

ABSTRACT

Tatian's *Diatessaron* in Latin:
A New Edition and Translation of Codex Fuldensis

Nicholas J. Zola, Ph.D.

Mentor: Mikeal C. Parsons, Ph.D.

When Tatian composed his *Diatessaron* in the second half of the second century, his text would have predated nearly all extant copies of the Gospels today. But his gospel harmony has not survived intact, either in Greek or Syriac. What we have instead are citations and translations. The oldest surviving translation is in Codex Fuldensis, a Latin NT commissioned by Victor of Capua between 541 and 546. Like all surviving translations, its text has been “vulgarized” to read like a standard version of the Gospels, in this case the Latin Vulgate.

Scholars once assumed that Fuldensis was the sole parent of all medieval Diatessaronic harmonies, but closer examination in the last century revealed readings in these later vernaculars that seemed to disagree with Fuldensis but agree with Eastern Diatessaronic witnesses. Scholars therefore postulated that an “Old Latin” Diatessaron had somehow survived in the West and fed these vernaculars “unvulgarized” Diatessaronic readings. More recently, some have challenged that premise by demonstrating that certain “Old Latin” readings in the vernacular harmonies actually

derive from medieval exegetical glosses—and sometimes simply from mistakes in the printed editions themselves. As a result, the entire Western Diatessaronic tradition is collapsing back into a single witness: Codex Fuldensis.

However, the most recent—in fact, the only—edition of Codex Fuldensis is from 1868, by Ernst Ranke. It is known to contain errors and was produced at a time prior to all the major advancements of Diatessaronic studies. Moreover, Codex Fuldensis has never been translated into any modern language. The field is in dire need of an updated edition and translation, which is the aim of the current study.

Chapter one provides an introduction to the manuscript and its role in the shifting perspective on the *Diatessaron*. Chapters two through four provide selected texts and translation of Fuldensis, with apparatus and commentary. Chapter five uses indicative errors in Fuldensis to test its relationship with two later harmonies, Codex Sangallensis and the Liège Diatessaron. Upon completion, this edition and translation of Codex Fuldensis is intended to become the definitive edition of the manuscript for years to come.

Tatian's *Diatessaron* in Latin:
A New Edition and Translation of Codex Fuldensis

by

Nicholas J. Zola, B.S., M.A.

A Dissertation

Approved by the Department of Religion

W. H. Bellinger, Jr., Ph.D., Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved by the Dissertation Committee

Mikeal C. Parsons, Ph.D., Chairperson

D. H. Williams, Ph.D.

Daniel Nodes, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School

May 2014

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Copyright © 2014 by Nicholas J. Zola

All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	vii
List of Abbreviations	viii
Acknowledgments.....	ix
Dedication.....	xi
Chapter One: Introduction to Codex Fuldensis	1
Project Overview	1
A Latin Diatessaron	6
An Old Latin Diatessaron?.....	13
A New Edition of the Latin Diatessaron.....	26
Description of the Manuscript	26
Notes on the Transcription.....	30
Notes on the Translation.....	33
Notes on the Apparatus.....	35
Notes on the Commentary	40
Chapter Two: Selections from the Early Life of Jesus	42
Preface (F 1).....	42
Birth Narrative (F 2–11)	43
Chapter Three: Selections from the Public Ministry of Jesus.....	62
Sermon on the Mount (F 23–44).....	62
Feeding of the Five Thousand/Walking on Water (F 81–82).....	82

Chapter Four: Selections from the Final Days of Jesus	85
Passion Narrative (F 154–173)	85
Resurrection (F 174–182)	136
Chapter Five: Conclusions	153
State of the Question	153
Using <i>Leitfehler</i> to Test Dependence on Codex Fuldensis	154
Selection and Use of the <i>Leitfehler</i>	159
Results	162
Final Thoughts	167
Appendix: <i>Leitfehler</i> in Codex Fuldensis	169
Explanation of the Data	170
Readings from the Birth Narrative (F 2–11)	172
Readings from the Sermon on the Mount (F 23–44)	174
Readings from the Passion Narrative (F 154–173)	175
Bibliography	180

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Division of the selected texts and translation	5
Table 2. Layout of the front matter and harmony in Codex Fuldensis	27
Table 3. Sample verse division in the new edition of Fuldensis.....	32
Table 4. List of manuscripts cited in the apparatus	38
Table 5. Sigla used for correctors in the apparatus.....	39

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The following Latin manuscripts are cited in the textual apparatus. For further details and editions, see Bruce M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 285–362; and J. K. Elliott, “The Translations of the New Testament into Latin: The Old Latin and the Vulgate,” in *ANRW* 2.26.1 (ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), 198–245.

Vulgate Manuscripts:

A	Amiatanus (VII-VIII)
B	Bigotianus (VIII)
C	Cavensis (IX)
D	Dublinensis (IX)
D [§]	Durmachensis (VI-VII)
Δ	Dunelmensis (VI-VIII)
E	Egertonensis (IX)
F	Fuldensis (VI)
G	Sangermanensis (IX)
H	Hubertanus (IX-X)
I	Ingolstadiensis (IX)
J	Foro-Julienensis (VI-VII)
K	Grandivellensis (Karolinus) (IX)
Θ	Theodulphianus (IX)
L	Lichfeldensis (VII-VIII)
M	Mediolanensis (VI)
N	Augustodunensis (V)
O	Oxoniensis (VII)
P	Perusinus (VI-VII)
P [§]	(no name) (VI-VII)
Q	Kenanensis (VII-IX)
S	Stonyhurstensis (VII)
R	Rushworthianus (IX)
T	Toletanus (X)
V	Vallicellianus (IX)
W	Codex Willelmi de Hales (XIII)
X	Corporis Christi (VII)
Y	Lindisfarnensis (VII-VIII)
Z	Harleianus (VI-VII)
Σ	Sangallensis (V-VI)

Old Latin Manuscripts:

<i>aur</i>	Aureus Holmiensis (VI-VII)
<i>a</i>	Vercellensis (IV)
<i>b</i>	Veronensis (IV-V)
<i>c</i>	Colbertinus (XI-XII)
<i>d</i>	Cantabrigiensis (Bezae) (V-VI) (Latin portion of D in Greek)
<i>δ</i>	Sangallensis (IX) (Latin portion of Δ in Greek)
<i>e</i>	Palatinus (IV-V)
<i>f</i>	Brixianus (VI)
<i>ff¹</i>	Corbeiensis I (VIII)
<i>ff²</i>	Corbeiensis II (V)
<i>k</i>	Bobiensis (IV-V)
<i>l</i>	Rehdigeranus (VII)
<i>m</i>	Speculum Pseudo-Augustine (V)
<i>q</i>	Monacensis (VI)
<i>r¹</i>	Usserianus I (VI)

Abbreviations in the Appendix:

F	Codex Fuldensis
§	Stuttgart Vulgate
Vg	Vulgate
It	Old Latin
Gk	Greek
Syr	Syriac
T ^{ar}	Arabic Diatessaron
Sg	Codex Sangallensis
Li	Liège Diatessaron

Where the Stuttgart Vulgate and the Wordsworth and White Vulgate employ a conflicting siglum (D, P), I have added a superscript (§) to distinguish the sigla in the Stuttgart edition (D[§], P[§]).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many hands make light work, but complicated manuscripts. I am indebted to many hands. Jeff Childers first taught me Syriac at Abilene Christian University and thereby introduced me to Tatian and his enigmatic *Diatessaron*. Jeff Fish at Baylor University first agreed to oversee my Latin independent study on Codex Fuldensis, from which this project emerged. Three faculty readers were kind enough to review the final product: Kelly Iverson, who added valuable insight on my methodology; Lidija Novakovic, whom I thank for paying special attention to my German; and Bruce Longenecker, whose constant encouragement throughout my time at Baylor has changed the course of my career. My three dissertation committee members have each refined my work and spurred me on in their respective fields of expertise: Mikeal Parsons, in the areas of New Testament and textual criticism; Dan Williams, in the areas of early Christian thought and theology; and Daniel Niles, in the areas of Classics and ecclesiastical Latin. I thank each of them for the time they have devoted to bettering not only this study, but also me.

I am indebted to Hugh Houghton of the University of Birmingham's Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing for initially providing me access to the digitized microfilm of Codex Fuldensis that allowed this project to get underway, as well as for his continual aid and support throughout the duration of the project. I also thank David Smith for providing me access to his digitized version of Ranke's edition, which saved me valuable time in the transcription process.

I would like to express special thanks to James Nogalski and the Baylor Religion Department's Graduate Administrative Committee for awarding me the Glenn O. and Martell B. Hillburn Endowed Graduate Research Scholarship, which made possible my July 2013 trip to Fulda, Germany, to view Codex Fuldensis in person. Likewise, I would like to thank Frau Gerda Lobe-Röder of the Hochschul- und Landesbibliothek Fulda for graciously arranging my viewing of the manuscript, and Herr Berthold Weiß for generously allowing me to use his (frigid) office all week. Similarly, I must thank the library staff of both Baylor and Lincoln Christian University (where I relocated at the tail end of the project) for repeatedly procuring for me the assortment of esoteric materials that constitute Diatessaronic studies. I also thank my Dean Dinelle Frankland for reducing my first-year teaching load so that I could finish this project.

I entered Baylor with four other New Testament doctoral students who have become my best friends: Heather, Peter, Brian, and David. Not a week went by that they did not make fun of me for studying a heretic whose work is not even in the New Testament, and I love them for it. I smile knowing that during the two minutes that Tatian garners in each of their introductory courses, they will think of me.

Finally, I thank my family: my wife, Joy, who knew the sacrifices she was making and made them willingly; and my son, Luke, whose smile at the end of the day was sometimes the only thing that made the sacrifices worth it. Most importantly, I thank the God whose story I have committed to telling. May this work serve that purpose.

To Luke

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction to Codex Fuldensis

Project Overview

The oldest surviving complete gospel harmony in the world is in Codex Fuldensis (Fulda, Germany: Hochschul- und Landesbibliothek, Bonifatianus 1), a sixth-century copy of the New Testament in Latin, but with the four Gospels arranged into a single, continuous narrative. However, this harmony was originally composed neither in Latin nor in the sixth century. It derives from a still earlier harmony compiled in the second half of the second century: Tatian's *Diatessaron*. It is one of the ironies of Diatessaronic studies that while the title attached to Tatian's harmony is Greek (διὰ τεσσάρων, meaning "through four"), it spent its first few centuries largely circulating in Syriac circles of Eastern Christianity, and yet the oldest extant version of the entire *Diatessaron* is the Latin Codex Fuldensis, to which the current study is devoted.

Codex Fuldensis was copied sometime between 541 and 546 C.E. by order of Bishop Victor of Capua. Victor describes in his preface how he landed upon an unidentified gospel harmony which, after some research, he correctly ascribed to Tatian.¹ The manuscript Victor found is now lost to us. But the copy he commissioned became the backbone of an impressive Diatessaronic tradition in the West, with the result that although Tatian's *Diatessaron* is now lost in Syriac (and whether it ever existed in Greek is debated), its legacy lives on amid scores of medieval Latin vernacular harmonies

¹ In his seminal work on the *Diatessaron*, William L. Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 46–48, provides a partial English translation of Victor's preface to Codex Fuldensis.

spanning hundreds of years and some half a dozen languages (such as Old High German, Old Saxon, Middle Dutch, Middle Italian, and Middle English, among others).

Sadly, the text of this Latin Diatessaron was “vulgatized” somewhere along its transmission line to read like a very pure Hieronymic Vulgate.² At first it was thought that the later harmonies derived from Fuldensis consistently exhibited this same vulgatization, but over the last two centuries Diatessaronic scholars such as O. Schade, T. Zahn, H. J. Vogels, D. Plooij, A. Baumstark, and G. Quispel³ studiously compared the texts of these medieval vernaculars to Eastern Diatessaronic witnesses and found enough agreements which they shared against Codex Fuldensis to posit the existence of a now-lost “Old Latin” Diatessaron as their base, so-called due to its apparent agreements with the Old Latin text of the Gospels. It would seem this unvulgatized, Old Latin harmony continued alongside the Western Diatessaronic tradition and provided it with ancient Tatianic readings independent of Codex Fuldensis. W. L. Petersen called the potential of an Old Latin Diatessaron “one of the most important discoveries in the history of

² Pope Damasus commissioned Jerome to produce his revision of the Latin Bible beginning in about 382 C.E. Jerome began with the four Gospels, where the variations among the Old Latin manuscripts were most extreme. The Old Latin Gospels had first emerged sometime in the last quarter of the second century, contemporaneous with Tatian’s *Diatessaron*. By the sixth century, however, scribes had corrected the text of the Latin Diatessaron to read like Jerome’s Vulgate. In fact, Vulgate scholars generally rank Codex Fuldensis among the three best witnesses to the Vulgate text, along with Codices Amiatinus (eighth century) and Mediolanensis (sixth century). See Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (4th ed.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 100–109.

³ See, for an example from each figure: Oskar Schade, *Altdeutsches Wörterbuch* (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1882); Theodor Zahn, “Zur Geschichte von Tatians Diatessaron im Abendland,” *NKZ* 5 (1894): 85–120; Heinrich Joseph Vogels, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Diatessaron im Abendland* (NTAbh 8.1; Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1919); Daniel Plooij, *A Primitive Text of the Diatessaron: The Liège Manuscript of a Mediaeval Dutch Translation: A Preliminary Study* (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1923); Anton Baumstark, *Die Vorlage des althochdeutschen Tatian* (ed. Johannes Rathofer; NdS 12; Köln: Böhlau, 1964); Gilles Quispel, *Tatian and the Gospel of Thomas: Studies in the History of the Western Diatessaron* (Leiden: Brill, 1975).

Diatessaronic studies” and remarked in his landmark work on the subject that “it constitutes the basis for all current research into the Western witnesses.”⁴

In the last few decades, however, U. Schmid (with A. den Hollander),⁵ building on critiques from B. Fischer⁶ and the work of J. Rathofer,⁷ has attempted to debunk that scholarly consensus by demonstrating that the so-called “Old Latin” readings in the vernacular harmonies actually stem from medieval exegetical glosses—and sometimes simply from mistakes in the printed editions themselves. Rather than being vestiges of an ancient, unadulterated witness to the *Diatessaron*, they are simply fallout from a complicated and poorly-understood Vulgate transmission process. As David Parker writes in a recent review, “At a sweep, therefore, the entire Western tradition is reduced to a single witness [= Codex Fuldensis]. This is a matter to which scholars will need to turn their attention rather urgently.”⁸

⁴ Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 112.

⁵ Ulrich Schmid, “In Search of Tatian’s Diatessaron in the West,” *VC* 57 (2003): 176–199; Ulrich Schmid, *Unum ex quattuor: Eine Geschichte der lateinischen Tatianüberlieferung* (AGLB 37; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2005); August den Hollander and Ulrich Schmid, “The Gospel of Barnabas, the Diatessaron, and Method,” *VC* 61 (2007): 1–20.

⁶ Bonifatius Fischer, “Das neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache: Der gegenwärtige Stand seiner Erforschung und seine Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte,” in *Die alten Übersetzungen des neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare* (ed. K. Aland; ANTF 5; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972), 45–49.

⁷ Johannes Rathofer, “‘Tatian’ und Fulda: Die St. Galler Handschrift und der Victor-Codex,” in *Zeiten und Formen in Sprache und Dichtung: Festschrift f. Fritz Tschirch z. 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Karl Heinz Schirmer and Bernhard Sowinski; Köln: Böhlau, 1972), 337–56; Johannes Rathofer, “Die Einwirkung des Fuldischen Evangelientextes auf den althochdeutschen ‘Tatian’: Abkehr von der Methode der Diatessaronforschung,” in *Literatur und Sprache im europäischen Mittelalter: Festschrift f. Karl Langosch z. 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Alf Önnersfors, Johannes Rathofer, and Fritz Wagner; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973), 256–308.

⁸ D. C. Parker, review of Nicholas Perrin, *Thomas and Tatian: The Relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the Diatessaron*, *TC* 8 (2003): §15 [cited 18 September 2012]. Online: <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/v08/Perrin2003rev.html>.

However, the most recent—in fact, the only—edition of Codex Fuldensis is from 1868, transcribed by Ernst Ranke.⁹ It is known to contain errors¹⁰ and was produced at a time prior to all the major discoveries and advancements of Diatessaronic studies. Yet for the last two centuries Diatessaronic scholarship has been forced to rely on this faulty and out-of-date edition, a fact that has led to numerous embarrassing blunders for the proponents of the Old Latin Diatessaron.¹¹ Furthermore, Codex Fuldensis has never been translated into any modern language. Thus the field is in dire need of an updated, careful edition of Codex Fuldensis, accompanied by a modern translation, which is the aim of the current study.

My project consists of three main parts: (1) an introductory chapter, (2) selected texts and translation, with apparatus and commentary, and (3) a concluding chapter, with an appendix of unique readings. The introduction (chapter one) provides a brief history of the manuscript and its role in the rise and fall of the Old Latin Diatessaron. It concludes with a description of my new edition and explanation of my methodology for the transcription, translation, apparatus, and commentary.

The bulk of the project is devoted to the second part, the selected transcription and translation (chapters two, three, and four). If one were to line up the four Gospels back to back, the *Diatessaron* would take up roughly seventy percent of their total length

⁹ Ernst Ranke, *Codex Fuldensis: Novum Testamentum Latine Interprete Hieronymo* (Marburg: Sumtibus N.G. Elwertii Bibliopolae Academici, 1868).

¹⁰ Some of these are corrected in the *Corrigenda* and the *Commentarius Diplomaticus*, but most are not. For a sample list of errors (from Romans), see Donatien de Bruyne, “La préface du Diatessaron latin avant Victor de Capoue,” *RBén* 39 (1927): 5; Bonifatius Fischer, “Bibelausgaben des frühen Mittelalters,” in *La Bibbia nell’alto Medioevo* (SSAM 10; Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1963), 546 n. 66, emphatically agrees that Ranke’s edition “nicht alle Ansprüche befriedigt” (= does not meet all demands).

¹¹ For some examples, see Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 301–2.

(accounting for their parallel material).¹² Hence a transcription and translation of the entire harmony would be a sizable undertaking (well over three hundred pages). As such, for the present study I have carefully selected a sample of several sections from Codex Fuldensis to transcribe and translate which together comprise about one third of the entire harmony.¹³ I have arranged these sections into three chapters, as outlined in table 1.

Table 1. Division of the selected texts and translation

Chapter	Section
2: Early Life of Jesus	Preface (F 1) Birth Narrative (F 2–11)
3: Public Ministry of Jesus	Sermon on the Mount (F 23–44) Feeding of the Five Thousand/Walking on Water (F 81–82)
4: Final Days of Jesus	Passion Narrative (F 154–173) Resurrection (F 174–182)

These sections cover the full span of the gospel narrative, from Jesus’ birth, to his public ministry, to his death and resurrection. They also represent the full range of common source combinations, from special material (unique to a single Gospel), to double tradition (Matt-Luke), to triple tradition (Matt-Mark-Luke), to material shared by all four Gospels. They further represent several of the typical gospel forms, including narrative, teaching material, and miracle stories. Lastly, they contain material from the beginning, middle, and end of the manuscript. Thus they are sufficiently representative of the harmony as a whole and serve well to demonstrate its style, textual character, and approach.

¹² Leslie McFall, “Tatian’s Diatessaron: Mischievous or Misleading?” *WTJ* 56 (1994): 95.

¹³ For a precedent of similar scope, see the dissertation by N. Peter Joosse for the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam in which he produced a new edition with extended commentary of *The Sermon on the Mount in the Arabic Diatessaron* (Amsterdam: Centrale Huisdrukkerij VU, 1997).

Since the main question facing Diatessaronic studies at the moment is the pending collapse of the Old Latin Diatessaron theory, my concluding chapter (chapter five) is a provisional demonstration of my new edition's potential role in resolving that question. Using a compilation of "indicative errors" or *Leitfehler* that I have discovered in Codex Fuldensis (whose data I outline in the appendix), I test the relationship between Fuldensis and two later harmonies (Codex Sangallensis and the Liège Diatessaron) as an illustration of what a carefully executed edition and apparatus of Codex Fuldensis can provide for future scholarship.

Upon conclusion, it is my hope that this new edition and first-ever English translation of Codex Fuldensis will become the definitive scholarly edition of the manuscript for years to come and thereby make a lasting contribution to the field of Diatessaronic studies and to the study of the New Testament as a whole.

A Latin Diatessaron

Victor was bishop of Capua from 541 to 554.¹⁴ It was within the first two or three years of his role as bishop, therefore, that he commissioned the production of what became Codex Fuldensis, now the oldest Latin MS of the complete NT in existence.¹⁵ We know the entire MS was complete by 19 April, 546, for Victor provides a dated subscription at the end of Revelation that he had proofread the text.¹⁶ Especially

¹⁴ E. v. Dobschütz, "Wann las Victor von Capua sein Neues Testament?" *ZNW* 10 (1909): 90 n. 1.

¹⁵ Notwithstanding, of course, that the Gospels appear in harmonized form. One might even say that Fuldensis is more than a complete NT, as it also includes Paul's alleged letter to the Laodiceans.

¹⁶ Just under a year later, on 12 April, 547, Victor adds a second subscription that he had read the text again. Some confusion has arisen over these subscriptions, along with a third one at the end of Acts dated to 2 May, 546. To begin, Ranke, *Codex Fuldensis*, 398, 462, mis-transcribed some small details of the subscriptions, which are not easy to read. Dobschütz, "Wann las Victor," interpreted them as reflective of Victor's liturgical calendar, which P. Corssen, "Die Subskriptionen des Bischofs Victor in dem Codex Fuldensis," *ZNW* 10 (1909): 175–77, effectively invalidated by providing corroborative data that the term

fortuitous for Diatessaronic scholarship, Victor also provides a Preface exclusively concerning the gospel harmony that opens the new MS (ff. 1r-4r). In it he recounts his chance discovery of a “single gospel compiled from the four” (*unum ex quattuor euangelium conpositum*) without title or author.¹⁷ Intrigued by this figure who had “restored the deeds and words of our Lord” back into their apparent historical order, Victor set out to discover who the mysterious author was and landed on two potential candidates: Ammonius of Alexandria and Tatian. Since, however, Ammonius is said to have joined parts of the other three Gospels to Matthew, whereas the harmony that Victor found commenced with and seemed structured upon Luke, he ultimately ascribed the work to Tatian. Ironically, Tatian’s *Diatessaron* quite likely did not originally begin with Luke (more on which below), but later scholarship has confirmed Victor’s deduction on other grounds, for the harmonized sequence of Fuldensis largely agrees with those of other major representatives of Tatian’s *Diatessaron*, particularly Ephrem’s *Commentary on the Diatessaron* and the Arabic *Diatessaron*.¹⁸ Absent for some two-hundred and fifty years, Tatian had reappeared in the West.

legi is indeed a corrector’s notation. Still, Corssen’s time-scheme is bettered by the careful study and explanation of Fischer, “Bibelausgaben des frühen Mittelalters,” 546–48, who concludes that Victor finished his initial read-through on 19 April, 546, added a section to Acts shortly before 2 May of the same year, and then completed a final read-through on 12 April, 547. Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 45 (n. 33), appears to have misread Fischer, for he says that Victor wrote the Preface in the MS himself on 2 May 546. Fischer, in contrast, says that shortly before that date Victor had a prologue and *capitula* for the book of Acts added to the MS, unrelated to the harmony’s Preface. It seems unlikely that Petersen ever saw Codex Fuldensis or a facsimile thereof, or he would have noticed that Victor’s Preface is in the same hand as the rest of the MS, not Victor’s own. The corrected text of the subscriptions may be found in Regina Hausmann, *Die theologischen Handschriften der Hessischen Landesbibliothek Fulda bis zum Jahr 1600* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1992), 6–7. Unfortunately, the two subscriptions below Revelation are now almost entirely unreadable in the MS, having been largely destroyed by a reagent.

¹⁷ Translations of Victor’s Preface are my own (but cf. note 1).

¹⁸ Bruce M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 26–27.

Victor, however, was not altogether comfortable with his discovery, for he learned from his research in Eusebius' *Historia ecclesiastica* (4.29.1-7) that Tatian's reputation was not entirely spotless. Victor writes that Tatian, a "most learned man and illustrious orator of that time," began as a disciple of Justin "the philosopher of Christ" in Rome, but that once the latter was martyred, Tatian "abandoned the holy instruction and learning of his teacher" and lapsed into the heresy of the Encratites and of Marcion. To Victor's horror, Tatian even taught that marriage is as sinful as adultery and attempted to emend the writings of Paul.¹⁹ Despite all this, Victor concludes, the "power of Christ our God" can even work through "unfaithful people." Thus, says Victor, in the same way that even the demons confessed Christ or the sons of Sceva were able to drive out demons in Jesus' name (Acts 19:14), "Tatian, too, although involved in profane errors, arranged this gospel, it seems to me, with expert composition, producing an example not useless for the studios." Victor then adds a wishful afterthought, "And perhaps he laid out this work while still clinging to the blessed Justin's side."

Victor's assessment of Tatian is not far off from the biographical data we are able to glean from other patristic sources (particularly Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.28.1; and Epiphanius, *Pan.* 46.1.6-9) and Tatian's one other surviving work, his *Oratio ad Graecos*.²⁰ Tatian came from the East, what he calls "Assyria" (*Or.* 42), and arrived in Rome sometime in the middle of the second century on a quest for truth and meaning (*Or.* 35). Generally

¹⁹ These claims are Victor's, who bases his description of Tatian on what he found in Eusebius. Of course, how closely Victor's description reflects the reality of Tatian's teachings is difficult to say. Tatian's alleged Encratism (or asceticism) would likely not have seemed so extreme within the Syriac Christian circles of the East. Eusebius, quoting Irenaeus, goes on to claim that Tatian invented certain invisible aeons (which might link him to Valentinus and Gnosticism) and denied the salvation of Adam (which might link him to Marcion). But today most conclude that Tatian was unfairly denounced by Western heresiologists with larger agendas. For further details, see below and the references in note 21.

²⁰ Quotations and references are from the edition of Molly Whittaker, *Tatian: Oratio ad Graecos and Fragments* (OECT; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982).

dissatisfied by what he found in Greek philosophy, he turned instead to some “barbarian writings”—that is, the Septuagint—and found himself persuaded by their simplicity, intelligibility, and great age (*Or.* 29). He converted to Christianity and was indeed Justin’s disciple, of whom he thought highly (and mentions twice: *Or.* 18, 19). After Justin’s martyrdom, however, Irenaeus reports that Tatian became “puffed up by the thought of being a teacher” and broke off from the church (1.28.1 [*ANF* 1:353]). Irenaeus and Epiphanius both list various heretical teachings Tatian allegedly espoused and compare him to the likes of Valentinus, Marcion, and Saturninus. Epiphanius reports that Tatian returned to the East, likely around 172 C.E. (*Pan.* 46.1.6), and that is the last we hear of him.²¹

Although Eusebius praises the *Oratio* as Tatian’s most useful work (*Hist. eccl.* 4.29.7), he also supplies a brief word on Tatian’s *Diatessaron*, though his comments suggest he never saw a copy in person: Tatian “formed a certain combination and collection of the Gospels, I know not how, to which he gave the title *Diatessaron*, and which is still in the hands of some” (4.29.6 [*NPNF*² 1:209]). Those “some” to which Eusebius refers are quite likely Syriac-speaking Christians, where the *Diatessaron* became most popular. Indeed, in the fourth-century Syriac translation of Eusebius, the translator removes the statement “I know not how” and adds in the Syriac title of the

²¹ For fuller biographical details on Tatian and evaluations of the legitimacy of the heretical charges against Tatian, see Emily J. Hunt, *Christianity in the Second Century: The Case of Tatian* (London: Routledge, 2003); Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 67–72; Molly Whittaker, “Tatian’s Educational Background,” *StPatr* 13 (1975): 57–59; Naomi Koltun-Fromm, “Re-imagining Tatian: The Damaging Effects of Polemical Rhetoric,” *JECS* 16 (2008): 1–30. Epiphanius’ chronology does not agree with Eusebius’ (*Chron.* 12), but Petersen (*Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 71) finds a satisfying way of reconciling the two.

Diatessaron, *دا مختلج* (*da-Mehalleṭē*, “[the Gospel] of the Mixed.”)²² Like Eusebius, we do not know exactly when Tatian composed his *Diatessaron* or even whether he composed it first in Greek or in Syriac.²³ But, *pace* Eusebius, it is not the *Oratio* but the *Diatessaron* that has certainly become Tatian’s *magnum opus*, heretic or not, and which has maintained a lasting influence on the church in more than a dozen languages, an influence which Victor’s Codex Fuldensis had no small hand in facilitating.

It was from Eusebius’ description that Victor first learned of Tatian’s *Diatessaron*, yet Victor includes an odd detail in his Preface that has puzzled scholars ever since. When it comes to naming the title of Tatian’s work, Victor calls it not a *Diatessaron* (“through four”) but a *Diapente* (“through five”), despite having just written that Tatian “joined together a single gospel from the four” (*unum ex quattuor compaginauerit euangelium*).²⁴ Victor is unique in this appellation, and there is no simple

²² For discussion of the Greek, Syriac, and Latin text of Eusebius’ note on the *Diatessaron*, see Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 35–38.

²³ There are good arguments for each side of this debate and Diatessaronic scholarship seems to be split down the middle, with (among others) T. Zahn, D. Plooij, and W. Petersen all arguing for Syriac, and H. Vogels, H. von Soden, and U. Schmid all arguing for Greek. The title, of course, is Greek, and Tatian’s only other surviving work is in Greek, which was the language of the church in Rome. But Tatian’s native language was Syriac, and he eventually returned to the East, where the *Diatessaron* clearly had its greatest early influence. The problem is exacerbated by the discovery of the Dura Fragment, fourteen lines of a Greek gospel harmony found at Dura-Europos but whose Diatessaronic status is likewise debated (for recent studies on which, see note 33 below). Without new evidence, a resolution is unlikely. For points of the discussion and the bibliographic details of those named above, see Metzger, *Early Versions*, 30–32; William L. Petersen, “From Justin to Pepys: The History of the Harmonized Gospel Tradition,” *StPatr* 30 (1997): 76–81; Ulrich Schmid, “The Diatessaron of Tatian,” in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis* (ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes; 2d ed.; Leiden: Brill, 2013), 115 n. 5.

²⁴ Victor’s full sentence is: “I also learned from his [Eusebius’] history that Tatian, a most learned man and illustrious orator of that time, joined together a single gospel from the four, for which he composed the title ‘Diapente’” (*ex historia quoque eius comperi quod tatianus uir eruditissimus et orator illius temporis clarus unum ex quattuor compaginauerit euangelium cui titulum diapente composuit*). This language is nearly identical to the phrase Victor uses in the opening line of the Preface to describe the harmony he found (*unum ex quattuor euangelium compositum*), which itself is nearly identical to the way Rufinus in 402 translated Eusebius’ note on the *Diatessaron* in *Hist. eccl.* 4.29.6 (*composuit unum ex quattuor euangelium*), upon which Victor may have been reliant, though he also read Greek. The Latin phrase *unum ex quattuor* appears to be the standard way of translating the Greek phrase *διὰ τεσσάρων*, for

explanation for its presence. Some have proposed that Victor simply made an error; others suggest Victor knew that Tatian employed a fifth source; others that Victor's copy of Eusebius actually read *Diapente*; and still others fall back on a solution in musical terms, where *diapente* refers to the musical interval of a fifth, but which is made up of four whole steps, whereas a *diatessaron* (the musical fourth) is made up of only three whole steps.²⁵ Although no consensus exists, the first two options are less likely than the second two.

It is possible that Victor made a mistake in the title, but the great care with which he researched the harmony's origin and then proofread his new edition (including the Preface, where he makes other corrections) would argue against the persistence of such an obvious error. Likewise, Victor repeatedly refers to the harmony as a single gospel from *four* (see note 24), and his careful insertion of the Eusebian section and canon numbers (see below) would necessitate his having read the entire harmony thoroughly, from which he could be certain that hardly a word is present that cannot be traced back to one of the four canonical Gospels.²⁶ So his awareness of Tatian's purported fifth source is highly unlikely.

this is also how Victor renders the latter when quoting Eusebius' letter to Carpianus, where the phrase is in reference to Ammonius' synopsis. In short, Victor is quite familiar with the concept of "one gospel from four," so his use of the term *diapente* is all the more curious.

²⁵ For details on the arguments including proponents of each, see Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 49–51; Theodor Zahn, *Tatian's Diatessaron* (Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur 1; Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1881), 2–3; Curt Peters, *Das Diatessaron Tatians* (OrChrAn 123; Rome: Pont. institutum orientalium studiorum, 1939), 201–204.

²⁶ This line of reasoning presumes that Victor is not the one who converted the Old Latin harmony that stands somewhere behind Codex Fuldensis into the Vulgate harmony it is now, which I will argue below. Petersen and Vogels agree with this reasoning, while Zahn and Fischer think Victor himself "vulgarized" the text. For details, see note 40 below. This reasoning is not meant to deny that Tatian may well have integrated into the *Diatessaron* a fifth, non-canonical source such as a Jewish-Christian gospel (or, perhaps more likely, an early version of a canonical gospel with readings that were eventually amended), as many scholars believe. But there are few if any traces of such a source left in Codex Fuldensis.

Although no copy of Eusebius has come down to us with the reading *Diapente*, it is always possible that one existed to which Victor had access, though this solution further necessitates explaining how the reading arrived in Eusebius and therefore resolves little. Likewise, the musical solution, while creative, is purely speculative, and can be neither proved nor disproved.

Victor concludes his preface with a prolonged discussion of the Eusebian section and canon numbers,²⁷ which he went to great lengths to insert into his new edition of the harmony, including how they function and why there must be exactly ten tables, no more and no fewer.²⁸ Victor does not exaggerate the effort it must have taken to add these numbers to the text, for it involved identifying the gospel source of practically every passage in the harmony and inserting a notation, along with notations for its parallel passages. The pages of Victor's exemplar, if that is where he made the initial notations, must have been a jumble of Roman numerals and not easy to read. Codex Fuldensis, by contrast, is laid out with considerable forethought and beauty, for it integrates two-letter sigla for each of the four Gospels (*Mt*, *Mr*, *Lc*, *Io*) directly into the text, to make the

²⁷ The Eusebian section and canon numbers (not to be confused with the *capitula*, or "Table of Contents," discussed below) were an early way of identifying parallel passages in the four Gospels. Each Gospel was numbered into consecutive sections, and these sections were then categorized into ten tables (or canons) that identified the relationship between them (paralleled in all four Gospels; paralleled in just Matthew, Mark, and Luke; paralleled in just Matthew, Luke, and John; etc.). These section and canon numbers were then added to the margins of gospel manuscripts to allow readers to locate parallel passages quickly. Eusebius writes a well-known letter to Carpianus detailing the system (now reprinted along with the canon tables in the Nestle-Aland²⁸, pp. 89*–94*), which he says is based on a synopsis that Ammonius of Alexandria put together. Ironically, for a brief period Codex Fuldensis itself was considered an authority for the Eusebian section numbers, until E. Nestle pointed out the foolishness of using a gospel harmony to demarcate the section numbers. See his article, "Die Eusebianische Evangelien-Synopse," *NKZ* 19 (1908): 40–51, 93–114, 219–32. I am indebted to Mark Genter for pointing out this fact to me.

²⁸ Victor is particularly emphatic on this last point, which is odd, because the Eusebian tables as they stand do omit certain combinations of (admittedly rare) potential parallel gospel passages (Mark-Luke-John and Mark-John). Ironically, at the end of the list of canon tables which follows the Preface (f. 4v), a later hand has written *ubi est marcus iohannes* (= "where is the Mark-John [table]?"). De Bruyne, "La préface du Diatessaron latin," 5–11, provides interesting information on the translation of Eusebius' letter to Carpianus that Victor may have had before him.

corresponding Eusebian numbers in the margins easy to identify.²⁹ Scholarship would give a great deal to have the *unum ex quattuor euangelium* that once fell into Victor's hands by chance, but the copy of it he has left us in Codex Fuldensis is nonetheless a biblical masterpiece—one that may well have single-handedly preserved Tatian's presence in the West, although this very question is currently in fierce debate.

An Old Latin Diatessaron?

A. Vööbus commences his study on the early versions of the NT with these words: “In the history of the versions, as well as in the early phase of textual developments of the New Testament as a whole, there is no greater and more important name than Tatian. This is not an overstatement.”³⁰ The reasons for this claim are two-fold. One, the *Diatessaron* is probably the earliest translation of the Gospels into any language. It predates and/or influenced the Old Syriac, Old Latin, Armenian, Georgian, and Arabic translations of the Gospels, among others.³¹ Two, when Tatian compiled the *Diatessaron* in the mid- to late-second century, he used copies of the Gospels that predate nearly all of our surviving MSS thereof. Access to Tatian's *Diatessaron*, therefore, would mean access to a text of the Gospels that is earlier than any we have so far been able to recover. In short, “the Diatessaron is of fundamental importance for the study of the text of the Gospels and for the study of the evolution of the gospel tradition.”³²

²⁹ For further details on these insertions, see my description of the MS below.

³⁰ Arthur Vööbus, *Early Versions of the New Testament* (Stockholm: Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 1954), 1; cf. Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 1.

³¹ Sebastian P. Brock, *An Introduction to Syriac Studies* (Piscataway, N. J.: Gorgias Press, 2006), 4–5.

³² So Schmid, “The Diatessaron of Tatian,” 116, borrowing from Petersen's essay in the first edition of the same collection, “The Diatessaron of Tatian,” in *The Text of the New Testament in*

The problem with such a claim is, simply put, the *Diatessaron* no longer exists—at least, not as Tatian wrote it. If it ever existed in Greek, no Greek copy has survived, save perhaps for the fourteen-line Dura Fragment, whose Diatessaronic status itself is contested.³³ It certainly existed in Syriac, where (among others) Ephrem wrote a *Commentary* on it and Aphrahat quoted from it.³⁴ But there it succumbed to a fifth-century campaign to replace it with the four separated Gospels, and at least two hundred copies of it were removed and presumably destroyed.³⁵ As such, the only remnants of the *Diatessaron* are either embedded in the writings of Christians who used it, or found in later gospel harmonies somehow derived from it—the two earliest and most important of these being the Arabic *Diatessaron* translated from Syriac in the tenth or eleventh century,³⁶ and, of course, the Latin translation in Codex Fuldensis. The field of Diatessaronic studies has largely arisen around the careful scouring of these and other “Diatessaronic witnesses” in hopes of reconstructing Tatian’s lost *Diatessaron*.

Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis (ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 77.

³³ On which see most recently, David C. Parker, David G. K. Taylor, and Mark S. Goodacre, “The Dura-Europos Gospel Harmony,” in *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts* (ed. David G. K. Taylor; Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1999), 192–228; and the rebuttal by Jan Joosten, “The Dura Parchment and the Diatessaron,” *VC* 57 (2003): 159–75.

³⁴ For a list of the primary editions (Syriac and Armenian) and translations (Latin and French) of Ephrem’s *Commentary*, see Carmel McCarthy, *Saint Ephrem’s Commentary on Tatian’s Diatessaron: An English Translation of Chester Beatty Syriac MS 709* (JSSSup 2; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), vi. For Aphrahat’s likely use of the *Diatessaron*, see Tjitze Baarda, *The Gospel Quotations of Aphrahat the Persian Sage: Aphrahat’s Text of the Fourth Gospel* (Amsterdam: Krips Repro B.V. Meppel, 1975).

³⁵ As evidenced in Rabbula, *Canon* 43; and Theodoret, *Haer. fab. comp.* 1.20. An interesting wordplay occurs in Theodoret, probably unintentionally: Theodoret replaces τὸ διὰ τεσσάρων εὐαγγέλιον with τὰ τῶν τεσσάρων εὐαγγελιστῶν εὐαγγέλια. For further discussion, see Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 41–43; and F. C. Burkitt, *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe: The Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels, with the Readings of the Sinai Palimpsest and the Early Syriac Patristic Evidence* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904), 2:176–78.

³⁶ See the excellent introduction by N. Peter Joosse, “An Introduction to the Arabic Diatessaron,” *OrChr* 83 (1999): 74–129.

The effort is marred by an additional complication. The texts of most witnesses to the *Diatessaron* have been conformed to read like whatever the standard form of the Gospels was current at the time. This is a process Diatessaronic scholars have come to call “vulgatization,” regardless of the language in which it occurs.³⁷ The victims of vulgatization include the Arabic Diatessaron, whose Syriac base was conformed to read like the Peshitta, and, of course, Codex Fuldensis, which reads like a very pure Latin Vulgate. Since the Vulgate did not exist until sometime after Jerome initiated the revision in 384, behind the text of Codex Fuldensis must lie some pre-Vulgate Latin harmony that was later converted to Vulgate form. Indeed, in the case of Codex Fuldensis, this hypothesis is a certainty, demonstrated by the *capitula*—the “Table of Contents,” so to speak—that precede the harmony (ff. 13r-20r).

T. Zahn was the first to notice the differences between the wording in the *capitula* and the wording in the text itself.³⁸ It soon became clear that while the harmonized text read like the Vulgate, the *capitula* still had a number of Old Latin readings that had not been corrected to match the text. Consider the following three examples, one from the birth narrative, one from the passion narrative, and one from the resurrection appearances:

Cap. 10 reads *ubi herodes interfecit pueros* (“where Herod killed the boys”). The text in F 10:1 (Matt 2:16), however, uses the synonym *occidit*, which is the standard Vulgate reading, instead of *interfecit*, which is the reading in Old Latin MSS *d* and *k*.

³⁷ See Petersen’s explanation in *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 127–29.

³⁸ Zahn, *Tatian’s Diatessaron* (FGNK 1), 300–303. See further Vogels, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Diatessaron im Abendland*, 8–16, from which the following examples are drawn.

Cap. 157 reads *ubi ihesus dicit ad petrum· expetiuit satanas ut uos uentilet* (“where Jesus says to Peter: Satan has sought to sift you”). The text in F 157:6 (Luke 22:31), however, reads *satanas expetiuit uos ut cribraret* (“Satan has sought you to sift”), which is the standard Vulgate reading. The word order *ut uos* and the synonym *uentilet* are the readings of Old Latin MSS *b e fff² i l q r¹*. Note, however, that (a) *aur* both read *uos ut (s)cribraret* with the Vulgate.

Cap. 180 reads *ubi iterum apparuit ihesus discipulis super mare tiberiadis* (“where again Jesus appeared to the disciples on the Sea of Tiberias”). The text in F 180:1 (John 21:1), however, reads that Jesus appeared *ad mare tiberiadis* (“at the Sea of Tiberias”), which is the standard Vulgate reading. The preposition *super* is the reading of Old Latin MSS *b* and *d*, and would seem to reflect a rather literal rendering of the Greek ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης.

While not all the readings are as strong as others, together (Vogels adduces twenty-two examples), they make the demonstrable case that the *capitula* were composed when the text of the harmony still had many Old Latin readings, which are clearly no longer present in the text. Therefore there once existed an unvulgarized or Old Latin translation of the *Diatessaron* somewhere behind Codex Fuldensis.³⁹

The question is whether Victor himself vulgatzed the Old Latin harmony or simply found it that way. Both Zahn and Fischer argue that Victor himself reworked the text, whereas Vogels and Petersen believe that Victor inherited an already vulgatzed

³⁹ Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 129. Although Jerome completed his revision of the Gospels by 384, it took some time for the Vulgate to catch on. Not until 604 did Pope Gregory allow the Vulgate equal status with the Old Latin in liturgy, and not until the ninth century did the Vulgate truly surpass the Old Latin in the churches; see J. K. Elliott, “The Translations of the New Testament into Latin: The Old Latin and the Vulgate,” in *ANRW* 2.26.1 (ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), 221–222.

text.⁴⁰ Victor states that the harmony he found is structured around Luke, by which he presumably means it begins with Luke 1:1-4, as Codex Fuldensis does. However, the *capitula* begin not with Luke, but with John 1:1, which suggests this is another change the Old Latin harmony has undergone. There is a great deal of external evidence to suggest that Tatian's *Diatessaron* originally began with John 1:1 (and presumably omitted Luke 1:1-4).⁴¹ The fact that the harmony Victor found already began with Luke and not John suggests to Petersen that its text had already been tampered with, and Victor is innocent.

Fischer, on the other hand, notes that Victor adds the Eusebian numbers to allow a reader to compare the wording in the harmony to the wording of the individual Gospels. In Fischer's mind, this implies that Victor himself brought the wording into agreement. In my opinion, however, it is Victor's description of his painstaking effort to insert these reference numbers that offers the most solid proof that Victor is not the one who vulgarized the text. Given the detailed description Victor includes concerning the addition of the numbers, it is hard to imagine that he would remain silent about what must have been the far more arduous task of identifying, locating, and then substituting, word by word, a Vulgate text for an Old Latin one. Granted, it is an argument from silence, but combined with the arguments above (the discrepancies between the *capitula* and the text, and the revised *incipit*), it is a powerful silence.

⁴⁰ For details, see Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 127; Vogels, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Diatessaron im Abendland*, 6–7; Zahn, *Tatian's Diatessaron* (FGNK 1), 3–4; Fischer, "Bibelausgaben des frühen Mittelalters," 549–551.

⁴¹ The witnesses include the Arabic *Diatessaron*; the Middle Italian harmonies; all Middle Dutch harmonies but one; several Latin harmonies; Aphrahat, *Demonstrations* I.10; and Ephrem, *Commentary on the Diatessaron*, I.2. Petersen discusses the issue in several locations (*Tatian's Diatessaron*, 45, 48–49, 62–63, 98, 127–128, 248, 307).

Whether or not Victor was the culprit who vulgarized the text, it would appear that the Old Latin Diatessaron is lost to us today, permanently erased from the text of the harmony. Or is it? Early scholars assumed that Codex Fuldensis, being the oldest surviving witness to the *Diatessaron* in the West, was naturally the archetype of all later Latin and vernacular harmonies, particularly those in Old High German, Middle Dutch, Middle Italian, and Middle English, from the ninth to the fifteenth century. The noted Germanist E. Sievers, for instance, stated in 1892 that Fuldensis is “der Stammhandschrift aller erhaltenen lateinischen Tatiancodices.”⁴² Sievers wrote this statement in his second edition of *Codex Sangallensis*, a ninth-century bilingual harmony with Latin on one side and Old High German on the facing page (St. Gallen, Switzerland: Stiftsbibliothek, MS 56; not to be confused with the MS by the same name often cited in NT textual criticism, Δ [037]).

Not long before, however, O. Schade, examining the same MS for his *Altdeutsches Wörterbuch*, noticed what he perceived to be a number of significant variants between the Latin and Old High German columns, adding up to over one hundred examples. From these he concluded that the *Vorlage* of the Old High German translation was not its neighboring Latin column, or even Codex Fuldensis, “sondern ein anderer Text, der viele Lesarten der alten Itala hatte.”⁴³ Thus Schade became the first to posit (by implication) the existence of an “Old Latin” Diatessaron hidden away in a

⁴² Eduard Sievers, *Tatian: Lateinisch und altdeutsch mit ausführlichem Glossar* (2d ed.; BADL 5; Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1892), xviii (= the parent manuscript of all surviving Latin codices of Tatian).

⁴³ Schade, *Altdeutsches Wörterbuch*, xix (= but rather another text that had many Old Latin readings). Schade only provided a single example to corroborate his claim, but later A. Baumstark, *Die Vorlage des althochdeutschen Tatian*, conducted an exhaustive analysis of the text against Codex Fuldensis and produced a series of readings that seemed to demonstrate that Codex Sangallensis had some undeniable roots in an Old Latin Diatessaron, independent of Codex Fuldensis.

Diatessaronic witness. These differences, however, did not impress Sievers, who called them “geringfügig und fast bedeutungslos” (= negligible and almost meaningless) and deduced they were merely the result of chance and what he called “Uebersetzungskunst” (= creative translation).⁴⁴

Schade and Sievers unwittingly laid the groundwork for what would become the recurring rhetoric between the two sides of the Old Latin debate. Old Latin proponents would carefully screen Western Diatessaronic witnesses against Codex Fuldensis for disagreements, which they would then compare to Eastern Diatessaronic witnesses for corroboration. The irresistible conclusion was that Western witnesses that shared with Eastern witnesses readings that were not present in Codex Fuldensis must have acquired those readings from some, now-lost Old Latin Diatessaron that continued along the transmission line with Fuldensis.⁴⁵ Old Latin skeptics, in return, would dismiss the evidence as based on the minutiae of word order, missing pronouns, grammatical cases, and the like, and therefore insubstantial for proving the existence of an otherwise hypothetical document.⁴⁶

The work of two further figures tells the story of how the debate progressed. The first is D. Plooi, who in 1923 produced a report on what he called a “primitive text of the

⁴⁴ Sievers, *Tatian: Lateinisch und altdeutsch*, xviii, xix.

⁴⁵ Zahn, “Zur Geschichte von Tatians Diatessaron im Abendland,” (1894) was the first to employ this reasoning outright when he examined the sequences of two later Latin harmonies and found they agreed better with the order of the Arabic Diatessaron than with Fuldensis, leading him to conclude “dass F[uldensis] nicht die einzige und nicht die ursprüngliche Gestalt des lateinischen Tatian sei” (= that F[uldensis] is not the only and not the original form of the Latin Tatian; “Zur Geschichte von Tatians Diatessaron,” 115).

⁴⁶ This description is, of course, an oversimplification of what amounts to lifetimes of research and debate. For a description of the debate from a proponent of each side, see the *status quaestionis* essays by W. Petersen (1995) and U. Schmid (2013), in the first and second edition (respectively) of the collection edited by B. Ehrman and M. Holmes, *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*.

Diatessaron,” that is, the thirteenth-century Middle Dutch harmony referred to as the Liège Diatessaron (Liège, Belgium: Bibliothèque de l’Univ., no. 199), followed by a second report two years later with additional data, and finally a monumental project to collect the variant readings of practically every major Diatessaronic witness, collated against the Liège harmony.⁴⁷ In all of these studies Plooij continued the same method of presenting a number of parallels that the Middle Dutch harmony tradition (which includes a handful of other MSS alongside Liège) shared with Eastern witnesses but which were absent from Fuldensis, and thus pointed back to what Plooij officially called an Old Latin Diatessaron. Plooij and his team likely gathered more data than any researcher working on the Diatessaron theretofore. On account of Plooij’s detailed work, Petersen labels the Liège Diatessaron the “single most important Western Diatessaronic witness.”⁴⁸

Though not adduced by Plooij directly, one example that Petersen highlights frequently will suffice. At John 20:16, where the resurrected Jesus encounters Mary Magdalene, a number of Diatessaronic witnesses—but not Codex Fuldensis—interpolate the line “and she ran to touch him” (*et occurit ut tangeret eum*, in the Latin harmonies). According to Petersen, “most scholars have concluded” that this “is indeed the reading of the Diatessaron.”⁴⁹ The great cloud of witnesses attesting to this reading, which they

⁴⁷ Daniel Plooij, *A Primitive Text of the Diatessaron: The Liège Manuscript of a Mediaeval Dutch Translation: A Preliminary Study* (Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1923); idem, *A Further Study of the Liège Diatessaron* (Leiden: Brill, 1925); D. Plooij et al., *The Liège Diatessaron* (8 vols.; VKAW 31.1-8; Amsterdam: Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1929-70). Plooij, unfortunately, passed away before the completion of this last project, which was finally brought to closure by one of his students over forty years after it had begun.

⁴⁸ Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 171.

⁴⁹ Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 171. The list Petersen includes is impressive: Syr^{s(c)h.pal}; several Latin harmonies (Codex Cassellanus; Munich Clm. 23 346; Reims A.35; Leipzig Codd. lat 192 and 193; Berlin Phillipps 1707); all the Middle Dutch harmonies (but see below); the Middle High German harmony (Zürich C 170); the *Heliand*; the *Vita Rythmica*; the *Rijmbijbel*; *Saelden Hort*; and Ps.-Bonaventura’s *Meditationes Vitae Christi* (see the lists at *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 108–109, 304–305, 435). However,

could not have picked up from Fuldensis, is undeniable evidence, affirms Petersen, “of the existence of an Old Latin, unvulgarized harmony.”⁵⁰

Just as the last fascicle of Plooiij’s critical edition of the Liège Diatessaron was published, our second figure arrives to drive “a knife through the heart of the ‘Methode der Diatessaronforschung.’”⁵¹ J. Rathofer began as a proponent of the Old Latin Diatessaron, but later drastically rejected the theory in two back-to-back, scathing critiques.⁵² Rathofer was one of the first to offer tangible evidence for the holes in the hypothetical Old Latin Diatessaron. He focused his study on the relationship between Codex Fuldensis and Codex Sangallensis, the ninth-century Latin/Old High German harmony introduced above. Rathofer demonstrated that a number of the supposed divergences between Fuldensis and Sangallensis are no more than errors in the printed editions of those MSS (by Ranke and Sievers, respectively). For instance, at Luke 2:23 (F 7:3), Sievers reports that Fuldensis reads *sanctum domini*, a genitive, whereas both columns of Sangallensis read a dative (*domino*), agreeing with the Vulgate. Baumstark

Petersen is wrong that *all* the Middle Dutch harmonies include this reading. In fact it is not found in the Liège harmony itself (but is found in the Stuttgart and Hague harmonies; see Plooiij et al., *The Liège Diatessaron*, 8:767 for the data). This fact is especially ironic, for Petersen chides Rathofer for erroneously reporting that this interpolation was not in a particular Latin harmony (AD) when in fact it was, and writes, “Here we see how easy it is for as astute a critic as Rathofer to make a misstep” (p. 304 n. 120). Indeed we do. The irony goes deeper when it turns out that Petersen has simply misread Rathofer’s abbreviation (AD = Munich Clm. 23 977 and 10 025, not 23 346 as Petersen claims). Rathofer was correct after all, and Petersen doubly wrong.

⁵⁰ Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 435.

⁵¹ Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 303 (= the method of Diatessaronic research).

⁵² Johannes Rathofer, “‘Tatian’ und Fulda: Die St. Galler Handschrift und der Victor-Codex,” in *Zeiten und Formen in Sprache und Dichtung: Festschrift f. Fritz Tschirch z. 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Karl Heinz Schirmer and Bernhard Sowinski; Köln: Böhlau, 1972), 337–56; Johannes Rathofer, “Die Einwirkung des Fuldischen Evangelientextes auf den althochdeutschen ‘Tatian’: Abkehr von der Methode der Diatessaronforschung,” in *Literatur und Sprache im europäischen Mittelalter: Festschrift f. Karl Langosch z. 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Alf Ötnerfors, Johannes Rathofer, and Fritz Wagner; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973), 256–308.

had noted that the genitive agrees with two Old Latin MSS, the Stuttgart harmony, and Munich Cgm. 532, and was thus likely a Diatessaronic reading. As it turns out, this is a typographical error in Ranke's edition of Fuldensis, which Ranke notes in the *corrigenda* but which Sievers failed to read. In truth, Fuldensis also reads the dative *domino* and thereby agrees with Sangallensis.

All in all, Rathofer counted some two hundred errors in Sievers' (second!) edition of Codex Sangallensis, and then he extrapolated. If roughly this same number of differences between Codex Fuldensis and Codex Sangallensis has convinced scholarship that Sangallensis is not, in fact, dependent on Fuldensis, does not the equal number of differences between the physical MS of Sangallensis and Sievers' printed edition of that MS warrant the same—clearly absurd—conclusion? In short, prior conclusions had been drawn from a faulty premise. Rathofer then moved to codicological and internal tests of dependence. He noted that Sangallensis and Fuldensis shared Victor's Preface, the same Eusebian canon tables, and practically the same *capitula*, frequently with the same errors. Furthermore, Rathofer noted common textual omissions between the two MSS. For instance, in the example discussed above concerning the interpolation of *et occurit ut tangeret eum* at John 20:16, Fuldensis and Sangallensis alone omit the phrase among the Latin harmonies Rathofer investigated. These and many more examples led Rathofer to conclude that Sangallensis was clearly dependent on Fuldensis and not on some lost Old Latin harmony.⁵³

⁵³ G. Quispel, in a study that came out shortly thereafter but which was already prepared for press, was forced to take account of Rathofer's revelations in the preface: Rathofer "establishes without any possible doubt that the Sangallensis is based upon the Codex Fuldensis. ... More alarming is that according to Rathofer the text editions both of Ranke and of Sievers are not completely trustworthy. This may serve as a timely warning and makes a *caveat* necessary: it may be that in my innocence I have sometimes drawn conclusions from imaginary variants which are not to be found in the manuscripts" (*Tatian and the Gospel of Thomas*, vii).

Rathofer's evidence was a major blow to Diatessaronic studies. Before Rathofer, the critics had generally been outsiders looking in on the esoteric world of Diatessaronic research and challenging its complex methodology—like Sievers, who attributed the readings to “Uebersetzungskunst,” or Fischer, who attributed them to medieval “exegetische und homiletische Traditionen und Absichten.”⁵⁴ These challenges were easy to ignore. But here was an insider, a member of the “Orden innerhalb eines Ordens,”⁵⁵ who had now defected from the Old Latin camp with a devastating critique of its shortcomings. It was the beginning of the end for the Old Latin Diatessaron.⁵⁶

The latest nails in the coffin have come from one last figure, U. Schmid, another insider who knew the sources and the method of the field but was not swept up by the fervency of the Old Latin theory. In a series of careful and well-reasoned studies (some with A. den Hollander),⁵⁷ Schmid articulated the many drawbacks and inconsistencies in the Old Latin scholarly construct. To begin, Schmid pointed out the insensibility of turning to witnesses from the second to sixth centuries (such as the Old Syriac and Old Latin Gospels, Ephrem, Aphrahat, and even Codex Fuldensis) in order to discover the source of allegedly “Old Latin” readings in medieval vernacular harmonies from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, without first checking the contemporary medieval

⁵⁴ Sievers, *Tatian: Lateinisch und altdeutsch*, xix; Fischer, “Das neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache,” 47 (= exegetical and homiletical traditions and tendencies).

⁵⁵ To borrow a phrase from Georg Baesecke, *Die Überlieferung des althochdeutschen Tatian* (HM 4; Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1948), 3 (= order within an order).

⁵⁶ To be clear, Rathofer and other critics do not dispute the fact that an Old Latin Diatessaron once existed (as the *capitula* of Fuldensis would strongly suggest). The debate is whether the Old Latin Diatessaron survived long enough to feed Old Latin readings to the medieval vernacular harmonies. For Petersen's summary of and response to Rathofer's contributions, see *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 301-309.

⁵⁷ Ulrich Schmid, “In Search of Tatian's Diatessaron in the West,” *VC* 57 (2003): 176–199; idem, *Unum ex quattuor: Eine Geschichte der lateinischen Tatianüberlieferung* (AGLB 37; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2005); August den Hollander and Ulrich Schmid, “The Gospel of Barnabas, the Diatessaron, and Method,” *VC* 61 (2007): 1–20.

tradition, particularly the nearly two dozen medieval Latin harmonies and their glosses, for these same readings. In doing so, Schmid discovered that a number of the supposedly Old Latin Diatessaronic readings were actually circulating throughout the medieval period within the *Glossa Ordinaria*, an established collection of patristic exegetical and homiletical traditions (demonstrating Fischer’s hunch above). These medieval traditions, whose history is not well studied, were largely ignored by Diatessaronic scholars in preference for much earlier sources, whose relationship to the vernacular harmonies in question is considerably more distant—chronologically, textually, and culturally. J. Joosten provides a helpful summary of Schmid’s results:

August den Hollander and Ulrich Schmid subjected a number of readings discussed by Plooiij in his first study to renewed scrutiny. Variants that had been claimed to occur in no other source but Ephraem’s commentary or the Old Syriac gospels were identified either in mediaeval exegetical writings or, most interestingly, in interlinear or marginal glosses to Latin gospel harmonies with a “Vulgatized” text type. That a thirteenth-century Dutch cleric should have consulted such glosses while translating a gospel harmony from Latin into the vernacular surely is more likely than that he possessed a now lost Old Latin Diatessaron transmitting second-century readings.⁵⁸

Furthermore, in an in-depth analysis of twenty-four witnesses to the Latin Diatessaronic tradition,⁵⁹ Schmid was able to layout a stemma of all the major Latin harmonies and their relationship to Codex Fuldensis. In short, he traced two clear transmission lines stemming from Fuldensis, one line of harmonies with 181 chapters, and another with 184 chapters (Fuldensis has 182 chapters). Schmid provided textual evidence that led all of these harmonies back singly to Codex Fuldensis. In the same study, Schmid also uncovered the likely sources *from outside the Diatessaronic tradition*

⁵⁸ Jan Joosten, “The Gospel of Barnabas and the Diatessaron,” *HTR* 95 (2002): 78.

⁵⁹ *Unum ex quattuor: Eine Geschichte der lateinischen Tatianüberlieferung* (AGLB 37; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2005).

of many supposed Diatessaronic readings, including the interpolation at John 20:16 discussed above. Schmid found evidence that the addition *et occurit ut tangeret eum* probably came into the Western harmony tradition at Fulda in the ninth century, via an eighth-century Irish gospel book.⁶⁰ As Rathofer had done previously, Schmid's results further deflated the supposedly isolated Diatessaronic bubble, demonstrating it could be contaminated from readings outside its tradition, just like any biblical MS.

Ultimately, Schmid concluded that the Old Latin Diatessaron hypothesis raises more questions than it answers, is based on unsafe textual analysis, and relies on anachronistic use of source material. As such, the old perspective must be abandoned, and a new one embraced.⁶¹ What is the effect of this paradigm shift in Diatessaronic studies on Codex Fuldensis?

Since the Codex Fuldensis sequence appears to be—when compared to other Latin and Western vernacular harmony sequences—the closest to the Arabic harmony sequence and the sequence derived from Ephraem's commentary on the Diatessaron, in all likelihood only one Western witness had an independent voice, and that is Codex Fuldensis itself. Forget about the rest, if you want to reconstruct Tatian's Diatessaron.⁶²

And yet, scholarship is still reliant on a faulty and antiquated edition of Codex Fuldensis, that of Ranke from 1868. Already in 1963, Fischer was calling for a new edition that would meet modern demands: "Die Textkritiker verlassen sich allzu ausschliesslich auf die Ausgabe von Ranke, und mancher wurde dadurch in die Irre geführt."⁶³ Now that

⁶⁰ Schmid, *Unum ex quattuor*, 200-201.

⁶¹ In fact, Schmid labels this shift "the new perspective on the Diatessaron," purposely echoing the new perspective of Pauline fame; see "The Diatessaron of Tatian," 115.

⁶² Schmid, "The Diatessaron of Tatian," 137.

⁶³ Fischer, "Bibelausgaben des frühen Mittelalters," 546 (= The text-critics rely all too exclusively on Ranke's edition, and many were thereby misled). Fischer is astounded that a better study does not exist and says a new edition is "wünschenswert" (= desirable).

Fuldensis' importance has been reestablished, the need for a new edition is greater than ever. Such is the motivation behind the present new edition and English translation of Codex Fuldensis, whose details I lay out below.

A New Edition of the Latin Diatessaron

Description of the Manuscript

I will focus my description on the gospel harmony and related portions of Codex Fuldensis.⁶⁴ The manuscript is housed in the Hochschul- und Landesbibliothek, Fulda, Germany, under the catalog Cod. Bonifatianus 1. Although composed in Italy between 541 and 546 at the behest of Victor bishop of Capua (see the discussion above), it was brought to Fulda by St. Boniface in the mid-eighth century and has remained there ever since (originally in the cathedral, then later moved to the library).⁶⁵

The folio dimensions are 28.6 x 13.5 cm, with a single column of text. The written area is 19.1 x 7.0 cm, with upper and lower margins of 4 and 5.5 cm, respectively, and inner and outer margins of 1.5 and 5 cm, respectively. The MS is written by a single hand in Italian uncial script as a continuous text, with semicolons (single mid-level dots) frequently separating clauses or sense units. Folios are consistently ruled for 35 lines per page, with an average of approximately 19 letters per line (typically ranging from 15-23). The script is regular, round, relatively large, and generally bi-linear, save for initial

⁶⁴ For an official report of the entire MS, see the well-researched collection by Hausmann, *Die theologischen Handschriften der Hessischen Landesbibliothek Fulda*, 3–7. The older description by Carl Scherer still has several helpful features, including an easy to read table of contents for the manuscript: “Die Codices Bonifatiani in der Landesbibliothek zu Fulda,” in *Festgabe zum Bonifatius-Jubiläum 1905* (Fulda: Fuldaer Actiendruckerei, 1905), 6–12. The most thorough study and description is Fischer, “Bibelausgaben des frühen Mittelalters,” 545–57. I have modeled my own description after the guidelines in D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 90–94.

⁶⁵ Scherer, “Die Codices Bonifatiani,” 2–3.

capitals and the extending arms of *d, f, g, h, l, p,* and *q*. The letter width ranges from 1-6 mm and the height consistently averages 3 mm, with a consistent line spacing of 5-6 mm.

The total number of leaves is 505. Based on the quire (re)numbering, it appears the MS was assembled in three parts: first the gospel harmony, then the Pauline epistles, then the remainder of the MS (Acts, Catholic Epistles, Revelation). The initial sections of the manuscript are laid out in table 2.

Table 2. Layout of the front matter and harmony in Codex Fuldensis

Folio	Content
1r-4r	Victor's Preface
4v	Overview of the Canon Tables
5r-12v	Canon Tables
13r-20v	<i>Capitula</i> (last leaf blank)
21r-179v	Gospel Harmony

The text of the gospel harmony is on sixteen quinions (five-sheet quires, folded for a total of twenty folios). These were originally numbered one through sixteen in Roman numerals by the scribe on the inside of the first leaf. The *capitula* are written on their own quaternion (four-sheet quire), the insertion of which before the harmony caused the scribe to renumber quires I-XVI to II-XVII. Victor's Preface is in its own, unnumbered quire; and the canon tables bridge two smaller (also unnumbered) quires, for an unknown reason.⁶⁶

The text is written on parchment, in a rich brown ink that varies in darkness. The first line of each chapter is in red ink (occasionally now bordering on orange). Also in red are the Eusebian canon numbers (the lower number of the two), and the corresponding two-letter gospel sigla (*Mt, Mr, Lc, Io*) within the text, except for those added later by

⁶⁶ Fischer, "Bibelausgaben des frühen Mittelalters," 546-47.

Victor. Although the MS is written in a single hand, Victor's own sloping uncial with cursive elements has also made occasional corrections and notes in the MS, including the invocation $\bar{X}\bar{F}$ (= *Christe fave*), *legi, legi meum*, and three dated subscriptions on ff. 433r and 502v (see note 16 above).⁶⁷ Other hands have also corrected the MS, some obviously late in a black or dark-green colored ink, others perhaps contemporary with Victor or the scribe in a similar color ink as the text. Ranke identifies two such hands, one of an unknown scribe with a similar hand to Victor's (which Ranke calls V^s), and another who corrected those places where Victor left sigla calling for emendation, and some places where Victor did not leave sigla (which Ranke calls C). In the later sections of the MS there are glosses and corrections from various eighth-century Anglo-Saxon minuscule hands, including what may well be the hand of Boniface himself.⁶⁸

Two further items are of note. The chapter numbers within the text of the MS have undergone a complicated and haphazard revision, leaving inconsistencies in the text and especially between the text and the *capitula*. It would appear that at some point after having completed both the *capitula* and the text, the scribe realized that the chapter numbers in the text did not always correspond with the contents of the *capitula*.⁶⁹ In an attempt to rectify the divergence, the scribe decreased chs. 21-101 in the text by one, such that now they read chs. 20-100. This means that there are two ch. 20s (for the scribe did not erase the initial ch. 20) and no ch. 101. However, it would appear the scribe halted the revision prematurely, for the chapter contents in the text continue to diverge from the

⁶⁷ Hausmann, *Die theologischen Handschriften der Hessischen Landesbibliothek Fulda*, 4, 6–7.

⁶⁸ Hausmann, *Die theologischen Handschriften der Hessischen Landesbibliothek Fulda*, 3.

⁶⁹ This divergence may well be another repercussion of the vulgatization that was applied to the text but not to the *capitula*, on which see the discussion above. Ranke discusses the issue of the chapter numbers in his Prolegomena, xxi-xxiii.

capitula all the way through ch. 157. The scribe may have been misled by a further mixture that has occurred between chs. 102-106 and the *capitula*.

Ranke elected to follow the scheme of the original chapter numbering rather than print an edition with two ch. 20s and no ch. 101. I agree with Ranke's reasoning, as it would seem this is the chapter numbering in the exemplar, which the scribe only later attempted (unsuccessfully) to conform to the *capitula*. Were I to adopt a new chapter numbering scheme at this point, it would throw off all previous studies that make reference to the chapter numbers based on Ranke's edition. These chapter inconsistencies also help explain why later streams of the Latin Diatessaron have either 181 or 184 chapters, each a different way of fixing Fuldensis' 182-chapter scheme.

The second item of note is the existence of the two-letter gospel sigla (*Mt*, *Mr*, *Lc*, *Io*) inserted directly into the text. Although these symbols may at first appear to identify the source(s) of the ensuing text (which at times they do), they primarily serve as markers to show where the corresponding Eusebian section and canon numbers in the margin begin. For this reason they are frequently added by Victor later (in brown ink, rather than red) where a Eusebian number stands in the margin but there is no corresponding marker in the text. Thus the insertions do not indicate the source of the material as much as they indicate the presence of parallel material, as tabulated in the Eusebian canons.

For instance, when F 5:17 (f. 26r) switches from Matthean to Lukan material, the scribe inserts *Lc* into the text and provides a corresponding Eusebian number in the margin. When the text returns to Matthean material at F 5:21, the scribe likewise notes *Mt* in the text with a corresponding Eusebian number in the margin. But when the text comes to F 5:22, the scribe inserts *Mt* and *Lc* into the text with the corresponding

Eusebian numbers in the margin, even though the source material is still coming verbatim from Matthew. Then when the text comes to F 5:23 (now f. 26v), the scribe inserts *Mt* into the text again (and the corresponding Eusebian number in the margin), even though the text continues to come from Matthew. In other words, the source material has not changed; what has changed is the Eusebian number, so *Mt* is inserted into the text to indicate where the Eusebian section has transitioned, not the source text.

There are occasions, however, where the sigla do appear to refer to a change in source text and lack a corresponding Eusebian number in the margin. For instance, at F 82:10-12 (f. 74v), where the text switches from Matt 14:32 to John 6:21 and then back to Matt 14:33, the scribe has inserted *Io* into the text just before the Johannine verse, but there is no Eusebian number corresponding to John in the margin. Likewise, the scribe inserts *Mt* into the text just before returning to the Matthean material, again with no corresponding Eusebian number. A similar case occurs at F 35:5 (f. 44r). Thus, although the primary function of the insertions is for correspondence with the Eusebian section and canon numbers, they do occasionally serve to mark the source text of the harmony.

Ranke does not include the sigla in his edition, and I too have left them out of the current version, although I intend to include them in the complete edition of the text. Likewise I have omitted the Eusebian section and canon numbers from the current version for the sake of simplicity, but will also include them in the complete edition.

Notes on the Transcription

For the transcription of the MS, I have begun with Ranke's text as a base but have performed a fresh and careful collation with the physical manuscript, both in person and

with the aid of high-resolution color images.⁷⁰ I have corrected not only Ranke's textual mistakes, but also his erroneous references to the gospel source text, which I have discovered are far more numerous. These mistakes in identifying the source text of the harmony are not trivial, for they led Wordsworth and White to list false readings for Fuldensis in their critical edition of the Vulgate on more than one occasion.

For instance, at Luke 6:16, Wordsworth and White⁷¹ list two MSS (DW) as including an initial *et* at the beginning of the verse. Although Fuldensis also has this reading, they do not list Fuldensis because they were reliant on Ranke, who has mislabeled the verse as coming from Matt 10:4 (F 23:14). The Stuttgart Vulgate,⁷² on the other hand, correctly notes Fuldensis' reading at Luke 6:16, which can only mean its editorial team performed an independent collation of the text once they learned Ranke's edition could not be trusted. Although it contains some errors with regard to Fuldensis, I have so far not found an error in the Stuttgart apparatus that is attributable to an error in Ranke's edition.

Since it is frequently the case that Fuldensis includes only partial verses harmonized together, my reference system relies on the *cola et commata* (clausal breaks) printed in the Stuttgart Vulgate edition. Thus my verse division rules are as follows:

Superscripts a, b, c, etc., denote the inclusion of the complete clause
Superscripts α, β, γ, etc., denote the inclusion of only part of the clause

⁷⁰ My consultation of the MS in Fulda occurred on July 15-19, 2013, and was made possible by the generous support of the Baylor Religion Department's Glenn O. and Martell B. Hillburn Endowed Graduate Research Scholarship. Since that visit, the Hochschul- und Landesbibliothek Fulda has made high-resolution digital images of Codex Fuldensis available online: <http://fuldig.hs-fulda.de/viewer/image/PPN325289808/1/>.

⁷¹ J. Wordsworth and H. J. White, *Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi latine: Secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi: Pars Prior—Quattuor Euangelia* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1889), 341.

⁷² Robert Weber and Roger Gryson, eds., *Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (5th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007), 1617.

For example, table 3 provides the text of Luke 11:1 as printed in the Stuttgart Vulgate and as found in the corresponding text of Fuldensis (F 35:5).

Table 3. Sample verse division in the new edition of Fuldensis

Luke 11:1 in the Stuttgart Vulgate	Luke 11:1 ^{βcδ} in F 35:5
Et factum est cum esset in loco quodam orans	
ut cessavit dixit unus ex discipulis eius ad eum	Tunc dixit unus ex discipulis eius ad eum·
Domine doce nos orare	domine doce nos orare·
Sicut et Iohannes docuit discipulos suos	sicut iohannes docuit discipulos suos·

Thus the reference in Fuldensis becomes Luke 11:1^{βcδ}. Since the first clause is entirely missing, there is no “a” or “α” in the reference. Since the second clause is only partially present, there is a “β” in the reference. Since the third clause is entirely present, there is a “c” in the clause. And since the fourth clause is only partially present (despite the fact that only one word is missing), there is a “δ” in the reference. With this system, a reader can immediately ascertain whether a particular verse in Fuldensis is partial or complete as regards the gospel text. When the entire verse is complete, no letters are provided. I have followed the verse divisions of the Stuttgart Vulgate, which occasionally disagree with other editions of the Gospels, including Ranke, but was necessary for consistency.

In adding a more robust reference system, I have also taken the opportunity to versify Codex Fuldensis. Until now, scholars have been forced to use the page and line numbers of Ranke’s edition, which is an imprecise and undesirable method. My new edition adds verse numbers to the harmony, to facilitate future references. As described above, I retain the original chapter numbers of the text (prior to their attempted revision by the scribe). Within these chapters, I have now also divided the text into verses,

following as closely as possible the verse divisions of the source text. Generally speaking, when a new verse in the source text begins, so does a new verse in the harmony. However, when the harmonized text has combined two or more parallel verses, and switches back and forth between them, I generally allow it to stand as a single verse rather than dividing the line into several smaller, unwieldy verses.

Ranke's edition printed the mid-level dots (semicolons) found throughout the text, and I have retained these and corrected them where necessary. Similarly, Ranke printed capital letters to indicate a corresponding change in size in the initial letter of a new clause in the text, and I have retained these as well and occasionally corrected them. Ranke's paragraphing also followed the paragraphing of the MS, which was a helpful feature. For the current study, however, I have not retained the paragraphing in my layout, in order to divide the text by its gospel references, which I considered to be more important information. In the final edition, however, I intend to find a way to match the paragraph breaks of the MS while also providing my detailed source references.

I have retained the orthography of the scribe throughout, even when the scribe uses non-standard or inconsistent spelling, and have transcribed any apparent textual errors exactly as they appear. To standardize (vulgarize?) the text would, of course, defeat the purpose of the edition.⁷³

Notes on the Translation

Following Jerome himself in his translation of the Vulgate (Letter 57, *To Pammachius*), my translation of Codex Fuldensis falls on the side of "word for word"

⁷³ The editor of the Arabic Diatessaron, A.-S. Marmardji, unfortunately fell into such a trap: *Diatessaron de Tattien: Texte arabe établi, traduit en français, collationné avec les anciennes versions syriaques* (Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique, 1935).

rather than “thought for thought.” That is, I have produced a modified formal correspondence translation.⁷⁴ My goal is to provide an accurate rendering of the Latin as best as English grammar will allow, so that a reader less familiar with Latin will still gain an insight into its structure and meaning. As such, I have at times retained the Latin word order where it does not conflict with acceptable English syntax. Likewise, I have not attempted to be gender inclusive, except where it does not interfere with an accurate rendering of the Latin. However, I have not distinguished between the second person singular and plural pronouns or verbs, which is a drawback of the English language.

I have also elected to imitate the Latin spelling of proper nouns (in the nominative case) in the translation. Thus Peter is Petrus and Galilee is Galilaea. This decision eliminates the inconsistency in English biblical translations of Anglicizing some names (like James) and not others (like Alphaeus). In this way, the English reader will come closer to what the Latin reader of Fuldensis would have read. There are cases where retaining this spelling can be significant. For instance, Matthew usually spells Jerusalem as Hierosolyma, whereas Luke usually spells Jerusalem as Hierusalem. Were the translation simply to render both forms as Jerusalem, that important source information might be lost on the English reader. Where the Latin is inconsistent in its spelling of proper nouns, the English translation follows suit. Similarly, where there were apparent errors in the Latin, the English reflects (where possible) the same errors. Where the Latin verb tense is ambiguous (e.g. is *venit* perfect or present? is *sciam* present subjunctive or future indicative?) the Greek text has been consulted.

⁷⁴ As defined in Eugene A. Nida and Charles R. Taber, *The Theory and Practice of Translation* (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 22–24. I am, of course, aware that Nida is a proponent of functional equivalence and not formal correspondence; however, my “receptor” audience is a scholarly community interested in comprehending the wording and structure of the Latin. Thus my context and goals are different than Nida’s.

Notes on the Apparatus

The current edition is, in a strict sense, not a critical edition, based on the collation of many manuscripts, but a diplomatic edition, since it is an exact transcription of a single manuscript: Codex Fuldensis, the oldest surviving version of the *Diatessaron* we have. As such, it does not require an apparatus, save in the reporting of corrections to the MS (to which I will return below). Nonetheless, I have elected to include an apparatus of readings that requires some explanation.

Petersen summed the field up well when he wrote, “Diatessaronic research is always a search for what should *not* be in the text.”⁷⁵ In other words, Tatian’s *Diatessaron* presumably agreed in large part with the standard gospel text. Thus where Diatessaronic witnesses also agree with the standard text, there is no way to determine whether the agreement goes all the way back to Tatian, or was vulgatized to agree somewhere along the way. The only way to distinguish a potential Diatessaronic reading with certainty is to note where a witness *deviates* from the standard gospel text. Then one can move on to determine whether the deviation goes back to Tatian’s text or came into the tradition at a later point.

For this reason, although I have not included the readings of other Diatessaronic witnesses in my apparatus,⁷⁶ I have collated Codex Fuldensis against our best critical edition of the Vulgate, the fifth edition (2007) of the Stuttgart Vulgate.⁷⁷ Wherever the Stuttgart Vulgate and Fuldensis disagree, I have listed the Stuttgart reading (under the

⁷⁵ Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 369.

⁷⁶ This work has already been accomplished by the team that produced the eight-part critical edition of the Liège Diatessaron, described above.

⁷⁷ See note 72 above.

siglum Š, to distinguish it from any MS).⁷⁸ Since the Stuttgart Vulgate, however, is a manual edition with a limited apparatus of its own (like the Nestle-Aland editions of the Greek NT), I have consulted the more complete edition of Wordsworth and White for MS evidence. I list all Vulgate MSS that agree with Fuldensis (F) against Š. These data allow the reader to determine whether F is unique in this reading within the Vulgate tradition, or simply one of many MSS that deviate from what Š has reconstructed to be the Vulgate's text. In essence, this apparatus lists every potential Diatessaronic reading that Fuldensis can possibly supply. It remains only to test the readings against the rest of the Diatessaronic tradition (heeding Schmid's new methodology,⁷⁹ of course).

Some further explanations are in order. The purpose of the apparatus is to show where Fuldensis deviates from our best reconstruction of Jerome's Vulgate text, of which Fuldensis is often a very pure example. As such, the only variants I list are those where F disagrees with Š. If F agrees with Š, even if there are other Vulgate MSS that have variant readings (which is constantly the case), I have no need to note this. The apparatus is not designed to display the complete state of Vulgate readings in the Gospels. Likewise, where F disagrees with Š, I only list witnesses that agree with F. I do not list witnesses that agree with Š against F, since there is no use for this information.

There is one exception to this rule. I have identified four important early MSS that are contemporary with Fuldensis both in provenance (Italian type) and time (within one to two centuries), and thus representative of the type of text in circulation at the time

⁷⁸ The Stuttgart edition itself relies on a MS it calls S (Sangallensis [typically Σ], not to be confused with the Diatessaronic witness of the same name), while Wordsworth and White list another MS they call S (Stonyhurstensis), whereas the Nestle-Aland edition of the Nova Vulgata refers to the Stuttgart edition itself as S, so the symbol S is highly ambiguous. For this reason, I have adopted the siglum Š for the Stuttgart edition, to ensure that the reader never mistakes this item for another MS.

⁷⁹ Hollander and Schmid, "The Gospel of Barnabas, the Diatessaron, and Method," 19–20.

Fuldensis was copied. These four are also the primary MSS that the Stuttgart edition relies on to establish its critical text. They are:

- Σ Sangallensis (V-VI)
- A Amiatanus (VII-VIII)
- M Mediolanensis (VI)
- Z Harleianus (VI-VII)

When F disagrees with Š, where the readings of these four MSS are available, I always report them, whether they agree with F, with Š, or offer an alternative reading. To be clear, I do not report their readings whenever they deviate from F. I only report their readings where F first deviates from Š. Including these four MSS provides a sampling of what the best Vulgate MSS are doing.

The apparatus generally includes only readings from Vulgate MSS and not from Old Latin MSS. When a variant in F has Vulgate support, there is no need to turn to the Old Latin gospels as its source. On the occasions where a variant in F has little or no Vulgate support, and Wordsworth and White have listed an Old Latin MS that agrees with F's reading, I list the Old Latin support.

The complete list of MSS cited in the apparatus is in table 4 (this same list can be found in the List of Abbreviations on p. viii). Where the Stuttgart Vulgate and Wordsworth and White employ a conflicting siglum (D, P), I have added a superscript (Š) to distinguish the sigla in the Stuttgart edition (D^Š, P^Š). The majority of the data come from Wordsworth and White's apparatus, with occasional supplementation from the Stuttgart Vulgate's apparatus and A. Jülicher's edition of the Old Latin Gospels.⁸⁰

⁸⁰ Adolf Jülicher, Walter Matzkow, and Kurt Aland, eds., *Itala: Das neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung* (4 vols., 2d ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963-76).

Table 4. List of manuscripts cited in the apparatus

Vulgate Manuscripts	Old Latin Manuscripts
A Amiatanus (VII-VIII)	<i>aur</i> Aureus Holmiensis (VI-VII)
B Bigotianus (VIII)	<i>a</i> Vercellensis (IV)
C Cavensis (IX)	<i>b</i> Veronensis (IV-V)
D Dublinensis (IX)	<i>c</i> Colbertinus (XI-XII)
D ^Š Durmachensis (VI-VII)	<i>d</i> Cantabrigiensis (Bezae) (V-VI) (Latin portion of D in Greek)
Δ Dunelmensis (VI-VIII)	<i>δ</i> Sangallensis (IX) (Latin portion of Δ in Greek)
E Egertonensis (IX)	<i>e</i> Palatinus (IV-V)
F Fuldensis (VI)	<i>f</i> Brixianus (VI)
G Sangermanensis (IX)	<i>ff</i> ¹ Corbeiensis I (VIII)
H Hubertanus (IX-X)	<i>ff</i> ² Corbeiensis II (V)
I Ingolstadiensis (IX)	<i>k</i> Bobiensis (IV-V)
J Foro-Julienensis (VI-VII)	<i>l</i> Rehdigeranus (VII)
K Grandivellensis (Karolinus) (IX)	<i>m</i> Speculum Pseudo-Augustine (V)
Θ Theodulphianus (IX)	<i>q</i> Monacensis (VI)
L Lichfeldensis (VII-VIII)	<i>r</i> ¹ Usserianus I (VI)
M Mediolanensis (VI)	
N Augustodunensis (V)	
O Oxoniensis (VII)	
P Perusinus (VI-VII)	
P ^Š (no name) (VI-VII)	
Q Kenanensis (VII-IX)	
S Stonyhurstensis (VII)	
R Rushworthianus (IX)	
T Toletanus (X)	
V Vallicellianus (IX)	
W Codex Willelmi de Hales (XIII)	
X Corporis Christi (VII)	
Y Lindisfarnensis (VII-VIII)	
Z Harleianus (VI-VII)	
Σ Sangallensis (V-VI)	

In terms of the apparatus, I have generally ignored inconsequential differences between F and Š that are characteristic of Latin, except where they seemed noteworthy. I do not report, for example, orthographical differences, like *athuc* for *adhuc*, and *aput* for *apud*, etc.; or contracted prefixes, like *aff-* for *adf-*, *inp-* for *imp-*, *pre-* for *prae-*, etc.; or common abbreviations, like *quodcumq.* for *quodcumque*, or *omnib.* for *omnibus*; or

insignificant verbal contractions, like *-ii-* for *-ivi-*; or common letter exchanges, like *scribtura* for *scriptura*, or *omnis* for *omnes*.

Similarly, one soon discovers in the MS that Victor often did not approve of the scribe's syllabification at the end of many lines and consequently made minute adjustments, transposing single letters from one line to the next. I have ignored these changes as they make no real difference, orthographic or otherwise. Those desiring to study these corrections may consult Ranke's *Commentarius Diplomaticus*, where he lists them along with the rest of the MS corrections he notes.

There are intermittent corrections in the MS, most either in the scribe's own hand or in Victor's hand, though it is not always easy to tell. As described above, Ranke identified several further hands, most of whom were late and do not concern us, but some of whom may have been contemporary with Victor and the original scribe.⁸¹ Ranke usually does not identify the correcting hand in his commentary. Where he does, I usually follow him; where he does not, I have provided my own assessment. I report every correction made to the harmony text in the apparatus and have developed my own nomenclature for identifying the various hands, using the sigla listed in table 5.

Table 5. Sigla used for correctors in the apparatus

Siglum	Meaning
F*	what the scribe initially wrote
F ^s	what the scribe himself corrected
F ^v	what Victor corrected
F ^c	what a contemporary corrector corrected, with a hand similar to Victor's
F ^b	what a later medieval corrector corrected, in black ink

⁸¹ Ranke, *Codex Fuldensis*, 465–66. Ranke lists four main correcting hands: the scribe (S), Victor (V), a hand with handwriting similar to Victor's (V^s), and a contemporary hand that made some corrections for Victor and some independent corrections (C). My sigla are similar (the scribe = F^s; Victor = F^v), except that I have combined Ranke's last two hands (V^s and C) into a single contemporary corrector (F^c).

In terms of deciding what reading to keep in the text, I have followed the following principle: the transcription reproduces, as best as I can determine, the text Victor intended to be final. Ideally, we would hope for a text that came closest to the exemplar on which Fuldensis is based. Although it is tempting to presume that what the scribe initially wrote comes closest that exemplar, this is not always necessarily the case. It may well be that the scribe made an initial error, and what the scribe or Victor corrected comes closest to the exemplar. Rather than attempt to decide the matter in each case, I have elected (as Ranke did) to print the corrected text, along with the initial reading in the apparatus, and allow the reader to decide what is more likely to represent the exemplar. Additionally, this corrected version of the text is the form that later copiers in the Diatessaronic tradition would have encountered and likely elected to copy. To print the uncorrected form might lead once again to “imaginary variants” based on differences in an edition and not in the text. My exception to this principle is to print the original chapter numbers of the text and not the corrected chapters, for the reasons already stated above.

Notes on the Commentary

The running commentary with the text primarily includes three items: First, it discusses noteworthy sequence choices of the harmonized text, particularly when these agree or disagree with other major Diatessaronic witnesses, or produce an oddity in the Latin text that may provide some clue about the language from which the Latin was translated. Second, it provides a description of the corrections or errors in the text that are noted in the apparatus, so the reader can have a better understanding of their nature and potential origin. And third, it discusses apparently unique readings in the text of

Fuldensis, based on the information gathered in the apparatus. Not only may some of these readings eventually prove to go back to Tatian's *Diatessaron* itself, but they may also serve to test a later harmony's potential dependence on Codex Fuldensis, an exercise that lies at the very heart of the "new perspective" on the *Diatessaron*, and which is reserved for the concluding chapter of this study.

CHAPTER TWO

Selections from the Early Life of Jesus

Preface (F 1)

<i>[21r]</i> <i>Caput I</i>	<i>Chapter 1</i>	
Lk 1:1 Quoniam quidem multi conati sunt ordinare narrationem quae in nobis completae sunt rerum·	Seeing that many indeed have tried to set in order a narration of the things that have been fulfilled among us,	1
1:2 sicut tradiderunt nobis qui ab initio ipsi uiderant et ministri fuerunt sermonis	just as those, who themselves had seen from the beginning and were servants of the message, have handed on to us,	2
1:3 Uisum est et mihi assecuto a principio omnibus diligenter ex ordine tibi scribere optime theofyle·	it also seemed good to me, having followed everything carefully from the beginning, to write for you in order, most excellent Theophilus,	3
1:4 ut cognoscas eorum uerborum de quibus eruditus es ueritatem	so that you may know the truth of those words about which you were taught.	4
Jn 1:1 In principio erat uerbum et uerbum erat apud deum et deus erat uerbum·	In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.	5
1:2 hoc erat in principio apud deum·	It was with God in the beginning.	6
1:3 omnia per ipsum facta sunt· et sine ipso factum est nihil· quod factum est	All things were made through it, and without it nothing was made. What was made	7
1:4 in ipso uita erat· et uita erat lux hominum·	in it was life, and the life was the light of humans.	8
1:5 et lux in tenebris lucet· et tenebrae eam non comprehenderunt	And the light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not grasped it.	9

1:2 (Lk 1:2) uiderant] uiderunt Š

Notes

1:1 (Lk 1:1): F begins its harmony with Luke 1:1-4, whereas other major versions of the Diatessaron begin with John 1:1 (e.g., Arabic; Middle Italian; all Middle Dutch but one; several Latin versions; cf. Aphrahat, *Demonstrations* I.10; Ephrem, *Commentary on the Diatessaron*, I.2). Some versions, however, follow F in beginning with Luke 1:1-4

(e.g., Codex Sangallensis). Noticeably, F's *capitula* begin with John 1:1, betraying the likely revision the text has undergone.

1:7-8 (Jn 1:3-4): Primitive punctuation present in the manuscript (a medial point) suggests that the ending of John 1:3 was understood as the beginning of the clause in 1:4 (and not as concluding the thought in 1:3). Such is the standard Latin (and Syriac) reading.

Birth Narrative (F 2–11)

	<i>Caput II</i>	<i>Chapter 2</i>	
Lk 1:5	Fuit in diebus herodis regis iudae sacerdos quidam nomine zaccharias de uice auia· et uxor illi de filiabus· aaron· et nomen eius· elisabeth·	In the days of Herodes, king of Judae, there was a certain priest by the name of Zaccharias, in the office of Avia, and his wife, of the daughters of Aaron. And her name (was) Elisabeth.	1
1:6	erant autem iusti ambo ante deum [21v] incedentes in omnibus mandatis et iustificationibus domini sine quaerella·	Now they were both right before God, walking in all the commands and precepts of the Lord without blame.	2
1:7	Et non erat illis filius· eo quod esset elisabeth sterilis· et ambo processissent in diebus suis·	But they had no son, for the reason that Elisabeth was barren, and both were advanced in their days.	3
1:8	factum est autem cum sacerdotio fungeretur· in ordine uicis suae ante deum·	However, it happened that when he was performing the priestly function in the order of his office before God,	4
1:9	secundum consuetudinem sacerdotii· sorte exiit· ut incensum poneret· ingressus in templum domini·	according to the custom of the priesthood, (chosen) by lot he went out to offer the incense, entering into the temple of the Lord.	5
1:10	Et omnis multitudo erat populi orans foris hora incensi·	And the whole crowd of people was outside praying at the hour of incense.	6
1:11	apparuit autem illi angelus domini stans a dextris altaris incensi·	Now an angel of the Lord appeared to him, standing on the right side of the altar of incense.	7
1:12	et zaccharias turbatus est· uidens· et timor inruit super eum·	And Zaccharias was troubled, seeing (the angel), and fear rushed over him.	8
1:13	ait autem ad illum angelus· ne timeas zaccharia· quoniam exaudita est depraecatio tua· et uxor tua elisabeth pariet tibi filium· et uocabis nomen eius	But the angel said to him, “Do not fear, Zaccharias, for your supplication has been clearly heard, and your wife Elisabeth will bear you a son. And you will name	9

	iohannem·	him Johannes.	
1:14	Et erit gaudium tibi et exultatio· et multi in natiuitate eius gaudebunt·	And you will have joy and gladness, and many will rejoice in his birth.	10
1:15	erit enim magnus coram domino et uinum et sicera non bibet· et spiritu sancto replebitur adhuc ex <i>[22r]</i> utero matris suae·	For he will be great before the Lord, and he will not drink wine and strong drink, and he will be filled with the Holy Spirit even from his mother's womb.	11
1:16	Et multos filiorum israhel conuertit ad dominum deum ipsorum·	And he turns many of the children of Israel to the Lord their God.	12
1:17	et ipse praecedet ante illum in spiritu· et uirtute heliae· ut conuertat corda patrum in filios· et incredibiles ad prudentiam iustorum· parare domino plebem perfectam·	And he himself will go before him in the spirit and power of Helias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children and the unbelievers to the wisdom of the just, to prepare for the Lord a perfected people.”	13
1:18	Et dixit zaccharias ad angelum· unde hoc sciam ego enim sum senex· et uxor mea processit· in diebus suis·	And Zaccharias said to the angel, “From whom will I know this? For I am old, and my wife has advanced in her days.”	14
1:19	Et respondens angelus dixit ei· Ego sum gabriel qui adsto ante deum· et missus sum ad te et haec tibi euangelizare·	And answering, the angel said to him, “I am Gabriel, who stand before God. And I was sent to you and to proclaim this good news to you.	15
1:20	Et ecce eris tacens et non poteris loqui usque in diem quo haec fiant· pro eo quod non credidisti uerbis meis quae inplebuntur in tempore suo·	And look, you will be silent and will not be able to speak until the day on which these things take place, for the reason that you did not trust my words, which will be fulfilled in their time.”	16
1:21	Et erat plebs expectans zacchariam. Et mirabantur quod tardaret ipse in templo·	And the people were expecting Zaccharias. And they were surprised that he delayed in the temple.	17
1:22	Egressus autem non poterat loqui ad illos· et cognouerunt quod uisionem uidisset in templo· et ipse erat innuens illis· et permansit mutus·	But coming out, he could not speak to them. And they recognized that he had seen a vision in the temple. And he was motioning to them, but he remained mute.	18
1:23	Et factum est ut impleti sunt dies <i>[22v]</i> officii eius· abiit in domum suam·	And it happened that, when the days of his service were complete, he went off to his home.	19

1:24	post hos autem dies concepit· elisabeth· uxor eius· et occultabat se mensibus quinque dicens·	And after these days his wife Elisabeth conceived, and she hid herself for five months, saying,	20
1:25	quia sic mihi fecit dominus in diebus quibus respexit auferre opprobrium meum inter homines	“Thus has the Lord done for me in the days in which he has cared to take away my shame among the people.”	21

2:1 (Lk 1:5) iudae DL] iudeae MZ; iudaeae AŠ

2:2 (Lk 1:6) incedentes F^{SŠ}] incidentes F*DO* | quaerella F^{SZŠ}] quaerilla F*; querella
AM

2:12 (Lk 1:16) conuertit] conuertet Š

2:15 (Lk 1:19) sum²] *add.* loqui Š

2:16 (Lk 1:20) usque F^{VŠ}] quousque F*

Notes

2:1 (Lk 1:5): F sets the Johannine prologue aside to continue with the birth narrative from Luke and Matt, not returning to it again until John the Baptist comes on the scene in F 13. F makes little attempt to harmonize the birth narratives, save slightly in the genealogies. Instead what follows simply alternates between Luke and Matt: F 2-4 = Luke 1:5-80; F 5:1-29 = Matt 1:1-25 + Luke 3:34-37; F 5:30-7:19 = Luke 2:1-39; F 8-11 = Matt 2.

2:2 (Lk 1:6): In the words *incedentes* and *quaerilla*, the scribe has corrected the *i* to read like an uppercase “E” by adding three horizontal strokes (rendering a different form than the MS’s typical *e*, which looks more like a large lowercase “e”). This corrective technique is employed frequently throughout the MS.

2:12 (Lk 1:16): *Israhel* is uncharacteristically abbreviated with a *nomen sacrum* here (*isrl*). Typically in F it is spelled out in full, but there are a handful of further exceptions (e.g., F 7:14 [Lk 2:34]; F 11:3 [Mt 2:21]).

2:16 (Lk 1:20): Victor (or possibly the scribe) has used supralinear dots to mark out *quo* before *usque*. This corrective technique is employed frequently throughout the MS.

Caput III

Lk 1:26 In mense autem sexto· missus est
angelus gabrihel a deo in
ciuitatem galileae· cui nomen
nazareth·

1:27 ad uirginem disponsatam uiro· cui
nomen erat· ioseph· de domo
dauid· et nomen uirginis mariam

1:28 Et ingressus angelus ad eam dixit·
habe gratia plena dominus
tecum· benedicta tu in
mulieribus·

Chapter 3

Now in the sixth month, the angel
Gabriel was sent by God to a city
of Galilaea, whose name (was)
Nazareth,

to a virgin engaged to a man
whose name was Joseph, of the
house of David. And the name of
the virgin was Mariam.

And having entered, the angel said
to her, “Greetings, one full of
favor! The Lord (is) with you.
Blessed are you among women.”

1:29	quae cum uidisset· turbata est in sermone eius· et cogitabat qualis esset ista salutatio·	When she saw (the angel), she was troubled at his words, and she began pondering what kind of greeting that might be.	4
1:30	Et ait· angelus ei ne timeas maria· Inuenisti enim gratiam apud deum·	But the angel said to her, “Do not fear, Maria. For you have found favor before God.	5
1:31	ecce concipies in utero et paries filium· et uocabis nomen eius ihesum·	Listen, you will conceive in your womb and will bear a son, and you will name him Jesus.	6
1:32	Hic erit magnus et filius altissimi uocabitur· et dabit illi dominus sedem dauid patris eius·	He will be great and will be called Son of the Most High, and the Lord will give him the throne of David his father.	7
1:33	et regnabit in domo iacob in aeternum· <i>[23r]</i> Et regni eius non erit finis·	And he will reign in the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there will be no end.”	8
1:34	Dixit autem maria ad angelum· quomodo fiet istud quoniam uirum non cognosco·	But Maria said to the angel, “How will that take place, since I do not know a man?”	9
1:35	Et respondens angelus dixit ei· Spiritus sanctus superueniet in te et uirtus altissimi obumbrabit tibi· Ideoque et quod nascetur sanctum uocabitur filius dei·	And answering, the angel said to her, “The Holy Spirit will come over you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. And for this reason also what will be born will be called holy, the Son of God.	10
1:36	Et ecce elisabeth· cognata tua et ipsa concepit filium in senectute sua· et hic mensis est sextus illi quae uocatur sterilis·	And listen, your relative Elisabeth, even she has conceived a son in her old age, and this is the sixth month for her who is called barren.	11
1:37	quia non erit impossibile apud deum omne uerbum·	For no word will be impossible with God.	12
1:38	Dixit autem maria· ecce ancilla domini fiat mihi secundum uerbum tuum· Et discessit ab illa angelus·	But Maria said, “Here (am I), the servant of the Lord. May it be done to me according to your word.” And the angel withdrew from her.	13
1:39	Exurgens autem maria in diebus illis· abiit in montana cum festinatione in ciuitatem iuda·	Now rising up in those days, Maria went out to the hill country in haste, to a city of Judaea.	14
1:40	et intrauit in domum zacchariae· et salutauit elisabeth·	And she entered into the house of Zaccharias and greeted Elisabeth.	15
1:41	Et factum est· ut audiuit salutationem mariae elisabeth exultauit infans in utero eius· et repleta est spiritu sancto	And it happened that when Elisabeth heard Maria’s greeting, the child in her womb leaped, and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy	16

	elisabeth·	Spirit	
1:42	et exclamauit uoce magna· et <i>[23v]</i> dixit benedicta tu inter mulieres· et benedictus fructus uentris tui·	and cried out in a loud voice and said, “Blessed (are) you among women, and blessed (is) the fruit of your womb!	17
1:43	Et unde hoc mihi· ut ueniat mater domini mei ad me·	And by what means (does) this (happen) to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me?	18
1:44	Ecce enim ut facta est uox salutationis tuae in auribus meis· Exultauit in gaudio infans in utero meo·	For listen, as soon as the sound of your greeting reached my ears, the child in my womb leaped for joy.	19
1:45	Et beata quae credidit· quoniam perficientur ea quae dicta sunt ei a domino·	And blessed is she who has believed that the things spoken to her by the Lord will be accomplished.”	20
1:46	Et ait maria· Magnificat anima mea dominum·	And Maria said, “My soul praises the Lord,	21
1:47	et exultauit spiritus meus in deo salutari meo	and my spirit leaped for God, my salvation,	22
1:48	Quia respexit humilitatem ancillae suae· ecce enim ex hoc beatam me dicent omnes generationes·	because he has cared for the lowliness of his servant. For look, after this all generations will call me blessed,	23
1:49	Quia fecit mihi magna qui potens est· et sanctum nomen eius·	because he who is powerful has done great things for me, and holy (is) his name.	24
1:50	Et misericordia eius in progenies et progenies timentibus eum·	And his mercy (is) from generation to generation for those who fear him.	25
1:51	fecit potentia in brachio suo· dispersit superbos mente cordis sui·	He has accomplished by the power in his arm; he has scattered the proud by the intention of their heart.	26
1:52	Deposuit potentes de sede et exaltauit humiles·	He has brought down the powerful from the throne and raised up the lowly.	27
1:53	Esurientes impleuit bonis et diuites dimisit inanes·	The hungry he has filled up with goods and the rich he has sent away empty.	28
1:54	Suscepit israhel puerum suum memorari misericordiae·	He has received Israel as his child, in memory of his mercy,	29
1:55	Sicut locutus est ad patres <i>[24r]</i> nostros· abraham et semini eius in saecula·	just as he said to our ancestors, Abraham and his descendants forever.”	30
1:56	Mansit autem maria cum illa	And Maria remained with her for	31

quasi mensibus tribus et reuersa est in domum suam	about three months, and she returned to her home.
---	--

- 3:2 (Lk 1:27) disponsatam CDGHΘLORT] desponsatam AMZŠ | mariam HY] maria Š
 3:3 (Lk 1:28) plaena F^s] plena F*Š
 3:7 (Lk 1:32) dominus AHY] *add.* deus MZŠ
 3:11 (Lk 1:36) senectute BCDD^sIJKOTVWXZ*] senecta AMZ¹Š
 3:26 (Lk 1:51) potentia Z] potentiam AMŠ
 3:28 (Lk 1:53) inanes F^sŠ] inanis F*

Notes

3:2 (Lk 1:27): Although F introduces the mother of Jesus as *mariam* here, for the remainder of the birth narrative it refers to her as *maria* (notwithstanding those cases where the Latin accusative necessarily renders the name with a final *m*).

<i>Caput III</i>	<i>Chapter 4</i>	
Lk 1:57 elisabeth autem impletum est tempus pariendi et peperit filium suum	Now the time came for Elisabeth to give birth, and she gave birth to her son.	1
1:58 Et audierunt uicini et cognati eius quia magnificauit dominus misericordiam suam cum illa. Et congratulabantur ei.	And her neighbors and relatives heard that the Lord magnified his mercy with her, and they rejoiced with her.	2
1:59 Et factum est in die octauo. uenerunt circumcidere puerum. Et uocabant eum nomine patris eius zacchariam.	And it happened on the eighth day that they came to circumcise the boy. And they were going to call him by the name of his father, Zaccharias.	3
1:60 Et respondens mater eius dixit. nequaquam. sed uocabitur iohannes.	But answering, his mother said, “No! He will be called Iohannes.”	4
1:61 Et dixerunt ad illam. quia nemo est in cognatione qui uocetur hoc nomine.	And they said to her, “There is no one among your relatives who is called by this name.”	5
1:62 Innuebant autem patri eius quem uellet uocari eum.	And they began to motion to his father for what he wanted him to be called.	6
1:63 Et postulans pugillarem scripsit dicens. iohannes est nomen eius. Et mirati sunt uniuersi.	And asking for a writing tablet, he wrote, stating, “His name is Iohannes.” And all were amazed.	7
1:64 apertum est autem ilico. os eius. et lingua eius. et loquebatur benedicens deum.	And immediately his mouth was opened and his tongue (freed), and he began to speak, blessing God.	8
1:65 Et factus est timor super omnes uicinos eorum. et super omnia	And fear came over all their neighbors, and all these things	9

	montana iudeae diulgabantur omnia uerba haec·	were circulated over the whole hill country of Judaea.	
1:66	Et posuerunt omnes qui audierant in corde suo dicentes· quid putas puer iste erit· etenim manus domini erat cum illo·	And all who had heard considered (it) in their heart, saying, “What do you think that boy will be? Because the hand of the Lord was with him.”	10
1:67	et zaccharias pater eius· impletus est spiritu sancto· et prophetauit dicens·	And his father Zaccharias was filled with the Holy Spirit and prophesied, saying,	11
1:68	Benedictus deus israhel· quia uisitauit et fecit redemptionem plebi suae·	“Blessed (is) the God of Israel, because he has shown favor and brought about redemption to his people.	12
1:69	Et erexit cornum salutis nobis in domo dauid pueri sui·	And he has raised the horn of salvation for us in the house of David his servant.	13
1:70	Sicut locutus est per os sanctorum qui a saeculo sunt prophetarum eius	Just as he spoke through the mouth of his holy prophets who are from the beginning,	14
1:71	salutem ex inimicis nostris· et de manu omnium qui oderunt nos·	salvation from our enemies and from the hand of all who hate us,	15
1:72	ad faciendam misericordiam cum patribus nostris et memorari testamenti sui sancti·	to have mercy on our ancestors and to remember his holy covenant,	16
1:73	iusiurandum quod iurauit ad abraham patrem nostrum·	the oath that he swore to Abraham our father,	17
1:74	daturum se nobis· ut sine timore de manu inimicorum nostrorum liberati· seruiamus illi	to grant us that without fear, having been freed from the hand of our enemies, we may serve him	18
1:75	in sanctitate et iustitia coram ipso omnibus diebus nostris	in holiness and righteousness before him for all our days.	19
1:76	Et tu puer propheta altis[simi <i>[25r]</i> uocaueris praehibis enim ante faciem domini parare uias eius·	And you, child, will be called prophet of the Most High, for you will go before the presence of the Lord, to prepare his ways,	20
1:77	ad dandam scientiam salutis plebi eius in remissione peccatorum eorum·	to bestow the knowledge of salvation to his people, by the forgiveness of their sins,	21
1:78	per uiscera misericordiae dei nostri in quibus uisitauit nos· oriens ex alto·	through the heart of mercy of our God, by which the dawn visits us from the height,	22
1:79	inluminare his qui in tenebris et in umbra mortis sedent· ad dirigendos pedes nostros in uiam pacis·	to illuminate these ones who sit in darkness and the shadow of death, to direct our feet on the way of peace.”	23

1:80	Puer autem crescebat et confortabatur spiritu· et erat in deserto usque in diem ostensionis suae ad israhel·	And the child grew and was strengthened in the Spirit, and he was in the wilderness until the day of his appearance to Israel.	24
------	--	--	----

- 4:1 (Lk 1:57) suum *om.* Š
 4:5 (Lk 1:61) cognatione L] *add.* tua Š
 4:12 (Lk 1:68) redemptionem AHTY] redemptionem Š
 4:13 (Lk 1:69) cornum GJO*Y] cornu Š
 4:14 (Lk 1:70) est F^sŠ] es? F*^{vid} | qui F^sŠ] ??orum qui F*^{vid} (see note)
 4:20 (Lk 1:76) uocaueris CO*QR] uocaberis Š
 4:21 (Lk 1:77) remissione Θ*KTVZ^c] remissionem Š | eorum F^sŠ] meorum F*RW

Notes

- 4:1 (Lk 1:57): Apparently unique in the Vulgate tradition, F adds *suum* to read “her son.”
 4:14 (Lk 1:70): Two erasures have occurred in this verse. First, rather than *est* it appears the scribe ended the word with a now indistinct letter, which was subsequently erased and replaced with *t* by the same hand. Second, before *qui* the scribe originally wrote a now indistinct word which was subsequently scratched out. Ranke (p. 468) posits *tuorum*. Perhaps more likely is that the erased word was a partial repetition of the previous word *sanctorum*, which is abbreviated as a *nomen sacrum* in F here as *scōrum*. If the letter *t* is indeed visible, the erasure may suggest that F’s exemplar did not abbreviate this particular word (or at least this instance) and that the abbreviation was introduced by F.
 4:20 (Lk 1:76): As is not uncommon, the scribe of F frequently interchanges the labials *b* and *v*, as in the current case of *uocaueris* for *uocaberis*. At times the interchange affects the sense.

	<i>Caput V</i>	<i>Chapter 5</i>	
Mt 1:1	Liber generationis ihesu christi· filii dauid· filii abraham·	A register of the birth of Jesus Christus, the son of David, the son of Abraham.	1
1:2	abraham genuit isaac· isaac· autem genuit· iacob· iacob autem genuit iudam et fratres eius·	Abraham fathered Isaac, and Isaac fathered Jacob, and Jacob fathered Judas and his brothers,	2
1:3	iudas autem genuit phares· et zara de thamar phares autem· genuit· esrom· esrom autem genuit· aram·	and Judas fathered Phares and Zara from Thamar, and Phares fathered Esrom, and Esrom fathered Aram,	3
1:4	aram autem genuit· aminadab· aminadab· autem genuit naasson· naasson autem genuit salmon·	and Aram fathered Aminadab, and Aminadab fathered Naasson, and Naasson fathered Salmon,	4
1:5 [25v]	salmon autem genuit booz· de rachab· booz· genuit obed ex ruth· obed autem genuit· iesse·	and Salmon fathered Booz from Rachab. Booz fathered Obed from Ruth, and Obed fathered Jesse.	5

	iesse genuit dauid regem·	Jesse fathered David the king.	
1:6	dauid autem rex genuit salomonem ex ea quae fuit· uriae·	And David the king fathered Salomon from her who was (the wife) of Urias,	6
1:7	salomon autem genuit roboam· roboam autem genuit· abia· abia autem genuit· asa·	and Salomon fathered Roboam, and Roboam fathered Abia, and Abia fathered Asa,	7
1:8	asa autem genuit iosaphat· iosaphat autem genuit ioram· ioram autem genuit oziam·	and Asa fathered Josaphat, and Josaphat fathered Joram, and Joram fathered Ozias,	8
1:9	ozias autem genuit ioatham Ioatham autem genuit achaz· achaz· autem genuit ezechiam·	and Ozias fathered Joatham, and Joatham fathered Achaz, and Achaz fathered Ezechias,	9
1:10	ezechias· autem genuit manassen· manasses autem genuit amon· amon autem genuit· iosiam·	and Ezechias fathered Manasses, and Manasses fathered Amon, and Amon fathered Josias,	10
1:11	iosias autem genuit iechoniam· et fratres eius in transmigracione babylonis·	and Josias fathered Jechonias and his brothers during (the time of) the expulsion to Babylon.	11
1:12	Et post transmigracionem babylonis· iechonias genuit salatihel· salatihel autem genuit zorobabel	And after the expulsion to Babylon, Jechonias fathered Salatiel, and Salatiel fathered Zorobabel,	12
1:13	zorobabel· autem genuit abiud· abiud autem genuit· eliachim· eliachim autem genuit azor·	and Zorobabel fathered Abiud, and Abiud fathered Eliachim, and Eliachim fathered Azor,	13
1:14	azor autem genuit saddoc· saddoc autem genuit· eliachim· eliachim autem genuit eliud·	and Azor fathered Saddoc, and Saddoc fathered Eliachim, and Eliachim fathered Eliud,	14
1:15	eliud autem genuit eleazar· ^[26r] eleazar autem genuit matthan· matthan autem genuit iacob·	and Eliud fathered Eleazar, and Eleazar fathered Matthan, and Matthan fathered Jacob,	15
1:16	Iacob autem genuit ioseph uirum mariae de qua natus est ihesus· qui uocatur christus·	and Jacob fathered Joseph, the husband of Maria, from whom was born Jesus, who is called Christus.	16
Lk 3:34 ^y	abraham	And Abraham	17
	F autem·		
3:34 ^δ	fuit	was	
3:23 ^β	filius	the son	
3:34 ^δ	tharae·	of Thare,	
3:34 ^e	qui fuit nachor·	who was (the son) of Nachor,	
3:35	qui fuit seruch· qui fuit ragau· qui fuit phaleg· qui fuit· eber· qui fuit· salae·	who was (the son) of Seruch, who was (the son) of Ragau, who was (the son) of Phaleg, who was (the son) of Eber, who was (the son) of Sale,	18

3:36	qui fuit cainan· qui fuit· arfaxat· qui fuit sem· qui fuit noe· qui fuit lamach	who was (the son) of Cainan, who was (the son) of Arfaxat, who was (the son) of Sem, who was (the son) of Noe, who was (the son) of Lamach,	19
3:37	qui fuit matusalae· qui fuit· enoc· qui fuit iared qui fuit malelehel· qui fuit cainan· qui fuit enos· qui fuit seth· qui fuit adam qui fuit dei·	who was (the son) of Matusale, who was (the son) of Enoc, who was (the son) of Jared, who was (the son) of Malaleel, who was (the son) of Cainan, who was (the son) of Enos, who was (the son) of Seth, who was (the son) of Adam, who was (the son) of God.	20
Mt 1:17	Omnes ergo generationes· ab abraham usque ad dauid· generationes· XIII· et a dauid usque ad transmigrationem babylonis generationes· XIII· et a transmigratione babylonis· usque ad christum· generationes XIII	Therefore all the generations from Abraham up to David (are) fourteen generations, and from David up to the expulsion to Babylon (are) fourteen generations, and from the expulsion to Babylon up to Christus (are) fourteen generations.	21
1:18	Christi autem generatio sic erat· Cum esset desponsata mater eius maria ioseph antequam conuenirent <i>[26v]</i> Inuenta est in utero habens de spiritu sancto·	Now the birth of Christus took place in this way: When his mother Maria was engaged to Joseph, before they came together she was found to be with child, from the Holy Spirit.	22
1:19	Ioseph autem uir eius cum esset iustus· et nollet eam traducere· uoluit occulte dimittere eam·	And Joseph her husband, since he was righteous and was unwilling to disgrace her, wanted to dismiss her privately.	23
1:20	haec autem eo cogitante· ecce angelus domini in somnis paruit ei dicens· Ioseph filii dauid noli timere accipere mariam coniugem tuam· quod enim in ea natum est de spiritu sancto est·	But while he was reflecting on these things, there appeared to him an angel of the Lord in (his) sleep, saying, “Joseph, son of David, do not be afraid to take Maria as your wife, for what was conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit.	24
1:21	pariet autem filium et uocabis nomen eius ihesum· ipse enim saluum faciet populum suum a peccatis eorum·	And she will bear a son and you will call him Jesus, for he will save his people from their sins.”	25
1:22	Hoc autem totum factum est· ut adimpleretur quod dictum est a domino per prophetam dicentem·	Now all this took place so that what was spoken by the Lord through the prophet might be fulfilled, saying,	26

1:23	Ecce uirgo in utero habebit et pariet filium et uocabunt nomen eius· emmanuel· quod est interpretatum nobiscum deus·	“Look, a virgin will be with child and she will bear a son and they will call him Emmanuel,” which is translated, “God with us.”	27
1:24	Exurgens autem ioseph a somno fecit sicut praecepit ei angelus domini· et accepit coniugem suam	And waking from (his) sleep, Joseph did just as the angel of the Lord instructed him. And he took (Maria) as his wife.	28
1:25	et non cognoscebat eam· donec peperit filium suum primogenitum et uocauit nomen eius ihesum	But he had no union with her until she bore her first-born son, and he called him Jesus.	29
Lk 2:1	Factum est autem in diebus illis· [27r] exiit edictu a caesare augusto· ut describeretur uniuersus orbis·	Now it happened in those days that a proclamation went out from Caesar Augustus that the whole world should be registered.	30
2:2	haec descriptio prima facta est praeside syriae cyrino·	This was the first registration that took place while Cyrinus was governor of Syria.	31
2:3	Et ibant omnes ut profiterentur singuli in suam ciuitatem·	And all were going that they each might be enrolled in their own city.	32
2:4	ascendit autem et ioseph· a galilaea de ciuitate nazareth· in iudaeam ciuitatem dauid· quae uocatur bethleem· eo quod esset de domo et familia dauid·	And Joseph too went up from Galilaea, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judaea (to) the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was from the house and family of David,	33
2:5	ut profiteretur cum maria desponsata sibi uxore pregnante·	that he might be enrolled with Maria, who was engaged to him as wife, (and who was) pregnant.	34
2:6	factum est autem cum essent ibi· impleti sunt dies ut pareret·	Now it happened that while they were there, the time came for her to give birth.	35
2:7	et peperit filium suum primogenitum· et pannis eum inuoluit· et reclinauit eum in praesepio quia non erat eis locus in diuersorio	And she bore her first-born son, and she wrapped him with cloths and laid him back in a manger, because there was no place for them in the inn.	36

5:1 (Mt 1:1) filii¹ F^sŠ] fili F*K

5:5 (Mt 1:5) booz² ABCHU*X] add. autem Š | iesse² BLU*XYZ] add. autem Š

5:7 (Mt 1:7) abia¹ D^sUWY] abiam AZŠ

5:14 (Mt 1:14) eliachim^{1,2}] achim Š

5:18 (Lk 3:35) phaleg KVZ] falec M; phalec AŠ | salae CIX] sale Š

5:19 (Lk 3:36) lamach] lamech Š

5:24 (Mt 1:20) paruit AUY*] apparuit MZŠ | filii F^sAM] fili F*ZŠ

- 5:26 (Mt 1:22) adimpleretur ΣCDEJLRTVWXZ] *add.* id AMŠ
 5:30 (Lk 2:1) edictu] edictum Š
 5:34 (Lk 2:5) pregnante GOT]; praegnante MZ; praegnate Š

Notes

- 5:1 (Mt 1:1): Some ancient evidence suggests that the genealogies were not originally present in Tatian's *Diatessaron*, at least insofar as it circulated in the East. Theodoret of Cyrrihus (*Haer. fab. comp.* I.20) famously critiques Tatian for cutting out (or up?) the genealogies (along with other material that demonstrated Jesus' Davidic lineage). Likewise, one recension of the Arabic *Diatessaron* omits the genealogies in the main text but includes them in an appendix (MSS B O E), while the other recension includes them each in a separate chapter in the text (MSS A C) (cf. also Isho' bar Ali's entry on the *Diatessaron* in his ninth century Syriac/Arabic Lexicon). The presence of the genealogies in F, however, would seem to represent the Western *Diatessaronic* tradition, where they are usually present (except in the Papyrusian Harmony), but in various forms (including Matt alone, Matt harmonized with a part of Luke [as here], and Matt and Luke in their totality and unharmonized). See also the note on F 5:17 (Lk 3:34) below.
- 5:1 (Mt 1:1): The scribe has added a superscript *i* to *fili* after the fact. This strategy is frequently applied, sometimes erroneously (e.g., F 5:24 [Mt 1:20]).
- 5:14 (Mt 1:14): F is unique in reading *eliachim* for *achim* (cf. Matt 1:13, where the name has just appeared).
- 5:17 (Lk 3:34): Matt's genealogy, which F includes in its entirety, only traces Jesus' lineage back to Abraham. Therefore F adds as an addendum the portion of Luke (3:34^y-38) that continues from Abraham up to Adam. However, F adds a transition (*autem*) from outside the context. Furthermore, F also retains the original descending order of Matt and the ascending order of Luke, which results in a rather disjunctive harmony. This sequence is followed by Codices Cassellanus, Sangallensis, Stuttgart, and Haaren. There is some evidence that an early version of the *Diatessaron* circulated in which this harmonized lineage was reordered as either an all-descending or all-ascending list (cf. Aphrahat, *Demonstrations* 23.21; Codex Bezae's version of Luke 3:23-38).
- 5:29 (Mt 1:25): In the Matthean context, the subject of *vocauit* is clearly Joseph; however, in this harmonized account, Maria has already received instruction from Gabriel to name her son Jesus (F 3:6 [Lk 1:31]). Thus the subject of the verb is now ambiguous (although local context might still suggest Joseph).

	<i>Caput VI</i>	<i>Chapter 6</i>	
Lk 2:8	Et pastores erant in regione eadem· uigilantes et custodientes uigilias noctis supra gregem suum·	And shepherds were in the same area, watching and keeping guard over their flock during the night.	1
2:9	et ecce angelus domini stetit iuxta illos· et claritas dei circumfulsit illos· et timuerunt timore magno·	And there stood an angel of the Lord next to them, and the brightness of God shined around them, and they were afraid with	2

2:10	Et dixit illis angelus· nolite timere· ecce enim euangelizo uobis gaudium magnum quod erit omni populo·	great dread. But the angel said to them, “Do not fear. For listen, I proclaim good news to you, a great joy that will be for all people.	3
2:11	quia natus est uobis hodie <i>[27v]</i> saluator· qui est christus dominus in ciuitate dauid·	For today a savior was born to you, who is Christus the Lord, in the city of David.	4
2:12	et hoc uobis signum· inuenietis infantem pannis inuolutum et positum in praesepio·	And this (will be) your sign: you will find a child wrapped with cloths and placed in a manger.	5
2:13	Et subito facta est cum angelo multitudo militiae caelestis· Laudantium deum et dicentium·	And suddenly with the angel there was a throng of the heavenly forces, praising God and saying,	6
2:14	gloria in altissimis deo· et in terra pax in hominibus bonae uoluntatis·	“Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to people of good will.”	7
2:15	Et factum est ut discesserunt ab eis angeli in caelum· pastores loquebantur ad inuicem· transeamus usque bethleem· et uideamus hoc uerbum quod factum est· quod fecit dominus et ostendit nobis	And it happened that, after the angels withdrew from them into heaven, the shepherds were saying to each other, “Let us crossover to Bethleem and see this thing that has happened, which the Lord has done and has revealed to us.”	8
2:16	Et uenerunt festinantes et inuenerunt mariam et ioseph· et infantem positum in praesepio·	And hurrying, they went and found Maria and Joseph, and the child placed in the manger.	9
2:17	uidentes autem cognouerunt de uerbo quod dictum erat illis de puero hoc·	And seeing (him), they inquired about the word that had been spoken to them concerning this boy.	10
2:18	et omnes qui audierunt mirati sunt et de his quae dicta erant a pastoribus ad ipsos·	And all who heard were also amazed concerning these things that had been said to them by the shepherds.	11
2:19	mariam autem conseruabat omnia uerba haec conferens in corde suo·	But Maria began saving all these words, considering (them) in her heart.	12
2:20	Et reuersi sunt pastores glorificantes et laudantes deum· in omnibus quae audierant et uiderant sicut dictum est ad illos	And the shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God for all that they had heard and seen, just as it was spoken to them.	13

(no textual variants)

	<i>Caput VII</i>	<i>Chapter 7</i>	
Lk 2:21	Et postquam consummati sunt dies octo ut circumcideretur· uocatum est nomen eius ihesus· quod uocatum est ab angelo priusquam in utero conciperetur·	And after eight days were complete, (it was time) that he be circumcised. He was named Jesus, which he was called by the angel before he was conceived in the womb.	1
2:22	Et postquam inpleti sunt dies purgationis eius secundum legem mosi· tulerunt illum in hierusalem ut sisterent eum domino·	And after the days of her purification were fulfilled according to the law of Moses, they brought him to Hierusalem, that they might present him to the Lord,	2
2:23	Sicut scriptum est in lege domini· quia omne masculinum adaperiens uuluam sanctum domino uocabitur·	just as it is written in the law of the Lord that every male who opens the womb shall be declared holy to the Lord,	3
2:24	et ut darent hostiam secundum quod dictum est in lege· par turturum aut duos pullos columbarum·	and that they might offer the sacrifice according to what is designated in the law: a pair of turtledoves or two young pigeons.	4
2:25	Et ecce homo erat in hierusalem· cui nomen symeon· et homo iste iustus et timoratus· expectans consolationem israhel· et spiritus sanctus erat in eo	Now there was a man in Hierusalem by the name of Symeon, and that man was righteous and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel. And the Holy Spirit was in him.	5
2:26	Et responsum acceperat ab spiritu· sancto· non uisurum se mortem· nisi prius uideret christum domini·	And he had received a response from the Holy Spirit that he would not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ.	6
2:27	Et uenit in spiritu· in templum· et cum inducerent puerum ihesum [28v] parentes eius ut facerent secundum consuetudinem legis pro eo·	And by the Spirit he went into the temple. And when his parents brought the child Jesus in, to do for him according to the custom of the law,	7
2:28	et ipse accepit eum in ulnas suas· et benedixit deum et dixit·	he himself also took him into his arms and blessed God and said,	8
2:29	Nunc dimittis seruum tuum domine secundum uerbum tuum in pace·	“Now you dismiss your servant, Lord, according to your word, in peace.	9
2:30	quia uiderunt oculi mei salutare tuum	For my eyes have seen your salvation,	10
2:31	quod parasti ante faciem omnium populorum·	which you have prepared in the presence of all peoples,	11
2:32	lumen ad reuelationem gentium·	a light for the revelation of the	12

	et gloriam plebis tuae israhel·	Gentiles and for the glory of your people Israel.”	
2:33	Et erat pater eius et mater mirantes super his quae dicebantur de illo·	And his father and mother marveled over these things that were being spoken about him.	13
2:34	Et benedixit illis symeon· et dixit ad mariam matrem eius· ecce positus est hic in ruinam et resurrectionem multorum in israhel· et in signum cui contradicetur·	And Symeon blessed them and said to Maria his mother, “Listen, this one has been set for the falling and rising again of many in Israel, and as a sign which will be opposed,	14
2:35	et tuam ipsius animam pertransibit gladius· ut reuelentur ex multis cordibus cogitationes	and a sword will pierce your very soul, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed.”	15
2:36	Et erat anna prophetissa filia fanuel· de tribu aser· haec processerat in diebus multis· et uixerat cum uiro suo annis septem a uirginitate sua·	And there was a prophetess, Anna, a daughter of Fanuel, of the tribe of Aser. She was far advanced in days. Now she had lived with her husband seven years after her marriage	16
2:37	Et haec uidua usque ad annos octoginta quattuor· quae non [29r] discedebat de templo ieiuniis et obseruationibus· Seruiens nocte ac die·	and as a widow until age eighty-four. She would not withdraw from the temple, observing with fastings and prayers night and day.	17
2:38	et haec ipsa hora superueniens confitebatur domino· et loquebatur de illo omnibus qui expectabant redemptionem hierusalem·	And coming up at that time, she herself began acknowledging the Lord and speaking about him to all who were waiting for the redemption of Hierusalem.	18
2:39	et perfecerunt omnia secundum legem domini reuersi sunt in galilaeam in ciuitatem suam nazareth	And they completed all things according to the law of the Lord. They returned to Galilaea, to their city, Nazareth.	19

7:4 (Lk 2:24) lege ADM(G)MPY] *add.* domini ZŠ

7:15 (Lk 2:35) pertransibit A] pertransiuit M; pertransiet ZŠ

7:19 (Lk 2:39) et] *add.* ut Š

Notes

7:1 (Lk 2:21): The naming of Jesus, although originally a reference back to F 3:6 (Lk 1:31), is now redundant with F 5:29 (Mt 1:25), where Jesus has already been named.

7:19 (Lk 2:39): F is unique in omitting *ut* after *et*, which slightly changes the sense of the sentence.

	<i>Caput VIII</i>	<i>Chapter 8</i>	
Mt 2:1	Cum ergo natus esset ihesus in bethleem iudaeae· in diebus herodis regis· ecce magi ab oriente uenerunt hierosolymam	Therefore after Jesus was born in Bethleem of Judaea, in the days of king Herodes, there came wise men from the east to Hierosolyma,	1
2:2	dicentes· ubi est qui natus est rex iudaeorum· uidimus enim stellam eius in oriente et uenimus adorare eum·	saying, “Where is the one who was born king of the Jews? For we saw his star in the east and we have come to honor him.”	2
2:3	audiens autem herodes rex turbatus est· et omnis hierosolyma cum illo·	But hearing (this), king Herodes was troubled, and all Hierosolyma with him.	3
2:4	et congregans omnes principes sacerdotum et scribas populi sciscitabatur ab eis ubi christus nasceretur	And gathering all the chief priests and scribes of the people, he was inquiring of them where the Christ should be born.	4
2:5	at illi dixerunt ei in bethleem iudae· sic enim scribtum est per prophetam·	But they said to him, “In Bethleem of Judaea, for thus it is written through the prophet:	5
2:6	Et tu bethleem terra iuda· nequaquam minima es in principibus iuda· ex te enim exiet iudex· qui reget populum meum israhel·	‘And you, Bethleem, land of Judaea, you are by no means least among the leaders of Judaea, for out of you will emerge a judge who will rule my people Israel.’”	6
[29v]			
2:7	Tunc herodes clam uocatis magis· diligenter didicit ab eis tempus stellae quae apparuit eis·	Then Herodes, having privately called the wise men, carefully learned from them the timing of the star that appeared to them.	7
2:8	Et mittens illos in bethleem dixit· Ite et interrogate diligenter de puero· et cum inueneritis renuntiate mihi ut et ego ueniens adorem eum·	And sending them to Bethleem, he said, “Go and carefully investigate about the child. And when you have found (him), report to me, so that I too may go and honor him.”	8
2:9	qui cum audissent regem· abierunt· et ecce stella quam uiderant in oriente antecedebat eos usque dum ueniens staret supra· ubi erat puer·	After they had heard the king, they left. And there, the star that they had seen in the east was going before them until it came and stood over where the child was.	9
2:10	uidentes autem stellam· gauisi sunt gaudio magno ualde·	And seeing the star, they deeply rejoiced with great gladness.	10
2:11	Et intrantes domum inuenerunt puerum cum maria matre sua· Et procidentes adorauerunt eum· Et apertis thesauris suis obtulerunt ei munera· aurum tus· et murram·	And entering the house, they found the child with Maria its mother. And falling down, they honored him. And uncovering their treasures, they offered him gold, frankincense, and myrrh as gifts.	11

2:12	Et responso accepto in somnis ne redirent· ad herodem per aliam uiam reuersi sunt in regionem suam·	And having received a response in (their) sleep that they should not return to Herodes, they went back to their own country by another way.	12
------	---	---	----

8:6 (Mt 2:6) iudex] dux Š
8:7 (Mt 2:7) stellae F^sŠ] stillae F*
8:11 (Mt 2:11) sua *aur d*] eius Š

Notes

- 8:1 (Mt 2:1): Following the implication of the text, F places Matt’s visit of the wise men sometime after Jesus’ birth, and not at the manger itself.
8:6 (Mt 2:6): F replaces the standard Vulgate reading of *dux* (leader) with *iudex* (judge), apparently unique in the Vulgate tradition (however, E reads *rex* [king]). This variant may stem from the similarity of the two words in Latin.
8:12 (Mt 2:12): In this harmonized context, the Matthean language to describe the wise men’s reception of a vision (*responso accepto*) is now reminiscent of the Lukan language for Symeon’s vision (*responsum acceperat*) in F 7:6 (Lk 2:26) above.

	<i>Caput VIII</i>	<i>Chapter 9</i>	
Mt 2:13	qui cum recessissent ecce angelus domini apparuit in somnis ioseph dicens· Surge et accipe puerum et matrem eius· et fuge in aegyptum· et esto [30r] ibi usque dum dicam tibi· futurum est enim ut herodes quaerat puerum ad perdendum eum·	After they had gone back, there appeared an angel of the Lord to Joseph in (his) sleep, saying, “Rise and take the child and his mother and flee to Aegyptus, and stay there until I tell you. For it will come to pass that Herodes will search for the child to destroy him.”	1
2:14	qui consurgens accepit puerum et matrem eius nocte· et recessit in aegyptum·	Rising, he took the child and his mother by night and retreated into Aegyptus.	2
2:15	et erat ibi usque ad obitum herodis· ut adimpleretur quod dictum est a domino per prophetam dicentem· ex aegypto uocauit filium meum	And he was there until the death of Herodes, that what was spoken by the Lord through the prophet might be fulfilled, saying, “Out of Aegyptus I have called my son.”	3

(no textual variants)

Notes

- 9:3 (Mt 2:15): This and the following two short chapters are so divided by their each fulfilling a messianic prophecy.

	<i>Caput X</i>	<i>Chapter 10</i>	
Mt 2:16	Tunc herodes uidens quoniam inlusus esset a magis· iratus est ualde· et mittens occidit omnes pueros qui erant in bethleem et in omnibus finibus eius· a bimatu et infra· secundum tempus quod exquisierat a magis·	Then Herodes, seeing that he had been duped by the wise men, was exceedingly enraged, and he sent and had all the boys killed who were in Bethlehem and in all its territory, from two years old and under, according to the timing that he had sought out from the wise men.	1
2:17	Tunc adimpletum est quod dictum est per hieremiam prophetam dicentem·	Then what was spoken through the prophet Hieremias was fulfilled, saying,	2
2:18	Uox in rama audita est· ploratus et ululatus multus rachel plorans filios suos· et noluit consolari quia non sunt	“A voice in Rama was heard, great weeping and wailing, Rachel weeping for her children, and she refused to be consoled, for they were no more.”	3

(no textual variants)

	<i>Caput XI</i>	<i>Chapter 11</i>	
Mt 2:19	Defuncto autem herode ecce apparuit angelus domini in somnis ioseph in aegypto	But when Herodes died, there appeared an angel of the Lord to Joseph in Aegyptus in (his) sleep,	1
2:20	dicens· surge et accipe puerum et matrem eius et uade in terram	saying, “Rise and take the child and his mother and go to the land	2
[30v]	israhel defuncti sunt enim qui quaerebant animam pueri·	of Israel, for those who were seeking the life of the child are dead.”	
2:21	qui surgens accepit puerum et matrem eius et uenit in terram israhel·	Rising, he took the child and his mother and went to the land of Israel.	3
2:22	audiens autem quod archelaus regnaret in iudaeam pro herode patre suo· timuit illuc ire· et ammonitus in somnis· secessit in partes galilaeae·	But hearing that Archelaus was ruling in Judaea in place of his father Herodes, he feared to go there, and, having been warned in (his) sleep, he withdrew to the regions of Galilaea.	4
2:23	et ueniens habitauit in ciuitate quae uocatur nazareth ut adimpleretur quod dictum est per prophetas· quoniam nazareus uocabitur	And coming, he settled in a city that is called Nazareth, that what was spoken through the prophets might be fulfilled, that he will be called a Nazarene.	5

11:4 (Mt 2:22) iudaeam] iudaea Š | illuc ADD^ŠEHØLQR(T)UY] illo ZŠ

Notes

11:5 (Mt 2:23): Although this is the first mention of Nazareth in the Matthean context, the preceding Lukan material has already made clear that Nazareth was the original home of Maria and Joseph (cf. F 3:1 [Lk 1:26]; F 5:33 [Lk 2:4]; F 7:19 [Lk 2:39]). Thus in this new context their decision to (re)settle there is not as innovative as the text might suggest.

CHAPTER THREE

Selections from the Public Ministry of Jesus

Sermon on the Mount (F 23–44)

	<i>Caput XXIII</i>	<i>Chapter 23</i>	
Mt 4:23	Et circuibat ihesus totam galilaeam docens in synagogis eorum et praedicans euangelium regni et sanans omnem languorem et omnem infirmitatem in populo·	And Jesus was going around all Galilaea, teaching in their synagogues and proclaiming the good news of the kingdom and healing every (kind) of disease and every sickness among the people.	1
4:24	et abiit opinio eius in totam syriam· et optulerunt ei omnes male habentes uariis languoribus· et tormentis comprehensos· et qui [39v] daemonia habebant et lunaticos et paralyticos et curauit eos	And his reputation went throughout all Syria. And they brought him all those feeling ill, those taken by various diseases and pains, and those were demon-possessed, and epileptics, and paralytics, and he healed them.	2
4:25	et secutae sunt eum turbae multae de galilaea et decapoli· ex hierosolymis et iudaea· et de trans iordanen	And great crowds followed him from Galilaea and the Decapolis, out of Hierosolyma and Judaea, and from across the Jordanis.	3
Lk 4:42 ^c	et detinebant illum ne discederet ab eis·	And they were trying to keep him from departing from them,	4
4:43	quibus ille ait· quia et aliis ciuitatibus oportet me euangelizare regnum dei· quia ideo missus sum	to whom he said, “It is necessary for me to preach the good news of the kingdom of God to other cities as well, for that is why I was sent.”	5
Mt 5:1 ^{ab}	et cum uidisset turbas ascendit in montem et cum sedisset	And when he had seen the crowds, he ascended onto a mountain. And when he had sat,	6
Mk 3:13 ^{ab}	uocauit ad se quos uoluit ipse et uenerunt ad eum	he called to himself those he wanted, and they came to him.	7
3:14 ^a	et fecit ut essent duodecim cum illo	And he appointed twelve to be with him,	8
Lk 6:13 ^c	Quos et apostolos nominauit·	whom he also named apostles:	9
6:14 ^{ab}	simonem quem cognominauit petrum· et andream fratrem eius·	Simon, whom he surnamed Petrus, and Andreas, his brother;	10
Mk 3:17 ^{ab}	iacobum zebedaei· et iohannem fratrem iacobi· Quibus inposuit nomina	Jacobus (son) of Zebedaeus, and Johannes, the brother of Jacobus, to whom he assigned the names	11

	boanerges quod est fili tonitruī·	Boanerges, that is, Sons of Thunder;	
Lk 6:14 ^d	philippum et bartholomeum·	Philippus and Bartholomeus;	12
6:15	mattheum· et thoman· iacobum alpei et simon qui uocatur zelothēs·	Mattheus and Thomas; Jacobus (son) of Alpheus and Simon who is called the Zealot;	13
6:16	et iudam iacobi· et iudam scarioth· qui fuit proditor	and Judas (son) of Jacobus, and Judas Scarioth, who was a traitor.	14
Mt 5:2 ^a	Et	And	15
5:1 ^β [40r]	accesserunt ad eum discipuli eius	his disciples approached him,	
Lk 6:20 ^a	et eleuatis oculis in eos	and lifting (his) eyes to them,	16
Mt 5:2 ^a	Aperiens os suum docebat eos dicens	opening his mouth, he began to teach them, saying,	17
5:3	Beati pauperes spiritu· quoniam ipsorum est regnum caelorum·	“Blessed (are) the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of the heavens.	18
5:4	beati mites· quoniam ipsi possidebunt terram·	Blessed (are) the meek, for they will inherit the earth.	19
5:5	beati qui lugent· quoniam ipsi consolabuntur·	Blessed (are) those who mourn, for they will be comforted.	20
5:6	beati qui esuriunt et sitiunt iustitiam quoniam ipsi saturabuntur·	Blessed (are) those who hunger and thirst for righteous, for they will be filled.	21
5:7	beati misericordes quoniam ipsi misericordiam consequentur·	Blessed (are) the merciful, for they will acquire mercy.	22
5:8	Beati mundo corde· quoniam ipsi deum uidebunt·	Blessed (are) the pure in heart, for they will see God.	23
5:9	beati pacifici· quoniam filii dei uocabuntur·	Blessed (are) the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God.	24
5:10	beati qui persecutionem patiuntur propter iustitiam· quoniam ipsorum est regnum caelorum·	Blessed (are) those who suffer persecution for the sake of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of the heavens.	25
5:11 ^a	Beati estis cum maledixerint uobis	Blessed are you when people revile you	26
Lk 6:22 ^a	et odierint uos homines·	and hate you,	
Mt 5:11 ^{αβ}	et persecuti fuerint· et dixerint omne malum aduersum uos mentientes·	and they persecute and speak every evil against you falsely,	
Lk 6:22	et cum separauerint uos et exprobauerint et eiecerint nomen uestrum tamquam malum propter [40v] filium hominis·	and when they exclude you and reproach (you) and spit out your name as if it were evil, for the sake of the Son of Man.	
6:23 ^a	gaudete in illa die et exultate	Rejoice on that day and leap for	27

Mt 5:12 ^{ab}	quoniam merces uestra copiosa est in caelis· sic enim persecuti sunt prophetas qui fuerunt ante uos	joy, for your reward in the heavens is plentiful. For in this way their ancestors persecuted the prophets who were before you.”
Lk 6:23 ^y	patres eorum	

23:1 (Mt 4:23) circuibat HΘW] circumibat Š
 23:3 (Mt 4:25) ex] et Š
 23:6 (Mt 5:1) et cum uidisset turbas] cum uidisset autem populum *k*; uidens autem turbas Š
 23:11 (Mk 3:17) Quibus inposuit] et inposuit eis Š | fili V] filii Š
 23:13 (Lk 6:15) simon] simonem Š
 23:14 (Lk 6:16) et^l DW] *om.* Š
 23:16 (Lk 6:20) et] *add.* ipse Š | eos] discipulos suos Š
 23:22 (Mt 5:7) quoniam ΣA] quia MZŠ
 23:26 (Lk 6:22) et odierint uos homines] cum vos oderint homines Š
 23:26 (Mt 5:11) persecuti] *add.* vos Š | mentientes] *add.* propter me Š

Notes

23:6 (Mt 5:1): Rather than the standard Vulgate opening of Matt 5:1 (*uidens autem turbas*), F reads *et cum uidisset turbas*, coming close to Old Latin *k*'s reading (*cum uidisset autem populum*) and paralleling the *et cum sedisset* that follows in the verse.

23:7 (Mk 3:13): F interrupts the opening of Matt's Sermon on the Mount to insert the calling of the twelve apostles, patterning Luke's sequence (and much of Luke's language, *pace* Ranke) in which the calling of the twelve comes directly before Luke's Sermon on the Plain (see Luke 6:12-26). The likely impetus was the parallel language in Matt 5:1 and Mark 3:13 of Jesus climbing a mountain, to introduce the sermon in the former and to call the twelve in the latter.

23:7 (Mk 3:13): Beginning at this point in the manuscript (f. 39v), the scribe began inserting some of the Eusebian section and canon numbers into the text itself, in addition to those that appear in the margin. However, this exercise only continues through to the following page (f. 40r) and then ceases. It makes particular appearance in the Beatitudes that begin at F 23:17 (Mt 5:2). The last example appears before F 23:22 (Mt 5:7).

23:11 (Mk 3:17): F has altered the standard *et inposuit eis* to *quibus inposuit*, which has no significant effect on the sentence, except perhaps to keep an independent clause from interrupting the continued syntax in the list of apostles. This verse comes only from Mark, so no parallel could have fed F this unique reading, although there is a noteworthy similarity in Codex Bezae's (*d*) variant reading of Luke 6:14 (*quos cognominauit boanerges quod est fili tonitruui*).

23:16 (Lk 6:20): F has collapsed *discipulos suos* simply to *eos*, likely to avoid repetition with the reference to the disciples from Matt 5:1 in the previous verse.

23:18 (Mt 5:3): The Sermon on the Mount formally begins. F draws its material and order almost entirely from Matt, with occasional wording from Luke (and Mark) sprinkled in, but by no means to the degree that might have been possible. Where parallel sayings exist elsewhere (e.g., on salt, divorce, etc.), F generally saves them for a later context.

23:19-20 (Mt 5:4-5): As is typical in the Latin tradition, F reverses the standard Greek order of vv. 4 and 5.

23:26 (Lk 6:22): It appears F has slightly rephrased Luke to fit the harmonized context.

	<i>Caput XXIII</i>	<i>Chapter 24</i>	
Lk 6:24	Uerumtamen uae uobis diuitibus quia habetis consolationem uestram	“Nevertheless, woe to you (who are) rich, because you have your comfort.	1
6:25	Uae uobis qui saturati estis quia esurietis· Uae uobis qui ridetis nunc quia lugebitis et flebitis	Woe to you who are filled, because you will be hungry. Woe to you who are laughing now, because you will mourn and cry.	2
6:26	Uae cum bene uobis dixerint omnes homines· secundum haec faciebant prophetis patres eorum	Woe when all people speak well of you; in these (ways) their ancestors were acting toward the prophets.	3
6:27 ^a	Sed uobis dico qui auditis	But I say to you who are listening,	4

(no textual variants)

Notes

24:1 (Lk 6:24): F diminishes the parallelism of Luke’s “woes” by placing them after Matt’s Beatitudes.

24:3 (Lk 6:26): F agrees with the majority of the Vulgate tradition in reading “prophets” here, against the standard Greek reading of “false prophets.”

24:4 (Lk 6:27): F’s placement of a chapter division mid-sentence may indicate that the exemplar was delimited based not only on content but also on transitions in source text, which goes from Luke back to Matt at this point. However, chapter divisions do not appear to follow a strict pattern.

	<i>Caput XXV</i>	<i>Chapter 25</i>	
Mt 5:13 ^{aby}	Uos estis sal terrae· quod si sal· euanuerit in quo salietur ad nihilum ualet ultra· nisi ut proiciatur foras· et conculcetur ab hominibus	“You are the salt of the earth; but if the salt should lose strength, how will it be salted? It is good for nothing further except to be thrown away outside and trampled upon by people.”	1

25:1 (Mt 5:13) proiciatur *d*] proici *k*; mittatur Š

Notes

25:1 (Mt 5:13): In place of the Vulgate reading *mittatur*, F reads *proiciatur* with Old Latin *d* (cf. *proici* in *k*; also Matt 5:29-30, where the verb appears normally).

	<i>Caput XXVI</i>	<i>Chapter 26</i>	
Mt 5:14	Uos estis lux mundi· non potest ciuitas abscondi supra montem posita	“You are the light of the world. A city set on a hill cannot be hidden.	1
5:15 ^a	neque accendant lucernam et ponunt eam sub modio	Neither do they light a lamp and put it under a measuring bowl,	2
Mk 4:21 ^β	neque sub lecto	nor under a bed,	
Lk 11:33 ^α	neque in loco abscondito·	nor in a hidden place,	
Lk 8:16 ^α	neque sub uaso·	nor under a vessel,	
Mt 5:15 ^{bc} [41r]	sed super candelabrum ut et luceat omnibus qui in domo sunt	but on a lampstand, that it too may shine on all that are in the house.	
5:16	Sic luceat lux uestra coram hominibus ut uideant uestra bona opera· et glorificent patrem uestrum qui est in caelis·	In this way let your own light shine before people, that they may see your good deeds and glorify your Father who is in the heavens.	3
5:17	nolite putare quoniam ueni soluere legem aut prophetas· non ueni soluere· sed adimplere	Do not think that I have come to loosen the Law or the Prophets. I have not come to loosen, but to fulfill.	4
5:18	amen quippe dico uobis· donec transeat caelum et terra· iota unum aut unus apex· non praeteribit ex lege donec omnia fiant	Truly indeed I say to you, until heaven and earth pass away, not one jot or one speck will pass from the law, until all things happen.	5
5:19	Qui ergo soluerit unum de mandatis istis minimis· et docuerit sic homines minimus uocabitur in regno caelorum· Qui autem fecerit et docuerit hic magnus uocabitur in regno caelorum	Therefore, the one who loosens the least one of these commands, and teaches people thus, will be called least in the kingdom of the heavens. But the one who does (them), and teaches (thus), this one will be called great in the kingdom of the heavens.	6
5:20	Dico enim uobis quia nisi abundauerit iustitia uestra plus quam scribarum et pharisaeorum non intrabitis in regno caelorum	For I say to you that unless your righteousness abounds more than (that) of the scribes and of the Pharisees, you will not enter in the kingdom of the heavens.”	7

26:2 (Mk 4:21) neque sub lecto] aut sub lecto Š

26:2 (Lk 11:33) neque in loco abscondito] et in abscondito ponit Š

26:2 (Lk 8:16) neque sub uaso] operit eam uaso Š

26:2 (Mt 5:15^{bc}) et *om.* Š

26:3 (Mt 5:16) est in caelis BHΘY] in caelis est Š

26:5 (Mt 5:18) ex H] a Š

26:7 (Mt 5:20) regno BJM] regnum Š

Notes

26:2 (Mt 5:15): The “light on a stand” saying appears four times in the Synoptics in various forms (Matt 5:14-16; Mark 4:21; Luke 8:16; 11:33; cf. John 8:12). F manages to incorporate the objects of each instance into the Matthean form by supplying *neque* before each one, and by altering other small details.

	<i>Caput XXVII</i>	<i>Chapter 27</i>	
Mt 5:21	audistis quia dictum est antiquis· non occides· qui autem occiderit· reus erit iudicio·	“You have heard that it was said to the ancients, ‘Do not murder.’ And ‘the one who murders will be liable to judgment.’	1
5:22 ^{abyδ} [41v]	ego autem dico uobis quia omnis qui irascitur fratri suo· reus erit iudicio qui autem dixerit fratri suo racha· reus erit gehennae ignis	But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother will be liable to judgment. And the one who says ‘Racha’ to his brother will be liable to the fire of Gehenna.”	2

27:2 (Mt 5:22) reus erit gehennae ignis] reus erit concilio qui autem dixerit fatue reus erit gehennae ignis S

Notes

27:2 (Mt 5:22): A significant portion of this verse is omitted, likely from parablepsis with the repeated phrase *reus erit*. However, the resulting sentence still makes sense.

	<i>Caput XXVIII</i>	<i>Chapter 28</i>	
Mt 5:23	Si ergo offeres munus tuum ad altare et ibi recordatus fueris· quia frater tuus habet aliquid aduersum te·	“If, therefore, you are offering your gift at the altar and there you have remembered that your brother has something against you,	1
5:24	relinque ibi munus tuum ad altare et uade prius reconciliari fratri tuo· et tunc ueniens offer munus tuum·	leave your gift there at the altar and go first to be reconciled with your brother. And then come offer your gift.	2
5:25	Esto consentiens aduersario tuo cito dum es in uia cum eo· ne forte tradat te aduersarius iudici· et iudex· tradat te ministro et in carcere mittaris·	Find agreement with your accuser quickly while you are on the way with him, lest the accuser should hand you over to the judge, and the judge hand you over to the officer, and you be thrown in prison.	3
5:26	amen dico tibi non exies inde donec reddas nouissimum quadrantem	Truly, I say to you, you will not leave there until you repay the last quadrans.”	4

28:2 (Mt 5:24) ad ACD^ŠO*T*Y] ante MZŠ | reconciliari ΘORW] reconciliare S | offer
 B(C)MZ^c] offers AZ*Š
 28:3 (Mt 5:25) carcere EMT] carcerem Š

	<i>Caput XXVIII</i>	<i>Chapter 29</i>	
Mt 5:27	audistis quia dictum est antiquis non moechaberis·	“You have heard that it was said to the ancients, ‘You shall not commit adultery.’	1
5:28	ego autem dico uobis quoniam omnis qui uiderit mulierem ad concupiscendum eam iam moechatus est eam in corde suo·	But I say to you that everyone who looks at a woman to desire her has already committed adultery with her in his heart.	2
5:29	Quod si oculus tuus dexter scandalizat te· erue eum et proice [42r] abs te· expedit enim tibi ut pe reat unum membrorum tuorum quam totum corpus tuum mittatur in gehennam·	But if your right eye causes you to stumble, tear it out and throw (it) away from you. For it is beneficial for you that one of your body parts be destroyed rather than your whole body be thrown into Gehenna.	3
5:30	Et si dextra manus tua scandalizat te· abscide eam et proice abs te· expedit enim tibi ut pereat unum membrorum tuorum quam totum corpus tuum eat in gehennam	And if your right hand causes you to stumble, cut it off and throw (it) away from you. For it is beneficial for you that one of your body parts be destroyed rather than your whole body pass into Gehenna.”	4

29:4 (Mt 5:30) enim AGM] om. ZŠ

	<i>Caput XXX</i>	<i>Chapter 30</i>	
Mt 5:31	dictum est autem· quicumque dimiserit uxorem suam· det illi libellum repudii·	“Now it was said, ‘Whoever dismisses his wife, let him give her a notification of divorce.’	1
5:32	ego autem dico uobis· quia omnis qui dimiserit uxorem suam excepta fornicationis causa· facit eam moechari· et qui dimissam duxerit adulterat	But I say to you that everyone who dismisses his wife, except on account of sexual immorality, causes her to commit adultery. And the one who marries the dismissed woman commits adultery.”	2

(no textual variants)

	<i>Caput XXXI</i>	<i>Chapter 31</i>	
Mt 5:33	audistis quia dictum est antiquis non peierabis· reddes autem domino iuramenta tua·	“You have heard that it was said to the ancients, ‘You shall not swear falsely, but you shall render your oaths to the Lord.’	1
5:34	Ego autem dico uobis· non iurare omnino neque per caelum quia thronus dei est·	But I say to you, do not swear at all: neither by heaven, for it is the throne of God,	2
5:35	neque per terram· quia scabyllum est pedum eius· neque per hierosolymam quia ciuitas est magni regis·	nor by earth, for it is the footstool of his feet, nor by Hierosolyma, for it is the city of the great king,	3
5:36 [42v]	neque per caput tuum iuraberis· quia non potes unum capillum album facere aut nigrum·	nor shall you swear by your head, for you are not able to make one hair white or black.	4
5:37	sit autem sermo uester· est· est· non non· quod autem his abundantius est a malo est	But let your speech be, ‘Yes, yes,’ ‘No, no.’ And what is more abundant than these is from the evil one.”	5

31:1 (Mt 5:33) audistis] *praem.* iterum Š | peierabis F^vAMZ*Š] perierabis F*BO*
31:4 (Mt 5:36) iuraberis] iuraveris Š

Notes

31:1 (Mt 5:33): Victor (or the scribe) has dotted out the first *r* in *perierabis*.

	<i>Caput XXXII</i>	<i>Chapter 32</i>	
Mt 5:38	audistis quia dictum est oculum pro oculo· et dentem pro dente·	“You have heard that it was said, ‘An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.’	1
5:39	Ego autem dico uobis· non resistere malo· Sed si quis te percusserit in dextra maxilla tua· praebe illi et alteram·	But I say to you, do not resist an evil person. But if anyone should strike you on your right cheek, offer to that one the other also.	2
5:40	et illi qui uult tecum iudicio contendere· et tunicam tuam tollere· remitte et pallium·	And to the one who wants to fight with you in court and take your tunic, surrender your cloak also.	3
5:41	et quicumque te angariauerit mille passus uade cum illo alia duo·	And whoever compels you one mile, walk with that one two others.	4
5:42	Qui petit· a te da ei· et uolenti mutuare a te ne auertaris	The one who asks of you, give to him; and from the one who wishes to borrow from you, do not turn away.	5
Lk 6:30 ^b	et qui auferet quae tua sunt non	And the one who takes what are	6

6:31 ^{ab}	repetas et prout uultis ut faciant uobis homines· facite illis similiter	yours, do not demand (them) back. And just as you wish people to do to you, do likewise to them.”	7
--------------------	--	---	---

32:3 (Mt 5:40) illi AHΘY] ei Š | remitte AJO*XY] *add.* ei Š
 32:5 (Mt 5:42) mutuare] mutuari Š
 32:6 (Lk 6:30) auferet ΣAGJMZ] aufert Š | non] ne Š
 32:7 (Lk 6:31) facite] *praem.* et vos Š

Notes

32:4 (Mt 5:41): F follows the standard Vulgate, Old Latin, and Old Syriac reading of two “others” (*alia*), for an apparent total of three miles walked.
 32:5 (Mt 5:42): F has a tendency to alternate *i* and *e*, especially in infinitives, as in the current case of *mutuari* to *mutuare*. In the active voice, *mutuare* can mean “lend” instead of “borrow”; however, it is unlikely this was the intention of the scribe. For another potential example, see below at F 33:1 (Mt 5:43).
 32:7 (Lk 6:31): F’s insertion of Luke’s “Golden Rule” here anticipates its Matthean appearance much later in the sermon (F 41:11 [Mt 7:12]).

	<i>Caput XXXIII</i>	<i>Chapter 33</i>	
Mt 5:43	audistis quia dictum est diligis proximum tuum et odio habebis inimicum tuum·	“You have heard that it was said, ‘You love your neighbor and you shall hate your enemy.’	1
5:44	ego autem dico uobis· diligite inimicos uestros· benefacite his qui uos oderunt· et orate pro ^[43r] persequentibus et calumniantibus uos	But I say to you, love your enemies, do good to those who hate you, and pray for those who are persecuting and falsely accusing you,	2
5:45	Ut sitis fili patris uestri qui in caelis est· quia solem suum oriri facit super malos et bonos· et pluit super iustos et iniustos·	that you may be children of your Father who is in the heavens. For he causes his sun to rise over the evil and the good, and he rains on the righteous and the unrighteous.	3
5:46	Si enim diligatis eos qui uos diligunt quam mercedem habebitis· Nonne et publicani hoc faciunt·	For if you should love those who love you, what reward shall you have? Do not even tax collectors do this?	4
Lk 6:33	Et si benefeceritis his qui bene uobis faciunt quae uobis est gratia· siquidem et peccatores hoc faciunt·	And if you should do good to those who do good to you, what credit is it to you, since even sinners do this?	5
6:34	Et si mutuum dederitis his a quibus speratis recipere quae gratia est uobis nam et peccatores peccatoribus	And if you should lend to those from whom you hope to receive, what credit is it to you, for even sinners lend on interest to sinners,	6

Mt 5:47 ^{ab}	faenerant ut recipiant aequalia et si salutaueritis fratres uestros tantum· nonne et ethnici hoc faciunt·	that they may receive as much. And if you should wish only your brothers well, do not even the Gentiles do this?	7
Lk 6:35	Uerumtamen diligite inimicos uestros· et benefacite· et mutuum date nihil desperantes et erit merces uestra multa et eritis filii altissimi quia ipse benignus est· super ingratos et malos	However, love your enemies and do good and lend, despairing of nothing, and your reward will be great and you will be children of the Most High, for he is kind over the ungrateful and the evil.	8
6:36 [43v]	Estote ergo misericordes· sicut et pater uester misericors est	Therefore, be merciful, just as your Father also is merciful.	9
Mt 5:48	Estote ergo uos perfecti sicut pater uester caelestis perfectus est	Therefore, be perfect, just as your heavenly Father is perfect.”	10

33:1 (Mt 5:43) diligis CO*RTX*] diliges Š
33:2 (Mt 5:44) uos oderunt] oderunt uos Š
33:3 (Mt 5:45) fili F*] filii F^bŠ | quia F*Y] qui F^bŠ | malos et bonos BH] bonos et malos Š
33:5 (Lk 6:33) bene uobis faciunt] uobis bene faciunt Š
33:6 (Lk 6:34) faenerant (DGQ)] fenerantur (AM)ZŠ
33:7 (Mt 5:47) tantum] *add.* quid amplius facitis Š
33:8 (Lk 6:35) fili F*] filii F^bŠ
33:10 (Mt 5:48) sicut JLR] *add.* et Š

Notes

33:2 (Mt 5:44): This chapter exhibits an uncharacteristic number of transpositions of words in close proximity: *uos oderunt* in F 33:2 (Mt 5:44); *malos et bonos* in F 33:3 (Mt 5:45); and *bene uobis faciunt* in F 33:5 (Lk 6:33). Although the second example has outside attestation, the other two appear to be unique to F, which may indicate that some amount of tinkering with the original form of the text has occurred here.

33:3 (Mt 5:45): A later hand using black ink has corrected *fili* to *filii* and *quia* to *qui*, as well as *fili* to *filii* in F 33:8 (Lk 6:35) below. It is noteworthy that the *quia* in F agrees with Old Latin *d* as well as the accepted Greek reading ὅτι, against the traditional Latin reading *qui* (also reflected in a handful of Greek MSS as ὄς or ὄστις [e.g. 1573]).

33:10 (Mt 5:48): The chapter is fairly well-harmonized except for the last two verses, which are strikingly repetitive.

	<i>Caput XXXVIII</i>	<i>Chapter 34</i>	
Mt 6:1	attendite ne iustitiam uestram faciatis coram hominibus et uideamini ab eis· alioquin mercedem non habebitis· apud patrem uestrum qui in caelis est·	“Take care that you do not do your righteousness before people and are seen by them. Otherwise you shall not have a reward in the presence of your Father who is in	1

6:2	Cum ergo facies elemosinam· noli tuba canere ante te sicut hypocritae faciunt in synagogis et in uicis ut honorificentur ab hominibus· amen dico uobis receperunt mercedem suam·	the heavens. When, therefore, you give alms, do not play a trumpet before you, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, to be honored by people. Truly I say to you, they have received their reward.	2
6:3	te autem faciente elemosynam nesciat sinistra tua· quid faciat dextera tua·	But when you give alms, let not your left hand know what your right hand is doing,	3
6:4	ut sit elemosyna tua in abscondito· et pater tuus qui uidet in abscondito reddet tibi	that your alms may be in secret. And your Father, who sees in secret, will give back to you.”	4

34:1 (Mt 6:1) et] ut Š | apud F^sŠ] aput F*CJO*X*Z*

34:2 (Mt 6:2) hypocritae F^sŠ] hypocrite F*

Notes

34:1 (Mt 6:1): The English translation reflects the change from *ut* to *et*; however, the reading is likely a scribal mistake. In this same verse, the scribe has corrected *aput* to *apud* by altering the *t* into an uncharacteristic *d*.

34:2 (Mt 6:2): The scribe has added a small *a* above the *e* to correct *hypocrite*.

	<i>Caput XXXV</i>	<i>Chapter 35</i>	
Mt 6:5	et cum oratis non eritis sicut hypocritae· qui amant in synagogis et in angulis platearum stantes orare· ut uideantur ab hominibus· Amen dico uobis· receperunt mercedem suam	“And when you pray, you shall not be like the hypocrites, who love to pray standing in the synagogues and on the corners of streets, to be seen by people. Truly I say to you, they have received their reward.	1
6:6 [44r]	Tu autem cum orabis intra in cubiculum tuum et cluso ostio tuo· ora patrem tuum in abscondito· et pater tuus qui uidet in abscondito reddet tibi·	But you, when you shall pray, enter into your bedroom and, with your door closed, pray to your Father in secret. And your Father, who sees in secret, will give back to you.	2
6:7	orantes autem nolite multum loqui sicut ethnici· putant enim quia in multiloquio suo exaudiantur·	And while praying, do not speak much, like the Gentiles. For they think that they are heard clearly in their loquaciousness.	3
6:8	nolite ergo adsimilari eis· scit enim pater uester quibus opus sit uobis antequam petatis eum·	Therefore do not imitate them, for your Father knows what is beneficial for you before you ask	4

		him.”	
Lk 11:1 ^{βcδ}	F Tunc dixit unus ex discipulis eius ad eum· domine doce nos orare· sicut iohannes docuit discipulos suos·	Then one of his disciples said to him, “Lord, teach us to pray, just as Johannes taught his disciples.”	5
Lk 11:2 ^{ab}	et ait illis cum oratis dicite·	And he said to them, “When you pray, say:	6
Mt 6:9 ^{bc}	pater noster qui in caelis es· sanctificetur nomen tuum·	Our Father, who are in the heavens, may your name be sanctified.	7
6:10	ueniat regnum tuum· fiat uoluntas tua· sicut in caelo et in terra·	May your kingdom come, may your will be done, just as in heaven, also on earth.	8
6:11 ^α	panem nostrum supersubstantialem	Our life-sustaining	9
Lk 11:3 ^α	cotidianum	daily	
Mt 6:11 ^α	da nobis die·	bread give us (this) day.	
6:12	et demitte nobis debita nostra· sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris	And release us of our debts, just as we also forgive those indebted to us.	10
6:13	et ne inducas nos in temptacionem sed libera nos a malo·	And do not lead us into temptation, but free us from the evil one.	11
6:14 ^[44v]	si enim dimiseritis hominibus peccata eorum dimittet et uobis pater uester caelestis delicta uestra	For if you forgive people their sins, your heavenly Father will also forgive you your offenses.	12
6:15	Si autem non dimiseritis hominibus nec pater uester dimittet uobis peccata uestra	But if you do not forgive people, neither will your Father forgive you your sins.”	13

35:2 (Mt 6:6) cluso F*ΘJL*MO*QRZ*Š] clauso F^b

35:5 (Lk 11:1) sicut B(C)DEGΘJKORTVWZ] *add.* et AMŠ

35:9 (Lk 11:3) cotidianum F*] *om.* F^v

35:9 (Mt 6:11) die] hodie Š

35:10 (Mt 6:12) demitte BHKO*VY] dimitte Š | dimittimus AMGC] dimisimus Z*Š

35:11 (Mt 6:13) temptacionem AQTXYZ] temptationem MŠ

35:13 (Mt 6:15) uobis DEGLQRW] *om.* Š

Notes

35:2 (Mt 6:6): A later hand in black ink has corrected *cluso* to *clauso*.

35:5 (Lk 11:1): F interrupts the Matthean Jesus’ speech with the Lukan disciples’ question before the “Lord’s Prayer.” To do so, F also adds a transitional word (*tunc*) not found in either gospel text.

35:9 (Lk 11:3): A handful of Vulgate manuscripts (CDEGLTW) replace *supersubstantialem* in Matt 6:11 with *cotidianum* from Luke 11:3, while Σ adds

cotidianum into the margin; but only F places the two words side by side in the text. In F, Victor has placed three dots over *cotidianum* and his editorial symbol in the margin to indicate his dissatisfaction with its presence. Ranke defends the decision to retain the word in the text of his edition with the explanation that normally when Victor deletes a word, all of its letters have dots over them. The word's presence in the current edition (despite Victor's deletion) reflects the strong likelihood that it represents the reading of F's harmonized exemplar.

	<i>Caput XXXVI</i>	<i>Chapter 36</i>	
Mt 6:16	Cum autem ieiunatis nolite fieri sicut hypocritae tristes· exterminant enim facies suas ut pareant hominibus ieiunantes· amen dico uobis quia receperunt mercedem suam·	“And when you fast, do not be sullen like the hypocrites, for they deprive their faces, that they may be evident to people while fasting. Truly I say to you that they have received their reward.	1
6:17	tu autem cum ieiunas unge caput tuum et faciem tuam laua·	But you, when you fast, anoint your head and wash your face,	2
6:18	ne uidearis hominibus ieiunans· sed patri tuo qui est in abscondito· et pater tuus qui uidet in abscondito reddet tibi·	that you may not be seen by people while fasting, but by your Father who is in secret. And your Father, who sees in secret, will give back to you.	3
Lk 12:32	nolite timere pusillus grex· quia conplacuit patri uestro dare uobis regnum	Do not fear, little flock, for it has pleased your Father to give you the kingdom.	4
12:33 ^{abc}	Uendite quae possidetis et date elemosynam· facite uobis sacculos qui non ueterescunt· thesaurum non deficientem in caelis	Sell what you possess and give alms; make yourselves purses that do not age, treasure in the heavens that will not run out.”	5

36:1 (Mt 6:16) exterminant ΣABCDFHΘJMTVWXY] demoliuntur Z*Š

36:2 (Mt 6:17) unge F^s] ungue F*Š

Notes

36:1-2 (Lk 12:32-33): F uses the verses that follow Luke's version of the “do not worry” teaching (Luke 12:22-31) as an introduction to Matt's version thereof (Matt 6:19-34 = F 37-39 below).

	<i>Caput XXXVII</i>	<i>Chapter 37</i>	
Mt 6:19 ^{ab}	nolite thesaurizare uobis thesauros in terra· ubi erugo et tinea demolitur·	“Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth, where rust and moth destroy.	1
6:20 [45r]	thesau rizate autem uobis	But store up for yourselves	2

	thesauros in caelo· ubi neque erugo neque tinea demolitur· et ubi fures non effodiunt· nec furantur·	treasures in heaven, where neither rust nor moth destroys, and where thieves do not dig up or steal.	
6:21	ubi enim est thesaurus tuus ibi est et cor tuum·	For where your treasure is, there your heart is also.	3
6:22	lucerna corporis est oculus· si fuerit oculus tuus simplex totum corpus tuum lucidum erit·	The eye is the lamp of the body. If your eye is pure, your whole body will be bright.	4
6:23	si autem oculus tuus nequam fuerit totum corpus tuum tenebrosum erit· si ergo lumen quod in te est tenebrae sunt· tenebrae quantae erunt	But if your eye is wicked, your whole body will be dark. If therefore the light that is in you is darkness, how great the darkness will be.”	5

37:1 (Mt 6:19) demolitur] *add.* ubi fures effodiunt et furantur Š

Notes

37:1 (Mt 6:19): F has omitted the last third of Matt 6:19, perhaps by homoeoteleuton.

	<i>Caput XXXVIII</i>	<i>Chapter 38</i>	
Mt 6:24	nemo potest duobus dominis seruire· aut enim unum odio habebit et alterum diligit· aut unum sustinebit· et alterum contemnet Non potestis deo seruire et mamonae	“No one can serve two masters. For either he will hate the one and loves the other, or he will support the one and disregard the other. You cannot serve God and wealth.”	1

38:1 (Mt 6:24) odio F^{SŠ}] hodio F*CEQ | diligit LZ*] diliget Š

Notes

38:1 (Mt 6:24): F does not abbreviate *dominis* here as a *nomen sacrum*, whereas instances where it has a “sacred” referant (God or Jesus) are abbreviated.

38:1 (Mt 6:24): In *hodio*, the *h* has both been scratched out and crossed out.

	<i>Caput XXXVIII</i>	<i>Chapter 39</i>	
Mt 6:25	Ideo dico uobis· ne solliciti sitis animae uestrae· quid manducetis· neque corpori uestro quid induamini· nonne anima plus est quam esca· et corpus plus est quam uestimentum·	“For that reason I say to you, do not be worried about your life, what you should eat, nor about your body, what you should wear. Is not life more than food and body more than clothes?	1
6:26 [45v]	respicite uolatilia caeli· quoniam	Consider the birds of heaven, since	2

	non serunt· neque metunt· neque congregant in horrea· et pater uester caelestis pascit illa· nonne uos magis plures· estis illis·	they neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns, and your heavenly Father feeds them. Are you not even more than they?	
6:27	quis autem uestrum cogitans potest adicere ad staturam suam cubitum unum·	But which of you, by pondering, is able to add one cubit to his height?	3
Lk 12:26	Si ergo neque quod minimum est potestis· quid de ceteris solliciti estis·	If therefore you are not even able (to do) what is the smallest thing, why are you worried about the others?	4
Mt 6:28	et de uestimento quid solliciti estis· considerate lilia agri quomodo crescunt· non laborant neque nent·	And why are you worried about clothes? Look at the lilies of the field, how they grow. They do not work, nor do they spin.	5
6:29	dico autem uobis quoniam nec salomon· in omni gloria coopertus est· sicut unum ex istis·	But I say to you that not even Salomon, in all glory, was clothed like one of those.	6
6:30	Si autem faenum agri· quod hodie est· et cras in clibanum mittitur· deus sic uestit· quanto magis uos minimae fidei·	Now if the hay of the field, which exists today and tomorrow is thrown into the oven, God thus clothes, how much more you, of littlest faith?	7
6:31	nolite ergo solliciti esse dicentes· quid manducabimus aut quid bibemus· aut quod operiemur·	Therefore do not be worried, saying, ‘What will we eat?’ or ‘What will we drink?’ or ‘(With) what will be clothed?’	8
6:32	haec enim omnia gentes inquirunt· scit enim pater uester	For the Gentiles seek all these things. For your Father knows that	9
[46r]	quia his omnibus indigetis	you need all these things.	
6:33	Quaerite autem primum regnum dei et iustitiam eius· et omnia haec adicientur uobis	But seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things will be added to you.	10
6:34	nolite ergo solliciti esse in crastinum· crastinus enim dies sollicitus erit sibi ipse· sufficit diei malitia sua	Therefore do not be worried about tomorrow, for the day of tomorrow will worry about itself. Its own malice is sufficient for the day.”	11

39:2 (Mt 6:26) plures ΣABD[§]DEGLMO*QRTXYZ] pluris Š

39:5 (Mt 6:28) neque ΣACM] nec ZŠ

39:6 (Mt 6:29) gloria] *add.* sua Š

39:8 (Mt 6:31) quod] quid MZ*; quo AŠ

39:10 (Mt 6:33) dei ΣCD[§]M] *om.* AZ*Š

39:11 (Mt 6:34) solliciti esse ED[§]QRWX*] esse solliciti Š

Notes

39:4 (Lk 12:26): F has correctly perceived that this is the only verse wherein the Lukan version adds something substantial to the Matthean version of this passage. Ranke neglects to label the verse as coming from Luke, although in the MS the scribe begins a new paragraph with this verse, and then begins a new paragraph again when returning to Matt, such that it stands out noticeably on the page (f. 45v).

	<i>Caput XL</i>	<i>Chapter 40</i>	
Mt 7:1	nolite iudicare ut non iudicemini·	“Do not judge, that you may not be judged.	1
7:2 ^a	in quo enim iudicio iudicaberitis iudicabimini·	For with what judgment you judge, you will be judged.	2
Lk 6:37 ^{bc}	nolite condemnare et non condemnabimini· dimittite et dimittimini	Do not condemn, and you will not be condemned. Forgive and you are forgiven.	3
6:38 ^{ab}	date et dabitur uobis· mensuram bonam confertam et coagitatam et superfluentem dabunt in sinum uestrum	Give and it will be given to you. A good measure, pressed and shaken together and overflowing, they will bestow into your lap.	4
Mt 7:2 ^b	Et in qua mensura mensi fueritis metietur uobis	And by the measure you measure out, it will be measured out to you.	5
7:3	quid autem uides festucam in oculo fratris tui· et trabem in oculo tuo non uides·	But why do you look at the straw in your brother’s eye and do not look at the log in your eye?	6
7:4	Aut quomodo dicis fratri tuo· sine eiciam festucam de oculo tuo Et ecce trabis est in oculo tuo·	Or how do you say to your brother, ‘Allow me to extract the straw from your eye,’ and look, there is a log in your eye?	7
7:5	hypocrita· eice primum trabem de oculo tuo· et tunc uidebis eicere	Hypocrite, first extract the log from your eye. And then you will see to extract the straw from your brother’s eye.	8
[46v]	festucam de oculo fratris tui·		
7:6	nolite dare sanctum canibus neque mittatis margaritas uestras ante porcos ne forte conculcent eas pedibus suis et conuersi dirumpant uos	Do not give what is holy to dogs; neither shall you throw your pearls before pigs, lest perhaps they trample them with their feet and, turning around, dash you to pieces.”	9

40:2 (Mt 7:2) iudicaberitis YZ] iudicaveritis Š

40:3 (Lk 6:37) dimittimini A¹(G)IMY] dimittetur uobis Z; dimittimini Š

40:4 (Lk 6:38) confertam F^sAHΘJOVWXY] conferam F*P^s; confersam MZŠ | superfluentem FGP] supereffluentem Š

40:6 (Mt 7:3) festucam F^sŠ] fistucam F*DHL*QR

40:9 (Mt 7:6) porcos F^sŠ] porcus F*

Notes

40:3-4 (Lk 6:37-38): F cleverly inserts parts of Luke 6:37-38 inside of Matt 7:2 that result in a rather seamless flow.

40:4 (Lk 6:38): The scribe has added a small *t* above to correct to *confertam*.

40:9 (Mt 7:6): In *porcus* the scribe has closed the top of the *u* to form *porcos*.

	<i>Caput XLI</i>	<i>Chapter 41</i>	
Lk 11:5 ^{bcd}	quis uestrum habet amicum et ibit ad illum media nocte· et dicit illi· amice conmoda mihi tres panes·	“Who of you has a friend, and will go to him at midnight, and say to him, ‘Friend, lend me three loaves, because my friend has come to me from the road and I do not have something to place before him.’	1
11:6	quoniam amicus meus uenit de uia ad me et non habeo quod ponam ante illum·	And he should say from inside, ‘Do not be a nuisance to me. The door is already shut, and my children are with me in bed. I cannot get up and give to you.’	2
11:7	et ille de intus dicat· noli mihi molestus esse· iam ostium clausum est· et pueri mei mecum sunt in cubili· non possum surgere et dare tibi·	I say to you, even if he will not give to him and get up because he is his friend, nevertheless, on account of his impudence, he will get up and give him as many needs as he has.	3
11:8	dico uobis et si non dabit illi· surgens eo quod amicus eius sit· propter inprobritatem tamen eius· surget et dabit illi quot habet necessarios·	And I say to you, ask and it will be given to you, seek and you will find, knock and it will be opened to you.	4
Lk 11:9 ^a	Et ego uobis dico·	For everyone who asks receives, and the one who seeks will find, and to the one who knocks it will be opened.	5
Mt 7:7	petite et dabitur uobis· quaerite et inuenietis· pulsate et aperietur uobis·	Or what person is among you, whom if his son asks for bread, will extend to him a stone?	6
7:8	omnis enim qui petit accipit· et qui quaerit inuenit· et pulsanti aperietur·	Of if he asks for a fish, extends to him a snake?	7
7:9	aut quis est ex uobis homo quem [47r] si petierit filius suus panem numquid lapidem porrigit ei·	Or if he asks for an egg, extends to him a scorpion?	8
7:10	aut si piscem petit· numquid serpentem porrigit ei		9
Lk 11:12	aut si ouum petierit· numquid porrigit ei scorpionem·		10
Mt 7:11	Si ergo uos cum sitis mali nostis bona dare filiis uestris· quanto magis pater uester qui in caelis est dabit bona petentibus se·	If you therefore, although you are evil, know how to give good things to your children, how much more will your Father who is in the heavens give good things to those	

		who ask him?	
7:12	Omnia ergo quaecumque uultis ut faciant uobis homines et uos facite eis· haec est enim lex et prophetae·	Therefore all things whatsoever that you want people to do for you, do also for them, for this is the law and the prophets.	11
7:13	Intrate per angustam portam· quia lata porta et spatiosa uia quae ducit ad perditionem· et multi sunt qui intrant per eam·	Enter through the narrow gate, for wide (is) the gate and broad (is) the road that leads to destruction, and there are many who enter through it.	12
7:14	quam angusta porta et arta uia quae ducit ad uitam· et pauci sunt qui inueniunt eam	How narrow (is) the gate and little (is) the road that leads to life, and there are few who find it.”	13

41:1 (Lk 11:5) habet DD^ŠGP^ŠQRTX] habebit Š

41:3 (Lk 11:7) de intus AY] *add.* respondens (M)ZŠ

41:4 (Lk 11:8) quot AGØPX] quotquod M; quotquot ZŠ | necessarios F^ŠŠ] necessarium
F*T δ

41:7 (Mt 7:9) porrigit BD^ŠJN] porriget Š

41:8 (Mt 7:10) petit DD^ŠGHØJLO*X*] petet AMZ*Š | porrigit D^ŠJO*] porriget Š

41:9 (Lk 11:12) ouum petierit] petierit ouum Š | porrigit ACD^ŠGH*P^ŠQTXYZ*] porriget
MZ¹Š | ei ERZ] illi Š

Notes

41:1 (Lk 11:5): Uncharacteristically, F turns to a large section of Lukan material (Luke 11:5-10) to introduce the next Matthean segment of the sermon. The last two verses of the Lukan material (11:9-10) overlap with the next two verses in Matt’s sermon (Matt 7:7-8).

41:4 (Lk 11:8): In *necessarium*, the *u* was turned into an *o* and the *m* was scratched out and replaced with *s* to read *necessarios*.

	<i>Caput XLII</i>	<i>Chapter 42</i>	
Mt 7:15	Attendite a falsis prophetis· qui ueniunt ad uos in uestimentis ouium Intrinsecus autem sunt lupi rapaces·	“Watch for false prophets, who come to you in sheep’s clothes, but inside they are ravenous wolves.	1
7:16	a fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos· numquid colligunt de spinis ^[47v] uuas aut de tribulis ficus	By their fruit you will recognize them. They do not gather grapes from thorn-bushes, or figs from thistles, do they?	2
7:17	sic omnis arbor bona fructus bonos facit· mala autem arbor fructus malos facit·	Thus every good tree produces good fruit, but a bad tree produces bad fruit.	3
7:18	non potest arbor bona fructus	A good tree is not able to produce	4

	malos facere neque arbor mala fructus bonos facere	bad fruit; neither is a bad tree able to produce good fruit.	
Lk 6:45	Bonus homo de bono thesauro cordis sui profert· bona· et malus homo de malo profert mala ex abundantia enim cordis os loquitur·	A good person out of the good treasure of his heart brings forth good things, and a bad person out of badness brings forth bad things. For out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks.	5
Mt 7:19	omnis arbor quae non facit fructum bonum excidetur et in ignem mittitur·	Every tree that does not bear good fruit will be cut down and is thrown into the fire.	6
7:20	igitur ex fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos	Therefore from their fruit you will recognize them.”	7

42:5 (Lk 6:45) bona D^ŠGJP^ŠZ*] bonum Š | mala DGP] malum Š

42:6 (Mt 7:19) excidetur CDEHΘJKLOQRTVWX*Z] exciditur AMŠ

	<i>Caput XLIII</i>	<i>Chapter 43</i>	
Mt 7:21	non omnis qui dicit mihi domine domine· intrabit in regno caelorum· sed qui facit uoluntatem patris mei qui in caelis est· ipse intrauit in regno caelorum·	“Not everyone who says to me, ‘Lord, Lord,’ will enter the kingdom of the heavens; but the one who does the will of my Father who is in the heavens, that one has entered the kingdom of the heavens.	1
7:22	multi dicent mihi in illa die· domine domine· nonne in nomine tuo prophetauimus· et in tuo nomine daemonia eiecimus· et in tuo nomine uirtutes multas fecimus	Many will say to me on that day, ‘Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name, and drive out demons in your name, and do many great works in your name?’	2
7:23	et tunc confitebor illis· quia numquam noui uos· discedite a ^[48r] me qui operamini iniquitatem	And then I will reveal to them, ‘I never knew you. Depart from me, you who practice injustice.’”	3

43:1 (Mt 7:21) regno^{1.2} M] regnum Š | intrauit] intrabit Š

43:2 (Mt 7:22) eiecimus F^ŠŠ] eiecimus F*EH*L*

Notes

43:1 (Mt 7:21): The exchange of *b* and *u* in *intrabit* renders a slightly different sense (from future to perfect).

43:2 (Mt 7:22): The scribe has added a small *e* above *eiecimus* to correct it to *eiecimus*.

	<i>Caput XLIIII</i>	<i>Chapter 44</i>	
Mt 7:24	Omnis ergo qui audit uerba haec et facit ea assimilabitur uiro sapienti· qui aedificauit domum suam supra petram·	“Therefore everyone who hears these words and does them will be comparable to a wise man who built his house upon the rock.	1
7:25	et descendit pluuiā· et uenerunt flumina· et flauerunt uenti· et inruerunt in domum illam· et non cecidit· fundata enim erat supra petram·	And the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and they beat on that house, and it did not topple, for it was founded upon the rock.	2
7:26	et omnis qui audit uerba mea haec· et non facit ea· similis erit uiro stulto· qui aedificauit domum suam supra harenam·	And everyone who hears these words of mine and does not do them will be like a foolish man who built his house upon the sand.	3
7:27	Et descendit pluuiā· et uenerunt flumina· et flauerunt uenti· et inruerunt in domum illam et cecidit· et fuit ruina eius magna·	And the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and they beat on that house, and it toppled. And its collapse was great.”	4
7:28	Et factum est cum consummasset ihesus uerba haec ammirabantur turbae super doctrina eius	And it happened that when Jesus had summed up these words, the crowds were amazed concerning his teaching.	5
7:29	Erat enim docens eos sicut potestatem habens non sicut scribae eorum et pharisaei	For he was teaching them like one who has power, not like their scribes and Pharisees.	6

44:1 (Mt 7:24) uerba] *add.* mea Š

44:2 (Mt 7:25) supra AGMZ] super Š

44:5 (Mt 7:28) doctrina BCJKTVWZ] doctrinam AMŠ

Notes

44:6 (Mt 7:29): Here ends the Sermon on the Mount in F. In some derivatives of the *Diatessaron* (Pepysian harmony, Clement of Llanthony), Jesus then descends and delivers Luke’s Sermon on the Plain, or some portion thereof. In the Arabic *Diatessaron*, Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount is actually delivered on Luke’s plain by inserting Luke 6:17^a just before Jesus begins (a verse not present in F). In the Liège *Diatessaron*, a gloss explains that Jesus gave two sermons, one on the mount to his disciples, and the other on the plain to the people (which may explain the Pepysian harmony and Clement of Llanthony). The Liège text, however, follows F.

Feeding of the Five Thousand/Walking on Water (F 81–82)

<i>Caput LXXXI</i>		<i>Chapter 81</i>	
Mt 14:15 ^a Lk 9:12 ^{βcd}	Uespere autem facto accedentes duodecim dixerunt illi· dimitte turbas· ut euntes in castella uillasque quae circa sunt deuertant et inueniant escas quia hic in loco deserto sumus·	Now when it was evening, approaching, the twelve said to him, “Dismiss the crowds, so that they may go into the towns and villages that are around and lodge and find food, for here we are in a deserted place.”	1
Mt 14:16 ^a Mk 6:37 ^a Mt 14:16 ^{bc}	Ihesus autem dixit illis non habent necesse ire· date illis uos manducare·	But Jesus said to them, “They have no need to go. You give them (something) to eat.”	2
Jn 6:7	Respondit ei philippus ducentorum denariorum panes non sufficiunt eis ut unusquisque	Philippus answered him, “Bread worth two hundred denarii is not enough for each one of them to get	3
[73v] Mk 6:38 ^{ab}	modicum quid accipiat· Et dicit eis· quot panes habetis·	a small piece.” And he says to them, “How many loaves do you have?”	4
Jn 6:8	Dicit ei unus ex discipulis eius andreas frater simonis petri·	One of his disciples, Andreas the brother of Simon Petrus, says to him,	5
6:9	Est puer unus hic qui habet quinque panes hordiacios et duo pisces sed haec quid sunt inter tantos·	“There is one boy here who has five barley loaves and two fish. But what are these among so many,	6
Lk 9:13 ^e	nisi forte nos eamus et emamus in omnem hanc turbam escas·	unless perhaps we go and buy food for this whole crowd?”	7
Mt 14:18	qui ait eis· afferte illos mihi huc·	He said to them, “Bring them here to me.”	8
Mk 6:39 ^a	Et praecipit illis ut accumbere facerent omnes secundum contubernia	And he instructed them to have everyone recline in companies	9
Mt 14:19 ^a Mk 6:39 ^a 6:40	supra uiride faenum· et discubuerunt in partes per centenos et per quinquagenos	on green grass. And they reclined in camps, by hundreds and by fifties.	10
Lk 9:16 ^{aby}	acceptis autem quinque panibus et duobus piscibus· respexit in caelum· et benedixit illis et fregit et distribuit discipulis·	And taking the five loaves and the two fish, he looked into the sky and blessed them and broke (them) and distributed (them) to the disciples,	11
Mt 14:19 ^e 14:20	discipuli autem turbis et manducauerunt omnes et saturati sunt· Tulerunt reliquias·	and the disciples to the crowds. And all ate and were satisfied. They took up the leftovers: twelve	12

	XII· cofinos fragmentorum plenos·	baskets full of pieces.	
14:21	Manducantium autem fuit numerus· V· milia uirorum· exceptis mulieribus et paruulis	Now the number of those who had eaten was five thousand men, excluding women and children.	13
14:22 ^{ab} [74r]	Et statim iussit discipulos ascendere in nauicula et praecedere eum trans fretum ad bethsaidam	And immediately he ordered the disciples to climb into the boat and go before him across the sea to Bethsaida	14
Mk 6:45 ^b Mt 14:22 ^b Jn 6:14	donec dimitteret turbas· illi ergo homines cum uidissent quod fecerat signum dicebant quia hic est uere propheta qui uenturus est in mundum·	until he could dismiss the crowds. Those people, therefore, when they had seen the sign that he had performed, began to say, “This is indeed the prophet who is going to come into the world.”	15
6:15 ^{ab}	ihesus ergo cum cognouisset quia uenturi essent ut raperent eum et facerent eum regem fugiit·	Jesus, therefore, when he had recognized that they were about to come to seize him and make him king, fled.	16
Mt 14:23 ^a	et dimissa turba ascendit in monte solus orare	And with the crowd dismissed, he ascended onto a mountain alone to pray.	17

81:12 (Mt 14:20) sunt] *add.* et Š
81:16 (Jn 6:15) fugiit CEHΘOT] fugit Š
81:17 (Mt 14:23) monte ΣH] montem Š

Notes

81:1 (Mt 14:15): When compared to the Arabic Diatessaron’s version of the same event (18:27-46), F’s rendering of the feeding of the five thousand comes across as a trimmed down version, which contains all the main turning points but lacks a number of trivialities particular to each Gospel.

81:17 (Mt 14:23): Jesus’ act of personally dismissing the crowd in Matt 14:23 does not follow well after his fleeing from the crowd in John 6:15 (F 81:16). Due to the ablative absolute in Latin, it is possible to render the crowd’s dismissal in a passive voice; however, Jesus’ agency would be more explicit in the Greek. The Arabic harmony (18:46) does not include this tension in its text.

	<i>Caput LXXXII</i>	<i>Chapter 82</i>	
Mt 14:23 ^b	Uespere autem facto solus erat ibi·	And when it was evening, he was there alone.	1
14:24	nauicula autem in medio mari iactabatur fluctibus· erat enim contrarius uentus	But the boat was being tossed about by the waves in the middle of the sea, for there was an opposing wind.	2

14:25 ^a	Quarta autem uigilia noctis·	And in the fourth watch of the night,	3
Mk 6:48 ^a	uidens eos laborantes·	seeing them struggling,	
Mt 14:25 ^a	uenit ad eos ambulans supra mare·	he went to them, walking over the sea	
Mk 6:48 ^d	et uolebat praeterire eos	and intending to pass by them.	
Mt 14:26	Et uidentes eum supra mare ambulantem turbati sunt dicentes· quod phantasma est et prae timore clamauerunt·	But seeing him walking over the sea, they were disturbed, saying, “It is a ghost!” And they cried out from fear.	4
14:27	Statimque ihesus locutus est eis dicens· habete fiduciam ego sum nolite timere·	And immediately Jesus spoke to them, saying, “Have courage! It is I. Do not fear.”	5
14:28	Respondens autem petrus dixit· [74v] domine si tu es iube me uenire ad te super aquas·	And answering, Petrus said, “Lord, if it is you, command me to come to you on the waters.”	6
14:29	at ipse ait· ueni Et descendens petrus de nauicula ambulabat super aquam ut ueniret ad ihesum·	And he said, “Come.” And climbing out of the boat, Petrus began walking on the water to go to Jesus.	7
14:30	Uidens uero uentum ualidum timuit· Et cum coepisset mergi clamauit dicens· domine saluum me fac·	However, seeing a strong wind, he was afraid. And when he had begun to sink, he cried out, saying, “Lord, save me!”	8
14:31	et continuo ihesus extendens manum appraehendit eum· Et ait illi· modice fidei quare dubitasti·	And immediately stretching out (his) hand, Jesus caught him. And he said to him, “O little of faith! Why did you doubt?”	9
14:32	Et cum ascendissent in nauiculam cessauit uentus·	And after they had climbed into the boat, the wind stopped.	10
Jn 6:21 ^b	et statim fuit nauis ad terram quam ibant·	And immediately the ship was at the land to which they were going.	11
Mt 14:33	qui autem in nauicula erant uenerunt et adorauerunt eum dicentes uere filius dei es	But those who were in the boat came and worshiped him, saying, “Truly you are the Son of God.”	12

82:4 (Mt 14:26) quod] quia Š

82:8 (Mt 14:30) mergi F^sŠ] mergere F*; mergeri A

82:9 (Mt 14:31) modice LD^šOP^šWZ] modicae Š

Notes

82:8 (Mt 14:30): It appears the scribe first wrote *mergere* and then corrected it to *mergi* by scratching out the last three letters and replacing them with *i* (in agreement with Ranke’s notes but contra the Stuttgart apparatus, which indicates F reads *mergeri* here).

CHAPTER FOUR

Selections from the Final Days of Jesus

Passion Narrative (F 154–173)

	<i>Caput CLIII</i>	<i>Chapter 154</i>	
Mt 26:1	Et factum est cum consummasset ihesus sermones hos omnes dixit discipulis suis	And it happened that when Jesus had finished all these words, he said to his disciples,	1
26:2	Scitis quia post biduum pascha fiet· et filius hominis tradetur ut crucifigatur	“You know that after two days the Passover will take place, and the Son of Man will be handed over to be crucified.”	2
26:3 <i>[146v]</i>	Tunc congregati sunt principes sacerdotum· et seniores populi in atrium principis sacerdotum· qui dicebatur caiaphas·	Then the chief priests and elders of the people were gathered in the forecourt of the high priest, who was called Caiaphas.	3
26:4	Et consilium fecerunt· ut ihesum dolo tenerent et occiderent·	And they made a plan that they might take Jesus with deceit and kill him.	4
26:5	Dicebant autem· non in die festo· ne forte tumultus fieret in populo	But they were saying, “Not on the festival day, lest perhaps an uprising should occur among the people.”	5
26:14 ^a	Tunc abiit unus de XII qui dicitur iudas scarioth	Then one of the twelve, who is called Judas Scarioth, withdrew and spoke	6
Lk 22:4 ^a	et locutus est	to the chief priests	
Mt 26:14 ^a	ad principes sacerdotum	and to the teachers.	
Lk 22:4 ^a	et magistratibus·		
Mt 26:15 ^{ab}	et ait illis· quid uultis mihi dare· et ego uobis eum tradam·	And he said to them, “What are you willing to give me, and I will hand him over to you?”	7
Mk 14:11 ^a	qui audientes gauisi sunt· Et	Those who heard him became glad and	8
Mt 26:15 ^y	constituerunt ei XXX argenteos·	they appointed him thirty silver coins.	9
26:16	et exinde quaerebat opportunitatem ut eum traderet	And from that point he began to seek an opportunity to hand him over	10
Lk 22:6 ^b	sine turbis	without the crowds.	

(no textual variants)

Notes

154:1 (Mt 26:1): Having concluded the final parable, the Passion Narrative proper now begins.

154:6 (Mt 26:14): In the Matthean context, it is *abiit* that governs *ad principes sacerdotum*. In F, *locutus est* (from Luke 22:4) now precedes. It is possible for *loquor* to take the preposition *ad* (cf. Luke 1:55), but *ad* requires an accusative, whereas *magistratibus* has been left in the ablative from Luke 22:4 where it followed *cum*. Without *cum* in the present context, *magistratibus* must now be dative. The resulting sentence is an odd grammatical construction.

	<i>Caput CLV</i>	<i>Chapter 155</i>	
Jn 13:1	ante diem autem festum paschae sciens ihesus quia uenit hora ut transeat ex hoc mundo ad patrem Cum dilexisset suos qui erant in mundo· in finem dilexit eos·	Now before the festival day of Passover, knowing that the time has come for him to cross over from this world to the Father, having loved his own who were in the world, Jesus loved them to the end.	1
13:4	Surgit a cena et ponit uestimenta sua· et cum accepisset linteum praecinxit se	He rises from supper and takes off his garments and, when he had taken a linen cloth, wrapped himself (with it).	2
13:5 [147r]	deinde mittit aquam in peluem et coepit lauare pedes discipuloram et extergere linteo quod erat praecinctus·	Then he pours water into a bowl and began to wash the feet of the disciples and to wipe them with the linen cloth (in) which he was wrapped.	3
13:6	Uenit ergo ad simonem petrum et dicit ei petrus· domine tu mihi lauas pedes·	Now he comes to Simon Petrus, and Petrus says to him, “Lord, do you wash my feet?”	4
13:7	Respondit ihesus et dicit ei· quod ego facio tu nescis modo· scies autem postea	Jesus answered and says to him, “What I am doing you do not understand presently; but you will understand afterwards.”	5
13:8	Dicit ei petrus non lauabis mihi pedes in aeternum· respondit ihesus ei Si non lauero te non habes partem mecum·	Petrus says to him, “You will not ever wash my feet.” Jesus answered him, “If I do not wash you, you have no part with me.”	6
13:9	Dicit ei simon petrus domine non tantum pedes meos· sed et manus et caput·	Simon Petrus says to him, “Lord, not only my feet, but also (my) hands and head.”	7
13:10	dicit ei ihesus· qui lotus est non indiget ut lauet· sed est mundus totus· et uos mundi estis· Sed non	Jesus says to him, “The one who has been washed does not need to wash, but is wholly clean. And you	8

	omnes·	are clean, but not all.”	
13:11	Sciebat enim quisnam esset qui traderet eum· propterea dixi· non estis mundi omnes·	For he knew who it would be who would betray him. For this reason I said, “You are not all clean.”	9
13:12	postquam ergo lauit pedes eorum· et accepit uestimenta sua Cum recubisset iterum dixit eis· Scitis quid fecerim uobis	So after he washed their feet and put on his garments, when he had reclined again, he said to them, “Do you understand what I have done for you?”	10
13:13	Uos uocatis me magistrum et domine· et bene dicitis· sum etenim	You call me a teacher and ‘Lord’ and you speak rightly, for I am.	11
13:14	Si ergo ego laui pedes [147v] uestros· dominus et magister· et uos debetis· alter alterius lauare pedes·	Therefore, if I, (your) Lord and teacher, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another’s feet.	12
13:15	exemplum enim dedi uobis ut quemammodum ego feci uobis ita et uos faciatis	For I have given you an example, that just as I have done for you, so you also should do.	13
13:16	Amen· amen dico uobis· non est seruus maior domino suo· neque apostolus maior eo qui misit illum	Truly, truly I say to you, a slave is not greater than his lord, nor is a messenger greater than the one who sent him.	14
13:17	Si haec scitis beati eritis si feceritis ea	If you understand these things, you will be blessed if you do them.	15
13:18	non de omnibus uobis dico· ego scio quos elegerim· Sed ut impleatur scriptura· qui manducat mecum panem· leuabit contra me calcaneum suum·	I do not speak of you all. I know whom I have chosen. But that the Scripture may be fulfilled, ‘The one who eats bread with me will lift his heel against me,’	16
13:19	amodo dico uobis priusquam fiat· ut credatis cum factum fuerit quia ego sum	from now on I am telling you before it occurs, so that when it has occurred you may believe that I am (he).	17
13:20	Amen amen dico uobis qui accipit· si quem misero· me accipit· qui autem me accipit· accipit eum qui me misit	Truly, truly I say to you, the one who receives whomever I send receives me. And the one who receives me receives him who sent me.”	18

155:1 (Jn 13:1) uenit AΔHΘX^cY] *add.* eius MZŠ

155:3 (Jn 13:5) quod E] quo Š

155:9 (Jn 13:11) dixi] dixit Š

155:11 (Jn 13:13) magistrum *fl m r*] magister Š | domine F*Š; dominum F^c *fl m r*

155:12 (Jn 13:14) pedes uestros AGMP^S] vestros pedes ZŠ

155:16 (Jn 13:18) leuabit ACDΔEHΘIJKSTVWY] levauit MZŠ

Notes

155:2 (Jn 13:4): Curiously, F skips over John 13:2-3, perhaps because Judas' decision to hand Jesus over has already been revealed, although the verses also serve to introduce the meal.

155:9 (Jn 13:11): The scribe has inadvertently omitted the *t* on the end of *dixit*.

155:11 (Jn 13:13): F shares the reading *magistrum* with a handful of Old Latin gospels (*f l m r*). Those same four MSS read *dominum* where F reads the vocative *domine*. An unknown later scribe (whose hand Ranke suggests is similar to Victor's) attempted to change the reading to *dominum* by adding an *m* over the *nomen sacrum*.

	<i>Caput CLVI</i>	<i>Chapter 156</i>	
Mt 26:17	prima autem die azimorum· accesserunt discipuli ad ihesum dicentes Ubi uis paremus tibi comedere pascha·	Now on the first day of Unleavened Bread the disciples approached Jesus, saying, “Where do you want us to prepare for you to eat the Passover?”	1
26:18 ^{ab}	at ihesus dixit· Ite in ciuitatem	But Jesus said, “Go into the city	2
Lk 22:10 ^{abc} [148r]	et introeuntibus uobis occurret uobis homo amphoram aquae portans sequimini eum in domo in qua intrat	and when you enter, a man carrying a pitcher of water will meet you. Follow him to the house in which he enters	
Mt 26:18 ^b	ad quendam	to a certain man.	
Lk 22:11 ^a	Et dicitis	And you say	3
Mk 14:14 ^a	domino domus·	to the master of the house,	
Mt 26:18 ^{cde}	magister dicit· tempus meum prope est· apud te facio pascha cum discipulis meis·	‘The teacher says: My time is near. At your house I celebrate the Passover with my disciples.’	
Mk 14:15	et ipse uobis demonstrabit cenaculum grande stratum· et illic parate nobis·	And he will show you a large dining room arranged. And prepare for us there.”	4
14:16 ^{acd}	et abierunt discipuli eius et inuenerunt sicut dixit eis et parauerunt pascha·	And his disciples went out and found (everything) just as he told them, and they prepared the Passover.	5
14:17 ^a	Uespere autem facto uenit	And when it was evening he comes	6
14:18 ^a	et	and	
Mt 26:20 ^a	discumbebat cum XII· discipulis suis·	was reclining with his twelve disciples.	
26:21 ^a	Et edentibus illis dixit	And as they ate, he said,	7
Lk 22:15 ^b	desiderio desiderauit hoc pascha manducare uobiscum antequam patiar·	“I have greatly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer.	
22:16	dico enim uobis· quia ex hoc non manducabo illud donec impleatur	For I say to you that from this (time) I will not eat it until it is	8

	in regno dei·	fulfilled in the kingdom of God.”	
Jn 13:21	Cum haec dixisset turbatus est spiritu· et protestatus est et dixit· amen amen dico uobis· quia unus ex uobis tradet me	When he had said these things, he was troubled in spirit and testified and said, “Truly, truly I say to you that one of you will hand me over.”	9
Mk 14:19 ^a	at illi coeperunt contristari et dicere singillatim·	But they began to be saddened and to say one by one,	10
Mt 26:22 ^b	numquid ego sum domine	“Surely I am not (the one), Lord?”	
Mk 14:20 ^{ab}	Quibus ait Qui intingit mecum manum in catino	To whom he said, “The one who dips his hand with me into the bowl,	11
Mt 26:23 ^b	hic me tradet·	this one will hand me over.	
[148v]			
26:24	filius quidem hominis uadit sicut scriptum est de illo· Uae autem homini illi per quem filius hominis traditur· Bonum erat ei si natus non fuisset homo ille	Indeed, the Son of Man goes as it was written about him. But woe to that man through whom the Son of Man is handed over. It was good for him if that man had not been born.”	12
Jn 13:22	aspiciebant ergo ad inuicem discipuli haesitantes de quo diceret	So the disciples were looking at one another, being uncertain of whom he spoke	13
Lk 22:23 ^a	Et quaerentes inter se quis esset ex eis qui hoc facturus esset·	and asking among themselves which of them it was who would do this.	14
Jn 13:23	Erat ergo recumbens unus ex discipulis eius in sinu ihesu· quem diligebat ihesus·	Now reclining on the bosom of Jesus was one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved.	15
13:24	Innuit ergo huic simon petrus et dicit ei· quis est de quo dicit·	So Simon Petrus signals to this one and says to him, “Who is it of whom he speaks?”	16
13:25	Itaque cum recubisset ille supra pectus ihesu· dicit ei· domine quis est·	And so, as he reclined on Jesus’ breast, he says to him, “Lord, who is it?”	17
13:26	Cui respondit ihesus· ille est cui ego intinctum panem porrexero· Et cum intinxisset panem dedit iudae simonis scariothis·	Jesus answered him, “It is the one to whom I will extend the dipped bread.” And when he had dipped the bread, he gave (it) to Judas (son) of Simon Scarioth.	18
13:27	et pos buccellam tunc introiuit in illum satanas· Dicit ei ihesus· quod facis· fac citius·	And after (he took) the morsel, then Satan entered into him. Jesus says to him, “What you do, do quickly.”	19
13:28	hoc autem nemo sciuit discumbentium ad quid dixerit ei·	But none of those reclining knew to what purpose he said this to him.	20

13:29	quidam enim putabant quia [149r] loculos habebat iudas· quod dicit ei ihesus· eme ea quae opus sunt nobis ad diem festum aut egenis ut aliquid daret·	For some were supposing, since Judas had the money box, that Jesus is saying to him, “Buy the things that we need for the festival day,” or so that he should give something to the needy.	21
Mt 26:25	Respondens autem iudas qui tradidit eum dixit· numquid ego sum rabbi· ait illi· tu dixisti·	But answering, Judas, who handed him over, said, “Surely I am not (the one), Rabbi?” He said, “You have said (it).”	22
Jn 13:30	Cum ergo accepisset ille buccellam exiit continuo· Erat autem nox·	So when he had taken the morsel, he went out immediately. And it was night.	23
13:31	cum ergo exisset dicit ihesus· Nunc clarificatus est filius hominis· et deus clarificatus est in eo·	Now once he had gone out, Jesus says, “Now the Son of Man has been glorified. And God has been glorified in him.	24
13:32	et deus clarificauit eum in semet ipso et continuo clarificauit eum	And God has glorified him in himself and has glorified him immediately.”	25

156:1 (Mt 26:17) die BDD[§]EΘJKLOP[§]QW] *om.* AMZŠ

156:2 (Lk 22:10) domo KP[§]VZΣ] domum Š

156:3 (Lk 22:11) dicitis BO] dicetis Š

156:5 (Mk 14:16) eius] *add.* et uenerunt in ciuitatem Š | dixit eis] dixit illis *a*^{vid} *d*; dixerat
illis Š (*cf.* Luke 22:13) | parauerunt AGM] praeparauerunt ZŠ

156:6 (Mt 26:20) suis BCEΘJKLOP[§]TVWXZ] *om.* AMŠ

156:9 (Jn 13:21) dixisset] *add.* iesus Š

156:10 (Mk 14:19) dicere CDJKO*TVX*Z] *add.* ei Š

156:11 (Mk 14:20) quibus ait *a d ff² i l*] quibus ipse ait *c f q*; qui ait illis Š | manum Q] *om.*
Š (*cf.* Mt 26:23)

156:14 (Lk 22:23) quaerentes] ipsi coeperunt quaerere Š

156:18 (Jn 13:26) cui¹ ABΔGHΘMOSXY] *om.* ZŠ

156:19 (Jn 13:27) pos] post Š

156:21 (Jn 13:29) quod KOP[§]TVWXZ] quia Š

156:25 (Jn 13:32) et deus EGH*X*Z] *praem.* si deus clarificatus est in eo Š | clarificauit¹
ΔΘIJKMOSWXZ] clarificabit AŠ | clarificauit² BEHΘKOP[§]WXZ*Σ] clarificabit Š

Notes

156:1 (Mt 26:17): It is noteworthy that Jesus’ instructions to his disciples for preparing the Passover take place *after* the foot-washing meal of John 13:1-20 (F 155). The Arabic Diatessaron agrees with this order, as do a handful of later Diatessaronic derivatives (Codex Sangallensis, the *Heliand*, Venetian Harmony). It would appear that Tatian’s solution to the apparent discrepancy between the Synoptics and John over the nature of the Last Supper is that there were in fact *two* Last Suppers—an actual Last

Supper as found in the Synoptic Passover meal, and a second-to-last supper, as it were, as found in the Johannine foot-washing meal.

- 156:2 (Mt 26:18): The phrase *ad quendam* borrowed from Matt 26:18 does not fit well at the end of Luke 22:10. In its Matthean context it refers to the “certain man” in whose house the disciples are to prepare the Passover, without having followed anyone there. F incorporates Luke by having the disciples first follow a different man into a house, to a “certain man,” apparently the master within the house. The Arabic Diatessaron (44:37) confirms such an interpretation, where the same the phrase is saved for the end of the clause as in F, except that the word order clearly makes the “certain man” and the “master of the house” one and the same, the addressee of the disciples’ speech. In F, the delimitation and syntax make that explicit association impossible, for the scribe begins a new paragraph after *ad quendam*, and *domino* is in the dative. This confusion may suggest that somewhere behind F’s transmission lies a version of the *Diatessaron* unencumbered by the restrictions of declensions.
- 156:5 (Mk 14:16): F omits the phrase *et uenerunt in civitatem*, perhaps from homoeoteleuton with *et*.
- 156:11 (Mk 14:20): F has followed the Old Latin reading *quibus ait* (where the relative pronoun refers back to the disciples) against the Vulgate reading *qui ait illis* (where the relative pronoun refers to Jesus).
- 156:14 (Lk 22:23): F has altered Luke’s *ipsi coeperunt quaerere* into simply *quaerentes*, perhaps to parallel the grammar of the previous clause from John 13:22.
- 156:19 (Jn 13:27): The scribe has inadvertently left off the final *t* on *post*, an error which went unnoticed.
- 156:23 (Jn 13:30): It is noteworthy that Judas’ departure ensures that he will not be present for Jesus’ institution of the Eucharist in the next chapter.
- 156:25 (Jn 13:32): F shares its omission of the initial phrase *si deus clarificatus est in eo* with several other Vulgate MSS (along with several Old Latin and Greek copies), rendering its absence unremarkable.

	<i>Caput CLVII</i>	<i>Chapter 157</i>	
Mt 26:26	Cenantibus autem eis· accepit ihesus panem et benedixit ac fregit deditque discipulis suis dicens· accipite et comedite· hoc est corpus meum	And as they dined, Jesus took bread and blessed (it) and broke (it) and gave (it) to his disciples, saying, “Take and eat. This is my body,	1
Lk 22:19 ^β	quod pro uobis datur·	which is given for you.”	
Mt 26:27	Et accipiens calicem gratias egit· et benedixit· et dedit eis dicens· bibite ex hoc omnes·	And taking a cup, he gave thanks and blessed (it) and gave (it) to them, saying, “Drink from this, all (of you).	2
26:28 ^{αβ}	hic est enim sanguis meus· noui testamenti qui pro	For this is my blood of the new covenant, which for	3
Lk 22:20 ^β	uobis	you	
F	et	and	
Mt 26:28 ^β	multis effunditur in remissione	many is poured out for the	

	peccatorum·	forgiveness of sins.	
26:29 [149v]	dico autem uobis non bibam amodo de hoc genimine uitis usque in diem illum cum illud bibam uobiscum nouum in regno patris mei·	And I say to you, from this time forward I shall not drink of this fruit of the vine until that day when I shall drink it with you anew in the kingdom of my Father.	4
Lk 22:19 ^c	hoc facite· in meam memorationem·	Do this, for my memory.”	5
22:31	ait autem dominus· simon· simon· ecce satanas expetiuit uos ut cribraret sicut triticum·	And the Lord said, “Simon, Simon. Look, Satan has sought you to sift like wheat.	6
22:32	ego autem rogavi pro te ut non deficiat fides tua· Et tu aliquando conuersus confirma fratres tuos·	But I have prayed for you, that your faith may not fail. And you, once you have repented, strengthen your brothers.	7
Jn 13:33	filioli athuc modicum uobiscum sum· quaeritis me et sicut dixi iudaeis· quo ego uado uos non potestis uenire· Et uobis dico modo·	Dear children, I am with you yet a little while. You search for me and, just as I said to the Jews, ‘Where I am going you are not able to come,’ I also say to you now.	8
13:34	mandatum nouum do uobis· ut diligatis inuicem sicut dilexi uos· ut et uos diligatis inuicem·	A new command I give you, that you love one another, just as I have loved you, that you also love one another.	9
13:35	In hoc cognoscent omnes quia mei discipuli estis· si dilectionem habueritis ad inuicem·	By this all will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another.”	10
13:36	Dicit ei simon petrus· domine· quo uadis· respondit ei ihesus· Quo ego uado non potes me modo sequi· Sequeris autem postea·	Simon Petrus says to him, “Lord, where are you going?” Jesus answered him, “Where I am going you are not able to follow me now. But you will follow later.”	11
Mt 26:31 [150r]	Tunc dicit illis ihesus· omnes uos scandalum patiemini in me in ista nocte Scriptum est enim· percutiam pastorem et dispergentur oues gregis	Then Jesus says to them, “You will all undergo a stumbling because of me during this night. For it has been written, ‘I will strike the shepherd and the sheep of the flock will be scattered.’	12
26:32	Postquam autem resurrexero praecedam uos in galilaeam	But after I rise I will go before you into Galilaea.”	13
26:33	Respondens autem petrus ait illi· Et si omnes scandalizati fuerint in te ego numquam scandalizabor·	But answering, Petrus said to him, “Even if all have been caused to stumble because of you, I will never be caused to stumble,	14
Lk 22:33 ^{ab}	qui tecum paratus sum et in	(I) who am prepared to go with	15

	carcerem et in mortem ire·	you both to prison and to death.	
Jn 13:37 ^c	animam meam pro te ponam·	I will lay down my life for you.”	16
13:38 ^{abc}	Respondit ihesus· animam tuam	Jesus answered, “Do you lay down	17
	pro me ponis· amen amen dico	your life for me? Truly, truly I say	
	tibi·	to you,	
Mt 26:34 ^c	quia hac nocte antequam gallus	that this night, before the cock	18
	cantet· ter me negabis	crows, you will deny me three	
		times.”	
26:35	ait illi petrus	Petrus said to him, “Even if it were	19
	Etiam si oportuerit me mori	necessary for me to die with you, I	
	tecum non te negabo· Similiter et	will not deny you.” And all the	
	omnes discipuli dixerunt	disciples said likewise.	

157:1 (Mt 26:26) dicens LQR] et ait Š (cf. Lk 22:19)

157:2 (Mt 26:27) et benedixit a^{vid}] om. Š (cf. Mk 14:23 c ff i k q r¹) | eis] illis Š

157:3 (Mt 26:28) remissione CET] remissionem Š

157:5 (Lk 22:19) memorationem] commemorationem Š

157:8 (Jn 13:33) quaeritis ΔEGHIKOQRSXYZ] quaeretis AMŠ

157:15 (Lk 22:33) qui] add. dixit ei domine Š

157:18 (Mt 26:34) quia D] add. in Š

Notes

157:2 (Mt 26:27): Jesus does not normally also bless the cup, but here F adds *et benedixit* as a parallel to the blessing of the bread, perhaps in reflection of liturgical practice. One Old Latin MS (*a*) also appears to include this addition in Matt, while several more witnesses include the addition (*et benedixit* at Mark 14:23: *c ff i (k) q r¹ syr^{(s)p}* (cf. Luke 22:17 where *d* adds *benedicens*). The addition is also present in several other Diatessaronic witnesses, including the Arabic, Old High German, Middle Dutch, and Middle Italian harmonies.

157:3 (Mt 26:28): F has inserted Luke 22:20’s *uobis* in the middle of the Matthean phrase, but was forced to supply *et* to tie the two together. Oddly, the Book of Kells (Q) includes nearly the same harmony with a different order: *qui effundetur pro uobis et pro multis*.

157:5 (Lk 22:19): F appears to be unique in altering *commemorationem* to *memorationem*, but to no apparent end.

157:15 (Lk 22:33): Removing *dixit ei domine* from Luke’s sentence forces the *qui* to become part of Peter’s speech. This omission may be F’s strategy for fusing Peter’s Matthean and Lukan dialogue, although it makes for an odd construction. The identical strategy would not work in Greek, where the definite article (ὁ) that represents *qui* would have to be changed to a relative pronoun (ὃς). This may suggest that behind F lies a Syriac version of the *Diatessaron*, where the *qui* may instead have been represented by a first person pronoun, as in the Arabic *Diatessaron* (45:26), which also exhibits the identical word order to the Latin.

	<i>Caput CLVIII</i>	<i>Chapter 158</i>	
Jn 14:1	non turbetur cor uestrum· creditis in deum et in me credite·	“Let not your heart be troubled. You believe in God; believe also in me.	1
14:2	in domo patris mei mansiones multae sunt· Si quo minus dixissem uobis quia uado parare uobis locum·	In my Father’s house are many dwellings. If not, would I tell you that I go to prepare a place for you?	2
14:3 [150v]	Et si abiero et praeparauero uobis locum· Iterum uenio et accipiam uos ad me ipsum· ut ubi sum ego et uos sitis·	And if I go away and prepare a place for you, I am coming again and will take you to myself, that where I am you also may be.	3
14:4	Et quo ego uado scitis· et uiam scitis·	And you know where I am going, and you know the way.”	4
14:5	Dicit ei thomas· domine· nescimus quo uadis· et quomodo possumus uiam scire·	Thomas says to him, “Lord, we do not know where you are going. Then how can we know the way?”	5
14:6	Dicit ei ihesus· Ego sum uia et ueritas et uita Nemo uenit ad patrem nisi per me·	Jesus says to him, “I am the way and the truth and the life. No one comes to the Father except through me.	6
14:7	Si cognouissetis me· et patrem meum utique cognouissetis· Et amodo cognoscitis eum et uidistis eum·	If you had recognized me, you certainly would also have recognized my Father. And henceforth you do recognize him and you have seen him.”	7
14:8	Dicit ei philippus· domine· Ostende nobis patrem et sufficit nobis·	Philippus says to him, “Lord, show us the Father and it is sufficient for us.”	8
14:9	Dicit ei ihesus· Tanto tempore uobiscum sum· et non cognouistis me· philippe· qui uidit me· uidit et patrem· quomo tu dicis· ostende nobis patrem·	Jesus says to him, “I am with you so much time, and you have not recognized me? Philippus, the one who sees me also sees the Father. How (can) you say, ‘Show us the Father’?	9
14:10	non credis quia ego in patre· et pater in me est· Uerba quae ego loquor uobis· a me ipso non loquor· pater autem in me manens ipse facit opera·	Do you not believe that I am in the Father, and the Father is in me? The words that I say to you I do not say from myself. But the Father who abides in me does the works.	10
14:11	non creditis· quia ego in patre et pater in me est·	Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father is in me?	11
14:12 ^{abcδ} [151r]	alioquin propter opera ipsa credite· amen· amen dico	Otherwise believe because of the works themselves. Truly, truly, I	12

	uobis· qui credit in me· opera quae ego facio et ipse faciet· quia ego ad patrem uado·	say to you, the one who believes in me will also do the works that I do, because I am going to the Father.	
14:13	Et quodcumque petieritis in nomine meo hoc faciam· ut glorificetur pater in filio·	And whatever you ask in my name, this I will do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son.	13
14:15	Si diligitis me mandata mea seruate·	If you love me, keep my commands.	14
14:16	et ego rogabo patrem et alium paracletum dabit uobis· ut maneat uobiscum in aeternum·	And I will ask the Father and he will give you another Advocate, that he may abide with you forever:	15
14:17	Spiritum ueritatis quem mundus non potest accipere quia non uidet eum· nec scit eum· uos autem cognoscitis eum quia apud uos manebit· et in uobis erit	the Spirit of truth, whom the world is not able to receive because it does not see him, nor does it know him. But you recognize him because he will abide among you and he will be in you.	16
14:18	non relinquam uos orfanos ueniam ad uos·	I will not leave you as orphans. I will come to you.	17
14:19	adhuc modicum et mundus me iam non uidet· Uos autem uidetis me quia ego uiuo· et uos uiuetis·	Yet a little while and the world no longer sees me. But you see me because I live, and you will live.	18
14:20	In illo die uos cognoscetis quia ego sum in patre meo et uos in me· et ego in uobis·	On that day you will recognize that I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you.	19
14:21	qui habet mandata mea et seruat ea· ille est qui diligit me· qui autem diligit me diligitur a patre meo· et ego diligam eum· et manifestabo ei me ipsum	The one who has my commands and keeps them, that is the one who loves me. And the one who loves me will be loved by my Father. And I will love him and will reveal myself to him.”	20
	[151v]		
14:22	Dicit ei iudas non ille scariothis· domine quid factum est· quia nobis manifestaturus es te ipsum et non mundo·	Judas, not the (son) of Scarioth, says to him, “Lord, how is it that you are going to reveal yourself to us and not to the world?”	21
14:23	Respondit ihesus et dixit ei· Si quis diligit me sermonem meum seruauit· et pater meus diligit eum et ad eum ueniemus et mansiones apud eum faciemus·	Jesus answered and said to him, “If anyone loves me, he has kept my word. And my Father loves him and we will come to him and will make (our) dwellings among him.	22
14:24	qui non diligit me· sermones meos non seruat· Et sermonem quem audistis non est meus· sed	The one who does not love me does not keep my words. And the word that you have heard is not	23

	eius qui me misit patris·	mine, but his, the Father's who sent me.	
14:25	haec locutus sum uobis aput uos manens·	I have said these things to you while abiding among you.	24
14:26	paracletus autem spiritus sanctus quem mittet pater in nomine meo· ille uos docebit omnia· et suggeret uobis omnia quaecumque dixero uobis·	But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things and will remind you of all things, whatsoever I will have said to you.	25
14:27	Pacem relinquo uobis· pacem meam do uobis· non quomodo mundus dat ego do uobis· non turbetur cor uestrum· neque formidet·	Peace I leave with you. My peace I give to you. I do not give to you in the way the world gives. Let not your heart be troubled, nor let it be afraid.	26
14:28 [152 ^r]	audistis quia ego dixi uobis· uado et non uenio ad uos· si diligeretis me gauderetis utique quia uado ad patrem· quia pater maior me est·	You heard that I said to you, 'I am going,' and not 'I am coming to you.' If you loved me, you would certainly rejoice that I am going to the Father, because the Father is greater than I.	27
14:29	Et nunc dixi uobis· priusquam fiat· ut cum factum fuerit credatis·	And I have spoken to you now, before it occurs, so that when it will have occurred, you may believe.	28
14:30	iam non multa loquar uobiscum· Uenit enim princeps mundi huius· et in me non habet quicquam·	I will no longer say many things with you, for the ruler of this world is coming and he does not have anything in me.	29
14:31 ^{ab}	sed ut cognoscat mundus quia diligo patrem· Et sicut mandatum dedit mihi pater sic facio	But that the world may recognize that I love the Father, even as the Father has given me a command, thus I do."	30

158:9 (Jn 14:9) quomo] quomodo Š

158:12 (Jn 14:12) faciet *e*] *add.* et maiora horum faciet Š

158:13 (Jn 14:13) in filio *b*] *add.* si quid...faciam (= Jn 14:14) Š

158:16 (Jn 14:17) apud F^sŠ] aput F*GORWX

158:22 (Jn 14:23) seruauit B] servabit Š | diligit² BCHJKMOQRSTVXZ] diliget AŠŠ | apud F^sŠ] aput F*GRW

158:23 (Jn 14:24) me misit ABΔHΘMQXY] misit me ZŠ

158:27 (Jn 14:28) non *om.* Š

Notes

158:9 (Jn 14:9): The scribe has inadvertently left the *do* off the end of *quomodo*.

158:12 (Jn 14:12): Perhaps by homeoteleuton with *faciet*, F omits *et maiora horum faciet* (along with Old Latin *e*).

158:13 (Jn 14:13): F is not alone in omitting all of John 14:14 (*si quid... faciam*), perhaps by parablepsis with the initial *si* of v. 15. Also omitting the verse are Greek MSS X Λ* f¹ 565; Old Latin *b*; Old Syriac Sinaiticus; and some Diatessaronic witnesses, including the Old High German, Middle Italian, and Dutch harmonies. Whether the omission is an error in F or reflective of a larger tradition is difficult to ascertain. Although it is possible that the verse was omitted due to its redundancy with earlier material, there is no indication of other repetitive Johannine phrases being omitted for that reason.

158:16 (Jn 14:17): The scribe has corrected *aput* to *apud* by altering the *t* into an uncharacteristic *d*. Likewise in F 158:22 (John 14:23).

158:27 (Jn 14:28): F's unique addition of *non* to the sentence significantly alters its meaning. Jesus has just stated that he will come back to them (158:3 [John 14:3]), so it is difficult to imagine why a scribe would add *non* here. An alternative (though no less problematic) translation is, "You heard that I said to you, 'I am going and I am not coming to you.'"

	<i>Caput CLVIII</i>	<i>Chapter 159</i>	
Lk 22:35	Et dixit eis quando misi uos sine sacculo et pera et calciamentis· numquid aliquid defuit uobis· at illi dixerunt nihil·	And he said to them, "When I sent you without purse or bag or shoes, did you lack anything?" But they said, "Nothing."	1
22:36	Dixit ergo eis· sed nunc qui habet sacculum tollat· similiter peram Et qui non habet uendat tunicam suam et emat gladium	So he said to them, "But now whoever has a purse should take (it); likewise a bag. And whoever does not have (one) should sell his tunic and buy a sword.	2
22:37	dico autem uobis quoniam athuc hoc quod scriptum est oportet impleri in me Et quod cum iniustis deputatus est etenim ea quae sunt de me finem habent·	But I say to you that this that was written must yet be fulfilled in me: 'and he was counted with the unrighteous,' for these things that are about me have an end."	3
22:38 [152v]	at illi dixerunt domine ecce gladii duo hic at ille dixit eis sat est·	But they said, "Lord, look, here (are) two swords." But he said to them, "It is enough.	4
Jn 14:31 ^c	Surgite eamus hinc	Rise, let us go from here."	5
Mt 26:30 ^a	et hymno dicto exierunt	And after reciting a hymn, they withdrew,	6
Lk 22:39 ^a Mt 26:30 ^a	secundum consuetudinem in montem oliueti	according to (their) custom, to the Mount of Olives.	

159:2 (Lk 22:36) similiter] *add.* et Š
159:4 (Lk 22:38) sat AIYZ] satis Š

Notes

159:1 (Lk 22:35): F interrupts the Johannine Farewell Discourse to insert a final saying of Jesus from Luke's Last Supper. The narrative then returns to the end of John 14:31, where Jesus commands the disciples to rise and leave.

	<i>Caput CLX</i>	<i>Chapter 160</i>	
	F dicit eis	He says to them,	1
Jn 15:1	ego sum uitis uera et pater meus agricola est·	“I am the true vine, and my Father is the gardener.	
15:2	Omnem palmitem in me non ferentem fructum· tollet eum· et omnem qui fert fructum purgabit eum· ut fructum plus afferat	Every branch in me not bearing fruit, he will remove it. And every one that bears fruit, he will prune it, that it may bring forth more fruit.	2
15:3	Iam uos mundi estis· propter sermonem quem locutus sum uobis·	You are already clean, because of the word that I have spoken to you.	3
15:4	manete in me et ego in uobis Sicut palmes non potest ferre fructum a semet ipso nisi manserit in uite· sic nec uos nisi in me manseritis·	Remain in me, and I in you. Just as a branch cannot bear fruit by itself unless it remains in the vine, so neither (can) you unless you remain in me.	4
15:5	Ego sum uitis· uos palmites· qui manet in me et ego in eum hic fert fructum multum quia sine me nihil potestis facere·	I am the vine. You are the branches. The one who remains in me, and I in him, this one bears much fruit; because without me you can do nothing.	5
15:6	Si quis in me non manserit mittetur foras sicut palmes· et aruit et colligent eos et in ignem mittunt et ardent·	If anyone does not remain in me, he will be thrown out, just like the branch: and it withered, and they will gather them together and they throw them into the fire; and they burn.	6
15:7	Si manseritis in me et uerba mea in uobis manserint· quodcumque ^[153r] uolueritis petitis et fiet uobis	If you remain in me and my words remain in you, you ask whatever you desire, and it will be done for you.	7
15:8	In hoc clarificatus est pater meus ut fructum plurimum afferatis et efficiamini mei discipuli·	In this my Father is glorified, that you bring forth very much fruit and become my disciples.	8
15:9	Sicut dilexit me pater· et ego dilexi uos· Manete in dilectione mea·	Just as the Father has loved me, I have also loved you. Remain in my love.	9
15:10	si praecepta mea seruaueritis· manebitis in dilectione mea· sicut	If you keep my commands, you will remain in my love, just as I	10

	et ego patris mei praecepta seruavi· et maneo in eius dilectione·	have also kept the commands of my Father, and I remain in his love.	
15:11 ^{αβ}	haec locutus sum uobis ut gaudium meum impleatur	I have said these things to you that my joy may be complete.	11
15:12	hoc est praeceptum meum ut diligatis inuicem sicut dilexi uos·	This is my command, that you love one another, just as I have loved you.	12
15:13	Maiorem hanc dilectionem nemo habet· ut animam suam quis ponat pro amicis suis	No one has this greater love, that one would lay down one's life for one's friends.	13
15:14	Uos amici mei estis si feceritis quae ego praecipio uobis·	You are my friends if you do what I command you.	14
15:15	Iam non dico uos seruos· quia seruus· nescit quid faciat dominus eius· Uos autem dixi amicos· quia omnia quaecumque audiui a patre meo nota feci uobis	Now I do not call you slaves, for a slave does not know what his master is doing. Rather I called you friends, for everything whatsoever that I heard from my Father I have made known to you.	15
15:16	Non uos me elegistis· Sed ego elegi uos· et posui uos ut eatis et fructum afferatis· et fructus uester <i>[153v]</i> maneat· Ut quodcumque petieritis patrem in nomine meo det uobis	You did not choose me, but I chose you. And I appointed you that you should go and bring forth fruit and that your fruit should endure, such that whatever you ask of my Father in my name, he should give you.	16
15:17	haec mando uobis ut diligatis inuicem·	These things I command you, that you love one another.	17
15:18	Si mundus uos odit· Scitote quia me priorem uobis odio habuit·	If the world hates you, know that it hated me before you.	18
15:19	Si de mundo fuissetis· mundus quod suum erat diligeret· quia uero de mundo non estis sed ego elegi uos de mundo propterea odit uos mundus·	If you had been from the world, the world would love what belonged to it. Since you are not, in fact, from the world, but I have chosen you from the world, for that reason the world hates you.	19
15:20	Mementote sermonis mei quem ego dixi uobis· non est seruus maior domino suo· Si me persecuti sunt et uos persequentur· Si sermonem meum seruauerunt· et uestrum seruabunt·	Remember my word, which I have spoken to you. A slave is not greater than his master. If they persecuted me, they will persecute you. If they kept my word, they will keep yours too.	20
15:21	Sed haec omnia facient uobis propter nomen meum· quia nesciunt eum qui misit me	But all these things they will do to you on account of my name, because they do not know him who sent me.	21

15:22	Si non uenissem et locutus fuissem eis peccatum non haberent· nunc autem excusationem non habent de peccato suo·	If I had not come and spoken to them, they would not have sin; but now they have no excuse for their sin.	22
15:23	Qui me odit· et patrem meum odit·	The one who hates me also hates my Father.	23
15:24	Si operam non fecissem· in eis quae nemo alius <i>[154r]</i> fecit· peccatum non haberent· Nunc autem et uiderunt et oderunt et me et patrem meum·	If I had not done work among them that no one else did, they would not have sin; but now they have both seen and hated both me and my Father.	24
15:25	Sed ut impleatur sermo qui in lege eorum scriptus est· quia odio me habuerunt gratis·	But that the word may be fulfilled that is written in their law: ‘They hated me without reason.’	25
15:26	Cum autem uenerit paracletus quem ego mittam uobis a patre· spiritum ueritatis qui a patre procedit· ille testimonium perhibebit de me·	Yet when the Advocate comes, whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father, he will bear witness concerning me.	26
15:27	Et uos testimonium perhibebitis quia ab initio mecum estis·	And you will bear witness, since you are with me from the beginning.	27
Jn 16:1	haec locutus sum uobis ut non scandalizemini·	I have said these things to you that you may not be caused to stumble.	28
16:2	absque synagogis facient uobis· sed uenit hora· ut omnis qui interficit uos· arbitretur obsequium se prestare deo·	They will put you out of the synagogues; but a time is coming when everyone who kills you will think he is rendering a service to God.	29
16:3	et haec· facient quia non nouerunt patrem neque me·	And they will do these things because they recognized neither the Father nor me.	30
16:4	Sed haec locutus sum uobis· ut cum uenerit hora eorum reminiscamini quia ego dixi uobis·	But I have said these things to you, that when the time has come, you may remember them, because I told you.	31
16:5	haec autem uobis ab initio non dixi· quia uobiscum eram at nunc uado ad eum qui me misit· et nemo ex uobis interrogat me quo uadis·	But I did not tell you these things from the beginning, because I was with you. But now I go to him who sent me, and none of you asks me, ‘Where are you going?’	32
16:6 <i>[154v]</i>	sed quia haec locutus sum uobis· Tristitia impleuit cor uestrum·	But because I said these things to you, sadness has filled your heart.	33

16:7	Sed ego ueritatem dico uobis· expedit uobis ut ego uadam· Si enim non abiero· paracletus non ueniet ad uos· Si autem abiero· mittam eum ad uos·	But I tell you the truth, it is to your advantage that I go. For if I do not depart, the Advocate will not come to you. But if I depart, I will send him to you.	34
16:8	Et cum uenerit· ille arguet mundum de peccato et de iustitia et de iudicio·	And when he has come, he will convict the world regarding sin and regarding righteousness and regarding judgment:	35
16:9	De peccato quidem quia non credunt in me	now regarding sin, because they do not believe in me;	36
16:10	De iustitia uero quia ad patrem uado· et iam non uidebitis me·	and regarding righteousness, because I am going to the Father, and you will no longer see me;	37
16:11	De iudicio autem· quia princeps mundi huius iudicatus est·	and regarding judgment, because the ruler of this world has been judged.	38
16:12	athuc multa habeo uobis dicere sed non potestis portare modo·	I still have many things to say to you, but you are not able to bear (them) now.	39
16:13	Cum autem uenerit ille spiritus ueritatis· docebit uos in omnem ueritatem· Non enim loquitur a semet ipso· sed quaecumque audiet loquitur· et quae uentura sunt annuntiabit uobis·	But when that Spirit of Truth has come, he will instruct you in all truth. For he does not speak from himself, but whatever he will hear, he speaks. And he will announce to you things going to come.	40
16:14	ille me clarificabit· quia de meo accipiet· et annuntiabit uobis·	He will glorify me, because he will receive from me and will announce to you.	41
16:15	Omnia quaecumque habet pater mea sunt· propterea dixi quia de meo accipiet· et annuntiabit uobis	All things whatsoever the Father has are mine. For this reason I said that he will receive from me and will announce to you.	42
[155r]			
16:16	Modicum et iam non uidebitis me· Et iterum modicum et uidebitis me quia uado ad patrem·	A little while and you will no longer see me. And again a little while and you will see me, because I am going to the Father.”	43
16:17	dixerunt ergo ex discipulis eius ad inuicem· quid est hoc quod dicit nobis modicum et non uidebitis me· et iterum modicum et uidebitis me· et quia uado ad patrem·	Therefore some of his disciples said to one another, “What is this that he will say to us, ‘A little while and you will not see me. And again a little while and you will see me,’ and ‘because I am going to the Father?’”	44

16:18	Dicebant ergo quid est hoc quod dicit modicum nescimus quid loquitur·	So they kept saying, “What is this that he says, ‘A little while’? We do not know what he is saying.”	45
16:19	cognouit autem ihesus· quia uolebant eum interrogare· et dixit eis· de hoc quaeritis inter uos quia dixi modicum et non uidebitis me· Et iterum modicum et uidebitis me	But Jesus perceived that they wanted to ask him, and he said to them, “You are asking about this among yourselves, because I said, ‘A little while and you will not see me. And again a little while and you will see me.’	46
16:20	Amen· amen dico uobis· quia plorabitis et flebitis uos mundus autem gaudebit uos autem contristabimini· Sed tristitia uestra uertetur in gaudium	Truly, truly, I say to you that you will weep and cry, but the world will rejoice, while you will be made sad. But your sadness will be turned to joy.	47
16:21	Mulier cum parit tristitiam habet quia uenit hora eius· Cum autem pepererit puerum· iam non meminit pressurae propter gaudium quia natus est homo in mundum·	A woman, when she gives birth, has sadness because her time has come. But when she has given birth to the child, she no longer remembers the distress because of the joy that a person has been born into the world.	48
16:22	Et uos igitur nunc quidem ^[155v] tristitiam habebitis· iterum autem uidebo uos et gaudebit cor uestrum· et gaudium uestrum nemo tollit a uobis·	And you, therefore, will indeed have sadness now, but I will see you again and your heart will rejoice. And no one takes your joy away from you.	49
16:23	Et in illo die me non rogabitis quicquam Amen· amen dico uobis si quid petieritis patrem in nomine meo dabit uobis·	And on that day you will not ask me anything. Truly, truly I say to you, if you ask the Father anything in my name, he will give (it) to you.	50
16:24	Usque modo non petistis quicquam in nomine meo· petite et accipietis ut gaudium uestrum sit plenum·	Until now you have not asked anything in my name. Ask and you will receive, that your joy may be full.	51
16:25	haec in prouerbiis locutus sum uobis· uenit hora cum iam non in prouerbiis loquar uobis· sed palam de patre annuntiabo uobis·	I have said these things to you in proverbs. The time is coming when I will no longer speak to you in proverbs, but will announce to you openly regarding the Father.	52
16:26	illo die in nomine meo petitis· et non dico uobis quia ego rogabo patrem de uobis·	On that day you ask in my name; and I am not saying to you that I will ask the Father concerning you.	53
16:27	ipse enim pater amat uos· quia uos me amatis· et credidistis quia	For the Father himself loves you, because you love me and have	54

	ego a deo exiui·	believed that I went out from God.	
16:28	et exiui a patre et ueni in mundum Iterum relinquo mundum et uado ad patrem·	And I went out from the Father and came into the world. Again I leave the world and go to the Father.”	55
16:29	Dicunt ei discipuli eius· ecce nunc palam loqueris et prouerbiu nullum dicis·	His disciples say to him, “Look, now you are speaking openly and not saying any proverb.	56
16:30	Nunc scimus quia scis omnia et <i>[156r]</i> non opus est tibi ut quis te interroget· in hoc credimus quia a deo existi	Now we know that you know all things and you have no need that anyone ask you. By this we believe that you went out from God.”	57
16:31	Respondit eis ihesus· A modo creditis·	Jesus answered them, “From now on you believe?	58
16:32	ecce uenit hora· et iam uenit ut dispargamini unusquisque in propria et me solum relinquitis· Et non sum solus quia pater mecum est·	Look, the time is coming and has already come when you shall be dispersed, everyone to his own, and you leave me alone. But I am not alone because the Father is with me.	59
16:33	haec locutus sum uobis· ut in me pacem habeatis in mundum pressuram habebitis Sed confidite ego uici mundum·	I have said these things to you that you may have peace in me. You will have distress in the world. But be assured, I have conquered the world.”	60
Jn 17:1	haec locutus est ihesus· Et subleuatis oculis in caelum ad patrem dixit· uenit hora· clarifica filium tuum· ut filius tuus clarificet te	Jesus said these things. And lifting (his) eyes to heaven he said to the Father, “The time has come. Glorify your Son, that your Son may glorify you.	61
17:2	Sicut dedisti ei potestatem omnis carnis· ut omne quod dedisti ei det eis uitam aeternam	Just as you gave him authority over all flesh, that everything that you gave him, to them he may give eternal life.	62
17:3	haec est autem uita aeterna· ut cognoscant te solum deum uerum et quem misisti ihesum christum·	Now this is eternal life, that they may recognize you, the only true God, and whom you sent, Jesus Christus.	63
17:4	Ego te clarificaui super terram· opus consummaui quod dedisti mihi ut faciam·	I have glorified you upon the earth. I accomplished the work that you gave me to do.	64
17:5	Et nunc clarifica me tu pater· apud temet <i>[156v]</i> ipsum· claritatem quam habui priusquam mundus esset apud te	And now glorify me, Father, with yourself, the glory that I had with you before the world existed.	65
17:6	Manifestaui nomen tuum	I have revealed your name to the	66

	hominibus· quos dedisti mihi de mundo tui erant et mihi eos dedisti et sermonem tuam seruauerunt·	people whom you gave to me from the world. They were yours and you gave them to me, and they have kept your word.	
17:7	nunc cognouerunt quia omnia quae dedisti mihi abs te sunt·	Now they have recognized that all things that you gave me are from you.	67
17:8	Quia uerba quae dedisti mihi dedi eis· et ipsi acceperunt· et cognouerunt uere quia a te exiui Et crediderunt quia tu me misisti·	For the words that you gave me I gave to them. And they themselves received (them) and truly recognized that I went out from you. And they have believed that you sent me.	68
17:9	et ego pro eis rogo non pro mundo rogo· sed pro his quos dedisti mihi· quia tui sunt	And I pray for them. I do not pray for the world, but for those whom you gave me, because they are yours.	69
17:10	Et mea omnia tua sunt· et tua mea sunt et clarificatus sum in eis·	And all my things are yours, and yours are mine. And I am glorified in them.	70
17:11	Et iam non sum in mundo et hi in mundo sunt· et ego ad te uenio· pater sancte serua eos in nomine tuo quod dedisti mihi ut sint unum sicut et nos	And I am no longer in the world, and they are in the world. And I am going to you. Holy Father, keep them in your name, which you gave me, that they may be one just as we also (are one).	71
17:12	Cum essem cum eis ego seruabam eos in nomine tuo quos dedisti mihi custodiui· et nemo ex his periuit nisi filius perditionis· ut scriptura inpleatur·	When I was with them I kept them in your name; I guarded those whom you gave me. And none of them has been lost except the son of perdition, that Scripture may be fulfilled.	72
17:13	nunc autem ad te uenio et haec <small>[157r]</small> loquor in mundo· ut habeant gaudium meum inpletum in semet ipsis	But now I am going to you, and I say these things in the world, that they may have my joy filled in themselves.	73
17:14	Ego dedi eis sermonem tuum et mundus odio eos habuit quia non sunt de mundo· Sicut et ego non sum de mundo·	I gave them your word and the world hated them because they are not from the world, just as I too am not from the world.	74
17:15	non rogo ut tollas eos de mundo· sed ut serues eos ex malo·	I do not pray that you take them from the world, but that you keep them from evil.	75
17:16	de mundo non sunt sicut et ego non sum de mundo·	They are not from the world just as I too am not from the world.	76
17:17	Sanctifica eos in ueritate· sermo	Sanctify them in truth. Your word	77

	tuus ueritas est·	is truth.	
17:18	sicut me misisti in mundum· et ego misi eos in mundum	Just as you sent me into the world, I also sent them into the world.	78
17:19	et pro eis ego sanctifico me ipsum· ut sint et ipsi sanctificati in ueritate	And for them I sanctify myself, that they themselves may also be sanctified in truth.	79
17:20	Non pro his autem rogo tantum· sed et pro eis qui credituri sunt per uerbum eorum in me	However, I do not pray for them only, but also for those who are going to believe in me through their word,	80
17:21	Ut omnes unum sint· sicut tu pater in me et ego in te· ut et ipsi in nobis unum sint· ut mundus credat quia· tu me misisti·	that they all may be one, just as you, Father, (are) in me and I (am) in you, that they too may be one in us, that the world may believe that you sent me.	81
17:22	et ego claritatem quam dedisti mihi dedi illis ut sint unum· sicut nos unum sumus·	And the glory that you gave to me, I have given to them, that they may be one, just as we are one;	82
17:23 [157v]	ego in eis et tu in me· ut sint consummati in unum et cognoscat mundus quia tu me misisti· Et dilexisti eos sicut et me dilexisti·	I in them and you in me, that they may be complete in unity and that the world may recognize that you sent me and have loved them just as you have also loved me.	83
17:24	pater quos dedisti mihi· uolo ut ubi ego sum et illi sint mecum Ut uideant claritatem meam quam dedisti mihi quia dilexisti me· ante constitutionem mundi	Father, those whom you gave to me, I wish that where I am, they also may be with me, that they may see my glory, which you gave to me, because you loved me, before the creation of the world.	84
17:25	Pater iuste et mundus te non cognouit· ego autem te cognoui· et hi cognouerunt quia tu me misisti·	Righteous Father, even the world has not recognized you. But I have recognized you, and they have recognized that you sent me.	85
17:26	et notum feci eis nomen tuum et notum faciam· ut dilectio qua dilexisti me in ipsis sit et ego in ipsis	And I have made your name known to them, and I will make (it) known, that the love with which you have loved me may be in them, and I in them.”	86

160:4 (Jn 15:4) manserit in F^cŠ] manseritnin F*

160:5 (Jn 15:5) eum DG] eo Š

160:7 (Jn 15:7) petitis F^vBGRTXZ^c] petetis F*Š; petieritis Z*

160:11 (Jn 15:11) meum] *add.* in uobis sit et gaudium uestrum Š

160:13 (Jn 15:13) hanc DEGΘIKMQRSTWZ*] hac AZ^cŠ

160:15 (Jn 15:15) faciat BCΘJKQRTVWXZ] facit AMŠ

160:20 (Jn 15:20) sermonis F^vŠ] sermones F*E *d e ff² l*
 160:24 (Jn 15:24) operam F*D] opera F^bŠ
 160:29 (Jn 16:2) vobis F* δ] vos F^bŠ
 160:40 (Jn 16:13) loquitur¹ P^šD^šMOQZ] loquitur Š | loquitur² OQ] loquitur Š
 160:42 (Jn 16:15) accipiet AM] accipit Z*ΣŠ
 160:44 (Jn 16:17) dicet G *b q*] dicit Š
 160:47 (Jn 16:20) flebitis F^vŠ] fleuitis F*O
 160:49 (Jn 16:22) habebitis ABDGHOQSXY] habetis MZŠ
 160:53 (Jn 16:26) petitis BD^šGP^šQRXYΣ] petetis Š
 160:54 (Jn 16:27) amatis ADGHΘIKMOQRSWY] amastis ZΣŠ
 160:55 (Jn 16:28) et¹ F^vT^c *aur*] *om.* F*Š
 160:58 (Jn 16:31) a modo F^sΘZ*] modo F*Š
 160:59 (Jn 16:32) dispargamini JMT] dispergamini Š | relinquitis F] relinquitis Š
 160:60 (Jn 16:33) in mundum AHΘSXY] in mundo Š | habebitis F^vAH^cMZŠ] habetis
 F*EH*JΣ
 160:61 (Jn 17:1) ad patrem dixit F^v] ad patrem F*; dixit pater Š
 160:63 (Jn 17:3) deum uerum ABD^šΔEHIMQRSXY] uerum deum ZŠ
 160:65 (Jn 17:5) apud F^sŠ] aput F*GQRWXZ*
 160:69 (Jn 17:9) et *aur c e*] *om.* Š
 160:71 (Jn 17:11) quod Y *d*] quos Š
 160:76 (Jn 17:16) et F^vŠ] *om.* F*D^šHMRX*
 160:82 (Jn 17:22) illis AD^šΔEHΘMRSXY] eis ZŠ

Notes

- 160:1 (Jn 15:1): F adds *dicit eis* from outside the gospel text as a transition back into Jesus' Johannine speech, although it added no such transition at F 158:1 to begin John 14:1. This same outside addition appears in the Arabic Diatessaron 46:17. This single chapter of F contains the rest of the Farewell Discourse (John 15-17).
- 160:4 (Jn 15:4): It appears the scribe first wrote *manseritnin* but scratched out the second *n*, leaving a space between *manserit* and *in*. A remarkable number of corrections appears in this section; see the apparatus and notes at 160:7 (Jn 15:7); 160:20 (Jn 15:20); 160:58 (Jn 16:31); 160:60 (Jn 16:33); 160:61 (Jn 17:1); 160:65 (Jn 17:5); 160:71 (Jn 17:11); 160:76 (Jn 17:16).
- 160:7 (Jn 15:7): Although the scribe clearly wrote *petetis*, it appears Victor has faintly dotted out the second *e* and placed an *i* before it to read *petitis*, in agreement with a handful of MSS but against the now accepted Vulgate reading.
- 160:11 (Jn 15:11): Perhaps due to homoeoteleuton, F omits a sizable portion of this verse (*in vobis sit et gaudium vestrum*) that significantly changes the meaning of the sentence, although it retains grammatical sense. Jesus now says these things that *his own* joy—and not the disciples'—may be complete.
- 160:20 (Jn 15:20): The scribe wrote *sermones*, but it appears Victor has dotted out the final *e* and written *i* above to read *sermonis*, which the grammar of the sentence demands. F would not have been alone in reading *sermones* (an accusative plural), also found in one Vulgate (E) and four Old Lation (*d e ff² l*) MSS, along with the Greek side of Codex Bezae (D); but some of these make further adjustments to the sentence which F does not.

- 160:24 (Jn 15:24): A later hand in black ink has attempted to cross out the *m* of *operam*.
- 160:29 (Jn 16:2): A later hand in black ink has attempted to cross out the *bi* of *vobis* to read *vos* in agreement with the Vulgate tradition, but F clearly reads *vobis* (with Old Latin δ).
- 160:47 (Jn 16:20): Although the scribe wrote *fleuitis*, Victor appears to have altered the *u* to read *flebitis*.
- 160:55 (Jn 16:28): In what appears to be Victor's hand, *et* is inserted above the line before *exiui* (after the *exiui* of v. 27).
- 160:58 (Jn 16:31): In what appears to be the scribe's hand, *a* is inserted above the line before *modo*.
- 160:60 (Jn 16:33): Although the scribe wrote *habetis*, it appears Victor has inserted *bi* above to read *habebitis*. Vulgate MS H makes the identical correction.
- 160:61 (Jn 17:1): In the standard Vulgate reading at this point, *pater* (vocative) is part of Jesus' speech ("he said, 'Father..."). F uniquely reads *ad patrem* instead ("he said to the Father..."). However, perhaps on account of this variant reading, the scribe also omitted *dixit*, which Victor has added in his own hand in the margin, with a siglum in the text after *patrem* to alert the reader. The switch from *pater* to *ad patrem* might be explained by a Syriac *Vorlage* in which the grammatical function of the word for father, lacking a declension, was ambiguous; however, the Syriac Sinaiticus and Peshitta both read "my father" (ܡܝܦܛܪܝܢ) here, against the standard Greek and Latin reading.
- 160:65 (Jn 17:5): The scribe (or Victor) has corrected *aput* to *apud* by altering the *t* into an uncharacteristic *d*; however, the second *aput* in the same verse (which appears on the next leaf), is untouched.
- 160:71 (Jn 17:11): For *sancte*, the scribe originally wrote the *nomen sacrum* as *sc̄ae*, but then appears to have crossed out the *a* with a slash.
- 160:76 (Jn 17:16): In what appears to be Victor's hand, *et* is inserted above the line at *ego*.

	<i>Caput CLXI</i>	<i>Chapter 161</i>	
Mt 26:36 ^a	Tunc uenit ihesus cum illis in uillam qui dicitur gesemani·	Then Jesus went with them into a country place that is called Gesemani,	1
Jn 18:1 ^{βc}	trans torrentem cedron· ubi erat hortus· in quem introiuit ipse et discipuli eius·	over the Cedron stream, where there was a garden, into which he and his disciples entered.	2
18:2	Sciebat autem et iudas qui tradebat eum locum quia frequenter ihesus conuenerat illuc cum discipulis suis	But Judas, who intended to hand him over, also knew the place, because Jesus had often met there with his disciples.	3
Lk 22:40 ^a	Et cum peruenisset ad locum dixit	And when he had come to the place he said	4
Mt 26:36 ^{βγ}	discipulis suis sedete hic et	to his disciples, "Stay here and	
Lk 22:40 ^b [158r]	orate ne intretis in temtationem	pray that you may not enter into temptation,	
Mt 26:36 ^γ	Donec uadam illuc· et orem·	while I go off and pray."	

26:37 ^a	et adsumto petro· et duobus filiis zebedaei·	And taking Petrus and the two sons of Zebedaeus,	5
Mk 14:33 ^a	iacobum et iohannen·	Jacobus and Johannes,	
Mt 26:37 ^b	coepit contristari et mestus esse·	he began to be distressed and to be sad.	
26:38	Tunc ait illis· Tristis est anima mea usque ad mortem· sustinete hic· et uigilate mecum·	Then he said to them, “My soul is sorrowful to the point of death. Wait here and stay awake with me.”	6
Lk 22:41 ^a	Et ipse	And he	7
Mt 26:39	progressus	proceeded	
Lk 22:41 ^{ab}	est ab eis· quantum iactus est lapidis Et positus genibus	from them as far as a stone’s throw. And kneeling,	
Mt 26:39 ^a	procidit in faciem suam	he fell to his face	
Mk 14:35 ^b	et orabat	and he began to pray that, if it	8
	Ut si fieri posset transiret ab eo hora·	could be, the time would pass from him,	
Mt 26:39 ^b	dicens pater· si possibile est	saying, “Father, if it is possible—	9
Mk 14:36 ^b	abba pater· omnia tibi possibilia sunt·	Abba, Father, all things are possible for you—	
Mt 26:39 ^b	mi pater si possibile est	my Father, if it is possible,	
Mk 14:36 ^d	transfer calicem hunc a me	carry this cup away from me.	
Mt 26:39 ^γ	Uerumtamen	Nevertheless,	
Mk 14:36 ^δ	non quod ego uolo sed quod tu (wish).”	not what I wish, but what you (wish).”	
Lk 22:45 ^a	Et cum surrexisset ab oratione·	And when he had risen from prayer	10
Mt 26:40 ^a	uenit ad discipulos suos et inuenit eos dormientes·	he came to his disciples and found them sleeping.	
Lk 22:46 ^{ab}	Et ait eis· quid dormitis	And he said to them, “Why are you sleeping?”	11
Mt 26:40 ^c	sic non potuistis una hora uigilare mecum·	Thus you were not able to stay awake with me one hour?	12
26:41	Uigilate et orate ut non intretis in temptationem	Stay awake and pray that you may not enter into temptation. The	13
	Spiritus quidem promptus est caro	spirit indeed is ready, but the flesh	
[158v]	autem infirma	is weak.”	
26:42 ^a	Iterum secundo abiit· et orauit·	He went away again a second time and prayed.	14
Lk 22:43	apparuit autem illi angelus de caelo confortans eum· et factus est in agonia et prolixius orabat·	But an angel from haeven appeared to him, strengthening him. And he was in agony, and he kept praying more intensely,	15
Mt 26:42 ^{ab}	dicens pater mi· si non potest calix hic transire· nisi bibam	saying, “My Father, if this cup cannot pass by unless I drink it,	16

	illum fiat uoluntas tua·	may your will be done.”	
Lk 22:44	Et factus est sudor eius sicut guttae sanguinis decurrentis in terram·	And his sweat became like drops of blood flowing onto the ground.	17
22:45 ^a	et cum surrexisset·	And when he had risen	18
Mt 26:40 ^a	Uenit iterum ad discipulos suos et inuenit eos dormientes	he came again to his disciples and found them sleeping	
Lk 22:45 ^y	prae tristitia	out of sadness.	
Mk 14:40 ^{bc}	Erant enim oculi eorum ingrauari et ignorabant quid responderent ei	For their eyes were heavy; and they did not know what to answer him.	19
Mt 26:44	Et relictis illis iterum abiit et orauit tertio	And leaving them he went away again and prayed a third time, saying the same thing.	20
26:45	Eundem sermonem dicens Tunc uenit ad discipulos suos· et ait illis· dormite et requiescite adpropinquauit hora· et filius hominis traditur in manus peccatorum·	Then he came to his disciples and said to them, “Sleep and rest! The time has drawn near and the Son of Man is handed over into the hands of sinners.	21
26:46	Surgite eamus· ecce adpropinquauit qui me tradet	Rise, let us go. Look, the one who will hand me over has drawn near.”	22

161:1 (Mt 26:36) qui DELR] quae Š
161:3 (Jn 18:2) eum AM] *add.* ipsum Z*Š
161:4 (Lk 22:40) temptacionem ATXYZ] temptationem Š
161:11 (Lk 22:46) eis] illis Š
161:15 (Lk 22:43) est ABD^ŠEHIJKOP^ŠQRTVXYΣ] *om.* MZŠ | et²
ABD^ŠHΘJKOQRVXY] *om.* MZŠ
161:16 (Mt 26:42) calix hic] hic calix Š
161:19 (Mk 14:40) eorum DGJLMORTVW] illorum AZŠ
161:21 (Mt 26:45) ait R] dicit Š | dormite] *add.* iam Š | requiescite] *add.* ecce Š (*cf.* Mk 14:41)
161:22 (Mt 26:46) tradet BCDEΘJKLOQRTVWX*Z] tradit AMΣŠ

Notes

161:1 (Mt 26:36): It would appear that Victor left a mark over *qui* to indicate it needed correction (presumably to *quae*), but the correction was not carried out.
161:5 (Mk 14:33): In borrowing the names from Mark, F has left *iacobum et iohannen* in the accusative, whereas the Matthean context (26:37) into which they are inserted (an ablative absolute phrase substituted for the Greek aorist active participle, for which Latin has no equivalent) requires ablative. While this construction confirms that Latin is not likely the original language of the current harmony, it unfortunately does not help decide the debate over the exemplar from which the Latin was translated, as the construction could work in either Greek or Syriac. Notably, the Arabic Diatessaron displays the same word order (48:5).

161:9 (Mt 26:39): It is not apparent why F would employ *pater si possibile est* from Matthew twice when there is ample fodder for parallels in this section, unless it is simply a scribal or harmonistic error.

161:12 (Mt 26:40): Despite its plural verb, in the Matthean context Jesus speaks this phrase directly to Peter, whereas here it is more naturally addressed to all the disciples.

161:15, 17 (Lk 22:43-44): These verses in Luke are missing in some early manuscripts (P⁷⁵ A B f syr^s). It is noteworthy that F splits them apart by inserting the content of Jesus' second prayer (from Matt 26:42) between them.

161:18 (Lk 22:45): The beginning of this verse is used twice (cf. 161:10). At the end of this verse, an interesting leitmotif is produced with the reappearance of *tristitia* and its prior appearance in 160:33, 47-49 (John 16:6, 20-22).

	<i>Caput CLXII</i>	<i>Chapter 162</i>	
Mt 26:47 ^{ab}	Et athuc ipso loquente ecce iudas unus de duodecim·	And while he was still speaking, Judas, one of the twelve,	1
Jn 18:3 ^a	cum accepisset cohortem	when he had received a band of soldiers,	
Mt 26:47 ^{bc}	uenit et cum eo turba multa	came there, and with him a large mob,	
[159r]			
Jn 18:3 ^y	cum lanternis et facibus et armis	with lanterns and torches and weapons	
F	et	and	
Mt 26:47 ^d	gladiis et fustibus a principibus sacerdotum	swords and clubs, from the chief priests	
Mk 14:43 ^y	et scribis	and the scribes	
Mt 26:47 ^d	et senioribus populi	and the elders of the people.	
26:48 ^a	qui autem tradebat eum	Now the one who intended to hand him over	2
Mk 14:44 ^a	dederat	had given	
Mt 26:48 ^{ab}	illis signum dicens· quemcumque osculatus fuero ipse est tenete eum	them a sign, saying, “Whomever I kiss, it is he. Seize him	
Mk 14:44 ^b	et ducite eum·	and lead him away.”	
Mt 26:49 ^{ab}	Et confestim accedens ad ihesum dixit· habe rabbi·	And immediately approaching Jesus, he said, “Greetings, Rabbi!”	3
Lk 22:47 ^c	et adpropinquauit ihesu· ut oscularetur eum·	And he drew near to Jesus to kiss him.	4
48	ihesus autem dixit ei· iuda osculo filium hominis tradis·	But Jesus said to him, “Judas, do you hand over the Son of Man with a kiss?	5
Mt 26:50	amice ad quod uenisti·	Friend, why did you come?”	6
26:49 ^c	et osculatus est eum	And he kissed him.	7
Jn 18:4	ihesus itaque sciens omnia quae uentura erant super eum· processit et dicit eis· quem	And so Jesus, knowing all things that were going to come upon him, stepped forward and says to them,	8

	quaeritis·	“Whom are you seeking?”	
18:5	responderunt ei· ihesum nazarenum· dicit eis ihesus ego sum· stabat autem et iudas qui tradebat eum cum ipsis·	They answered him, “Jesus the Nazarene.” Jesus says to them, “I am (he).” Now Judas, who intended to hand him over, was also standing with them.	9
18:6	Ut ergo dixit eis· ego sum· abierunt retrorsum et ceciderunt in terram·	So when he said to them, “I am (he),” they retreated backwards and fell to the ground.	10
18:7	Iterum ergo eos interrogavit quem quaeritis· illi autem dixerunt ihesum nazarenum·	So again he asked them, “Whom are you seeking?” And they said, “Jesus the Nazarene.”	11
18:8	Respondit ihesus dixi uobis quia ego sum <i>[159v]</i> Si ergo me quaeritis· sinite hos abire·	Jesus answered, “I told you that I am (he). So if you are seeking me, allow these ones to leave,”	12
18:9	ut impleretur sermo quem dixit· quia quos dedisti mihi non perdi ex ipsis quicquam	that the word that he spoke might be fulfilled: “Those whom you gave me, I did not lose any of them.”	13
Mt 26:50 ^{cd}	Tunc accesserunt et manus iniecerunt in ihesum· et tenuerunt eum	Then they approached and laid (their) hands on Jesus and seized him.	14
Lk 22:49	Uidentes autem hi qui circa ipsum erant· quod futurum erat dixerunt ei domine· si percutimus in gladio·	But those who were around him, seeing what was about to happen, said to him, “Lord, do we strike with the sword?”	15
Jn 18:10 ^{ab}	Simon ergo petrus habens gladium· eduxit eum· et percussit pontificis seruum Et	Therefore Simon Petrus, having a sword, drew it out and struck the slave of the high priest. And	16
Mt 26:51 ^y	amputauit	he cut off	17
Jn 18:10 ^{bc}	auriculam eius dextram· Erat autem nomen seruo malchus·	his right ear. Now the name of the slave was Malchus.	
Mt 26:52 ^a	Tunc ait	Then	18
Jn 18:11 ^{ac}	ihesus Petro· calicem quem dedit mihi pater non bibam illum·	Jesus said to Petrus, “The cup the Father has given me, should I not drink it?”	
18:11 ^b	mitte gladium in uaginam	Put (your) sword in (its) sheath.	
Mt 26:52 ^c	Omnis enim qui acceperint gladium gladio peribunt·	For all who take up the sword will perish by the sword.	19
26:53	an putas quia non possum rogare patrem meum et exhibebit mihi modo· plus quam XII· legiones angelorum	Or do you think that I cannot ask my Father and he will provide me right now with more than twelve thousand legions of angels?	20
26:54	Quomodo ergo implebuntur	How then will the Scriptures be	21

	[160r] scribturae· quia sic oportet fieri·	fulfilled that it must happen this way?	
Lk 22:51 ^{bc}	Sinite usque huc· et cum tetigisset auriculam eius sanauit eum·	Stop this!” And when he had touched his ear, he healed him.	22
Mt 26:55 ^{aby}	In illa hora dixit ihesus turbis Tamquam ad latronem existis cum gladiis et fustibus comprehendere me· cotidie apud uos	At that time Jesus said to the mobs, “Have you come out with swords and clubs to arrest me like you would a bandit? Daily	23
Mk 14:49 ^a	eram	I was among you,	
Mt 26:55 ^y	docens in templo et non me tenuistis	teaching in the temple, and you did not seize me.	
Lk 22:53 ^b	sed haec est hora uestra et potestas tenebrarum·	But this is your time and the power of darkness.	24
Mt 26:56 ^{abc}	hoc autem factum est· ut implerentur scribturae prophetarum· Tunc discipuli omnes relicto eo fugerunt·	And this has happened that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled.” Then the disciples all fled, leaving him.	25
Jn 18:12	Cohors ergo et tribunus et ministri iudaeorum comprehenderunt ihesum et ligauerunt eum·	So the band of soldiers and the tribune and the officers of the Jews arrested Jesus and bound him.	26
18:13	et adduxerunt eum ad annam primum erat enim socer caiphae· qui erat pontifex anni illius·	And they led him away to Annas first, for he was the father-in-law of Caiphas, who was the high priest of that year.	27
18:14	Erat autem caiaphas qui consilium dederat iudaeis· quia expedit unum hominem mori pro populo	Now it was Caiaphas who had given the advice to the Jews that it is advantageous for one man to die on behalf of the people.	28

162:1 (Mt 26:47) Et J] *om.* Š

162:2 (Mt 26:48) tradebat *df*] tradidit Š

162:2 (Mk 14:44) ducite eum] ducite eum caute GV; ducite caute M; caute ducite A; ducite ZŠŠ

162:13 (Jn 18:9) quicumque *ff*²] quemquam Š; *om.* Z*

162:16 (Jn 18:10) auriculam eius EJO] eius auriculam Š

162:20 (Mt 26:53) XII (= duodecim milia) BGJOP^SXZΣ] *om.* milia AŠ

162:25 (Mt 26:56) autem] *add.* totum Š

162:27 (Jn 18:13) caiphae BCDGΘIJKOVXZ] caiaphae AMŠ

Notes

162:1 (Mt 26:47^β): Notably, *duodecim* is spelled out in full here, whereas elsewhere Roman numerals are employed (e.g. F 162:20 [Mt 26:53]).

162:1 (Jn 18:3^γ): F must supply the conjunction *et* to bridge between what Judas brings in John 18:3 and what he brings in Matt 26:47, making for a nearly complete list, but still omitting Mark 14:43's *lignis*.

162:16 (Jn 18:10): F has followed the Johannine wording of Peter's rash act entirely except for the single substitution of the verb *abscidit* with *amputauit*, which is the verb all three parallel accounts employ (cf. Matt 26:51; Mark 14:47; Luke 22:50). Old Latin *a* also reads *amputauit* at John 18:10, so the reading may be an Old Latin remnant, or may reveal a tendency in F to harmonize by majority rule, or may simply show that F prefers Matthean wording when available.

162:25 (Mt 26:56): Perhaps by homoeoteleuton, the scribe has omitted *totum* after *autem*. However, the same omission occurs in the Arabic Diatessaron (48:43).

	<i>Caput CLXIII</i>	<i>Chapter 163</i>	
Mk 14:51	adulescens autem quidam sequebatur eum amictus sindone super nudo et tenuerunt eum	Now a certain young man was following him, clothed with a linen cloth over (his) naked body. And they seized him.	1
	14:52 at ille reiecta sindone nudus [160v] profugit ab eis	But, throwing off the linen cloth, he ran away from them naked.	2
Jn 18:15 ^a	Sequebatur autem ihesum simon petrus	Now Simon Petrus was following Jesus	3
Mt 26:58 ^a	a longe	from a distance—	
Jn 18:15 ^a	et alius discipulus·	and the other disciple—	
Mt 26:58 ^b	usque in atrium principis sacerdotum·	up to the court of the high priest.	
Jn 18:15 ^{bc}	Discipulus autem ille erat notus pontifici· et introiuit cum ihesu in atrium pontificis·	Now that disciple was known to the high priest, and he went in with Jesus into the court of the high priest.	4
	18:16 petrus autem stabat ad ostium foris Exiuit ergo discipulus alius qui erat notus pontifici· et dixit ostiariae et introduxit petrum·	But Petrus was standing at the gate outside. So the other disciple who was known to the high priest went out and spoke to the woman keeping the gate and brought Petrus in.	5
Lk 22:56 ^a	quem cum uidisset	When	6
Jn 18:17 ^a	ancilla ostiaria	the servant woman keeping the gate had seen him	
Lk 22:56 ^b	et eum fuisset intuita· dixit·	and stared at him, she said,	
Jn 18:17 ^{by}	numquid et tu ex discipulis es hominis istius· dicit ille	“You too are not (one) of the disciples of that man, are you?” He says	
Lk 22:57 ^b	mulieri· non noui illum	to the woman, “I do not know him.	
Mk 14:68 ^β	neque scio quid dicas·	I do not even understand what you are saying.”	
Jn 18:18	stabant autem serui et ministri ad prunas quia frigus erat et calefiebant· erat autem cum eis et	Now the slaves and officers were standing at a fire of coals because it was cold and they were trying to	7

petrus stans· et calefaciens se	get warm. So Petrus was also with them, standing and warming himself,
Mt 26:58 ^y ut uideret finem··	that he might see the outcome.

163:1 (Mk 14:51) eum AM] illum ZŠ
 163:6 (Lk 22:57) mulieri] mulier Š

Notes

163:6 (Lk 22:56): F must take some liberties in its harmonization of Peter’s three denials, particularly the second and third. It follows John 18:17 in placing the first denial at the gate itself, uses only John’s accusation from the servant woman, and combines Peter’s responses from Luke 22:57 and Mark 14:68. The narrative then breaks to recount part of Jesus’ trial, as in John. The denials pick up again in F 164:7 below.

163:6 (Lk 22:57): An additional *i* has changed *mulier* from vocative to dative and pulled it outside of Peter’s speech. F appears to be unique in this reading, which could easily be explained by a Syriac *Vorlage* in which the grammatical function of the word for woman, lacking a declension, was ambiguous. Unfortunately, Luke’s two other vocatives from this scene (22:58, 60) are not present in F and therefore cannot be tested.

	<i>Caput CLXIII</i>	<i>Chapter 164</i>	
Jn 18:19	pontifex ergo interrogauit ihesum de discipulis et de doctrina eius	Therefore the high priest asked Jesus about his disciples and teaching.	1
18:20 <i>[161r]</i>	Respondit ei ihesus· ego palam locutus sum mundo Ego semper docui in synagoga et in templo· quo omnes iudaei conueniunt et in occulto locutus sum nihil·	Jesus answered him, “I have spoken openly to the world. I have always taught in the synagogue and in the temple, where all Jews come together, and I have spoken nothing in secret.	2
18:21	quid me interrogas· interroga eos qui audierunt quid locutus sum ipsis· ecce hi sciunt quae dixerim ego·	Why do you ask me? Ask those who heard what I have spoken to them. Listen, they know the things I have said.”	3
18:22	haec autem cum dixisset· unus assistens ministrorum dedit alapam ihesu dicens Sic respondes pontifici	But when he had said these things, one of the officers standing by gave Jesus a blow, saying, “Is this the way you answer the high priest?”	4
18:23	Respondit ei ihesus· si male locutus sum· testimonium perhibe de malo· Si autem bene quid me caedis·	Jesus answered him, “If I have spoken wrongly, give testimony of the wrong. But if rightly, why do you strike me?”	5
18:24	Et misit eum annas ligatum ad caiphan ponticem·	And Annas sent him bound to Caiphas the high priest.	6

18:25 ^a	Erat autem simon petrus	Now Simon Petrus was	7
Mt 26:69 ^a	foris in atrio	outside in the court,	
Jn 18:25 ^a	stans et calefaciens se·	standing and warming himself.	
Mk 14:69 ^a	rursum autem	And again	8
Mt 26:71 ^{aβ}	uidit eum alia ancilla· et ait	another servant woman saw him	
Mk 14:69 ^a	circumstantibus·	and said	
Mt 26:71 ^c	et hic erat cum ihesu nazareno·	to those standing around,	
26:73 ^{abc}	accesserunt qui stabant· et	“This man was also with Jesus the	
	dixerunt petro· uere et tu ex illis	Nazarene.”	
	es· nam et loquella tua	Those who were standing (there)	9
	manifestum te facit·	approached and said to Petrus,	
Mk 14:70 ^δ	quod sis galilaeus·	“Truly you too are one of them.	
Mt 26:72	et iterum negauit cum iuramento	For your speech also makes you	
[161v]	quia non noui hominem	obvious,	
26:73 ^a	Et post pusillum	that you are a Galilaean.”	
Lk 22:59 ^a	quasi horae unius·	And again he denied (it) with an	10
Jn 18:26 ^a	dicit unus ex seruis pontificis	oath: “I do not know the man.”	
	cognatus eius cuius abscidit	And after a little while,	11
	petrus auriculam·	about one hour,	
Lk 22:59	uere et hic cum illo erat· nam et	one of the slaves of the high priest,	
	galilaeus est·	a relative of the one whose ear	
Jn 18:26 ^b	nonne ego te uidi in horto cum	Petrus cut off, says,	
	illo·	“Truly this man was also with him,	
Mt 26:74 ^a	Tunc coepit detestari· et	for he is also a Galilean.	
Mk 14:71 ^a	anathematizare et iurare	Did I not see you in the garden	
Mk 14:68 ^β	neque noui	with him?”	
Lk 22:57 ^a	eum	Then he began to detest and	12
Mt 26:70 ^b	nescio quid dicis·	to curse and to swear,	
		“I do not even know	
Lk 22:57 ^β	non noui	him!	
Mk 14:71 ^a	hominem istum quem dicitis	I do not understand what you are	
Jn 18:27 ^b	Et statim gallus cantauit·	saying!	
Lk 22:61 ^a	et conuersus dominus respexit	I do not know	
	petrum et recordatus est petrus	that man about whom you speak!”	
Mk 14:72 ^β	uerbi domini	And immediately the cock crowed.	13
Mt 26:75 ^b	quod dixerat ei·	And turning, the Lord looked back	14
	priusquam gallus cantet· ter me	at Petrus and Petrus remembered	
	negauis	the word of the Lord,	
Lk 22:61	hodie·	that he had said to him,	
22:62	et egressus foras petrus fleuit	“Before the cock crows, you will	
	amare	deny me three times	
		today.”	
		And going outside, Petrus wept	15
		bitterly.	

164:1 (Jn 18:19) discipulis AΔGMX] *add.* suis ZŠ | doctrina F^vŠ] doctrinam F*

164:6 (Jn 18:24) caiphan BEΘIKOVXZ] caiaphan A(M)Š | ponticem] pontificem Š
 164:8 (Mt 26:71) ancilla BEΘKO(Q)VWZ] *om.* AMŠ (*cf.* Mk 14:69)
 164:9 (Mk 14:70) quod sis galilaeus] nam et galilaeus es Š
 164:12 (Mk 14:68) neque noui F^sŠ] neque non noui F*
 164:14 (Lk 22:61) hodie ff² (*b l*)] *om.* Š

Notes

164:1 (Jn 18:19): Although the scribe clearly wrote *doctrinam*, it would appear Victor (or perhaps the scribe) placed a (now faint) dot over the final *m*.
 164:6 (Jn 18:24) The scribe's misspelling of *pontificem* went unnoticed.
 164:7 (Jn 18:25): F now returns to the account of Peter's denials. The second denial takes place around the fire, as in John's second denial, but as in the first denial of Mark and Luke. Another servant woman sees him and identifies him to those around her, as in Matt's second denial (and Mark's, where it is the same servant woman). However, before Peter has a chance to respond, the group collectively accuses him with the wording of Matt/Mark's third denial, to which Peter responds with Matt's second response. After Matt/Mark's "little while" combined with Luke's "about an hour," the third denial takes place. The final accuser comes from John, the relative of the man whose ear Peter cut off, who accuses him first with wording from Luke's third denial, and then his own wording from John's third denial. Peter responds with a harmonized crescendo of Matt's third and first, Mark's third and first, and Luke's first denials. And at last the cock crows (from John). Unlike the Arabic Diatessaron, F does not include Mark's two cock-crow tradition.
 164:9 (Mk 14:70): The phrase *quod sis galilaeus* is difficult to explain. As is, it does not come from any Gospel, although it closely parallels the *nam et galilaeus es* of Mark 14:70 (and a variant reading of Matt 26:73 in two Greek manuscripts [C* Σ]; *cf.* also Luke 22:59, which F employs in 164:11). If it is from Mark, there is no obvious reason to have so drastically changed its form.
 164:12 (Mk 14:68): The scribe originally wrote *neque non noui* and then dotted out *non*.
 164:14 (Lk 22:61): While *hodie* does not appear at this point in the Vulgate tradition, several Old Latin manuscripts testify to its presence (ff² *b l*) as well as several Greek manuscripts (Ⲣ⁷⁵ Ⲙ B K L). Thus Ranke appeal's back to Jesus' initial prediction in Luke 22:34 to supply the word is unnecessary.

	<i>Caput CLXV</i>	<i>Chapter 165</i>	
Mt 27:1 ^a	Mane autem facto	Now when it was morning,	1
Lk 22:66 ^β	conuenerunt		
Mt 27:1 ^β	omnes principes sacerdotum	all the chief priests	
Mk 15:1 ^β	cum senioribus	with the elders	
Lk 22:66 ^β	plebis	of the people	
Mk 15:1 ^{β^α}	et scribis concilium facientes	and the scribes came together, holding a hearing.	
Mt 26:59	quaerebant falsum testimonium contra ihesum· ut eum morti traderent	They were seeking false testimony against Jesus, that they might hand him over to death.	2

26:60 ^{ab}	et non inuenerunt· Cum multi falsi testes accessissent	And they did not find (any), although many false witnesses had come forward.	3
Mk 14:55 ^c	nec inueniebant·	But they kept not finding (any),	4
14:56 ^b	Et conuenientia testimonia [162r] illorum non erant·	and their testimonies were not in agreement.	5
Mt 26:60 ^c	Nouissime autem uenerunt duo falsi testes	But finally two false witnesses came	6
26:61 ^a	et dixerunt	and said,	7
Mk 14:58 ^a	Nos audiuimus eum dicentem·	“We heard him saying,	
Mt 26:61 ^b	possum destruere templum dei	‘I can destroy this temple of God	
Mk 14:58 ^b	hoc manufactum	made with human hands	
Mt 26:61 ^b	et post triduum	and after three days	
Mk 14:58 ^y	aliud manufactum	build another made with human hands.”	
Mt 26:61 ^b	aedificare·		
Mt 26:63 ^a	ihesus autem tacebat	But Jesus was silent.	8
26:62 ^a	Et surgens princeps sacerdotum	And rising in the midst, the high priest	9
Mk 14:60 ^a	In medium interrogauit ihesum dicens·	asked Jesus, saying,	
Mt 26:62 ^b	Nihil respondis ad ea quae isti aduersus te testificantur·	“Do you answer nothing to the things that those men are testifying against you?”	
Mt 26:63 ^a	ihesus autem	But Jesus	10
Mk 14:61 ^a	nihil respondit	answered nothing.	

165:1 (Mk 15:1) concilium W] consilium Š (cf. Mt 26:59)

165:5 (Mk 14:56) illorum] om. Š (cf. Mk 14:59)

165:7 (Mk 14:58^y) aliud F*L] add. non F^bŠ

165:9 (Mt 26:62) aduersus] aduersum Š

Notes

165:1 (Mt 27:1 et al.): The harmonization of this verse is highly complex.

165:7 (Mk 14:58^y): The scribe has omitted *non* and a later hand in a darker ink has added it in above the line between *aliud* and *manufactum*. Ranke suggests the handwriting is similar to (but not) Victor's.

	<i>Caput CLXVI</i>	<i>Chapter 166</i>	
Mt 26:63 ^b	Et	And	1
Mk 14:61 ^b	rursum summus sacerdos	again the high priest	
Mt	ait illi· adiuro te per deum	said to him, “I charge you under	
26:63 ^{bcd}	uiuum· ut dicas nobis· si tu es christus filius dei	oath by the living God to tell us if you are the Christus, the Son of the blessed God.”	

Mk 14:61 ^γ	benedicti·		
Mt 26:64 ^a	dicit illi ihesus· tu dixisti·	Jesus says to him, “You have said (it).”	2
Lk 22:67	et ait illis si uobis dixero non creditis mihi·	And he said to them, “If I tell you, you do not believe me.	3
22:68	si autem et interrogauero non respondebitis mihi neque dimittetis	But even if I ask, you will not answer me, nor release me.	4
Mt 26:64 ^{bcd}	Uerumtamen dico uobis a modo Uidebitis filium hominis sedentem a dextris uirtutis dei et uenientem in nubibus caeli	Nevertheless, I say to you from now on: you will see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of the power of God and coming on the clouds of the sky.”	5
26:65 [162v]	Tunc princeps sacerdotum scidit uestimenta sua dicens· blasphemauit quid adhuc· egeus testibus Ecce nunc audistis blasphemiam	Then the high priest tore his own garments, saying, “He has slandered! What need do we still have for witnesses? Listen, now you have heard the slander from his mouth!	6
Lk 22:71	de ore eius		
Mt 26:66 ^{ab}	quid uobis uidetur at illi respondentes	How does it seem to you?” But answering, they	7
Mk 14:64 ^β	omnes	all	
Mt 26:66 ^{βc}	dixerunt· reus est mortis·	said, “He is guilty of death.”	
26:67 ^a	Tunc expuerunt in faciem eius	Then they spit in his face,	8
Lk 22:63 ^α	et qui tenebant eum inludebant ei·	and those who were holding him began mocking him.	9
22:64 ^α	et uelauerunt	And they covered	10
Mk 14:65 ^β	faciem eius·	his face	
Mt 26:67 ^{bc}	et colaphis eum caeciderunt· alii autem palmas in faciem eius dederunt	and struck him with (their) fists. But others slapped his face,	
26:68	dicentes prophetiza nobis christe quis est iste qui percussit	saying, “Prophecy to us, Christus. Who is that one who hit (you)?”	11
Lk 22:65	Et alia multa blasphemantes dicebant in eum	And slandering, they kept saying many other things against him.	12

166:5 (Mt 26:64) dei T] om. Š (cf. Lk 22:69)
166:9 (Lk 22:63) eum ACEGHMQTY] illum ZŠ
166:10 (Mt 26:67^c) eius DEL(Q)R] ei Š
166:11 (Mt 26:68) iste qui F*] iste qui te F^c; qui te Š

Notes

166:1 (Mk 14:61): An oddity emerging from the pastiche of sources is the frequent shift in language referring to the “high priest.” Each Gospel consistently employs the same term: *princeps sacerdotum* (e.g. Matt 26:65; cf. Luke 3:1); *summus sacerdos* (e.g. Mark 14:61); or *pontifex* (e.g. John 18:19).

166:11 (Mt 26:68): This verse of Matthew contains two possibly related variants in F. The scribe wrote *iste* between *est* and *qui*, perhaps as a result of parablepsis with similar letter combinations nearby. The scribe also omitted *te*, but it has been added back in above the line between *qui* and *percussit*. The hand is difficult to identify. The ink color is very close to that of the scribe's, perhaps slightly lighter. The handwriting could be that of the original scribe, or a contemporary hand (though probably not Victor's). Ranke identifies it as the hand of a scribe that came through and made some corrections where Victor indicated, and some corrections where Victor did not. It is curious that when adding *te*, the corrector did not strike out *iste*, which appears to be a singular reading in F. It is also possible to divide the original sentence as *quis est is te qui percussit*, which would read close to the standard form ("who is he who hit you"), with *te* slightly fronted for emphasis. This division could obviate the need for the interpolated *te*, which, once added, forces *is te* to be read as *iste*.

	<i>Caput CLXVII</i>	<i>Chapter 167</i>	
Mt 27:2 ^a	Et adduxerunt eum uinctum	And they led him bound	1
Jn 18:28 ^a	in praetorio	in the governor's residence	
Mt 27:2 ^b	et tradiderunt pontio pilato	and handed him over to Pontius	
	praesidi	Pilatus, the governor.	
Jn 18:28 ^{cd}	Et ipsi non introierunt in	And they did not enter into the	2
	praetorium ut non	governor's residence themselves,	
	contaminarentur sed manducarent	that they might not be defiled but	
	pascha·	might eat the Passover.	
Mt 27:3	tunc uidens iudas qui eum tradidit	Then Judas, who handed him over,	3
	quod damnatus esset· paenitentia	seeing that he had been	
	ductus retulit XXX argenteos	condemned, was moved by	
	principibus sacerdotum et	remorse. He brought the thirty	
	senioribus	silver coins back to the chief	
		priests and the elders,	
27:4	dicens	saying, "I have sinned by handing	4
	Peccauit tradens sanguinem	over innocent blood." But they	
[163r]	iustum· at illi dixere runt· quid ad	said to him, "What (is that) to us?	
	nos· Tu uideris	See to it yourself."	
27:5	et proiectis argenteis in templo	And throwing the silver coins in	5
	recessit abiens laqueo se	the temple, he went back. Going	
	suspendit·	out, he hanged himself with a	
		noose.	
27:6	principes autem	But the chief priests, taking the	6
	sacerdotum· acceptis argenteis	silver coins, said, "It is not lawful	
	dixerunt	to put them into the offering,	
	Non licet mittere eos in corbanan	because it is payment for blood."	
	quia praetium sanguinis est·		
27:7	Consilio autem inito· emerunt ex	And after entering into council,	7
	illis agrum figuli in sepulturam	they bought the potter's field with	
	peregrinorum·	them, for the burial of foreigners.	

27:8	propter hoc uocatus est ager ille acheldemach· ager sanguinis usque in hodiernum diem·	Because of this, that field is called Acheldemach, the Field of Blood, up to this very day.	8
27:9	Tunc impletum est quod dictum est per hieremiam prophetam dicentem· Et acceperunt XXX argenteos praetium adpraetiati quem adpraetiauerunt a filiis israhel·	Then what was spoken by Hieremias the prophet was fulfilled, saying, “And they took the thirty silver coins, the price of the one who was apprised, whom they apprised from the children of Israel.	9
27:10	et dederunt eos in agrum figuli sicut constituit mihi dominus	And they gave them for the potter’s field, as the Lord decreed for me.”	10

167:1 (Mt 27:2^a) Et¹ F^sŠ] E (*sine t*) F* | adduxerunt eum uinctum] uinctum adduxerunt eum Š

167:1 (Jn 18:28) praetorio] praetorium Š

167:5 (Mt 27:5) recessit] *add.* et Š

Notes

167:1 (Mt 27:2): The scribe appears to have left off the *t* of the initial *et* but then quickly added it back in slightly above the line, for it appears in the same red ink as the rest of the line (used for the initial line of every chapter).

	<i>Caput CLXVIII</i>	<i>Chapter 168</i>	
Jn 18:29	Exiuit ergo pilatus ad eos foras et dixit quam accusationem affertis aduersus hominem hunc·	Therefore Pilatus went out to them and said, “What accusation do you bring against this man?”	1
18:30	Responderunt et dixerunt ei· si non esset hic malefactor· non tibi tradidissem eum·	They answered and said to him, “If he were not a wrongdoer, I would not have handed him over to you.	2
Lk 23:2 ^{bcd} [163v]	hunc inue nimus subuertentem gentem nostram et prohibentem tributa dari caesari· et dicentem se christum regem esse	We found this man subverting our people and forbidding taxes to be paid to Caesar and declaring himself to be the Christus, a king.”	3
Jn 18:31	Dixit ergo eis pilatus· accipite eum uos· et secundum legem uestram iudicate eum· Dixerunt ergo iudaei· nobis non licet interficere quemquam	So Pilatus said to them, “You take him and judge him according to your law.” So the Jews said, “It is not lawful for us to execute anyone,”	4
18:32	ut sermo domini impleretur quem dixit· significans qua esset morte moriturus·	that the word of the Lord might be fulfilled, which he spoke, indicating what death he was going to die.	5
18:33	Introiuit ergo iterum in	So Pilatus went into the governor’s	6

	praetorium pilatus· et uocauit ihesum et dixit ei· tu es rex iudaeorum·	residence again and summoned Jesus and said to him, “Are you the king of the Jews?”	
18:34	Et respondit ihesus· a temet ipso hoc dicis· an alii tibi dixerunt de me·	And Jesus answered, “Do you say this all by yourself or did others speak to you about me?”	7
18:35	Respondit pilatus· numquid ego iudaeus sum· gens tua et pontifices tradiderunt te mihi· quid fecisti·	Pilatus answered, “I am not a Jew, am I? Your people and chief priests handed you over to me. What have you done?”	8
18:36	Respondit ihesus· regnum meum non est de mundo hoc· si ex hoc mundo esset regnum meum· ministri mei decertarent ut non traderer iudaeis· Nunc autem regnum meum non est hinc·	Jesus answered, “My kingdom is not from this world. If my kingdom were of this world, my servants would fight so that I would not be handed over to the Jews. But at present my kingdom is not from here.”	9
18:37 <i>[164r]</i>	Dixit itaque ei pilatus· ergo rex es tu· Respondit ihesus· Tu dicis quia rex sum ego Ego in hoc natus sum et ad hoc ueni in mundum ut testimonium perhibeam ueritati· Omnis qui est ex ueritate audit meam uocem·	And so Pilatus said to him, “Then you are a king?” Jesus answered, “You say that I am a king. For this reason was I born and to this end have I come into the world, that I may bear witness to the truth. Everyone who is of the truth hears my voice.”	10
18:38 ^{abc}	dicit ei pilatus· quid est ueritas· Et cum hoc dixisset iterum exiuit ad iudaeos·	Pilatus says to him, “What is truth?” And when he had said this, he went out again to the Jews.	11
Jn 18:38 ^δ Lk 23:4 ^a	Et ait ad principes sacerdotum et turbas·	And he said to the chief priests and crowds,	12
Jn 18:38 ^e Lk 23:4 ^β 23:5	nullam inuenio causam in hoc homine· at illi inualescebant dicentes· Conmouet populum docens per uniuersam iudaeam· et incipiens a galilaea usque huc·	“I find no fault in this man.” But they were becoming intense, saying, “He stirs up the people, teaching throughout all Judaea, beginning from Galilaea even up to this place.”	13
23:6	Pilatus autem audiens galilaeam· interrogauit· si homo galilaeus esset	But Pilatus, hearing Galilaea, asked if the man was a Galilaean.	14
23:7	et ut cognouit quod de herodis potestate esset remisit eum ad herodem· qui et ipse hierosolymis erat illis diebus·	And when he learned that he was from Herodes’ jurisdiction, he released him to Herodes, who himself was also at Hierosolyms in those days.	15

23:8	herodes autem uiso ihesu· gauisus est ualde· erat enim cupiens ex multo tempore uidere eum· eo <i>[164v]</i> quod audiret multa de illo Et sperabat signum aliquod uidere ab eo fieri	Now Herodes, upon seeing Jesus, greatly rejoiced. For he was wanting to see him for a long time, because he kept hearing many things about him. And he was hoping to see some sign performed by him.	16
23:9	Interrogabat autem illum multis sermonibus· at ipse nihil illi· respondebat	And he began questioning him with many words; but he kept answering nothing to him.	17
23:10	Stabant etiam principes sacerdotum et scribae constanter accusantes eum	Furthermore, the chief priests and scribes were standing (by), continually accusing him.	18
23:11	Spreuit autem illum herodes cum exercitu suo et inlusit indutum ueste alba· et remisit ad pilatum	And Herodes with his retinue scorned him and mocked (him), dressed in a white robe. And he released him to Pilatus.	19
23:12	Et facti sunt amici herodes et pilatus in ipsa die Nam antea inimici erant ad inuicem·	And Herodes and Pilatus came to be friends on that very day. For before this they were enemies with each other.	20
23:13	pilatus autem conuocatis principibus sacerdotum et magistratibus et plebe	Now Pilatus, having summoned the chief priests and the magistrates and the people,	21
Jn 19:4 ^a	exiuit ad eos foras et dixit eis·	went out to them and said to them,	
Lk 23:14 ^b	optulistis mihi hunc hominem quasi auertentem populum	“You have presented me this man as someone disturbing the people.	22
Jn 19:4 ^{bc}	ecce adduco uobis eum foras ut cognoscatis quia in eo nullam causam inuenio	Look, I am bringing him out to you so that you may understand that I find no fault in him	23
Lk 23:14 ^c	ex his in quibus eum accusatis·	from these things of which you are accusing him,	
23:15	Sed neque herodes· nam remisi uos ad illum et ecce nihil dignum morte actum est ei	nor Herodes either. For I sent you to him and look, nothing worthy of death was done by him.	24
23:16	Emendatum ergo illum dimittam	After disciplining him, therefore, I will release him.”	25
23:18 ^{ab}	Exclamauit autem uniuersa turba <i>[165r]</i> dicens· tolle hunc	But the whole crowd cried out, saying, “Take this man away!	26
Jn 19:6	crucifige crucifige Dicit eis pilatus· accipite eum uos et crucifigite· Ego enim non inuenio in eo causam·	Crucify (him)! Crucify (him)! Pilatus says to them, “You take him and crucify (him). For I do not find fault in him.”	27
19:7	Responderunt ei iudaei· nos legem habemus· et secundum	The Jews answered him, “We have a law, and according to the law he	28

	legem debet mori quia filium dei se fecit·	must die, because he has made himself the Son of God.”	
19:8	Cum ergo audisset pilatus hunc sermonem· magis timuit·	When, therefore, Pilatus had heard this phrase, he was more afraid.	29
19:9	et ingressus est praetorium iterum et dicit ad ihesu· unde es tu ihesus autem responsum non dedit ei·	And he went into the governor’s residence again and says to Jesus, “Where are you from?” But Jesus did not give him an answer.	30
19:10	Dicit ergo ei pilatus· mihi non loqueris· nescis quia potestatem habeo crucifigere te et potestatem dimittere·	So Pilatus says to him, “Do you not speak to me? Do you not understand that I have the power to crucify you and the power to release (you)?”	31
19:11	Respondit ihesus· non haberes potestatem aduersum me ullam· nisi tibi esset datum desuper· propterea qui tradidit me tibi maius peccatum habet·	Jesus answered, “You would not have any power against me unless it had been given to you from above. For this reason, the one who handed me over to you has the greater sin.”	32
19:12	exinde quaerebat pilatus dimittere eum· Iudaei autem clamabant dicentes· si hunc dimittis· non es amicus caesaris· Omnis qui se <i>[165v]</i> regem facit· contradicit caesari·	Thereafter Pilatus kept striving to release him. But the Jews kept crying out, saying, “If you are releasing this man, you are not a friend of Caesar. Everyone who makes himself a king is opposed to Caesar.”	33
19:13	pilatus ergo cum audisset hos sermones adduxit foras ihesum· et sedit pro tribunali in locum qui dicitur lithostrotus· hebraicae autem gabbatha·	So Pilatus, when he had heard these words, brought Jesus out. And he sat on the judgment seat in the place that is called Lithostrotus, but in Hebrew, Gabbatha.	34
19:14	Erat autem parasceue paschae hora quasi sexta Et dicit iudaeis· ecce rex uester·	Now it was the day of preparation of the Passover, about the sixth hour. And he says to Jews, “Look, your king.”	35
19:15	illi autem clamauerunt· tolle tolle crucifige eum Dixit eis pilatus· regem uestrum crucifigam Responderunt pontifices· non habemus regem nisi caesarem	But they cried out, “Take (him) away! Take (him) away! Crucify him!” Pilatus said to them, “Should I crucify your king?” The chief priests answered, “We do not have a king except Caesar!”	36
Mk 15:3	Et accusabant eum summi sacerdotes in multis	And the chief priests began accusing him of many things.	37
F Mt 27:12 ^a	ihesus uero nihil respondit·	Jesus, however, answered nothing.	38

27:13	Tunc dicit illi pilatus non audis quanta aduersum te dicant testimonia·	Then Pilatus says to him, “Do you not hear how much evidence they are alleging against you?”	39
27:14	et non respondit ei ad ullum uerbum ita ut miraretur preses uehementer	And he did not answer him with a single word, so that the governor was very much amazed.	40
Mk 15:6 ^a Mt 27:15 ^a	Per diem autem festum consueuerat preses dimittere populo unum·	Now on the festival day the governor had become accustomed to release to the people one	41
Mk 15:6 ^a	ex uinctis quemcumque petissent·	of the prisoners, whomsoever they had requested.	
Mt 27:16 [166 ^r]	habebat autem tunc uinctum insignem qui dicebatur barabbas·	And at that time he was holding a notorious prisoner who was called Barabbas.	42
27:17 ^a Jn 18:39 ^a	Congregatis ergo illis dixit pilatus Est consuetudo uobis ut unum dimittam uobis in pascha	So Pilatus said to those assembled, “It is your custom that I release one (prisoner) to you during Passover.	43
Mt 27:17 ^{bc}	quem ergo uultis dimittam uobis· barabban· an ihesum qui dicitur christus·	Whom, therefore, do you desire I release to you: Barabbas, or Jesus, who is called Christus?”	
27:18	Sciebat enim quod per inuidiam tradidissent eum	For he knew that they had handed him over out of spite.	44

168:2 (Jn 18:30) tradidissem] tradidissemus Š
168:4 (Jn 18:31) ergo² AD^ŠΔHKORS*TVWYΣ] *add.* ei MZŠ
168:5 (Jn 18:32) domini] dei δ; iesu Š
168:9 (Jn 18:36) autem regnum meum Z] autem meum regnum AMΣŠ
168:15 (Lk 23:7) potestate F^vŠ] potestatem F*O
168:21 (Jn 19:4^a) ad eos] *om.* Š (cf. Jn 18:29) | dixit f δ] dicit Š (cf. Jn 18:29)
168:22 (Lk 23:14) hunc F^sŠ] *om.* F*
168:26 (Lk 23:18) autem a c d ff²] *add.* simul Š
168:30 (Jn 19:9) ad ihesu] ihesu δ; ad iesum Š
168:31 (Jn 19:10) potestatem² HX^cY (e)] *add.* habeo Š | dimittere E] *add.* te Š
168:34 (Jn 19:13) hebraicae ΔΘ*M^cX] hebraeice Z; hebraice Š
168:36 (Jn 19:15) clamauerunt b c e (f ff² g)] clamabant Š
168:43 (Jn 18:39) Est] *add.* autem Š
168:43 (Mt 27:17^b) ergo²] *om.* Š

Notes

- 168:2 (Jn 18:30): The scribe has left off the plural ending (-us) of *tradidissem*, but the mistake went unnoticed.
168:5 (Jn 18:32): Although F’s reading of *domini* has no other Latin support, it finds Greek support in two witnesses (245 435), and may be related to the reading *dei* in δ, supported by Greek witnesses L Δ 59 and 259.

- 168:15 (Lk 23:7): It appears that Victor has dotted out the final *m* to read *potestate*.
- 168:22 (Lk 23:14): It appears the scribe originally wrote *mihunc* at the end of the line, then noticed the mistake, scratched out *-unc* to read *mihi*, and added *hunc* to the left margin on the next line.
- 168:25 (Lk 23:16): It is impossible to determine whether F's exemplar lacked Luke 23:17, as with several other early manuscripts (\mathfrak{P}^{75} A B a), since F postpones mentioning Pilate's custom of releasing a prisoner until 168:41 below, at which point F employs the language of Matthew and Mark.
- 168:38: It would appear that F has pulled the words *ihesus uero* from no Gospel, but supplied them for continuity (cf. Mark 15:5). The Arabic Diatessaron (50:16) has a canonical reading here.

	<i>Caput CLXVIII</i>	<i>Chapter 169</i>	
Mt 27:19	Sedente autem illo pro tribunali· misit ad illum uxor eius dicens· Nihil tibi et iusto illi· multa enim passa sum hodie per uisum propter eum·	And while he was sitting on the judgment seat, his wife sent to him, saying, "Have nothing to do with that innocent man. For I suffered many things today during a vision because of him."	1
27:20	princeps autem sacerdotum et seniores persuaserunt populis ut peterent barabban· ihesum uero perderent·	But the high priest and the elders persuaded the people to ask for Barabbas, but to destroy Jesus.	2
27:21	Respondens autem preses ait illis· quem uultis uobis de duobus dimitti· at illi dixerunt barabban·	And answering, the governor said to them, "Which of the two do you want to be released to you?" But they said, "Barabbas."	3
Jn 18:40 ^y	Erat autem barabbas latro	Now Barabbas was a bandit,	4
Lk 23:19 ^a	qui erat propter seditionem quondam factam in ciuitate et homicidium	who, on account of a riot that occurred previously in the city, and a murder,	5
Mk 15:7 ^b	uinctus	was bound	
Lk 23:19 ^a	in carcere·	in prison.	
Mt 27:22	dicit illis pilatus· quid ergo faciam de ihesu· qui dicitur christus·	Pilatus says to them, "What, then, should I do about Jesus, who is called Christ?"	6
27:23 [166v]	dicunt omnes crucifigatur· ait illis praeses· quid enim mali fecit· at illi magis clamabant dicentes crucifigatur	They all say, "Let him be crucified!" The governor said to them, "Indeed, what evil has he done?" But they began crying out even more, saying, "Let him be crucified!"	7
27:24	Uidens autem pilatus quia nihil proficeret· sed magis tumultus fieret· accepta aqua lauit manus	And Pilatus, seeing that he was accomplishing nothing, but rather an uproar was forming, taking	8

	coram populo dicens· Innocens ego sum a sanguine iusti huius· uos uideritis·	water, washed (his) hands in the presence of the people, saying, “I am innocent of the blood of this righteous man. You see (to it).”	
27:25	Et respondens uniuersus populus dixit· sanguis eius super nos et super filios nostros	And answering, the whole people said, “His blood (be) on us and on our children.”	9

169:5 (Lk 23:19) quondam ACGHQTY] quondam MZŠ | ciuitate F^vŠ] ciuitatem

F*GRX* | carcere ER^fq] carcerem Š

169:6 (Mt 27:22) ergo E a b c d ff² h q r¹] igitur Š

169:8 (Mt 27:24) manus F^vŠ] add. suas F*EH d ff² h r¹

Notes

169:5 (Lk 23:19): The scribe originally wrote *ciuitatem*, but Victor has dotted out the final *m*.

169:8 (Mt 27:24): The scribe originally wrote *manus suas*, but Victor has dotted out *suas*. Since the addition of *suas* finds support in some Old Latin MSS, it may well be the reading of F’s exemplar.

	<i>Caput CLXX</i>	<i>Chapter 170</i>	
Mt 27:26 ^{ab}	Tunc dimisit illis barabban· ihesum autem	Then he released Barabbas to them. But Jesus,	1
Mk 15:15 ^y	flagellis caesum	after having him scourged,	
Mt 27:26 ^b	tradidit eis ut crucifigeretur··	he handed over to them to be crucified.	
27:27 ^{ab}	Milites praesidis suscipientes ihesum in praetorio· congregauerunt ad eum uniuersam cohortem	When the governor’s soldiers took Jesus into the governor’s residence, they gathered the whole band of soldiers to him.	2
27:28 ^a	et exuentes eum	And stripping him,	3
Mk 15:17 ^a	induunt eum	they dress him	
Mt 27:28 ^a	tunicam purpuream et clamidem coccineam circumdederunt ei·	in a purple tunic and put a scarlet cloak around him.	
27:29	et plectentes coronam de spinis· posuerunt super caput eius et harundinem in dextera eius· et genu flexu ante eum inludabant dicentes· haue rex iudaeorum	And weaving a crown from thorns, they put (it) on his head and a staff in his right hand. And kneeling before him, they were mocking him, saying, “Hail, king of the Jews!”	4
27:30 [167r]	Et expuentes eum acceperunt harundinem et percutiebant caput eius	And spitting on him, they took the staff and kept striking his head.	5
27:31 ^a	Et postquam inluserunt ei· exuerunt eum clamidem	And after they mocked him, they stripped him of the cloak	6

Mk 15:20 ^a	et purpuram	and the purple garment	
Mt 27:31 ^{bc}	et induerunt eum uestimentis eius et duxerunt eum ut crucifigerent	and dressed him in his clothes and led him to crucify (him),	
Jn 19:17 ^a	baiulantem sibi crucem	him carrying his own cross.	
Mt 27:32 ^a	Exeuntes autem inuenerunt hominem cyrineum	But going out, they found a Cyrinean man	7
Mk 15:21 ^a	uenientem de uilla	coming from the country	
Mt 27:32 ^a	nomine simon	named Simon,	
Mk 15:21 ^b	patrem alexandri et rufi	the father of Alexander and Rufus.	
Mt 27:32 ^β	hunc angariauerunt	They compelled this man	
Lk 23:26 ^γ	portare crucem post ihesum·	to carry the cross behind Jesus.	
23:27	Sequebatur autem illum multa turba populi et mulierum quae plangebant· et lamentabantur eum·	Now following him was a large crowd of people and of women who were mourning and lamenting for him.	8
23:28	Conuersus autem ad illas ihesus dixit· filiae hierusalem nolite flere super me sed super uos ipsas flete et super filios uestros·	But turning to them, Jesus said, “Daughters of Hierusalem, do not weep over me, but weep over yourselves and over your children.	9
23:29	quoniam ecce uenient dies in quibus dicent· beatae steriles· et uentris qui non genuerunt et ubera quae non lactauerunt	For look, the days will come in which they say, ‘Blessed are the barren and the wombs that have not given birth and the breasts that have not nursed.’	10
23:30	Tunc incipient dicere montibus· cadite super nos et collibus· operite nos	Then they will begin to say to the mountains, ‘Fall upon us,’ and to the hills, ‘Bury us.’	11
23:31 [167 ^v]	quia si in uiridi ligno haec faciunt· in arido quid fiet	For if they do these things in green wood, what will happen in dry (wood)?”	12

- 170:2 (Mt 27:27) Milites] Tunc milites Š (cf. Mk 15:16)
170:3 (Mt 27:28) tunicam purpuream et (Q Y*) a b c d f f f² h] om. Š
170:4 (Mt 27:29) dextera F^vŠ] dexteram F*DJLQR | flexu BHΘRTY] flexo Š
170:5 (Mt 27:30) expuentes] add. in Š
170:6 (Jn 19:17) baiulantem] baiulans Š
170:7 (Mt 27:32) simon] simonem Š
170:7 (Lk 23:26) portare crucem] crucem portare Š
170:8 (Lk 23:27) lamentabantur AHΘIKMOVWXZ²] lamentabant Z*Š
170:10 (Lk 23:29) uentris] uentres Š
170:11 (Lk 23:30) cadite F^cDHΘJMOQRVWXZŠ] cadete F*ABCEGIKTY

Notes

170:3 (Mk 15:17): The standard Vulgate reading of Matt 27:28 specifies only that the soldiers dressed Jesus in a “scarlet cloak” (*clamydem coccineam*), whereas Mark 15:17 says it was something “purple” (*induunt eum purpura[m]*), and John 19:2 says it was a

“purple garment” (*ueste purpurea*). F combines them with a harmonized reading that is found in several Old Latin MSS at Matt 27:28, specifying a purple tunic and a scarlet cloak (*tunicam purpuream et clamidem coccineam*).

170:4 (Mt 27:29): Although the scribe wrote *dexteram*, Victor has dotted out the final *m*.

170:6 (Jn 19:17): F has adjusted John’s nominative participle (*baiulans*) to an accusative (*baiulantem*), to keep the verb in agreement with the preceding *eum* of Matt 27:31. The adjustment may indicate that the Latin was translated from a language without case endings, although the Arabic Diatessaron (51:15) has a slightly different verse order here. At the same time, it functions as a way of harmonizing John’s statement that Jesus carried his own cross with the Synoptic introduction of Simon of Cyrene.

170:7 (Lk 23:26): In the Lukan context, *crucem* functioned as the object of *inposuerunt*, but by reversing the word order, F has rendered it the object of *portare*.

170:11 (Lk 23:30): The scribe wrote *cadete*, but someone (perhaps Victor or a contemporary corrector) placed an *i* above the first *e* to read *cadite*.

	<i>Caput CLXXI</i>	<i>Chapter 171</i>	
Lk 23:32	Ducebantur autem et alii duo nequam cum cum eo ut interficerentur·	Now two other wicked men were also being led with with him to be executed.	1
23:33 ^a	Et postquam	And after	2
Mt 27:33 ^a	uenerunt in locum qui dicitur golgotha·	they came to the place that is called Golgotha,	
Mk 15:22 ^a	quod est interpretaatum caluariae locus	which is translated the Place of the Skull,	
Mt 27:34 ^a	et dederunt ei uinum	they also offered him wine	3
Mk 15:23 ^a	murratum	(with) myrrh	
Mt 27:34 ^{ab}	bibere cum felle mixtum· et cum gustasset noluit bibere	to drink, mixed with gall. But when he tasted it, he refused to drink.	
Lk 23:34 ^{ab}	ihesus autem dicebat· pater dimitte illis· non enim sciunt quid faciunt·	And Jesus was saying, “Father, forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing.”	4
Mt 27:35 ^a	Postquam autem crucifixerunt eum	And after they crucified him,	5
Jn 19:23 ^{b-c}	acceperunt uestimenta eius et fecerunt IIII partes unicuique militi partem et tunicam· Erat autem tunica inconsutilis desuper contexta per totum·	they took his clothes—and made four parts, a part to each soldier—and (his) tunic. Now the tunic was seamless, woven all together from the top.	
19:24	dixerunt ergo ad inuicem· non scindamus eam sed sortiamur de illa cuius sit· ut scribtura inpleatur dicens· partiti sunt uestimenta mea sibi et super uestem meam miserunt sortem· Et milites	So they said to one another, “We should not tear it, but cast lots for it, (to see) whose it should be,” that the Scripture may be fulfilled, saying, “They have divided my clothes for themselves and cast a	6

	<i>[168r]</i> quidem haec fecerunt	lot over my garment.” And the soldiers indeed did these things.	
Mt 27:36	Et sedentes seruant eum	And sitting, they were watching over him.	7
Jn 19:19 ^a	Scrpsit autem et titulum pilatus	Now Pilatus also wrote an inscription	8
Mk 15:26	causae eius·	of his charge	
Mt 27:37 ^a	et inposuit	and placed (it)	
Mt 27:37 ^{ab}	super caput eius·	over his head:	
Jn 19:19 ^b	Hic est ihesus nazarenus· rex iudaeorum	This is Jesus the Nazarene, King of the Jews.	
19:20	hunc ergo titulum multi legerunt iudaeorum quia prope ciuitatem erat locus· ubi crucifixus est ihesus· Et erat scriptum hebraice· graece· et latine·	Therefore many of the Jews read this inscription, since the place where Jesus was crucified was near the city, and it was written in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin.	9
19:21 ^{ab}	Dicebant ergo pilato pontifices iudaeorum· noli scribere rex iudaeorum·	So the chief priests of the Jews tried to say to Pilatus, “Do not write, ‘King of the Jews.’”	10
19:22	Respondit pilatus· quod scripsi scripsi·	Pilatus answered, “What I have written, I have written.”	11
Mt 27:38 ^a	Tunc	Then	12
Jn 19:18 ^a	crucifixerunt	they crucified	
Mt 27:38 ^a	cum eo duo latrones·	two bandits with him,	
Mk 15:27 ^b	unum a dextris et	one on his right	
Lk 23:33 ^y	alterum	and the other	
Mk 15:27 ^b	a sinistris eius·	on his left.	
Mt 27:39	praetereuntes autem blasphemabant eum· mouentes capita sua	And those passing by slandered him, shaking their heads	13
27:40	et dicentes Ua· qui destruit templum et in triduo illud reaedificat· Salua temet ipsum· si filius dei es· descende de cruce·	and saying, “Ha! The one who destroys the temple and rebuilds it in three days, save yourself! If you are the Son of God, come down from the cross!”	14
27:41	Similiter et principes sacerdotum inludentes cum scribis et senioribus dicebant·	Likewise also the chief priests, with the scribes and the elders, mocking, were saying,	15
27:42 ^{ab}	alios saluos fecit· se ipsum non potes saluum facere· Si rex israhel est· descendat nunc de cruce et	“He saved others; himself you cannot save. If he is the king of Israel, let him come down now from the cross and	16
Mk 15:32 ^b	uideamus et credamus	let us see and believe	
Mt 27:42 ^b	ei	in him.	
27:43 ^{ab}	Confidet in deum· ideo liberet	He will trust in God, therefore let	17

	nunc eum si uult eum Dixit enim quia dei filius sum·	him free him now if he wants him. For he said, ‘I am the Son of God.’”	
27:44 ^a	Id ipsum autem	And in the same way	18
Lk 23:39 ^{abc}	unus de his qui pendebat latronibus· blasphemabat eum dicens· Si tu es christus saluum fac temet ipsum et nos·	one of those bandits who was hanging (next to him) slandered him, saying, “If you are the Christus, save yourself and us!”	
23:40	Respondens autem alter· increpabat illum dicens· neque tu times deum quod in eadem damnatione es	But answering, the other rebuked him, saying, “Do you not even fear God, since you are under the same condemnation?”	19
23:41	et nos quidem iuste· nam digna factis recepimus Hic uero nihil mali gessit	And we indeed justly, for we have received what is deserving of (our) deeds. This man, however, has performed nothing evil.”	20
23:42	et dicebat ad ihesum· domine memento mei cum ueneris in regnum tuum	And he was saying to Jesus, “Lord, remember me when you come into your kingdom.”	21
23:43	Et dixit illi ihesus· amen dico tibi· hodie mecum eris in padiso·	And Jesus said to him, “Truly, I say to you, today you will be with me in paradise.”	22
Jn 19:25	Stabant autem iuxta crucem ihesu mater eius et soror matris eius maria cleopae· et maria magdalenae·	Now standing next to the cross of Jesus were his mother and his mother’s sister, Maria (the wife) of Cleopas, and Maria Magdalene.	23
19:26	Cum uidisset ergo ihesus matrem et discipulum stantem quem <i>[169r]</i> diligebat· dicit matri suae Mulier· Ecce filius tuus·	Therefore when Jesus had seen (his) mother and the disciple whom he loved standing (by), he says to his mother, “Woman, look, your son.”	24
19:27	deinde dicit discipulo· ecce mater tua et ex illa hora· accepit eam discipulus in sua	Then he says to the disciple, “Look, your mother.” And from that time, the disciple took her into his own (home).	25
Mt 27:45	A sexta autem hora tenebrae factae sunt super uniuersam terram usque ad horam nonam	Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over the whole land up to the ninth hour.	26
27:46 ^{ab}	Et circa horam nonam· clamauit ihesus uoce magna dicens· heli· heli· lema sabacthani·	And about the ninth hour, Jesus cried out in a great voice, saying, “Heli, Heli, lema sabacthani?”	27
Mk 15:34 ^c	quod est interpretaatum	which is translated,	
Mt 27:46 ^y	deus meus deus meus· ut quid reliquisti me·	“My God, my God, why have you abandoned me?”	
27:47	quidam autem illic stantes et	Now some of those standing there	28

	audientes dicebant heliam uocat iste·	and listening were saying, “He is calling Helias.”	
Jn 19:28	postea· sciens ihesus quia iam omnia consummata sunt ut consummaretur scriptura· dicit sitio·	Afterwards, knowing that now all things have been completed, so that Scripture might be completed, Jesus says, “I am thirsty.”	29
19:29 ^a	Uas ergo positum erat aceto plenum	Now a vessel full of vinegar had been set (there).	30
Mt 27:48	et continuo currens unus ex eis acceptam spongiam inpleuit aceto et inposuit harundini et dabat ei bibere·	And running immediately, one of them filled a sponge (he had) taken with vinegar and placed (it) on a staff and tried to offer it to him to drink.	31
Jn 19:30 ^{ab}	Cum ergo accepisset ihesus acetum dixit· consummatum est·	When, therefore, Jesus had taken the vinegar, he said, “It has been completed.”	32
Mt 27:49	Ceteri uero dicebant sine uideamus· an ueniat helias	The others, however, were saying, “Leave (him). Let us see whether Helias comes to free him.”	33
	<i>[169v]</i> liberans eum		
27:50 ^a	ihesus autem iterum clamans uoce magna·	But Jesus, again crying out in a great voice,	34
Lk 23:46 ^b	pater in manus tuas commendo spiritum meum·	“Father, into your hands I entrust my spirit,”	
Jn 19:30 ^y	et inclinato capite·	and bowing (his) head,	
Mt 27:50 ^a	Emisit spiritum·	released (his) spirit.	
27:51	Et ecce uelum templi scissum est in duas partes· a summo usque deorsum et terra mota est· et petrae scissae sunt·	And there the curtain of the temple was split into two parts, from the top to the bottom, and the earth was shaken, and the stones were split,	35
27:52	Et monumenta aperta sunt· et multa corpora sanctorum qui dormierant surrexerunt·	and tombs were uncovered, and many bodies of saints who had been sleeping arose.	36
27:53	et exeuntes de monumentis post resurrectionem eius· uenerunt in sanctam ciuitatem et apparuerunt multis·	And going out from the tombs after his resurrection, they came into the holy city and appeared to many.	37
27:54 ^{ab}	Centurio autem et qui cum eo erant custodientes ihesum· uiso terremotu· et his quae fiebant timuerunt ualde	Now the centurion and those who were with him watching over Jesus, seeing the earthquake and the things that were happening, were very afraid,	38
Lk 23:47 ^b	glorificantes deum et	glorifying God and	
Mt 27:54 ^b	dicentes·	saying,	
Lk 23:47 ^y	hic homo iustus est·	“This man is innocent,	
Mt 27:54 ^y	uere dei filius·	truly the Son of God.”	

Lk 23:48	Et omnis turba eorum qui simul aderant ad spectaculum istum· et uidebant quae fiebant percutientes pectora sua reuertebantur	And the whole crowd of them who likewise were present for that sight and were seeing what was happening began to return, beating their chests.	39
Lk 23:49 ^{ab}	a longe· et mulieres	From a distance also (were)	40
Mk 15:41 ^β	multae quae simul cum eo	many women who likewise had	
	[170r] ascenderant	gone up with him	
Mt 27:55 ^β	a galilaea	from Galilee	
Mk 15:41 ^β	hierosolymis	to Hierosolyma,	
Mk 15:40 ^b	Inter quas erat maria magdalene et maria iacobi minoris et ioseph mater· et salomae	among whom was Maria Magdalene, and Maria the mother of Jacobus the Lesser and Joseph, and Salomae	41
Mt 27:56 ^c	mater filiorum zebedaei	the mother of the sons of Zebedaeus—	
Mk 15:41 ^a	Et cum esset in galilaea sequebantur eum·	they also followed him when he was in Galilaea—	
Lk 23:49 ^β	haec uidentes	seeing these things.	
Jn 19:31	iudaei ergo quoniam parasceue erat· ut non remanerent in cruce corpora sabbato· Erat enim magnus dies ille sabbati· Rogauerunt pilatum ut frangerentur eorum crura et tollerentur	Therefore the Jews, since it was the day of preparation, in order that the bodies might not remain on the cross on the Sabbath (for that was a great day of Sabbath), asked Pilatus to have their legs broken and have them removed.	42
19:32	Uenerunt ergo milites et primi quidem fregerunt crura· et alterius qui crucifixus est cum eo·	Therefore the soldiers went and indeed broke the legs of the first and the second who was crucified with him.	43
19:33	ad ihesum autem cum uenissent· ut uiderunt eum iam mortuum non fregerunt eius crura	But once they had come to Jesus, when they saw that he was already dead, they did not break his legs.	44
19:34	Sed unus militum lancea latus eius aperuit· et continuo exiuit sanguis et aqua·	But one of the soldiers opened his side with a spear, and immediately blood and water came out,	45
19:36 ^{ab}	ut scribtura inpleatur os· non conminuetis ex eo·	that the Scripture may be fulfilled, “You shall not break a bone of him.”	46
19:37	iterum alia scribtura dicit· uidebunt in quem [170v] transfixerunt	Again another Scripture says, “They will look upon the one whom they have pierced through.”	47

171:1 (Lk 23:32) cum cum] cum Š
171:6 (Jn 19:24) super EJ *c fff² q r aur*] in Š
171:8 (Mt 27:37^a) inposuit] inposuerunt Š (*cf.* Jn 19:19)

171:14 (Mt 27:40) Ua BDILQR] uah EΘKO*VZ; *om.* AMŠ (*cf.* Mk 15:29)
 171:15 (Mt 27:41) dicebant EJKMOP^SVWXZ] dicentes AŠ
 171:16 (Mt 27:42) potes] potest Š
 171:17 (Mt 27:43) deum DD^SP^SR c d f g¹] deo Š | *ideo*] *om.* Š | eum² BMP^SY a b c d f f f¹
 ff²* g¹* h l q r δ] *om.* AZŠ
 171:18 (Lk 23:39) pendebat c] pendebant Š
 171:20 (Lk 23:41) recepimus AI*XY] recipimus Š
 171:22 (Lk 23:43) padiso] paradiso Š
 171:23 (Jn 19:25) magdalenae BΔGΘIJVZ*] magdalene Š
 171:38 (Lk 23:47) glorificantes] glorificavit Š | *et om.* Š | *est* AMO*Y] erat Š
 171:39 (Lk 23:48) istum l] istud Š
 171:40 (Mk 15:41) hierosolymis n] (+ in Σ) hierosolymam AΣ; hierosolyma MZŠ
 171:41 (Mk 15:40) erat GΘIKOQWXZ] *et* Š (*cf.* Mt 27:56)
 171:47 (Jn 19:37) iterum R] *praem.* *et* Š

Notes

- 171:1 (Lk 23:32): The scribe accidentally wrote *cum* twice, once at the end of one line and again at the beginning of the next.
- 171:5 (Mt 27:35): It is odd that F, following Matthew, chooses not to narrate the moment Jesus is crucified, when the other Gospels provide material for the action (Luke 23:33; *cf.* Mark 15:23; John 19:18).
- 171:8 (Mt 27:37): It looks as though F has combined the *inposuerunt* of Matt 27:37 with the *posuit* of John 19:19 to form *inposuit*.
- 171:10 (Jn 19:21): The missing second half of the verse (*sed quia ipse dixit rex sum Iudaeorum*) is easily explained by homoeoteleuton, although it is also possible that it was purposely omitted to avoid redundancy.
- 171:16 (Mt 27:42): The scribe has left the final *t* off of *potest*.
- 171:16 (Mk 15:32): By integrating Mark's *uideamus et credamus* into Matt 27:42 but allowing Matthew's *et* to replace Mark's *ut*, F diminishes the nature of the purpose-clause and leaves some hanging subjunctives without a clear function.
- 171:17 (Mt 27:43): The addition of *ideo* here finds no parallel in the four Gospels; it may reflect a conflation with the more standard reading of *in deo*.
- 171:38 (Lk 23:47): F has adjusted the number and mood of Luke's *glorificavit* to reflect the plural and participial context of Matthew, hence *glorificantes*. Had the verb simply been left in the indicative, the extra *et* before *dicentes* (which comes from no Gospel) could have been avoided.
- 171:40–41 (Lk 23:49): Although the scribe punctuated *a longe* to connect to the previous clause, in its Lukan context it belongs with the following clause, referring to the women who stand “at a distance.” Likewise, at the end of this expanded clause the scribe has punctuated *haec uidentes* to connect to the next clause, whereas in its Lukan context it still refers to the women who were “seeing these things.” Through its complex shuffling and combining, F also seems to have omitted a main verb for this large clause.
- 171:41 (Mk 15:40 // Mt 27:56): A result of harmonization is the identification of Salome (from Mark) as the mother of the sons of Zebebee (from Matthew).
- 171:46 (Jn 19:36): It is perhaps not surprising that F skips over John 19:35, whose focus on eye-witness testimony intrudes into the narrative.

<i>Caput CLXXII</i>		<i>Chapter 172</i>	
Mt 27:57 ^{ab}	Cum sero autem factum esset· uenit quidam homo diues	When it was evening, a certain rich man came,	1
Mk 15:43 ^a	nobilis decurio	a noble counselor	
Lk 23:51 ^b	ab arimathia ciuitate iudae·	from Arimathia, a city of Judaea,	
Mt 27:57 ^b	nomine ioseph	named Joseph,	
Lk 23:50 ^b	uir bonus et iustus·	a good and righteous man,	
Mt 27:57 ^y	qui et ipse	who himself	
Jn 19:38 ^y	occultus		
Mt 27:57 ^y	discipulus erat ihesu·	was also a secret disciple of Jesus,	
Jn 19:38 ^y	propter metum iudaeorum·	on account of fear of the Jews,	
Lk 23:51 ^{ca}	qui expectabat et ipse regnum dei· hic non consenserat concilio et actibus eorum·	who himself was also anticipating the kingdom of God. He had not consented to their decision and actions.	2
Mt 27:58 ^a	hic accessit ad pilatum et petit corpus ihesu·	He approached Pilatus and asks for the body of Jesus.	3
Mk 15:44	pilatus autem mirabatur si iam obisset· et accersito centurione interrogauit eum si iam mortuus esset·	But Pilatus was amazed that he had already died, and when he had sent for the centurion, he asked him whether he was already dead.	4
15:45 ^a	Et cum cognouisset·	And when he had learned (it),	5
Mt 27:58 ^b	iussit reddi corpus·	he ordered the body to be returned.	
Jn 19:39	Uenit autem et nicodemus qui uenerat ad ihesum nocte primum ferens mixturam murrae et aloes· quasi libras centum	And Nicodemus, who had gone to Jesus first at night, also came, bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloe, about a hundred pounds.	6
19:40	acceperunt ergo corpus ihesu· et ligauerunt eum linteis cum aromatibus· sicut mos iudaeis est sepelire	So they took the body of Jesus and bound him in linen cloths with the spices, just as it is the custom of the Jews to bury.	7
19:41	Erat autem in loco ubi crucifixus est hortus· et in horto monumentum nouum in quo	Now there was a garden in the place where he was crucified, and in the garden (was) a new tomb in	8
[171r]	nondum quisquam positus fuerat	which no one had yet been laid.	
Mt 27:60 ^a	Et posuit illud	And Joseph laid it (in)	9
Mk 15:46 ^a	ioseph		
Mt 27:60 ^b	et aduoluit saxum magnum ad ostium monumenti et abiit·	and rolled a large stone to the entrance of the tomb and went away.	
27:61	Erat autem ibi maria magdalene· et altera maria sedentes contra sepulchrum	But Maria Magdalene was there, and the other Maria, sitting opposite the grave.	10
Lk 23:55 ^{yo}	Uiderunt quoniam positus erat corpus eius	They saw that his body was laid (in the tomb).	11
23:56 ^a	Et reuertentes parauerunt aromata	And returning, they prepared	12

	et ungenta·	spices and oils,
Mk 16:1 ^c	ut uenientes ungerent eum·	that going, they might anoint him.
Lk 23:56 ^b	Et sabbato quidem siluerunt secundum mandatum	But on the Sabbath, of course, they rested, according to the commandment.

172:3 (Mt 27:58) petit ABDEH*JMOQRYZ*Σ] petiit Z²Š
 172:8 (Jn 19:41) fuerat K VWX*Z q] erat Š (cf. Lk 23:53)
 172:10 (Mt 27:61) maria² F^vŠ] mariam F*
 172:11 (Lk 23:55) quoniam] quemadmodum Š | positus (E)] positum Š
 172:12 (Lk 23:56) ungenta F^vABHMOXYZ^c] unguenta F*DEGΘIJKQRTVWZ*Š
 172:12 (Mk 16:1) ungerent AM] unguerent Z*Š

Notes

- 172:1 (Mt 27:57; Mk 15:43; Lk 23:50-51; Jn 19:38): F combines practically every available biographical detail concerning Joseph of Arimathea.
 172:2 (Lk 23:51): Splitting up and changing the internal order of this verse in Luke renders a more fluid narrative.
 172:10 (Mt 27:61): Although the scribe wrote *mariam*, Victor dotted out the final *m*.
 172:11 (Lk 23:55): It would appear that F has turned Luke's *quemadmodum* to *quoniam*, though the change seems unnecessary. There is no obvious explanation for shifting the neuter *positum* to the nominative *positus*, which renders the sentence grammatically incorrect.
 172:12 (Lk 23:56): Victor has dotted out the inner *u* of *unguenta*.

	<i>Caput CLXXIII</i>	<i>Chapter 173</i>	
Mt 27:62	altera autem die quae est parasceuen· conuenerunt principes sacerdotum et pharisaei ad pilatum	Now on the next day, which is the day of preparation, the chief priests and the Pharisees went to meet Pilatus,	1
27:63	dicentes· domine recordati sumus· quia seductor ille dixit athuc uiuens· post tres dies resurgam·	saying, “Sir, we have remembered that that deceiver said while still living, ‘After three days I will rise.’	2
27:64	iube ergo custodiri sepulchrum usque in diem tertium· ne forte ueniant discipuli eius et furentur eum· et dicant plebi· surrexit a mortuis Et erit nouissimus error peior priore·	Therefore, order the grave to be guarded until the third day, lest perhaps his disciples come and steal him and say to the people he has risen from the dead. The latest deception will be even worse than the first.”	3
27:65	ait illis pilatus· habetis custodiam ite custodite sicut scitis·	Pilatus said to them, “You have a guard. Go guard (it) as you know (how).”	4
27:66	illi autem abeuntes munierunt	And departing, they secured the	5

[171v] sepulchrum | signantes lapidem grave with guards, sealing the
cum custodibus stone.

173:1 (Mt 27:62) est H*Y] *add.* post Š

Notes

173:1 (Mt 27:62): The omission of *post* before *parasceuen* muddles the crucifixion chronology. This event should take place on the Sabbath, but now takes place the day before. Most likely its absence is accidental, as *parasceuen* is left in the accusative.

Resurrection (F 174–182)

	<i>Caput CLXXIII</i>	<i>Chapter 174</i>	
Mt 28:1 ^a	Uespere autem sabbato· quae lucescit in prima sabbati·	Now late on the Sabbath, which dawns into the first day of the week,	1
Jn 20:1 ^α	cum athuc tenebrae essent·	while it was still dark,	
Mt 28:1 ^β	uenit maria magdalene· et altera maria·	Maria Magdalene and the other Maria	
Mk 16:1 ^β	et salomae	and Salomae went	
Lk 24:1 ^{ab}	ad monumentum portantes quae parauerant aromata·	to the tomb, carrying the spices that they had prepared.	
Mk 16:2 ^α	Et orto iam sole·	And when the sun had risen,	2
16:3	dicebant ad inuicem· quis reuoluet nobis lapidem ab ostio monumenti·	they began to say to one another, “Who will roll the stone back from the entrance of the tomb for us?”	3
16:4 ^b	erat quippe magnus ualde	For it was very large.	4
Mt 28:2 ^{aby}	Et ecce terraemotus factus est magnus· Angelus enim domini descendit de caelo· et accedens reuoluit lapidem	And there was a great earthquake. For an angel of the Lord came down from heaven. And approaching, he rolled back the stone.	5
Mk 16:4 ^a	Et respicientes uident reuolutum lapidem	And looking about, they see the stone rolled back	6
Lk 24:2 ^α	a monumento·	from the tomb	
Mt 28:2 ^γ	et angelum sedentem super eum·	and the angel sitting on it.	
28:3	erat autem aspectus eius sicut fulgur· et uestimentum eius sicut nix	And his appearance was like lightning and his garment like snow.	7
28:4	prae timore autem eius· exterriti sunt custodes et facti sunt uelut mortui·	And out of fear of him, the guards were struck with terror and became as if they were dead.	8
28:5	Respondens autem angelus dixit mulieribus nolite timere uos· scio enim quod ihesum qui crucifixus	But answering, the angel said to the women, “You, do not fear. For I know that you are seeking Jesus,	9

	est· quaeritis·	who was crucified.	
28:6 [172r]	non est hic surrexit enim sicut dixit· uenite et uidete locum ubi positus erat dominus	He is not here. For he has risen, just as he said. Come and see the place where the Lord was laid.”	10
Lk 24:4	Et factum est dum mente consternatae essent de isto ecce duo uiri steterunt secus illas in ueste fulgenti·	And it happened that while they were confused in (their) mind about that, there stood two men beside them in shining clothes.	11
24:5	cum timerent autem et declinarent uultum in terram· dixerunt ad illas quid quaeritis uiuentem cum mortuis·	But when they were afraid and were lowering the face to the ground, they said to them, “Why are you seeking the living one among the dead?”	12
24:6	non est hic sed surrexit· recordamini· qualiter locutus est uobis· Cum autem athuc in galilaea esset	He is not here but has risen. Remember how he spoke to you, however, when he was still in Galilaea,	13
24:7	dicens· quia oportet filium hominis tradi in manus hominum peccatorum et crucifigi· et die tertia resurgere·	saying, ‘It is necessary for the Son of Man to be handed over into the hands of sinful people, and to be crucified, and on the third day to rise again.’	14
Mt 28:7	Et cito euntes dicite discipulis eius quia surrexit a mortuis· et ecce praecedit uos in galilaeam· ibi eum uidebitis· ecce praedixi uobis	And, going quickly, tell his disciples that he has risen from the dead. And listen, he goes before you into Galilaea. You will see him there. Listen, I have foretold (it) to you.”	15
Lk 24:8	et recordatae sunt uerborum eius	And they remembered his words.	16
Mt 28:8	Et exierunt cito de monumento cum timore et magno gaudio· currentes nuntiare discipulis eius·	And they quickly went out of the tomb with fear and great joy, running to inform his disciples.	17
Jn 20:2 [172v]	cucurrit ergo et uenit ad simonem petrum et ad alium discipulum quem amabat ihesus· et dicit eis· tulerunt dominum meum de monumento et nescimus ubi posuerunt eum·	So she ran and comes to Simon Petrus and to the other disciple whom Jesus loved. And she tells them, “They have carried off my Lord from the tomb and we do not know where they have laid him.”	18
20:3	Exit ergo petrus· et ille alius discipulus et uenerunt ad monumentum·	So Petrus went out, and that other disciple, and they went to the tomb.	19
20:4	currebant autem duo simul· Et ille alius discipulus praecurrit citius petro et uenit primus ad monumentum·	Now they were both running together, but that other disciple ran ahead faster than Petrus and came first to the tomb.	20

20:5	Et cum se inclinasset· uidet posita lintheamina· non tamen introiuit·	And when he had bent down, he sees the linen cloths lying (there). Nevertheless, he did not go in.	21
20:6	Uenit ergo simon petrus sequens eum· et introiuit in monumentum· et uidit lintheamina posita·	Then Simon Petrus comes following him. And he went into the tomb, and he saw the linen cloths lying (there),	22
20:7	et sudarium quod fuerat supra caput eius· non cum lintheaminibus positum· Sed separatim inuolutum in unum locum·	and the small cloth that had been over his head, not lying with the linen cloths, but wrapped up separately in one place.	23
20:8	Tunc ergo introiuit et ille discipulus qui uenerat primus ad monumentum et uidit et credidit·	Then, therefore, that disciple who had come first to the tomb also went in. And he saw and believed.	24
20:9	nondum enim sciebant scribituram· quia oportet eum a mortuis resurgere	For they were not yet understanding the Scripture, that it is necessary for him to rise again from the dead.	25
20:10	abierunt ergo iterum ad semet ^[173r] ipsos discipuli	So the disciples went away again, each to themselves.	26
Jn 20:11 ^α	Maria autem	But Maria	27
Mk 16:9 ^β	magdalenae de qua eiecerat VII daemonia·	Magdalene, from whom he had driven out seven demons,	
Jn 20:11 ^{αβ}	stabat ad monumentum foris plorans Dum ergo fleret·	was standing outside at the tomb, weeping. Therefore while she was crying,	
20:13	dicit illi mulier· quid ploras· dicit ei· quia tulerunt dominum meum et nescio ubi posuerunt eum·	he says to her, “Woman, why are you weeping?” She says to him, “Because they have carried away my Lord and I do not know where they have laid him.”	28
20:14	haec cum dixisset· Conuersa est retrorsum· et uidit ihesum stantem· et non sciebat quia ihesus est·	When she had said these things, she turned back and saw Jesus standing (there), but she did not know that it is Jesus.	29
20:15	dicit ei ihesus· mulier quid ploras quem quaeris illa existimans quia hortulanus esset· dicit ei domine si tu sustulisti eum dicito mihi ubi posuisti eum· et ego eum tollam	Jesus says to her, “Woman, why are you weeping? Whom are you seeking?” She, supposing that he was the gardener, says to him, “Sir, if you have carried him away, tell me where you have laid him, and I will take him away.”	30
20:16	dicit ei ihesus· maria· conuersa illa dicit ei rabboni quod dicitur magister	Jesus says to her, “Maria.” Turning, she says to him, “Rabboni!,” which is to say,	31

20:17	dicit ei ihesus· noli me tangere· nondum enim ascendi ad patrem meum· uade autem ad fratres meos et dic eis· ascendo ad patrem meum et patrem uestrum· et deum meum et deum uestrum	“Teacher!” Jesus says to her, “Do not touch me. For I have not yet gone up to my Father. But go to my brothers and tell them I am going up to my Father and your Father, and my God and your God.”	32
-------	---	---	----

174:1 (Mt 28:1) sabbato] sabbatorum *d*; sabbati Š | prima AMZ] primam ΣŠ

174:6 (Mt 28:2) angelum *om.* Š | sedentem] sedebat Š

174:10 (Mt 28:6) et CDD[§]EHØKLP[§]QRTWX] *om.* AZŠ

174:13 (Lk 24:6) autem *om.* Š

174:18 (Jn 20:2) meum D r δ] *om.* Š (*cf.* Jn 20:13)

174:20 (Jn 20:4) praecurrit (D)ΔRY a q v δ *aur*] praecucurrit Š

174:22 (Jn 20:6) uidit DD[§]EHØIKRTVW] uidet AMZŠ

174:23 (Jn 20:7) supra AΔHMSY] super Š

174:28 (Jn 20:13) dicit *ff*²] dicunt ei Š | ei] eis Š

174:29 (Jn 20:14) uidit DEG*HØIKMRTVW] uidet AZŠ

174:32 (Jn 20:17) meos F^cŠ] meo F*

Notes

174:4 (Mk 16:4): F has successfully repositioned a clause in Mark that interrupts the narrative in its normal sequence.

174:6 (Mt 28:2): F has altered Matthew’s *sedebat* to *sedentem* to fit the new context and supplied *angelum* to make the sentence more clear.

174:15 (Mt 28:7): F has neglected to adjust *praedixi* to reflect the fact that it is now the two men from Lk 24:4 speaking (see F 174:11-12).

174:18 (Jn 20:2): F provides no indication of which of the women is now the subject, although the Johannine context specifies Mary Magdalene. One begins to understand the later critique that Tatian gave up when it came to harmonizing the resurrection narrative (so Theodore bar Koni, Dionysius bar Salibi, and a thirteenth-century gloss in MS Vatican Syr. 154). At the same time, in the harmonized context, Mary Magdalene’s reference to “we” now makes sense.

174:27 (Mk 16:9): One wonders why this line was not used back before F 174:18 (Jn 20:2) to identify Mary Magdalene as the one running. Furthermore, in its Markan context *magdalенаe* is dative, which no longer makes sense in the new Johannine context. But the scribe is elsewhere prone to spelling the word with this ending, even when no harmonizing has shifted its context (*cf.* F 171:23 [Jn 19:25]).

174:28 (Jn 20:13): Presumably because the two angelic figures have already been introduced from Luke 24:4 above (see F 174:11), F chooses to skip over John 20:11^β–12. Consequently, it is unclear who is talking to Mary in the current verse. Even more curious, F has cleverly altered this verse so that the one with whom Mary speaks is now singular, not plural. In the Johannine context, *illi* was originally the nom. masc. pl. subject, but now functions as the dat. fem. sg. object. The mysterious speaker, the reader will learn in a moment, turns out to be Jesus himself.

174:32 (Jn 20:17): It appears the scribe first wrote *meo* and a second hand, perhaps Victor or a contemporary, added *s* above the *o* to read *meos*.

	<i>Caput CLXXV</i>	<i>Chapter 175</i>	
Mt 28:11 ^{bc}	Ecce quidam de custodibus uenerunt in ciuitatem et nuntiauerunt principibus [173v] sacerdotum omnia quae facta fuerant	There went some of the guards into the city and reported to the chief priests all the things that had occurred.	1
28:12	et congregati cum senioribus consilio accepto pecuniam copiosam dederunt militibus	And having met together with the elders, after taking counsel, they offered the soldiers ample money,	2
28:13	dicentes Dicite quia discipuli eius nocte uenerunt et furati sunt eum nobis dormientibus·	saying, “Say, ‘His disciples came at night and stole him while we were sleeping.’”	3
28:14	Et si hoc auditum fuerit a praeside nos suadebimus ei et securos uos faciemus·	And if this is heard by the governor, we will persuade him and keep you safe.”	4
28:15	at illi accepta pecunia fecerunt sicut erant docti et diuulgatum est uerbum istud apud iudaeos usque in hodiernum diem	So, taking the money, they did just as they were shown. And that word has spread among the Jews up to this very day.	5
Jn 20:18	Uenit maria magdalene annuntians discipulis quia uidi dominum et haec dixit mihi	Maria Magdalene goes in order to announce to the disciples, “I have seen the Lord and he said these things to me!”	6

(no textual variants)

Notes

175:6 (Jn 20:18): It is unclear why this verse would be here and not in the next chapter, where its story continues. Note the related disjunction at the end of chapter 177 below.

	<i>Caput CLXXVI</i>	<i>Chapter 176</i>	
Mt 28:9 ^{ab}	Et ecce ihesus occurrit illis dicens hauete· illae autem· accesserunt et tenuerunt pedes eius et adorauerunt·	And there Jesus met them, saying, “Greetings!” But the women approached and grasped his feet and worshipped (him).	1
28:10	Tunc ait illis ihesus· nolite timere· ite nuntiate fratribus meis· ut eant in galilaeam ibi me uidebunt·	Then Jesus said to them, “Do not fear. Go report to my brothers, that they may go into Galilaea. There they will see me.”	2

28:11 ^a	Quae cum abissent	When they had gone off,	3
Lk 24:9 ^β	nuntiauerunt haec omnia illis undecim·	they reported all these things to the eleven,	
Mk 16:10 ^α	lugentibus et flentibus	(who were) mourning and crying,	
Lk 24:9 ^β	et ceteris omnibus	and to all the others	
[174r]			
Mk 16:10 ^α	qui cum eo fuerant·	who had been with him.	
16:11	et illi audientes quia uiueret et uisus esset ab eis non crediderunt eis·	But they, hearing that he was alive and had been seen by them, did not believe them.	4
Lk 24:11	Et uisa sunt ante illos sicut deliramentum uerba ista et non credebant illis	And those words seemed like nonsense before them, and they kept not believing them.	5

176:1 (Mt 28:9) adorauerunt] *add.* eum Š

176:4 (Mk 16:11) eis¹] ea Š | eis² *om.* Š

Notes

176:1 (Mt 28:9): Whom Jesus meets is at first unclear, since it was only Mary Magdalene going out in the previous verse. Furthermore, the women grasping his feet breaks Jesus' earlier command to Mary Magdalene not to touch him yet (see F 174:32 [Jn 20:17]), unless perhaps he has already been to the Father and back.

176:4 (Mk 16:11): Unlike in the opening verse (see note above), here F adjusts Mark's *ea* to *eis* and adds an additional *eis* at the end to reflect the plural context in Matthew and Luke.

	<i>Caput CLXXVII</i>	<i>Chapter 177</i>	
Mk 16:12 ^α	post haec autem duobus ex eis ambulantibus ostensus est euntibus	And after these things he appeared to two of them (who were) walking, going	1
Lk 24:13 ^{abc}	Hoc ipsa die in castellum quod erat in spatio stadiorum CLX ab hierusalem nomine· emmaus·	on this same day to a town that was a distance of 160 stadia from Hierusalem, by the name of Emmaus.	2
24:14	Et ipsi loquebantur ad inuicem de his omnibus quae acciderant·	And they were talking to one another about all these things that had happened.	3
24:15	et factum est dum fabularentur et secum quaerent et ipse ihesus adpropinquans ibat cum illis·	And it happened that while they were conversing and reasoning with themselves, Jesus himself, drawing near, was also going with them.	4
24:16	oculi autem eorum tenebantur ne eum agnoscerent·	But their eyes were kept from recognizing him.	5
24:17	et ait ad illos· qui sunt hi sermone quos confertis ad	And he said to them, "What are these words that you are discussing	6

	inuicem ambulantes· et estis tristes·	with one another while you walk and are sad?”	
24:18	Et respondens unus cui nomen cleopas dixit ei Tu solus peregrinus es in hierusalem· et non cognouisti quae facta sunt in illa· his diebus	And answering, one by the name of Cleopas said to him, “Are you only a stranger in Hierusalem and have not been aware of the things that have happened in that (city) in these days?”	7
24:19	Quibus ille dixit· quae et <i>[174v]</i> dixerunt· de ihesu nazareno qui fuit uir propheta· potens in opere et sermone coram deo et omni populo·	He said to them, “What things?” And they said, “Concerning Jesus the Nazarene, the man who was a prophet, powerful in deed and word, in the presence of God and all the people,	8
24:20	et quomodo eum tradiderunt summi sacerdotum et principes nostri in damnationem mortis et crucifixerunt eum·	and how the chief priests and our leaders handed him over to the sentence of death and crucified him.	9
24:21	nos autem sperabamus quia ipse esset redempturus israhel· Et nunc super haec omnia tertia dies hodie quod haec facta sunt·	But we were hoping that he was going to redeem Israel. And now, besides all these things, today (is) the third day (from the time) that these things happened.	10
24:22	sed et mulieres quaedam ex nostris terruerunt nos quae ante lucem fuerunt ad monumentum·	But also certain women among us frightened us, who were at the tomb before dawn.	11
24:23	et non inuento corpore eius uenerunt dicentes· se etiam uisionem angelorum uidisse qui dicunt eum uiuere·	And not finding his body, they came, claiming even to have seen a vision of angels, who say he is alive.	12
24:24	et abierunt quidam ex nostris ad monumentum et ita inuenerunt sicut mulieres dixerunt· ipsum uero non inuenerunt·	And some of us went off to the tomb and found it so, just as the women said, but him they did not find.”	13
24:25	Et ipse dixit ad eos· O· stulti et tardi corde ad credendum in omnibus quae locuti sunt prophetae·	And he said to them, “O foolish ones, and slow of heart to believe in all the things that the prophets have spoken.	14
24:26	nonne haec oportuit pati christum · et intrare in gloriam suam <i>[175r]</i>	Was it not necessary for the Christus to suffer these things and to enter into his glory?”	15
24:27	Et incipiens a mose et omnibus prophetis interpretaebatur illis in omnibus scripturis quae de se ipso erant·	And beginning from Moses and all the prophets, he began explaining to them the things in all the Scriptures that were about him himself.	16

24:28	et adpropinquauerunt castello quolibant· et ipse finxit longius ire·	And they drew near to the town where they were going. And he made himself out to go farther.	17
24:29	et coegerunt illum dicentes mane nobiscum· quoniam aduesperascit et declinata est iam dies· et intrauit cum illis·	But they compelled him, saying, “Stay with us, since evening is coming on and the daylight has already declined.” And he went in with them.	18
24:30	Et factum est dum recumberet cum illis· accepit panem et benedixit ac fregit· et porrigebat illis·	And it happened that while he was reclining with them, he took bread and blessed (it) and broke (it) and was extending it to them,	19
24:31	et aperti sunt oculi eorum· et cognouerunt eum· et ipse euauit ex oculis eorum	and their eyes were opened and they recognized him. And he vanished from their eyes.	20
24:32	Et dixerunt ad inuicem nonne cor nostrum ardens erat in nobis dum loqueretur in uia et aperiret nobis scripturas	And they said to one another, “Was our heart not burning within us while he was speaking on the road and revealing the Scriptures to us?”	21
24:33	et surgens eadem hora regressi sunt in hierusalem· et inuenerunt congregatos XI et eos qui cum ipsis erant	And rising at that very hour, they returned to Hierusalem. And they found the eleven assembled and those who were with them	22
24:34	dicentes· quod surrexit dominus uere· et apparuit simoni	saying, “The Lord has risen indeed! And he has appeared to Simon.”	23
24:35 ^{ab}	et ipsi narrabant quae gesta erant in uia et quomodo cognouerunt eum	And they began to recount all the things that had taken place on the road and how they recognized him...	24
	[175v]		

177:2 (Lk 24:13) Hoc *om.* Š | CLX (centum sexaginta) GO*Y] sexaginta Š
177:5 (Lk 24:16) eorum AD^ŠE^ŠHMQX*Y] illorum ZŠ
177:10 (Lk 24:21) redempturus AHTXYZ^c] redempturus Š
177:13 (Lk 24:24) inuenerunt AGHΘIKMNOVWXY] uiderunt ZŠ
177:15 (Lk 24:26) pati christum F^vŠ] christum pati F*J ff² r¹ | et a c d e ff² r¹ δ] *add.* ita Š
177:16 (Lk 24:27) se GHΘO* (a) *aur]* *om.* Š
177:17 (Lk 24:28) ipse DD^ŠEGMR* δ] *add.* se ZŠ
177:18 (Lk 24:29) declinata AHXY] inclinata Š
177:22 (Lk 24:33) surgens] surgentes Š

Notes

177:1 (Mk 16:12): F cleverly introduces Luke’s “road to Emmaus” scene with the apparent reference to it in (the long ending of) Mark, while omitting some key words so as not to give away the story.

177:2 (Lk 24:13): The addition of *hoc*, which comes from no Gospel, seems unnecessary, and intrudes on the grammar. The Latin word *dies* can function as a masculine or feminine noun. Luke's *ipsa die* makes it feminine, but the addition of *hoc* makes it masculine, belying *hoc*'s secondary nature.

177:2 (Lk 24:13): F reads CLX (*centum sexaginta*) where most manuscripts read simply *sexaginta*, in agreement with three Vulgate MSS and some Greek MSS (⌘ K* N Θ).

177:15 (Lk 24:26): The scribe originally had the order *christum pati* (agreeing with two Old Latin MSS and one Vulgate), but Victor has inserted small tick marks above the words to reverse their order.

177:24 (Lk 24:35): See the first line of the next chapter for the remainder of this verse.

	<i>Caput CLXXVIII</i>	<i>Chapter 178</i>	
Lk 24:35 ^β	In fractione panis	...in the breaking of the bread.	1
Mk 16:13 ^b	Nec illis crediderunt	Neither did they believe them.	2
Lk 24:36 ^a	dum haec antem loquuntur	But while they are saying these things,	3
Jn 20:19	Cum esset sero die illo una sabbatorum et fores· essent clausae· ubi erant discipuli propter metum iudaeorum Uenit ihesus et stetit in medio discipulorum· et dicit eis pax uobis	when it was late on that day, the first of the week, and the doors were closed where the disciples were on account of fear of the Jews, Jesus came and stood in the midst of the disciples. And he says to them, "Peace to you.	
(Lk 24:36 ^c)	uobis	to them, "Peace to you.	
Lk 24:36 ^c	ego sum nolite timere·	It is I. Do not fear."	
24:37	conturbati uero et exterriti existimabant se spiritum uidere·	However, confused and struck with terror, they thought they were seeing a spirit.	4
24:38	et dixit eis· quid turbati estis et cogitationes ascendunt in corda uestra·	But he said to them, "Why are you troubled and why do (these) thoughts rise up in your hearts?	5
24:39	uidete manus meas et pedes quia ipse ego sum· palpate et uidete quia spiritus carnem et ossa non habet sicut me uidetis habere	See my hands and feet, that it is truly I. Feel and see that a spirit does not have flesh and bones, as you see that I have."	6
24:40 ^a	et cum haec dixisset· ostendit eis manus pedes	And when he had said these things, he showed them (his) hands, feet, and side.	7
Jn 20:20 ^a	et later		
Lk 24:41	athuc autem illis non credentibus et mirabantibus prae gaudio· dixit· habetis hic aliquid quod manducetur·	But when they did not yet believe and were in awe out of joy, he said, "Do you have anything here to eat?"	8
24:42	at illi optulerunt ei partem piscis assi et fabum mellis	So they offered him a piece of roasted fish and a honeycomb.	9
24:43	Et cum manducasset coram eis	And when he had eaten in their	10
[176 ^r]	sumens reliquias dedit illis	presence, taking up what was left,	

		he gave (it) to them.	
24:44	Et dixit ad eos haec sunt uerba quae locutus sum ad uos cum athuc essem uobiscum· quoniam necesse est impleri omnia quae scribta sunt in lege mosi et prophetis et psalmis de me	And he said to them, “These are the words that I spoke to you when I was still with you, that it is necessary that all things be fulfilled that are written in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms about me.”	11
24:45	Tunc aperuit illis sensum ut intellegerent scripturas	Then he opened their perception, that they might understand the Scriptures.	12
24:46	et dixit eis· quoniam sic scribturn est Et sic oportebat christum pati et resurgere a mortuis die tertia·	And he said to them, “For thus it was written, and thus it was necessary for the Christus to suffer and to rise again from the dead on the third day,	13
24:47	et praedicari in nomine eius paenitentiam et remissionem peccatorum in omnes gentes incipientibus ab hierosolyma·	and for repentance and forgiveness of sins to be preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Hierosolyma.	14
24:48	uos autem estis testes horam·	But you are witnesses of these things.	15
24:49 ^a	et ego mitto promissum patris mei in uos·	And I am sending the promise of my Father into you.”	16
Jn 20:20 ^b	Gauserunt ergo discipuli uiso domino·	Therefore the disciples rejoiced when they saw the Lord.	17
20:21	Dixit ergo eis iterum pax uobis· sicut misit me pater et ego mitto uos·	So he said to them again, “Peace to you. Just as the Father sent me I am also sending you.”	18
20:22	hoc cum dixisset insuflauit et dicit eis· accipite spiritum sanctum	When he had said this, he breathed into (them) and says to them, “Receive the Holy Spirit.	19
20:23	quorum remisistis peccata remittuntur eis· et quorum [176v] retinueritis detenta sunt··	Whose sins you forgive are forgiven them. And whose you retain have been detained.”	20

178:3 (Jn 20:19) esset M^c] *add.* ergo Š | discipulorum] eorum M; *om.* Š

178:4 (Lk 24:37) exterriti] conterriti Š

178:7 (Lk 24:40) haec] hoc Š | manus] *add.* et Š

178:8 (Lk 24:41) mirabantibus] mirabantur c; mirantibus Š

178:10 (Lk 24:43) illis G] eis Š

178:12 (Lk 24:45) scripturas F^vŠ] scribturnas F*EGO*X*YZ

178:20 (Jn 20:23) et AM] *om.* ZŠ

Notes

- 178:1 (Lk 24:35): This half verse clearly belongs at the end of the last chapter, suggesting either that chapter divisions were not transferred carefully from the exemplar or were not selected carefully to begin with. It is perhaps noteworthy that the end of the last chapter falls at the bottom of a leaf, where the scribe's writing is clearly condensed to fit. See also the note at F 175:6 (Jn 20:18) above.
- 178:3 (Jn 20:19): F cleverly inserts John 20:19 into the middle of Luke 24:36.
- 178:7 (Lk 24:40): F has removed Luke's conjunction between *manus* and *pedes*, perhaps in order to add John's *latus* to the list.
- 178:8 (Lk 24:41): With the nonsensical *mirabantibus*, the scribe has conflated an imperfect indicative (*mirabant*) with a present participle (*mirantibus*).
- 178:12 (Lk 24:45): When re-syllabifying this word that bridges two lines, Victor changed it from *scribturas* to *scripturas*.

	<i>Caput CLXXVIII</i>	<i>Chapter 179</i>	
Jn 20:24	Thomas autem unus ex duodecim qui dicitur didymus non erat cum eis quando uenit ihesus·	But Thomas, one of the twelve, who is called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came.	1
20:25	dixerunt ergo ei alii discipuli· uidimus dominum· ille autem dixit eis· nisi uidero in manibus eius figuram clauorum· Et mittam digitum meum in locum clauorum· et mittam manum meam in latus eius non credam	So the other disciples said to him, "We have seen the Lord." But he said to them, "Unless I see the mark of the nails in his hands, and cast my finger into the place of the nails, and cast my hand into his side, I will not believe."	2
20:26	Et post dies VIII iterum erant discipuli eius intus et thomas cum eis· Uenit ihesus ianuis clausis· et stetit in medio et dixit· pax uobis·	And after eight days, his disciples were again inside, and Thomas with them. Jesus comes, although the doors were closed, and stood in (their) midst and said, "Peace to you."	3
20:27	deinde dicit thomae· infer digitum tuum huc· et uide manus meas et affer· manum tuam et mitte in latus meum et noli esse incredulus sed fidelis·	Then he says to Thomas, "Put your finger in here and see my hands. And put up your hand and cast (it) into my side. And do not be unbelieving but faithful!"	4
20:28	Respondit thomas et dixit ei· dominus meus et deus meus·	Thomas answered and said to him, "My Lord and my God."	5
20:29	dicit ei ihesus quia uidisti me credidisti· beati qui non uiderunt et crediderunt·	Jesus says to him, "Because you have seen me, you have believed. Blessed are those who have not seen, and have believed."	6
20:30	multa quidem et alia signa fecit ihesus in conspectu discipulorum	Indeed, Jesus also did many other signs in the sight of his disciples	7

	suorum quae non sunt scribta in libro hoc·	which were not written in this book.	
20:31 [177r]	haec autem scribta sunt ut credatis quia ihesus est christus filius dei et ut credentes uitam habeatis in nomine eius	But these things were written, that you may believe that Jesus is the Christus, the Son of God, and that, believing, you may have life in his name.	8

(no textual variants)

Notes

179:7-8 (John 20:30-31): It is interesting that F chooses to place these verses here, following the Johannine order, rather than save them for the end of the harmony, where they would make a fitting conclusion.

	<i>Caput CLXXX</i>	<i>Chapter 180</i>	
Jn 21:1	postea manifestauit se iterum ihesus ad mare tiberiadis· manifestauit autem sic·	Afterwards Jesus revealed himself again at the Sea of Tiberias. But he revealed (himself) in this way:	1
21:2	erant simul simon petrus· et thomas qui dicitur didymus· et nathanahel· qui erat a chanan galileae· et filii zebedaei· et alii ex discipulis eius duo·	Simon Petrus, and Thomas, who is called Didymus, and Nathanael, who was from Chanan of Galilaea, and the sons of Zebedaeus, and two others of his disciples were together.	2
21:3	Dicit eis simon petrus· uado piscari· Dicunt ei· uenimus et nos tecum· et exierunt et ascenderunt in nauem et illa nocte nihil prendiderunt·	Simon Petrus says to them, “I am going to fish.” They say to him, “We are also coming with you.” And they went out and climbed into the ship. And they caught nothing that night.	3
21:4	mane autem iam facto stetit ihesus in litore· non tamen cognouerunt discipuli quia ihesus est·	But now when it was morning, Jesus stood on the shore. Yet the disciples did not recognize that it is Jesus.	4
21:5	Dicit ergo eis ihesus pueri· numquid pulmentarium habetis· responderunt ei· non·	So Jesus says to them, “Children, do you not have any food?” They answered him, “No.”	5
21:6	dixit eis mittite in dextram nauigii rete et inuenietis· Miserunt ergo et iam non ualebant illum trahere a multitudine piscium·	He said to them, “Throw the net on the right side of the ship and you will find (some).” So they threw (it) and now they were not strong (enough) to haul it (in), from the great number of fish.	6
21:7	Dicit ergo discipulus ille quem	Therefore that disciple whom Jesus	7

[177v]	diligebat ihesus petro· dominus est· Simon petrus cum audisset quia dominus est· tunicam succinxit se· erat enim nudus· et misit se in mare	loved says to Petrus, “It is the Lord.” Simon Petrus, when he had heard that it is the Lord, gathered his tunic about himself, for he was naked, and threw himself into the sea.	
21:8	alii autem discipuli nauigio uenerunt· non enim longe erant a terra· sed quasi a cubitis ducentis trahentes rete piscium	But the other disciples came in the ship—for they were not far from land, but about two hundred cubits—hauling the net of fish.	8
21:9	Ut ergo descenderunt in terram· uiderunt prunas positas et piscem superpositum et panem	Therefore when they climbed out onto land, they saw a fire of coals set up and fish set up over (it) and bread.	9
21:10	Dicit eis ihesus· afferte de piscibus· quos prendistis nunc	Jesus says to them, “Bring over some of the fish that you have now caught.”	10
21:11	ascendit simon petrus et traxit retem in terram· plenum magnis piscibus centum quinquaginta tribus· Et cum tanti essent non est scissum rete·	Simon Petrus climbed up and hauled the net to land, full of large fish: one hundred and fifty-three. And although there were so many, the net was not torn.	11
21:12	Dicit eis ihesus· uenite prandete Et nemo audebat discumbentium interrogare eum· Tu quis es· Scientes quia dominus esset·	Jesus says to them, “Come, eat!” And none of those reclining to eat dared to ask him, “Who are you?” knowing that it was the Lord.	12
21:13	Et uenit ihesus et accepit panem et dedit eis et piscem similiter	And Jesus comes and takes the bread and gave (it) to them, and likewise the fish.	13
21:14	Hoc iam tertio manifestatus est ihesus discipulis cum surrexisset a mortuis	This (was) now the third time Jesus appeared to the disciples after he had risen from the dead.	14

180:6 (Jn 21:6) illum] illud Š

180:10 (Jn 21:10) prendistis ABCD[§]ORSXY] prendidistis Š

180:11 (Jn 21:11) retem G b ff² r¹] rete Š

180:12 (Jn 21:12) discumbentium ABCDEΘIKOSTVWXYZ] discentium MŠ

180:13 (Jn 21:13) dedit DERW a c d e f r¹ δ] dat Š

Caput CLXXXI

Jn 21:15 Cum ergo prandissent· dicit simoni petro ihesus· simon iohannis diligis me plus his dicit ei· etiam domine· tu scis quia

Chapter 181

Therefore when they had eaten, Jesus says to Simon Petrus, “Simon, (son) of Iohannes, do you love me more than these?” He says

	amo te· dicit ei· pasce agnos meos·	to him, “Certainly, Lord. You know that I love you.” He says to him, “Feed my lambs.”	
21:16	dicit ei iterum· simon iohannis diligis me· ait illi Etiam domine tu scis quia amo te· dicit ei pasce agnos meos·	He says to him again, “Simon, (son) of Johannes, do you love me?” He said to him, “Certainly, Lord. You know that I love you.” He says to him, “Feed my lambs.”	2
21:17	dicit ei tertio· simon iohannis amas me· Contristatus est petrus quia dixit ei tertio amas me· et dicit ei· domine· tu omnia scis tu scis quia amo te· dicit ei· pasce oues meas	He says to him a third time, “Simon, (son) of Johannes, do you love me?” Petrus was saddened that he asked him a third time, “Do you love me?” And he says to him, “Lord, you know all things. You know that I love you.” He says to him, “Feed my sheep.	3
21:18	Amen amen dico tibi· cum esses iunior· cingebas te et ambulabas ubi uolebas· Cum autem senueris· extendes manus tuas· et alius te cinget· et ducet quo non uis	Truly, truly, I say to you, when you were younger, you would dress yourself and go where you wanted. But when you are older, you will stretch out your hands and another will dress you and will lead you where you do not wish.”	4
21:19	Hoc autem dixit· significans qua morte clarificaturus esset deum· Et hoc cum dixisset· dicit ei sequere me·	Now he said this, indicating by what death he was going to glorify God. And when he had said this, he says to him, “Follow me.”	5
21:20	Conuersus petrus uidit illum discipulum quem diligebat ihesus sequentem <i>[178v]</i> qui et recubuit in cena super pectus eius et dixit domine quis est qui tradidit te·	Turning, Petrus saw that disciple, whom Jesus loved, following, who also reclined at the meal on his breast and said, “Lord, who is it who has handed you over?”	6
21:21	hunc ergo cum uidisset petrus dicit ihesu domine hic autem quid·	Therefore when he had seen him, Petrus says to Jesus, “Lord, but this man, what (about him)?”	7
21:22	dicit ei ihesus· sic eum uolo manere donec ueniam quid ad te tu me sequere·	Jesus says to him, “Thus I want him to remain until I come. What (is that) to you? You, follow me!”	8
21:23	Exiuit ergo sermo iste in fratres· quia discipulus ille non moritur· et non dixit ei ihesus non moritur Sed sic eum uolo manere donec uenio quid ad te·	Therefore that rumor emerged among the brothers that that disciple does not die. But Jesus did not say to him, “He does not die,” but, “Thus I want him to remain until I come. What (is that) to you?”	9

21:24	hic est discipulus qui testimonium perhibet de his· et qui scripsit haec· Et scimus quia uerum est testimonium eius·	This is the disciple who bears witness concerning these things and who wrote these things. And we know that his witness is true.	10
21:25	Sunt autem et alia multa quae fecit ihesus· quae si scribantur per singula· nec ipsum arbitror mundum capere eos qui scribendi sunt libros·	Now there are also many other things that Jesus did, which, if they were each written, I imagine not even the world itself could hold the books that would have to be written.	11

181:6 (Jn 21:20) tradidit F* *d f*] tradet F^bM; tradit AŠ

181:8 (Jn 21:22) sic F^vABCDEGΘIKRSTWXY] si M; si sic F*H*V *ff*² Š

181:9 (Jn 21:23) sic ABCDEHΘIKRSTWXY] si sic MŠ

181:10 (Jn 21:24) qui² F^vB *b (c) d e ff*² *q r*¹ (*δ*)] *om.* F*Š

Notes

181:6 (Jn 21:20): In *tradidit* a later hand in black ink has attempted to dot out the middle *di* and change the final *i* to an *e*, to read *tradet*.

181:8 (Jn 21:22): Although the scribe wrote *si sic*, Victor dotted out the *si*.

181:10 (Jn 21:24): Victor has added the second *qui* above *scripsit*.

181:11 (Jn 21:25): F chooses to keep this concluding verse in its Johannine position, rather than save it for the end of the harmony, as the Arabic Diatessaron does (51:17).

	<i>Caput CLXXXII</i>	<i>Chapter 182</i>	
Mt 28:16	Undecim autem discipuli· abierunt in galilaeam in montem ubi constituerat illis ihesus	Now the eleven disciples went off to Galilaea, to the mountain where Jesus had appointed them.	1
28:17	Et uidentes eum adorauerunt· quidam autem dubitauerant	And seeing him, they worshipped (him); but some doubted.	2
Mk 16:14 ^{bc} [179r]	et exprobrauit incredulitatem illorum et duritiam cordis· quia his qui uide derant eum resurrexisse non crediderant·	And he reproached their disbelief and hardness of heart, because they had not believed those who had seen that he was raised again.	3
Mt 28:18 ^{ab}	Et locutus est eis dicens data est mihi omnis potestas· in caelo et in terra	And he said to them, saying, “All power in heaven and on earth has been given to me.	4
Mk 16:15 ^b	euntes in mundum uniuersum· praedicate euangelium omni creaturae	Going into the whole world, preach the good news to every creature.	5
Mt 28:19 ^{ab}	Docete omnes gentes baptizantes eos in nomine patris· et filii et spiritus sancti·	Teach all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,	6

28:20	Docentes eos seruare omnia quaecumque mandaui uobis· et ecce ego uobiscum sum omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem saeculi·	teaching them to keep all things whatsoever that I commanded you. And look, I am with you all days, until the completion of the age.	7
Mk 16:16	Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit saluus erit Qui uero non crediderit condemnabitur·	The one who believes and is baptized will be saved; however, the one who does not believe will be condemned.	8
16:17	Signa autem eos qui crediderint haec sequentur In nomine meo daemonia eicient· linguis loquentur nouis	And these signs will follow those who believe: in my name they will drive out demons, they will speak in new languages,	9
16:18	serpentes tollent· et si mortiferum quid biberint· non eos nocebit· Super aegrotos manus inponent et bene habebunt	they will remove snakes, and if they drink anything deadly it will not harm them. They will place (their) hands upon the sick, and they will get well.	10
Lk 24:49 ^{bc}	Uos autem sedete in ciuitate· quoadusque induamini uirtutem ex alto·	But you, stay in the city, until you are clothed with strength from the height.”	11
24:50 [179 ^v]	Eduxit autem eos foras in bethaniam· et eleuatis manibus suis benedixit eis·	Then he led them out to Bethania. And lifting up his hands, he blessed them.	12
24:51	Et factum est dum benediceret illis recessit ab eis· et ferebatur in caelum·	And it happened that while he was blessing them, he receded from them and was carried into heaven	13
Mk 16:19 ^β	et sedit a dextris dei·	and sat at the right hand of God.	
Lk 24:52	et ipsi adorantes regressi sunt in hierusalem cum gaudio magno·	And worshipping, they returned to Hierusalem with great joy.	14
24:53	et erant semper in templo· laudantes et benedicentes deum	And they were always in the temple, praising and blessing God.	15
Mk 16:20 ^{ab}	Et profecti praedicauerunt ubique domino cooperante et sermonem confirmante sequentibus signis· amen·	And setting out, they preached everywhere, while the Lord worked together with (them) and confirmed the word with the signs that followed. Amen.	16

182:3 (Mk 16:14) uidederant] uiderant Š

182:9 (Mk 16:17) nouis F^vŠ] nobis F*LMOZ*

182:16 (Mk 16:20) Et] illi autem Š | amen A(D)GHJMOX] om. ZŠ

Notes

182:3 (Mk 16:14): The nonsensical *uidederant* occurs at a page break, such that *uide-* is on one page and *-derant* is on the next, an obvious scribal error.

182:9 (Mk 16:17): The scribe originally wrote *nobis* here, but it appears that Victor or a contemporary scratched out the *b* and tried to change it to a *u* to read *nouis*.

182:11 (Lk 24:49): At this point in the harmonized narrative, *in ciuitate* no longer refers to the city they are in, since they are on a mountain somewhere in Galilee, although the natural inference is still Jerusalem. Nevertheless, it will be a long walk in the next verse from Galilee back to Bethany.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusions

State of the Question

The most pressing question facing Diatessaronic scholarship today is the continued existence of the Old Latin Diatessaron. The answer to this debate will determine the fate of every Diatessaronic witness in the West. Codex Fuldensis lies at the bottom of this issue. Did it father the entire Western Diatessaronic tradition? Or did another Latin Diatessaron with more ancient readings continue alongside it? Codex Fuldensis itself has not been given sufficient attention in settling the matter, partly because a trustworthy edition has hitherto not been available.

One way of testing one manuscript's relation to another is to isolate *Leitfehler* or "indicative errors" in the text and trace them through the various copies. P. Maas defines *Leitfehler* as "errors which can be utilized to make stemmatic inferences."¹ In other words, they are distinctive variant readings whose presence in more than one manuscript is unlikely to have arisen independently. Agreement in error, particularly errors that are unique or unusual, is a probable sign of relationship between witnesses. A single common error is not noteworthy, but a collection of common errors considerably increases the probability of relationship.

The apparatus I have compiled throughout chapters two through four provides an exhaustive list of verses in the selected passages of Codex Fuldensis that contain

¹ Paul Maas, *Textual Criticism* (trans. Barbara Flower; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), 42. Günther Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), uses *Leitfehler* to posit a relationship between P⁴⁶ and B in Paul. Also see note 13.

apparently unique readings within the separated-gospel tradition. As described in the introduction, these unique readings can be used to discover potential Diatessaronic readings left over in Fuldensis even after its vulgatzation. However, the list can serve a second purpose. It can also be used to identify a list of potential *Leitfehler* in Fuldensis, unique errors that Fuldensis may have subsequently introduced into the harmonized tradition. If these *Leitfehler* are present in later harmonies, it makes their ultimate dependence on Fuldensis evermore likely. The conclusion of the current study is devoted to running such a test.

Using Leitfehler to Test Dependence on Codex Fuldensis

I have selected two later harmonies with which to demonstrate the potential use of these unique readings, both introduced in chapter one. The first is Codex Sangallensis, the ninth-century Latin/Old High German bilingual. The second is the Liège Diatessaron, the thirteenth-century Middle Dutch harmony. My reasons for selecting these two harmonies are several. They represent two ends of the spectrum chronologically and linguistically. Codex Sangallensis is the next earliest surviving Tatianic harmony after Codex Fuldensis. The Liège Diatessaron, while not the latest surviving harmony, comes from the period when the Latin and vernacular harmonies reached their height. Sangallensis has a Latin side that will be easy to compare to Fuldensis, whereas the Middle Dutch of the Liège will complicate direct comparison.

Furthermore, Rathofer has already convinced even the skeptics that Sangallensis is dependent on Fuldensis.² This fact makes Sangallensis the perfect candidate with

² Consider Petersen's pronouncement in *Tatian's Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 306: "He is unquestionably correct in arguing that Codex Sangallensis is dependent upon Codex Fuldensis, and that the Old High German

which to test my methodology. Since its dependency on Fuldensis has already been demonstrated by other means, if my *Leitfehler* test fails to uncover a relationship, it will demonstrate that the readings I have selected are not distinctive enough to trace dependency.

The Liège Diatessaron is another matter. Ever since Plooiij's initial studies of the harmony, proponents of the Old Latin theory have been reluctant to let it go, despite Schmid and den Hollander's incisive critiques of the methodology used to establish its position. Petersen once called it "the single most important Western Diatessaronic witness,"³ and even as recently as 2008, J. Joosten was still arguing that the Liège harmony transmits genuine Tatianic elements independent of Codex Fuldensis.⁴ Its prominence in the field makes the Liège Diatessaron another excellent candidate with which to test my *Leitfehler* methodology.

My final (and not inconsequential) reason for selecting these two harmonies is that both manuscripts now have carefully executed and dependable editions.⁵ Moreover, high-resolution color images of Codex Sangallensis are readily available online, and I have consulted these for every reading, to avoid the errors of my predecessors.⁶

column of Codex Sangallensis is probably—as Sievers argued—dependent upon its neighbouring Latin column.”

³ Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 171.

⁴ Jan Joosten, review of Ulrich B. Schmid, *Unum Ex Quattuor: Eine Geschichte Der Lateinischen Tatianüberlieferung*, *Gnomon* 80 (2008): 19–22.

⁵ A new edition of Sangallensis has recently emerged to replace Sievers' 1892 edition: Achim Masser and Elisabeth De Filip-Jaud, *Die Lateinisch-althochdeutsche Tatianbilingue Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen Cod. 56* (StAhd 25; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994). The standard edition of Liège is the eight-part series begun by Plooiij and his team: D. Plooiij et al., *The Liège Diatessaron* (8 vols.; VKAW 31.1-8; Amsterdam: Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1929-70).

⁶ These images are hosted by the St. Gallen Stiftsbibliothek at: <http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/csg/0056>.

My *Leitfehler* test is similar to but ultimately different from the prior work done on Fuldensis in some very important ways. Most related is Rathofer's careful comparison of Fuldensis and Sangallensis described in chapter one, in which he even uncovered some of the *Leitfehler* I am using for my test. However, Rathofer skipped a critical step that renders some of his findings inconclusive. He was concerned with demonstrating Sangallensis' alignment with Fuldensis against the rest of the Latin harmony tradition. He relied on codicological similarities in the front matter and even shared errors (*Leitfehler*) in the Eusebian tables and numbers. He also identified some common textual readings that Fuldensis and Sangallensis share against the rest of the harmonized tradition. But Rathofer failed to screen these readings against the rest of the separated-gospel tradition, that is, the rest of the Vulgate, Old Latin, Greek, and Syriac manuscripts of the Gospels. Had he done so, he would have discovered that some of his variants are actually quite common in the larger tradition and therefore cannot be used to demonstrate dependence.

Petersen actually includes this rule as one of his three criteria for identifying a potential Diatessaronic reading: "The reading should not be found in any non-Diatessaronic texts, from which the Diatessaronic witnesses might have acquired it."⁷ This criterion acts as a control on the method. If a particular variant reading exists both inside and outside the Diatessaronic stream, there is no way to ensure that a witness did not receive it from outside the tradition, and therefore no way to prove it goes back to Tatian's *Diatessaron*. To demonstrate dependency, a reading must have no or little outside support in the separate Greek, Latin, or Syriac gospel tradition.

⁷ Petersen, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, 373–74. In one sense, it is this very criterion that has the potential to undermine the entire Old Latin Diatessaron enterprise. For if it can be shown that so-called Old Latin readings present in the Western Diatessaronic witnesses are actually also present in Western non-Diatessaronic witnesses (like the *Glossa Ordinaria* of separate Gospels), then those readings' statuses as Diatessaronic fall through.

This rule eliminates some of Rathofer's findings, including some of his more compelling examples. For instance, Rathofer pointed out that at John 13:32, Codex Fuldensis (F 156:25) and both sides of Codex Sangallensis omit the first line (*si deus clarificatus est in eo*), an error which he attributes to homoeoteleuton with the end of the previous verse (*et deus clarificatus est in eo*).⁸ This is a reasonable assumption. However, Fuldensis and Sangallensis are not alone in this omission. Several Vulgate and Old Latin MSS also omit the first part of this verse (EGH*X*Z *a b c d ff²* l*), not to mention several prominent Greek MSS (P⁶⁶ \aleph * B C* D L W 1 579), and the Old Syriac Sinaiticus. Thus its absence in Fuldensis and Sangallensis, despite being present in all the other harmonies that Rathofer investigated, is inconclusive. This reading may be an error in Fuldensis, or may be a remnant of its Old Latin text. Sangallensis may have picked up this omission from Fuldensis, or may have bypassed Fuldensis entirely and gotten it from the Old Latin Diatessaron itself.⁹ The reading cannot be used to show what Rathofer desires to prove, that Sangallensis is dependent on Fuldensis.¹⁰

My investigation starts from the opposite end. Rather than beginning with how Fuldensis is different from the rest of the harmonized tradition, as Rathofer did, I have

⁸ See Rathofer's discussion in "Die Einwirkung des Fuldischen Evangelientextes auf den althochdeutschen 'Tatian': Abkehr von der Methode der Diatessaronforschung," in *Literatur und Sprache im europäischen Mittelalter: Festschrift f. Karl Langosch z. 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Alf Önnersfors, Johannes Rathofer, and Fritz Wagner; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973), 271.

⁹ Unfortunately, Petersen (*Tatian's Diatessaron*, 304) selected this reading as one of the examples he uses to explain Rathofer's conclusive results. Moreover, Petersen has seriously misread Rathofer here and reports that Fuldensis and Sangallensis both omit *et deus clarificatus est in eo* from John 13:31 and are alone in the tradition in reading *si deus clarificatus est in eo* in John 13:32, when in fact the opposite is the case. Rathofer, whose German is admittedly roundabout here, correctly states that it is after the last line in John 13:31 that the omission occurs (thus in 13:32).

¹⁰ A similar case is Fuldensis and Sangallensis' shared omission of all of John 14:14 (while keeping John 14:13 and 14:15), which Rathofer notes on p. 278. The same omission occurs in Old Latin *b*, Greek MSS X Λ * *f*¹ 565, and Syr^s. Again the data cannot preclude the possibility of contamination into the Diatessaronic stream and therefore render Sangallensis' dependence on Fuldensis inconclusive.

begun with how Fuldensis is different from the rest of the Vulgate tradition, and moved on from there. Rathofer was most interested in isolating Fuldensis and Sangallensis against other harmonies. I am interested in tracing all later harmonies' potential dependence on Fuldensis. Thus, although similar, my test is fundamentally different than Rathofer's and has the potential to produce more extensive and conclusive results.

My *Leitfehler* test is also similar to the work U. Schmid has done investigating the stemmatic relationships of more than a score of Latin harmonies, but it is different in the same crucial way. Like Rathofer, Schmid also begins with codicological and paratextual elements (the Preface, the *capitula*, etc.) and then moves to comparisons of the text. Schmid selects four "test passages" on which to do full collations for his assortment of MSS: (1) the baptism of Jesus; (2) the temptation of Jesus; (3) Gethsemane; and (4) the empty tomb. In performing these full collations (on what he estimates to be about 3% of the total harmony text), Schmid uses Fuldensis as the base text and compares all other harmonies to it, noting where they diverge. Such a process is excellent for uncovering stemmatic relationships between later harmonies, which is Schmid's goal. But it will not identify verses where Fuldensis has introduced errors into the tradition unless later harmonies fix those errors. In other words, if Fuldensis happens to have a unique reading that every later harmony faithfully copies, Schmid's collation will not uncover this variant, since every MS in his investigation agrees. My *Leitfehler* test, by contrast, begins with the unique errors in Fuldensis and then allows one to trace their presence or absence in other harmonies.¹¹ In these ways my work is different from the work that has gone

¹¹ This is not intended to be a criticism of Schmid's excellent work, which is effective on its own right for tracing the relationship particularly among later harmonies as they get further and further away from Fuldensis.

before me. To my knowledge, no other study has identified unique readings in Codex Fuldensis and used them to trace its relationship with later harmonies.

Selection and Use of the Leitfehler

To identify the *Leitfehler*, I began by collating the text of Fuldensis (F) against the Stuttgart critical edition of the Vulgate (Š), as described in chapter one. Where F diverged from Š, I noted it in my apparatus, along with any MS support on F's side, using the more complete apparatus in Wordsworth and White's edition of the Vulgate (which also includes some Old Latin readings). Where F appeared to be unique in the Latin tradition, I selected those readings as potential examples of *Leitfehler* in F.

From that larger list of apparently unique readings in my selections of F (about sixty), I further narrowed the field down to readings that appeared to be obvious errors in the text and could not otherwise be attributed to harmonistic choices or the result of conflating two texts together. As a gospel harmony, F exhibits a number of unique readings that do not seem to find parallels in any separated-gospel manuscripts, yet may have been introduced into the text for the sake of the harmony, perhaps to transition from one source text to another, or to adjust for the new harmonized context. Tracing these harmonized readings through later harmonies is fruitless, since we expect them to be there, and there is no way to determine whether their presence is attributable to dependence on Fuldensis or on an Old Latin Diatessaron, which presumably would have shared many of them. The key is to identify errors that we do not expect to be in the text.

From the list of obvious errors, I further had to narrow down to the types of errors a copyist would be unlikely to notice and fix. F exhibits occasional spelling errors or nonsensical words. For instance, at F 156:19 (John 13:27), the scribe omits the final *t* on

post. However, *pos* is not a Latin word, and a copier is unlikely to transmit this reading without correcting it.¹² So although these are obvious and generally unique errors, they do not make good *Leitfehler*, since they are too easily caught and corrected. The perfect *Leitfehler* is a variant reading that is both an obvious mistake and yet unlikely to be noticed, because the resulting Latin still makes good grammatical and contextual sense. In the case of Codex Fuldensis, the bulk of these types of errors are omissions due to homoeoteleuton or parablepsis, where a scribe leaves anywhere from one to several words out but the verse still flows.¹³ Then only a copyist who knows the text quite well, or who is consulting a second source while copying, will discover the error.

There is another advantage to focusing on errors of omission. These types of errors are much easier to trace across different languages. One of the frequent criticisms from those outside the field is that the method of isolating Diatessaronic readings is dependent on “textual trivia,” small changes in conjunctions, noun cases, verb tenses, synonyms, and the like.¹⁴ Such trivialities are notoriously difficult to identify accurately

¹² Indeed, the scribe of Codex Sangallensis does correct this error. Some other examples of this type of obvious error in F, most of which are corrected in Sangallensis, include: F 155:9 (Jn 13:11) dixi] dixit Š; F 158:9 (Jn 14:9) quomo] quomodo Š; F 164:6 (Jn 18:24) ponticem] pontificem Š; F 171:1 (Lk 23:32) cum cum] cum Š; F 171:16 (Mt 27:42) potes] potest Š; F 171:22 (Lk 23:43) padiso] paradiso Š; F 174:1 (Mt 28:1) sabbato] sabbati Š; F 178:8 (Lk 24:41) mirabantibus] mirantibus Š.

¹³ Some handbooks of textual criticism warn that accidental errors of omission may be weak candidates for *Leitfehler* because they can arise in different texts independently and therefore may not be distinctive enough (see, for example, Martin L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique: Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts* [Stuttgart: Teubner, 1973], 32, 42; but cf. D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008], 162., who includes “the absence of a significant block of text which may be ascribed to . . . oversight” as an example following his definition.) I readily acknowledge that several of the errors I have selected, in isolation, could arise independently. Two factors justify their selection: (1) I have consulted the critical editions of the Latin, Greek, and Syriac Gospels to ensure these are not common errors in the traditions, and eliminated any that were; (2) it is the cumulative effect of the shared errors that I am relying on to posit a relationship and not the individual presence of any one error.

¹⁴ On which, see Petersen, *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 360–61.

across multiple languages. I have tried to avoid such trivialities by limiting my selection of errors to those that best lend themselves to trans-lingual comparison.

For instance, one reading in F that was tempting to include among the *Leitfehler* involved the substitution in F 8:6 (Matt 2:6) of *iudex* (“judge”) for *dux* (“leader”), likely due to the similarity of the Latin words. Although there is a great deal of variance with how to translate this term (ἡγούμενος) from the Greek, no known Latin, Greek, or Syriac manuscript employs the equivalent of “judge,” making F unique.¹⁵ Indeed, the Latin side of Codex Sangallensis also reads *iudex* here. Its Old High German side, however, reads *tuomo*, which Schade notes in his lexicon can translate either *dux* or *iudex*.¹⁶ Moreover, the Liège Diatessaron here reads *richtre*, which Barnouw translates as “ruler,” but which consultation with a Middle Dutch lexicon reveals can also translate the Latin *iudex*.¹⁷ The results of including this variant in the *Leitfehler*, therefore, would be inconclusive, since it can never be demonstrated with certainty which reading—*iudex* or *dux*—a later harmony was translating.

I next took the resulting list of potential errors and further screened them against the best available critical editions of the Latin, Greek, and Syriac gospels, to confirm that the readings were truly unique to F.¹⁸ This is the step that Rathofer skipped, which

¹⁵ The range includes: princeps *b f q*; principes *g*¹; rex *E a* syr^{scp}; and ducator *k*.

¹⁶ Oskar Schade, *Altdeutsches Wörterbuch* (Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1882), 2:971.

¹⁷ S. v. *rechter* in the Middelnederlandsch Woordenboek provided by the Instituut voor Nederlandse Lexicologie (INL; online at <http://gtb.inl.nl>). A. J. Barnouw provides the English translation in the critical edition of the Liège Diatessaron by Plooij et al.

¹⁸ I list the critical editions I consulted in the appendix with the results. Of course, a textual critic is always dependent on the accuracy of the data that is available, as more than one Diatessaronic scholar has learned the hard way. If the information in these critical editions is incorrect or incomplete, then my results will be as well. For this reason I have relied on the most up-to-date editions available and cross-referenced them when possible.

renders some of his results inconclusive. Without this control, there is no way to ensure that a given reading did not graft itself into the Diatessaronic family tree from a neighboring orchard. On multiple occasions, this step revealed outside support for a reading that had otherwise appeared to be unique in F, usually upon the discovery of Old Latin agreement that Wordsworth and White do not list, but occasionally on the discovery of Greek or Syriac agreement as well.

The above filtering took my initial list of sixty down to fifteen final readings that I have identified as *Leitfehler* in F that warrant tracing in later harmonies. These fifteen *Leitfehler* are drawn only from the selections I transcribed and translated in chapters two through four. Of these fifteen *Leitfehler*, three come from the Birth Narrative (F 2-11), two come from the Sermon on the Mount (F 23-44), and the remaining ten come from the Passion Narrative (F 154-173). As a final filter, I also screened these fifteen readings against the Arabic Diatessaron. Should the Arabic Diatessaron happen to agree with Fuldensis in the variant, it raises the possibility that the alleged *Leitfehler* is actually a Diatessaronic reading and not an error after all. Only in a single case (#12), does the Arabic Diatessaron agree with Fuldensis, which I have left in for the purposes of illustration. With the *Leitfehler* properly screened and selected, the final step in my investigation was to trace their presence or absence in the two selected Western harmonies, Codex Sangallensis (Sg) and the Liège Diatessaron (Li).

Results

I have tabulated the complete results of my fifteen *Leitfehler* tests in the appendix, where the reader is welcome to review the details. I will assess some examples here that are illustrative of the whole and then summarize the larger results. The first example is

reading #5 from F 37:1 (Matt 6:19), in the Sermon on the Mount. In the standard Vulgate reading, Jesus says not to store up treasures *ubi erugo et tinea demolitur ubi fures effodiunt et furantur*. But F has omitted the underlined section (“where thieves dig up and steal”), likely due to homoeoteleuton with the *-tur* ending. In the next verse, F includes its corollary (“where thieves do not dig up or steal”) despite the prior omission. This passage comes from a Matthew-only section of the harmony, so the omission is not a result of harmonizing. No known Latin, Greek, or Syriac MSS parallel the omission. The Arabic Diatessaron does not have the omission, so it is unlikely to be a Diatessaronic reading. Codex Sangallensis, however, *does* repeat the omission. The Liège Diatessaron, on the other hand, does not.

A similar example is reading #10 from F 160:11 (John 15:11). The context is the Johannine Farewell Discourse, so there is no risk of harmonization. F includes practically all of John 15-17 in one chapter. Where Jesus normally tells the disciples that he has said these things so that “my joy may be in you and your joy may be complete” (*ut gaudium meum in vobis sit et gaudium vestrum impleatur*), F omits the underlined phrase to read, “that my joy may be complete.” Although the reading still makes grammatical sense, it is an obvious case of homoeoteleuton with the *-um* ending. No known Latin, Greek, or Syriac MSS parallel the omission, nor does the Arabic Diatessaron. Again, however, Codex Sangallensis repeats the omission, while the Liège Diatessaron does not.

Although not all of the data are as clean cut, the vast majority of the readings proceed as in the case of the first two examples. There are three exceptions, two where Sangallensis does not follow Fuldensis, and one where Liège does. The first counter example is reading #4 from F 27:2 (Matt 5:22), in the Sermon on the Mount. Where Jesus

normally warns that calling one's brother "racha" will make one liable to the council, and calling him a fool will make one liable to the fire of Gehenna, F skips over a section so that the one who calls his brother "racha" is directly liable to the fire of Gehenna. No known Latin, Greek, or Syriac MSS parallel the omission, nor does the Arabic Diatessaron. However, neither Codex Sangallensis nor the Liège Diatessaron follows Fuldensis in the reading. It is possible that the passage is familiar enough that a copyist would notice its absence.¹⁹

The second counter example is reading #9 from F 158:27 (John 14:28), in the Passion Narrative. F includes a unique reading in which Jesus tells the disciples that he is going and *not* coming back to them (*ego dixi uobis uado et non uenio ad uos*). There is no obvious explanation for the addition beyond simple error. No known Latin, Greek, or Syriac MSS parallel the addition, nor does the Arabic Diatessaron. However, once again, neither Codex Sangallensis nor the Liège Diatessaron follows Fuldensis in the reading. In this case in particular it is likely that the error was simply too easy to spot, despite being grammatically correct.

The final counter example is reading #12 from F 162:25 (Matt 26:56), in the Passion Narrative. Jesus traditionally says to the mob that has come to arrest him that "all this has happened that the Scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled." But in F Jesus omits "all" (*totum*). However, the omission of *totum* may possibly be a Diatessaronic reading, since the Arabic Diatessaron also omits *totum* here. (This is the only reading of the fifteen where the Arabic Diatessaron and F agree.) On the other hand, it is also possible that the Arabic Diatessaron picked up the omission from the Syriac Peshitta,

¹⁹ Indeed, this is the reasoning Rathofer offers for its inclusion in Sangallensis despite its absence in Fuldensis ("Die Einwirkung des Fuldischen Evangelientextes," 283).

which likewise omits *totum*, especially since the Old Syriac Sinaiticus does not omit it. Both Sangallensis and Liège omit *totum* here. This is the only case where all four Diatessaronic witnesses (Fuldensis, the Arabic harmony, Sangallensis, and the Liège harmony) agree.

The final results are telling. In thirteen of the fifteen readings (87%), Codex Sangallensis follows the *Leitfehler* of Codex Fuldensis.²⁰ Similarly, in fourteen of the fifteen readings (93%), the Liège Diatessaron does *not* follow the *Leitfehler* of Codex Fuldensis. In other words, in only two cases (#4 and #9, discussed above) does Codex Sangallensis not repeat what appears to be a unique error in Fuldensis, whereas in only one case (#12, discussed above) can the Liège harmony be said to have followed an apparently unique error in Fuldensis, and this is the one reading that the Arabic Diatessaron's agreement suggests may be Diatessaronic.

It is important to consider what these results can and cannot demonstrate. A test of this nature can only demonstrate the likelihood of relationship between manuscripts; it cannot demonstrate the lack of relationship. In other words, the sharing of multiple *Leitfehler* suggests either one manuscript is (directly or indirectly) dependent on another, or they are both dependent on a common archetype. But disagreement on *Leitfehler* does not prove that a later manuscript is independent of an earlier manuscript, for it is always possible that the later manuscript is but a careful revision of the earlier one, with all the *Leitfehler* removed. That is the nature of *Leitfehler*; they are errors and could be caught and corrected at any time.

²⁰ I have not discussed reading #13, where the Latin side of Sangallensis agrees with Fuldensis but the Old High German side does not; since, however, the scribe then corrected the Latin side, I am concluding that the correction occurred before or while translating the Old High German side, which would account for its correct reading.

In the case of Codex Sangallensis, the evidence is clear that it almost always repeats the *Leitfehler* in Codex Fuldensis. One must now explain how Sangallensis acquired these indicative errors if not through Fuldensis. Either Sangallensis is a direct copy of Fuldensis, an indirect copy of Fuldensis (by means of one or more intermediary copies), or descends from the same exemplar (with the same *Leitfehler*) as Fuldensis. Could that potential exemplar have been an Old Latin Diatessaron, from which both Fuldensis and Sangallensis picked up the *Leitfehler*? This would mean, however, that when the *Vorlage* of Fuldensis was vulgatized, the vulgatizer somehow left all these *Leitfehler* in the text, and Sangallensis independently picked up these same *Leitfehler* from the Old Latin Diatessaron. Such a scenario is obviously unreasonable. Far more likely is that Sangallensis is directly or indirectly descended from Fuldensis. Since Sangallensis was copied at Fulda in the ninth century, where Fuldensis had been housed since the early eighth century, its direct descent from Fuldensis is more likely. More importantly, the very clear relationship that emerges between Fuldensis and Sangallensis through the *Leitfehler* is confirmation that they are well-chosen and have the potential to shed light on other harmonies' relationships with Fuldensis.

In the case of the Liège Diatessaron, on the other hand, the evidence is clear that it almost never repeats the *Leitfehler* in Codex Fuldensis. Although it would have been desirable to demonstrate some kind of relationship, negative results are still progress. My test shows that a simple line cannot be drawn from the Liège Diatessaron directly back to Fuldensis. If the Latin harmony from which the Liège Diatessaron was translated does eventually go back to Codex Fuldensis, it has gone through careful revisions and corrections, and likely one or more intermediaries. Of course, one cannot infer from this

test that the Liège harmony is conclusively *independent* of Fuldensis, for the reasons stated above. There may yet be a line from Fuldensis to the Liège Diatessaron.

Ultimately, these results suggest that there is still other work to be done in order to dislodge the Liège harmony from its Old Latin pedestal.

Final Thoughts

The collection of fifteen *Leitfehler* came only from those selected sections of Codex Fuldensis that I transcribed and translated in chapters two through four, which comprise about one third of the total harmony. By extrapolation, we may expect that a careful collation of the complete edition will produce some forty to fifty total *Leitfehler* that can be used to test later Western harmonies' relationships to Codex Fuldensis, and thereby continue to disentangle the Old Latin Diatessaron web.²¹

A byproduct of my careful screening of the seemingly unique readings in Fuldensis further revealed just how many of those readings actually have Old Latin support and are not unique after all—far more than many Diatessaronic scholars have often surmised.²² Furthermore, while collecting the *Leitfehler* I also set aside several more potentially unique readings that are probably not errors, but harmonistic choices in the text. Some of these readings produced such convoluted Latin that they may well

²¹ Of course, such an extrapolation is only surmise and the final number will remain to be seen. However, since the Passion Narrative is approximately three times the length of the Birth Narrative and also three times the length of the Sermon on the Mount, and since it also produced approximately three times the number of *Leitfehler* of each of those sections, the extrapolation may well be justified, assuming the *Leitfehler* are more or less evenly distributed. Since I have collected evidence from the beginning, middle, and end of the harmony, there is no reason to suspect at this time that the scribe increased or decreased in precision as the copying went on. Furthermore, I have transcribed sections of the Gospels that are relatively well-known; we may well expect to find more *Leitfehler* in some of the less rehearsed portions of the Gospels elsewhere in the harmony.

²² This assessment agrees with Fischer, who notes in passing that not a few Old Latin readings have remained in the text; see “Bibelausgaben des frühen Mittelalters,” in *La Bibbia nell’alto Medioevo* (SSAM 10; Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1963), 550.

reveal something about the language from which the Latin Diatessaron was translated.²³

Between them, these Old Latin readings and harmonized readings may contain some legitimate Diatessaronic readings, previously overlooked because Fuldensis has long been considered a barren witness to the text of the *Diatessaron*. The same was once thought of the Arabic Diatessaron, until T. Baarda began carefully analyzing its text and revealed that it contains a surprising number of readings that go back to an earlier form of the *Diatessaron*.²⁴ Notably, Petersen attributes the lack of attention to the Arabic Diatessaron to the “insurmountable obstacles” of the “poor editions and translations” available.²⁵ I believe the same is likely to be the case with Codex Fuldensis. Now that a new edition and translation will soon be available, these are the next steps toward getting to the bottom of Tatian’s *Diatessaron*.

²³ For the best examples, see the commentary at F 156:2 (Mt 26:18); F 157:15 (Lk 22:33); F 160:61 (Jn 17:1); F 161:5 (Mk 14:33); F 163:6 (Lk 22:57); F 170:6 (Jn 19:17); and F 177:2 (Lk 24:13). Two of the most significant are F 160:61 and 163:6. In both, F transposes a word normally spoken by someone in the vocative case (*dixit pater; dicens mulier*) to an indirect object outside the speech (*ad patrem dixit; dicens mulieri*). This transposition is readily explained if the source language did not have case endings (as in Syriac, but not Greek), rendering the grammatical position of the noun ambiguous.

²⁴ For two early examples out of many, see Tjitze Baarda, “An Archaic Element in the Arabic Diatessaron? (T^A 46:18 = John XV 2),” *NovT* 17 (1975): 151–55; Tjitze Baarda, “To the Roots of the Syriac Diatessaron Tradition (T^A 25:1-3),” *NovT* 28 (1986): 1–25.

²⁵ *Tatian’s Diatessaron*, 310 n. 132.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

Leitfehler in Codex Fuldensis

Explanation of the Data

The following *Leitfehler* are a collection of “indicative errors” that I have isolated as unique readings in Codex Fuldensis which can be used to test a later harmony’s relationship to Fuldensis. I describe my process for isolating them in chapter five. They are numbered sequentially here from the beginning of the harmony to the end. There are fifteen total: three from the Birth Narrative (F 2-11), two from the Sermon on the Mount (F 23-44), and ten from the Passion Narrative (F 154-173). The template for each reading follows on the next page, with the critical editions used to collect the data noted on each line.

Each reading begins with the apparatus listing followed by the relevant line of text as it appears in Codex Fuldensis (F) and in the Stuttgart Vulgate (Š), with the differences underlined for clarity. The next line is a short comment on the significance of the reading. The next four lines present the relevant variants in the Vulgate (Vg), Old Latin (It), Greek (Gk), and Syriac (Syr) traditions. On these lines, I do not list every variant present in every tradition, but only those relevant to the reading at hand. Where there are no relevant variants to report in a given tradition, I place two n-dashes (--) on the line. The next three lines note whether the Arabic Diatessaron (T^{ar}), Codex Sangallensis (Sg), and the Liège Diatessaron (Li) agree with F or Š in the reading. In the case of Codex Sangallensis agreement signifies both the Latin and Old High German columns unless otherwise specified. The last line offers my conclusions on the reading.

(#) **Apparatus listing**

F *Latin text in context*

Š *Latin text in context*

Comment on the significance of the reading

Vg *Relevant readings in the Vulgate tradition*¹

It *Relevant readings in the Old Latin tradition*²

Gk *Relevant readings in the Greek tradition*³

Syr *Relevant readings in the Syriac tradition*⁴

T^{ar} *Does the Arabic Diatessaron agree with F or Š?*⁵

Sg *Does Codex Sangallensis agree with F or Š?*⁶

Li *Does the Liège Diatessaron agree with F or Š?*⁷

Conclusions

¹ Robert Weber and Roger Gryson, eds., *Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* (5th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007); J. Wordsworth and H. J. White, *Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi latine: Secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi: Pars Prior—Quattuor Euangelia* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1889-98).

² Adolf Jülicher, Walter Matzkow, and Kurt Aland, eds., *Itala: Das neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung* (4 vols., 2d ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963-76); Philip Burton et al., “Vetus latina iohannes: The Verbum Project: The Old Latin Manuscripts of John’s Gospel”, December 2010, n.p. [cited 25 January 2014]. Online: <http://www.iohannes.com/vetuslatina/index.html>.

³ Barbara Aland et al., eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (28th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012); Constantin von Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece: Editio octava critica maior* (2 vols., 8th ed.; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1869-72); S. C. E. Legg, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece: Secundum textum Westcotto-Hortianum: Euangelium secundum Marcum* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1935); S. C. E. Legg, ed., *Novum Testamentum Graece: Secundum textum Westcotto-Hortianum: Euangelium secundum Matthaeum* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1940); The American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project, ed., *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1984-87).

⁴ George Anton Kiraz, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels: Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshittâ and Harklean Versions* (4 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1996). I list Old Syriac (where extant) and Peshitta readings, but not Harklean readings.

⁵ A.-S. Marmardji, *Diatessaron de Tatien: Texte arabe établi, traduit en français, collationné avec les anciennes versions syriaques* (Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique, 1935); J. Hamlyn Hill, *The Earliest Life of Christ Ever Compiled from the Four Gospels Being The Diatessaron of Tatian: Literally Translated from the Arabic Version and Containing the Four Gospels Woven into One Story* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1894); Hope W. Hogg, “The Diatessaron of Tatian,” in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (ed. Alan Menzies; vol. 9, 5th ed.; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1912), 33–138. References refer to the chapter and verse.

⁶ Achim Masser and Elisabeth De Felip-Jaud, *Die Lateinisch-althochdeutsche Tatianbilingue Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen Cod. 56* (StAhd 25; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994). References refer to the page numbers in the physical manuscript.

⁷ D. Plooiij et al., *The Liège Diatessaron* (8 vols.; VKAW 31.1-8; Amsterdam: Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1929-70). References refer to the fascicles of this edition.

Readings from the Birth Narrative (F 2–11)

(1) F 2:15 (Lk 1:19) missus sum] add. loqui Š

F et missus sum ad te
Š et missus sum loqui ad te

Gabriel says, “I was sent to you” instead of “I was sent to speak to you.” Special Luke material.

Vg loqui ad te] ad te loqui Codex Martini-Turonensis
It sum] *om. b* | loqui ad te] ad te loqui *c l q*
Gk --
Syr^p --

T^{ar} = Š (1:20)

Sg = F (p. 27)
Li = Š (Pl. 1:8)

Conclusions: Although there is some word order exchange in the Latin tradition, no known MS omits *loqui* except F. Sg agrees with F; Li does not.

(2) F 4:1 (Lk 1:57) suum] om. Š

F et peperit filium suum
Š et peperit filium

Elizabeth gives birth to “her son” rather than “a son.” Special Luke material.

Vg --
It --
Gk --
Syr^{sp} --

T^{ar} = Š (1:58)

Sg = F (p. 30)
Li = Š (Pl. 1:14)

Conclusions: Although minor, F’s addition of *suum* appears unique. Sg agrees with F; Li does not.

(3) F 5:14 (Mt 1:14) *eliachim*^{1,2}] *achim* Š

F saddoc autem genuit eliachim eliachim autem genuit eliud

Š saddoc autem genuit achim achim autem genuit eliud

F has changed Achim to Eliachim (cf. Matt 1:13). Special Matt material.

Vg --

It --

Gk --

Syr^{scp} --

T^{ar} = Š (appendix; Marmardji p. 533)

Note: In one recension of T^{ar} (B E O), the genealogies appear in an appendix to the text; in the other recension (A C), they appear near the beginning of the main text.

Marmardji's edition of the genealogies appears to be based on A and E, which agree in this instance.

Sg = F (p. 33); Sg^{lat} *eliachim*^{1,2}] :::*achim* (erasure); Sg^{ohg} untouched

Li = Š (Pl. 1:19)

Conclusions: F is unique in reading *eliachim* instead of *achim* in this verse, an obvious error. Sg has *eliachim* in both columns, but the *eli* was later erased on just the Latin side. Li reads *achim*.

Readings from the Sermon on the Mount (F 23–44)

(4) F 27:2 (Mt 5:22) reus erit gehennae ignis] reus erit concilio qui autem dixerit fatue reus erit gehennae ignis Š

F qui autem dixerit fratri suo racha reus erit gehennae ignis

Š qui autem dixerit fratri suo racha reus erit concilio qui autem dixerit fatue reus erit gehennae ignis

F omits a large part of this verse, likely from parablepsis with *reus erit*, but the remaining sentence still makes sense. Special Matt material.

Vg --
It --
Gk --
Syr^{scp} --

T^{ar} = Š (8:51)

Sg = Š (p. 62)

Li = Š (Pl. 1:68-69)

Conclusions: Although F appears unique in this omission, neither Sg nor Li follows F. Rathofer notes the disagreement between F and Sg here and says it is to be expected that Sg will occasionally fix F's errors. Rathofer also notes that no other Latin harmony he investigated carries on F's omission here (including Casselanus, Munich Clm 23 977 and 10 025).⁸

(5) F 37:1 (Mt 6:19) demolitur] add. ubi fures effodiunt et furantur Š

F ubi erugo et tinea demolitur

Š ubi erugo et tinea demolitur ubi fures effodiunt et furantur

F omits the last third of Matt 6:19 ("where thieves dig up and steal"), perhaps by homoeoteleuton with *-tur*. In the next verse, F includes its corollary ("where thieves do not dig up or steal") despite the prior omission. Although this material is paralleled in Luke 12:33, F's wording here comes from Matt.

Vg --
It --
Gk --
Syr^{cp} --

T^{ar} = Š (9:44)

Sg = F (p. 69)

Li = Š (Pl. 1:78)

Conclusions: F appears unique in this omission. Sg follows F; Li does not.

⁸ Rathofer, "Die Einwirkung des Fuldischen Evangelientextes," 283.

Readings from the Passion Narrative (F 154–173)

(6) F 156:5 (Mk 14:16) eius] *add. et uenerunt in ciuitatem* Š

F et abierunt discipuli eius et inuenerunt sicut dixit eis

Š et abierunt discipuli eius et uenerunt in ciuitatem et inuenerunt sicut dixerat illis

Likely by parablepsis, F omits the line “and they went into the city,” while including the text before and after. The whole verse comes from Mark, and is framed by Markan material on either side. (F’s reading of *dixit eis* for *dixerat illis* has some Old Latin support and is inconsequential.)

Vg --

It et uenerunt] *add.* discipuli eius et uenit *d* | et inuenerunt] *om. k*

Gk οι μαθηται και ηλθον] *om.* 475* | και ηλθον] *om. 8**

Syr discipuli (*om. eius*)] *add.* sicut dixit eis (ܥܘܡܢ ܝܫܘܥܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ) syr^s; syr^p = Š

T^{ar} = Š (44:40)

Sg = F (p. 272)

Li = Š (Pl. 7:631)

Conclusions: Although this verse exhibits some fluidity in the various traditions (perhaps suggesting that it lends itself to error), no MS has the same omission as F, which therefore appears unique. Sg follows F; Li does not.

(7) F 156:9 (Jn 13:21) dixisset] *add. iesus* Š

F cum haec dixisset turbatus est spiritu

Š cum haec dixisset iesus turbatus est spiritu

F has left out the name “Jesus.” Otherwise the entire Johannine verse is present.

Vg --

It --

Gk --

Syr^{sp} --

T^{ar} = Š (44:44)

Sg = F (p. 273)

Li = Š (Pl. 7:640)

Conclusions: Although a minor omission, F appears to be unique in this reading. Sg follows F; Li does not.

(8) **F 158:12 (Jn 14:12) faciet] *add. et maiora horum faciet* Š**

F opera quae ego facio et ipse faciet quia ego ad patrem uado

Š opera quae ego facio et ipse faciet et maiora horum faciet quia ego ad patrem uado

Likely by parablepsis with *faciet*, F omits “and he will do greater things than these.”
Special John material (in a continuous block of nearly all of John 14).

Vg --

It et maiora horum faciet] *om. e*

Gk --

Syr^{sc̅p} --

T^{ar} = Š (45:40)

Sg = F (p. 279)

Li = Š (Pl. 7:651)

Conclusions: Although Old Latin *e* omits the identical phrase, the rest of the verse in *e* is so unlike F that it is probable the two simply made the same error independently.
Otherwise, F appears unique in its omission. Sg follows F; Li does not.

(9) **F 158:27 (Jn 14:28) non] *om.* Š**

F audistis quia ego dixi uobis uado et non uenio ad uos

Š audistis quia ego dixi uobis uado et uenio ad uos

F has Jesus tell the disciples he is going and *not* coming back. Special John material (in a continuous block of nearly all of John 14).

Vg --

It --

Gk --

Syr^{sc̅p} --

T^{ar} = Š (46:8)

Sg = Š (p. 281)

Li = Š (Pl. 7:656)

Conclusions: F appears alone in adding *non* to John 14:28, but neither Sg nor Li follows F in this reading.

(10) **F 160:11 (Jn 15:11) meum] add. in vobis sit et gaudium vestrum Š**

F ut gaudium meum impleatur

Š ut gaudium meum in vobis sit et gaudium vestrum impleatur

Likely due to homoeoteleuton, Jesus now tells the disciples that he has said these things so that *his* joy—and not the disciples’ joy—may be complete. Special John material (in a continuous block of John 15-17).

Vg --

It --

Gk --

Syr^{sp} --

T^{ar} = Š (46:27)

Sg = F (p. 284)

Li = Š (Pl. 7:661)

Conclusions: F appears unique in this omission. Sg follows F; Li does not.

(11) **F 160:61 (Jn 17:1) ad patrem dixit F^v] ad patrem F*; dixit pater Š**

F* et subleuatis oculis in caelum ad patrem uenit hora

F^v et subleuatis oculis in caelum ad patrem dixit uenit hora

Š et subleuatis oculis in caelum dixit pater uenit hora

F takes “Father” out of Jesus’ speech and moves it to be the object to whom Jesus is lifting his eyes. The scribe also omits *dixit*, which Victor adds in the margin. Special John material (in a continuous block of John 15-17).

Vg --

It --

Gk --

Syr^{sp} pater] pater mi (ܡܝܐܘܪܐ)

T^{ar} pater] pater mi (47:19)

Sg = F (p. 290)

Li = Š (Pl. 8:674-75)

Conclusions: F appears unique in this alternative reading. The change of *pater* to *ad patrem* may also lie behind the scribe’s initial omission of *dixit*. Sg takes up F’s reading, including the *dixit* from the margin; Li does not.

(14) F 171:10 (Jn 19:21) rex iudaeorum] *add. sed quia ipse dixit rex sum iudaeorum* Š

F noli scribere rex iudaeorum

Š noli scribere rex iudaeorum sed quia ipse dixit rex sum iudaeorum

The chief priests say to Pilate, “Do not write ‘king of the Jews,’” but (likely by parablepsis with *iudaeorum*) F cuts them off before they can say, “but that he said, ‘I am the king of the Jews.’” Special John material (in a small section just from John 19).

Vg sum] *om.* B

It rex iudaeorum] rex isdrahel *e* | ipse] ille *c e ff*²

Gk μη γραφε ο βασιλευς των ιουδαιων] *om.* Y

Syr^p --

T^{ar} = Š (51:33)

Sg = F (p. 315)

Li = Š (Pl. 8:737)

Conclusions: Only F appears to omit this phrase. Greek majuscule Y omits the prior phrase, likely also by parablepsis with ιουδαιων. Sg follows F; Li does not.

(15) F 173:1 (Mt 27:62) est] *add. post* Š

F altera autem die quae est parasceuen

Š altera autem die quae est post parasceuen

The omission of *post* muddles the chronology. The following scene should occur on the Sabbath, but now takes place the day before, despite the fact that the previous verse declared that the Sabbath was about to begin. Most likely the absence of *post* is accidental, as *parasceuen* is left in the accusative. Special Matt material.

Vg post] *om.* H*Y

It --

Gk --

Syr^{sp} --

T^{ar} altera...parasceuen] *om.* (52:40)

Sg = F (p. 322); the scribe initially left off *quae est parasceuen* from both columns, then added it to both sides in tighter print to fit; when adding it, however, the scribe corrected the accusative to a nominative (*quae est parasceue* = *thie dar ist frigetag*)

Li = Š (Pl. 8:756); Li has an expanded reading, but still includes *post*: *Des anders dags na din uridach din die yoeden heten parasceuen* (= “The next day after that Friday which the Jews call parasceven”)

Conclusions: Although F is not unique in omitting *post* in the Vulgate tradition, the other two MSS have likely made the same error independently, since the reading is nonsensical so long as *parasceuen* is accusative. That Sg is dependent on F is almost guaranteed by the fact that Sg’s scribe has corrected the grammar of F’s error not by adding *post* back in, but by changing *parasceuen* to *parasceue*. Li does not follow F. The Arabic Diatessaron omits the entire phrase.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Holger Strutwolf, eds. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 28th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.
- The American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project, ed. *The Gospel According to St. Luke*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1984-87.
- Baarda, Tjitze. "An Archaic Element in the Arabic Diatessaron? (T^A 46:18 = John XV 2)." *Novum Testamentum* 17 (1975): 151-55.
- . *The Gospel Quotations of Aphrahat the Persian Sage: Aphrahat's Text of the Fourth Gospel*. Amsterdam: Krips Repro B.V. Meppel, 1975.
- . "To the Roots of the Syriac Diatessaron Tradition (T^A 25:1-3)." *Novum Testamentum* 28 (1986): 1-25.
- Burton, Philip, Jon Balsarak, H. A. G Houghton, and D. C. Parker. "Vetus latina iohannes: The Verbum Project: The Old Latin Manuscripts of John's Gospel." December 2010. No pages. Cited 25 January 2014. Online: <http://www.iohannes.com/vetuslatina/index.html>.
- Baesecke, Georg. *Die Überlieferung des althochdeutschen Tatian*. Hallische Monographien 4. Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1948.
- Baumstark, Anton. *Die Vorlage des althochdeutschen Tatian*. Edited by Johannes Rathofer. Niederdeutsche Studien 12. Köln: Böhlau, 1964.
- Brock, Sebastian P. *An Introduction to Syriac Studies*. Piscataway, N. J.: Gorgias Press, 2006.
- De Bruyne, Donatien. "La préface du Diatessaron latin avant Victor de Capoue." *Revue bénédictine* 39 (1927): 5-11.
- Burkitt, F. C. *Evangelion Da-Mepharreshe: The Curetonian Version of the Four Gospels, with the Readings of the Sinai Palimpsest and the Early Syriac Patristic Evidence*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904.
- Corssen, P. "Die Subskriptionen des Bischofs Victor in dem Codex Fuldensis." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums* 10 (1909): 175-77.

- Dobschütz, E. v. "Wann las Victor von Capua sein Neues Testament?" *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums* 10 (1909): 90–96.
- Fischer, Bonifatius. "Bibelausgaben des frühen Mittelalters." Pages 519–600, 685–704 in *La Bibbia nell'alto Medioevo*. Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 10. Spoleto: Presso la Sede del Centro, 1963.
- . "Das neue Testament in lateinischer Sprache: Der gegenwärtige Stand seiner Erforschung und seine Bedeutung für die griechische Textgeschichte." Pages 1–92 in *Die alten Übersetzungen des neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare*. Edited by K. Aland. Arbeiten zur neutestamentlichen Textforschung 5. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972.
- Hausmann, Regina. *Die theologischen Handschriften der Hessischen Landesbibliothek Fulda bis zum Jahr 1600*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1992.
- Hill, J. Hamlyn. *The Earliest Life of Christ Ever Compiled from the Four Gospels Being The Diatessaron of Tatian: Literally Translated from the Arabic Version and Containing the Four Gospels Woven into One Story*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1894.
- Hogg, Hope W. "The Diatessaron of Tatian." Pages 33–138 in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Alan Menzies. Vol. 9. 5th ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1912.
- Hollander, August den, and Ulrich Schmid. "The Gospel of Barnabas, the Diatessaron, and Method." *Vigiliae Christianae* 61 (2007): 1–20.
- Hunt, Emily J. *Christianity in the Second Century: The Case of Tatian*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Joosse, N. Peter. "An Introduction to the Arabic Diatessaron." *Oriens Christianus* 83 (1999): 74–129.
- . *The Sermon on the Mount in the Arabic Diatessaron*. Amsterdam: Centrale Huisdrukkerij VU, 1997.
- Joosten, Jan. "The Dura Parchment and the Diatessaron." *Vigiliae Christianae* 57 (2003): 159–75.
- . "The Gospel of Barnabas and the Diatessaron." *Harvard Theological Review* 95 (2002): 73–96.
- . Review of Ulrich B. Schmid, *Unum ex quattuor: Eine Geschichte der lateinischen Tatianüberlieferung*. *Gnomon* 80 (2008): 19–22.

- Jülicher, Adolf, Walter Matzkow, and Kurt Aland, eds. *Itala: Das neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung*. 4 vols. 2d ed. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963-76.
- Kiraz, George Anton. *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels: Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshîttâ and Harklean Versions*. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Koltun-Fromm, Naomi. "Re-imagining Tatian: The Damaging Effects of Polemical Rhetoric." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 16 (2008): 1–30.
- Legg, S. C. E., ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece: Secundum textum Westcotto-Hortianum: Euangelium secundum Marcum*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1935.
- , ed. *Novum Testamentum Graece: Secundum textum Westcotto-Hortianum: Euangelium secundum Matthaeum*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1940.
- Marmardji, A.-S. *Diatessaron de Tatien: Texte arabe établi, traduit en français, collationné avec les anciennes versions syriaques*. Beyrouth: Imprimerie Catholique, 1935.
- Maas, Paul. *Textual Criticism*. Translated by Barbara Flower. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Masser, Achim, and Elisabeth De Felip-Jaud. *Die Lateinisch-althochdeutsche Tatianbilingue Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen Cod. 56*. Studien zum Althochdeutschen 25. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.
- McCarthy, Carmel. *Saint Ephrem's Commentary on Tatian's Diatessaron: An English Translation of Chester Beatty Syriac MS 709*. *Journal of Semitic Studies* Supplement 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- McFall, Leslie. "Tatian's Diatessaron: Mischievous or Misleading?" *Westminster Theological Journal* 56 (1994): 87–114.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- Metzger, Bruce M., and Bart D. Ehrman. *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Nestle, Eberhard. "Die Eusebianische Evangelien-Synopse." *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* 19 (1908): 40–51, 93–114, 219–32.
- Nida, Eugene A., and Charles R. Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill, 1969.

- Parker, D. C. *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- . Review of Nicholas Perrin, *Thomas and Tatian: The Relationship between the Gospel of Thomas and the Diatessaron*. *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 8 (2003). No pages. Cited 18 September 2012. Online: <http://rosetta.reltech.org/TC/v08/Perrin2003rev.html>.
- Parker, D. C., David G. K. Taylor, and Mark S. Goodacre. “The Dura-Europos Gospel Harmony.” Pages 192–228 in *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts*. Edited by David G. K. Taylor. Birmingham: University of Birmingham Press, 1999.
- Peters, Curt. *Das Diatessaron Tatians*. Orientalia christiana analecta 123. Rome: Pont. institutum orientalium studiorum, 1939.
- Petersen, William L. “From Justin to Pepys: The History of the Harmonized Gospel Tradition.” *Studia Patristica* 30 (1997): 71–96.
- . “The Diatessaron of Tatian.” Pages 77–96 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- . *Tatian’s Diatessaron: Its Creation, Dissemination, Significance, and History in Scholarship*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Plooij, Daniel. *A Further Study of the Liège Diatessaron*. Leiden: Brill, 1925.
- . *A Primitive Text of the Diatessaron: The Liège Manuscript of a Mediaeval Dutch Translation: A Preliminary Study*. Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff, 1923.
- Plooij, D., A. J. Barnouw, C. A. Phillips, and A. H. A. Bakker. *The Liège Diatessaron*. 8 vols. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen 31.1-8. Amsterdam: Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, 1929-70.
- Quispel, Gilles. *Tatian and the Gospel of Thomas: Studies in the History of the Western Diatessaron*. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Ranke, Ernst. *Codex Fuldensis: Novum Testamentum Latine Interprete Hieronymo*. Marburg: Sumtibus N.G. Elwertii Bibliopolae Academici, 1868.
- Rathofer, Johannes. “Die Einwirkung des Fuldischen Evangelientextes auf den althochdeutschen ‘Tatian’: Abkehr von der Methode der Diatessaronforschung.” Pages 256–308 in *Literatur und Sprache im europäischen Mittelalter: Festschrift f. Karl Langosch z. 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Alf Önnersfors, Johannes Rathofer, and Fritz Wagner. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1973.

- . “‘Tatian’ und Fulda: Die St. Galler Handschrift und der Victor-Codex.” Pages 337–56 in *Zeiten und Formen in Sprache und Dichtung: Festschrift f. Fritz Tschirch z. 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Karl Heinz Schirmer and Bernhard Sowinski. Köln: Böhlau, 1972.
- Schade, Oskar. *Altdeutsches Wörterbuch*. Halle: Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1882.
- Scherer, Carl. “Die Codices Bonifatiani in der Landesbibliothek zu Fulda.” Pages 1–37 in *Festgabe zum Bonifatius-Jubiläum 1905*. Fulda: Fuldaer Actiendruckerei, 1905.
- Schmid, Ulrich. “The Diatessaron of Tatian.” Pages 115–42 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. 2d ed. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- . “In Search of Tatian’s Diatessaron in the West.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 57 (2003): 176–99.
- . *Unum ex quattuor: Eine Geschichte der lateinischen Tatianüberlieferung*. Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 37. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2005.
- Sievers, Eduard. *Tatian: Lateinisch und altdeutsch mit ausführlichem Glossar*. 2d ed. Bibliothek der ältesten deutschen Literatur-Denkmäler 5. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1892.
- Tischendorf, Constantin von. *Novum Testamentum Graece: Editio octava critica maior*. 2 vols. 8th ed. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1869-72.
- Vogels, Heinrich Joseph. *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Diatessaron im Abendland*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 8.1. Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1919.
- Vööbus, Arthur. *Early Versions of the New Testament*. Stockholm: Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 1954.
- Weber, Robert, and Roger Gryson, eds. *Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem*. 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.
- West, Martin L. *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique: Applicable to Greek and Latin Texts*. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1973.
- Whittaker, Molly. *Tatian: Oratio ad Graecos and Fragments*. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- . “Tatian’s Educational Background.” *Studia Patristica* 13 (1975): 57–59.
- Wordsworth, J., and H. J. White. *Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi latine: Secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi: Pars Prior—Quattuor Euangelia*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1889-98.

Zahn, Theodor. *Tatian's Diatessaron*. Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur 1. Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1881.

———. “Zur Geschichte von Tatians Diatessaron im Abendland.” *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* 5 (1894): 85–120.

Zuntz, Günther. *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum*. The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1946. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.