of the disciples, and especially for the richness which is conferred on it by its being rooted in the beginnings of the history of Israel.

¹ This examination of variant readings in Lk 24 is more fully developed in a detailed study of the chapter carried out in collaboration with Josep Rius-Camps, to be published separately.

I am grateful for comments made by participants at the Birmingham Colloquium, which have been taken into account in this article.

² In addition to the information provided in the introductions to recent editions of intertestamental literature, there have been detailed studies of Jewish exegetical techniques which give an idea of how the first Christians may have used and interpreted Scripture. Among the many contributions to the field, the following may be cited as particularly helpful: the comprehensive, if technical work by M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1987; a collection of studies specifically of targumic techniques, D.R.G. Beattie and M.J. McNamara (eds), *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994; and, in French, a collection of a more general nature edited by M. Tardieu, *Les Règles de l'Interprétation*, Paris: Le Cerf, 1987.

For studies relating to the writings of Luke, see C.A. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994; see also C.A. Evans, 'Luke and the Rewritten Bible: Aspects of Lukan Hagiography', in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*, J.H. Charlesworth and C.A. Evans (eds), Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993, pp. 00-00; Read-Heimerdinger, 'Acts 8:37: A Textual and Exegetical Study', *The Bulletin of the Institute for Reformation Biblical Studies* 2:1, 1991, pp.8-13.

³ Cf. B.T. Arnold, 'Luke's Characterizing Use of the Old Testament in the Book of Acts', in *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts*, B Witherington (ed), Cambridge: CUP, 1996, pp. 300-323; C.A. Evans - J.A. Sanders, *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*, Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993; cf. Evans, 1995, pp. 172-3. R.G. Hall, *Revealed Histories. Techniques for Ancient Jewish and Christian Historiography*, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991, pp. 171-208. Although the exact definition of Midrash is disputed, it can be broadly said to represent the interpretation of events which occur in the history of Israel as a commentary on the divine revelation expressed through the events narrated in the Torah. For a discussion of Midrash in the modern world, see J. Sacks, *Crisis and Covenant*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1992, pp. 209-46; cf. Read-Heimerdinger, 'The Seven Steps of Codex Bezae. A Prophetic Interpretation of Acts 12', in D.C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux (eds), *Codex Bezae. Studies from the Lunel Colloquium June 1994*, Leiden: Brill, 1996, pp. 303-10; 'Barnabas in Acts', forthcoming.

The evidence in Luke's writing of a Jewish way of thinking, suggests that he was himself a Jew. This is a possibility which is increasingly being considered, contrary to the traditional view of Luke as gentile Christian, cf. F. Bovon, 'Studies in Luke-Acts: Retrospect and Prospect', *HTR*, 85:1, 1992, pp. 175-96, for a survey of contributions to the debate over Lukan identity.

⁴ For the book of Acts, the figure of 10% is usually quoted as the difference in the length of the two texts, based on the calculations of A.C. Clark, see B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, London/New York: UBS, 1975, p.260; cf. W. Strange, *The Problem of the Text of Acts*, Cambridge: CUP, 1992, p. 213, n.18. The difference is, in fact, somewhat smaller when actual MSS are compared: according to a detailed word count of the extant chapters of Acts, the text of D.05 is only 7% longer than that of B.03 and in any case, the additional material only accounts for about one third of the variation between the MSS.

⁵ Because of their preference for the MSS of S01 and B03, which they believed to have a 'neutral text' in the NT generally, W-H. refer to the longer text of the Alexandrian witnesses at the end of Luke as 'non-Western interpolations' which, if nothing else, is an indication of their prejudices. The traditional maxims of lectio brevior potior and lectio diffilior potior, formulated by G. von Mästricht in 1711 (see L.Vaganay- C.-B. Amphoux, *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*, Cambridge: CUP, 1992, pp.80-81), are no longer viewed by many textual critics as valid criteria for evaluating readings, see M.W. Holmes, 'Reasoned Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism', in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, B.D. Ehrman and M.W. Holmes eds, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1995, pp. 342-3.

⁶ See for example, Vaganay and Amphoux, *An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism*, p. 110.

⁷ In addition to his full-scale comparative translation of the two texts of Acts (*Les Deux Actes des Apôtres*, Paris: Gabalda, 1986), E. Delebecque has published a number of exegetical articles which defend the carefulness of the Bezan scribe and which point to a coherence of meaning in the Bezan text of Acts. E.J. Epp argued that there was an anti-Judaic tendency in Codex Bezae in *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis*, Cambridge: CUP, 1966, but his discussion is flawed in so far as it draws on other MSS when Codex Bezae does not support his claims. The commentary on Acts in Catalan by J. Rius-Camps agrees on the homogeneity of Codex Bezae following a more rigorous comparison of the MS with those of the Alexandrian tradition (*Comentari als Fets dels Apòstols*, Vols I, II, III, Barcelona: Herder, 1992-6, vols IV and V forthcoming). A linguistic examination which I carried out using the principles of Discourse Analysis tends to confirm the uniformity of the language and purpose of Codex Bezae in Acts ('The Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism: A Study of the Bezan Text of Acts', PhD Thesis, University of Wales, 1994). On the consistency of the Bezan text in other books of the New Testament, cf. a study of Matthew's Gospel by C.-B. Amphoux, *L'Évangile Selon Matthieu. Codex de Bèze*, L'Isle-sur-la-Sorgue: Le Bois d'Orion, 1996.

⁸ This view is advocated by D.C. Parker, *Codex Bezae. An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text*, Cambridge: CUP, 1994; cf. 'Professor Amphoux's History of the New Testament Text: A Response', *New Testament Update* 4, 1996, pp.41-5. A range of opinions are expressed in the collection of papers from the Lunel Colloquium in France 1994 (*Codex Bezae. Studies from the Lunel Colloquium June 1994*, D.C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux eds, Leiden: Brill, 1996).

⁹ This has been traditionally the most popular view, see Metzger *Commentary*, 1975, *passim*. It is maintained with respect to Acts by M.-E. Boismard and A. Lamouille (*Le texte occidental des Actes des Apôtres: Reconstitution et Réhabilitation*, Vol. I, Paris: Editions Recherches sur les Civilisations, p. 11) who regard Codex Bezae as a 'témoin très abâtardi' of the Western text, a text which they otherwise regard as representing the primitive text.

¹⁰ Nestle-Aland²⁷ or UBS⁴.

¹¹ *The Gospel According to St. Luke*, edited by The American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project, Vol I, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984; Vol II, 1987.

¹² The form 'ohulammaùs' is read by Codex Alexandrinus and MS 370. Most Greek MSS have a form of the name which retains the 'L' of Luz ('ohulamloùz', for example). Eusebius alone reads the exact form of D05 in Lk 24:13, 'ohulammaoùs'. A number of versions also have the name in one form or another without the 'L'.

¹³ The Hebrew allows for both meanings of the pronoun; it is interpreted in the personal sense in some exegetical traditions. See J.L. Kugel, *In Potiphar's House. The Interpretative Life of Biblical Texts*, Cambridge, Massachusetts/London: Harvard University Press, 1994, pp. 112-120; cf. J. Massonnet ('Targum, Midrash et Nouveau Testament', in *Les Premières Traditions de la Bible*, Editions du Zèbre, Lausanne, 1996, pp. 67-101, especially pp. 86-9), who shows the use of this Jacob story in the Gospel of John.

¹⁴ The account as it stands in Genesis looks as if it is made up of several strands, on which see A. De Pury, *Promesse Divine et Légende Culturelle Dans le Cycle de Jacob*, vol I+II, Paris: Gabalda, 1975. Luke makes use of elements from different strands of the account which he clearly takes as a whole, despite the apparent discrepancies within it.

¹⁵ C.-B. Amphoux, 'Le Chapitre 24 de Luc et l'origine de la tradition textuelle du Codex de Bèze (D.05 du NT), *Fil Neo* IV, 1991, pp. 21-49), thinks that there is an underlying play on words between Bethel (house of God, Temple worship) and Bethlehem (house of bread, represented by Jesus who replaces the cultic practices in the Temple with the breaking of bread, 24:19), see pp. 29-30. This interpretation tends to render Luke's message somewhat complicated and obscure, to conceal the significance of the event, whereas in fact Luke's use of coded language rather has the opposite function of *unveiling* deeper meaning. In any case, there would have been no need for Luke to use the singular designation of Bethel, 'oulammaous', if it were the name 'Bethel' itself which was important. 'oulammaous' is never used again to refer to Bethel.

¹⁶ In the B text, the sign of the bread is presented in a form which links the breaking and the blessing of the bread (v.13 τὸν ἄρτον, where D does not have the article). This creates an association which is a typically Jewish one, absent from the D form of the text. The avoidance of stereotypical expressions and associations is, however, a characteristic which has been noticed in the Bezan text of Acts, where there is a correspondingly more spontaneous and creative use of language, cf. J. (Read-)Heimerdinger and S.H. Levinsohn, 'The Use of the Definite Article Before Names of People in the Greek Text of Acts with Particular Reference to Codex Bezae', *Fil Neo* 9, pp. 15-44.

¹⁷ In the lectionary cycle of readings identified by J. Mann (*The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*, Vol I, New York: KTAV, 1940, p.226ff), the start of the *Haftarot* connected with the *Seder* which begins at Gen 28:10 is Hos 12:13 (12) where Jacob's flight to Haran is cited because of the reference to the cities of refuge. The associated homily develops the theme of seeking refuge after killing a person in order to escape the avenger of blood. The existence of such traditions illustrates how much the Genesis passage was seen as portraying Jacob in flight when he left Beersheba.

¹⁸ See especially Midrash Rabbah Genesis 28, and Targum Neofiti I of Genesis.

¹⁹ TgGen 28:10; cf.v.12. The Targumic text may have an echo in the remark of the disciples in the text of Lk 24:32B (read by most MSS except D), 'did not our hearts burn within us while he talked with us...?' The presence of the allusion in the non-Bezan text may be an indication that even in there the Jewish traditions of the Jacob story were recognized as behind the Lukan narrative. Cf. v.31B which likewise displays evidence of a Jewish perspective in the association of the blessing and the breaking of the bread (see n. 17 above).

²⁰ καὶ ἐγγίσας ἐφίλησεν αὐτόν. Lk 22:47D: καὶ ἐγγίσας ἐφίλησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν. The other Greek MSS read καὶ ἤγγισεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλεῖσαι αὐτόν,

which expresses exactly the same idea but the form no longer resembles the LXX text of Gen 27:27. Furthermore, the D text of LK 22:47 has the narrator specify that the kiss was a pre-arranged sign. Old Latin and Old Syriac MSS share the Bezan reading. On the one hand, the presence of the reading in a range of MSS can be seen as evidence that it was an early reading which had been randomly adopted by several witnesses. On the other hand, if the Bezan text is viewed as the original text with a peculiarly Jewish perspective, it is possible that it was modified within a short space of time by subsequent Greek editors in order to attenuate the Jewish reminiscences, but not before it had been translated into the languages of neighbouring peoples.

²¹ The tractate of the Mishnah, *Horayoth*, which would have been in existence at least in oral form in the 1st century, spells out the consequences for Israel when the rulers sin. All the people of Israel are implicated, although it is the rulers alone who have to carry out the steps necessary to obtain forgiveness.

²² Ναζωραῖος (Messianic form) is the only form found in Acts (2:22; 3:6; 4:10; 6:14; 22:8; 24:5; 26:9) where Jesus is always referred to in a Messianic context. In the Gospel, the only firm reading is of Ναζαρηνός (nationalistic form) at 4:34 (the demonic in the synagogue). The Messianic form is read elsewhere by S/B at 18:37 (the people to the blind man) and by D at 2:39 (by Luke, as a fulfillment of prophecy, cf. Matt 2:23) and here at 24:19. The nationalistic form is read by D at 18:37 and by S/B at 24:19.

²³ Ac 12:11. Cf. Rius-Camps, *Comentari*, vol III, on Acts 12.

²⁴ The wording of both texts in this phrase is unusual, because of the apparently impersonal use of ἄγει. For a discussion of the phrase, and the existence of a comparably unusual expression in the Testmonium in the *Jewish Antiquities* of Josephus, see G.J. Goldberg, 'The Coincidences of the Emmaus Narrative of Luke and the Testmonium of Josephus', *JSP* 13, 1995, pp.59-77, esp. pp. 68-9.

²⁵ There has been an ongoing debate for some time now among linguists on the significance of verbal aspect in Greek. For a summary of the current thinking, see R.A. Young, *Intermediate New Testament Greek. A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach*, Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman and Holman, 1994, pp. 00-00.

²⁶ Other attempts to find a place which fits better with the mention of sixty stadia have not been satisfactory, see I.H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978, pp. 892-3.

²⁷ There are a number of close affinities of this nature between the final chapter of Luke and the opening chapter of Luke, which are evidence that the two books are volumes of the same work. The studies which claim the contrary (see, most recently, M.C. Parsons and R.I. Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1993; cf. J.B. Green, 'Internal Repetition in Luke-Acts' in B. Witherington ed., pp. 283-299) do not take account of these underlying, non-literal, connections which stand as evidence of conscious authorial links.

²⁸ Rius-Camps, *Comentari*, Vol I, pp. 60-62.

²⁹ The distance between Jerusalem and the Mount of Olives is given by Josephus in *War* 5.70 as six stadia and in *Ant.* 20.169 as five stadia.