

# STAGES OF THE HARKLEAN TRADITION AND THE PROCESS OF ITS “BYZANTINIZATION” IN THE EXAMPLE OF THE GOSPEL OF LUKE IN THE MS CHALDEAN 25 OF ALQOSH<sup>1</sup>

PIOTR JUTKIEWICZ

THE PONTIFICAL BIBLICAL INSTITUTE

## ABSTRACT

*Andreas Juckel has shown that MS Vat. Sir. 268 is the best witness to the Harklean text of the Gospels, since its text is less “byzantinized” than the other manuscripts. However, the complexity of the particular features of the Harklean version (variant readings in the margin and “critical signs” in the text) and their transmission history elude easy and conclusive solutions. This paper illustrates that the process of “Byzantinization” of the Harklean text was not a unilateral development, but rather a complex and multidimensional transformation that still needs more research, as even late Harklean manuscripts may preserve ancient and original readings. MS Chaldean 25*

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to express my gratitude to the anonymous reviewers for helping me to develop a more complete version of this paper. I am also grateful to Fr. Paul Bechter (Dallas, USA) who kindly proofread and edited the English.

*of Alqosh, which lays at the dawn of the new revision of the Harklean version by Dionysios bar Salibi in the twelfth century, is helpful in tracing the process of these textual transformations.*

The Syriac translation of the New Testament by Thomas of Harkel, created at the monastery of Enaton near Alexandria at the beginning of the seventh century, still conceals many mysteries for NT scholarship. The Harklean version was most likely intended from the beginning to be a type of “scholarly edition (...), furnished with a critical apparatus,”<sup>2</sup> which consists of variant readings in the margin and signs in the text. Between 1778–1803 Joseph White published what for centuries remained its only edition [=White], but was based exclusively on late manuscripts.<sup>3</sup> The necessity of a critical edition has been widely acknowledged by scholars. The question, however, of the best witness to the Harklean text has remained open, because more than one hundred Harklean manuscripts survive but even the oldest among them have their flaws.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, a revisional development, likely deliberate, led to a progressive accommodation of this Syriac translation towards the Byzantine text-type. The Greek text of the Gospels was itself in

---

<sup>2</sup> A. Juckel, “Introduction to the Harklean Text”, in *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels. Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshîttâ and Harklean Versions*, ed. G. A. Kiraz (Leiden: Brill 1996) I, xxxii–xxxiii.

<sup>3</sup> Oxford, *New College Library*, MS 333 (twelfth/thirteenth century) [=NC333], with lacunae completed from the Oxford, *New College Library*, MS 334 (twelfth/thirteenth century) [=NC334] and Oxford, *Bodleian Library*, MS Or. 361 (fourteenth century). All examined manuscripts are reported with their full names only the first time they appear in this paper. Later, they are referred to with their abbreviations, introduced within the square brackets.

<sup>4</sup> J. D. Thomas, “A List of Manuscripts Containing the Harklean Syriac Version of the New Testament” (*ThRev* II/2 [1979]) 26–32. His list contains 129 manuscripts in total. Among these more or less 60 contain the gospels.

a state of development and gradually influenced scribes who copied Harklean manuscripts. As a result, both of the typical Harklean features, namely critical signs in the text (*asteriskoi* and *obeloi*) and variant readings in the margin, often differ among the manuscripts. The consistency of the transmission of these features over time (or its absence) may argue for the quality of the manuscripts and reveal stages of the Harklean tradition.

Andreas Juckel, among the leading Harklean scholars, has long argued for the precedence of Vatican, *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, Vat. Sir. 268 (eighth/ninth century) [=V268] for determining the Harklean original and producing its critical edition. He established MS V268 as the less “byzantinized” text with respect to other early witnesses. However, a new chapter for the Harklean research began in 2015 with the publication of the critical edition by Samer Soreshow Yohanna.<sup>5</sup> His edition of the Gospel of Mark presented the full text of Alqosh, *Chaldean Antonian Order of St. Hormizd*, Chaldean 25 [=C25]<sup>6</sup> with its

---

<sup>5</sup>S. S. Yohanna, *The Gospel of Mark in the Syriac Harklean Version. An Edition Based upon the Earliest Witnesses*, BibOr 52 (Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2015).

<sup>6</sup>MS C25 was dated by Yohanna to ninth/tenth century. Juckel proposed different date ranges for this manuscript in 2017: tenth–thirteenth cent. (A. Juckel, “La version harqléenne du Nouveau Testament: forme, intention, tradition”, in *Le Nouveau Testament en syriaque*, ed. J.-C. Haelewyck (Études syriaques 14; Paris: Geuthner 2017) 174) and in the same paper eleventh/twelfth cent. (Juckel, “La version harqléenne”, 175) and in 2018: tenth/eleventh cent. (A. Juckel, “Review of: Samer S. Yohanna, *The Gospel of Mark in the Syriac Harklean Version. An Edition Based upon the Earliest Witnesses*” (*Hugoye* 21:1 [2018]) 209). MS C25 was, however, not mentioned by Juckel among the best Harklean witnesses (A. Juckel, “Die Bedeutung des Ms. Vat. Syr. 268 für die Evangelien-Überlieferung der Harklensis” (*Oriens Christianus* 83 [1999]) 33–35). Scher (and Thomas after him) previously dated MS C to the thirteenth cent. (A. Scher, “Notice sur les Manuscrits Syriaques Conservés dans la Bibliothèque du Couvent des Chaldéens de Notre Dame des Semences” (*JA* Tome VII/Dixième Série

critical signs, marginal readings and critical apparatuses that offer textual variants from thirteen other manuscripts. The C25 manuscript had not been studied before nor used in the previous editions of the Harklean version.<sup>7</sup> The choice of this manuscript has been critiqued by Juckel, who argued that MS C25 “reflects a pre-history of the revisional stage” and, thus, presents a text which belongs to an intermediate stage between the “original” Harklean (seventh century) and a late correction of it, preserved in MSS NC334 and London, *British Library*, Add. 17124 (1233/34 CE.) [=BL17124] and called by him the “Dionysios bar Salibi stage” (twelfth century).<sup>8</sup> This last “Dionysios-stage” still needs, however, more research, first of all in a more precise description of the textual resemblance of these two manuscripts. For this very reason, MS C25 is worth much more scholarly attention. This manuscript preserves a wealth of Harklean features and stands in-between the two extremes of the Harklean tradition (the “original” stage and “Dionysios-stage”), thus providing unique insights about transformations in development between them and revealing a more balanced view on the process of the “Byzantinization” of the Harklean tradition.

MS C25 will be compared in this paper with MS V268. The best test-field in this regard is the Gospel of Luke, which has

---

[1906]) 483). Also van Rompay suggested recently that a later date (eleventh/twelfth cent.) cannot be entirely ruled out (L. Van Rompay, “Review of: Samer Soreshow YOHANNA, *The Gospel of Mark in the Syriac Harklean Version. An Edition Based upon the Earliest Witnesses*” (*Orientalia* 88/3 [2019]) 331).

<sup>7</sup> G. A. Kiraz, *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels. Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshîttâ and Harklean Versions. Volume Three. Luke*, (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 1996) [=CESG]; P. A. L. Hill, *The Harklean Version of St. Luke 1–11. A Critical Edition and Introduction*, (University of Melbourne: unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, 2002).

<sup>8</sup> Juckel, “Review of: Yohanna, *The Gospel of Mark*,” 205–217 (here 212–215); Juckel, “Introduction,” xxxvii–xxxix.

served as the basis for previous studies by Juckel.<sup>9</sup> The comparison of these two manuscripts is undertaken in three steps: analysis of the process of Graecization of the proper names (see 2), analysis of the Harklean margin (see 3), and analysis of the critical signs in the Harklean lemma (see 4). Then, these results are further compared with the manuscripts believed to be witnesses of the “Dionysios-stage” in order to determine how far or far close is MS C25 related to that stage. All of this will finally allow to evaluate MS C25’s relevance for the study of the Harklean Gospels.

## 1. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Juckel’s studies included a broader comparison of MS V268 with other Harklean manuscripts. In this paper, as well, some of them are occasionally checked in order to ascertain or confirm particular readings (their dating is given here according to Juckel): Dublin, *Chester Beatty Library* Syr. 703 (previously Syr. 3, 1177 CE, copied from a model from 841 CE) [=D], Damascus, *Syriac Orthodox Patriarchate*, 12–8 (1055 CE) [=E], “unknown manuscript” (ninth/tenth cent.)<sup>10</sup> [=G], Birmingham, *Cadbury Research Library*, Mingana Syr. 124 (ninth/tenth cent.) [=M], Vatican, *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, Vat. Sir. 267 (eighth cent.) [=V267], Florence, *Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana*, Plut. 1.40 (756 CE) [=F]. Late manuscripts, believed to be connected with the so-called “Dionysios-stage,” are also cited (three of these were already mentioned above): NC333, NC334, BL17124

---

<sup>9</sup>Juckel’s research on the Harklean Gospel of Luke has appeared mainly in three papers: A. Juckel, “Zur Revisionsgeschichte der Harklensis”, in *Bericht der Hermann Kunst-Stiftung zur Förderung der Neutestamentischen Textforschung für die Jahre 1992 bis 1994* (Münster – Westfalen: 1995) 50–68; A. Juckel, “Ms Vat. Syr. 268 and the Revisional Development of the Harklean Margin” (*Hugoye* 11 [1998]) 19–33; Juckel, “Die Bedeutung,” 22–45 (this is a more developed version of the previous one).

<sup>10</sup>Juckel cites this manuscript saying that he cannot name its proprietary.

and Paris, *Bibliothèque Nationale de France*, Syriac 362 (twelfth/ thirteenth cent.) [=BF362].

First, it should be noted that Juckel has omitted from his study several marginal readings and *asteriskoi* for reasons that are not always clear.<sup>11</sup> Such an approach, however, risks losing the complete picture of the Harklean features and some particularities of the manuscripts in question. For this reason, in this paper all the marginal readings and critical signs in MS V286 and MS C25 are analyzed. Also, for the marginal readings, these results are compared separately with those reached by Juckel (see 3.2).

For the Greek text (and other versions) of the Gospel of Luke the classic editions have been consulted: Tischendorf's edition,<sup>12</sup> Swanson's New Testament Greek Manuscripts,<sup>13</sup> Nestle–Aland 28th edition [=NA28], along with more comprehensive modern editions: the IGHNT edition<sup>14</sup> and the CNTTS apparatus.<sup>15</sup> The

---

<sup>11</sup> 113 of 185 marginal readings of MS V268 were analyzed. The rest were omitted as Peshitta variants or on other grounds: "(...) die restlichen können entweder griechisch nicht eindeutig identifiziert oder aus anderen Gründen nicht kommentarlos dargeboten werden" (Juckel, "Die Bedeutung," 36–37). 57 of 79 *asteriskoi* were analyzed: "Die restlichen können hier gebotenen Kürze nicht dargestellt werden" (Juckel, "Die Bedeutung," 37).

<sup>12</sup> C. von Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece. Ad antiquissimos testes denuo recensuit apparatus criticum omni studio perfectum apposuit commentationem Isagogicam. Editio Octava Critica Maior*, (Lipsia: Giesecke & Devrient, <sup>8</sup>1869).

<sup>13</sup> R. J. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts. Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus. Luke*, (Sheffield – Pasadena, CA: Tyndale House, 1995).

<sup>14</sup> American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project (ed.), *The New Testament in Greek: The Gospel according to St. Luke. Part One: Chapters 1–12. Part Two: Chapters 13–24* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984–1987).

<sup>15</sup> *The Center for New Testament Textual Studies NT Critical Apparatus* (revised edition), New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary 2014,

Greek text is presented without diacritics. All analyzed material has been also compared with the Old Syriac and Peshitta versions.<sup>16</sup> For these Syriac versions the CESG has been used. Unfortunately, due to the large quantity of the analyzed material, it is impossible to cite all these texts in their entirety. But the reader can consult the editions mentioned above.

Juckel has applied terms “Byzantine” and “non-Byzantine” as rather broad labels. First, it is crucial to recall the basic difference between a “Byzantine” [=Byz.] and a “Majority” text/reading [=ℳ].<sup>17</sup> In this paper, on one hand the broad “Byzantine” and “non-Byzantine” opposition is followed, especially in the presentation of Juckel’s results, but on the other hand, whenever needed, a more detailed list of witnesses is provided. This is significant, above all, in regard to several rare readings which, although they are Byzantine (or even Majority),

---

Accordance edition hypertexted and formatted by OakTree Software, Inc., Version 1.5.

<sup>16</sup> Vööbus observed a possible further influence of the Peshitta on later Harklean manuscripts. He explained it on liturgical grounds: the Harklean version entered into use in the Syriac liturgy (proved by the liturgical notes in the manuscripts, numerous lectionaries with mixed Peshitta and Harklean readings), but its technical over-Graecized style must have been corrected to some extent with the Peshitta. See A. Vööbus, *Early Versions of the New Testament*. Manuscript Studies, PETSE 6 (Stockholm: Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 1954) 120–121.

<sup>17</sup> “Majority Text” is a purely quantitative category, while “Byzantine Text” is an historical (and text-critical) category. Thus, it would be misleading to call all Majority readings “Byzantine,” or all Byzantine readings “Majority”. *Textus Receptus* [=TR] is yet another category, which refers to the standard edition of the Byzantine text, first by Erasmus. Other editions followed this standard text until the 19th cent. See K. Wachtel, *Der Byzantinische Text der Katholischen Briefe. Eine Untersuchung zur Entstehung der Koine des Neuen Testaments*, Arbeiten zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung 24 (Berlin – New York: de Gruyter, 1995) 6–8.

may also be attested by ancient witnesses.<sup>18</sup> For very rare readings full evidence is given. In other cases, in order not to clutter the footnotes, only a limited list is provided (often more Byzantine witnesses are omitted). The evidence presented should be sufficient to allow the readers to make their own judgment. Obviously, this paper focuses on a wide panorama of the manuscripts, but for a more specific text-critical evaluation of each variant, a detailed study should be made.

## 2. GRAECIZATION OF PROPER NAMES

One of the major fields where the ongoing process of the Byzantinization may be noticed is the way of spelling in Syriac of proper names which gradually tend to be less Semitic and more Greek. In this field the transformation may be easily studied. Juckel already proved this revisional development among the Harklean manuscripts. Now, the data from MS C25 may be added to those results. The “Dionysios-stage” (represented here by MS BL 17124) was an intermediate one, with many Semitic spellings still evident. A full accommodation

---

<sup>18</sup> See recent K. Wachtel, “Notes on the Text of the Acts of the Apostles”, in *Novum Testamentum Graecum. Editio Critica Maior. III: Acts of the Apostles. Part 1.1* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 2017): “If the bias against the text of the majority of all witnesses has been overcome, then the variants transmitted by the majority will appear in a different light, even if some early witnesses read differently. It can then be considered with due impartiality whether or not a majority reading does in fact follow the tendency towards the fuller, easier, more smooth variant. There can be no doubt that this tendency exists, but it applies to the transmission on the whole, not only with scribes of younger manuscripts. It is true that variants of this kind accumulated in the majority text, but in more than a few cases the more difficult variant is in the majority text. Moreover, the editorial team of the ECM sees a strong external criterion in favor of the majority reading where a variant with A-related attestation is confirmed by the majority, because this points to a continuous transmission since the early period.”



to the Greek spelling was reached later in the MS NC333. The most extensive among Juckel's examples comes from the first part of Jesus's genealogy according to Luke (3:23–30).<sup>19</sup> His table is reproduced here with the last column added according to MS C25. The forms with which MS C25 agrees are underlined.

	NA28	MS V268 (Thomas)	MS BL 12178 <sup>20</sup> (Massora)	MS NC333 (White)	MS BL Add. 17124 (Dionysios)	MS C25
1. υιος (...) Ιωσηφ		<u>Ἰωσήφ</u>	Ἰωσήφ	Ἰωσήφ	Ἰωσήφ	Ἰωσήφ
2. του Ηλι		Ἡλ	<u>Ἡλ</u>	Ἡλ	Ἡλ	Ἡλ
3. του Μαθθατ		<u>Μαθθατ</u>	Μαθθατ	Μαθθατ	Μαθθατ	Μαθθατ
4. του Λευι		<u>Λευι</u>	Λευι	Λευι	Λευι	Λευι
5. του Μελχι		<u>Μελχι</u>	Μελχι	Μελχι	Μελχι	Μελχι
6. του Ιανναι		Ἰανναι	Ἰανναι	Ἰανναι	Ἰανναι	Ἰανναι
7. του Ιωσηφ		<u>Ἰωσήφ</u>	Ἰωσήφ	Ἰωσήφ	Ἰωσήφ	Ἰωσήφ
8. του Ματθαθίου		<u>Ματθαθίου</u>	Ματθαθίου	Ματθαθίου	Ματθαθίου	Ματθαθίου
9. του Αμωσ		<u>Αμωσ</u>	Αμωσ	Αμωσ	Αμωσ	Αμωσ
10. του Ναουμ		<u>Ναουμ</u>	Ναουμ	Ναουμ	Ναουμ	Ναουμ
11. του Εσλι		<u>Εσλι</u>	Εσλι	Εσλι	Εσλι	Εσλι
12. του Ναγγαι		<u>Ναγγαι</u>	Ναγγαι	Ναγγαι	Ναγγαι	Ναγγαι
13. του Μααθ		<u>Μααθ</u>	Μααθ	Μααθ	Μααθ	Μααθ
14. του Ματθαθίου		<u>Ματθαθίου</u>	Ματθαθίου	Ματθαθίου	Ματθαθίου	Ματθαθίου
15. του Σεμειν		<u>Σεμειν</u>	Σεμειν	Σεμειν	Σεμειν	Σεμειν
16. του Ιωσηχ		<u>Ἰωσήφ</u>	Ἰωσήφ	Ἰωσήφ	Ἰωσήφ	Ἰωσήφ
17. του Ιωδα		<u>Ἰωδα</u>	Ἰωδα	Ἰωδα	Ἰωδα	Ἰωδα
18. του Ιωαναν		<u>Ἰωαναν</u>	Ἰωαναν	Ἰωαναν	Ἰωαναν	Ἰωαναν
19. του Πησα		<u>Πησα</u>	Πησα	Πησα	Πησα	Πησα

<sup>19</sup> Juckel, "Zur Revisionsgeschichte der Harklensis", 56–58.

<sup>20</sup> London, *British Library*, Add. 12178 (ninth/tenth cent.)

20. του Ζοροβαβελ	<u>אֶחָד</u> <u>אֶחָדִים</u>	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָד אֶחָדִים	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָד אֶחָדִים
21. του Σαλαθιηλ	אֶחָדִים אֶחָדִים	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָדִים	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָדִים
22. του Νηρι	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד
23. του Μελχι	<u>אֶחָדִים</u> אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד
24. του Αδδι	<u>אֶחָדִים</u> אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד
25. του Κωσαμ	<u>אֶחָדִים</u> אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד
26. του Ελμαδαμ	אֶחָדִים <u>אֶחָדִים</u>	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד
27. του Ηρ	<u>אֶחָדִים</u> אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד
28. του Ιησου	<u>אֶחָדִים</u> אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד
29. του Ελιεξερ	אֶחָדִים <u>אֶחָדִים</u>	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד
30. του Ιωριμ	<u>אֶחָדִים</u> אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד
31. του Μαθθατ	אֶחָדִים <u>אֶחָדִים</u>	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד
32. του Λευι	<sup>21</sup> <u>אֶחָדִים</u> אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד
33. του Συμεων	אֶחָדִים <u>אֶחָדִים</u>	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד	אֶחָדִים אֶחָד

MS C25 stands in an intermediate stage of the tradition. In most cases MS C25 is still close to the most ancient spelling, having in 29 cases the same form as MS V268.<sup>22</sup> It disagrees only four times: three are unique name forms (6, 21, 22), and one agrees with the “Massora” manuscript (2). Seven times MS C25 reports the “Dionysios-stage” form in the margin (1, 8, 12, 14, 19, 26, 29) and three times other forms as well. This means that MS C25, when compared to the earliest Harklean manuscripts,<sup>23</sup> shows the Graecization of the proper names already in the course of development, but still at an early stage. This

<sup>21</sup> אֶחָד in Juckel's publication.

<sup>22</sup> MS NC333 preserves the ancient forms in 13 of 33 cases.

<sup>23</sup> Juckel reports that MS V267 and MS F read here always with MS V268.

development is also irregular, and remains such even in the “Dionysios-stage.”

### 3. THE HARKLEAN MARGIN

The next step of the analysis of the relationship between MSS V268 and C25 will be the comparison of their marginal variant notes. Variant notes in the margin stand among typical Harklean features, but the inconsistencies in their transmission may show particular choices being made between particular manuscripts in question. The first part of this section presents a general comparison of the Harklean margin in both manuscripts (3.1). The second part compares MS C25 with Juckel's results (3.2). This study does not include Greek and Syriac spelling notes appearing in the margin, because they do not present real variants to the lemma.

#### 3.1. A General Comparison of the Margins in MS V268 and MS C25

This broad overview at the entire Gospel of Luke and its margin in MS V268 and MS C25 is presented with a focus on possible revisional activity in the MS C25.<sup>24</sup> The marginal notes in the manuscripts are not always perfectly identical (for example, missing prepositions or minor orthographic issues), but the crucial part of the reading makes their correspondence clear. These minor variations are not recorded here. On rare occasion marginal notes may not be variants (namely substitutions or

---

<sup>24</sup> Thus, the description of differences occurring between these two manuscripts will be presented in a direct way. Of course, we cannot know how many stages of tradition actually passed between one manuscript and the other, or if there is any direct line of dependance between them.

pluses), but the copyist's corrections.<sup>25</sup> These rare corrections will not be included in the analysis below. Furthermore, minor errors in the placement of the notes in the MS V268 can be corrected with the MS C25's readings.<sup>26</sup> In the footnotes and tables the following abbreviations will be employed: L for "lemma" and M for "margin" in general and in connections with manuscripts' abbreviations, for example: V268-M for the margin of MS V268 or C25-L for the lemma of MS C25. The following lists in the footnotes will provide evidence in terms of the Syriac marginal readings unique to MS V268 (3.1.1), then to MS C25 (3.1.2) and, last, cases of exchange between the reading in the lemma and in the margin taking place between these two manuscripts (3.1.3). Where it is helpful the Greek behind the Syriac is presented as well, along with a list of the apposite witnesses to a particular reading.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> For example, in Luke 1:10 V268 note (ܠܐܡܐ) seems to be a correction of an omission rather than a variant. It is inserted into C25-L (=MSS F, D, M; MS V267 not extant).

<sup>26</sup> **Luke 23:48** (ܐܡܐ in the margin is moved down in V268 so that it is no longer next to the correct line in the lemma, with no sign in the lemma; C25 =V267); **24:19** (the second marginal note ܕܐܠܐ in V268 should probably be placed as in C25 in connection with ܕܐܠܐ); and **24:43** inside a Byzantine variant (ܐܠܐܐܠܐ should be referring to the second ܐܠܐ and not the first; in C25 ܐܠܐ and ܐܠܐܐܠܐ are also inverted).

<sup>27</sup> Because the amount of data is huge, the presentation seeks to be as concise as possible, trying also to remain user-friendly. Therefore, in all that follows, many abbreviations are employed. Apart from the Harklean manuscripts' abbreviations which were already mentioned, another abbreviations are used in the lists of the witnesses below: Ar. (Arabic), Copt. (Coptic), CPA (Christian Palestinian Aramaic Gospels), Diatess. (Diatessaron), Eth. (Ethiopic), Gr. (Greek), Old Syr. (Old Syriac), Old Syr. Sin. (Old Syriac Sinaiticus), Old Syr. Cur. (Old Syriac Curetonianus), Pers. (Persian), Pesh. (Peshitta), MS (one manuscript), MSS (more manuscripts), VL (Vetus Latina), Vulg. (Vulgata). When only one (or some) Vetus Latina, Vulgata or Peshitta manuscripts witness to a reading, it is recorded as (accordingly): VL MS, Vulg. MS, Pesh. MS or VL MSS, Vulg.

There are numerous marginal readings which appear only in MS V268. This means that in MS C25 these readings were either inserted into the lemma or suppressed. But it is hard to notice among the entirety of these cases any consistent revisional development towards the Byzantine text-type. Nine times these marginal readings that appear in MS V268 and were inserted into the lemma of MS C25 are traceable to (mostly rare) Greek variants, earlier Syriac renderings or variants of another origin.<sup>28</sup> Once MS C25 corrects an earlier Syriac rendering, inserting the marginal reading into the lemma.<sup>29</sup> Variants unknown from other witnesses are twice used<sup>30</sup> and twice omitted.<sup>31</sup> Five times MS C25 omits marginal notes of MS V268 that apply other Greek variants or earlier Syriac renderings.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>32</sup> **Luke 12:42** (V268–M: αο = Gr. *M* with P75, B; C25–L = V268–L = Gr. *α*, A, L, M, Θ); **13:15** (V268–M: ευσυνοχρητα Gr. P45, D, W, Old Syr., Pesh.; C25–L = V268–L = Gr. *M* with P75, *α*, B, A, Θ); **13:27** (V268–M: ερραζομενοι Gr. 13\*, l 547); **16:3** (V268–M: ο = και Gr. P75, B, 579, Old Syr., Pesh., Ar.



18:28	لعللم =C25	L: لعللم (=Pesh.) M =V268-M	=C25	=C25
21:9	حطبع =C25	=V268	=C25	=C25
22:9	لې لعللم حطبع =C25 (var. حطبع)	L= V268 (with a sign), no M	=C25 (var. حطبع)	=C25 (var. حطبع)
22:18	م حطبع =C25	=V268	=C25	=C25
22:57	حطبع =C25	=C25	=C25	=C25
24:24	لعللم =C25	=C25	=C25	=C25

### 3.1.2. Marginalia Unique to the MS C25

MS C25 offers numerous unique readings in the margin, but many of them are only spelling variants (mostly names), which witness to a later development of the Harklean margin (see 2. *Graecization of Proper Names*). Still, there are more “new” marginal notes and they do not seem to be the result of a unilateral revision. Many of them do not appear in other manuscripts.<sup>33</sup> They were either newly created by the later revisers, or they preserve some layer of a precedent Harklean tradition which is not extant in MS V268.

Only once here does MS C25 exhibit an accommodation to the Byzantine text.<sup>34</sup> The opposite is true five times, where the “new” marginalia read against the Majority readings or the more rare Byzantine readings in the lemma.<sup>35</sup> Four times Byzantine

<sup>33</sup> This aspect has not been examined here thoroughly though. Juckel’s “Liste I,3” presents only a selection of these “new” marginalia in the other manuscripts. See Juckel, “Die Bedeutung,” 40–41. See below for a comparison with later manuscripts, connected to the so-called “Dionysios stage.”

<sup>34</sup> Luke 4:9 (C25–L:  $\text{καὶ ἡγάγεν}$  Gr.  $\mathfrak{M}$  with A, D; C25–M:  $\text{καὶ ἡγάγεν}$  but the sign is wrongly placed after  $\text{καὶ ἡγάγεν}$ , which has no other witness; V268–L:  $\text{καὶ ἡγάγεν}$  is a mixture of both variants).

<sup>35</sup> Luke 7:28 (C25–L = V268–L:  $\text{πρὸς τὴν πόλιν}$  Gr.  $\mathfrak{M}$  with A, Ψ, Γ, Δ, Θ; C25–M:  $\text{πρὸς τὴν πόλιν}$  = to read without  $\text{πρὸς τὴν πόλιν}$  Gr. P75, B,  $\mathfrak{K}$ ); 10:37 (C25–L = V268–L:  $\text{οὐκ ἔστιν οὐρανός σου}$  Gr.  $\mathfrak{M}$  with A, C<sup>c</sup>, W, P; C25–M:  $\text{οὐκ ἔστιν οὐρανός σου}$  Gr. P75, P45, B,  $\mathfrak{K}$ , D); 13:32

readings are moved from the lemma of MS V268 to the margin in MS C25 and replaced with non-Byzantine readings.<sup>36</sup> Numerous “new” marginal readings seem to witness to diverse (known or unknown) textual traditions. Eleven marginal readings present other (rare but ancient) variants that are known from the Greek manuscripts, the Vetus Latina, and previous Syriac renderings (Old Syriac and Peshitta).<sup>37</sup> Twice these marginal readings are not attested in any other source.<sup>38</sup> Five times MS C25 moves to the margin the standard Greek readings and puts into the lemma those that are rare or unique.<sup>39</sup> Three times the contrary is true: MS C25 moves to the

---

(C25–L = V268–L: ܐܡܠ ܝܗܘܐ ܐܢ ܐܡ = ο δε ειπεν αυτοις Gr. M, Θ, VL; C25–M: ] ܐܡܠ ܕ ܝܗܘܐ = καὶ ειπεν αυτοις Gr. P75, B); 22:63 (C25–L = V268–L: ܕܠܥܠܐ = τον Ιησουν Gr. M with A, W, Θ; C25–M: ܡܠ = αυτον Gr. P75, B, ܠ, D); 24:11 (C25–L = V268–L: ܐܡܠܐ = αυτων Gr. M with A, K, M, W, Γ, Δ, Θ; C25–M: ܐܡܠ = ταυτα Gr. P75, B, ܠ, D).

<sup>36</sup> Luke 10:41 (C25–L: ܠܝܬܝܐ = κυριος Gr. P3, P75, P45, B\*, ܠ, VL MSS, Vulgate, Copt. sa bo; C25–M and V268–L: ܕܠܥܠܐ = Ιησους Gr. M with A, B<sup>c</sup>, C, Old Syr. Sin., Pesh.); 12:56 (C25–L: ܠܡܚܝܬܐ ܠܡܚܝܬܐ ܠܡܚܝܬܐ = ουκ οιδατε δοκιμαζειν Gr. P75, B, ܠ; C25–M = V268–L: ܠܡܚܝܬܐ ܠܡܚܝܬܐ = ου δοκιμαζετε Gr. M with P45, A); 13:5 (C25–L: ܕܝܠܠܐ ܐܡ = ωσαυτως Gr. B, ܠ, L, M; C25–M = V268–L: ܡܕܝܠܠܐ ܡܕ = ομοιως Gr. M with P75, A, D); 18:25 (C25–L: ܕܠܥܠܐ = Gr. M with B, ܠ, Pesh.; C25–M = V268–L: ܝܠܠܐ = διελθειν Gr. A, D, P, Θ, f, P<sup>3</sup>, VL MSS, Vulgate, Old Syr., Copt. sa bo).

<sup>37</sup> Luke 1:74 (ܠܝܠܠܐ ܠܝܠܐ = Old Syr. Sin., Pesh.); 4:23 (ܐܡܠ = Old Syr. Sin., Pesh.); 4:23 (ܝܠܠܐ = Old Syr. Sin., Pesh.); 5:25 (ܠܡܚܝܬܐ = Pesh.); 10:20 (ܠܡܚܝܬܐ = οτι τα δαιμονια Gr. D, f, VL MSS, Old Syr., Copt. bo, Ar. and Pers. Diatess., many Fathers); 11:4 (ܕܝܠܠܐ = Old Syr.); 11:45 (ܝܠܠܐ = ειπεν Gr. 157, VL MS); 11:52 (ܠܡܚܝܬܐ ܠܡܚܝܬܐ = Gr. G, VL MS); 14:22 (ܠܡܚܝܬܐ = Old Syr., Pesh.); 16:17 (ܝܠܠܐ = παρελθειν Gr. W, minuscules, Old Syr., Pesh., Ar. and Pers. Diatess.); 20:19 (ܠܡܚܝܬܐ = οχλον Gr. N, W, Ψ).

<sup>38</sup> Luke 2:43, first reading (ܡܕܝܠܠܐ [=V267 =D], Juckel labels it *ex err.*); 19:8 (ܕܠܥܠܐ, may be influenced by the same L/M pair ܠܡܚܝܬܐ/ܕܠܥܠܐ earlier in the verse).

<sup>39</sup> Luke 6:35 (C25–L: ܠܡܚܝܬܐ; C25–M = V268–L: ܕܡܚܝܬܐ); 12:2 (C25–L: ܝܠܠܐ = Gr. D, VL MSS, Vulg. MSS, Old Syr., Ar. Diatess., Eth.; C25–M = V268–L: ܝܠܠܐ = δε); 12:16 (C25–L: ܝܠܠܐ; C25–M = V268–L: ܝܠܠܐ); 12:58 (C25–L: ܝܠܠܐ; C25–M



margin rare or unique readings and leaves the expected text in the lemma.<sup>40</sup>

A closer look at the later manuscripts helps in determining some patterns. MS BF362 is a very faithful copy of MS C25. Only in four of thirty-one cases does MS BF362 exchange the margin with the lemma. MSS NC334 and BL17124 appear not only to be almost identical but they are also close relatives to MS C25. Numerous “new” marginalia in MS C25 are repeated also in MSS NC334 and BL17124. MS NC333 is different in this regard. It omits most of these “new” marginalia. Sometimes it inserts them into the lemma or exhibits mixed solutions. All four manuscripts (MSS BF362, NC333, NC334 and BL17124) show signs of a further redactional activity in comparison with MS C25. For example, in cases like 1:74 (NC333, BL17124), 4:32 (NC333), 6:35 (NC333), 12:2 (NC333), 12:6 (BF362, NC334, BL17124), 12:56 (BF362, NC333, BL17124), 13:32 (NC333, BL17124), 14:22 (NC333), 17:4 (NC333, BL17124), 18:25 (NC333), 20:19 (NC333), 21:23 (NC333), 22:63 (NC334, BL17124), “new” readings most probably appeared first in the margin of MS C25 (or another connected tradition) and later were inserted into the lemma of other manuscripts, while corresponding readings were either moved from the lemma into the margin or suppressed. This is seen most often in MS NC333. Four times (10:41; 12:2; 18:25; 21:23) the “new” readings, that appeared in the margin of MS C25 (probably earlier) and in the margin of MSS BF362, NC334 and BL17124 (probably later), and were created by moving to the margin the readings of MS V268, are now “corrected” in MS NC333: the lemma is reverted to MS V268 and the “new” lemma is moved to the margin. This proves that MS NC333 is most likely a witness to a sort of

---

= V268-L: (ⲓⲛ); and 21:23 (C25-L: ⲉⲓ; C25-M = V268-L: ⲓⲛ = Ar. Diatess.).

<sup>40</sup> Luke 4:32 (C25-M = V268-L: ⲁⲓ ⲛⲁⲛⲧⲉⲥ = παντες VL MS, Copt. sa); 17:4 (C25-M [=V267] = V268-L: ⲕⲁⲓ ⲉⲡⲓⲥⲧⲣⲉⲩⲱⲛ; 22:71 (C25-M = V268-L: ⲉⲓ = δε).

“correction” of the “Dionysios-stage” stage in the direction of the most ancient Harklean tradition (=MS V268). All of this data shows also that MS C25 certainly represents a connected but earlier stage of the tradition than the others. In the following table all the evidence for these “new” marginalia in MS C25 is now listed together and compared with other manuscripts.

	MS C25–M	MS BF362	MS NC333	MS NC334	MS BL17124
1:74	ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ	=C25	in L, no M	(lacuna)	in L, no M
2:43	ⲙⲁⲛⲁⲛ	=C25	L =C25, no M	(lacuna)	=C25
4:9	ⲛⲁ	=C25	=C25	(lacuna)	in L
4:23	ⲛⲁⲓ	=C25	L =C25, no M	(lacuna)	=C25
4:23	ⲛⲁ	=C25	L =C25, no M	(lacuna)	=C25
4:32	ⲛⲁ ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ	=C25	L =C25, no M	(lacuna)	in L (=V268)
5:25	ⲙⲁⲛⲁⲛ	=C25	L =C25, no M	(lacuna)	L =C25, no M
6:35	ⲙⲁⲛⲁⲛ	in L (=V268–L), L and M exchanged	L =C25, no M	(lacuna)	in L (=V268–L), L and M exchanged
7:28	ⲛⲁ	=C25	=C25	(lacuna)	=C25 (var. ⲛⲁⲓ)
10:20	ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ	=C25	L =C25, no M	(lacuna)	L =C25, no M
10:37	ⲛⲁ	=C25	=C25	=C25	=C25
10:41	ⲛⲁ	=C25	in L (=V268–L), L and M exchanged	=C25	=C25
11:4	ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ	in L, L and M exchanged	no M	in L, L and M exchanged	in L, L and M exchanged
11:45	ⲛⲁ	=C25	no M	=C25	=C25
11:52	ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ	=C25	no M	in L	=C25
12:2	ⲛⲁ	=C25	L =V268, M: ⲛⲁ L and M exchanged	=C25	=C25
12:16	ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ	in L (=V268 L), L and M exchanged	in L (=V268 L), no M	in L (=V268 L), L and M exchanged	in L (=V268 L), L and M exchanged
12:56	ⲛⲁⲓⲛⲁ	in L (=V268 L), L and M exchanged	in L (=V268 L), L and M exchanged	(lacuna)	in L (=V268 L), L and M exchanged

12:58	ܝܠܝܢ =C25	in L (=V268 L), no M	(lacuna)	=C25
13:5	ܡܢ ܡܢܝܢ =C25	=C25	(lacuna)	=C25
13:32	ܝܠܝܢ =C25 [ܝܠܝܢ]	in L, no M	(lacuna)	L =C25, no M
14:22	ܝܠܝܢ =C25	in L, no M	=C25	=C25
16:17	ܝܠܝܢ =C25	no M (but ܝܠܝܢ in the L with multiple dots below it)	no M (but ܝܠܝܢ has a sign over it)	=C25
17:4	ܝܠܝܢ ܡܢ =C25	L =C25, no M	=C25	L =C25, no M
18:25	ܝܠܝܢ =C25	in L (=V268 L), L and M exchanged	=C25	=C25
19:8	ܝܠܝܢ =C25	L =C25, no M	L =C25, no M	L =C25, no M
20:19	ܝܠܝܢ =C25	in L, no M	=C25	=C25
21:23	ܝܠܝܢ =C25	in L (=V268 L), L and M exchanged	=C25	=C25
22:63	ܝܠܝܢ =C25	=C25	in L, but mixed (ܝܠܝܢ ܝܠܝܢ)	in L, but mixed (ܝܠܝܢ ܝܠܝܢ)
22:71	ܝܠܝܢ =C25	no M	=C25	=C25
24:11	ܝܠܝܢ =C25	no M	=C25	=C25

### 3.1.3. Lemma and Margin Exchanged between MS V268 and MS C25

The reader can often observe how the lemma and the margin are exchanged between these two manuscripts in question. These cases show the particular choices being taken during the transmission of the Harklean tradition. However, it is difficult to describe any consistency in these choices. Fifteen times MS C25 prefers readings which agree with the well-attested, older tradition against the Majority readings (extant in the MS V268).<sup>41</sup> Yet the numerous cases when MS C25 chooses against

<sup>41</sup> Luke 1:78 (C25–L: ܝܠܝܢ =επισκεψεται Gr. P4<sup>vid</sup>, B, K\*, L, W, Θ, Old Syr. Sin., Pesh.; C25–M: ܝܠܝܢ =επεσκεψατο Gr. M with K<sup>c</sup>, A, C, D); 6:10, first reading (C25–L: ܝܠܝܢ ܡܢ =τω ανθρωπω Gr. K, D, W, f, f<sup>3</sup>; C25–M: ܡܢ =αυτω Gr. M with B, A, Θ, Pesh., CPA, Copt. sa); 6:10, second reading (C25–L: ܝܠܝܢ =εξετεινεν Gr. K, D, W, f, f<sup>3</sup>, Pesh., VL MSS, Vulg. MSS, Copt. sa bo; C25–M:



which read against all the rest (or most) of the tradition.<sup>44</sup> Six times MS C25 puts into the lemma readings unknown to other witnesses.<sup>45</sup> Three times MS C25 chooses to follow the standard text by moving secondary variants into the margin.<sup>46</sup> Earlier Syriac renderings are left in the margin three times<sup>47</sup> and twice they are inserted into the lemma.<sup>48</sup> All of this data shows that the numerous differences between the margins of MS V268 and

---

(C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ = εκατον εζηκοντα Gr. K, Π, Θ, N\*, VL MS, Vulg. MSS, CPA; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ).

<sup>44</sup> Luke 4:22 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ = εν τοις λογοις Gr. 69, Old Syr. Sin., Pesh.; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ = επι); 8:29 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ = των δαιμονιων Gr. A, 262, 1187, 2 lect., 2 CPA MSS, 1 MS Copt. sa; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ); and 9:50 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ = ειπεν δε προς αυτους Gr. 1071; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ = και ειπεν προς αυτον ο Ιησους); 11:49 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ = λεγει Gr. 1195\*, 2 VL MSS; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ = ειπεν); 17:26 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ = παρουσια Gr. 349, 1195, 1630, 213, VL MS, Vulg. MS, Eth.; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ = εν ταις ημεραις); 20:36 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ = μελλουσιν Gr. D, W, Θ; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ); 21:27 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ = εν νεφελαις Gr. C, 157, 565, 579, 1424, VL MSS, Vulg. MSS, Old Syr. Cur., Pesh., Copt. bo; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ); 23:55 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ = συνανελθυσθαι Gr. 115; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ).

<sup>45</sup> Luke 12:26 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ = δοκιμειτε; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ = μεριμνατε); 12:48 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ = ολιγον ολιγον; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ = πολυ); 19:9 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ = ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ; V268–L: ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ, V268–M: ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ; ειπεν δε προς αυτον (ο) κυριος Gr. 579, 1012, 1443, Vulg. MS, αυτους R, VL MSS, but the combination of both is unique); 20:31 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ = ομοιως; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ = ωσαυτως); 22:18 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ = καινον πτω αυτο; C25–M: [ܐܠܗܐ] ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ = η βασιλεια του Θεου ελθη); 24:5 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ = κλινασων; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ = κλινουσων).

<sup>46</sup> Luke 4:33 (C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ = δαιμονιον Gr. D, 579, VL MSS, Ar. Diatess.); 11:3 (C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ = σημερον Gr. D, 2, 28, 1071, VL MSS, Vulg. MSS, Copt. bo, Eth.); 11:32 (C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ = Nινευη Byz. variant with Gr. E, H, S, Y).

<sup>47</sup> Luke 6:17 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ = επι τοπου πεδινου; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ = Old Syr. Sin., Pesh.); 9:22 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ = τη τριτη; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ = Old Syr. Cur., Pesh.); 16:29 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ = Old Syr., Pesh.).

<sup>48</sup> Luke 17:25 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ = Old Syr., Pesh.; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ = δει); 24:7 (C25–L: ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ = Old Syr., Pesh.; C25–M: ܐܠܗܐ ܐܠܗܐ = δει).

MS C25 cannot simply be described as a purely linear “Byzantinization.”

Once more a broader look on the other manuscripts helps in evaluating how the Harklean tradition developed. The choices of MS C25 are almost always copied in MS BF362 and very often also in MSS NC334 and BL17124. These last two are sometimes uniform in very unique variants (see for example 16:9), but it does not mean that they are totally identical. One can see a further revisional activity in MS BL17124, as some marginal readings are totally suppressed, while the lemma remains as in MS C25 (4:22; 6:17; 10:39; 11:50; 13:3; 16:29; 17:26; 19:9; 19:30; 24:7). Only in two of these cases is MS NC334 identical BL17124 (19:9; 24:7). Here, also MS NC333 is often close to MS V268. Thirty-two out of forty-two times MS NC333 is identical in both lemma and margin to MS V268. In the following table all the mentioned cases of exchange between lemma and margin in MSS V268 and C25 are listed together and compared with other manuscripts.

	C25-L = V268-M	MS C25-M = V268-L	MS BF362	MS NC333	MS NC334	MS BL17124
1:78	ⲓⲛⲥⲁⲩⲉ	ⲛⲥⲁ	=C25	L = V268, no M	(lacuna)	=C25
2:9	ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁ	ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁ	=C25	=V268	(lacuna)	=V268
4:22	ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁ	ⲛⲥⲁ	=C25	=V268	(lacuna)	L = C25, no M
4:33	ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁ	ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁ	=C25	L = C25, no M	(lacuna)	=C25
6:7	ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁⲛⲁ V268-M: ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁ	ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁⲛⲁ	=C25	=V268	(lacuna)	=C25 (M: ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁⲛⲁ)
6:10	ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲥⲁ	ⲛⲥⲁ	=C25	=V268	(lacuna)	=C25
6:10	ⲛⲥⲁ	ⲛⲥⲁ	=C25	=V268	(lacuna)	=C25
6:17	ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁⲛⲁ	ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁⲛⲁ	=C25	L: ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁⲛⲁ ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁⲛⲁ no M	(lacuna)	L = C25, no M
8:29	ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁ	ⲛⲥⲁⲛⲁ	=C25	=V268	(lacuna)	=C25

9:22	ሥሐይክ	ሥሐይክ =C25	L =C25, no M	=V268	=V268
9:50	ጸጢል ደግሞ ትግላ	ጸጢል ትግላ =C25	=V268	(lacuna)	=C25
10:2	ደግሞ	ጸጢል =C25	=V268	(lacuna)	=C25
10:19	ክፍሉ	ሥሐይክ =C25	=V268	(lacuna)	=C25
10:39	ሥሐይክ	ጸጢል(ገ) =C25	=V268	=V268	L =V268, no M
11:3	ጸጢል(ገ ሰጠ) ሥሐይክ	ሥሐይክ =C25	=V268	=C25	=C25
11:32	ሥሐይክ	ሥሐይክ =V268	=V268	=V268	=V268
11:49	ሥሐይክ	ክፍሉ =C25	=V268	=V268	=C25
11:50	ጸጢል	ሥሐይክ =C25	=V268	=C25	L =C25, no M
12:26	ደግሞ	ሥሐይክ =C25	L ሥሐይክ, no M	=C25	=C25
12:48	ጸጢል ጸጢል	ሥሐይክ =C25	=V268	(lacuna)	=C25
13:3	ሥሐይክ ጸጢል	ክፍሉ ሰጠ =V268	=C25	(lacuna)	L =C25, no M
16:9	ሥሐይክ	ሥሐይክ(ገ) =C25	=V268	L =C25, M: ጸጢል	L =C25, M: ጸጢል
16:29	ሥሐይክ	ሥሐይክ =C25	=V268	=C25	L =C25, no M
17:2	ሥሐይክ ሥሐይክ	ሥሐይክ ሥሐይክ =V268	=V268	=V268	=V268
17:25	ሰጠ ጸጢል	ሰጠ =C25	=V268	=C25	=C25
17:26	ሥሐይክ(ገ)	ሥሐይክ(ገ) =C25	=V268	=C25	L =C25, no M
19:9	ሥሐይክ ደግሞ ጸጢል V268-M: ሥሐይክ ጸጢል	ጸጢል V268-L: ጸጢል ጸጢል	L =C25, no M (but with sign in the L)	L =V268, M: ሥሐይክ ጸጢል L =C25, no M	L =C25, no M
19:30	ክፍሉ	ክፍሉ =C25	L =C25, no M	=C25	L =C25, no M
20:12	ሰጠ	ሥሐይክ =C25	=V268	=C25	=C25
20:14	ሥሐይክ	ሥሐይክ =C25	=V268	=C25	=C25
20:31	ሥሐይክ ጸጢል	ክፍሉ ሰጠ =C25	L: ክፍሉ ሰጠ M =V268	=C25	=C25
20:36	ሥሐይክ	ሥሐይክ =C25	=V268	=C25	=C25
21:27	ሥሐይክ	ሥሐይክ =C25	=V268	=C25	=C25
22:16	ሥሐይክ	ሥሐይክ ጸጢል =C25	=V268 (but the sign is wrongly placed on	=V268	=V268

			different Δαα)		
22:18	ῥῥῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥῥῥῥῥ	ῥῥῥῥῥῥ =C25 ῥῥῥῥῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥῥῥῥ [ῥῥῥῥ]ῥῥ	=V268	L =C25 M:ῥῥῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥῥῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥῥῥ	=C25
22:34	ῥῥῥῥῥ	ῥῥῥῥ =C25	=V268	=C25	=C25
22:36	ῥῥ ῥῥ	ῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥ =C25	=V268	=C25	=C25
23:15	ῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥῥῥῥ ῥῥ ῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥ V268-M: ῥῥῥ ῥῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥῥ	ῥῥῥῥῥῥῥ =C25 ῥῥῥῥῥῥῥ	L =C25 M: ῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥῥῥῥῥ	=C25 (in the L	=C25
23:22	ῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥῥ (ῥῥῥῥῥ)ῥ	=C25	=V268	=C25	=C25
23:55	ῥῥῥῥῥ	ῥῥῥῥ =C25	=V268	=C25	=C25
24:5	ῥῥῥῥῥῥ	ῥῥῥῥῥῥ =C25	=V268	=C25	=C25
24:7	ῥῥ ῥῥῥῥῥ	ῥῥ ῥῥῥ[ῥ] L=C25, no M	=V268	L=C25, no M	L=C25, no M
24:13	ῥῥῥῥῥ ῥῥῥῥ	ῥῥῥῥ =C25	L =V268, no M	L =C25, no M	=C25

### 3.2. Comparison with Juckel's Results for MS V268

It is useful to compare the margin of MS C25 with the Juckel's previous results for MS V268. Obviously, to some extent what follows repeats the data presented earlier, but now from another perspective. Here, for the sake of conciseness only the final results are given without citing the content of every reading.

#### 3.2.1. Byzantine Foundations

The first part of Juckel's study showed that the Harklean version has been based on the early state of the Byzantine text-type ("Liste I,1").<sup>49</sup> In numerous examples the earliest Harklean

<sup>49</sup>Juckel, "Die Bedeutung," 37–38.



manuscripts agree in the Byzantine lemma and in the non-Byzantine margin.<sup>50</sup> In most of these cases MS C25 also agrees with other manuscripts, both in terms of the lemma and the margin. However, in 18 out of 55 cases, MS C25 exchanges lemma and margin, thus preferring non-Byzantine or rare Greek readings.<sup>51</sup> In several cases MS C25 inserts variants from the margin into the lemma,<sup>52</sup> and once it omits a variant.<sup>53</sup> Whenever the opposite is true, namely that the Harklean lemma is non-Byzantine and the margin is Byzantine (the second part of "Liste I,1"), except for one case,<sup>54</sup> MS C25 agrees with the others.<sup>55</sup>

These divergences confirm probable further redactional activity in MS C25 in comparison to the earliest Harklean manuscripts on the one hand,<sup>56</sup> but on the other, the divergences raise questions about the criteria employed to judge the quality of the Harklean text.<sup>57</sup> If a further redactional activity switched (regularly) to non-Byzantine readings, then the less byzantinized text is not necessarily closer to the original. Even if this transformation was a secondary

---

<sup>50</sup> Juckel, in his papers, called the lemma "textline" (1998) and "Haupttext" (1999).

<sup>51</sup> Luke 2:9; 4:22; 6:10 (2); 7:1; 9:50; 10:2 (see note 46); 10:19; 11:32; 11:49; 16:9; 17:2; 19:9; 20:33; 20:36; 22:16; 22:18 (1); 23:15; 23:55.

<sup>52</sup> Luke 3:23; 8:10; 11:53; 12:21; 18:28; 22:9; 22:18 (2).

<sup>53</sup> Luke 12:42.

<sup>54</sup> Luke 24:13.

<sup>55</sup> Luke 7:24; 11:28; 19:47; 22:61.

<sup>56</sup> Juckel, "Review of: Yohanna, The Gospel of Mark," 214–215.

<sup>57</sup> Juckel, "Vat. Syr. 268 and the Revisional Development," 23: "the revisional development of the Harklean is said to be generally connected with the development of the Greek text towards the uniform and then dominant Byzantine text (majority text). This is especially true with regard to the revisional alteration of the apparatus in the early Harklean manuscripts. For a great number of these alterations are promoting the Byzantine text by removing the non-Byzantine reading of the textline to the margin or even by eliminating it."

development in the Harklean tradition, these readings prove that much care is needed to judge them one by one. P.A.L. Hill has already pointed out the complexity of these processes and their possible interpretations.<sup>58</sup>

### 3.2.2. The Development of the Harklean Margin

The development of the Harklean margin may be observed in various manuscripts and, apparently, was due not just to casual omissions by the copyists but also to revisional activity: when a non-Byzantine marginal variant had no support in the contemporary Greek tradition, it was removed.<sup>59</sup> Juckel's "Liste I,2" presented Byzantine readings in the lemma of the rest of his manuscripts, accompanied by non-Byzantine marginal readings in MS V268 (and the others) but omitted in at least one of the other manuscripts.

In twenty-six cases the non-Byzantine marginal reading appears also in the margin of MS C25.<sup>60</sup> This may seem unexpected for a manuscript considered to be a subject of a

---

<sup>58</sup> P. A. L. Hill, "Review of Samer Soreshow Yohanna, *The Gospel of Mark in the Syriac Harklean Version: An Edition Based upon the Earliest Witnesses*," in *Review of Biblical Literature* (<http://www.bookreviews.org> [accessed: 01/08/2020]): "First, a common form of inner-Syriac scribal revision was the direct transposition of the readings of the textline and margin. Given that the primary marginal variants in sy<sup>h</sup> abound with non-Byzantine readings, it follows that such transpositions resulted in the accrual of non-Byzantine readings in the revised textline. (...) Second, while the initial sy<sup>h</sup> textline furnished many "early" readings, nonetheless (...) the Harklean textline generally is Byzantine in character. Consequently, in of itself the reflection of an early Greek reading may signal a secondary accretion and cannot be taken as an indicator to the initial state of the textline."

<sup>59</sup> Juckel, "Die Bedeutung," 38–40.

<sup>60</sup> Luke 1:63; 2:21; 2:27; 2:38; 2:43; 4:31; 5:7; 5:21; 5:29; 6:48; 8:37; 8:38; 8:41; 9:35; 10:10; 11:13; 13:15 (1); 13:31; 14:24; 19:8; 21:24; 22:49; 23:11; 23:12; 23:39 (V268–M is illegible); 23:45.

further revision. Only four times are these marginalia omitted.<sup>61</sup> Nine times the lemma and margin are exchanged in MS C25 (in comparison to MS V268) with a preference for a non-Byzantine (or rare) reading in the lemma.<sup>62</sup> Four times a Byzantine reading is inserted into the lemma, and no marginal note appears.<sup>63</sup> Whenever the Harklean lemma is non-Byzantine and the margin is Byzantine, MS C25 mostly agrees with MS V268,<sup>64</sup> and only three times does it exhibit other configurations.<sup>65</sup> When counting the marginal notes which are extant in MS V268 but are entirely omitted by other witnesses, MS C25 appears to be less subjected to revision than the other manuscripts.<sup>66</sup>

### 3.2.3. The Development of the Harklean Lemma

“Liste I,3” in Juckel’s paper presented readings that are not present in MS V268, but appear in other examined manuscripts.<sup>67</sup> In this way the non-Byzantine readings extant in MS V268 were probably moved by the revisers into the margin in order to render the text closer to the Byzantine text-type. Such transformations prove that MS V268 preserves an earlier stage of the Harklean text than the other manuscripts. MS C25 is special in this regard. In 13 out of 15 of these places MS C25’s

---

<sup>61</sup> Luke 5:10; 13:15 (2); 16:3; 20:13.

<sup>62</sup> Luke 1:78; 6:10 (1); 10:39; 13:3; 18:9; 20:14; 21:27; 22:34; 22:36.

<sup>63</sup> Luke 12:1; 12:49; 14:22; 22:27 (V268–M is illegible).

<sup>64</sup> Luke 2:17; 3:8; 4:44; 5:8; 6:4; 11:22; 21:2; 23:34.

<sup>65</sup> Twice exchanges the margin with the lemma (Luke 6:7; 11:3), once mixes them up (14:22).

<sup>66</sup> Out of 43 non-Byzantine marginalia in Juckel’s “Liste I,2” (which is, however, a selection): MS D omits 24, MS M omits 24, MS G omits 15, MS E omits 12, MS V267 omits 9, MS C25 omits only 4. These numbers do not count the readings exchanged between the lemma and the margin.

<sup>67</sup> Juckel, “Die Bedeutung,” 40–41.

lemma is identical to MS V268.<sup>68</sup> Only twice does MS C25 move a reading to the margin as the others do.<sup>69</sup>

#### 4. THE CRITICAL SIGNS IN THE HARKLEAN TEXT

There are two “critical” signs employed in the Harklean version: the *asteriskos* (\*) and the *obelos* (−). The meaning of these signs has been elucidated by the works of Barbara Aland and Andreas Juckel.<sup>70</sup> Inconsistency in the transmission of these signs among the manuscripts, as in the case of the marginal readings, may point to a revisional activity in the later stages of the tradition. In the later manuscripts some signs disappear, others are new. What kind of readings do they mark? Was their appearance/disappearance a one-way transformation in the direction of the Byzantine text-type? The following analysis tries to trace any possible pattern in this regard. The analysis makes use of a

---

<sup>68</sup> Luke 1:29; 1:66; 3:16; 5:34; 7:12; 8:10; 10:17; 12:58; 14:15; 17:1; 18:41; 21:9; 21:11. In two of these cases (18:41; 21:11) the words eliminated from the lemma by other manuscripts (ܠܐܡܝܢܐ; ܡܠܝܚܐ) in C25 are marked with a sign over them, without any reference in the margin; once (7:12) the word order is slightly changed: ܠܐܡܝܢܐ before ܡܠܝܚܐ.

<sup>69</sup> Luke 4:9 (C25 not only moved ܡܠܝܚܐ into the margin but also moved the sign after ܡܠܝܚܐ, which either becomes a reading not attested in Greek or might be an error) and 4:32.

<sup>70</sup> They discuss the interpretation of the signs in their introductions: B. Aland and A. Juckel, *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung I. Die grossen Katholischen Briefe*, ANTF 7 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986) 111–127; B. Aland and A. Juckel, *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung II. Die Paulinischen Briefe. Teil 1. Römer- und 1. Korintherbrief*, ANTF 14 (Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991) I 36–46; B. Aland and A. Juckel, *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung II. Die Paulinischen Briefe. Teil 2. 2 Korintherbrief, Galaterbrief, Epheserbrief, Philipperbrief und Kolosserbrief*, ANTF 23 (Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995) II 34–46; B. Aland and A. Juckel, *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung II. Die Paulinischen Briefe. Teil 3. 1./2. Thessalonicherbrief, 1./2. Timotheusbrief, Titusbrief, Philemonbrief und Hebräerbrief*, ANTF 32 (Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002) III 47–58.

### 4.1. The *Asteriskoi*

Most of the *asteriskoi* of MS V268 which signal non-Byzantine text (“Liste II,<sub>1</sub>”) are included in MS C25.<sup>73</sup> Five of

<sup>72</sup>Juckel, "Die Bedeutung," 41–43.

[illegible]



MS C25 includes fourteen “new” *asteriskoi*. Many of them appear also in other Harklean manuscripts.<sup>81</sup> If their function was to signal what, according to the later stage of the Harklean tradition, should be omitted as non-Byzantine, their usage does not seem consistent. Six of them mark readings which would need to be omitted in order to accommodate to the Majority Text.<sup>82</sup> Sometimes, however, the Majority Text follows an ancient reading. We cannot actually know if the accommodation in the Harklean version in these cases followed the emerging Byzantine text or rather some ancient witness. There are three cases of this type and they should be separated out.<sup>83</sup> Also, four times these “new” *asteriskoi* mark rare or unique

<sup>83</sup> Luke 3:8 (ⲕⲉⲛⲓ ⲁⲩⲱⲧⲏⲥ = οτι Gr. L, Θ, 33, 157, 579, Old Syr. Cur., Pesh.; without οτι Gr. M̄ with B, N, A, D, C); 8:25 (ⲙⲟⲩⲣⲁⲗⲟⲛⲧⲁ = οἱ Gr. N, L, 33, 157, VL 2 MSS, Old Syr., Pesh.; without οἱ Gr. P75, B, Ψ, fi, TR); 11:25 (ⲫⲁⲗⲁⲭⲟⲛⲧⲁ = σχολαζοντα και Gr. 16, 544, 892\*, 1342; σχολαζοντα Gr. B, N, C, Ψ, L; without σχολαζοντα και Gr. P75, D, 1071 and most of the tradition).





19:27	\ ܐܢܬ+	= C E G V M	=C25	=C25
19:36	\ ,ܡܠܟܡܐ+	= C D E G M V	=C25	=C25
22:3	\ ܡ+	= D E M V	=C25	=C25
		C G with <i>obelos</i>		
22:48	\ ܕܡܠܟܡܐ+	= C D E G M V	without	=C25
22:61	\ ܡܠܟܡܐ+	= C D E M V	=C25	=C25
22:69	\ ܐܢ+	= D E G M V	=C25	=C25
23:44	\ ܡܠܟܡܐ+	= D E G M V	=C25	without
24:50	\ ܡܠܟܡܐ+		=C25	without

#### 4.2. The *Obeloi*

The *obelos* “is used for the sake of translation technique to mark Syriac words which do not match the Greek *Vorlage* but are necessary for an intelligible rendering of the Greek.”<sup>88</sup> Therefore, from the text-critical point of view the *obelos* seems unimportant, as its presence does not signal any real variant. Still, its omission or appearance in a certain manuscript may speak further about manuscript’s quality and the fidelity of the transmission of the entire Harklean apparatus.

In most of the cases the *obeloi* in MS C25 agree with those in MS V268.<sup>89</sup> Only three times does MS C25 omit them,<sup>90</sup> and it once replaces an *obelos* with an *asteriskos*.<sup>91</sup> Seven times MS C25 produces “new” *obeloi*. Only one of them reports a case necessitated by the Syriac grammar and there are no variants.<sup>92</sup> Several others are probably a result of a later confusion with the

<sup>88</sup> Juckel, “Harklean Version”.

<sup>89</sup> Luke 1:9; 3:12; 4:8; 4:17; 5:2; 5:18; 5:25; 6:10; 7:47; 8:24; 8:39 (2x); 8:53; 9:10; 9:21; 9:58; 10:1; 11:1; 11:20; 12:9; 12:29; 13:14 (see 4.3); 13:27; 13:35; 14:32; 17:7; 17:23; 20:15; 21:12; 21:20; 22:34; 22:54 (3x); 22:61; 23:22; 24:39.

<sup>90</sup> Luke 4:20; 12:43; 20:10.

<sup>91</sup> Luke 6:35 (\ ܐܡܠܐ+).

<sup>92</sup> Luke 24:40 (\ ܡܠܟܡܐ, no Greek variant, Pesh.: ,ܡܠܟܡܐ ,ܡܠܟܡܐ).



the carelessness of the copyist.<sup>94</sup> This may be somewhat common, occurring in MS C25 as well.<sup>95</sup> Moreover, a confusion about the function of the *asteriskos* and the *obelos* can be seen already at these early stages of the transmission.<sup>96</sup> There are also cases where the placement of signs in MS C25 seems more precise because it refers to a real Greek variant, whereas MS V268 is apparently less precise.<sup>97</sup> Finally, there are signs which were poorly visible in MS V268 and did not appear in the CESG, but can now be further confirmed by MS C25.<sup>98</sup>

## 5. SUMMARY

1. Before Yohanna's edition MS C25 has never been included in the research of the Harklean text of the Gospels. As MS C25 exhibits the richness of the typical Harklean features (variants in the margin and critical signs in the text), its inclusion becomes very profitable for the Harklean research. Thanks to the high material quality of MS C25, numerous marginal notes

<sup>94</sup> For example: Luke 8:39 (ܐܠܗܝܡܝܢ ܟܝܢܝܢ); 11:11 (ܐܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ).

<sup>95</sup> For example: Luke 14:3 (ܐܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ).

<sup>96</sup> For example, in Luke 24:39 (CESG: ܐܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ; V268 [=V267]: ܐܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ) the *asteriskos* would make more sense, because there are Greek variants without the suffix, and the imperative ܐܠܗܝܢ can function without the suffix and appears also in the Old Syriac and Peshitta.

<sup>97</sup> Luke 13:14 (V268 [=V267]: ܐܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ, ܐܠܗܝܢ is employed to render a Gr. imperfect which is the standard reading; C25: ܐܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ, ܐܝܢܝܢ is a rare variant; Eth., VL MS; therefore it should be probably an *asteriskos*); 13:20 (V268: ܐܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ = ܐܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ marked, without ܐܠܗܝܢ reads only Gr. D, but it preserves a completely different phrase; C25: ܐܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ = ܐܠܗܝܢ marked, without ܐܠܗܝܢ reads Gr. M with A, K, M, N, Old Syr., Pesh.); 23:54 (V268: ܐܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ, there are no variants without ܐܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ; C25 [=V267]: ܐܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ = ܐܠܗܝܢ Gr. P75, B, K, C\*, Old Syr., Pesh., without ܐܠܗܝܢ Gr. M with A, C<sup>c</sup>, K, M, W).

<sup>98</sup> Luke 3:8 (ܐܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ); 5:25 (ܐܠܗܝܢ ܐܝܢܝܢ = V267).

which are poorly visible in MS V268 due to its damage can now be further confirmed.

2. A comparison with Juckel's results (see 3.2.2. and 3.2.3.) proved that MS C25 was less subjected to the ongoing "Byzantinization" than the other manuscripts examined by him. The detailed study of divergences between MSS V268 and C25 has revealed that the process of the "Byzantinization" of the Harklean version was not a unilateral process, but rather a complex and multidimensional transformation. MS C25 shows transformations not only in the direction of a further "Byzantinization" of the Harklean text, but also in the opposite direction, which might have been an attempt to clear this translation of the Byzantine elements and return to better and older traditions. Sometimes older Syriac renderings are once more employed. This paper has shown that there are no really overwhelming patterns among these textual choices. Moreover, several readings which belong to the Majority Text are attested by the ancient tradition as well. Care is needed when using these cases as an argument for the process of the "Byzantinization" of the Harklean text. The later revisers might have used different sources which still preserved these ancient readings.

3. For these reasons, any description of the nature of these developments among the Harklean manuscripts must avoid broad generalizations and judgments on the intention and the workflow of the copyists (or revisers), as these processes are extremely difficult to trace. Moreover, the wide variety of readings of diverse origins, attested in the long history of the Harklean version and witnessed here by the lemma and margin of MS C25, may point not only to a deliberate process of revisions but also to signs of confusion in the succeeding stages of the tradition. Perhaps later scribes tried to show more variants that were available to them in the Harklean (and eventual Greek?) manuscripts and inserted them, sometimes

into the margin, sometimes into the text. Numerous readings presented in this paper deserve a full treatment on their own.

4. The Harklean version during its transmission history was subject to more revisions. The most important was probably connected with the person of Dionysios bar Salibi (d. 1171). However, we do not know in what actually consisted his reworking of the Harklean version. Was it a real and proper revision or only an accommodation of some readings? More research is needed in order to reach final conclusions in this matter. However, with the inclusion of MS C25, we can trace now more sub-stages of this particular moment of the Harklean tradition. Several marginal readings appeared first in MS C25's margin, and only later were inserted into the lemma of MSS NC334 and BL17124 (and less frequently NC333, only rarely in BF362). Should this particular moment be called the "pre-history" of the "Dionysios-stage" or is MS C25 rather its best and undistorted witness? On the one hand, the MS C25 lemma and margin already reflect clear signs of the revision. Although MS C25 is close to MSS NC334 and BL17124, it is however much more consistent in its textual choices than the two others. On the other hand, MS C25 lacks some features considered to be particular hallmarks of Dionysios's revision: MS C25 does not omit the Greek marginalia nor most of the *asteriskoi* and *obeloi* (as MSS NC334 and BL17124 do) and lacks the *Pericope Adulterae* in the Gospel of John (7:53–8:11). Also, a closer study of some readings reveals that MSS BF362, NC334 and BL17124 are secondary to MS C25 (for example, an Old Syriac variant ܐܡܢ in Luke 11:4 probably first appeared in the margin of MS C25, and later it was inserted into the lemma of BF362 and NC334). If these features really belonged to the "Dionysios-stage", Juckel's intuition has been confirmed: MS C25 belongs to a "pre-history" of the Harklean version. But if these features are actually a further development of the Harklean tradition, maybe MS C25 is really the best witness to the "Dionysios-

stage.” If the second is true, the dating of MS C25 must be postponed even to the twelfth century. In order to solve this question in a satisfactory way still more research is needed.

5. Also other late Harklean manuscripts may now be better understood. MS BF362 appears as a close but not an exact copy of MS C25. Its script is very similar (but in two columns), as is the content of its lemma and margin. Sometimes, however, MS BF362 switches the lemma and the margin or takes particular choices, for example, the inclusion of the *Pericope Adulterae* (John 7:53–8:11). Yet another revision of the Harklean version is reflected in the state of the text preserved in MS NC333. Its relationship to the early stage of MS V268 is now further confirmed. However, MS NC333 depended also in some way on the tradition preserved in MS C25. In MS NC333 the lemma is sometimes reverted to MS V268 and the “new” lemma of “Dionysios-stage” is moved to the margin, numerous “new” *asteriskoi* of MS C25 appear in MS NC333 as well, but proper names in MS NC333 present already highly Graecized spellings. All of this shows that MS NC333 is probably the fruit of a “correction” in the direction of MS V268, which the “Dionysios-stage” text underwent later.

6. All of this proves, once again, that further studies on the Harklean text of the Gospels are needed. The production of critical editions of the Harklean version appears as a primary necessity. Their publication will make possible a careful analysis of particular cases, and then wider research on the nature of this translation and of the particular manuscripts. Perhaps future editions of the Greek New Testament should also include the variety of Harklean readings that further confirm the lemma or indicate new Greek variants.

## 6. CONCLUSION

The panorama of the transmission history of the Harklean version is very complex. The research of Andreas Juckel over the

years has shown the precedence of the V268 manuscript for profitable studies of the Harklean text. Samer Yohanna's edition of the Harklean version of Mark using MS C25 of Alqosh as the base text has given this manuscript a wider scholarly audience so that future studies can access this important witness to the Harklean text. While, in general, MS C25 does not offer a better text than MS V268, this paper shows that its inclusion among the Harklean witnesses may be useful in tracing the particular development of this version. MS C25 stands at the dawn of the late revision of the Harklean version and, as such, allows for a better explanation of the formation of that revision and its connections with the previous stages of the tradition.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aland, B. and Juckel, A. *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung I. Die grossen Katholischen Briefe*. ANTF 7. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1986.
- Aland, B. and Juckel, A. *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung II. Die Paulinischen Briefe. Teil 2. 2 Korintherbrief, Galaterbrief, Epheserbrief, Philipperbrief und Kolosserbrief*. ANTF 23. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995 II.
- *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung II. Die Paulinischen Briefe. Teil 1. Römer- und 1. Korintherbrief*. ANTF 14. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991 I.
- *Das Neue Testament in syrischer Überlieferung II. Die Paulinischen Briefe. Teil 3. 1./2. Thessalonicherbrief, 1./2. Timotheusbrief, Titusbrief, Philemonbrief und Hebräerbrief*. ANTF 32. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002 III.

Hill, P. A. L. *The Harklean Version of St. Luke 1–11. A Critical Edition and Introduction*. University of Melbourne: unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, 2002.

——— “Review of Samer Soreshow Yohanna, The Gospel of Mark in the Syriac Harklean Version: An Edition Based upon the Earliest Witnesses.” In *Review of Biblical Literature*. <http://www.bookreviews.org> (accessed: 01/08/2020).

Juckel, A. “Die Bedeutung des Ms. Vat. Syr. 268 für die Evangelien-Überlieferung der Harklensis.” *Oriens Christianus* 83 (1999): 22–45.

——— “Ḥarqlean Version.” In *GEDSH: Electronic Edition*. <https://gedsh.bethmardutho.org/Harqlean-Version> (accessed: 01/08/2020).

——— “Introduction to the Harklean Text.” In *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels. Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshîttâ and Ḥarklean Versions*, ed. G. A. Kiraz. Leiden: Brill, 1996 I, xxxi–li.

——— “La version harqléenne du Nouveau Testament: forme, intention, tradition.” In *Le Nouveau Testament en syriaque*, ed. J.-C. Haelewyck. Études syriaques 14; Paris: Geuthner, 2017, 149–180.

——— “Zur Revisionsgeschichte der Harklensis.” In *Bericht der Hermann Kunst-Stiftung zur Förderung der Neutestamentlichen Textforschung für die Jahre 1992 bis 1994*. Münster – Westfalen: 1995, 50–68.

——— “Ms Vat. Syr. 268 and the Revisional Development of the Harklean Margin.” *Hugoye* 11:1 (1998): 19–33.

——— “Review of: Samer S. Yohanna, The Gospel of Mark in the Syriac Harklean Version. An Edition Based upon the Earliest Witnesses.” *Hugoye* 21:1 (2018): 205–217.



- Kiraz, G. A. *Comparative Edition of the Syriac Gospels. Aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshîttâ and Harklean Versions. Volume Three. Luke*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 1996.
- Scher, A. "Notice sur les Manuscrits Syriaques Conservés dans la Bibliothèque du Couvent des Chaldéens de Notre Dame des Semences." *JA* Tome VII/Dixième Série (1906): 479–512.
- Swanson, R. J. *New Testament Greek Manuscripts. Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus. Luke*. Sheffield – Pasadena, CA: Tyndale House, 1995.
- Thomas, J. D. "A List of Manuscripts Containing the Harklean Syriac Version of the New Testament." *ThRev* II/2 (1979): 26–32.
- Van Rompay, L. "Review of: Samer Soreshow YOHANNA, The Gospel of Mark in the Syriac Harklean Version. An Edition Based upon the Earliest Witnesses." *Orientalia* 88/3 (2019): 330–332.
- Von Tischendorf, C. *Novum Testamentum Graece. Ad antiquissimos testes denuo recensuit apparatus criticum omni studio perfectum apposuit commentationem Isagogicam. Editio Octava Critica Maior*. Lipsia: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869.
- Vööbus, A. *Early Versions of the New Testament. Manuscript Studies*. PETSE 6. Stockholm: Estonian Theological Society in Exile, 1954.
- Wachtel, K. *Der Byzantinische Text der Katholischen Briefe. Eine Untersuchung zur Entstehung der Koine des Neuen Testaments. Arbeiten zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung* 24. Berlin – New York: de Gruyter, 1995.
- Wachtel, K. "Notes on the Text of the Acts of the Apostles." In *Novum Testamentum Graecum. Editio Critica Maior. III: Acts*

*of the Apostles*. Part 1.1. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017, 28–33.

Yohanna, S. S. *The Gospel of Mark in the Syriac Harklean Version. An Edition Based upon the Earliest Witnesses*. BibOr 52. Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2015.