

luscianus. Gamaliel compa-
 tens xpi ministro. et festinans
 habere mercedem et partem cu
 scathro. nisi per noctem quan-
 tos nouerim religiosos et in xpo
 ihu credentes. habitantes in
 ierlm in medio iudeoru. orta-
 tus sum eos et necessaria substan-
 tia ministraui. ac persuasi illis
 ut occulte ut portarent eius
 corpus in eo uehiculo in uillam
 meam hoc est in gapargamala
 quod interpretatur uillam ga-
 malielis uiginti milia obcurta-
 te abneq. et ibi planctu fieri
 dieb. xl. et posui eu in monum
 to meo nouo in orientali teta.
 Iussit et precepi eis ut quaecumq.
 necessaria erant pro eius planctu
 ex meo darent. Ipse eni dominus
 nichodemus in alia teta positus
 est qui uenit ad saluatorem
 hominu noctu. et euangeli-
 zatus est. ab eo audiens. Nisi quis renatus
 fuerit ex aqua et spu sco non po-
 test introire in regnum celoy
 et abiens baptizatus est a xpi
 discipulis. Et cognoscentes iudei
 amouerunt eu a principatu suo
 et anathematisauerunt eum
 et de ciuitate exiliauerunt.
 Et tunc ego gamaliel quasi per
 secutionem passum pro xpo fusti

scriptis uiginti annis
 te me mortuus est
 excelsiore in qua et
 defunctus ad plic
 uero uxor eterna h
 et sedemus primog
 ms qui noluerunt e
 aliam uillam matru
 hoc est in caper simu
 autem ego eum bun
 pbr dicens. Et ubi
 qui michi dixit. In
 quod potest intell
 de uilla ager qu
 bn qd interpretat
 Et euigilaui et de
 dnm dicens. Dne i
 ista uisitatio exte
 lusio. fac ut tunc et
 appareat. qndo
 ut possum cognosce
 Tueni dixisti in tua
 uia et ueritas et ut
 humilis lucianus
 reuelatione uidi
 bulatio erat in uni
 do. et tunc cepit ur
 ducere ad aliu pa
 ttm ipse dominus g
 similitudine et eod
 apparuit mi. chi
 glexisti ut et dicer
 Et cito responde et

MANUSCRIPTA

A Journal for Manuscript Research

Thank you for your
generous advice on the
provenience of this MS.
CG



ISSN 0025-2603

March 1998 (appeared April 2001)

A NEW MANUSCRIPT OF LUCIAN'S LETTER ON THE DISCOVERY OF THE RELICS OF ST. STEPHEN (CPL 575)*

Craig A. Gibson
University of Iowa

In 1991 the Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library at Duke University acquired a single mutilated leaf of a Latin manuscript (now Dukianus latinus 158) of Lucian's letter on the discovery of St. Stephen's relics, written A.D. 415.¹ Vanderlinden's edition of the Latin text of this work reports the existence of several different Latin recensions. There is a short recension (which Vanderlinden labels A or A'), represented by five manuscripts dating from the eleventh to the fifteenth centuries; a long recension (B), represented by fifteen manuscripts dating from the tenth to the thirteenth centuries; a recension derived from both the long and short recensions (A'), represented by nineteen manuscripts dating from the tenth to the fifteenth centuries; and a fourth recension (C), which is not discussed in detail nor its manuscripts collated. The Dukianus (saec. X/XI, Switzerland) is an excellent new representative of the A recension and a significant discovery for two further reasons: it appears to be the oldest known manuscript of the A recension, and it preserves a unique version of a group of lines found only in one branch of the A recension. The present collation and palaeographical study is intended as a contribution toward the goal of better understanding the transmission of this popular Christian text.

Historical Background²

Writing in December of 415, Lucian, the presbyter of Caphargamala,³ tells us that earlier in that month he had received a series of visions of the Rabbi Gamaliel (*Rev.* 1–2). The Gamaliel to whom he refers, as we learn from Acts 5:34–39, was a Pharisee and member of the Sanhedrin who is most famous for his speech urging the Sadducees not to kill the disciples Peter and John.⁴ According to Lucian, Gamaliel directed him to dig at Caphargamala for a tomb containing the bodies of Gamaliel, Gamaliel's wife and son, Nicodemus, and St. Stephen (*Rev.* 3–31).⁵ Unsure how and whether to proceed, Lucian sent a message to John, bishop of Jerusalem, who was then at a synod in Diospolis defending Pelagius against the attacks of Orosius (*Rev.* 32).⁶ Upon hearing Lucian's report, John directed him to follow Gamaliel's instructions and search for the tomb. The excavation was at first unsuccessful; Lucian needed more specific instructions about where to look (*Rev.* 35). After Gamaliel appeared once more to a local monk (*Rev.* 36–41), Lucian located the tomb and sent a report of his success to John

(Rev. 42–44). John responded by coming to Caphargamala with two colleagues to inspect the site (Rev. 44). He later arranged for the relics to be translated to the church of Sion in Jerusalem (Rev. 48).

Hunt (1982, 217–20) has made the attractive suggestion that the discovery of St. Stephen's relics at Caphargamala at precisely the time when the synod was being held nearby at Diospolis could only have increased the standing of John in the eyes of the other bishops; "it was not, after all, every council of the church which was favoured by so evident a token of divine intervention." Whatever the reasons, Pelagius, with the help of his supporter John, was absolved by the synod. As the unsuccessful Orosius was preparing to leave Palestine, he was summoned by his countryman Avitus of Braga (on whom see, e.g., Altaner [1941]), who reported that he had secretly obtained a portion of St. Stephen's relics from Lucian (Ep. 7). Avitus, ostensibly afraid of traveling himself (Ep. 3–4), asked Orosius to deliver the relics, together with a letter of introduction and a Latin translation of Lucian's Greek account of his experience (Ep. 8–9), to their bishop Balchonius at Braga (Ep. 1). But the relics never reached their intended destination. Fear of traveling in the Iberian peninsula forced Orosius to leave part of them at Minorca; of the rest, some went to Ancona and some to Uzalis in North Africa. The North African relics generated miracles, encouraged pilgrimage, and became the inspiration for a prominent cult of St. Stephen.⁷ The letter of Lucian, moreover, was to enjoy a popularity far beyond its immediate purpose and audience. As the letter and the cult were disseminated from the fifth century onward — the dissemination of the letter, it has been suggested (Hartdegen 1967, 692), aiding greatly in the dissemination of the cult — the number of Latin and Greek recensions multiplied, and the letter was also eventually translated into Syriac, Armenian, Georgian, and Ethiopic versions.⁸ So far as we know now, the Dukianus is one of the earliest extant Latin manuscripts of this letter's long and complex tradition.

Physical and Palaeographical Description

Each side of the Dukianus (hereafter *D*) originally contained two columns of 39 lines each. From calculations based on Vanderlinden's printed edition, it appears that the full copy of the letter of Lucian would then have occupied about four manuscript pages. Furthermore, since the text contained in *D* comes from approximately the center of Lucian's letter, we may deduce that the full copy of the letter began near the top of the verso of the leaf preceding our leaf and concluded near the bottom of the recto of the leaf following. *D* has been neatly trimmed at the top, the bottom, and along one side. See Figs. 1–2. It opens with *[u]llus canis* (Vanderlinden's paragraph 10) and closes with *consurgeret et* (his paragraph 35). The trimming at the top and bottom has eliminated ca. 6 lines from each column; it is impossible to know how

these six lines were distributed (e.g. three at the top and three at the bottom, or four at the top and two at the bottom, etc.). The trimming along the side has eliminated ca. 10 letters plus the right margin of recto, col. 2, and ca. 10 letters plus the left margin of verso, col. 1. The fully preserved columns are 8.5 cm. wide; the space between columns is 1.5–1.8 cm.; the outer margin is 2.5–2.8 cm.; the trimmed leaf is 18.5 cm. × 25.5 cm. The size of the original upper and lower margins is unknown, but the original leaf before trimming must have measured at least 24.0 cm. × 30.0 cm. It is possible that someone had planned to use the leaf as a decorative pastedown for the inside cover of a printed book, but if so, this plan was certainly not carried out. The circumstances of the manuscript's orderly mutilation must remain a mystery.

The page has been laid out with both horizontal and vertical dry ruling. The manuscript is written in a wide but not tall Caroline script, predominantly vertical but at times leaning forward. Minims before the terminating minim do not have finishing strokes. Word separation is irregular. The manuscript is written in a medium to dark brown ink, and a darker ink is used in writing over erasures. Capital letters are regularly filled in with red, which has now faded to a dull orange color. The general appearance of the text suggests a date of saec. X/XI, with a Swiss origin likely.⁹ The closest parallel to the script is found in Bamberg, Staatsbibl., Lit. 59, a manuscript from Verden or Aller dated to the second quarter of the eleventh century.¹⁰ The script of the Bamberg manuscript is more regular in spacing and more rounded and graceful in overall appearance than that of the Dukianus, suggesting a later date and a more accomplished scribe. The forms of the letters *a*, *g*, and *h* (discussed below) are very similar in the two manuscripts. Another close parallel is found in St. Gall, Stiftsbibliothek, 204, a manuscript from St. Gall dating to the first half of the tenth century.¹¹ As with the Dukianus, the St. Gall manuscript's words are rather tightly spaced. Its forms of *g* and *h* are similar to those of the Dukianus, but its *a* is not upright.

The script of the Dukianus features a dotted *y* that rests on the line, *z* in the form of a large *c* with cancelled tail and added 7-stroke, a high *st* ligature, *orum* ligature, *a* and *d* with vertical hastae (*a* is never open, and uncial *d* is never used), an *f* whose shaft ends about at the base line, a flat-topped *g* with the upper bow completely closed and the lower almost completely closed (typical of Swiss manuscripts), an *h* with a curled bow that does not always touch the base line (also typical of Swiss manuscripts), and frequently used *e*-caudata for *ae*. A third hand (discussed below) uses an uncial *e* in the correction of *do* to *de* (par. 24). Punctuation in *D* includes a low point, a midpoint, and a wavy oblique question mark. Many of these punctuation marks are further distinguished by delicate, rightward sloping virgules above the point. By far the most frequent abbreviation is the horizontal stroke, which the scribe uses for *m* and *n*, as well as in standard abbreviations such as *est*

and *enim* and *iterum*, and in the *nomina sacra*. The scribe's use of the horizontal stroke for final *m* twice results in error (*ducerem*, par. 17; *ipsam tertiam visionem*, par. 30); other errors in *m* may stem from similar errors in the exemplar (*in villam mean*, *Gapargamalam*, *interpretatur villam*, par. 11; *aliam villam*, par. 15). We also see a small 7-shaped mark with vestigial upper element used above the line for final *us*. A larger form of this abbreviation, with a more pronounced upper element, is used on the line in *bus*, below the line in *que*, and as the final element in the formation of the letter *z*. Some errors result from differences in aspiration; this occurs both in the original hand (e.g. *hubi* for *ubi*, pars. 16 and 30; *ortatus* for *hortatus*, par. 11; *hostium* for *ostium*, par. 23) and in the second hand (e.g. *Gamaliehel* for *Gamaliel*, par. 11 and 13).

The scribe corrects himself by inserting letters above and by erasing. The most extensive correction made by the original hand is *sic ... operarium* (par. 31), which has been written over a heavily erased area of the verso, column 2. A second hand (perhaps nearly contemporary) makes additional corrections, in a very light brown ink, by inserting letters above and cancelling letters with diagonal strokes. A third hand intervenes at only one point (*diligenterque*, par. 21). At two places, an unidentified corrector has inserted slender vertical lines to clarify word separations (between [*i*]ntroitu and *monument*[*i*], par. 23, and between *carri* and *tractorem*, par. 30).

The manuscript also contains two twentieth-century notes in pencil, each by a different hand (note the formation of the numeral 2 in each). In the lower right hand corner of the verso is what appears to be a catalog number, "VM 5402." This is not mentioned in the Special Collection Library's acquisition files and I have no further information about its significance. The other note, two lines in a cursive hand, is found on the recto, in the left margin opposite lines 12–15, and is written at about a 45° angle. It reads "Voir planche 22/Mss de St Petersburg" (no punctuation or accentuation). J. Griffiths takes the second note to refer to A. Staerk (1910). This seems a valid assumption, since "Staerk, Mss. de St.-Petersbourg" is the abbreviation for Staerk (1910) in CLA (1934–72, Part XI). But Plate 22 of Staerk, as Griffiths also points out, is an eighth- or ninth-century manuscript in insular uncial and does not provide a useful parallel to our manuscript. I have not found another volume of Latin manuscripts from St. Petersburg to which this remark could refer.

Relationship of D to the Manuscript Tradition

The A and B recensions of Lucian's letter are so different from each other that Vanderlinden chooses to print them as parallel texts and makes no attempt to reconcile them. The manuscripts of the A recension (Vanderlinden 1946, 181) fall into two groups, which are labeled Group

1 (consisting of two manuscripts, 1a and 1b, both *saec.* XIV) and Group 2 (consisting of three manuscripts, 2a, 2b, and 2c, *saec.* XI–XV). Vanderlinden's text is printed from manuscript 1a (Paris, Bibl. Nat., Ms. N. a. 1405, ff. 58r–60v, *saec.* XIV). The collation of *D* with Vanderlinden's edition shows that *D* is closely related to the A recension, Group 2.¹² *D* frequently agrees in error with all the manuscripts of Group 2 against Group 1, and equally often with 2a and 2b together against 2c. It rarely agrees with 2a alone (*de veteri testa[mento]* [Rev. par. 24]), 2b alone (*noctu* [par. 12]; *susti[nui]* [par. 13]), 2a and 2c together against 2b (*posui* [par. 11]; [*h*]abentes et tertius [par. 22]), and 2b and 2c together against 2a (*calathos id est in* [par. 24]; *in lo[co excelso]* [par. 24]). It never agrees with 2c against 2a and 2b together.

The Dukianus contains a variant of a group of lines found only in the manuscripts of the A recension, Group 2. In Rev. par. 17, Lucian prays as follows: ... *fac ut iterum et tertio appareat mihi quando vis et quomodo vis*. The manuscripts of the A recension, Group 2, continue with the following additional text: *ut possim cognoscere veritatem. Tu enim dixisti in evangelio: ego sum veritas et vita. Ego autem Lucianus quando hanc visionem vidi, siccitas et tribulatio erat in toto mundo. D* also contains this group of lines, with several variants:

evangelio: aeva[ngelio] *D* — veritas: via et veritas *D* — Lucianus: humilis Lucianus *D* — visionem: revelationem *D* — toto: uni[verso] *D*

The form *aevangelio* is a simple orthographical error. The words *revelationem* and *universo* are acceptable synonyms for *visionem* and *toto*, respectively, and may have crept in through glosses. On the other hand, *visionem* and *toto* could just as easily have replaced *revelationem* and *universo*. It is impossible to say for sure which is the preferred reading. The word *humilis* had appeared as Lucian's epithet only a few lines earlier, but it is difficult to know whether this reading is to be preferred. Did it creep into *D* through its proximity to the other occurrence of *humilis*, or was the second *humilis* accidentally dropped from the other MSS?

The remaining disagreement (*veritas: via et veritas D*) is more interesting. The accidental omission of *via et* from this popular passage (John 14:6) is unthinkable. As an intentional rhetorical move by the author, however, it could be very effective. Lucian requests another vision, "so that [he] may be able to grasp the truth." As support for his request, he continues, "For you said in the Gospel: I am the ... *truth* and the life" (emphasis and ellipses mine). The surprising omission of the words *via et* would have the effect of drawing special attention to the word *veritas*. When the scribe of *D* was confronted with this "omission," however, either he assumed that it was a mistake in the exemplar and restored the full quotation, or the phrase was so familiar to him that he accidentally added the words *via et*.

Collation of Dukianus latinus 158 (D)

I have collated *D* with the text and apparatus criticus of Vanderlinden, using the following sigla: *D* is the original hand of Dukianus latinus 158. *D*¹ represents the original hand correcting itself. *D*² and *D*³ represent the second and third hands respectively. All other sigla are taken from Vanderlinden. Square brackets denote letters supplied in lacunae. Following each variant, I note in parentheses the groups or individual manuscripts of the A recension (if any) which share the reading of *D*. Vanderlinden's stemma suggests that the manuscripts of Group 2 have been influenced by the A' recension. This hypothesis is corroborated by three readings in *D*: *eius corpus* [Rev. par. 11], *Sedemias* [par. 15] et *eod[em]* [par. 18], these being noted also in the collation. Minor variations in orthography (e.g. *michi* for *mihi*) are not noted, except where they cause error, as with *irae* for *ire* (par. 11).

10 non canis: [ul]lus canis *D* (2ab)¹³ — 11 compatiens: compatens *D* — fidei *om.* *D* (2) — hortatus: ortatus *D* — et hortatus: et *om.* *D* (1a, 2b) — ire: irae *D* — et portare: ut portarent *D* (1a, 2) — corpus eius: corpus *D* (3) — periculo: vehiculo *D* (2ab) — in villa mea: in villam meam *D* (1, 2ab) — Caphargamala: Gapargamalam *D* (1, 2ab acc.) — interpretatur villa: interpretatur villam *D* — Gamalielis: Gamalielis *D*, Gamalihelis *D*² — milliaria: milia *D*, miliaria *D*² — a civitate habens: ob civitatem abnes *D* — feci illi *om.* *D* — poni: posui *D* (1b, 2ac) — meo monumento: monumento meo *D* — et precepi: iussi et precepi *D* (2ab) — planctu: plantu *D*, planctu *D*² — de meo: ex meo *D* (1, 2) — 12 nocte: noctu *D* (2b) — catechizatus: evangelizatus *D* (2) — intrare: introire *D* (2) — iens: abiens *D* (2ab) — 13 et hunc: et tunc *D* (2ab) — Gamaliel: Gamaliel *D*, Gamalihel *D*² — sustuli: susti[nui (?)] *D* (2b) — 14 excelsiori: excelsiore *D* (1a, 2ab) — sum *om.* *D* — applicitus: adplica[tus] *D* (1a, 2ab) — 15 Selemias: Sedemias *D* (5a) — quia: qui *D* — alia villa: aliam villam *D* — Capharselemia: Capersimi[lia (?)] *D* (2ab) — 16 humilis: eum humilis *D* (2ab) — ubi: hubi *D* — dixit mihi: michi dixit *D* (2ab) — ager qui: ager qua[e] *D* — 17 Deum: dominum *D* (2) — visio: visitatio *D* (2a) — appareat mihi: [michi (?)] appareat *D* (1a, 2) — quomodo vis: [quomodo vis] ut possim cognoscer[e veritatem.] Tu enim dixisti in aeva[n]gelio, Ego sum] via et veritas et vi[ta. Ego autem] humilis Lucianus [quando hanc] revelationem vidi, [siccitas et tri]bulatio erat in uni[verso mun]do *D* (cf. 2)¹⁴ — coepi: caepieun[are] *D*, caepi ieun[are] *D*¹ — ergo *om.* *D* (2) — ducere: ducerem *D* — usque: *om.* *D* — 18 eodemque: et eod[em] *D* (3g) — mihi: michichi *D*, michi *D*¹ ut vid. — sicut in primo visu forsitan in *D* defuerit — 20 et iterum dixit *om.* *D* — 21 diligenter quae: digenter *D*, diligenter *D*², diligenterque *D*³ — 22 et tertius: [h]abentes et tertius *D* (2ac) — croco: groco *D*, croco *D*² — 23 quid sunt isti: quae sunt haec *D* (2) — lipsana: lympsamna *D* — rubeas: rubicundas *D* (2) — positus est ad: positus est ab *D* (2) — domnus: donus *D*, domnus *D*¹ — ostium: hostium *D* — 24 argenteus est: argenteus *D* — deuterotes tou

nomou: do (?) veteri testa[mento] *D*, de veteri testa[mento] *D*² ut vid. (2a) — calathio in: calathio id est in *D* (2bc) — in excelso loco: in lo[co excelso (?)] *D* (2bc) — ambo: iam *D* (2ab) — 25 minitans: militans *D*, minitans *D*² — 29 quasi: quia *D* — 30 ipsa tertia visione: ipsam tertiam visionem *D* — oportet: oportet *D* (1, 2a) — aratorem *om.* *D* — ubi: hubi *D* — 31 laborantem in eo: laborantem laborantem in eo *D*, corr. *D*¹ — sic ... operarium: in ras. *D*¹ — colligam: tollam *D* (1a, 2) — 35 minutorum: munitorum *D* — ubi: urbi *D* — venissem: venissem autem *D* (2ab) — villam: villam quae suprascripta est *D* (2) — consurgerent: consurgent *D*, consurgerent *D*²

NOTES

*I wish to thank Prof. Francis Newton, Joshua D. Sosin, the staff of the Rare Book, Manuscript and Special Collections Library at Duke University, and the editors of *Manuscripta* for their valuable advice and assistance.

1. Various titles; see *CPL* 575. The most recent edition of the Latin text is that by Vanderlinden (1946). I have not been able to examine other manuscripts of this work first-hand. Dukianus latinus 158 was formerly identified in the library's records as "Gamaliel fragment" or "Gospel of Gamaliel" (in the collection's "Early Manuscripts Shelf List"), as it was thought to be a Latin translation of the apocryphal Gospel of Gamaliel, on which work see Elliott (1993, 159–60). The manuscript was previously described in an unpublished report by Jeremy Griffiths of St. John's College, Oxford. A copy of this report was provided to me by the Special Collections Library.

2. Lucian's letter (*Revelatio Sancti Stephani*, hereafter *Rev.*) and its accompanying cover letter (*Epistula Aviti*, hereafter *Ep.*) are the only literary sources for the discovery of St. Stephen's relics. The letter's historical veracity is generally not questioned; cf. Peeters (1950, 55). For discussions of the letter and its historical circumstances, see Hunt (1982, 203–20), Peeters (1950, 53–58), Chadwick (1976, 178 and 190); and the brief account by Vanderlinden (1946, 178–80). Cf. Wermelinger (1975, 89 n. 3).

3. Either Beit-el-jemal (to the southwest of Jerusalem) or Jemmala (to the northwest of Jerusalem). Cf. Hunt (1982, 216–17), who prefers Jemmala.

4. On Gamaliel and his speech, see Chilton (1992), Bauernfeind (1980, 94–97), Barrett (1994–98, 1: 292–98), and Trumbower (1993).

5. For Gamaliel and Nicodemus as Christian converts, see Hunt (1982, 215–16), Hartdegen (1967). Stephen was martyred soon after Gamaliel's above-mentioned speech. For a full discussion of his trial and death, see Watson (1996).

6. Orosius had left Braga in 414 to study with Augustine at Hippo and was sent by him to Jerusalem to represent orthodoxy in the Pelagian controversy. For a chronological overview of the Pelagian controversy, see Rees (1988, 140–42); for the proceedings of the synod at Diospolis, see 135–39.

7. Vanderlinden (1946, 179–80). On the miracles and their literary sources, see Delehaye (1975, 74–85), Hartdegen (1967). In general on the role of relics in this period, see Hunt (1982, 128–54, esp. 131–34).

8. Vanderlinden (1945, 180 n. 18). An impressionistic comparison of the Latin and Greek versions is provided by Martin (1958).

9. Griffiths, following the opinion of M.B. Parkes (cited in Griffiths' report), dated the manuscript to the mid-tenth century and also believed that it was produced in a Swiss monastic center.

10. See Hoffmann (1986, 1: p. 185, 2: Pl. 54). For its date and provenience, see Leitschuh (1966, 206–07). In personal correspondence dated 5 May 1997, Prof. Dr. Hoffmann drew my attention to another potential parallel, Vaticanus Palatinus latinus 3

(saec. XI, Italy); see Berschin (1992, 19–21). To my eye, however, the Swiss MS is a closer match.

11. See Plate 33 and p. 82 in Bruckner (1936–38). This excellent parallel is mentioned in Griffiths' report.

12. The manuscripts of Group 2 include the following: an edition of Mombritius (saec. XV) derived from an unknown manuscript (=2a); Brussels, Bibl. Royale 64, ff. 145r–146v (saec. XI) (=2b); and Brussels, Bibl. Royale 98–100, ff. 122v–123v (saec. XI) (=2c) (Vanderlinden 1946, 181).

13. Vanderlinden's manuscript 2a reads *non ullus canis*, while 2b reads *nec ullus canis*. Since the Dukianus rarely agrees with either of these manuscripts alone (see above, p. 57), it is not possible to say which reading would more likely have occurred in it. Even *nullus canis* would be a possibility, though this reading does not occur in any of the manuscripts surveyed by Vanderlinden.

14. Cf my remarks on p. 57 above.

REFERENCES AND ABBREVIATIONS

- Altaner, B. 1941. "Avitus von Braga: Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Literaturgeschichte." *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 60: 456–68.
- Anchor Bible Dictionary*, The. David Noel Freedman, editor-in-chief. Associate editors Gary A. Herion, David F. Graf, John David Pleins. Managing editor Astrid B. Beck. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, c1992.
- Ep.* = Avitus Bracarenis. *Epistula*. In Vanderlinden (1946, 188–89).
- Barrett, Charles Kingsley. 1994–98. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* ... 2 vols. The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Bauernfeind, Otto. 1980. *Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* ... Mit einer Einleitung von Martin Hengel, herausgegeben von Volker Metelmann. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 22. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (P. Siebeck).
- Berschin, Walter. 1992. *Die Palatina in der Vaticana: eine deutsche Bibliothek in Rom* ... Stuttgart: Belser.
- BHL* = *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina antiquae et mediae aetatis*. Ediderunt Socii Bollandiani. 2 vols. Subsidia hagiographica 6. Bruxellis: Socii Bollandiani, 1898–1901. — Paged continuously: Supplementum pp. [1305]–1387.
- Bruckner, Albert, ed. 1936–38. *Schreibschulen der Diözese Konstanz: St. Gallen* ... 2 vols. Vols. 2–3 of the editor's *Scriptoria medii aevi Helvetica* ... Genf: Verlag Roto-Sadag.
- Chadwick, Henry. 1976. *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church* ... Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Chilton, Bruce. 1992. "Gamaliel (2)." In *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 2: 904–06.
- CLA* = Lowe, Elias A. 1934–72. *Codices latini antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century* ... 11 vols. + supplement. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.
- CPL* = Dekkers, Eligius, and Emil Gaar. 1995 *Clavis patrum latinorum: qua in corpus christianorum edendum optimas quasque scriptorum recensiones a Tertulliano ad Bedam*. Commode recludit Eligius Dekkers, opera usus qua rem praeparavit et iuvit Aemilius Gaar. Editio tertia, aucta et emendata. Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina. Steenbrugis: In Abbatia Sancti Petri.
- Delehay, H. 1975. "Les recueils antiques des miracles des Saints." *Analecta Bollandiana* 43: 1–85.
- Elliott, J. K., ed. 1993. *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation*. [Edited by] J. K. Elliott. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press.

- Griffiths, Jeremy. [Unpublished report on what is now Dukianus latinus 158].
- Hartdegen, S. J. 1967. "Stephen (Protomartyr), St." In *NCE* 13: 692–94.
- Hoffmann, Hartmut. 1986. *Buchkunst und Königtum im ottonischen und frühsalischen Reich* ... 2 vols. Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica 30. Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann.
- Hunt, E. D. 1982. *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire, AD 312–460* ... Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leitschuh, Friedrich. 1966. *Katalog der Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Bamberg* ... Erster Band, Erste Abtheilung, *Bibelhandschriften [und] liturgische Handschriften*. Revidierter Nachdruck der Ausgabe von 1895[–1898]. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Martin, J. 1958. "Die revelatio S. Stephani und Verwandtes." *Historisches Jahrbuch* 77: 419–33.
- NCE* = *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. Prepared by an editorial staff at The Catholic University of America, Washington, District of Columbia. 15 vols. New York [etc.]: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Peeters, Paul. 1950. *Orient et Byzance: le tréfonds oriental de l'hagiographie byzantine*. Subsidia hagiographica 26. Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes.
- Rees, Brinley Roderick. 1988. *Pelagius, a Reluctant Heretic* ... Woodbridge, Suffolk; Wolfboro, New Hampshire: Boydell Press.
- Rev.* = Lucianus. *Revelatio Sancti Stephani*. In Vanderlinden (1946, 190–217).
- Staerk, Antonio. 1976. *Les manuscrits latins du V^e au XIII^e siècle conservés à la Bibliothèque Impériale de Saint-Petersbourg*. 2 vols. Hildesheim; New York: Georg Olms Verlag. — Nachdruck der Ausgabe Saint-Petersbourg: Franz Krois, 1910.
- Trumbower, Jeffrey A. 1993. "The Historical Jesus and the Speech of Gamaliel (*Acts* 5.35–39)." *New Testament Studies* 39: 500–17.
- Vanderlinden, E. 1946. "Revelatio Sancti Stephani (*BHL* 7850–6)." *Revue des Études Byzantines* 4: 178–217.
- Watson, Alan. 1996. *The Trial of Stephen: The First Christian Martyr* ... Athens: University of Georgia Press.
- Wermelinger, Otto. 1975. *Rom und Pelagius: die theologische Position der römischen Bischöfe im pelagianischen Streit in den Jahren 411–432* ... Päpste und Papsttum 7. Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann.

luseani. ego gamaliel compa-
rens xpi ministro. et festinans
habere mercedem et partem cu
sco thro. misi per noctem quan-
tos noueram religiosos et in xpo
ibu credentes. habitantes in
iherosolymis in medio iudeoru. orta
tus sum eos et necessaria substan-
tia ministerui. ac persuasi illis
ut occulte ut portarent eius
corpus in eo uehiculo in uillam
meam hoc est in gapargamula
quod interpretatur uillam ga-
malieus uiginti milia obducit
te abneq. et ibi planctu fieri
dixi. xl. et posui eu in monum
to meo nouo in orientali teca.
Iussit et precepit ut quicumq.
necessaria erant procius plaritu
ex meo darent. Ipse eni dominus
nichodemus in alia teca positus
est qui uenit ad saluatorem
thm noctu. et euangeli. et uise.
ab eo audiens. nisi quis renatus
fuerit ex aqua et spu sco non po-
test introire in regnum celoy
et abiens baptizatus est xpi
discipulis. Et cognoscentes iudei
amouerunt eu a principatu suo
et anathematizauerunt eum
et de ciuitate exiliauerunt.
Et tunc ego gamaliel quasi per-
secutionem passum pro xpo susti-

sepelis uiginti annu
te me mortuus est.
excellentior in qua et
defunctus ad plio
uero uxor et hna h
et sedemas primog
nis qui noluerunt e
aliam uillam matru
hoc est in caper simi
autem ego eum hui
pbr dicens. Et. ubi
qui michi dixit. In
quod potest intell
de uilla ager qui
bri qd interpretat
Et euigilaui et de
dnm dicens. Dne u
ista uisitatio exi
lusio. fac ut ttm ei
appareat. qndo
ut possim cognoscere
Tu eni dixisti in eu
uia et ueritas et ut
humilis lucianus
reuelatione uidi
bulatio erat in uni
do. et tunc cepit ui
ducere ad aliu tpa
tm ipse dominus ex
similitudine et eod
apparuit mi. dxi
glexisti ut et dicer
Et ego respondit.

et michi qm requi
i singuloru qm do
posuit appone sen
de d. genit. osten
et dixi. Et ad dne. Et
et quattuor calatos
et unu argenteum.
emerant rosas. duo
bentes. et certus
habens quasi san
us uero calatus ar
nistrat. et dico. be
posuit eos ante
fieri. Quae sunt hec
et michi ymptana.
in ubi cundas habet
et dominus stephan
et positus est ab
et rotu monumentu
us dohus nichode
us contra hostium.
ilatus argenteus ab
usms. de ueteri testa
tutus in lege in ma
tero matris sue. con
ocalato. idem in lo
ibi iam positus sumus
u. et ttm euigila
et ieiunauisq. ad
teu. et ecce ttm
militudine et simi
paruit michi. militans
et dxi. Dne. Quare tan

uero hora uidi quia. et nichipo
que supra scripte sunt uisionem
et audio ipsu papa dicente michi
sic in ipsa terna uisione. Sibe
ita uidisti dilectissime. me oportet
accipere inde bouem mas
culum amaxicon. quod in os por
sumus caritatore. et ope
rarum et dimitte tibi agri
ubi sunt fructus et dixi illi.
Dne ut quid michi agrum. Si
non habeo bouem laborante
in eo. Et ait michi epi.
sic placuit ut ego tollam inde
bouem masculu astatorem ama
xicon opertarium. Et statim eu
gilaui et uidi et dixi cuncta
sco epd iohi et omi legocius.
Dixit autem michi. Vade et fode
in aceruo qui est in ipso agro
et si in ueneris nuntia michi.
et ego dixi. De ambulaui
agri. et uidi aceru uimitor
lapidum in medio u. bi arbi
trabareosee. Et dixit michi
papa. Vade et fode. et si inue
neris sedens custodi locum. et
manda michi per diaconu ut
ueniam ad locu. et tme di
misit. Cum uenisssem autem in
uilla que supra scripta est. misi
precone ut omis habuatores
uille diluculo confurgerent et

Figure 1. Dukianus latinus 158, recto. By permission of the Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library, Duke University. — See p. 54.

Figure 2. Dukianus latinus 158, verso. By permission of the Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library, Duke University. — See p. 54.

et michi quoniam requi-
 sit singulorum quomodo
 posite appone sen-
 de diligenter osten-
 dit dicens. Et ad dñe. Et
 et quattuor calatos
 unum argenteum
 enuerant rosas. duo
 habentes. et tertius
 habens quasi san-
 guis uero calatus ar-
 nus erat. Et sic be-
 ne posuit eos ante
 me. Quae sunt haec
 et michi. Ilymphae ana-
 rubei cunctas habet
 et dominus stephanus
 et postus est ab
 eorum monumentum
 et dominus nichode-
 mus contra hostium.
 et argenteus abi-
 usus. de ueteri testa-
 mento in lege in ma-
 tero matris suae con-
 uocalato. id est in lo-
 cubi iam positi sumus
 u. et tunc euangeli-
 a et ieiunauimus ad
 secum. et ecce tunc
 militudine. et simi-
 laruit michi. militans
 id est. et uarstan

uero hora uidi quia ceteris epo-
 que suprascriptae sunt uisiones
 et audio ipsum papam dicentem michi
 sic in ipsa tertia uisione. Si hec
 ita uidisti dilectissime. me oportet
 accipere inde bouem mas-
 culum amaxicon. quod nos pos-
 sumus carrivactorem ducere ope-
 rarium et dimittere tibi agrum
 ubi sunt fructus. et dixi illi.
 Domine ut quid michi agrum. Si
 non habeo bouem laborantem
 laborum in eo. Et ait mihi episcopus.
 Sic placuit ut ego tollam inde
 bouem masculum aratorem ama-
 xicon operarium. Et statim eu-
 angeli et uidi et dixi cuncta
 sancto episcopo iohanni et omni clero eius.
 Dixit autem michi. Vade et fode
 in aceruo qui est in ipso agro
 et si inueneris nuntia michi.
 et ego dixeris. De ambulaui
 agrum. et uidi aceruum munitum
 lapidum in medio ubi arbi-
 trabar eos esse. Et dixit michi
 papa. Vade et fode. et si inue-
 neris sedens custodi locum. et
 manda michi per diaconum ut
 ueniam ad locum. et tamen di-
 misit. Cum uerissem autem in
 uillam quae suprascripta est. misi
 preconem ut omnes habitatores
 uille diluculo consurgerent et