

EARLY WITNESSES TO THE SYRIAC  
TEXT OF ACTS 15 WITH AN  
INVESTIGATION INTO THE TEXT OF  
ACTS 15 IN THE *DIDASCALIA*  
*APOSTOLORUM*

And with an Appendix on the Western / Jacobite  
Peshitta Manuscript Tradition for Acts

DANIEL L. MCCONAUGHY

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY NORTHRIDGE

ABSTRACT

*This paper examines the transmission of the early Syriac text of Acts Chapter fifteen based on collations of 44 Syriac Biblical manuscripts and 6 lectionary manuscripts and citations of Acts in the Syriac patristic sources. Chapter fifteen is extensively quoted in the Didascalia Apostolorum, and these readings are the focus of the analysis of the patristic sources. The collation results show a very consistent text among the Biblical and lectionary manuscripts. The collations also support the idea that the Peshitta text of Acts appears less revised than the Gospel text in the Peshitta version. This is most evidenced by the many 'Western' text readings present in*

*the Peshitta, the lack of variant readings of any significance in the mss, and the use of the Peshitta in the fourth century Syriac translation of the Didascalia. The appendix to this article provides an analysis of the Western / Jacobite manuscript tradition for Acts.'*

## INTRODUCTION

This research extends earlier research on the early history of the Syriac text of Acts by examining the Syriac Biblical and patristic evidence for Acts Chapter Fifteen. It also closely examines the evidence of the *Didascalia Apostolorum* in assessing the early history of the Syriac text of Acts.

Bruce Metzger's (1977) comment regarding the Old Syriac text remains relevant today, four decades after he wrote:

Although no manuscript of an Old Syriac version of the Acts and Pauline Epistles is known, scholars have suspected from the form of quotations from these books in the writings of early Syriac and Armenian authors that an older form of the Syriac text of the Apostolos preceded that of the Peshitta...<sup>2</sup>

Brock (2014) likewise comments on the Pauline epistles and Acts:

Since fourth-century writers quote these books (and Ephrem wrote commentaries on them-unfortunately preserved only in Armenian), there is no doubt that a Syriac version did exist. What is uncertain is whether this text was as different from the Peshitta as the Old Syriac gospels, or whether instead the Peshitta Acts and epistles more or less represent the original Syriac

---

<sup>1</sup> For the Appendix on the Western / Jacobite manuscript tradition, I am thankful to Dr. Andreas Juckel, for his helpful comments.

<sup>2</sup> Metzger (1977), *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, p. 39

Translation of these books, with little or no subsequent revision ever having been undertaken.<sup>3</sup>

Metzger(1968) also comments on the Peshitta text of the Gospels compared to the Peshitta text of Acts:

The textual complexion of the Peshitta version has not yet been satisfactorily investigated, but apparently it represents the work of several hands in various parts of the New Testament. In the Gospels it is closer to the Byzantine type of text than in Acts, where it presents many striking agreements with the Western text.<sup>4</sup>

Research on the early Syriac text of Acts has focused mostly on the first two chapters. This is due to the richness of the Patristic literature that is concerned with the first two chapters which record Jesus' post-resurrection appearances and Ascension, and the record of the Day of Pentecost. There is much less interest in Acts until chapter fifteen which deals with the first Church Council in Jerusalem. Here one finds more interest among the patristic writers and especially the Syriac *Didascalia Apostolorum*, which cites much of Acts Fifteen. This article extends the literature by examining the evidence for Chapter Fifteen of Acts and considering the evidence in light of the more recent research by Juckel and Williams.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Brock (2014), pp. 416-417.

<sup>4</sup> Metzger (1968), *The Text of the New Testament*, p. 70

<sup>5</sup> "Research on the Old Syriac Heritage of the Peshitta Gospels: A Collation of MS Bibl. Nationale Syr. 30 (Paris)," *Hugoye* 12.1, pp 41-115. Williams, Peter (2004) *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels*, Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press. Williams, Peter (2012), 'Where Two or Three Are Gathered Together': The Witness of the Early Versions," in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

The textual problems of the Acts in Syriac differ from the Gospels in two major ways: first, there are no Old Syriac manuscripts of Acts and second, the complicating factor of harmonizations among the Gospels and the Diatessaron's relationship with the Gospels, is not present for Acts. Since there are no Old Syriac manuscripts of Acts, one is dependent on variant readings in Peshitta Biblical manuscripts and lectionaries. Because of the consistency among the Peshitta manuscripts of Acts, the patristic literature has been the primary way scholars have investigated the Old Syriac text of Acts. When one speaks of the Old Syriac text of Acts, it refers to a hypothetical, pre-Peshitta text of Acts, analogous to the Old Syriac Gospels. It is well documented that the early Syriac-speaking fathers, like Aphrahat and Ephrem, quoted from Old Syriac Gospels based on comparing their citations with the Curetonian and Sinai Palimpsest manuscripts. Thus, it is reasonable to think that the Syriac-speaking writers who used the Old Syriac Gospel text, similarly would have quoted from an 'Old Syriac' version of Acts. Consistent with this hypothesis, the evidence points us in that direction based on their citations of Acts that contain variant readings that appear to be echoes of an Old Syriac text of Acts. Kerschensteiner (1964), McConaughy (1985, 1988), Vööbus (1987), and Simonet (1998, 2001) have provided evidence for an Old Syriac text of Acts. The primary source of this material comes from the patristics, though McConaughy (1985) and Vööbus (1987) have found some support for patristic variant readings in the Biblical and lectionary MSS of Acts One and Two. None of these studies provide evidence for the Syriac text of Acts chapter fifteen.

Reliance on patristic quotations to recover the Old Syriac text of Acts is challenging and subject to interpretation. Brock (2014) comments on the difficulties of using patristic citations to establish an Old Syriac Text reading without a corroborating Biblical manuscript. An excellent example from the present

author's firsthand experience of this is the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus in Luke 16:19ff. This section is not included in either the Curetonian Gospel manuscript in the British Museum or in the Sinai Palimpsest in the library of the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai. Aphrahat, writing from Persia during 337-345 AD in Syriac and a known user of the Old Syriac Gospel text, referred to the parable extensively, and at first blush, due to his quotes' many differences from the Peshitta, one would not know for certain whether Aphrahat's references were a paraphrase or he was actually quoting from an Old Syriac Gospel text. Since this parable is not contained in the Sinai Palimpsest or the Curetonian text, for most of the twentieth century, one could not know for sure. The discovery in Egypt (McConaughy (1987) of a missing folio from the Curetonian Gospel manuscript made it clear that Aphrahat was quoting from his Old Syriac Gospel text.<sup>6</sup> However, without this additional manuscript evidence from the Monastery of the Syrians in Wadi Natrun, any discussion whether Aphrahat's citations relating to the Rich Man and Lazarus were a paraphrase or quotes from the Old Syriac text would not have been resolved with certainty.

Williams (2004) examines in detail Syriac variant readings in the Gospels vis a vis the Nestle Aland 27<sup>th</sup> edition (NA27) of the Greek New Testament in light of translation technique. He provides extensive evidence that many early Syriac witnesses, once cited as support for a Greek variant, may not or do not support Greek variant readings. His detailed analyses show that there is less Syriac support for Greek variant readings than many scholars thought. He also provides a most useful set of guidelines regarding the use of Syriac witnesses as support of

---

<sup>6</sup> McConaughy (1987), "A Recently Discovered Folio of the Old Syriac (Sy<sup>c</sup>) Text of Luke 16,13-17,1," *Biblica* 68.1: 85-90.

Greek variant readings. These are summarized in his “Appendix 1: Brief Rules for the Use of Syriac in NT Textual Criticism.”<sup>7</sup> His “Appendix 2: Suggested Emendations to the Apparatus of NA27” synthesizes the body of his research on the Gospels.<sup>8</sup> His “Appendix 3: Agreements Between Syriac Witnesses and Codex Bezae for Which a Non-Genetic Explanation is Possible,” summarizes this aspect of his analyses and is most insightful and is germane when examining whether similarities between Syriac witnesses to Acts and Codex Bezae are genetic or translation.<sup>9</sup> Williams (2012) expands on his above-referenced book by extending the analysis more broadly, to Syro-Western agreements, including not only Codex Bezae, but the Old Latin and Coptic.

The present research focuses on the transmission of the Syriac text of Acts and does not intend to provide support for Greek variant readings. However, for the inner-Syriac variant readings, the ‘take-away’ from Dr. Williams’ research is that Western text similarities to Syriac readings for which there is little Syriac support, may not provide as strong a support for the Syriac variant as may be supposed at first blush. Expressing this concept with regard to Greek variant readings, he writes:

It appears that often citation of versions in the textual apparatus without due consideration of their translation technique gives the misleading impression that the support for a particular variant is much stronger than it really is. When the versions are cited in support of variants attested by few or no Greek manuscripts it gives the impression that the extant Greek manuscripts only attest a small proportion of variants that have existed.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Pp. 293-295.

<sup>8</sup> Pp. 277-305

<sup>9</sup> Pp. 307-309.

<sup>10</sup> Williams (2012), p. 258.

## CHARACTER OF THE OLD SYRIAC TEXT

The Syriac text of the Gospels can be viewed as one that developed over time, where the standard Peshitta text is the conclusion of what may be considered a revision of the Old Syriac Text. Later Syriac versions, the Philoxenian and Harklean, were based on more literal translations from Greek and arose with the increasing influence of the western, Greek-speaking church on the Syriac-speaking churches. Vööbus (1951, 1987) and Black (1951, 1972) provide evidence of the development of the Peshitta from the Old Syriac Gospel text.<sup>11</sup>

Some Syriac Gospel manuscript's texts were thought to lay between the Old Syriac and the Peshitta. Andreas Juckel (2009, 2003) collated and analyzed Bibl. Nationale Syr. 30 and Codex Phillips 1388 in great detail. His exemplary studies significantly extend the earlier work of Vööbus, Black and others. Juckel (2009) cautions that later manuscripts that appear to be related to the Old Syriac may not be genetically related. He shows that many of the variants in the Gospel text of Bibl. Nationale Syr. 30, a late twelfth century manuscript, are not genetically related to the Old Syriac texts of Sy<sup>c</sup> and Sy<sup>s</sup>:

From Ms BN syr. 30 we learn that besides adaptation to the Greek/Harklean and assimilation to similar or identical passages, harmonization within single Peshitta manuscripts can be responsible for creating a secondary Old Syriac heritage. In Ms BN syr. 30, the majority of singular agreement with S and/or C came into existence this way and is independent from genetic relation to the Old Syriac and the Diatessaron.... The

---

<sup>11</sup> Arthur Vööbus, *History of the Gospel Text in Syriac I, II*; Matthew Black, "The New Testament Peshitta and Its Predecessors", *Bulletin of Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* 1 (1950), pp. 51-62, Black, "The Syriac Versional Tradition" in K. Aland, *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments*, pp. 120-159.

codex provides the information that in later manuscripts the original Old Syriac harmonistic heritage of the Peshitta, which is genetically related to the Old Syriac, is faded out during transmission and supplemented by secondary non-genetic harmonizations.<sup>12</sup>

More recently, McConaughy (2021) analyzed the text of Acts in BNS 30 against forty-two Biblical manuscripts. He finds many variants readings, as did Juckel (2009)<sup>13</sup> and shows that the statistical profile of the text of Acts is remarkably similar to the statistical profile of the Gospels as presented by Juckel. Of the 230 variants he provides, only 24 had any patristic support, and none displayed a clear relation to an Old Syriac text. Based on Juckel's conclusion that seven variants in BNS 30 may derive from an Old Syriac Gospel text,<sup>14</sup> and assuming that the statistical profile of Acts extends to its relation with the Old Syriac text, then two or three variants may reflect an Old Syriac heritage.

Scholars classify the Old Syriac text as a representative of the 'Western Text'. Ropes' (1979 reprint) work on the text of Acts provides a detailed analysis of the Peshitta text of Acts collated against Codex Vaticanus. This collation was prepared by H.J. Cadbury and is found on pages 291ff. Cadbury identifies many variants in the Peshitta text of Acts that agree with Codex Bezae and the Old Latin against Codex Vaticanus. These variants are thought to be remnants of the Old Syriac where the Peshitta text was not completely revised, as was the later Harklean version. The Harklean version, completed about 616AD, closely follows the Greek text, resulting in a text that often is not idiomatic Syriac. This version generally does not contain the Western Text elements of the Peshitta, though it does provide

---

<sup>12</sup> Juckel (2009), p. 112.

<sup>13</sup> See his pp. 107, 108.

<sup>14</sup> p. 112.



marginal readings that often follow the 'Western' text when it deviates from the Peshitta.

The textual profile of the Syriac text of Acts chapters one and two is more researched and provides a benchmark of sorts that allows me to use Cadbury's detailed collations of Acts to determine whether the textual profile of the standard Peshitta text of chapter fifteen differs from chapters one and two. This would serve as a way to calibrate expectations regarding the text of chapter fifteen. If it happens that chapter fifteen of the Peshitta has significantly more Western Text readings than the first two chapters, then an analysis of Syriac patristic citations of chapter fifteen may not yield as many potential non-Peshitta, Old Syriac readings as the first two chapters since it may be less revised. Likewise if chapter fifteen has fewer Western text readings, being more revised, then an analysis of patristic citations may yield more potential Old Syriac readings.

In the first two chapters of Acts, Cadbury identified 57 variants that he determined were not due to translation. Of these 57 variants, 45, i.e., 79%, are 'Western': 30 agree with Codex Bezae (D); 11 agree with the Old Latin; and 4 agree with the Vulgate where it agrees with the Old Latin. For Chapter Fifteen, Cadbury finds 30 variants that are not due to translation. Of these 30 variants, 22, i.e., 73% are 'Western': 11 agree with Codex Bezae; 8 agree with the Old Latin; and 3 agree with the Vulgate where it agrees with the Old Latin.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> The statistics are my analysis of Cadbury's collations, not Professor Cadbury's statistics.

<b>Peshitta Text of Acts</b>	<b>Ch. 1, 2</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>	<b>Ch. 15</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
Total Variant Readings	57	100%	30	100%
Agree with D	30	53%	11	37%
Agree with Old Latin	11	19%	8	27%
Agree with Vulgate/OL	4	7%	3	10%
Total Western Variants	45	79%	22	73%

Source: Ropes (1979 Reprint), pp. 291ff

Since 73% of the Peshitta variants against Codex Vaticanus in chapter fifteen are related to the Western text compared to 79% of the variants in chapters one and two, one might conclude that chapter fifteen of the Peshitta is somewhat more revised than chapters one and two. To test this hypothesis, I employed the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test<sup>16</sup> for the equality of two samples. In applying this statistical test, I have assumed that Cadbury's collation methodology and analysis for chapter fifteen was applied in a manner consistent with his collations and analysis of the first two chapters. This non-parametric statistical test shows that the percentage differences between the first two chapters are not statistically different from the fifteenth. Thus, we would not expect to find more or fewer Western Text / Old Syriac variants in chapter fifteen than in chapters one and two.

---

<sup>16</sup> The Kolmogorov-Smirnov Goodness of Fit Test (K-S test) compares your data with a known distribution and lets you know if they have the same distribution. ...More specifically, the test compares a known hypothetical probability distribution to the distribution generated by your data... (<http://www.statisticshowto.com/kolmogorov-smirnov-test/>). The author thanks Pavan Kumar Nadiminti for his assistance with the calculation.

## BIBLICAL MANUSCRIPTS EXAMINED

Only brief descriptions of the manuscripts are provided below. For more detailed information, consult the proper manuscript catalogue. If a manuscript lacks a portion of Acts, it will be noted under “Contents.” The use of brackets (<>) indicates missing sections.

Siglum	Name	Date	Contents
1.	Mardin Orth. 61	XII cent.	<11-7:54>
2.	University of Chicago Syriac Ms. 823	VIII cent.	Acts 11-12 only.
3.	University of Chicago Syriac Ms. 716	VI/VII cent.	Begins with chapter 9.
4.	Leningrad Pigulevskaya 8	981 A.D.	
5.	Paris Syriac 342	894 A.D.	
6.	Sinai Syriac 5	X-XII cent.	
7.	Sinai Syriac 15	VIII/IX cent.	Begins with 2:27
8.	British Museum Add. 14,473	VI cent.	
9.	Sinai Syriac 17	VII/IX cent.	
10.	British Museum Add. 14,470	V/VI cent.	
11.	British Museum Add. 14,474	IX cent.	
12.	Sinai Syriac 12	VII cent.	
13.	Princeton University Garret Syriac 1	XIII cent.	
14.	Yale Syriac 6	917/18 A.D.	
15.	Mardin Orth. Metrop. 35 <sup>17</sup>	XIII cent.	
16.	Pierpont Morgan Syriac 236	749 A.D.	
17.	Pierpont Morgan Syriac 235	1212 A.D.	
18.	John Rylands Syriac 2 <sup>18</sup>	XII cent.	

<sup>17</sup> This valuable manuscript, which contains the Harklean version of the *Apocalypse*, is thoroughly described by: Arthur Vööbus, ed., *The Apocalypse in the Harklean Version*, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Subsidia 56 (Louvain: Secretariat du CorpusSCO, 1978), pp. 32-47.

<sup>18</sup> This manuscript contains the only text of the Catholic Epistles and the *Apocalypse* in the Philoxenian version.

	(Crawford Ms)		
19.	Yonan Codex	X/XI? cent.	
20.	British and Foreign Bible Society B.H. Syriac 2	1205/6 A.D.	
21.	Paris Syriac 31	1203 A.D.	
22.	Mingana Syriac 103	790 A.D.	
23.	Union Theological Seminary Cage CB42.7	1180 A.D.	
24.	British and Foreign Bible Society Syriac 72	No date	
25.	Oxford Or. 623	1821 A.D.	
26.	British and Foreign Bible Society B.H. Syriac 1	ca. 1000 A.D.	
27.	Sachau Syriac 3	IX cent.	Begins with 4:32b
28.	Sachau Syriac 6	IX cent.	1:11-2:33 only
29.	Sachau Syriac 18	VIII cent.	Begins with 3:7
30.	Sachau Syriac 201	VIII/IX cent.	Begins with 5:16b
31.	Oxford Dawkins 23	XIV cent.	
32.	Cambridge Oo.l. 2	XII cent.	Begins with 1:24; fragmentary
33.	British Museum Add. 7,158	XI cent.	
34.	Paris Syriac 28 <sup>19</sup>	X/XI cent.	
35.	Paris Syriac 30 <sup>20</sup>	before 1198 A.D.	
36.	Paris Syriac 361	X cent.	<2:46,47>
37.	Paris Syriac 343	IX cent.	
38.	Paris Syriac 360	X cent.	
39.	British Museum Add. 17,120	VI cent.	
40.	British Museum Add. 17,121	VI/VII cent.	

<sup>19</sup> This manuscript is described by Vööbus as having Old Syriac material in the Gospels. See: Arthur Vööbus, "Completion of the Vetus Syra Project," *Biblical Research* 7 (1962): 54, note 19.

<sup>20</sup> Vööbus found remnants of the Old Syriac Gospels. See: Vööbus, *Early Versions*, 87 and *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac II*, pp. 42ff. However, Juckel (2009) observed that many of the variants can be explained as later harmonistic changes and from the influence of the Harklean version and the Greek. Likewise McConaughy (2021) finds the text of Acts in BNS 30 is statistically similar to that of the Gospels.

41.	British Museum Add. 18,812	VI/VII cent.
42.	British Museum Add. 14,472	VI/VII cent.
43.	Vat. sir. 266	XI/XII cent.
44.	British Museum Add. 7157	767/768 A.D.

### Lectionary Manuscripts Cited

Siglum	Name	Date
L1	Sinai Syriac 13	XI cent.
L3	Mosul Orth. Lect. Paul/Prax.	No date
L5	Sinai Syriac 214	XIII cent.
L6	Sinai Syriac 100	ca. XI cent.
L12	British Museum Add. 14,485	824 A.D.
L17	Jerusalem St. Mark 2	1550 A.D.

## RESULTS OF MANUSCRIPTS' COLLATIONS

Table 1 provides the collations containing 99 variant readings. Below, I discuss the variants.

Table 1: Collations of Acts 15 Biblical and Lectionary Manuscripts

Vs	#	Variant	Peshitta	Witness
1	1	ܠܬܝܢ ܐܢ	ܠܬܝܢ	31
2	2	ܐܡܠܬܐ	(2) ܐܡܠܬܐ	L17
	3	ܐܠܝܐܢܐ	ܐܠܝܐܢܐ	15
3	4	ܚܒܐ	ܚܒܐ	42
	5	om. ܐܡܠܬܐ (3)		20, 21*
	6	ܐܢ	ܐܢܐ	7, 39
4	7	...ܚܒܐ ܠܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܢ ܚܒܐ... ܠܬܝܢ	ܚܒܐ...ܠܬܝܢ ܠܬܝܢ	13
	8	ܐܠܬܝܢܐ	ܐܠܬܝܢܐ	43

	9	om. <u>መከራ</u>	<u>Li2</u>
5	10	om. <u>ገጽ</u>	L5 (beg)
	11	om. <u>ገጽ</u> <u>ወደ</u>	L6 (beg)
	12	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u>	<u>ገጽ</u> 10, 35, 41, 43 cf. H
	13	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u>	(2) <u>ገጽ</u> L5, L6
		<u>ወደ</u>	
	14	om. <u>ወደ</u>	8, 35
6	15	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u>	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u> <u>Li2</u>
	16	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u>	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u> 31
7	17	<u>ገጽ</u>	<u>ገጽ</u> 31
	18	<u>ገጽ</u>	<u>ገጽ</u> 35
	19	<u>ገጽ</u>	<u>ገጽ</u> L6
	20	om. <u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u>	L5
		<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u>	
	21	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u>	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u> L5
8	22	<u>ገጽ</u>	<u>ገጽ</u> L5
9	23	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u>	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u> 5
	24	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u>	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u> 31
10	25	om. <u>ገጽ</u>	40
	26	<u>ገጽ</u>	43
		om (2)	
	27	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u>	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u> 15
	28	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u>	<u>ገጽ</u> 10
	29	<u>ገጽ</u>	<u>ገጽ</u> L6
	30	<u>ገጽ</u>	<u>ገጽ</u> L5
11	31	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u>	<u>ገጽ</u> <u>ገጽ</u> L1, L6
		<u>ገጽ</u>	

	32	ܣܠܡ ܡܚܠܝܢܐ	ܡܚܠܝܢܐ	3-8, 10-14, 16, 19-21, 23, 24 26, 36-38
	33	ܥܡܬܐܢܐ	ܥܡܬܐܢܐ	21
12	34	ܡܬܥܐ	ܡܡܬܥܐ	21, 43
	35	ܚܒܐ	ܚܒܐ	L5
	36	om. (1) ܥܡܡ		33*
	37	ܡܬܥܐܢܐ	ܡܬܥܐܢܐ	L6
		ܡܬܥܐܢܐ		
	38	ܡܬܥܐܢܐ	ܡܬܥܐܢܐ	L6
	39	ܚܬܐܢܐܐܐܐ	ܚܬܐܢܐܐܐܐ	7, H
	40	ܚܚܐ	ܚܚܐ	L6
13	41	ܡܬܥܐܐ	ܡܡܬܥܐܐ	21
	42	ܚܚܐ	ܚܚܐ	31
	43	om. ܚܚܐ		L1
14	44	ܡܠ ܚܚܐ	ܚܚܐ	L12
16	45	ܚܚܐ	ܚܚܐ	6, 39 (prob. sloppy repair of damaged page)
18	46	ܡܠ ܚܚܐ	ܚܚܐ	19 (between lines), L1
19	47	om. (1) ܚܚܐ		7
	48	ܚܚܐ	ܚܚܐ	7, 10, 11, 15, 41
20	49	ܚܚܐܚܚܐ	ܚܚܐܚܚܐ	19
	50	ܚܚܐܚܚܐ	ܚܚܐܚܚܐ	29*vid
21	51	om. ܚܚܐ		L3 (from continuous text)
		ܚܚܐ		
	52	ܚܚܐ	ܚܚܐ	42

	53	ክሕደሰ	ክሕደሰ	40
22	54	ክሕደ	ክሕደ	13 (prob. assoc. w/suffix on ሰ. Separated from both words)
	55	ክሕደ	ክሕደ	L1
	56	ክሕደ ክሕደ	ክሕደ	39
	57	ክሕደ	ክሕደ	12
23	58	ክሕደ	ክሕደ	L12
	59	ክሕደ	ክሕደ	15, 19, 39, 42, L3
	60	om.		40
		ክሕደ		
	61	ክሕደ	ክሕደ	L1
24	62	ክሕደ	ክሕደ	39
	63	ክሕደ	ክሕደ	43* (later corrected)
25	64	ክሕደ	ክሕደ	35
	65	om. ክሕደ		39
26	66	ክሕደ	ክሕደ	42
27	67	om. ክሕደ		10, H
28	68	om. ክሕደ		33
		... ክሕደ		
	69	ክሕደ	ክሕደ	L12, H
	70	ክሕደ	ክሕደ	43
29	71	ክሕደ	ክሕደ	L12
	72	ክሕደ	ክሕደ	42
	73	ክሕደ	ክሕደ	21



	74	ܠܡܢ	ܠܡܢ	14*
30	75	om. ܐܡ		39 (vid), L3
	76	ܐܡܠ ܐܬܝܢ	ܐܬܝܢ	1,3,4,6,11,14,16,19, 21,23,24,26,31,33,35,44
	77	ܐܠܝܐ	ܐܠܝܐ	35
	78	ܐܬܝܢ	ܐܬܝܢ	21
	79	ܐܬܝܢ	ܐܬܝܢ	L12
33	80	ܐܬܝܢ	ܐܬܝܢ	15
35	81	om. ܐܡ		L5, L6 (both begin lection)
	82	ܐܡ	ܐܡ	L6
	83	ܐܡܐܝܢ	ܐܡܐܝܢ	L5
	84	ܐܡܐܝܢ	ܐܡܐܝܢ	11 (later hand)
		ܐܡܐܝܢ		
	85	om. ܐܬܝܢ		33*
	86	ܐܬܝܢ	ܐܬܝܢ	7,15,35,41, L6
36	87	ܐܬܝܢ	ܐܬܝܢ	7
	88	ܐܬܝܢ	ܐܬܝܢ	L6
37	89	om. ܐܡ		33*
	90	ܐܬܝܢ	ܐܬܝܢ	L5
		ܐܬܝܢ		
38	91	om. ܐܬܝܢ		L17 (approx one line skipped?)
	92	om. ܐܬܝܢ		13*
39	93	ܐܬܝܢ	ܐܬܝܢ	6, 12, L17
	94	ܐܬܝܢ	ܐܬܝܢ	L17
	95	ܐܬܝܢ	ܐܬܝܢ	10, 14, 31, L12

96	ܐܠܝܐ	ܐܠܝܐ	43, L6
97	om. ܐܠܝܐ ... ܠܡܢܝܢ		31*
40	98 om. ܡܢ ܡܢܝܢ		42
99	ܠܡܢܝܢ	ܡܢܝܢ	3-5,7,8,11,15,16, 20,21, 25,26,31,33,35-38,42, 44, L17

### Variants agreeing with the Harklean version

There are four variants that agree with the Harklean version, and of these, three have but one witness. The reading with four witnesses is in verse 5, though it only partially agrees with H's addition of ܡܢ. The variant reading of manuscripts 10, 35, and 41, and 43 have ܡܢܝܢ, with the addition of ܡܢ, "from." This resembles the Harklean reading, ܡܢܝܢ ܡܢܝܢ, which also has ܡܢ, reflecting the Greek  $\alpha\pi\omicron$ . The three manuscript witnesses are 10, Add. 14,470 (5/6<sup>th</sup> century), 35, Par. Syr. 30 (BNS30) (11/12<sup>th</sup> century), 41, Add. 18,812 (6/7<sup>th</sup> century), and 43, Vat. sir. 266 (11/12<sup>th</sup> century). It is likely that the British Museum manuscripts predate the Harklean version and are thus not influenced by it. Thus, these testify to an early variant reading, perhaps influenced by the Greek text or an independent Syriac textual stream that has perished – perhaps the Old Syriac text. Par. Syr. 30, a twelfth century codex known for many variants in the Gospels, may have been influenced by the Harklean version or the Greek, as opposed to an older, genetic relationship with an earlier Syriac tradition reflected in the two British Museum manuscripts. Juckel (2009) has shown that many of the variants in the Gospel text of Par. Syr. 30, indeed, can be explained by harmonistic adaption of the Peshitta and Harklean/Greek adjustments and not to the Old Syriac text. Likewise, McConaughy's (2021) analysis of BNS30 shows little to no

genetic relation to an Old Syriac version of Acts. However, Juckel (2012) comments that this manuscript, his “12n2” is “remarkably non-Eastern” / Jacobite, which may connect it to variants many centuries older.<sup>21</sup> Thus, we cannot determine whether the variant reading in this manuscript is genetically “non-Eastern” or influenced by the Harklean.

The two variants in verses 12 and 28 agreeing with the Harklean, are witnessed by manuscripts Sinai Syr. 15, a Biblical manuscript (ca. 8<sup>th</sup> Century)<sup>22</sup> and Add. 14,485, a lectionary dated 824AD, respectively. These manuscripts are late enough to be influenced by the Harklean or the Greek, especially the variant in verse 12, which has ܠܗܝܠܐܝܬܐ (wonders/marvels) instead of the Peshitta reading, ܠܗܝܠܐܝܬܐ (powers/wonders). The Harklean reading reflects more closely τερατα, whereas the Peshitta would be more akin to δυνάμεις. The variant in verse 28 is minor, dropping of “and” in front of “even”, and since it is from a lectionary, not much can be made of the variant reading.

The fourth variant agreeing with the Harklean, in verse 27, is witnessed by the ancient Add. 14,470 (6/7<sup>th</sup> century). It involves the omission of “to you” after “they might speak”, which agrees with the Harklean. Since the manuscript predates the Harklean and the variant is minor, without other attestation, it is likely reflects a scribal error of omission.

### Variants with one witness

Of the 99 variants noted, 79 have one witness each. These include likely copying errors, the addition or a deletion of a conjunction such as ܐ, ܐܐ, ܐܡ, or the addition or deletion of a particle or preposition such as ܐܢܝ, ܕ, ܡܢ, and ܐܢ. There are variations in number, which, in Syriac, is common because the

<sup>21</sup> p. 95.

<sup>22</sup> Juckel (2012), pp. 95, 103, considers Sin. Syr. 15 (9x1) as a Western / Jacobite related manuscript.

plural symbol, the *seyame*, is two dots over a letter, which can be missed or mistaken if there is dirt on the exemplar or copy, or if there are other dots in the text. As noted above, three of these variants are similar to the Harklean version.

### Variants with two witnesses

There are 11 variants with two witnesses. Three are lectionary readings from Mt. Sinai manuscripts and may be an ‘inner-Mt. Sinai’ phenomenon. Two other variants, in verses 16 and 30 may be due to a repair to manuscript 39, British Museum Add. 17,120, as it appears to have been repaired here. Two, in verses 3 and 5, are omissions of ܐܐܡ and ܐܡ, respectively, and do not change the sense.

### Variants with three witnesses

There is one variant with three witnesses in verse 39, and it involves the addition of ܐ, namely ܐܠܗܐ for the Peshitta’s ܐܠܗ.

### Variants with four or more witnesses

There are eight variants with four or more witnesses. Two, in verses 30 and 40, have more than 15 witnesses each and thus have significant support. However, they are of relatively minor significance. The variant in verse 30, ܐܡܠ ܐܕܝܐ instead of the reading ܐܕܝܐ is stylistic (an ethical dative) and the meaning is not changed.<sup>23</sup> The variant in verse 40, ܡܕܐܠܐܠܐ, instead of ܡܕܐܠܐܠܐ, both followed by ܐ, have the same meaning “grace of.” A third variant, in verse 35, with five witnesses (7, 15, 35, 41, L6), is also stylistic along the lines of the variant in verse 40:

---

<sup>23</sup> Theodore Nöldeke, *Compendious Syriac Grammar* (translated by J. A. Crichton), page 177, para. 224, refers to this as a pleonastic Δ: “The preposition Δ with reflexive personal pronoun often stands alongside of a verb, without essentially modifying its meaning (*Dativus ethicus*).”

ܠܗܝܠܐ instead of ܠܗܝܠܐ. These have the same meaning as they are followed by “of God”.

A fourth variant, in verse 19 has the following reading:

Variant	Peshitta	Witness
ܠܗܝܠܐ	ܠܗܝܠܐ	7, 10, 11, 15, 41

The Peshitta reading is a loose translation of the Greek infinitive *παρενοχλεῖν*, using the third person plural imperfect, “they,” referring to the Judaizing Christians who troubled the Antiochene church. The variant reading here has the first person plural: “let us (not be vexing)” instead of “let them (not be vexing),” where “vex” is a plural participle. The common translation of the Greek is to consider it to be first person plural, as reflected in the Harklean. Since manuscript 10, Add. 14,470 is dated to the 5/6<sup>th</sup> century, it cannot have been influenced by the Harklean. However, though the Harklean has the first person plural, it uses a different verb and construction, ܠܗܝܠܐ, “let us (not) annoy.” Manuscripts 7, 11, and 15, Sin. Syr. 15, Add. 14,474 and Mardin Orth. 35 are considered by Juckel (2012)<sup>24</sup> as witnesses to the ‘Western’/Jacobite family of Peshitta manuscripts.<sup>25</sup> Manuscript 41, Add 18,812 (VI/VII century) belongs to this more archaic, non-eastern, “Pre-masoretic Period.”<sup>26</sup> All of this suggests that there was an early Peshitta stream of mss (perhaps Old Syriac?) that took the verb to be first person, agreeing with the more common understanding of the Greek, as it was later

<sup>24</sup> p. 103. His sigla are 9x1, 9x2, and 13n2, respectively.

<sup>25</sup> This family of Peshitta mss is not to be confused with the ‘Western’ text witnessed by Greek, Latin, Syriac and other early versions.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid, p.102. Juckel did not assign this manuscript a siglum as it is not a witness to the Corpus Paulinum, the subject of his study.

translated in the Harklean. This will be reinforced when we examine the text of the DA below.

The fifth variant in this group, in verse 23, has “letters” instead of the singular “letter,” a ‘Western’<sup>27</sup> text variant in the Peshitta.

Variant	Peshitta	Witness
ⲛⲁⲓⲗⲛ	ⲛⲁⲓⲗ	15, 19, 39, 42, L3

Manuscripts 39 (Add. 17,120) and 42 (Add. 14,472) are among some of the oldest Syriac witnesses to the text of Acts, dated 6<sup>th</sup> and 6/7<sup>th</sup> centuries, respectively. Manuscript 15, Mardin Orth. Metrop. 35, is dated to the 13<sup>th</sup> century and manuscript 19 is the X / XI? century Yonan Codex. L3 is an undated manuscript, Mosul Orth. Lect. Paul/Prax. The plural is not related to the Greek or Harklean. There is no patristic evidence to support this reading, nor does the ECM provide any Greek mss that have the plural.

Summary regarding the MSS witnesses

The collations show that there is very little variation in the Syriac manuscripts. Many variants are minor and even the few variants with some support may not rise to the level of evidence of an Old Syriac type text. However, the variant in verse 19, with four witnesses, possesses patristic support as we shall see shortly. Interestingly, the text of Acts in BNS30, a source of many variant readings for the Gospels and Acts,<sup>28</sup> shows only a five minor variants in this chapter.

<sup>27</sup> I.e. ‘Western text’ as in text family, not Juckel’s Western/Jacobite/non-Eastern Peshitta manuscript classification.

<sup>28</sup> Juckel (2009), McConaughy (2021).

## PATRISTIC WITNESSES TO ACTS FIFTEEN

## Overview

Acts Chapter Fifteen is composed of 41 verses, and 27 verses are quoted in various Syriac patristic sources. First place goes to the *Didascalia Apostolorum* ("DA"), chapter 24, "On the Stability of the Church Showing also that the Apostles Came Together for the Rectification of Deviations."<sup>29</sup> This section cites, sometimes extensively, from 23 verses. Dionysius bar Salibi (DionEpp)<sup>30</sup> cites 8 verses from chapter fifteen in his commentary on Acts. Ishodad's commentary on Acts (IshA)<sup>31</sup> cites this chapter only twice with another two allusions. His commentary on the Old Testament (IshOT)<sup>32</sup>, quotes it once. Barhadbeshabba (BarhadHist)<sup>33</sup> quotes this section once. Marutha of Maipherqat<sup>34</sup> quotes this section once as does Bar Hebraeus (BarhCS)<sup>35</sup>. Ephrem (ECom, ECat) provides some allusions to Acts fifteen in his commentary on Acts, preserved in Armenian, and also some Armenian catenae. These were translated by F.C.

---

<sup>29</sup> A. Vööbus, ed., *The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac*, CSCO, SS 175, 176, 179, 180 (Louvain: CSCO, 1979). Specifically the chapter is in SS 179, pp. 31-37, and SS 180, pp. 214-219.

<sup>30</sup> I. Sedlacek, ed., *Dionysius bar Salibi in Apocalypsim, Actus, et Epistulas Catholicas*, CSCO SS, Series Secunda, Tomus 101 (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1909).

<sup>31</sup> Margaret Gibson, *The Commentaries of Ishodad of Merv* 5 Vols. Horae Semiticae, 5-7, 10, 11 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911-1916).

<sup>32</sup> Ceslas van den Eynde, *Commentaire d'Isodad de Merv sur L'Ancien Testament*, vols 1-6.

<sup>33</sup> F. Nau, *Barhadbesabba 'Arba 'ia Histoire Ecclesiastique* (1ere Partu), *Patrologia Orientalis* 23.2 (Paris: 1932)

<sup>34</sup> Arthur Vööbus, *The Canons Ascribed to Marutha of Maipherqat and Related Sources*, CSCO SS 191, 192 (Louvain: Peeters, 1982).

<sup>35</sup> Francois Graffin, *Le Candelabre du Sanctuaire*, *Patrologia Orientalis* 27.4 (Paris: 1957).

Conybeare and are provided in Rope's volume on the text of Acts.<sup>36</sup>

### *Didascalia Apostolorum*

Since the DA is the primary patristic source for the text of Acts fifteen, a discussion of the background of this early Syriac translation work is in order. The Didascalia is one of the oldest examples of the Syriac-speaking church's translations of Greek patristic works. Connolly conjectured that the time of translation was between 300 AD and 330AD because of the DA's similarities with Aphrahat's *Demonstrations*, written 337-345AD.<sup>37</sup> However the evidence is not conclusive. Vööbus notes a number of archaisms in Syriac terminology and concludes it was translated no later than the end of the fourth century, though it could be much earlier.<sup>38</sup> Connolly noted that the Syriac translator used the text of the Old Syriac Gospels in his translation of the DA.<sup>39</sup> Vööbus has also noted the Old Syriac character of the Gospel text of the older portions.<sup>40</sup>

The Syriac DA comes down in two recensions. Vööbus' edition, used in this analysis, is based upon the older recension, from eighteen manuscripts. Vatican Syriac 560, a seventh to eighth century manuscript, has been used as a base for the whole DA, and where it is lacking, Paris Syriaque 62, a ninth century manuscript, has been used. All the variants are carefully and copiously noted in the apparatus.

Ropes recognized the importance of the Syriac DA in his work on the text of Acts, and he discusses this ancient work at

---

<sup>36</sup> Ropes, *Text of Acts*, pp. 373-453.

<sup>37</sup> Richard Hugh Connolly, ed., *Didascalia Apostolorum: The Syriac Version Translated and Accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929), pp. 265ff.

<sup>38</sup> Vööbus, *The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac*, 1:26\*-28\*.

<sup>39</sup> Connolly, *Didascalia*, p. xviii.

<sup>40</sup> Vööbus, *The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac*, 1:52\*-54\*.



length, especially with a view to chapter fifteen.<sup>41</sup> He notes that the text of Acts in the DA is:

... plainly not the Antiochian... Occasional non-western readings are found in the Syriac Didascalia, but ... there are reasons for suspecting that the original reading of the Didascalia has been modified so as partially to accord with a non-western (probably Antiochan) text.<sup>42</sup>

Later he concludes, “the text of the quotations from Acts in the Didascalia was originally completely ‘Western’ and has been occasionally modified in our Syriac version.”<sup>43</sup> We will come back to this observation of Ropes after analyzing DA’s text of Acts chapter 15.

### **Analysis of DA and other Patristic Sources with Reference to Biblical and Lectionary Variants**

In this section, I discuss some of the more notable variants found in the DA and other patristic sources and include variant readings from the Biblical and lectionary manuscripts. Verses 20 and 29 will be discussed separately because of the more extensive interest and more complex textual issues. Table 2 compares the Peshitta text with the collations of DA and the other patristic citations along with other data from the Biblical and lectionary mss. The readings are aligned to make the visual analysis of the readings clearer. The variants of interest are in red type.

**Table 2: Acts Chapter 15: Peshitta, Didascalia and other Patristic Sources**

**Vs.    Text**

---

<sup>41</sup> Ropes, *Text of Acts*, pp. cxci – cxcviii.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid. pp. cxcii, cxciii.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid. p. cxcvi. See also, Vööbus, *Didascalia I*, p. 54\*.



- 5 D,233, 19f ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
- 7 P ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
- 7 D,233, 19f ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
- 7 P ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
- 7 D,233, 19f ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
- 8 P ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
- 8 D,234, 4 ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
- 8 P ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
- 8 D,235, 5 ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
- 9 P ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
- 9 D,235, 6f ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
- 10 P ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ
- 10 D,235, 7f ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܡܨܚܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ

DionEpp. 90: ܡܨܚܐcf. Peshitta: ܡܨܚܐ

- 11 P כל פולחנה ונתיב מעד חשש חסותה דא  
מפחא
- 11 D,235, כל פולחנה ונתיב מעד חשש חסותה דא  
10f מרדא
- 12 P חסותה חסותה  
12 D,236, חסותה חסותה  
21 חסותה חסותה  
H, Ms 21, DionEpp 90: חסותה , εσιγησεν ; L5: חסותה
- 13 P חסותה חסותה  
13 D,235, חסותה חסותה  
22 חסותה חסותה
- 14 P חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה  
חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה
- 14 D,235, חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה  
22 חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה  
L12: חסותה
- 15 P חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה  
15 D,236, חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה  
1f חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה
- 16 P חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה  
חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה
- 16 D,236, חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה  
2f חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה  
DionEpp.92 has חסותה for חסותה whereas DA adds חסותה;  
and DA and DionEpp. 92 both omit: חסותה
- 17 P חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה  
חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה חסותה

17 D,236, 4f      ܐܬܬܝܬܝܬ ܠܚܝܬܐ ܕܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ  
ܡܠܬܐ ܕܥܪܬܝܬܐ, ܥܬܐ ܡܠܬܐ ܐܬܝ  
ܠܚܝܬܐ

18 P      ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ, ܕܥܪܬܐ

18 D,236, 6      ܕܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ  
ܡܬܬܝܬ; DionEpp.92: ܡܬܬܝܬ; DionEpp.92: ܡܬܬܝܬ,  
ܡܬܬܝܬ

19 P      ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ, ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ  
ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ

19 D,236, 6f      ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ, ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ  
ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ  
M7, M10, M11, M15, M41 read: ܡܬܬܝܬ. H: ܡܬܬܝܬ

See the separate analysis of verse 20.

20 P      ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ, ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ  
ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ

20 D,236, 8f      ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ, ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ  
ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ

DA, GeoOffII.84 and BarhadHist.7: ܡܬܬܝܬ; BarhadHist.7  
adds ܡܬܬܝܬ; M19: ܡܬܬܝܬ - cf. DA's plural ܡܬܬܝܬ

22 P      ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ, ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ  
ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ

22 D,236, 10f      ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ, ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ  
ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ

22 P      ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ, ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ  
ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ

22 D,236, 10f      ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ, ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ  
ܡܬܬܝܬ ܡܬ ܡܠܬܐ ܡܬܬܝܬ

חר דבא: DA and Peshitta: חר דבא - cf. Peshitta: חר דבא - **M39**  
 חר דבא חר דבא

- 22 P חר דבא חר דבא חר דבא
- 22 D,236, 10f חר דבא חר דבא
- 23 P חר דבא חר דבא חר דבא
- 23 D,236, 15f חר דבא חר דבא חר דבא  
 חר דבא חר דבא חר דבא  
 DionEpp.93: חר דבא חר דבא
- 23 P חר דבא חר דבא חר דבא
- 23 D,236, 15f חר דבא חר דבא חר דבא  
 חר דבא חר דבא חר דבא  
 DA, DionEpp.93: חר דבא חר דבא חר דבא  
 DionEpp.93 omits: חר דבא חר דבא
- 24 P חר דבא חר דבא חר דבא
- 24 D,236, 18f חר דבא חר דבא חר דבא
- 25 P חר דבא חר דבא חר דבא
- 25 D,236, 20f חר דבא חר דבא חר דבא
- 27 P חר דבא חר דבא חר דבא

- [illegible]

## Verse 1

Verse 1 provides variants with varying levels of support. “To Antioch” in the DA has some support from Ishodad and Ephrem. The text of DA is a running quote where this is added, and it gives the impression of that this was in the text. It’s possible that since both Ephrem and Ishodad are citing this in the context of their commentaries, that it is explanatory. ECat does not appear to be intended as a quote but an allusion. The English translation of ECat is, “...and as they saw that the gentiles believed in Christ without this, they went down from Jerusalem to Antioch, still having the disease of avarice.”<sup>44</sup> Based on the lack of evidence among the Syriac Biblical mss, the Greek text and other versions, the evidence for “to Antioch” as reflecting a form of the early Syriac text of Acts is tenuous.

The second variant, “conducting/walking,” is taken as a ‘Western’ text reading by Ropes<sup>45</sup>, Metzger<sup>46</sup> and Vööbus<sup>47</sup> due to agreements to D, Sahidic and Irenaeus. There also is agreement with the Harklean margin, which often provides evidence of the ‘Western’ text variant. The Harklean margin uses ܡܠܚܡܐ, “walking” in imitation of the Greek, περιπατητε, instead of ܡܠܚܡܐ, “conducting”, as in the DA, but the meaning is the same. Without support from other Syriac Biblical mss and patristic witnesses, this variant is more likely from a Greek ‘Western’ text underlying the Syriac DA and not an Old Syriac variant.

The Peshitta has ܠܚܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܐ “by the custom of the law”, whereas the DA has ܠܚܝܬܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܐ ܕܡܘܨܝܐ, “according to the law of Moses”, which combines the Peshitta’s “law” with “of Moses” from the Greek τῷ ἐθει τῷ μωυσεως, “by the custom of

---

<sup>44</sup> Ropes, p. 421.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., p. cxciv.

<sup>46</sup> Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 426.

<sup>47</sup> Vööbus, *Didascalia*, 2:215.



Moses". Tischendorf's 8<sup>th</sup> edition notes that Epiphanius' text supports "law of Moses". The ECM also provides support from other sources.

#### Verses 2, 4 and 5

The citations of the DA follow the Peshitta.

#### Verse 7

The texts of the DA and the Peshitta are quite similar except for two distinctive items where the DA follows the Greek rather than the Peshitta. The DA uses "Peter" where the Peshitta uses "Simon." In addition, the DA, with the Harklean, uses ܥܘܥܥܥܝܠܝܘܢ, which is the transliteration of εὐαγγέλιον, whereas the Peshitta uses the more Semitic, ܕܝܢܝܬܐ, "Gospel/hopeful news". Both words have the same meaning.

#### Verses 8, 10, 11

The text of the DA follows the Peshitta.

#### Verse 12

This verse provides two interesting observations. First, the Peshitta uses a plural form of 'keep silent' compared to the DA and Greek that use the singular form, as well as the Harklean, Biblical manuscript 21 (Paris Syr. 31, dated 1203AD) and Dionysius bar Salibi (d. 1171AD). It is likely that these all were influenced by the Greek or Harklean singular verb. However, given the subject is "all the crowd," a singular collective noun, the meaning doesn't really change. The other variant is the DA's use of ܕܢܚܝܬܐ "people," instead of ܕܡܬܬܐ, "crowd," which reflects the Greek πλῆθος. Lectionary manuscript 5, Sinai Syriac 214, a thirteenth century manuscript, also has "people." Given the disparity in dates between Par. Syr. 31 and the lectionary and

the translation of DA, and lack of other witnesses to “people,” one cannot draw any conclusion.

#### Verse 14

The DA reads “would choose for himself”, where ܡܠ, “for himself” is added. This addition is also found in L12 (Add. 14,485, dated 824AD). This is not supported elsewhere; so one cannot draw any conclusion. Note that here the DA goes with the Peshitta in using the verb whose root is ܠܚܝܒ, “choose” instead of the Greek λαβειν, “take. However, the Peshitta uses the infinitive, like the Greek and the DA uses the imperfect. It is possible that the Peshitta is revised in using the infinitive form applied to the verb “choose,” which is found in some manuscripts. Unlike in verse 7, the Peshitta, DA and Greek all use “Simon.”

#### Verses 15 to 17

The text of the DA in verses 15 and 17 resembles the Peshitta and there are no other patristic citations. In verse 16, both D and DionEpp omit ܠܚܝܒ, which follows the Greek, but does not change the sense in Syriac.

#### Verse 18

Dionysius bar Salibi agrees with the Harklean and the Byzantine text with “all his works,” where the Peshitta has “works of God,” adding “all” but substituting “his” for “God.” The Peshitta text of Acts reflects a more ‘Western’ text reading than the DA.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup> Ropes, op. cit., p. 305

## Verse 19

The DA's reading of ܐܢܬܐ ܒܪܐܝܬܐ for ܐܢܬܐ ܒܪܐܝܬܐ, the third person singular for the third person plural, finds support from Biblical mss 7, 10, 11, 15, 41 and H. The lengthy, almost verbatim, quotation from the Peshitta with this variant supported by five mss, suggests that this may in fact, be an archaic, Old Syriac element reading. This is reinforced by the fact that Juckel (2012) categorizes mss 7, 11 and 15 as representatives of the 'Western / Jacobite' Peshitta tradition.<sup>49</sup> This will be discussed more in the appendix.

## Verse 22

This verse is almost fully quoted in the DA. In the first part the DA adds "bishops," but there is no support for this ecclesiastical term. Otherwise, there is not much variation beyond some periphrastic features.

## Verse 23

Both the Peshitta and DA witness to the addition of "letter", a feature of the 'Western' text as found in D, g, w, 614, and the Harklean margin.

## Verse 24

The DA cites this partially but provides nothing for comment.

## Verse 25

The DA's ܐܢܬܐ ܒܪܐܝܬܐ resembles the Greek ομοθυμαδον and expands the text to accommodate. It is not attested to anywhere else in Syriac and is a result of translation of the Greek.

---

<sup>49</sup> Juckel (2012), pp. 103, 104.

Verses 37, 38 and 40

These verses each show a minor variant from DionEpp and IshA.

The Apostolic Decree in verses 20 and 29<sup>50</sup>

The DA provides almost complete quotes for verses 20 and 29. Fortunately, there are other patristic sources that provide references to these verses.

Acts 15:20 – ‘Abstain’

The first variant from DA, from the root ܐܝܢ (keep your selves far from, abstain) instead of ܚܝܢ (be away from, abstain), has some support from George of Arbela and Bar Hebraeus. The evidence for ܐܝܢ in verse 20 is:

VARIANT	PESHITTA	WITNESS <sup>51</sup>
ܐܝܢܐ	ܚܝܢܐ	DA.236
ܐܝܢܐ	ܚܝܢܐ	
ܐܝܢܐ	ܚܝܢܐ	GeoOff II.84;
	ܚܝܢܐ	BarhadHist.7

However, it is difficult to determine whether this indicates an Old Syriac reading or a reflection of the Peshitta text of verse 29, which uses ܐܝܢ: ܐܝܢܐ.

Based on this evidence one cannot conclude whether the variant ܐܝܢ in verse 20 comes from an Old Syriac text because

<sup>50</sup> This was initially presented at the 8<sup>th</sup> World Syriac Conference at the St. Ephrem Ecumenical Research Institute in September 2018, and published in *The Harp*, Vol. 35 (2019), pp. 187-200.

<sup>51</sup> Page numbers are given after patristic abbreviation: DA = Didascalia Apostolorum, ed. Vööbus (1979); GeoOff II = Georgio Arbelensi, ed. Connolly (1960 reprint); BarhadHist = Barhadbeshabba ‘Arbaia, *Histoire Ecclastique*, ed. Nau, F. (1932).



ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
 ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
 ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
 ܡܠܟܐ  
 ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
 ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
 ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
 ܡܠܟܐ  
 ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
 ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ  
 ܡܠܟܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ

GeoOff II.84

DionEpp.92, 93

BarhadHist.7

Both the DA and Barhadbeshabba mention “idols”, ܡܠܟܐ, more in line with the Greek, εἰδωλῶν. In verse 20, Barhadbeshabba omits “strangled”, which omission is a feature of the ‘Western’ text. However, Barhadbeshabba’s evidence may be a paraphrase, “from the worship of idols and from sacrifices and from blood.” Likewise, his use of ܠܡܠܟܐ for the Peshitta’s ܡܠܟܐ suggests he may be paraphrasing or perhaps thinking along the line of DA’s plural use of ܡܠܟܐ. Thus, his omission cannot be given much weight, considering his late date and considering that the older patristic witnesses include “strangled” and none omit “strangled.”

One important thing to note is that none of the Syriac patristic variant readings support the other notable ‘Western’ text reading which adds a negative form of the Golden Rule. Metzger (1971) discusses this variant as a characteristic of the ‘Western’ text.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Metzger (1971), p. 430.

## Lists – Verse 29

VARIANT	PESHITTA	WITNESS <sup>54</sup>
ܐܢܬܝܢ ܠܝܠܐ	ܐܢܬܝܢܝܢ	DA.237
ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ		
ܠܝܠܐ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	DA.237
ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	
ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	
ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	
ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	DA.237; M42
ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	GeoOff II.84
ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	GeoOff II.84
ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	
ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	MC.20
ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ ܡܢ ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ	MC.20

The DA prefers the plural form of ܡܨܡܝܢܝܢ as does manuscript 44, ADD 14472, a 6<sup>th</sup>/7<sup>th</sup> century Biblical manuscript.<sup>55</sup> However the plural second person suffix on the singular form provides the same sense. Both reflect the plural of the Greek ὑμῖν in verse 28.

George of Arbella and Marutha reverse the Peshitta's "blood and strangled." This may reflect the wording of verse 20; so nothing conclusive can be determined regarding whether it reflects an older text.

<sup>54</sup> Page numbers are given after patristic abbreviation; M42 = ADD 14472 ; DA = Didascalia Apostolorum, ed. Vööbus (1979); GeoOff II = Georgio Arbelensi, ed. Connolly (1960 reprint); MC = Marutha of Maipherqat, ed. Vööbus (1982).

<sup>55</sup> Wright (1870), volume 1, pp. 81, 82.

This analysis of Acts 15:20 and 29 provides a broader sampling of the patristic data and illustrates the challenges awaiting the textual critic interested in the early history of the Syriac text of Acts. Because of potential harmonization between verses 20 and 29, the task was rendered more difficult. We cannot make any conclusive statement, or even offer a reasonable probability regarding whether the variant reading ܡܡܝܢ in verse 20 or the reversal of blood and strangled reflect possible Old Syriac texts.

## CONCLUSION

Our analysis of the data shows that the Biblical manuscripts are quite consistent with the Gwilliam and Pusey's standard Peshitta text. Indeed, they provide a sort of textual 'golden mean' of the mss evidence, minimizing the number of variants.

Some of the observed variants may be due simply to the influence of the Greek text on the Syriac church and the Harkean version. Aside from the short 'Western' text variant found in verse 1 "walk/behave," the text of the DA is consistent with the Peshitta. We find none of the longer distinctive 'Western' text readings such as the negative Golden Rule or the omission of "strangled" in verse 20. Nor do we observe the 'Western' text expansions in verses 2 and 12 in the DA or any of the Syriac sources. Verse 18 of the Peshitta even conforms more closely to the 'Western' text than the DA. Ropes' comment that the text of Acts found in the DA "was originally completely 'Western'<sup>56</sup> may be simply due to the many 'Western' text variants in the Syriac translators' own Biblical text which was like the Peshitta, or they were translating a Greek text like the one underlying the Peshitta.

The lack of variation among the Biblical mss and the DA's early translation date, suggest that the Peshitta text of Acts was

---

<sup>56</sup> Ropes, p. cxcvi.



used authoritatively in the 4<sup>th</sup> century. Thus, the Peshitta may reflect the initial Syriac text of Acts (Old Syriac) to a greater degree than the Peshitta text of the Gospels does. That is, there was less revision work on the Peshitta text of Acts. This is suggested by the Peshitta's consistency with the citations in the DA, which was translated no later than the fourth century and rests on an Old Syriac heritage due to the many Old Syriac Gospel text elements. The 'Western' text elements in the Peshitta text of Acts, may simply reflect its 'Old Syriac' roots, and that it was not revised as much as the Peshitta Gospel text. These observations may reduce the uncertainty that Acts is less revised from an Old Syriac form than the Gospels, as Brock (2014) so aptly states:

What is uncertain is whether this text was as different from the Peshitta as the Old Syriac gospels, or whether instead the Peshitta Acts and epistles more or less represent the original Syriac translation of these books, with little or no subsequent revision ever having been undertaken.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> Brock (2014), pp. 416-417.

## APPENDIX: EVIDENCE FOR THE EASTERN AND WESTERN / JACOBITE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE PESHITTA TEXT OF ACTS<sup>58</sup>

Andreas Juckel (2012), in an article on the manuscripts of the Peshitta New Testament, describes at length the division of the “Eastern” and “Western / Jacobite” Peshitta texts for the Corpus Paulinum. Here he also lists the manuscripts he analyzed according to the “Byzantine (Pre-masoretic) Period,” “Islamic (Early Masoretic) Period” and “Islamic (Late Masoretic) Period.”<sup>59</sup> Five of these manuscripts overlap the present work on Acts 15. I list them below with my sigla, the manuscript identification and Juckel’s sigla:

### Western/Jacobite characteristic

#7 Sin. Syr. 15	9x1
#11 BL Add. 14, 474	9x2
#12 Sin. Syr. 54	9n6
#15 Mardin orth. 35	12n2
#35 BNS 30	12n2

### Eastern characteristic

#5 BNS 342	9n4
#44 BL Add. 7157	8n1

There is some evidence of this clustering for the Western/Jacobite manuscripts:

---

<sup>58</sup> I want to thank Dr. Juckel for suggesting this analysis, and for his helpful comments.

<sup>59</sup> pp. 102-104.

15:19

ܠܐܡܢ

ܠܐܡܢ

7, 10, 11, 15, 41

15:35

ܠܚܠܐ

ܠܚܠܐ

7, 15, 35, 41, L6

Here we see manuscript 10 (Add. 14,474 IX cent., and manuscript 41, British Museum Add. 18,812 (VI/VII cent.), associated with the Western/Jacobite MSS 7, 11, 15, and 35.

We also observe that mss 10 and 41 agree with BNS 30 in verse 5:

ܠܐܡܢ

ܠܐܡܢ

10, 35, 41, 43 cf. H

The small sample is not supportive of any firm conclusions, but is suggestive that Add. 14,474 and Add. 18,812 lean toward the Western/Jacobite text.

Another source of collations to examine the Western / Jacobite mss clustering can be obtained from McConaughy (2021), who provides collations of all of Acts in his analysis of the text of BNS 30 (manuscript 35) against the same set of Peshitta manuscripts plus one more (#44, BL Add. 7157) that should assist in this analysis.<sup>60</sup> Juckel (2012) considers BNS 30, “remarkably non-Eastern.”<sup>61</sup> Given its profile, collations focusing on this unique manuscript should collect more manuscript evidence the Western/Jacobite text in Acts than the collations of Acts 15 only. This proves to be the case in numerous instances. Manuscripts #10 and #41 occur with the

<sup>60</sup> McConaughy, Daniel, “The Text of Acts in Ms Bibl. Nationale Syr. 30,” *Hugoye* 24.2, pp. 478-490.

<sup>61</sup> p. 95.

Western/Jacobite readings fairly regularly. Note that #44, BL Add. 7157, an eastern manuscript, never occurs with BNS 30 and the Western/Jacobite witnesses. However, #5, BNS 342, another Eastern witness, does occur occasionally with the Western/Jacobite witnesses.

Certain patristic writers are more frequently associated with the Western / Jacobite Peshitta text tradition. Moshe bar Kepha, the ninth century West Syrian exegete, cites this text in Acts 1 and 2. Other writers who cite in the Western / Jacobite text tradition are the twelfth century East Syrian exegete, Dionysius bar Salibi, and the ninth century East Syrian exegete, Ishodad of Merv. That both East and West Syrian writers use the Western / Jacobite text tradition speaks to its antiquity.

## Conclusion

The agreements of manuscripts #39 - #42<sup>62</sup> with the Western/Jacobite tradition demonstrate the antiquity of the readings; namely, that they are not innovations or creations of a later period but stem from the earliest manuscript witnesses to the Syriac text of Acts. Over time, these archaic readings faded from the manuscript tradition with only a few exceptions. Overall, the evidence shows that the text of Acts was transmitted in a way similar to the transmission of the Corpus Paulinum.

[Note that the above analysis of BNS 30 does not provide a complete collation for all the text of Acts because it is an

---

<sup>62</sup> 39. British Museum Add. 17,120 VI cent.

40. British Museum Add. 17,121 VI/VII cent.

41. British Museum Add. 18,812 VI/VII cent.

42. British Museum Add. 14,472 VI/VII cent.

These mss do not contain the Corpus Paulinum and thus are not included in Juckel's "Guide to Mss of the Peshitta NT" as they are not witnesses to the Corpus Paulinum.

analysis of all of Acts as the collations relate to the variants contained in BNS 30. A complete analysis of the collations of all the manuscripts of Acts likely would provide more evidence to the extent that BNS 30 does not completely reflect the Western/Jacobite tradition.]

The following are the collations:

### Western/Jacobite Readings with Reference to BNS 30

Western reference manuscripts:

#7 – Sin. Syr. 15 (begins 2:27)

#11 – BL Add. 14,474

#12 – Sin. Syr. 54

#15 – Mardin Orth. 35

#35 – BNS 30 <20:30-32b, 20:36b-21:2a, 21:5b-8b, 21:12a-14b>

#	C	V	BNS 30	Peshitta	MSS Witnesses	Patristic Witnesses
3	1	10	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	6,11,12,15,21,24, 25,31,35,43	Lit.120, DionEpp.35; ThBKII.170; MBKAng; CE.138,155; JacSP.6; BarhCandV.14; JacHex.38
5	2	2	ܡܠܟܐ	ܡܠܟܐ	10, 15, 32, 35, 41, 42	
6	2	2	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	4-6,8-26, 28, 33-38, 41, 42	DionEvL.; JoDP; CE.180; MBKP.174a; BarhCandIV.48; DionEpp.39; IshJo.128; ThMJo.69
7	2	5	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	ܡܠܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ	4-6, 9, 11-14,16- 26,28,31,33-38, 40,41	DionEpp.41; MBKP.176a

12	2	14	ⲉⲓⲁⲟ	ⲉⲓⲁ	4-6,9,11-14,16, 17,19-26,28,35, 38,43	
16	2	27	omit	ⲙⲓ	4-6,8-10,12-14, 16-26,28,33- 37,39,41	Pal
17	2	29	ⲉⲣ	ⲉⲣⲟ	7,15,32,35,41	Pal
21	2	43	ⲁⲓⲓ	ⲁⲓ	4-14,16-26,31, 33-38,40,41,43	Lect; DionEPP.49
35	4	35	ⲉⲣⲙⲟⲟ ⲟⲟⲟ	ⲉⲣⲙⲟⲟ	4-7,11-17,20- 27, 29,35,39c	Asc.280; SevHom10.398; Ant.8
46	7	11	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓⲓ ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓⲓ	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓⲓ ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓⲓ	7,15,35	
49	7	17	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓ ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓⲓⲓ	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓⲓⲓ ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓ	15,35	
70	8	36	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓⲓ ⲟⲟ	ⲟⲟ ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓⲓ	1,4,5,7-9,11,25, 35,39,40,42,43	
93	11	25	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓⲓ	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓ	7,8,15,35,40,42	SevHom16.34
110	14	20	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓⲓ ⲉⲓⲁⲓ	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓⲓ	7,10(cf. variant for v. 21), 15,35, 40,41,43	
117	15	35	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓ	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓ	7,15,35,41	
118	15	40	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓⲓⲓ	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓⲓⲓ	3-5,7,8,11,15,16, 20, 21,26,31,33, 35,38, 42	
121	16	16	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓ	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓ	1,3,4,7,8,10,11, 15,25,35,39-42, 43	DioEv1.180
122	16	16	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓ	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓ	1,3,4,7,8,10,11,1 5, 25,35,39-42, 43	
131	17	23	omit	ⲉⲓⲁⲓ	15,35	ThBKII.183; PhilDiss3.108; DionEpp.97
153	19	39	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓ	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓ	5,7-11,35,39, 42,43	
189	25	10	ⲉⲓⲁⲓⲓⲓ	ⲉⲓⲁⲓ	4,5,7,8,10,11, 25,35,40-42,43	

196	25	23	ܡܠܚ	ܡܠܚ	7,8,10,15,35,39, 40,42
197	25	24	omit	ܡܠܚ	35
198	25	24	ܡܠܚ ܡܠܚ	ܡܠܚ	5,7,8,10,11,15,2 5, 35,39,40,41
216	27	22	ܡܠܚ ܡܠܚ	ܡܠܚ	3,5,7,8c,9,11,25 35,40,41,43
229	28	26	ܡܠܚ	ܡܠܚ	15,35

## REFERENCES

- Black, Matthew (1950), "The New Testament Peshitta and its Predecessors," *Bulletin of Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* 1, pp. 51-62.
- Black, Matthew (1972), "The Syriac Versional Tradition," pp. 120-159, in K. Aland, *Die alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenvaterzitate und Lektionare*, Berlin and New York.
- Brock, Sebastian (2014), "The Use of the Syriac Fathers for NT Textual Criticism," *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research* Second Edition, Chapter 15, pp. 407-428, especially pp. 416-220.
- Connolly, R. H. (1929) *Didascalia Apostolorum. The Syriac Version Translated and Accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments*, Oxford.
- Connolly, R. H. (1960), ed. *Anonymi Auctoris Expositio Officiorum Ecclesiae Georgio Arbelensi vulgo adscripta*, 2 vols., CSCO SS 25, 29 (reprint) Louvain.
- Eynde, Ceslas van den (1950-1981) ed. *Commentaire d'isho'dad de Merv sur l'Ancien Testament*, 6 vols., CSCO SS 67, 80, 96, 128, 146, 185, Louvain.

- Juckel, Andreas (2003), "A Re-examination of Codex Phillipps 1388", *Hugoye* 6.1, pp. 3-36.
- Juckel, Andreas (2009), "Research on the Old Syriac Heritage of the Peshitta Gospels: A Collation of MS Bibl. Nationale Syr. 30 (Paris)," *Hugoye* 12.1, pp 41-115.
- Juckel, Andreas (2012), "A Guide to Manuscripts of the Peshitta New Testament," *Hugoye* 15.1, pp. 79-163.
- Kerschensteiner, Josef (1964), "Beobachtungen zum altsyrischen Actatext," *Biblica* 45.1, pp. 63-74.
- McConaughy, Daniel L. (1985) *Research on the Early History of the Syriac Text of Acts One and Two*, University of Chicago dissertation.
- McConaughy, Daniel L. (1987), "A Recently Discovered Folio of the Old Syriac (Sy<sup>c</sup>) Text of Luke 16,13-17,1", *Biblica* 68.1: 85-90.
- McConaughy, Daniel L. (1988), "An Old Syriac Reading of Acts 1:4 and More Light on Jesus' Last Meal before his Ascension," *Oriens Christianus* 72:63-67.
- McConaughy, Daniel L. (2019), "Early Witnesses to the Syriac Text of Acts Chapter Fifteen, Verses 20 and 29," *The Harp* 35: 187-200.
- McConaughy, Daniel L. (2021), "The Text of Acts in MS Bibl. Nationale Syr. 30," *Hugoye* 24.2, 453-490.
- Metzger, Bruce M. (1971) *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Deutsche Biblegesellschaft.
- Metzger, Bruce M. (1968), *The Text of the New Testament*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Metzger, Bruce M. (1977) *The Early Versions of the New Testament*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nau, F. (1932) *Barhadbeshabba 'Arbaia. Histoire Ecclesiastique* (1<sup>ere</sup> Partie) *Patrologia Orientalis* XXIII, 2. Paris.
- Ropes, James H. (1979) *The Text of Acts*, Volume III of *The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I: The Acts of the Apostles* ed.



- F.J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, reprint, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.
- Sedlacek, I. (1909) *Dionysius bar Salibi in Apocalypsim, Actus, et Epistulas Catholicas*, CSCO Scriptorum Syri, Series Secunda, Tomus 101, Paris.
- Simonet, J.L. (1998), "Les citations des Apotres dans le 'Sur Etienne premier des serviteurs et premices des temoins,' oeuvre presentee sous le nom of Jacques de Saroug en syriaque et sus celui d'Ephrem en armenien," *Le Museon* 111: 59-94.
- Simonet, J.L. (2001), "Les citations des Actes des Apotres dans les chapitres edites du *Ketaba d-res melle* de Jean Bar Penkaye," *Le Museon* 114: 97-119.
- Vööbus, Arthur (1951) *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac I*, CSCO, Subsidia 3, Louvain.
- Vööbus, Arthur (1987) *Studies in the History of the Gospel Text in Syriac II*, CSCO, Subsidia 79, Louvain.
- Vööbus, Arthur (1979) *The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac*, CSCO SS 175, 176, 179, 180, Louvain.
- Vööbus, Arthur (1982) *The Canons Ascribed to Marutha of Maipherqat*, CSCO SS 191, Louvain.
- Williams, Peter (2004) *Early Syriac Translation Technique and the Textual Criticism of the Greek Gospels*, Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press.
- Williams, Peter (2012), 'Where Two or Three Are Gathered Together': The Witness of the Early Versions," in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. by Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wright, William (1870) *Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 3 vols. London.