

Christian Anti-Sabbath Polemic and the Textual Transmission of Luke 4:16 and 23:56*

Jason Robert Combs, Brigham Young University

Abstract: Ancient Christian anti-Sabbath polemic worked to fashion Christianity and Judaism as distinct. This article demonstrates how Christian polemic against Sabbath-day synagogue attendance as well as arguments insisting on worship only on the Lord's Day correspond with textual variants in Luke 4:16 and 23:56. These passages were altered in some manuscripts in a way that distances Jesus and his disciples from Jewish Sabbath observance. Although these textual variants reflect the broader Christian polemic, they do not themselves function as polemic and are not well preserved. For these reasons, they provide a case study for thinking about the nature of New Testament textual transmission at the nexus of reading practices, practices of communal worship, and Christian identity discourse.

The Gospel of Luke contains some of the most positive affirmations about Sabbath observance in the New Testament. Jesus attends synagogue on the Sabbath “as was his custom” (κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός—Luke 4:16), and some of his closest disciples “rested on the Sabbath according to the commandment” (τὸ μὲν σάββατον ἡσύχασαν κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν—Luke 23:56). Yet, as the text of the Gospel of Luke was transmitted, passages such as these were sometimes reworked in ways that distance Jesus and his disciples from Sabbath observance.¹ In the early centuries of Christianity, Jewish and Judaizing forms of Sabbath observance became a subject of contro-

* I would like to thank Lincoln H. Blumell and Thomas A. Wayment for their feedback on recent drafts. My research has also benefitted from discussions with Stephen C. Carlson, Luke Drake, Bart D. Ehrman, Alan Taylor Farnes, Brent Nongbri, and Shaily Patel. Early work on this topic was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in 2010 and benefitted from the response by Bill Warren. I am also grateful to the anonymous reviewers of *TC*.

¹ It was once commonplace to describe such alterations as “scribal”; e.g., Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011). Although the role of scribes should not be entirely discounted, I acknowledge with David Parker that most intentional alteration of the text likely did not occur during the scribal work of copying the text: “It is quite hard to believe that it could have happened in the middle of the process of copying from one page on to another. It is conceivable that it took place at a preparatory stage, in which the exemplar was examined and read, errors being corrected and changes proposed, this prepared text then being copied”; David C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 154; see also Ulrich Schmid, “Scribes and Variants—Sociology and Typology,” in *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies? Papers from the Fifth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. D. C. Parker and H. A. G. Houghton (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008), 1–23.

versy—some Christians worshipped in a manner said to be “too Jewish” by other Christians.² In this article, I show how polemic against Sabbath-day synagogue attendance and arguments insisting on worship only on the Lord’s Day correspond with textual variants in two key passages from Luke—4:16 and 23:56.³

The idea that textual variants in the Gospel of Luke could demonstrate a theological bias against Judaism or Jewish practices was first suggested by Friedrich Blass. In the preface to his 1897 text critical edition of the Gospel of Luke, Blass argued that Luke himself produced two editions of his gospel—and that the “western edition,” best represented by Bezae, was more openly antagonistic towards Jews.⁴ Although Blass’s idea of two Gospels of Luke has not withstood scrutiny, the idea that textual variants could represent an anti-Jewish bias was established in Eldon Epp’s 1966 study of Acts in Codex Bezae.⁵ Epp focused on demonstrating an anti-Judaic tendency in Bezae-Acts, but he suggests that Bezae-Luke may likewise reflect this tendency.⁶ Following Epp’s lead, George Rice completed a dissertation and subsequently published articles (1974–1980) wherein he argued that significant variants in Bezae-Luke also evince an anti-Judaic bias.⁷ Two of the variants addressed by Rice are found in the passages that are the focus of this article, Luke 4:16 and 23:65.⁸

² See below.

³ One relevant textual variant from Codex Bezae will not be examined in this essay, Luke 6:5D: “On the same day, when [Jesus] saw someone working on the Sabbath, he said to him, ‘Man, if you know what you are doing you are blessed, but if you do not know then you are cursed and a transgressor of the law.’” In a recently published article on Luke 6:5D, I show how this passage developed out of Christian polemic against Jewish or Judaizing forms of Sabbath observance. See Jason Robert Combs, “The Polemical Origin of Luke 6.5D: Dating Codex Bezae’s Sabbath-Worker Agraphon,” *JSNT* 42 (2019): 162–184.

⁴ See Friedrich Blass, *Evangelium secundum Lucam sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber prior: Secundum formam quae videtur Romanam* (Leipzig, 1897), xlii, xlix; and Eldon Jay Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigensis in Acts* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1966), 2.

⁵ Epp, *Theological Tendency*. For a critique of Epp’s work see C. K. Barrett, “Is There a Theological Tendency in Codex Bezae?,” in *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament presented to Matthew Black*, ed. Best Ernest and Wilson R. McL. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 15–27; and for responses to Barrett see Eldon Jay Epp, “Anti-Judaic Tendencies in the D-Text of Acts: Forty Years of Conversation,” in *Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays, 1962–2004*, NovTSup (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 699–739; and Bart D. Ehrman, “The Text of the Gospels at the End of the Second Century,” in *Codex Bezae: Studies from the Lunel Colloquium, June 1994*, ed. D. C. Parker and C.-B. Amphoux (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 95–122.

⁶ Epp, *Theological Tendency*, 41–42, 45, 66 n. 3. Epp had focused on Acts because “the characteristic features of the ‘Western’ text and Codex Bezae are the most prominent and abundant in the Acts”; Epp, *Theological Tendency*, 26. Additionally, Epp avoided the gospels because of the harmonistic tendency of Bezae; Epp, *Theological Tendency*, 26. Yet the relation between Luke and the other synoptics can also provide an advantage. If we assume Markan priority, we will be able to identify the ways in which Luke diverged from his source material. We can then compare the changes made at that early date with those made in the centuries that follow. In each passage examined, therefore, the attempt will be made to identify the changes made by Luke to Mark, noting variance with Matthew as well.

⁷ George Edward Rice, “The Alteration of Luke’s Tradition by the Textual Variants in Codex Bezae” (PhD diss., Case Western Reserve University, 1974); George E. Rice, “The Anti-Judaic Bias of the Western Text in the Gospel of Luke,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 18 (1980): 51–57; and George E. Rice, “Some Further Examples of Anti-Judaic Bias in the Western Text of the Gospel of Luke,” *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 18 (1980): 149–56.

⁸ See Rice, “Some Further Examples of Anti-Judaic Bias,” 149–56.

One of the major criticisms of these early studies was that they did not give sufficient attention to the social and theological contexts in which such theological tendencies could emerge.⁹ For instance, David Parker contends that “the only possible way to establish theological tendency is by comparison with the Fathers’ understanding of the text: given *their* interpretations of Luke and Acts, the critic would then have to ask whether the Bezan reading can credibly be regarded as representative of one or more of them.”¹⁰ Since then, a number of studies have been devoted to situating textual variants within their early Christian social and theological contexts—variants not from a single book and manuscript, such as Luke in Codex Bezae, but from a variety of New Testament texts across the spectrum of manuscript traditions.¹¹ This study of textual variants in Luke 4:16 and 23:65 likewise identifies variants from multiple manuscripts that reflect social and theological trends evident in other Christian writings.

Although this approach has the advantage of displaying the variety of ways a text might be adapted in response to new religious concerns, it also has a disadvantage. Ulrich Schmid, in his critique of Ehrman’s work, suggests that such studies do not sufficiently account for their “findings against the background of the potentially idiosyncratic tendencies of individual [textual] witnesses.”¹² Certainly any argument that a given textual variant was socially or theologically motivated would be more convincing if one could demonstrate multiple examples of similarly motivated changes within a single manuscript—for instance, the argument for an anti-Jewish tendency in Codex Bezae.¹³ Nevertheless, the absence of thematically related textual variants within a single manuscript does not disprove the potential theological or social significance of an individual variant. It is sometimes the case that one particular passage of scripture becomes more relevant to a theological debate than another thematically related scripture. Most of the manuscripts discussed in this article do not evince thematically related textual variants at both Luke 4:16 and 23:56—the exception is Codex Bezae.¹⁴ Significant variants from several manu-

⁹ On theological tendencies, see below.

¹⁰ Parker, *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 190.

¹¹ E.g., Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*; Kim Haines-Eitzen, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Wayne Campbell Kannaday, *Apologetic Discourse and the Scribal Tradition: Evidence of the Influence of Apologetic Interests on the Text of the Canonical Gospels* (Leiden: Brill, 2004); J. Hernández Jr., *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi*, WUNT 2/218 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2006); H. A. G. Houghton and D. C. Parker, ed., *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies? Papers from the Fifth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2008); and Elizabeth Schrader, “Was Martha of Bethany Added to the Fourth Gospel in the Second Century?,” *HTR* 110:3 (2017) 360–92. None of these addresses textual variants corresponding with Christian polemic against Judaism or Jewish practices, but Ehrman hints toward the potential for such a study in the last of his Shaffer Lectures, delivered at Yale University, October 2004; Bart D. Ehrman, “Christ in Early Christian Tradition: Texts Disputed and Apocryphal: Christ against the Jews” in *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, NTTS 33 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 384–88. Jennifer Knust considers the role of anti-Jewish rhetoric in the textual history of the *pericope adulterae* in her essay, “Early Christian Re-Writing and the History of the *Pericope Adulterae*,” *J ECS* 14 (2006): 485–536.

¹² Schmid, “Scribes and Variants,” 5.

¹³ Schmid favors the work of Epp on Bezae for this reason; see Schmid, “Scribes and Variants,” 3. It must be acknowledged, however, that significant variants sometimes appear in manuscripts that are too fragmentary to discern individual scribal tendencies.

¹⁴ The following manuscripts, which will be discussed below, evince what I am calling “anti-Sabbath variants” at either Luke 4:16 or Luke 23:56, but not in both: 579, 1424, 2643, and 2766.

scripts do, however, coincide with early Christian polemic against Jewish and Judaizing forms of Sabbath observance found in the apostolic fathers and church fathers from the second century to the fourth and beyond.

As we have seen, early scholarship on anti-Jewish textual variants categorized them under the umbrella of “theological tendencies.” The term *theology tendency*, however, is too narrow for this study of anti-Sabbath variants—what is at stake here are issues of religious and social praxis as they relate to traditions of Christian worship. We should be hesitant to establish a firm boundary between the theological and the social, since belief and practice are implicated in each other.¹⁵ Therefore, I will refer to the variants I discuss and the corresponding trends in early Christian writings as anti-Sabbath polemic.

Following a review of this anti-Sabbath polemic in early Christian writings, this article will focus in turn on Luke 4:16 and 23:56. Each section will begin with a discussion of the earliest attainable text of Luke, taking into consideration parallel passages in the Synoptic Gospels.¹⁶ This discussion will be followed by an analysis of significant textual variants, beginning in each instance with Codex Bezae.¹⁷ I have adopted this procedure as a matter of convenience because more has been written about Bezae and because Bezae contains variants at both Luke 4:16 and 23:56. Yet it is also significant that Bezae preserves these variants since, as Epp and Rice have demonstrated, the Bezan text evinces an anti-Judaic tendency.¹⁸

Sabbath Observance and the Synagogue

Anti-Jewish polemic functioned within Christian writings to fashion and maintain identity boundaries either vis-à-vis Judaism or vis-à-vis Christian “heretics” who were caricatured as too Jewish.¹⁹ The anti-Sabbath textual variants discussed in this article could be categorized as a

¹⁵ See Talal Asad, *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 27–79. For the history of thinking on the roles of belief and practice in religion, see the summary in Brent Nongbri, *Before Religion: A History of a Modern Concept* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013), 16–18; and the more detailed review in Manuel A. Vásquez, *More than Belief: A Materialist Theory of Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 211–57.

¹⁶ On the concept of earliest attainable text, see Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 341–44.

¹⁷ The variants studied below come from papyri and other manuscripts ranging in date from the fourth to the thirteenth century. These manuscripts might provide a *terminus post quem* for a variant. Yet it is often true that the ostensibly unique variants of late manuscripts attest to earlier unknown readings; see Ehrman, “Text of the Gospels,” 100. See Ehrman, “Heracleon and the Western Textual Tradition,” *NTS* 49 (1994), 465–86. Even the variants in Codex Bezae may have originated in earlier exemplars; see Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 112–19. Nevertheless, as Parker has also argued concerning Codex Bezae, “the early church could and did alter the transmitted sayings of Jesus ... right through to the fourth century”; Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 285. Rather than venture a precise date for origin of any variant, I will attempt to situate them within the general social and theological trends that can be identified in second- to fourth-century Christian polemic against Jewish Sabbath observance.

¹⁸ See above, notes 7–8.

¹⁹ For more on the function of anti-Jewish polemic in early Christian literature, see Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004); Paula Fredriksen and Oded Irshai, “Christian Anti-Judaism: Polemics and Policies, from the Second to the Seventh Century,” in *Cambridge History of Judaism*, ed. Steven T. Katz, vol. 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 977–1034; John G. Gager, *The Origins of Anti-Semitism: Attitudes toward Judaism in Pagan and Christian Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983); Andrew S. Jacobs, *Christ Circumcised: A Study in Early Christian History and*

subset of these anti-Jewish polemics since they also function to distance Christians from certain Jewish and Christian practices. In order to recognize the potential anti-Sabbath readings of the later textual variants, it is helpful to see how Christian readers in the second century and beyond differed from the author of Luke's Gospel. The majority of references to the Sabbath in Luke occur in pericopes that center on questions of proper Sabbath observance.²⁰ Outside of those accounts, there are only two additional mentions of the Sabbath-day in Luke, and they portray Jesus and some of his closest disciples observing Jewish customs (Luke 4:16; 23:56).²¹ There is nothing in Luke to suggest that Christians should reject the Sabbath commandment. Similarly, the Gospel of John (5:17) insists on Jesus's right to work on the Sabbath, and the Epistle to the Hebrews (4:4, 9) reinterprets the commandment to rest on the Sabbath as an eschatological promise, but neither explicitly negates the significance of actual Sabbath observance for Christians.²² Beginning

Difference, Divinations (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012); Judith M. Lieu, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century* (London: T&T Clark, 1996); Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire AD 135–425*, trans. H. McKeating (Portland, OR: Littman, 1986); and Miriam S. Taylor, *Anti-Judaism and Early Christian Identity: A Critique of the Scholarly Consensus*, StPB 46 (Leiden: Brill, 1995). Although this article focuses on the polemic of literate elites, we should recall the caution offered by Annette Yoshiko Reed: "Discursive acts of definition and differentiation by literate elites surely contributed to the articulation of 'Judaism' and 'Christianity' as communal identities. When we focus on such literary and discursive acts as determinative for religious self-definition, however, we may risk reinforcing, in a new way, the traditional privileging of Patristic and Rabbinic voices." See Reed, *Jewish-Christianity and the History of Judaism: Collected Essays* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 114.

²⁰ A preliminary review of the Synoptic Gospels reveals that Matthew uses the word "Sabbath"—σάββατον as "Sabbath" not "week"—as often as Mark (approximately ten times in NA28), whereas Luke uses the term almost twice as often as Matthew or Mark (approximately eighteen times in NA28). Matthew tends to omit Mark's narrative references to the Sabbath (cf. Mark 1:21; 3:2; 6:2) and include the word Sabbath more frequently in Jesus's direct speech (cf. Matt 12:5; 12:11; 24:20). Luke introduces two additional pericopes that center on questions of Sabbath observance (13:10–17; 14:1–6).

²¹ Occurrences of σάββατον not included in this discussion use the term to mean "week."

²² Regarding the Gospel of John, Raymond Brown argues that the Jews' negative response was not caused by the suggestion that God worked on the Sabbath but by the implication that "Jesus was claiming a divine prerogative"; Raymond Edward Brown, *The Gospel according to John (I–XII): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, ABC 29; (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966), 217; cf. M.-J. Lagrange, *Évangile selon Saint Jean* (Paris: Gabalda, 1936), 140–41; Rudolf Bultmann, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), 244–47; Rudolf Schnackenberg, *The Gospel according to St John*, trans. Kevin Smyth, vol. 1 (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 97, 100–101; Yves Simoens, *Selon Jean 2: Une Interprétation*, IET 17 (Brussels: Institut d'Études Théologiques, 1997), 243–44; and Ulrich Wilckens, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, Das Neue Testament Deutsch 4 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 115–16. Oscar Cullmann suggests that John intends this to end Sabbath-day worship in favor of Sunday worship, but this interpretation does not give sufficient attention to the immediate literary context; see Cullmann, 'Sabbat und Sonntag nach dem Johannesevangelium: ἕως ἄρτι (Joh 5, 17)', *In memoriam E. Lohmeyer* (Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1951), 127–31. On the challenge of arguing for evidence of Sunday worship in the New Testament, see Norman H. Young, "The Use of Sunday for Meetings of Believers in the New Testament: A Response," *NovT* 45 (2003): 111–22 responding to S. R. Llewelyn, "The Use of Sunday for Meetings of Believers in the New Testament," *NovT* 43 (2001): 205–23. On how Heb 4:4 contrasts with John 5:17, see Herbert Braun, *An die Hebräer*, HNT 14 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984), 110. Regarding Hebrews, Harold Attridge notes that "descriptions of heavenly or eschatological rest in Jewish sources often depict it in terms of such

in the second century, however, anti-Sabbath polemic becomes increasingly prominent. This new polemic contrasts starkly with the christological and eschatological interpretations of Sabbath found in works such as John and Hebrews, as well as with the debates over proper observance of Sabbath law found in the Synoptics. Two interrelated trends within this polemic include arguments that: (1) the Sabbath had been superseded by the celebration of the Lord's Day, and (2) synagogue attendance was, therefore, no longer a valid practice for Christians.

Sabbath versus the Lord's Day

Arguments that the Sabbath had been superseded by the celebration of the Lord's Day first appear in the letters of Ignatius and the Epistle of Barnabas. In Ignatius's *Letter to the Magnesians*, the Sabbath is represented as something that belongs to a time past. After contrasting those who live "according to Judaism" (some of whom may well have been Christian) with those who live "according to Christ Jesus," Ignatius contrasts Sabbath observance with the celebration of the Lord's Day: "And so those who lived according to the old ways came to a new hope, no longer keeping the Sabbath [μηκέτι σαββατιζοντες] but living according to the Lord's Day" (Ignatius, *Mag.* 9.1–2).²³ This sort of argument became prominent among a number of later writers, each of whom identified "the Lord's Day" as the proper time of Christian observance.²⁴

'sabbatical' activity"; Harold W. Attridge, *Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1989), 131; cf. 127 n. 56. See also Braun, *An die Hebräer*, 114; and Barnabas Lindars, *The Theology of the Letter to the Hebrews* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 49–50. In fact, Attridge concludes: "A foretaste of the eschatological Sabbath festivity may be actualized in the worship of the community"; Attridge, *Hebrews*, 131. For more on Hebrews' relationship to broader Jewish conversations about sacred time and space, see Jared C. Calaway, *The Sabbath and the Sanctuary: Access to God in the Letter to the Hebrews and its Priestly Context*, WUNT 2/349 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).

²³ Trans. Bart D. Ehrman, *The Apostolic Fathers*, LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2003), 1:249–51. On the reading κυριακός as the "Lord's Day," see William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch: A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 123 n. 3. For more on Ignatius and the Sabbath, see Gager, *Origins of Anti-Semitism*, 127–28; Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 23–56; and Heather A. McKay, *Sabbath and Synagogue: The Question of Sabbath Worship in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 179–83.

²⁴ Some subtle variation is seen in the wake of Marcion. Christians such as Irenaeus, Tertullian, and others sought to maintain a distinction from Judaism and simultaneously affirm a positive relation between the God of the Old Testament and Jesus. This resulted in affirmations of the Sabbath's end being accompanied by often contradictory reinterpretations of biblical Sabbath law intended to demonstrate Christian continuity with Judaism. For instance, Irenaeus maintains that the Sabbath was not "made void" but was "lawfully" observed by Jesus and others (*Haer.* 4.8.1–3); then he insists that the Christian should not observe the Sabbath-day, but live a continual Sabbath (*Haer.* 4.16.1–2). Likewise, Tertullian claims that Jesus did not end but fulfilled Sabbath law (*Marc.* 4.12), while at the same time insisting (with his recent predecessors) that the Sabbath command had come to an end (*Marc.* 5.4). Kenneth Strand provides a helpful summary of Tertullian's position that applies equally well to Irenaeus: "The unifying thread in [these discussions] is that the very same God was the God of both OT and NT dispensations and that the OT and NT do not contradict each other." Both Irenaeus and Tertullian argue this point fervently, even when it means that they contradict themselves. See Kenneth A. Strand, "Tertullian and the Sabbath," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 9 (1971): 140. Although Strand provides a useful overview of Tertullian's thought on the Sabbath, his conclusion that a shift in belief was caused by his Montanist conversion, is unconvincing. As Strand himself notes, the shift can be explained by the change from the exegesis of passages from Luke to those in Paul.

The contrast between Sabbath observance and the celebration of the Lord's Day is made more explicit in the Epistle of Barnabas. Barnabas explicitly argues for the cessation of Sabbath observance and justifies this conclusion with an appeal to the Septuagint. Following a paraphrase of Isa 1:13—"I cannot stand your new moons and sabbaths"—Barnabas explains that the Lord has "rejected" (κατήργησεν) such things as the Sabbath (Barn. 2.5–6).²⁵ Later, Barnabas paraphrases the Sabbath commandment (Exod 20:8 and Ps 24:4), then reinterprets it through an eschatological reading of Gen 2:2–3 (Barn. 15.3–9). The conclusion of the seven-day creation (Gen 2:2–3) is the basis for a seventh day of rest in Exod 20:11—"For in six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, but rested the seventh day" (NRSV). Yet Barnabas, citing Isa 1:13, insists that it is not the current Sabbaths that are acceptable to the Lord, but the eschatological eighth day of new creation (Barn. 15.8). These remarks replace the Sabbath-day celebration with a new celebration: "And for this reason we celebrate the eighth day with gladness, for on it Jesus arose from the dead, and appeared and ascended into heaven" (Barn. 15.9).²⁶ Barnabas's interpretation of a heavenly "rest" and his segue to the future "eighth day" have been considered at best clumsy and at worse contradictory.²⁷ Despite gaps in logic, however, the intent seems quite clear; as Bacchiocchi summarizes it, Barnabas presents these polemical arguments "both to invalidate the Sabbath and to justify the eighth as the continuation and replacement of the seventh."²⁸ Barnabas accomplishes this replacement by transposing the language of creation from the Sabbath command to the eighth day.

Justin Martyr makes the same transposition at the end of his *First Apology* when he accounts for Christian worship on Sunday by explaining: "And it is on Sunday that we all make assembly in common, since it is the first day, on which God changed darkness and matter and made the world, and Jesus Christ our savior rose from the dead on the same day."²⁹ This argument differs from the command to observe Sabbath in honor of the *conclusion* of creation, but

²⁵ For Greek of Epistle of Barnabas, see Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:1–84. On reading κατήργησεν as "rejected," see James Carleton Paget, *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background*, WUNT 64 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1994), 105; and Reidar Hvalvik, *The Struggle for Scripture and Covenant: The Purpose of the Epistle of Barnabas and Jewish-Christian Competition in the Second Century*, WUNT 2/82 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 123.

²⁶ Trans. Ehrman, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2:71 (adapted); Διὸ καὶ ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ἧ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανοὺς (Barn. 15.9).

²⁷ For instance, Bacchiocchi writes, "While, on the one hand, he repudiates the present Sabbath inasmuch as this would have a millenaristic-eschatological significance, on the other hand he justifies the observance of the eighth day by the same eschatological reasons advanced previously to abrogate the Sabbath"; Samuele Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath to Sunday: A Historical Investigation of the Rise of Sunday Observance in Early Christianity* (Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1977), 222. Although scholarly debate has focused on Barnabas's ostensible millenarianist beliefs, James Carleton Paget provides an apt summary of his approach to Sabbath: Barnabas attempts to "manoeuvre as many arguments as he can against the idea that there is any validity in the observance of a specifically Jewish commandment"; Paget, *Epistle of Barnabas*, 171.

²⁸ Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath to Sunday*, 223. Pierre Prigent describes how Barnabas borrows from Jewish traditions in order to distinguish Christianity from Judaism; Prigent, *L'Épître de Barnabé I–XVI et ses sources* (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1961), 65–70; see also Hvalvik, *Struggle for Scripture and Covenant*, 195–98; and McKay, *Sabbath and Synagogue*, 183–88.

²⁹ τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἡμέραν κοινῇ πάντες τὴν συνέλευσιν ποιούμεθα, ἐπειδὴ πρώτη ἐστὶν ἡμέρα, ἐν ἧ ὁ θεὸς, τὸ σκότος καὶ τὴν ὕλην τρέψας, κόσμον ἐποίησε, καὶ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος σωτὴρ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνέστη (Justin, *1 Apol.* 67.8); trans. and Greek from Denis Minns and Paul Parvis, *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies*, Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 260.

the subversion of Exod 20 is sufficiently clear—owing to the fact that the beginning of the creation of the world and the resurrection of Jesus (new creation) both occurred on the same day, Christians worship on that day.³⁰ The very logic used to explain the Sabbath commandment has been adapted to provide a reason for worship on the Lord's Day.

A little less than a century later, Origen also emphasizes how the Lord prefers the first day of the week over the Sabbath in his *Homilies on Exodus*. In Exodus, the account of manna from heaven describes how food miraculously appears on every day of the week except for the seventh (Exod 16:25–30). And Moses reinforces the importance of Sabbath rest, explaining: “The LORD has given you the sabbath, therefore on the sixth day he gives you food for two days; each of you stay where you are; do not leave your place on the seventh day” (Exod 16:29; NRSV). Origen, however, uses this very account to demonstrate the superiority of the Lord's Day—the first day of the week—over the Jewish Sabbath: “But if it is plain from the divine Scriptures that on the Lord's Day God rained manna and on the Sabbath he did not, let the Jews understand that already at that time our Lord's Day was preferred to the Jewish Sabbath.”³¹ For Origen, God has always preferred the Lord's Day.

What is implied in the writings of Barnabas, Justin, and Origen is made explicit by Eusebius: “The Logos conveyed and transferred the celebration of the Sabbath to the rising of the light, and he transmitted to us an image of true rest, the day of salvation, the day of the Lord, the first day of light.”³² The commandment issued in Exod 20 is transferred from the last day of the week to the first, from the Sabbath to the Day of the Lord. In this same period, polemic against Christians who attended synagogues also increased.

The Synagogue in Second- through Fourth-Century Christian Literature

There is little in the writings of second-century Christians that would allow us to understand their views on synagogues. Ignatius's statement that Christians “no longer observe Sabbath” (μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες—Ignatius, *Mag.* 9.1–2) has been interpreted by some to suggest that

³⁰ Regarding Justin's logic, McKay has explained, “In this piece of apologetic, Justin turns on its head the Jewish view of creation as a sequential act with rest as its completion.” See McKay, *Sabbath and Synagogue*, 189.

³¹ Origen, *Hom. Ex.* 7.5; Trans. Ronald E. Heine, *Origen: Homilies on Genesis and Exodus*, FC 71 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1982), 308. *Quod si ex diuinis Scripturis hoc constat quod in die dominica Deus pluit manna et in sabbato non pluit, intelligant Iudaei iam tum praelatam esse dominicam nostram iudaico sabbato*. Latin from Marcel Borret, ed., *Origène: Homélie sur l'Exode*, SC 321 (Paris: Cerf, 1985), 222. See also Bacchiocchi, *Anti-Judaism and the Origin of Sunday* (Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1975), 116; and Gager, *Origins of Anti-Semitism*, 133.

³² Trans. mine. Λόγος μετήγαγε καὶ μετατέθεικε τὴν τοῦ Σαββάτου ἑορτὴν ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ φωτὸς ἀνατολὴν, καὶ παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν ἀληθινῆς ἀναπαύσεως εἰκόνα, τὴν σωτηρίαν καὶ Κυριακὴν καὶ πρώτην τοῦ φωτὸς ἡμέραν (Eusebius, *Comm. Ps.*; PG 23.1169c). Bacchiocchi suggests that Eusebius was exaggerating in his statement that the Logos himself had transferred worship from Sabbath to Sunday because he (Eusebius) almost immediately contradicts that statement by saying “all that was prescribed for the Sabbath, we have transferred to the Lord's Day”; see Bacchiocchi, *Anti-Judaism and the Origin of Sunday*, 117–18; quoting Eusebius, *Comm. Ps.*; PG 23.1172. Eusebius's two statements are not necessarily contradictory: Eusebius could believe that the Logos had transferred the holy-day from Sabbath to Sunday and that Christians, therefore, transferred “all that had been necessary to do on the Sabbath ... to the Lord's Day”; trans. mine—καὶ πάντα δὴ ὅσα ἄλλα ἐχρῆν ἐν Σαββάτῳ τελεῖν, ταῦτα ἡμεῖς ἐν τῇ Κυριακῇ μετατεθείκαμεν (Eusebius, *Comm. Ps.*; PG 23.1172a). See also Reed, *Jewish-Christianity and the History of Judaism*, 188.

he spoke out against Christians who attended synagogue.³³ It is, of course, impossible to know precisely what Ignatius meant by the statement since he does not elaborate. At the end of the second century, Tertullian includes a brief discussion of synagogues in his *Against the Jews*, wherein he refers to them as the “broken cisterns” of Jer 2:13 that cannot hold the “living water” of Christ (*Adv. Iud.* 13).³⁴ He suggests that these synagogues had served a purpose in the past but explains that they made themselves obsolete by not accepting Jesus.³⁵ By the early third century, however, it is clear that some Christians had come to identify Sabbath-day synagogue attendance as a serious problem. In his *Homilies on Leviticus*, for example, Origen warns his readers of the danger of attending a synagogue on Saturday, then church on Sunday. Interpreting a passage from Ezekiel, “neither has any day-old meat entered my mouth” (Ezek 4:14), Origen cautions: “For if you bring that which you learned from the Jews yesterday into the Church today, that is to eat the meat of yesterday’s sacrifice” (*Hom. Lev.* 5.8.3).³⁶ In a collection of excerpted comments on Exodus, Origen is adamant about the transgressive nature of synagogue attendance: “For if in the church you partake of the words of God, but also partake in the synagogue of the Jews, you transgress what the commandment says: ‘In one house shall it be eaten’ (Exod 12:46).”³⁷ Origen is clear: for a Christian to attend synagogue is contrary to the commandments of God. John Chrysostom’s *Against the Jews*—or, better, *Against Judaizing Christians*—suggests that Christian synagogue attendance did not diminish after Origen. Chrysostom begins his First Homily by expressing concern that some Christians would attend and watch the Jewish festivals or, even more disconcerting, that some would participate with the Jews in those festivals and fasts (*Adv. Jud.* 1.1.5). Chrysostom makes it clear that this is an “evil custom” that he hopes to “drive away from the Church” (τοῦτο τὸ πονηρὸν ἔθος βούλομαι τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἀπελάσαι νῦν—*Adv. Jud.* 1.1.5).³⁸ He concludes his homily against this “Judaizing disease” by declaring himself guiltless were his audience to continue with such Jewish practices: “If any of you who are present or absent go to the spectacle of the Trumpets, attend the synagogue ... participate in the Sabbath, or perform any other Jewish custom, small or

³³ “It would be consonant with Ignatius’s concerns elsewhere,” Lieu concludes, “if some [Christians] were meeting on the sabbath”; Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 46. It is possible that “observance” in Magnessia could have included synagogue attendance, but that is not explicit in Ignatius’s letter. Moreover, “Sabbath observance” (σαββατίζω) could refer to any number of alternative social practices. For alternative interpretations, see Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 47; Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch*, 123; and Bacchiocchi, *From Sabbath to Sunday*, 213–18.

³⁴ *Indubitate non recipiendo Christum fontem aquae vitae lacus contritos coeperunt habere, id est synagogas in dispersiones gentium, in quibus iam spiritus sanctus non immoratur, ut in praeteritum in templo commorabatur ante adventum Christi qui est verum dei templum* (Tertullian, *Adv. Iud.* 13); cf. Jer. 2:13 and Justin, *Dial.* 140.1–2. Latin from Hermann Tränkle, *Q.S.F. Tertulliani: Adversus Iudaeos mit Einleitung und kritischem Kommentar* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1964), 35. Cf. trans. Geoffrey D. Dunn, *Tertullian, The Early Church Fathers* (London: Routledge, 2004), 69.

³⁵ For further discussion of Tertullian, *Adv. Iud.* 13, see McKay, *Sabbath and Synagogue*, 196–197.

³⁶ Trans. Gary Wayne Barkley, *Origen: Homilies on Leviticus 1–16*, FC 83 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America, 1990), 105. *Si enim ea quae didiceris a Judaeis hesterno, haec hodie in Ecclesia proferas, hoc est hesternam carnem sacrificii edere* (Origen, *Hom. Lev.* 5.8.3; PG 12.459a).

³⁷ Trans. mine. Εἰ γὰρ ἐν Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐσθίεις λόγους Θεοῦ, ἐσθίεις δὲ καὶ ἐν Ἰουδαίων συναγωγῇ, παραβαίνεις τὴν λέγουσαν ἐντολὴν, « Ἐν οἰκίᾳ μιᾶ βρωθήσεται » (Origen, *Sel. Exod.* 12.46; PG 12.285d). For more on Origen’s anti-Judaizing polemic, see Anna Tzvetkova-Glaser, “Polemics against Judaeo-Christian Practices in Origen’s *Homilies*,” *StPatr* 46 (2010): 217–22.

³⁸ Chrysostom, *Adv. Jud.* 1.1.5; PG 48.844. Translation mine; cf. Paul W. Harkins, trans., *Saint John Chrysostom: Discourses Against Judaizing Christians*, FC 68 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1979), 4–5.

large, I am free of the blood of all of you” (*Adv. Jud.* 1.8.1).³⁹ Sabbath observance and synagogue attendance are now portrayed as an “evil custom” (τὸ πονηρὸν ἔθος), which causes the Christian practitioner to “share in the transgression” of the Jews (μετάσχωσί τινες τῆς παρανομίας ἐκείνων—*Adv. Jud.* 1.1.5).⁴⁰ With this view of Sabbath-day synagogue attendance appearing in the writings of various Christians, it is little wonder that one of the canons from the Apostolic Constitutions would declare: “If any clergy or laity enter a synagogue of Jews or of Heretics to pray, let him be condemned and excommunicated” (Const. Ap. 8.47).⁴¹ Given such harsh rhetoric against synagogue attendance, how might some Christians have continued to justify the practice? Chrysostom provides a clue when, in *Adv. Jud.* 3, he is compelled to spend pages explaining why Jesus celebrated Jewish festivals but Christians should not (*Adv. Jud.* 3.3.9–3.4.1). If this is an indication of his opponents’ rhetoric, then it would seem Chrysostom’s Judaizers were relying on passages from the gospels to argue that they should observe the Jewish Sabbath because Jesus and his disciples had done so (*Adv. Jud.* 3.3.9–3.4.1).⁴² There are few passages in the New Testament that would have supported the view of Chrysostom’s Judaizers better than Luke 4:16—“Jesus went to the synagogue on the Sabbath-day as was his custom”—and Luke 23:56—“and they [some of Jesus’s female disciples] rested on the Sabbath according to the commandment.”

Luke 4:16

Luke 4:16 shares certain commonalities with both Matthew and Mark, even though the pericope that follows is unique to Luke’s Gospel. All three Synoptic Gospels begin with Jesus entering his hometown, which Luke specifies to be “Nazareth, where he was raised” (Luke 4:16; cf. Matt.13:53 and Mark 6:1). Mark continues, “and when it was Sabbath, he began to teach in the synagogue” (6:2). At this point all three texts diverge.

Matt 13:54	Mark 6:2	Luke 4:16
–	–	καὶ εἰσῆλθεν κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῶ
–	καὶ γενομένου σαββάτου	ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων
ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς	ἤρξατο διδάσκειν	–
ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν ...	ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ...	εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ...

³⁹ ὅτι ἐάν τις ἢ τῶν παρόντων ὑμῶν, ἢ τῶν ἀπόντων, πρὸς τὴν θεωρίαν ἀπέλθῃ τῶν σαλπύγγων, ἢ εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἀπαντήσῃ, ... ἢ σαββάτων μετάσχη, ἢ ἄλλο τι μικρὸν ἢ μέγα Ἰουδαϊκὸν ἔθος ἐπιτελέσῃ, καθαρὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος ὑμῶν πάντων (Chrysostom, *Adv. Jud.* 1.8.1; PG 48.855). Translation mine; cf. Harkins, trans., *Chrysostom: Against Judaizing Christians*, 31–32.

⁴⁰ Chrysostom, *Adv. Jud.* 1.1.5; PG 48.844–45; trans. mine. For more on John Chrysostom’s anti-Judaizing interpretation of Jesus’s Jewish practices, see Joshua Garroway, “The Law-Observant Lord: John Chrysostom’s Engagement with the Jewishness of Christ,” *J ECS* 18 (2010): 591–615; Jacobs, *Christ Circumcised*, 116–17; and Fredriksen and Irshai, “Christian Anti-Judaism,” 1005–7.

⁴¹ Trans. mine. Εἴ τις κληρικὸς ἢ λαϊκὸς εἰσέλθοι εἰς συναγωγὴν Ἰουδαίων ἢ αἰρετικῶν προσεύξασθαι, καθαιρείσθω καὶ ἀφοριζέσθω (Const. Ap. 8.47); Greek from Marcel Metzger, ed., *Les Constitutions Apostoliques*, vol. 3, SC 336 (Paris: Cerf, 1987), 298. See also Fredriksen and Irshai, “Christian Anti-Judaism,” 1005.

⁴² See Simon, *Verus Israel*, 323–24; and Robert L. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late Fourth Century* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1983), 73–76. For an overview of the Christian relationship with the Synagogue see Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 293–97.

Matthew omits the word *Sabbath*, while Luke seems to emphasize it.⁴³ Not only does Luke retain the word Sabbath, but he avers that Jesus's Sabbath-day synagogue attendance was common: it was "his custom" (τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ). This reading of Luke 4:16 is supported by nearly all early pandect uncial manuscripts including ⱼ A B Θ.⁴⁴ François Bovon suggests that the grammar, "κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός with the dative ('as was [his] custom') and "on the Sabbath day," is typical Lukan style based on the parallel construction in Acts 17:2.⁴⁵ Similarly, Michael Wolter identifies (ἐν) τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων as a common Septuagintal phrase that "is found only in Luke in the New Testament."⁴⁶ Furthermore, this description of Jesus regularly observing a Jewish custom follows shortly after narratives of his circumcision (Luke 2:21) and Passover pilgrimage (Luke 2:41–42). There is no reason to doubt that the earliest attainable text read: καὶ εἰσῆλθεν κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν (Luke 4:16). For Luke, it was Jesus's custom to attend the synagogue on the Sabbath.⁴⁷

⁴³ Although Luke here omits that Jesus taught, it is implicit in the following verses.

⁴⁴ See Reuben J. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus: Luke* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 67.

⁴⁵ François Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2002), 152. Other commentators have also identified the parallel grammar between Luke 4:16 and Acts 17:2; see Michael Wolter, *The Gospel according to Luke: Volume 1 (Luke 1–9:50)*, trans. Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016), 199; originally published as Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium*, HNT 5 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 190.

⁴⁶ Wolter, *Gospel according to Luke 1*, 199.

⁴⁷ Given the emphasis on Jewish piety in the early chapters of Luke (1:6; 2:22, 23, 27, 39, 42), this passage in Luke 4:16 most naturally emphasizes Jesus's Jewish piety; see Bovon, *Luke 1*, 152; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 78; Hans Klein, *Das Lukasevangelium*, KEK (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 186–87. This speaks to Jesus's present piety as an adult, not only to his piety as a youth; see Wolter, *Gospel according to Luke 1*, 199; *pace* Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Luke*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1942), 118. Schürmann reads the "custom" as applying to Jesus from his youth to the present situation; Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, vol. 1, HThKNT 3 (Freiburg: Herder, 1969), 227. Some commentators have argued that Jesus's custom was teaching in the synagogue—this argument is based on the grammatical parallel to the narrative of Paul's synagogue preaching in Acts 17:2; see Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997), 209; and Robert Banks, *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 91–92. As S.G. Wilson has argued, however, "it is improbable that this is conveyed solely by the phrase κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός. The parallel with Ac. 17:2 is imprecise, since there the reference is explicitly to Paul's preaching, and in context Lk. 4:16 most naturally refers to Jesus' participation in synagogue worship"; Wilson, *Luke and the Law*, SNTSMS 50 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 23–24; see also Erich Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, HNT 5 (Tübingen: Siebeck, 1929), 62; and Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Luke*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1942), 118.

Bezae-Luke 4:16 and other variants

NA ²⁸	D
Καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ναζαρά, οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ...	Ἐλθὼν δὲ εἰς Ναζαρέδ, οὗ ἦν <u>τεθραμμένος</u> , <u>εἰσῆλθεν</u> κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς — ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ...

In the first hand of Bezae-Luke 4:16, the words τεθραμμένος εἰσῆλθεν and the word αὐτῷ do not appear—a corrector later restored τεθραμμένος εἰσῆλθεν.⁴⁸ The first hand, therefore, read, “And coming to Nazareth, where he was, according to the custom, in the synagogue on the Sabbath-day.” As Rice has argued, the omission of τεθραμμένος is conspicuous since nowhere else does Bezae-Luke evince any concern regarding Jesus being raised in Nazareth.⁴⁹ In fact, Bezae even harmonizes Luke 2:39 with Matt 2:23 to affirm that Jesus’s time being raised in Nazareth fulfills a prophecy: “as was said through the prophet, He will be called a Nazorean.”⁵⁰ The corrector’s restoration of τεθραμμένος εἰσῆλθεν, therefore, brings this passage into harmony with other passages in the first hand of Bezae-Luke. What remains absent, however, is the pronoun, αὐτῷ—the dative of possession, “his custom.”

There is broad support for the omitted pronoun in Luke 4:16 within the so-called Western textual tradition.⁵¹ Besides the omission in Bezae’s parallel Latin (d), IGNTP shows that two more old Latin versions agree: Vercellensis (IV/V) and Colbertinus (XII). IGNTP also suggests that the Syriac Peshitta and seven Coptic Bohairic versions attest the omitted pronoun, as does the Latin of Origen’s *Hom. Luke* 32.⁵² It is clear that Bezae is not harmonizing with

⁴⁸ See Rice, “Alteration of Luke,” 218 n. 37. Parker argues that addition of τεθραμμένος εἰσῆλθεν should not be ascribed to corrector Hand H (*pace* Scrivener), but that “the words are in a fairly late hand”; Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 39; cf. 41, 44, 294. See Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (Cambridge University Library, MS Nn.2.41) Folio 198v Quire_25-6v (flesh): <https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-NN-00002-00041/377>.

⁴⁹ Rice, “Alteration of Luke,” 11–32. J. Rendel Harris proposed that Bezae Luke 4:16 adopts a Marcionite text; J. Rendel Harris, *Codex Bezae: A Study of the So-Called Western Text of the New* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891), 232; but Plummer is less certain; see Plummer, *Luke*, 119. See also Dieter T. Roth, *The Text of Marcion’s Gospel* (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 186 n. 3.

⁵⁰ καθὼς ἐρέθη διὰ τοῦ προφητοῦ ὅτι Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται (Bezae-Luke 2:39). See Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (Cambridge University Library, MS Nn.2.41) Folio 191v Quire_24-7v (hair): <https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-NN-00002-00041/363>. See also Rice, “Alteration of Luke,” 28–29.

⁵¹ The so-called Western texts most likely represents a “shared set of variants” rather than genealogical descent from a single shared ancestor. See Georg Gäbel, “‘Western Text,’ ‘D-Text Cluster,’ ‘Bezan Trajectory,’ Or What Else?—A Preliminary Study,” in *Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior III: Die Apostelgeschichte/Acts of the Apostles, Part III: Studien/Studies*, ed. Holger Strutwolf, Georg Gäbel, Annette Hüffmeier, Gerd Mink, and Klaus Wachtel (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017), 83–136; and Michael W. Holmes, “The ‘Western’ Text of Acts a Challenge for Historians,” in *The New Testament in Antiquity and Byzantium: Traditional and Digital Approaches to Its Texts and Editing: A Festschrift for Klaus Wachtel*, ed. H. A. G. Houghton, David C. Parker, and Holger Strutwolf (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2019), 3–22.

⁵² See The American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project, *The New Testament in Greek: The Gospel according to St. Luke (Part One: Chapters 1–12)* (Oxford:

Matthew or Mark, since Luke's text with or without the omissions remains very distinctive. The explanation for the absent αὐτῶ must be found elsewhere.

It is possible that αὐτῶ was omitted through unintentional scribal error. Yet, in the context of Codex Bezae, the omission of αὐτῶ opens the text to an alternative reading which coincides with Bezae's anti-Jewish tendency—it distances Jesus from Jewish practice.⁵³ As Rice has argued, “D implies that it was the custom of the townspeople of Nazareth to attend synagogue services on the Sabbath, and it was not necessarily Jesus's custom.”⁵⁴ Rice defends this reading by pointing to other variants in Bezae-Luke which also free Jesus from “Jewish custom or tradition.”⁵⁵ It should be noted that the word “custom” (ἔθος or ἔθω) also appears in Luke 1:9, 2:27, 2:42, 22:39, and Acts 17:2. In three of these passages (Bezae-Luke 1:9, 2:27, and 22:39), there are no variants that would affect the meaning of the “custom” or redefine its participants—none of these three describes Jesus or his disciples actively observing Jewish practices.⁵⁶ The exceptions, Luke 2:42 and Acts 17:2, narrate the observance of Jewish practices first by Jesus and then by Paul. In Bezae-Luke 2:42, the passage is restructured in a way that redirects agency away from Jesus so that he does not actively observe a Jewish custom.

NA ²⁸	D
ἀναβαινόντων αὐτῶν	ἀνέβησαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες αὐτὸν
κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἑορτῆς	κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἑορτῆς τῶν ἀζύμων

Instead of retaining the genitive absolute, which could include Jesus among those who “went up according to the custom of the feast,” Bezae specifies the subject, making it clear that Jesus is a passive participant: “his parents went up, taking him according to the custom of the feast of unleavened bread.”⁵⁷ In Acts 17:2, a passage that grammatically parallels Luke 4:16, Bezae

Clarendon, 1984), 83. The Latin of Origen's *Hom. Luke* 32.3 reads, *ingressus iuxta morem in synagogam*; Henri Crouzel, François Fournier, and Pierre Périchon, ed., *Origène, Homélie sur S. Luc*, SC 87 (Paris: Cerf, 1962), 388.

⁵³ See above, nn. 6–7.

⁵⁴ Rice, “Alteration of Luke,” 218.

⁵⁵ Rice, “Alteration of Luke,” 219. Rice suggests that a variant in Luke 11:42 may function similarly, in this instance to distance Jesus from Jewish tithing customs; see Rice, “Alteration of Luke,” 219 n. 38; cf. 187–89.

⁵⁶ Luke 1:9 simply sets the stage for Zechariah, “according to the custom of the priesthood” (κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἱερατείας); Luke 2:27 describes Jesus's circumcision but places the impetus on the parents to do “according to the custom of the law” (κατὰ τὸ εἰθισμένον τοῦ νόμου)—here Bezae has ἔθος in place of εἰθισμένον. Luke 22:39 is the only passage without a significant variant that describes a custom of Jesus, but it is rather benign: “he went according to his custom to the Mount of Olives” (ἐπορεύθη κατὰ τὸ ἔθος εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν).

⁵⁷ Although ἔχω here could be translated as “with,” this is not a grammatical phrase common to Bezae. In fact, on the whole, Bezae tends to use the verb ἔχω less than other textual traditions. The emphasis is clearly on the parents' action and not that of Jesus. My reading of the inclusion of Jesus's parents differs from Ehrman who, in an argument for an anti-adoptionistic intent behind certain variants, suggests that the anomalous addition of γονεῖς to Luke 2:42 was made for literary purposes: “In this case the change was apparently not made for theological but for literary reasons, simply to clarify what is assumed in the rest of the pericope, that Jesus accompanied his parents on the occasion.” The literary explanation is, however, unnecessary since, as Ehrman notes in the following sentence, “the scribe of codex Bezae reads γονεῖς in verse 41, [so] there can

again avoids direct attribution of the custom.⁵⁸ The verse describes Paul's custom of going into synagogues: κατὰ δὲ τὸ εἰωθὸς τῷ Παύλῳ εἰσηλθεῖν. In Bezae, however, the dative (τῷ Παύλῳ) is replaced with a nominative (ὁ Παύλος). Certainly the definite article may be translated as a possessive without the assistance of an αὐτῷ or τῷ Παύλῳ—as it is in Luke 22:39 (κατὰ τὸ ἔθος).⁵⁹ Yet, in other passages throughout Luke and Acts, Bezae manifests a tendency to retain the dative of possession: “he is my only child” (μονογενῆς μοί ἐστιν—Luke 9:38); “out of their abundance” (ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος αὐτοῖς—Luke 21:4); “who were friends of his” (ὄντες αὐτῷ—Acts 19:31). Against this trend, the omission of the dative of possession only where it implies participation in Jewish Sabbath observance is conspicuous. In Luke 4:16, the omitted αὐτῷ frees the reader, as Rice correctly observed, to interpret the “custom” apart from Jesus.⁶⁰

Other manuscripts go further to insist that this was not a custom of Jesus. Two thirteenth-century minuscules (2643 and 2766) and a twelfth-century lectionary (l211) attest to a more explicit shift of subject: κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῶν.⁶¹ Here the “custom” most definitely belongs to the people of Nazareth, or more generally to the Jews, but not to Jesus. If it was not Jesus's custom, then this passage could not be used to validate the practice of Christians attending synagogue on the Sabbath.

It should come as no surprise that the one verse from the New Testament that explicitly supports a practice of Sabbath-day synagogue attendance was altered given the polemic against that practice. Some Christian authors, already in the second century, labored to distinguish Christians from Jews on the issue of Sabbath observance. By the third and fourth centuries CE, some Christians explicitly rebuked other Christians for attending a synagogue on the Jewish Sabbath. John Chrysostom goes so far as to identify Synagogue attendance as an explicitly “Jewish custom” (Ἰουδαϊκὸν ἔθος) and calls it an “evil custom” (τὸ πονηρὸν ἔθος).⁶² Then he labors to explain how a custom practiced by Jesus should be considered evil for Christians in his time. In this same period, Codex Bezae and other manuscripts of Luke show an alteration to Jesus's Sabbath custom. Whether editors intended this change to avoid the problem of Jesus ostensibly supporting Sabbath-day synagogue attendance is impossible to demonstrate conclusively. Regardless, these four manuscripts unitedly distance Jesus from a custom of regular Sabbath-day synagogue attendance.

be no question of his importing an adoptionistic tone to the account.” See Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*, 121 n. 59.

⁵⁸ On Acts 17:2 as a grammatical parallel to Luke 4:16, see Bovon, *Luke 1*, 152; Plummer, *Luke*, 119; Wolter, *Gospel according to Luke*, 199.

⁵⁹ See James A. Brooks and Carlton L. Winbery, *Syntax of New Testament Greek* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1979), 77–78; and Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 215–216. For classical Greek, see Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 287 (#1121).

⁶⁰ See Rice, “Alteration of Luke,” 218.

⁶¹ For digital images of MS 2643, folio 1770, see <https://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/manuscript-workspace?docID=32643&pageID=1770>; for MS 2766, folio 1440 (076v), see <https://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/manuscript-workspace?docID=32766&pageID=1440>; and for l211, folio 1520, see <https://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/manuscript-workspace?docID=40211&pageID=1520> (accessed 14 Feb 2020). Cf. IGNTP, *Gospel according to St. Luke (Part One: Chapters 1–12)*, 83.

⁶² See Chrysostom, *Adv. Jud.* 1.1.5 (PG 48.844); and 1.8.1 (PG 48.855).

Luke 23:56

In Luke 23:56, some of Jesus's closest disciples observe a Sabbath rest. This passage transitions the narrative from Jesus's burial to his resurrection. In detailing the chronology of these events, all three Synoptic Gospels account for the passing of a Sabbath day.

Matt 28:1	Mark 16:1	Luke 23:56-24:1
–	–	ὑποστρέψασαι δὲ ἠτοίμασαν ἀρώματα καὶ μύρα.
Ὅψε δὲ σαββάτων,	Καὶ διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου	καὶ τὸ μὲν σάββατον
–	–	ἠσύχασαν κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν.
τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ	–	Τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων
εἰς μίαν σαββάτων	–	ὄρθρου βαθέως
ἦλθεν Μαριάμ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ	Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ	– (Luke 23:55; 24:10)
καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία	καὶ Μαρία ἡ [τοῦ] Ἰακώβου	
	καὶ Σαλώμη	
θεωρῆσαι τὸν τάφον.		ἐπὶ τὸ μνήμα ἦλθον φέρουσαι ἃ ἠτοίμασαν ἀρώματα.
	ἠγόρασαν ἀρώματα ἵνα ἐλθοῦσαι ἀλείψωσιν αὐτόν.	

Mark and Matthew mention the Sabbath simply to indicate the passing of time. Luke, however, pauses to observe the day of rest: “and they rested on the Sabbath according to the commandment” (Luke 23:56). This distinctive Lukan reading is well attested; it is supported by most all early pandect uncial manuscripts (including \aleph A B Θ) and papyri (including \mathfrak{P}^{75}).⁶³ With regard to intrinsic evidence, the same argument made for Luke 4:16 can be made in support of the Lukan reading here—that the disciples observe Sabbath and other Jewish customs is not unusual for Luke.⁶⁴ In fact, the Gospel of Luke concludes with Jesus's disciples “continually in the temple” (24:53).

Bezae-Luke 23:56 and other variants

The Bezan text diminishes the status of the Sabbath by omitting the three final words of Luke 23:56, κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν. In Bezae, the women may rest on the Sabbath, but it is not a commandment. As with the omission of αὐτῶ in 4:16, it is unlikely that the mere absence of the

⁶³ I argue only for the reading: καὶ τὸ μὲν σάββατον ἠσύχασαν κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν. See Swanson, *Luke*, 405.

⁶⁴ See above. Luke Timothy Johnson describes this as “characteristic” of Luke and explains, “At the end as at the beginning of the story, those around Jesus show the piety desired by Torah (1:6; 2:22, 23, 27, 39)”; Johnson, *Gospel of Luke*, 384; see also Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 831. Similarly, Bovon explains, “Wie es sich gehort—das Gesetz wird sowohl am Anfang wie auch am Ende des Evangeliums befolgt (vgl. 1,6.8–9.59; 2,21–24.41; 4,16)—halten die Frauen den Sabbat ein”; François Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas: Lk 19,28–24,53*, vol. 3/4; EKK (Düsseldorf: Neukirchener Verlag, 2009), 523. For Wolter, Luke is not trying to emphasize the women's Torah piety but simply to mark a narrative break; Michael Wolter, *The Gospel According to Luke: Volume II (Luke 9:51–24)*, trans. Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2017), 538; originally published as Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium*, HNT 5 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 767.

phrase κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν would be noticed by many ancient readers or hearers of this gospel. Moreover, for those Christians who polemicized against observing a Jewish Sabbath, this passage in Bezae would not go far enough. Even without those final three words—κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν—this passage still affirms that the women, Jesus’s disciples, observed a Sabbath rest. Despite the subtlety of this omission, this variant still agrees with a significant trend in Bezae-Luke—its anti-Judaism and its diminution of practices that had come to be considered Jewish.⁶⁵ For many Christian authors in the time that Codex Bezae was produced, the practice of weekly Sabbath-rest was no longer considered a commandment. In this manuscript, even if subtle, the Gospel of Luke came to reflect that view.

In this omission, Bezae is not well supported. Of the Western witnesses, only Bezae in its Greek (D) and Latin text (d) omit these three particular words.⁶⁶ Yet manuscripts from other textual traditions deal with this passage in similar ways. Some variants nuance either the commandment or the connection between the Sabbath day and the Lord’s Day.⁶⁷ The first hand of 1424, considered by Streeter to be tertiary witness to the Caesarean text,⁶⁸ omits the entire verse, so that the narrative moves from the women observing Jesus being placed in the tomb (Luke 23:55) to “the first day of the week” when they bring spices.⁶⁹ A thirteenth-century minuscule (579), which in Luke “preserves an extremely good Alexandrian text that often agrees with B, 8, and L,”⁷⁰ adds the particle δέ after κατὰ and removes the same particle from the beginning of Luke 24:1. This change has the effect of removing the final three words: κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν. More important, however, by moving the δέ backward by three words, the wom-

⁶⁵ Rice, “Alteration of Luke,” 220. See also above, nn. 6–7. Bovon calls this omission strange but does not provide an explanation: “Merkwürdigerweise lasst der Codex Bezae (D = 05) die Worte ... ‘wie es das Gesetz vorschreibt,’ aus”; Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 523 n. 32.

⁶⁶ Regarding the so-called Western witnesses, see above n. 51.

⁶⁷ For instance, Epiphanius records that Marcion changed the verse to read “according to the law” (κατὰ τὸν νόμον); perhaps to insist on the Jewishness of Sabbath observance—Epiphanius offers no commentary on the significance of that change (*Panarion*, 42.11.6 [lxxv]); trans. Frank Williams, *The Panarion of Epiphanius of Salamis: Book I (Sects 1–46)*, 2nd ed., Nag Hammadi and Manichaean Studies 63 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 310. A sixth-century uncial (P), an eleventh- and a twelfth-century minuscule (1012 and 2096 respectively), and a number of lectionaries remove the μέν from the phrase καὶ τὸ μέν σάββατον ἡσύχασαν, severing the connection between the Sabbath-day rest and the “first day of the week”—Lectionaries attesting to this omission include: 110, 112, 148, 170, 180, 150, 1211, 1299, 1127, 1579, and 1642 (The International Greek New Testament Project, *Luke [Chapters 13–24]*, 230). The Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project (IGNTP) suggest that a corrector to the seventh-century Byzantine uncial (0211) adds the dative form of the word God (θεῷ) after κατὰ. This strange grammatical construction would make the passage difficult to render. A more plausible explanation is that IGNTTP misread the marginal notation. Rather than read εω with the θ above as a corrector inserting the dative θεῷ, it is more likely that it should be read as a lectionary abbreviation (suspension) indicating that the reading is to begin in the morning ἑωθ(ινόν). Thanks to Lincoln Blumell who first suggested this reading to me. For comparanda, see William J. Elliott, “How to Change a Continuous Text Manuscript into a Lectionary Text,” in *Texts and Traditions: Essays in Honour of J. Keith Elliott*, ed. Peter Doble and Jeffrey Kloha, NTTSD 47 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 375. The abbreviation εω with the θ above appears twice in 0211. In both instances, it appears just before the common lectionary suspension αρ with the χ above for ἀρχῆ; see Bruce M. Metzger, *Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 30.

⁶⁸ Bruce Manning Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 91.

⁶⁹ This omission might also reflect harmonization with Matthew.

⁷⁰ Metzger et al., *Text of the New Testament*, 89.

en's visit to the tomb on Sunday morning becomes the commandment: "They rested on the Sabbath. And, according to the commandment, on the first day of the week at early dawn, they went to the tomb."⁷¹ A similar reading is made possible by the omission of δέ from the beginning of Luke 24:1, evidenced in three Coptic Bohairic versions and possibly some patristic witnesses according to IGNTP.⁷²

As we saw above, Christian authors from Barnabas and Justin Martyr to Origen and Eusebius, insisted—in supersessionist fashion—that the Jewish Sabbath was no longer valid but that the Lord had transferred divine approval from the Sabbath-day to the Lord's Day. Within this polemical context, the alterations in manuscripts of Luke seem to express concern for how the Sabbath rest of Jesus's disciples should be understood. Where one manuscript omits that Sabbath-rest was a commandment, another omits the Sabbath rest entirely, and yet another corrects the commandment to be about the first day of the week. The concern about the relation between the Sabbath-day and the Lord's Day that is evident in the early church fathers is also attested in the transmission of this gospel text. At very least, the variety of variants in Luke 23:56 from multiple textual traditions attests to the potentially problematic nature of this passage for early Christian readers and editors.

Conclusion

Early Christian controversy, such as the Christian observance of practices identified as Jewish, influenced readers of the Gospel of Luke. We have seen that two of the most positive affirmations of Sabbath observance in Luke (4:16 and 23:56) were altered in some manuscripts in a way that distances Jesus and his disciples from Jewish Sabbath observance. We have also seen that these changes coincide with the polemic of early Christian authors against Christians observing the Jewish Sabbath. In fact, more variants are seen in the passage that suggests Jesus's disciples observed the Jewish Sabbath (Luke 23:56), than in the passage suggesting Jesus himself observed Jewish Sabbath customs. It could be an accident of history that more variants have survived for Luke 23:56. Yet the existence of more variants around Luke 23:56 is precisely what one might expect given that Christians, such as Chrysostom, developed interpretations

⁷¹ In 579, a space is added between κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐντολὴν and τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων. This break may indicate that the scribe of 579 understands τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων to begin a new thought, even if the exemplar had moved the δε in order to associate the "commandment" with the "first day of the week." See CSNTM Image Id: 534626 (CSNTM Image Name: GA_579_0128.jpg), http://csntm.org/manuscript/View/GA_579 (accessed 11 Feb 2020).

⁷² See The American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project, *The New Testament in Greek: The Gospel according to St. Luke (Part Two: Chapters 13–24)* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1987), 231. Patristic support for the omission is also provided; however, the purported omissions of δέ in the references from the following may not be quotations from Luke: J. A. Cramer, *Catena Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1844), 243; Chrysostom, *Pasch.* 7, see Fernand Floëri et Pierre Nautin, *Homélie Pascales III: Une Homélie Anatolienne sur la Date de Pâques en Lân* 387, SC 48 (Paris: Cerf, 2004), 147; Eusebius, *Quaestiones evangelicae ad Marimum* 2.2, text in Roger Pearse, ed., *Eusebius of Caesarea, Gospel Problems and Solutions: Quaestiones ad Stephanum et Marimum*, CPG 3470 (Ipswich: Chieftain Publishing, 2010), 104–5; and Augustine, *Epist.* 36.28, text in A. Goldbacher, ed., *S. Aureli Augustini Hipponiensis Episcopi Epistulae*, CSEL 34.2 (Vienna: Tempsky, 1904), 57. Furthermore, in some of these, the omission may have been caused by the new literary context; that seems to be the case in Petrus Chrysologus, *Sermo* 79.1, text in Alexandri Olivar, ed., *Sancti Petri Chrysologi: Collectio sermonum a felice episcopo parata sermonibus extravagantibus adiectis*, CCSL 24A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1981), 483. In Eusebius, *Comm. Ps.* 21 (PG 23.201), though included by IGNTP, the δέ is simply not omitted.

of Jesus's Jewish practices (see Luke 4:16) that allowed him to argue against Christians' observance of those same practices.

Finally, few of these variants appear in the critical apparatus of the NA28, much less in modern translations. Heightened polemic, it seems, was not always sufficient to produce "orthodox" corruptions of scripture.⁷³ Why did later orthodox Christians not preserve these particular textual variants, which clearly align with orthodox polemic? What might this suggest about the nature of New Testament textual transmission at the nexus of reading practices, practices of communal worship, and Christian identity discourse? I offer only some preliminary thoughts here. The anti-Sabbath polemic reviewed above was intended to fashion Christianity and Judaism as distinct.⁷⁴ The variants at Luke 4:16 and 23:56 reflect this polemic, but they do not fully replicate it—one sees in these variants only a faint flicker of Origen's or Chrysostom's fiery rhetoric. The passages in Luke were shaped anew by an editor who had been shaped by that rhetoric.⁷⁵ As such, these variants reveal the impact of Christian anti-Sabbath polemic, but they do not function in the same way as that polemic. Preserving these variants would do little to discourage a Christian from attending a synagogue or celebrating the Sabbath. It is reasonable to suppose that a contributing factor to the preservation of one variant over another could be a given variant's effectiveness at addressing Christian controversy. Inasmuch as the variants at Luke 4:16 and 23:56 do little to address Sabbath controversy directly, this may help to explain their scarcity. However we explain the scarcity of these particular variants and whatever this might suggest about the intersection of polemic and practice, it is clear in a number of manuscripts that Christian anti-Sabbath polemic affected the textual transmission of Luke 4:16 and 23:56.

⁷³ See Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption of Scripture*. For additional examples of heightened polemic leading to textual corruptions see above, n. 11.

⁷⁴ On early Christian anti-Jewish/-Judaizing polemic as identity discourse, see Charlotte Fonrobert, "Jewish Christians, Judaizers, and Christian anti-Judaism," in *Late Ancient Christianity*, ed. Virginia Burrus, *A People's History of Christianity* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2005), 234–54, 306–9. See also Boyarin, *Border Lines*, 1–27; and Jacobs, *Christ Circumcised*, 1–10.

⁷⁵ See Parker, *Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts*, 154; and Schmid, "Scribes and Variants—Sociology and Typology," 1–23.