

# The Use of Sense-Lines in Codex Laudianus

## A Formal Analysis<sup>1</sup>

**Tilke Nelis**

A classical philologist, Tilke Nelis obtained her PhD at the KU Leuven Institute of Philosophy (Leuven, Belgium), where she is now a postdoctoral researcher.

tilke.nelis@kuleuven.be  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0371-196X>

**ABSTRACT** • Some of the Greek-Latin manuscripts of the New Testament are written in sense-lines. By means of the division of texts into such short corresponding units, the activities of both copying and reading were facilitated, as this division helps to see what Greek and Latin words or phrases correspond to one another. This article examines the use of sense-lines in Codex Laudianus, a bilingual manuscript (sixth or seventh century) transmitting the Acts of the Apostles in two narrow columns to the page (Latin on the left, Greek on the right). The investigation of text segmentation patterns sheds light on the production and function of sense-lines in Codex Laudianus.

**KEYWORDS** • New Testament Textual Criticism, bilingual manuscripts, Codex Laudianus, Acts of the Apostles, sense-lines

**ZUSAMMENFASSUNG** • Einige der griechisch-lateinischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments sind in Sinnzeilen geschrieben. Durch die Unterteilung der Texte in solche kurzen, einander entsprechenden Einheiten wurde sowohl das Kopieren als auch das Lesen erleichtert, da diese Unterteilung dabei hilft, zu erkennen, welche griechischen und lateinischen Wörter oder Phrasen einander entsprechen. Dieser Artikel untersucht die Verwendung von Sinnzeilen im Codex Laudianus, einer zweisprachigen Handschrift (6. oder 7. Jahrhundert), die die Apostelgeschichte in zwei schmalen Spalten auf der Seite wiedergibt (lateinisch links, griechisch rechts). Die Untersuchung der Textsegmentierung gibt Aufschluss über die Entstehung und Funktion von Sinnzeilen im Codex Laudianus.

**STICHWORTE** • Neutestamentliche Textkritik, zweisprachige Handschriften, Codex Laudianus, Apostelgeschichte, Sinnzeilen

<sup>1</sup> This article is based on my presentation given at the SBL Annual meeting in San Diego (November 2024). The research was conducted within the scope of the project “BICROSS – The Significance of Bilingual Manuscripts for Detecting Cross-Language Interaction in the New Testament Tradition” (grant no 101043730 – BICROSS – ERC-2021-COG). Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

I would like to thank the BICROSS project’s principal investigator, Christina M. Kreinecker (KU Leuven), as well as Stephen C. Carlson (Catholic University of Australia), Reinhart Ceulemans (KU Leuven), Martijn Jaspers (KU Leuven), Amy Myshrall (University of Birmingham), Oliver W. E. Norris (University of Birmingham), and Ulrich B. Schmid (Universität Münster and Niedersächsische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen), for their useful advice and suggestions.



In his book entitled *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts*, David Parker states that bilingual manuscripts are presented in two basic formats, “[...] either in parallel columns or with an interlinear translation.”<sup>2</sup> He describes the former, which can be of the facing-page type, i.e., one column to the page, or of a facing-column type, i.e., two columns to the page, as follows: “[...] the lines can be written either in full column blocks or in sense-lines.” When a bilingual manuscript is written in sense-lines, this means that the two versions of a text are divided into short corresponding units. These units—often, but not always, sense-units—start on a new line; hence, one could also speak of line breaks or line divisions. The use of sense-lines is sometimes described as a guide to both the scribe and the reader: the scribe is able to ensure that the two versions of a text are really parallel to each other, and the reader is able to compare the two versions.<sup>3</sup>

The present article consists of three parts. First, the concept of sense-lines in bilingual manuscripts will be discussed, specifically in Greek-Latin manuscripts. Subsequently, the focus will be on the bilingual Codex Laudianus, to which a brief introduction will be offered. Finally, two aspects of Codex Laudianus will be examined, namely its format and its text segmentation, with a view to shedding light on both the production and function of sense-lines in this Greek-Latin bilingual.

## I. Sense-Lines in Greek-Latin Manuscripts

Sense-lines are considered a regular feature of Greek-Latin manuscripts, particularly in the oldest extant bilinguals of the New Testament, which date to the fifth century at the earliest. Sense-lines are also known from non-biblical Greek-Latin manuscripts. Among these manuscripts are papyri containing Latin works of the Roman poet Virgil (70 BCE–19 CE) with a Greek translation—often parts of his *Aeneid*. In addition, parts of Latin works by the Roman orator Cicero (106–43 BCE) with a Greek translation have been preserved (likewise on papyrus), including parts of his *Catilinian Orations*.<sup>4</sup> Most of the known Latin-Greek Virgil and Cicero papyri date from the fourth and fifth centuries and were found in Egypt. The sense-lines in those papyri most likely served as teaching aids. The Latin is in the left column and the Greek in the right one, in exact corresponding—short—units. The length of the units in these so-called school vocabularies is uneven: they vary from one to three words for the users to easily discover their respective

<sup>2</sup> David C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2008, 70.

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., David C. Parker, *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and Its Text*. Cambridge University Press, New York 1992, 73–75.

<sup>4</sup> An example of a Latin-Greek Virgil papyrus is L24, Vienna, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek. The catalogue number given to this item in *Codices Latini Antiquiores* (hereafter: *CLA*) is 10,1522. An example of a Latin-Greek Cicero papyrus is Gr. 61, Manchester, John Rylands Library. This item has been catalogued as 2,224 in *CLA*. For a list of non-biblical Greek-Latin manuscripts (also including Greek texts with a Latin translation), see, e.g., Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 52–54. For *CLA*, see Elias A. Lowe (ed.), *Codices Latini Antiquiores: A Paleographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century*. 12 parts, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1934–1971. *CLA* can also be consulted online, on <https://elmss.nuigalway.ie/> (retrieved 28.01.2025).

meaning, i.e., to facilitate comparison.<sup>5</sup> As Eleanor Dickey points out,<sup>6</sup> this format allows two ways of reading. One way is across the lines, i.e., almost like a glossary, to find out quite easily the counterpart of a specific word or phrase in the other language. Another way is down one column, i.e., as a continuous text in one language, to get a clear understanding of the content in Latin or in Greek. Further, Dickey states that the system of presenting a source text with its translation in such narrow columns—a so-called columnar translation—probably stems from columnar glossaries. On the one hand, the format of the Virgil and Cicero papyri is like that of columnar glossaries. On the other hand, in those papyri, a continuous text is in fact regarded as a glossary.

As far as is known today, seven Greek-Latin manuscripts of the New Testament written in sense-lines have been preserved—five of which are majuscule manuscripts. These are GA 05 (Codex Bezae), GA 06 (Codex Claromontanus), GA 08 (Codex Laudianus), GA 0319 (Codex Sangermanensis), GA 628 (Codex Ottobonianus 258), and GA 629 (Codex Ottobonianus 298); there is also GA 0230, a manuscript of which only a small snippet has been preserved.<sup>7</sup> These seven bilinguals cover a period from the fifth century up to and including the fourteenth century and contain some of the oldest Greek-Latin bilinguals of the New Testament that have been preserved. While Codex Claromontanus and Codex Sangermanensis contain the Pauline Epistles, Codex Bezae and Codex Laudianus transmit the Acts of the Apostles (combined with the Gospels in Codex Bezae). The Codices Ottoboniani contain the book of Acts, as well as the Catholic and Pauline Epistles (combined with Revelation in 258). In terms of the *mise-en-page* and the manner in which the languages are presented, two different types of format are found in the seven bilinguals. On the one hand, three bilinguals (Codex Bezae, Codex Claromontanus, and GA 0230) are of the facing-page type, with Greek on the left, i.e., on the verso side of the folio, and Latin on the right, i.e., on the recto side of the next folio. As pointed out by Hugh Houghton, the left is the place of honour in late Antique bilingual manuscripts: normally, either the source language or the less familiar language is on the left.<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, four bilinguals are of a facing-column type: Latin on the left and Greek on the right (Codex Laudianus and Codex Ottobonianus 298), Greek on the left and Latin on the right (Codex Sangermanensis), or Greek in the inner and Latin in the outer column (Codex Ottobonianus 258).

<sup>5</sup> See Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 50–58.

<sup>6</sup> See Eleanor Dickey, “Columnar Translation: An Ancient Interpretive Tool that the Romans Gave the Greeks,” *CQ* 65.2 (2015) 807–821, here 808 and 814–815. See also eadem, “How Coptic Speakers Learned Latin? A Reconsideration of P.Berol. inv. 10582,” *ZPE* 193 (2015) 65–77.

<sup>7</sup> GA 05/VL 5 (Codex Bezae) is MS Cambridge, University Library, Nn. II. 41. GA 06/VL 75 (Codex Claromontanus) is MS Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, gr. 107 + 107 A + 107 B. GA 08/VL 50 (Codex Laudianus) is MS Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Laud. gr. 35. GA 0319/VL 76 (Codex Sangermanensis) is MS Saint Petersburg, National Library of Russia, Φ. № 906 / Gr. 20 / F.v. XX. GA 628 (Codex Ottobonianus 258) is MS Vatican City State, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. gr. 258. GA 629 (Codex Ottobonianus 298) is MS Vatican City State, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottob. gr. 298. GA 0230/VL 85 is MS Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, PSI XIII 1306, of which only one strip with two very short fragments of Ephesians (one on the recto and one on the verso side) has been preserved. In addition to these seven indisputable bilinguals, GA 0244 (MS Leuven, University Library, P.A.M. Khirbet Mird 8) is also written in sense-lines. Of this manuscript, however, only a Greek fragment has been preserved.

<sup>8</sup> See H.A.G. Houghton, *The Latin New Testament: A Guide to its Early History, Texts, and Manuscripts*. Oxford University Press, Oxford 2016, 27; idem, “Latin in Multilingual Biblical Manuscripts,” in: idem (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Latin Bible*. Oxford University Press, New York 2023, 152–168, here 152.

## II. Codex Laudianus: The Manuscript<sup>9</sup>

Codex Laudianus is a Latin-Greek bilingual (referred to as VL 50 and GA 08 respectively) counting 227 folios.<sup>10</sup> This manuscript contains only the book of Acts and is also called the ‘Laudian Acts’.<sup>11</sup> Due to missing leaves, Acts 26:30–28:25 is not present in the codex (see fols. 224v–225r).<sup>12</sup> This parchment manuscript dates from the late sixth or early seventh century and comes from Italy (possibly from Sardinia or Rome). As mentioned above (see section I.), the Latin is in the left column to the page, while the Greek in the right one.<sup>13</sup> Parker observes that the order of the languages in Codex Laudianus, combined with its facing-column format with short sense-lines (see below: section III.), comes very close to the format of the bilingual Virgil and Cicero papyri used as teaching aids (see above, section I.).<sup>14</sup>

The Latin is an Old Latin text.<sup>15</sup> The Greek—a mainly Byzantine text—also shows some similarity to the Greek text in Codex Bezae, as mentioned in Daniela Mairhofer’s catalogue.<sup>16</sup> In Codex Laudianus, both the Latin and the Greek have been changed to correspond to the facing text—the Latin frequently, while the Greek occasionally. In the Latin text, these changes have resulted

<sup>9</sup> For this section, the following publications served as a basis: Elias A. Lowe (ed.), *CLA*, Part II, *Great Britain and Ireland*. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1972, 37, here \*251, see also <https://elmss.nuigalway.ie/catalogue/570> (retrieved 28.01.2025); Roger Gryson, *Altlateinische Handschriften/Manuscripts vieux latins*, Première partie, *MSS 1 – 275* (VL 1/2A). Verlag Herder, Freiburg 1999, 77–78; Daniela Mairhofer, *Medieval Manuscripts from Würzburg in the Bodleian Library, Oxford: A Descriptive Catalogue*. Bodleian Library, Oxford 2014, 120–133. See also Andrea Lai, “Il codice Laudiano greco 35 e la Sardegna altomedievale,” *BSS* 1 (2008) 129–144.

<sup>10</sup> Its Latin and its Greek text are also known as *e* and *E* respectively in, e.g., the Oxford Vulgate. See John Wordsworth et al. (eds.), *Nouum Testamentum Domini nostri Jesu Christi latine secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi*. Vol. 3: *Actus apostolorum*. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1954, ix; xii. As mentioned above (see footnote 7), this manuscript’s shelfmark is MS. Laud. Gr. 35, Oxford, Bodleian Library. Its summary catalogue number is 1119.

<sup>11</sup> At the very end of the codex, other contents are found as well, written by several hands: the Apostle’s Creed in Latin (fol. 226v), a note on the Oracle of Delphi in Greek (fol. 226v), invocations to the Virgin Mary in Greek (fol. 227r), and an edict of Flavios Pankratios—a Byzantine official and leader of Sardinia who flourished in the seventh century—in Greek (fol. 227v).

<sup>12</sup> The note in the lower margin of fol. 224v, i.e., *nota hic <...><sup>(?)</sup> defectus*, is possibly a German note dating from the tenth century. See Mairhofer, *Medieval Manuscripts*, 120.

<sup>13</sup> The dimensions of the leaf are the following: c. 244–272 × 207–218 mm, the ruled space being c. 188–210 × 151–175 mm. Each left (Latin) column measures c. 68–82 mm and each right (Greek) column c. 65–75 mm. The other contents at the end of the codex (see above: footnote 11) are not of a facing-column type: there, the entire width of the page is usually used.

<sup>14</sup> See Parker, *Codex Bezae*, 69.

<sup>15</sup> Houghton, *The Latin New Testament*, 233, states that it “was based on a European Old Latin text.” Further, Otto Walther signals that the Latin text in Codex Laudianus is said to be similar to the text used by Lucifer of Cagliari, bishop of Sardinia in the fourth century. See Otto K. Walther, *Codex Laudianus G35, a Re-Examination of the Manuscript: A Reproduction of the Text and Accompanying Commentary* (PhD diss., University of St. Andrews 1980), vol. 1, 3.

<sup>16</sup> See Mairhofer, *Medieval Manuscripts*, 120.

in “solecisms and strange expressions”.<sup>17</sup> Examples, listed by Albert Clark (among others),<sup>18</sup> are the use of a genitive absolute, the mix of genitive and ablative cases, and the preservation of the gender of a Greek noun.<sup>19</sup> For the Greek text, James Ropes mentions,<sup>20</sup> on the one hand, what he calls “additions to the ordinary text”: at the points where the Latin column had more text, a translation into Greek was needed to create correspondence between the two columns. An illustration is δι ημερων τεσσαρακοντα (fol. 91r, ll. 12–13; Acts 10:41); this phrase is not present in the *ECM*.<sup>21</sup> On the other hand, Ropes mentions variant words that appear to have been caused by Latin readings that are imitated in the Greek text. An illustration is την θυραν, as a counterpart of *ianuam* (fol. 103v, l. 7; Acts 12:14); the *ECM* has τον πυλωνα.<sup>22</sup>

Both the Latin and the Greek texts in Codex Laudianus are written by one scribe in closely related scripts, i.e., in so-called Italian B uncial (with minuscule B and, sometimes, minuscule D as well) and in biblical majuscule respectively.<sup>23</sup> Probably, the scribe copied first a few Latin lines and then their Greek counterparts (see also below: section III.1.). This order is suggested by Latin lines running out of space, i.e., running on into either the *intercolumnium* or even the Greek column. Sometimes, the last few Latin letters of a line are also compressed. There are indications that the scribe had a background in Greek. First, the letters A, C, E, N, O, and P in Latin generally resemble the Greek form, suggesting an influence from the Greek.<sup>24</sup> With regard to scripts and orthography, mention must also be made of the interchange of the letters B and V in the Latin text—

<sup>17</sup> Mairhofer, *Medieval Manuscripts*, 121. See the lists in, e.g., von Konstantin Tischendorf, *Codex Laudianus sive actus apostolorum graece et latine ex codice olim Laudiano iam Bodleiano sexti fere saeculi: Addita sunt nonnulla ex celebri codice prophetarum Marchaliano Vaticano*, Monumenta sacra inedita 9, J. C. Hinrichs, Leipzig 1870, XVI–XVII; Adolf Jülicher, „Kritische Analyse der lateinischen Übersetzungen der Apostelgeschichte“, ZNW 15 (1914) 163–188, here 183–185; Albert C. Clark (ed.), *The Acts of the Apostles*, Clarendon Press, Oxford 1933, 234–246, here 236–238.

<sup>18</sup> See Clark, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 236–237.

<sup>19</sup> Illustrations, in the Latin text, of a genitive absolute, the mix of genitive and ablative cases, and the preservation of the gender of a Greek noun are *conuenientium enim eorum* (fol. 215r, ll. 21–22; Acts 25:17), *plenus gratia et fidei ac uirtute* (fol. 45r, l. 25 – fol. 45v, ll. 1–3; Acts 6:8), and *factus est murmuratio\*/murmuratio*<sup>c</sup> (fol. 43v, ll. 16–17; Acts 6:1) respectively.

<sup>20</sup> See James H. Ropes, „Three Papers of the Text of Acts“, HTR 16.2 (1923) 163–186, at 179–180.

<sup>21</sup> See H. Strutwolf et al. (eds.), *Novum Testamentum Graecum: Editio critica maior. 3: Die Apostelgeschichte*, 4 vols., Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart 2017, see also <https://ntvmmr.uni-muenster.de/ecm> (retrieved 28.01.2025). Ropes, „Three Papers“, 179, gives a list of additions found in Codex Laudianus, about which he states the following: “In many of them the addition is found in nearly or quite the same form in other Old-Latin copies besides e [= Codex Laudianus] and d [= Codex Bezae], so that it is clearly not a mere idiosyncrasy of Codex Laudianus. The form of these readings seems to show conclusively that their Greek is due to a new translation from the Latin; hence its disagreement with the other (and presumably original) Greek form of the added words.”

<sup>22</sup> The reading την θυραν is found in two other places, i.e., in GA 1884 (a sixteenth-century manuscript) and in a patristic citation, i.e., in chapter 24 of *Vita Porphyrii* by Marcus Diaconus, a hagiographer from the fourth–fifth century. See also Marc le Diacre, *Vie de Porphyre, évêque de Gaza*, ed. Henri Grégoire / M.-A. Kugener, Collection Byzantine, Les Belles Lettres, Paris 1930, 21, here l. 16.

<sup>23</sup> In addition, von Tischendorf identifies the activity of two correctors (which he calls A and B). These correctors focus mainly on the Latin text. Moreover, corrector B is responsible for the subdivision of the text and for the numbering into seventy-four chapters. See von Tischendorf, *Codex Laudianus*, XVII.

<sup>24</sup> On the other hand, the script of the Greek text is also influenced by the Latin to a certain degree. This is the case for the letters T and Y, the latter written as V in the Latin text. See Lowe, *CLA*, Part II, 37, here \*251. Further, there are also Greek forms in the Latin text, like *paralytikous* for παραλελυμενος (fol. 78v, l. 22; Acts 9:33).

which is a very common change.<sup>25</sup> Often, the interchange is not meaningful: it simply concerns orthographical mistakes.<sup>26</sup> In nine cases, however, this change is meaningful because of a difference in tense. In some cases, the change results in the use of the future tense in place of the perfect tense—in spite of the aorist tense in the Greek text.<sup>27</sup> These forms are also found in a limited number of pre-Vulgate and Vulgate manuscripts, all of which date later than Codex Laudianus.<sup>28</sup> In other cases, the perfect tense occurs in place of the future tense.<sup>29</sup> These perfect forms are also found in the fifth-century Codex Bezae; one of them has been corrected by a later hand.<sup>30</sup> Another indication of the scribe's Greek background is the subscription in Greek only (in the middle of the page, across the two language columns).<sup>31</sup>

Further, there are signs that Codex Laudianus was copied from a bilingual exemplar. Possibly, this happened in a (to date unidentified) monastery in Sardinia. Houghton states that "[t]he displacement of some Greek text by longer lines of Latin, especially toward the end of the manuscript, indicates that it was copied from a bilingual exemplar."<sup>32</sup> Others have also observed that Codex Laudianus is probably a copy of a model with the same line division but with a different pagination, because of dittography and *saut du même au même*.<sup>33</sup> In her catalogue, Mairhofer states that the production of Codex Laudianus "[...] belongs to a Greek-speaking milieu in which Latin was studied as a second language [...]", referring to the codex's scripts and layout in short sense-lines with Latin on the left.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>25</sup> The spelling B for V is described as far more common than V for B. See J. N. Adams, „Late Latin“, in James Clackson (ed.), *A Companion to the Latin Language*, John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken 2011, 257–283, here 275–277.

<sup>26</sup> See, e.g., *haye*bat, instead of *habebat*, for εἶχεν (fol. 32v, l. 19; Acts 4:35).

<sup>27</sup> Six cases were found: *baptizabit* (fol. 1v, l. 21; Acts 1:5); *inplebit* (fol. 7v, l. 11; Acts 2:2); *baptizabit* (fol. 71r, l. 2; Acts 8:38); *manducabit* (fol. 73r, l. 16; Acts 9:9); *nuntiabit* (fol. 143v, l. 2; Acts 16:36); *nuntiabit* (fol. 194v, l. 15; Acts 22:26). These future forms do not make sense in the context.

<sup>28</sup> That is, in manuscripts dating from the ninth, tenth, or eleventh century.

<sup>29</sup> Three cases were found: *suscitauit* (fol. 23r, l. 14; Acts 3:22); *mutauit* (fol. 47r, l. 17; Acts 6:14); *suscitauit* (fol. 56v, l. 22; Acts 7:37). These perfect forms do not make sense in their contexts either.

<sup>30</sup> The first of the three perfect forms mentioned in the previous footnote has been corrected (to the future form *suscitabit*) by a later hand in Codex Bezae. The first and the second perfect forms mentioned there are also found in the fifth-century Fleury Palimpsest (usually referred to as VL 55). Moreover, the first perfect form is likewise present in Codex Fuldensis (usually referred to as F), a sixth-century Vulgate manuscript. For all three perfect forms, the other manuscripts transmitting one or more of them date from the eighth until the twelfth century.

<sup>31</sup> That is, πράξεις των αγίων αποστολων (fol. 226r, ll. 11–12).

<sup>32</sup> Houghton, „Latin in Multilingual Biblical Manuscripts“, 161.

<sup>33</sup> See Jülicher, „Kritische Analyse“, 182 ff.; Clark, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 235. For examples of dittography, where one or more lines at the bottom of a page is or are repeated at the top of the next page, see fol. 7v, l. 25 – fol. 8r, l. 1 (Acts 2:4) and fol. 63v, ll. 24–25 – fol. 64r, ll. 1–2 (Acts 8:7). For an example of a *saut du même au même*, see fol. 167v, ll. 23–25 – fol. 168r, ll. 1–6 (Acts 19:33).

<sup>34</sup> Mairhofer, *Medieval Manuscripts*, 122.

High-quality digital images of Codex Laudianus can be consulted on the *Digital Bodleian* website.<sup>35</sup> The digital transcription of its Greek text by the Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung (INTF) is available online.<sup>36</sup> I have now made a digital transcription of its Latin text, which will be published online in the near future.<sup>37</sup>

In the following, the transcription of the Latin is separated from the Greek by means of a vertical stroke, |. When a transcription of subsequent lines in both the Latin and the Greek text is given, the start of a new line in both languages is marked by two slashes, //. Furthermore, the abbreviation for *post correctionem*, C, is added—in superscript—to a word that has been corrected in Codex Laudianus (by either the scribe or a corrector). These cases usually concern rectifications of reading mistakes or writing errors. In general, the reading before correction in the manuscript (marked by an asterisk, \*, and often separated from the corrected reading by one slash, /) is given in the case of an omission that has been completed afterwards.

### III. Sense-Lines in Codex Laudianus

#### III.1. Format

The narrow columns count 22–27 lines per page. Consequently, not every page of Codex Laudianus consists of exactly the same number of lines.<sup>38</sup> A line of the Latin or Greek text counts five words at most. One to three words in a Latin or Greek line are more common than four or five, which means that the sense-lines are usually very short—shorter, at least, than the *cola* and *commata* used as a typical division in other contemporary bilingual biblical manuscripts.<sup>39</sup> There are no word divisions, except one.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>35</sup> See <https://digital.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/objects/55b2e494-4845-403e-9ba6-d812bda79329/surfaces/a4d36822-1a1d-4844-91b8-4a7a85a7bc33/> (retrieved 28.01.2025).

<sup>36</sup> See the website of the New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room (NTVMR): <https://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/community/vmr/api/transcript/get/?docID=20008&indexContent=Acts&format=html> (retrieved 28.01.2025).

<sup>37</sup> Within the scope of the *Vetus Latina* edition of Acts, which is currently being prepared by Wilhelm Blümer at the Neutestamentliche Textforschung (NTTF) in Mainz, only a collation is available—no transcription. For a facsimile of the manuscript, see von Tischendorf, *Codex Laudianus*, 1–226. For an edition of the manuscript text, see Johannes Belsheim, *Acta apostolorum ante Hieronymum latine translata ex codice latino-graeco Laudiano Oxoniensi* (Christiania Videnskabs-Selskabs Forhandlinger 19). Dybwad, Christiania 1893.

<sup>38</sup> The pages transmitting Acts 15 (fols. 125v–134v), e.g., count 23–26 lines. The large majority of these pages (fol. 129r [Acts 15:13–16] and fols. 130r–134v [Acts 15:18–41]) count 24 lines.

<sup>39</sup> In Acts 15, e.g., the minimum is 1 word (3 Latin or 2 Greek characters) and the maximum 4 words (24 Latin or 22 Greek characters). In both languages, the 1-word lines occur most frequently, i.e., in (more than) half of the selected chapter, whereas the 4-word lines are thinly sown. Out of this chapter's 433 lines in total, the Latin text consists of 253 1-word lines, the Greek of 215. With regard to the 4-word lines, on the other hand, there are only 5 and 8 in the Latin and the Greek text respectively. For 2-word lines, the numbers are the following: 161 in the Latin text, 169 in the Greek. Finally, there are 14 3-word lines in the Latin text and 41 in the Greek.

<sup>40</sup> The absence of word divisions is also observed by Dickey, with respect to ancient texts with narrow columns and a translation next to it intended for language learners. See Eleanor Dickey, „Word Division in Bilingual Texts“, in: Gabriel



In cases of *ekthesis*, the projecting letter is one and a half to two times as big as the other (non-projecting) letters.<sup>41</sup> In general, *ekthesis* occurs in corresponding Latin and Greek words. At certain points, however, it is not immediately clear visually whether the *ekthesis* in the Latin text is answered by one in the Greek text, simply because the Latin line runs out of space and consequently (almost) touches, or even enters, the Greek column. Here, the bigger size of the Greek opening letter is the only indication of an *ekthesis*.<sup>42</sup>

I also found several—what I call—special cases of *ekthesis*, i.e., 41 in total, in which there is no correspondence between both versions of the text. In most of these cases, there is a clear *ekthesis* in either Latin or Greek. Possibly, the copyist overlooked the corresponding word.<sup>43</sup> However, in only 7 cases, the first *three* letters of a Greek line, of the same size as the other ones, are projecting into the *intercolumnium*. These cases are the following:

- (1) *de regno* | τα περι της βασιλειας (fol. 1v, l. 6; Acts 1:3);
- (2) *de ecclesia* | των απο της εκκλησιας (fol. 100r, l. 1; Acts 12:1);
- (3) *de heresi* | των απο της αιρεσεως (fol. 127r, l. 1; Acts 15:5);
- (4) *et diruta* | και τα ανεσκαμμενα (fol. 129v, l. 1; Acts 15:16);

Nocchi Macedo – Maria C. Scappaticcio (eds.), *Signes dans les textes, textes sur les signes : Érudition, lecture et écriture dans le monde gréco-romain*, Pap.Leod. 6. Presses Universitaires de Liège, Liège 2017, 159–175, here 162.

One word division was found in Codex Laudianus, in Greek only, at the bottom of folio 62v. There, the (long) Latin line runs into the Greek column. Due to the division of the last word, the Greek column counts one line more (i.e., 24) than the Latin column (i.e., 23): *quae erat in hierosolymis* | την εν ἱερημ // [empty line] | σολυμοις (fol. 62v, ll. 23–24; Acts 8:1). In the large majority of its occurrences in Codex Laudianus, the Greek word for Jerusalem is abbreviated (see also the discussion of the *nomina sacra* below). In only a few cases, it is written in full—see εις ιεροσολυμα (fol. 3v, l. 13; Acts 1:12), εις ιεροσολυμα (fol. 181v, l. 20; Acts 21:15), εις ιερουσαλεμ (fol. 192v, l. 6; Acts 22:17), and εις ιεροσολυμα (fol. 211v, l. 2 + l. 18; Acts 25:1 + 25:3). Of note, there are also occurrences of the preposition εις with the abbreviation ἱημ: see, e.g., fol. 37r, l. 2 (Acts 5:16) and fol. 71v, l. 24 (Acts 9:2). For this one word division, it seems like the scribe started with the abbreviation and then decided to write the second half of the word in full on the next line.

<sup>41</sup> In Acts 15, e.g., *ekthesis* occurs 19 times in the Latin text: 5 times in 1-word lines (on fol. 127r, l. 24 and fol. 128v, l. 25: *uiri*; fol. 129v, l. 20: *nota*; fol. 130v, l. 7: *tunc*; fol. 131r, l. 7: *apostoli*); 11 times in 2-word lines (on fol. 125v, l. 19: *et quidam*; fol. 126r, l. 6 + l. 24: *facta ergo + illi itaque*; fol. 126v, l. 24: *surrexerunt\* autem*; fol. 127r, l. 12: *conuenerunt\* autem*; fol. 128v, l. 6: *tacuit autem*; fol. 129r, l. 19: *post haec*; fol. 132v, l. 16: *illi quidem*; fol. 133r, l. 19: *paulus autem*; fol. 133v, l. 21: *barnabas autem*; fol. 134r, l. 3: *paulus autem*); and 3 times in 3-word lines (on fol. 128v, l. 20: *postquam autem tacuerunt*; fol. 133v, l. 5: *post aliquod autem*; fol. 134r, l. 13: *facta est ergo*). There are no occurrences in the very few 4-word lines.

In the Greek text of Laudian Acts 15, there are 14 clear cases of *ekthesis*. (For the cases that are not immediately clear visually, as well as—what I call—the special cases, see below.) It concerns 4 cases in 1-word lines (on fol. 127r, l. 24 and fol. 128v, l. 25: *ανδρες*; fol. 129v, l. 20: *γνωστα*; fol. 130v, l. 7: *τοτε*); 8 cases in 2-word lines (on fol. 126r, l. 6: *γενομενης ουν*; fol. 128v, l. 6: *εισηγησεν δε*; fol. 129r, l. 19: *μετα ταυτα*; fol. 131r, l. 7: *οι αποστολοι*; fol. 133r, l. 19: *παυλος δε*; fol. 133v, l. 21: *βαρναβας δε*; fol. 134r, l. 13 + l. 24: *εγενετο ουν + σαυλος δε*); and 2 cases in 3-word lines (on fol. 126r, l. 24 and fol. 132v, l. 16: *οι μεν ουν*). There are no occurrences of clear *ekthesis* in the highly limited number of 4-word lines.

<sup>42</sup> See, e.g., *surrexerunt\* autem* | εξανεστησαν δε (fol. 126v, l. 24; Acts 15:5). As the last letter of *autem* touches the Greek column, the first letter of *εξανεστησαν* is not projecting; it just has a bigger size.

<sup>43</sup> Such special cases do not occur in Acts 2, 6, 8, or 9, nor after Acts 23. In the following examples of special cases, the projecting letter is underlined: *super matthiam* | επι ματθιαν (fol. 7r, l. 18; Acts 1:26); *tunc* | τοτε (fol. 85v, l. 7; Acts 10:21); *respondens autem* | αποκριθεν δε (fol. 163v, l. 1; Acts 19:15).



- (5) *misimus ergo* | απεσταλκαμεν ουν (fol. 132r, l. 9; Acts 15:27);  
 (6) *gauisi sunt* | εχαρησαν (fol. 133r, l. 1; Acts 15:31);  
 (7) *a pamphylia* | απο παμφυλιας (fol. 134r, l. 7; Acts 15:38).

Cases (1), (2), (3), and (4) are in long Greek lines, but cases (5), (6), and (7) are not: there, a blank space is left in the line. Therefore, prevention of running out of space cannot be the general explanation for the projecting letters. Oddly enough, almost all of these special cases, i.e., 5, occur in Acts 15. Likewise remarkable is that 4 out of the 7 cases are in the first line of a page—although it can be assumed that more mistakes happen near the start of pages, i.e., when the flow of a scribe would be interrupted by moving from one page to the next. Below, a few hypotheses for the origin of these 7 special cases are formulated. The hypotheses, however, are only tentative.<sup>44</sup>

Cases (2) and (6) are likely to be ‘alignment’ errors: the scribe seems to have started writing των and εχα- respectively beside the wrong ruled vertical line. Such a mistake was easy to make due to the short Latin lines at the top of the respective pages. The same ‘alignment’ error seems to have occurred with τα π- in case (1), although this Greek line and its short Latin counterpart are not at the top of the page.

Cases (3), (4), (5), and (7), on the other hand, may be indicative of corrections by the scribe. In case (3), the re-inking could be a clue. Each time the scribe re-inks the pen, the colour of the letters is much darker. However, the difference in colour between the last projecting letter (the nu in των) and the first non-projecting letter (the alpha in απο) is not significant enough to consider the latter re-inked. This could be an indication that απο was written following on from previous text and that των was added later. In cases (4) and (7), the lining up with the ruling could be a clue. When one browses through the codex, it becomes clear that the scribe often compresses letters to the right of a line (see above: section II.). However, the scribe seems to maintain the left-justification of the column consistently. The position of the first non-projecting letter (the [re-inked] tau in τα and the pi in παμφυλιας respectively), which lines up with the ruling, gives the impression that the preceding word (και [with re-inked iota] and απο respectively) was added later. In case (5), finally, the combination of the re-inking and the lining-up with the ruling could be a clue. The colour of the last letter in the preceding line is very light, but the reinking appears to have happened only in the sigma in απεσταλκαμεν, not in the initial alpha. Moreover, this sigma lines up with the ruling. Therefore, απε- seems to have been added later.

Another remarkable aspect of Codex Laudianus is related to the abbreviations for *nomina sacra*: its Greek text contains such abbreviations, but in its Latin text, they are almost entirely lacking. The abbreviations in the Greek text include (forms of) ανθρωπος (ανος), δαυιδ (δαδ), θεος (θης), ιερουσαλημ (ιημ), ιησους (ις), ισραηλ (ιηλ), κυριος (κς), μητηρ (μηρ), ουρανος (ουνος), πατηρ

<sup>44</sup> I am grateful to Amy Myshrall (University of Birmingham) for sharing her insights into these special cases of *ekthesis* with me.

( $\overline{\pi\eta\rho}$ ),  $\overline{\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha}$  ( $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$ ),  $\overline{\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho}$  ( $\overline{\sigma\eta\rho}$ ), and  $\overline{\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma}$  ( $\overline{\chi\varsigma}$ ).<sup>45</sup> In the entire manuscript, I found only three such abbreviations in the Latin text:

- (1)  $\overline{ihs}$  |  $\overline{o\ \tau\varsigma}$  (fol. 3r, l. 25; Acts 1:11);
- (2)  $\overline{sancti^*/sancti\ sps^c}$  |  $\overline{\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\gamma\iota\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\nu\varsigma}$  (fol. 78r, l. 26; Acts 9:31);
- (3)  $\overline{dad}$  |  $\overline{\delta\alpha\delta}$  (fol. 111v, l. 28; Acts 13:22).

Abbreviation (2), for *spiritus*, was originally omitted by the scribe and added later by another hand, as is clear from the difference in both ink and handwriting. Abbreviations (1) and (3), for *iesus* and *dauid* respectively, are written in a smaller script. A comparison with the text in the preceding lines raises the question whether abbreviation (1) was written by the first hand or not. Yet, abbreviation (3) was clearly written by the first hand, albeit as an addition in the lower margin of the page: four lines, of both Latin and Greek text, were added there, in a smaller script. Actually, all three of these exceptions are found at the bottom of the respective pages. The general lack of abbreviations for *nomina sacra* in the Latin text is unusual, compared to their presence in other (older) manuscripts containing Old Latin texts, examples of which are Codex Bezae and Codex Claromontanus (fifth century).

In biblical manuscripts, words known as *nomina sacra* are frequently, and uniformly, abbreviated and, as such, provided with an overline.<sup>46</sup> This practice holds true for not only Greek texts, but also early Latin texts—especially for words like *deus*, *dominus*, *iesus*, and *christus*.<sup>47</sup> From the sixth–seventh century, more and more words were abbreviated in Latin as well.<sup>48</sup> In an article on *nomina sacra* in Codex Laudianus, Christopher Tuckett formulates a potential (tentative) explanation for the lack of abbreviations in this codex.<sup>49</sup> According to Tuckett, the *nomina sacra*—in both Latin and Greek—may have been written in full in an ancestor of Codex Laudianus. Later, during the copying (possibly in a manuscript between this ancestor and Codex Laudianus), *nomina sacra* in the Greek text were abbreviated by a scribe with a background in Greek, according to the standards of the time. Yet, for the Latin text, this did not happen: the Latin kept being mechanically copied, without adjusting the *nomina sacra* to the usual standards. Considering Tuckett’s explanation, the general lack of abbreviated *nomina sacra* in the Latin text may, in the first place, be an indication of the scribe’s Greek background (see also above: section II.). In the second place, this lack might perhaps point to the target audience as well: it is possible that Codex Laudianus was intended for Greek speakers less acquainted with Latin. Another potential

<sup>45</sup> In Acts 15, e.g., 26 abbreviations for *nomina sacra* occur. It concerns (forms of)  $\overline{\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma}$  (2 times: fol. 129v, l. 8; fol. 131v, l. 22),  $\overline{\delta\alpha\delta}$  (1 time: fol. 129r, l. 23), (forms of)  $\overline{\theta\varsigma}$  (9 times: fol. 126v, l. 21; fol. 127v, l. 6 + l. 16; fol. 128r, l. 11; fol. 128v, l. 15; fol. 129r, l. 6; fol. 129v, l. 23; fol. 130r, l. 10; fol. 134v, l. 6),  $\overline{\alpha\lambda\eta\mu\iota}$  (2 times: fol. 126r, l. 21; fol. 126v, l. 14),  $\overline{\omega}$  (2 times: fol. 128v, l. 2; fol. 132r, l. 5), (forms of)  $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$  (6 times: fol. 128v, l. 1; fol. 129v, l. 8 + l. 16; fol. 132r, l. 3; fol. 133v, l. 4 + l. 18),  $\overline{\pi\rho\epsilon\varsigma}$  (1 time: fol. 128r, l. 18), (forms of)  $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$  (2 times: fol. 127v, l. 20; fol. 132r, l. 19), and  $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$  (1 time: fol. 132r, l. 6).

<sup>46</sup> For examples, see the list of Greek *nomina sacra* above. For further reading on *nomina sacra* and their abbreviations, see e.g., Ludwig Traube, *Nomina Sacra: Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung*. Beck, München 1907.

<sup>47</sup> For further reading, see also Cuthbert H. Turner, “The *Nomina Sacra* in Early Latin Christian Manuscripts,” in: *Scritti di storia paleografica*. Vol. 4: *Paleografia e diplomatica*. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Roma 1924, 62–74.

<sup>48</sup> See e.g., Traube, *Nomina Sacra*, 252–266.

<sup>49</sup> See Christopher M. Tuckett, “*Nomina Sacra* in Codex E,” *JTS* 57.2 (2006) 487–499, here 497–499.

indication of this target audience is the position of the Latin text on the left, which can be the place of the less familiar language in a bilingual manuscript.

### III.2. Patterns of Text Segmentation into Sense-Lines

I examined more than ten chapters spread over the entire manuscript, i.e., Acts 1–5, 15–17, and 25–28, starting from the Latin. At first sight, the distribution of the words and phrases over the lines seems to be based on the constituents of the sentence. Each time, two to three Latin or Greek lines, sometimes even four or five, need to be read, in order to have a good understanding of the idea in a clause (either main or subordinate). For example, with respect to the beginning of Acts 15, of which a transcription is offered in the table below, separate lines have been attributed to the pronoun serving as the subject (l. 19), the finite verb (l. 22), and the direct object (l. 23). Likewise in separate lines are the participle modifying the pronoun (l. 20) and the prepositional phrase connected to the participle (l. 21).

<b>Beginning of Acts 15:1 (fol. 125v, ll. 19–23)</b>		
<i>et quidam</i>	και τινες	l. 19
<i>descendentes</i>	κατελθοντες	l. 20
<i>ab iudaea</i>	απο της ιουδαιας	l. 21
<i>docebant</i>	εδιδασκον	l. 22
<i>fratres</i>	τους αδελφους	l. 23
...	...	...

Moreover, there are cases in the Latin text in which two constituents, such as the direct object and the verb, are in the same line due to a compound or a one-word expression in the Greek text. Examples are *testimonium perhibuit* | εμαρτυρησεν (fol. 127v, l. 17; Acts 15:8), *hymnum canebant* | υμνουν (fol. 141r, l. 6; Acts 16:25), and *paenitentiam agere* | μετανοειν (fol. 152v, l. 12; Acts 17:30). Such cases make clear that the sense-lines, particularly the exact correspondence between the Latin and the Greek lines, were a point of special interest during the copying of the text. Other—at first sight remarkable—cases include a personal pronoun, which is often the object of a verb; they mostly concern the forms *me*, *mihi*, *te*, and *tibi*. These forms are nearly always with another constituent in the same line.<sup>50</sup> Examples are *repleuis me* | πληρωσεις με (fol. 13r, l. 24; Acts 2:28) and *mentire te* | ψευσασθαι σε (fol. 33v, l. 20; Acts 5:3). Forms of *nos* and *uos*, on the other hand, are in separate lines; the same holds true for the nominative cases *ego* and *tu*.<sup>51</sup> The explanation for the forms *me*, *mihi*, *te*, and *tibi* usually not standing alone is again to be

<sup>50</sup> Sometimes, however, these pronouns are in separate lines. One example is *nonne manens* | ουχι μενον // *tibi*<sup>c</sup> | *σοι* // *manebat* | εμενεν (fol. 34r, ll. 1–3; Acts 5:4). Another example is *feceris* | ποιησης // *tibi* | *σεαυτω* // *mala* | *κακον* (fol. 142r, ll. 1–3; Acts 16:28).

<sup>51</sup> See, e.g., *ego* | *εγω* // *iudico* | κρινω (fol. 130r, ll. 5–6; Acts 15:19) and *et saluus eris*<sup>c</sup> | και σωθησι // *tu* | *συ* (fol. 142v, ll. 6–7; Acts 16:31).

found in the Greek text: they are enclitics—με, μοι, σε, and σοι, as well as μου and σου—and, therefore, ‘lean back on’ the preceding word (also in the pronunciation), forming one unit together.<sup>52</sup> Such cases are a clear indication that the sense-lines were divided from the perspective of the Greek.

The observations above—the division of the parts of one constituent (e.g., a nominalised pronoun and the participle modifying it) over several lines, as well as the combination of several Latin constituents in one line to correspond to the Greek counterpart (whether being a compound or containing an enclitic)—make clear that the text segmentation is not merely based on the constituents of the sentence (syntax): often, meaning (semantics) plays a part as well. I discerned four specific patterns of text segmentation.

### Pattern 1: Coordinating Conjunction and Negation at the Beginning of a New Line

A coordinating conjunction like *et* is usually added to the constituent following it. Consequently, such a conjunction is not placed at the end of a line, but at the beginning of a new line.<sup>53</sup> The same principle holds true for a negation like *non*. Examples are *non potestis* | *ου δυνασθαι* (fol. 126r, l. 4; Acts 15:1) and *et faciebant* | *και εποιουν* (fol. 126v, l. 8; Acts 15:3). An example of a special case of pattern 1 is *nisi* | *εαν μη* (fol. 125v, l. 25; Acts 15:1). Here, the Greek negation *μη* is not moved to a new line, precisely to keep the correspondence between the two languages: the Greek phrase, meaning ‘if not’, is mirrored by one Latin word only, in which the negation is already included. Heinrich Vogels, who examined the use of sense-lines in Codex Claromontanus, found that line endings with *και* (or with an article) are avoided there; he states that line breaks are found where there are natural caesurae in a complex sentence.<sup>54</sup>

In Codex Laudianus, the conjunction *sed* is presented in various ways. Sometimes, it is added to the constituent following it, like in *sed ut ne* | *αλλ εινα μη* (fol. 28r, l. 12; Acts 4:17) and *sed erat* | *αλλ ην* (fol. 32r, l. 5; Acts 4:32). At other times, it stands alone, particularly at the start of a new sentence (see, e.g., fol. 128r, l. 24 [Acts 15:11] and fol. 130r, l. 11 [Acts 15:20], where its Greek counterpart is likewise *αλλα*).<sup>55</sup> Further, the number of exceptions to pattern 1 in the selected

<sup>52</sup> For further reading, see, e.g., Evert van Emde Boas et al., *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2019, 289–292.

<sup>53</sup> The combination *τε και* is divided over two lines: *τε* at the end of the first line (enclitic and, therefore, added to the word preceding it) and *και* at the beginning of the second line. For an example, see *nos* | *ημων τε* // *et illos* | *και αυτων* (fol. 128r, ll. 2–3; Acts 15:9). Although *τε* is often left untranslated, it sometimes has a counterpart in Latin. See, e.g., *consuetudinesque* | *εθων τε* // *et quaestiones* | *και ζητηματων* (fol. 219r, ll. 3–4; Acts 26:3).

<sup>54</sup> “Die Zeile bricht also nicht, wie bei unseren älteren Majuskeln, mitten im Wort ab, sondern endet mit dem Wortende und schliesst auch so nicht mit jedem beliebigen *και* oder *την*, sondern läuft bis zu einer Stelle, wo ein natürlicher Einschnitt im Satzgefüge vorliegt.” Heinrich J. Vogels, „Der Codex Claromontanus der paulinischen Briefe“, in: Herbert G. Wood (ed.), *Amicitiae Corolla: A Volume of Essays Presented to James Rendel Harris on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*. University of London Press, London 1933, 274–299, here 279.

<sup>55</sup> On the other hand, *enim*, *quoque*, and *-que* are added to the words preceding them. See, e.g., *praecipere quoque* | *παράγγελλειν τε* (fol. 127r, l. 8; Acts 15:5) and *moyses enim* | *μωσης γαρ* (fol. 130r, l. 20; Acts 15:21).

chapters is limited. An example is *neque*, used twice (meaning ‘neither ... nor ...’), standing alone (fol. 128r, ll. 17–21; Acts 15:10; twice οὐτε in Greek).<sup>56</sup>

### Pattern 2: Twofold Constituents Divided over Two Lines

With respect to a twofold constituent, or a compound constituent divided over more lines, the coordinating conjunction(s) is (are) added to the latter (or following) part(s). Such a division is in line with Vogels’s places of natural caesurae (see above: pattern 1). It also tallies with the so-called principle of parallelism: in an article on intonation units and grammatical structure, William Croft points to parallelism as a factor in splitting up a grammatical unit into several—what is called—intonation units.<sup>57</sup> In cognitive and functional linguistic theories, an intonation unit (also called *information* unit) is considered an attention-regulating device: it is the verbalisation of an idea, a piece of information brought to the attention of the audience.<sup>58</sup> An example of pattern 2 is *paulo* | τῷ παύλῳ // *et barnabae* | καὶ βαρναβᾶ (fol. 126r, ll. 9–10; Acts 15:2).

Only two exceptions to this pattern were found in the selected chapters. They concern twofold constituents, one in the middle of the manuscript and one at the end: *et syriae et ciliciae* | καὶ συρίαν καὶ κίλικίαν (fol. 131r, l. 11; Acts 15:23) and *ueritatis et sobrietatis* | ἀληθείας καὶ σωφροσύνης (fol. 224r, l. 15; Acts 26:25).

Patterns 1 and 2 are indications that the sense-lines in Codex Laudianus served to make texts easily comparable. Words systematically placed at the start of a line, like the coordinating conjunction *et*, seem to have been used as some kind of anchor in the text. As such, these words gave the reader something to hold on to when comparing both texts.

### Pattern 3: Modifiers Separated from Their Nouns

Concretely, this pattern means that the noun (or pronoun) is separated from the participle that modifies it, including in the *ablativus/genitivus absolutus*. The noun is likewise separated from its modifying genitive, adjective, or (demonstrative or possessive) pronoun. The same holds true when the noun is part of a prepositional phrase containing an adjective or pronoun. Finally, the apposition, too, is separated from the noun.

Of the separation of a participle, the example of *descendentes* | κατελθόντες has already been given (see the text segmentation of the beginning of Acts 15:1 above).<sup>59</sup> An example of the splitting up of an *ablativus/genitivus absolutus* is *facta ergo* | γενομένης οὖν // *seditione* | στασεως (fol. 126r, ll. 6–7; Acts 15:2). For the separation of a genitive, see, e.g., *de heresi* | τῶν ἀπο τῆς αἵρεσεως // *farisaeorum* | τῶν φαρισαίων (fol. 127r, ll. 1–2; Acts 15:5). Here, the first article τῶν is not in a separate line: this situation may bring Vogels’s places of natural caesurae

<sup>56</sup> It does not stand alone in, e.g., *neque docerent* | μὴδὲ διδάσκιν (fol. 28v, l. 7; Acts 4:18) and *neque uos* | οὐτε ὑμεῖς // *neque magistratus* | οὐτε οἱ ἀρχόντες (fol. 42v, ll. 23–24; Acts 5:39).

<sup>57</sup> See William Croft, “Intonation Units and Grammatical Structure,” *Linguistics* 33 (1995) 839–882, here 850–856.

<sup>58</sup> In this respect, see also Rutger J. Allan, “Cola and Caesurae in the Homeric Hexameter: A Functional-Cognitive Approach to Colometry,” *Philologia antiqua* 16 (2023) 101–117, here 102.

<sup>59</sup> A rather rare exception found in the selected chapters is *apertas ianuas* | ἀνεωγμένας τὰς θύρας (fol. 141v, l. 7; Acts 16:27).

to mind (see above: pattern 1), but, in fact, *των* simply does not have a counterpart in the Latin text. An example of an adjective separated from its noun is *gaudium*<sup>c</sup> | *χαράν* // *magnum* | *μεγαλην* (fol. 126v, ll. 9–10; Acts 15:3). For an example of the separation of a demonstrative pronoun, see *de quaestione* | *περι του ζητηματος* // *hac* | *τουτου* (fol. 126r, ll. 22–23; Acts 15:2). An instance of a prepositional phrase split up is *per omne* | *κατα παν* // *sabbatum* | *σαββατον* (fol. 130v, ll. 4–5; Acts 15:21). An example of the separation of an apposition is *uiri* | *ανδρες* // *fratres* | *αδελφοι* (fol. 127r, ll. 24–25; Acts 15:7). In fact, the separation of an apposition is also in agreement with Croft’s principle of parallelism (see above: pattern 2).<sup>60</sup>

Again, in several Latin lines where the modifier is *not* separated, this is due to the Greek text. The reason can be a Greek compound noun, like in *qui cordis cognitor es*\* | *και ο καρδιογνωστης* (fol. 127v, l. 15; Acts 15:8) and *custodi carceris* | *τω δεσμωφυλακι* (fol. 140v, l. 9; Acts 16:23). It is also possible that a Latin *phrase* was chosen to correspond to one Greek *word* (not a compound). Examples are *et maiores natu* | *και πρεσβυτερους* (fol. 126r, l. 20; Acts 15:2) and *uos ipsos* | *εαυτους* (fol. 132v, l. 12; Acts 15:29). In the first example, the ablative of specification *natu* is therefore added to the nominalised adjective *maiores*, while the second example concerns a counterpart of a form of the pronoun *εαυτον*. Of note, forms of the possessive pronouns *meus* and *tuus* are systematically in the same line as the nouns that they modify. Examples are *per os meum* | *δια στοματος μου* (fol. 127v, l. 9; Acts 15:7) and *nomen meum* | *το ονομα μου* (fol. 129v, l. 13; Acts 15:17). Forms of *noster* or *uester*, on the other hand, are separated. As mentioned before, *μου* and *σου* are enclitics, because of which they are considered one unit with the preceding word.

#### Pattern 4: Meaningful Combinations with Adverbs

Adverbs such as those of place and time (e.g., *ubique* and *tunc*) usually stand alone. However, there are a few combinations in which an adverb is added to the word or phrase following it. Such combinations make sense: they are meaningful units. Examples are *sicut ignis* | *ωσει πυρος* (fol. 7v, l. 20; Acts 2:3), *quasi quinque milia* | *ωσει χιλιαδες πεντε* (fol. 25r, l. 12; Acts 4:4), and *quam deum* | *η του θυ* (fol. 28v, l. 24; Acts 4:19). Combinations like these are an indication that, in addition to the comparison of individual words or short phrases (almost like in a glossary), the meaning of phrases—sense-units—was also taken into consideration in the text segmentation.

My analysis of the use of sense-lines in the Laudian Acts points to a combination of syntax and semantics as the guiding principle for the text segmentation. The four specifying patterns which I have discerned give the impression that the purpose of this text segmentation was to facilitate comparison between both texts as much as possible, by giving fixed positions to frequently occurring words like *et* and *non* (among other things). In large measure, the shortness of the sense-lines is reminiscent of a glossary in which the meaning of (almost) individual words can be ‘looked up’. However, certain combinations with, e.g., enclitics or adverbs hint that the meaning of small phrases—units—also played a part in the text segmentation.

<sup>60</sup> The following exception to pattern 3 was found: *iacobus alpheï* | *ιακωβος αλφαιου* // *et simon zelotes* | *και σιμων ο ζηλωτης* // *et iudas iacobi* | *και ιουδας ιακωβου* (fol. 4r, ll. 12–14; Acts 1:13). In this case, pattern 2 appears to take priority over pattern 3. Something similar is found in *et populo istrachel*<sup>f</sup> | *και λαος ισραηλ* (fol. 30v, l. 17; Acts 4:27).

## IV. Conclusions

Codex Laudianus is one of the Greek-Latin manuscripts of the New Testament written in sense-lines. As pointed out by previous scholarship, the use of sense-lines in bilingual manuscripts served to easily compare two versions of a text. The segmentation of the Laudian Acts appears to have been made from a Greek perspective, as is clear from combinations due to, e.g., enclitics. Further, there are several signs that the scribe also had a Greek background, such as the influence of Greek on the Latin script as well as the Greek subscription without any Latin counterpart.

The mention of the Byzantine official Flavios Pankratios (at the end of the codex) and the reference to Sardinia as the manuscript's potential place of origin (in secondary literature) reinforce the impression that Codex Laudianus was produced in an environment of mainly Greek speakers who were less acquainted with Latin—or, at least, in an environment in which using Greek to help understanding Latin was advisable. The two columns with very short sense-lines recall the Latin-Greek Virgil and Cicero papyri found in Egypt. The format and text segmentation of Codex Laudianus are indeed indications that this manuscript served as an aid as well. It may well have been a tool for learning—self-teaching—one of the two languages. Given its position in the right column (among other things), the language to be learnt is likely to have been Latin.